Paul Schuster Taylor

CALIFORNIA SOCIAL SCIENTIST

Volume II: California Water and Agricultural Labor

An Interview Conducted by
Malca Chall

Copy No. ___

© 1975 by The Regents of the University of California
EARL WARREN ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

Principal Investigators

Lawrence A. Harper
Ira M. Heyman
Arthur H. Sherry

Advisory Council

Barbara Nachtrieb Armstrong*
Walton E. Bean*
Richard M. Buxbaum
William R. Dennes
Joseph P. Harris
James D. Hart
John D. Hicks*
William J. Hill
Robert Kenny*
Adrian A. Kragen
Thomas Kuchel
Eugene C. Lee
Mary Ellen Leary

James R. Leiby
Helen McGregor*
Dean E. McHenry
Sheldon H. Messinger
Frank C. Newman
Allan Nevins*
Warren Olney III*
Bruce Poyer
Sho Sato
Mortimer Schwartz
Merrell F. Small
John D. Weaver

Project Interviewers

Miriam Feingold
Amelia R. Fry
Joyce A. Henderson
Rosemary Levenson
Gabrielle Morris

Special Interviewers

Orville Armstrong
Willa K. Baum
Malca Chall
June Hogan
Frank Jones
Alice G. King
Elizabeth Kirby
Harriet Nathan
Suzanne Riess
Ruth Teiser

*Deceased during the term of the project.
EARL WARREN ORAL HISTORY PROJECT  
(California, 1926-1953)

Single Interview Volumes


Johnson, Gardiner. In process.


Shell, Joseph. In process.


Sweigert, William, *Democrat, Friend, and Advisor to Earl Warren.* In process.


Multi-Interview Volumes

*PERPECTIVES ON THE ALAMEDA COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,* with an introduction by Arthur H. Sherry. Three volumes.
    Balaban, Edith, *Reminiscences about Nathan Harry Miller, Deputy District Attorney, Alameda County.*
    Hamlin, Judge Oliver D., *Reminiscences about the Alameda County District Attorney's Office in the 1920s and 30s.*
    Shaw, Mary, *Perspectives of a Newspaperwoman.*

Volume II (Continued)
Heinrichs, Beverly, Reminiscences of a Secretary in the District Attorney's Office.
Severin, Clarence E., Chief Clerk in the Alameda County District Attorney's Office
Spence, Homer R., Attorney, Legislator, and Judge.
Daly, E. A., Alameda County Political Leader and Journalist.
Bruce, John, A Reporter Remembers Earl Warren.

Coakley, J. Frank, A Career in the Alameda County District Attorney's Office.
Hederman, Albert E., Jr., From Office Boy to Assistant District Attorney.
Jensen, Lowell, Reflections of the Alameda County District Attorney.
Oakley, James H., Early Life of a Warren Assistant.

EARL WARREN'S BAKERSFIELD. 1971, 185 p.
Ashe, Maryann, and Ruth Smith Henley, Earl Warren's Bakersfield.
Cavins, Omar, Coming of Age in Bakersfield.
Vaughan, Francis, School Days in Bakersfield.
Kreiser, Ralph, A Reporter Recollects the Warren Case.

Rodda, Richard, From the Capitol Press Room.
Phillips, Herbert L., Perspective of a Political Reporter.

EARL WARREN'S CAMPAIGNS. Three Volumes.
Barnes, Stanley N., Experiences in Grass Roots Organization.
Cunningham, Thomas J., Southern California Campaign Chairman for Earl Warren, 1946.
Draper, Murray, Warren's 1946 Campaign in Northern California.
Mailliard, William S., Earl Warren in the Governor's Office.
Mull, Archibald M., Jr., Warren Fund-Raiser; Bar Association Leader.
McNitt, Rollin Lee, A Democrat for Warren.

Knowland, William F., California Republican Politics in the 1930s.
Feigenbaum, B. Joseph, Legislator, Partner of Jesse Steinhart, Aide to Earl Warren.
Ladar, Samuel, Jesse Steinhart, Race Relations, and Earl Warren.
Steinhart, John, Jesse and Amy Steinhart.
Hansen, Victor, West Coast Defense During World War II; The California Gubernatorial Campaign of 1950.

Clifton, Florence, California Democrats, 1934-1950.
Clifton, Robert, The Democratic Party, Culbert L. Olson, and the Legislature.
Kent, Roger, A Democratic Leader Looks at the Warren Era.
Outland, George, James Roosevelt's Primary Campaign, 1950.
Post, Langdon, James Roosevelt's Northern California Campaign, 1950.
Roosevelt, James, Campaigning for Governor Against Earl Warren, 1950.

Warren, Earl, Jr., California Politics.
Warren, James, Recollections of the Eldest Warren Son.
Warren, Nina (Honeybear)(Mrs. Stuart Brien), Growing Up in the Warren Family.

EARL WARREN: FELLOW CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. 1979, 244 p.
Brown, Edmund G., Sr., The Governor's Lawyer.
Kenney, Robert, Attorney General for California and the 1946 Gubernatorial Campaign.
Kuchel, Thomas H., California State Controller.

Links, Fred, An Overview of the Department of Finance.
Groff, Ellis, Some Details of Public Revenue and Expenditure in the 1940s.
Killion, George, Observations on Culbert Olson, Earl Warren, and Money Matters in Public Affairs.
Post, A. Alan, Watchdog on State Spending.
Leake, Paul, Statement on the Board of Equalization.

Albright, Horace, Earl Warren Job Hunting at the Legislature.
Stone, Irving and Jean, Earl Warren's Friend and Biographer.
Henderson, Betty Foot, Secretary to Two Warrens.
Swig, Benjamin H., Shared Social Concerns.

Lee, Russel VanArsdale, M.D., Pioneering in Prepaid Group Medicine.
Salsman, Byrl R., Shepherding Health Insurance Bills Through the California Legislature.
Claycombe, Gordon, The Making of a Legislative Committee Study.
Cline, John W., M.D., California Medical Association Crusade Against Compulsory State Health Insurance.

HUNTING AND FISHING WITH EARL WARREN. 1976, 186 p.
Lynn, Wallace, Hunting and Baseball Companion.
THE JAPANESE-AMERICAN RELOCATION REVIEWED, with an introduction by Mike M. Masaoka. Two Volumes.

- Rowe, James, The Japanese Evacuation Decision.
- Clark, Tom, Comments on the Japanese-American Relocation.
- Wenig, Herbert, The California Attorney General's Office, the Judge Advocate General Corps, and Japanese-American Relocation.

- Cozzens, Robert, Assistant National Director of the War Relocation Authority.
- Myer, Dillon S., War Relocation Authority: The Director's Account.
- Kingman, Ruth W., The Fair Play Committee and Citizen Participation.
- Hibi, Hisako, painting of Tanforan and Topaz camps.

- Brownell, Herbert, Earl Warren's Appointment to the Supreme Court.
- Finkelstein, Louis, Earl Warren's Inquiry into Talmudic Law.
- Hagerty, James, Campaigns Revisited: Earl Warren, Thomas Dewey, and Dwight Eisenhower.
- Oliver, William, Inside the Warren Court, 1953-1954.
- Stassen, Harold, Eisenhower, the 1952 Republican Convention, and Earl Warren.

- Bulcke, Germain, A Longshoreman's Observations.
- Chaudet, Joseph W., A Printer's View.
- Simonds, U. S., A Carpenter's Comments.
- Vernon, Ernest H., A Machinist's Recollection.

- Ash, Robert S., Alameda County Labor Council During the Warren Years.

- Tallman, Frank F., M.D., Dynamics of Change in State Mental Institutions.
- Hume, Portia Bell, M.D., Mother of Community Mental Health Services.

RICHARD M. NIXON IN THE WARREN ERA. 1980.
Scoggins, Verne, Observations on California Affairs by Governor Earl Warren's Press Secretary.
Vasey, Beach, Governor Warren and the Legislature.

Merrill, Malcolm E., M.D., M.P.H., A Director Reminisces.
Stead, Frank M., Environmental Pollution Control.
Ongerth, Henry, Recollections of the Bureau of Sanitary Engineering.
Zimmerman, Kent A., M.D., Mental Health Concepts.
Arnstein, Lawrence, Public Health Advocates and Issues.

Ramsay, Ernest G., Reminiscences of a Defendant in the Shipboard Murder Case.
Grossman, Aubrey, A Defense Attorney Assesses the King, Ramsay, Conner Case.
Harris, Myron, A Defense Attorney Reminisces.
Resner, Herbert, The Recollections of the Attorney for Frank Conner.
Odeen, Peter, Captain of the Point Lobos.

Drury, Newton, A Conservative Comments on Earl Warren and Harold Ickes.
Schottland, Charles I., State Director of Social Welfare, 1950-54.

Hale, Mildred, Schools, the PTA, and the State Board of Education.
Kerr, Clark, University of California Crises: Loyalty Oath and the Free Speech Movement.
Kragen, Adrian, State and Industry Interests in Taxation, and Observations of Earl Warren.
McConnell, Geraldine, Governor Warren, the Knowlands, and Columbia State Park.
McWilliams, Carey, California's Olson-Warren Era: Migrants and Social Welfare.
Siems, Edward H., Recollections of Masonic Brother Earl Warren.

Holton, Karl, Development of Juvenile Correctional Practices.
Scudder, Kenyon J., Beginnings of Therapeutic Correctional Facilities.
Stark, Heman G., Juvenile Correctional Services and the Community.
Beam, Kenneth S., Clergyman and Community Coordinator.
All uses of this manuscript are covered by a legal agreement between the Regents of the University of California and Paul Schuster Taylor, dated 25 June 1975. The manuscript is thereby made available for research purposes. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publish, are reserved to The Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the Director of The Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to the Regional Oral History Office, 486 Library, and should include identification of the specific passages to be quoted, anticipated use of the passages, and identification of the user. The legal agreement with Paul Schuster Taylor requires that he be notified of the request and allowed thirty days in which to respond.
TABLE OF CONTENTS -- Paul S. Taylor, Volumes II and III

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

INTRODUCTION by Paul W. Gates

INTRODUCTION by George M. Foster

INTERVIEW HISTORY by Malca Chall

BRIEF BIOGRAPHY of Paul S. Taylor

VOLUME II

(Interviewer - Malca Chall)

PART I AGRICULTURAL LABOR

I LABOR STRIFE IN THE FIELDS

Cotton Strikes in the San Joaquin Valley - 1933

Cotton Strikes in the Imperial Valley - 1934

The Lubin Society

Labor Leaders

The Associated Farmers - 1934

II STUDYING THE BACKGROUND OF RURAL POVERTY: THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Field Director, Rural Rehabilitation Division of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (Resettlement Administration) 1935-1936

Migrant Labor Camps

Cooperative Farming

California Conference on Housing of Migratory Agricultural Laborers
TABLE OF CONTENTS -- Paul S. Taylor, Volumes II and III

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

INTRODUCTION by Paul W. Gates

INTRODUCTION by George M. Foster

INTERVIEW HISTORY by Malca Chall

BRIEF BIOGRAPHY of Paul S. Taylor

VOLUME II

(Interviewer - Malca Chall)

PART I  AGRICULTURAL LABOR

I  LABOR STRIFE IN THE FIELDS

Cotton Strikes in the San Joaquin Valley - 1933

Cotton Strikes in the Imperial Valley - 1934

The Lubin Society

Labor Leaders

The Associated Farmers - 1934

II  STUDYING THE BACKGROUND OF RURAL POVERTY: THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Field Director, Rural Rehabilitation Division of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (Resettlement Administration) 1935-1936

Migrant Labor Camps

Cooperative Farming

California Conference on Housing of Migratory Agricultural Laborers
Consultant to the Social Security Board - 1936-1941

Reasons for Exempting Agricultural Labor
Change of Emphasis with the Impending War
The Commonwealth Club

Testifying Before Congressional Committees

The LaFollette Committee - 1938-1939
Senate Committee to Investigate Unemployment and Relief - 1938
Temporary National Economic Committee - 1940
Select Committee to Investigate Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens - 1940

Problems Raised by Agricultural Technology
Philosophy of Agricultural Fundamentalism

Congressional and Administration Support and Opposition to Agricultural Labor Reform

III STUDYING THE BACKGROUND OF RURAL POVERTY: THE STATE GOVERNMENT

Advisory Council on Employment - 1938-1942
Governor's Commission on Reemployment - 1939
Reflections on Some Plans, Ideas, and Politicians of the Thirties and Forties

IV THE SHIFT IN MEXICAN IMMIGRATION POLICY DURING WORLD WAR II

Evacuation of the Japanese - 1942-1945

Pacific Coast Committee on American Principles and Fair Play
Resolution of the Board of Agriculture

Return of Mexican Labor to the Fields

Developing an Expertise on Mexican-American Immigration - 1927-1932

Method Used in Field Work
Publishing the Results
Tracing the History of Mexican-American Immigration and its Relationship to Agriculture 113
Downey Committee Hearings - 1942 119
Institute on Migratory Labor Problems - 1945 122
Committees on Migratory Labor - 1950 123

The Warren Committee (State) 123
The Truman Committee (Federal) 125

Studies on Population 129

V THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA TO AGRICULTURE 131

Membership on the State Board of Agriculture - 1940-1944 131
Agricultural Extension Service 133
Giannini Foundation 135
Department of Economics 138
Studying Land-Use Issues 139

PART II WATER AND LAND: THE 160-ACRE ISSUE 143

VI FEDERAL STUDIES ON THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, 1942-1944 143
Paul Taylor Begins a Thirty-year Interest in Acreage Limitation 143
Walter Packard's Report on the Central Valley Project 145
The Bureau of Agricultural Economics: Central Valley Project Studies 147
Problem 19: Acreage Limitation in the Central Valley 149
The Arvin-Dinuba Study 158
Problems Posed by Publication 160
Carl Taylor and the Field of Rural Sociology 163
Handling Controversial Subject Matter 165
The Eisenhower Administration

The Lump Sum and Payout Questions 235
Political Pressure 243
W.A. Dexheimer Replaces Michael Straus 250

The Continuing Vitality of the Acreage Limitation Issue 252

INDEX to Volumes II and III

PART II WATER AND LAND: THE 160-ACRE ISSUE (continued)


Additional Congressional Efforts to Raise the Limitation Figure 256

The Engle Formula: HR 5881 259

Some Congressional Responses 266

Federal-State Partnership 269

The San Luis Project 269

Congressional Allies 273

Senate Hearings on Enforcement - 1964, 1966 278

The Administration and Enforcement - 1960-1972 286

Reactions of Landowners 289

Recommendations of the Reagan Task Force Commission 301

Paul Taylor Writes on Land and Water Issues 306

Law Journals 306

Bay Guardian 312

American West 312

Agricultural Labor 314

X FEDERAL WATER ISSUES IN 1972 319

Water Grants for Education: HR 5236 319

Paul Taylor's Role in Drafting the Bill 320

Effect of the Legislation on Agriculture 323

Review of Water Cases in the Courts 328

Imperial Valley, Tulare Lake Basin 328

State Water Project 332

Television Surveys the Issue 333

Earlier Court Cases 337

Some Favorable Administration Decisions 338
VII CONGRESS AND THE 160-ACRE LIMITATION LAW, 1944-1950

The Elliott Rider: HR 3961 - 1944

In the House of Representatives
168

In the Senate
168

Senator Sheridan Downey: Committee Hearings
170

Bureau of Reclamation: Different Opinions
172

Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation
179

and the Excess Acreage Law
182

Kings River Litigation - 1971
184

Imperial Valley Litigation - 1971
185

The Electric Power Issue
191

The Downey Bill: SB 912 - 1947
192

Debating the 160-Acre Issue
195

House Subcommittee on Irrigation of Public Lands - 1947
199

The Grange
200

Straus-Boke Rider - 1947-1950
203

The Truman Campaign - 1948
211

Helen Gahagan Douglas: Campaign for the Senate - 1950
213

State Politics and the Reclamation Issue
216

The Press and the Reclamation Issue - 1944-1950
220

Combining Duties as Professor and Consultant
224


The Truman Administration
227

The Water Resources Policy Commission - 1950
227

The Hoover Commission - 1947
230

Michael Straus-Felix Cohen Correspondence - 1947
232

California Water Conference - 1945

Governor Earl Warren

Edmund Brown as Attorney General

The State Water Project - 1950-1960

Origins of the Project
Working for Acceptance within the California Democratic Council
Edmund Brown as Governor
Tactics for Success of the State Water Project Election

The Bee Chain
Differing Views of the Project

The State Legislature and Acreage Limitation - 1961-1972

Water Grants for Education
Contrasting State and Federal Committee Hearing Procedures

Analysing Current Arguments

The Criterion: Unit Pricing or a Democratic Society

PART III COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - 1952-1972

XII COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF AMERICAN FOREIGN AID

Defining Community Development

AID and the Agriculture Bureaucracy

Culture as a Factor
The Effects of the Green Revolution

Examining Differing Ideas in the Bureaucracy Toward Community Development

The State Department
The Military
A Frustrating Experience with Bureaucracy
The Peace Corps

Preparation for Trips Abroad

Haiti - 1952

India and Pakistan - 1955, 1958

Vietnam - 1958, 1967

Response of Tenants to Land Reform
Land Reform - 1967
Publishing the Report

The Philippines - 1955, 1958

Korea - 1958

Japan - 1958

Indonesia - 1955, 1958

University of California Program in Economics

Touring the Soviet Union - 1958

Touring Germany and France - 1958

Cuba - 1959

Ecuador and Venezuela - 1960

UN-FAO Jurisdictional Concerns
Experiences at the Grass Roots Level

Jamaica and Colombia - 1961

Mexico - 1961

Egypt - 1962-1963

Teaching at the University of Alexandria
Conference on Community Development
Understanding Egyptian History and Culture

Field Work
Hostility Against Israel
Closing the Culture Gap
Housekeeping

Touring: Beirut, Damascus, Baghdad
Acknowledgements

The three-volume memoir of Paul Schuster Taylor was produced within the scope of two of the Regional Oral History Office's interview series--The Earl Warren Years in California, and the Biographical series. Started as an interview in the Earl Warren series, it soon became evident that Paul Taylor's significance extended far beyond both the Warren Years (1925-1953) and the geographic boundaries of California, and that to truncate his memoir to conform to the Warren series guidelines would be a disservice to research. The problem was presented to Professor Clark Kerr, former graduate student and then colleague of Professor Taylor, who offered to take responsibility for raising funds to enable the Regional Oral History Office to produce a full-length memoir with Professor Taylor. Our special thanks go to Dr. Kerr and Mrs. Kerr for their successful carrying out of this task.

In behalf of future researchers, the Office wishes to thank the National Endowment for the Humanities which underwrote the Earl Warren series, The Friends of The Bancroft Library who matched funds for the Earl Warren series and acted as treasurer for the Paul Taylor project, and Professor Taylor's many friends and colleagues whose contributions made possible the completion of the memoir and whose names are listed on the following page.

Suzanne Riess, Interviewer
Malca Chall, Interviewer
Willa Baum, Department Head
Regional Oral History Office

24 July 1973
DONORS TO PAUL S. TAYLOR ORAL HISTORY PROJECT
(Names as listed on the checks)

Mrs. Lucy W. Adams
Senator and Mrs. Clinton P. Anderson
Mr. Peter Barnes
Professor and Mrs. Walton Bean
Mr. and Mrs. Roger J. Blobaum
Professor and Mrs. Herbert Blumer
Mr. Arthur Brunwasser
Mr. Berge Bulbulian
Mr. Shirley Burden
California Labor Federation AFL-CIO
Mr. Winslow Carlton
Mr. Orin Cassmore
Professor Mary M. Clawson
Professor and Mrs. Arthur F. Corwin
Professor Ira B. Cross
Professors Judith and Kingsley Davis
Professor and Mrs. Paul A. Dodd
Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas
Senator Paul H. Douglas
Mrs. Faith B. Drobish
Justice Abe Fortas
Professor George M. Foster, Jr.
Professor Varden Fuller
Christina B. Gardner
Mr. and Mrs. William Gilmartin
Representative [U.N.] and Mrs. Arthur E. Goldschmidt
Mr. Karl Goldschmidt
Professor Walter Goldschmidt
Professor Robert A. and Margaret Gordon
Mr. and Mrs. Herman Grabow
Professor and Mrs. Ewald Grether
Professor and Mrs. Roger Heyns
Mr. and Mrs. Walter Hoadley, Jr.
Professor Emily Huntington
Professor and Mrs. Clark Kerr
Mr. and Mrs. Harry Kingman
Professor and Mrs. Albert Lepawsky
Professor and Mrs. Jack London
Professor Arthur Maass
Professor and Mrs. Ray Marshall
Mr. Angus H. McDonald
Professor Davis McEntire
Chancellor and Mrs. Dean E. McHenry
Mr. and Mrs. Carey McWilliams
Mr. Gerald H. Meral
Professor and Mrs. J.D. Mezirow
Professor and Mrs. Edgar L. Morphet
Mrs. Walter E. Packard
Professor and Mrs. James Shideler
Mr. and Mrs. Charles Smith
Senator Adlai E. Stevenson III
Mrs. Marilyn K. Stout
Councilman John Sutter
Mr. and Mrs. David Tatsuno
Mr. Thomas K. Vasey
Mr. and Mrs. Donald Vial
Congressman Jerome R. Waldie
Mr. David Weiman
Professor Harry R. Wellman
Mr. Ralph Wertheimer
Mr. and Mrs. Samuel E. Wood
Professor William W. Wurster
Mr. and Mrs. Hubert Wyckoff
Ben Yellen, M.D.
Mr. and Mrs. Martin J. Zonlign
INTRODUCTION by Paul W. Gates

I have known Paul Taylor through an irregular correspondence and a number of exciting meetings with him during the last twenty-four years, in which he had needled me to be more active in urging colleagues, associates and members of Congress to take a stand in behalf of the enforcement of the excess lands provision of the reclamation laws of the United States and alerted me to the corrupting influence of the utility, banking, real estate and water interests in California. But more, I have come to know the depth of his humanitarian feelings, his concern for the health of minorities and the underprivileged.

The classic treatment of the devastating effects on workers in the southern cotton fields of the great depression of the thirties that led to the swift elimination of sharecroppers and their desperate search for homes and jobs was presented in pictures and simple prose by Dorothea Lange and Paul Taylor in 1939 in An American Exodus. A Record of Human Erosion in the Thirties. Rarely have photographs and simple words so admirably documented a tragic story. It was the culmination of work he had done on migratory labor and problems relating to minority groups that had been published between 1928-1934. His Mexican Labor in the United States, which has been called by a recent authority "an invaluable storehouse of information on ... Mexican migrant labor," and his An American Frontier: Nueces County, Texas that led to his being called upon for surveys and studies by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, the Social Security Board, the famous La Follette committee investigating Violations of Free Speech and Rights of Labor, the latter with special reference to California, and by the equally well known and much quoted Temporary National Economic Committee Investigation of Concentration of Economic Power.

Paul Taylor's ability to get to the heart of a question, to marshal the facts, and to draw conclusions clearly based on the most careful and detailed examination made him a most valuable public servant, very different from the conventional picture of the scholar removed from public issues and isolated in his ivory tower. The extent of his investigations is truly amazing. They carried him to Cuba, Haiti, India, Pakistan, Vietnam, the Philippines, Korea, Japan, Indonesia, Egypt, Iran, Mexico, Ecuador, Venezuela, Panama, Jamaica and Colombia, where he surveyed the impact of land, water and population problems on peoples of these developing countries. Not only was he rendering valuable services to these countries but he must have been enriching his teaching by sharing with his students at Berkeley many of his experiences.
Paul Taylor's testimony frequently given before congressional committees and his many contacts with people in related fields of endeavor made him a well-known and highly respected scholar and one not at all hesitant to advance his views even though they might not be favorably regarded by powerful interests in California. The tenacity with which he pursued his independent course, the courage he displayed, and the fervor of his convictions have been constantly demonstrated and deeply admired.

Along the way Paul Taylor became deeply disturbed by the efforts of large land and water owners in California, as well as in other western states, to prevent the enforcement of the 160-acre excess land limitation in the Federal reclamation laws. Where farmers' organizations like the Grange had stood strongly for the single family farm, owner operated, and had believed with Liberty Hyde Bailey that agriculture was a way of life, some, like the American Farm Bureau, stressed only the business aspects of farming. In California the Farm Bureau was to line up with the reactionary forces fighting the battle of the great landowners against those favoring improvement in the lot of migratory workers. More immediately, they opposed the implementation of the excess lands provision and sought in every possible way to assure Federally provided water of the Central Valley Project should be available to owners of thousands of acres of rich land; thus giving them a rich gratuity at government expense and making a mockery of the principal purpose for which the Reclamation Act of 1902 had been adopted, the creation of small family farms. With business interests--land, utility, banking and transportation--lined up with the Farm Bureau and with leaders of both major parties abjectly following or afraid to give public support to the enforcement of the excess lands provision, there seemed at times little possibility of the advocates of the family farm making government obey the law. But Paul Taylor was not one to take this nullification of Federal law for the benefit of a small group of great landowners and corporations.

In 1949 his "Central Valley Project: Water and Land" was published in The Western Political Quarterly, in which he reviewed the history of irrigation in California and the West, showed how the Army Engineers had horned in on federal irrigation development in California to the advantage of large land owners and described other efforts in Congress to break down the fundamental objective of the reclamation legislation. He followed this up with a second article in the same journal in 1950, in which he showed the various ways administrators within the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation were permitting the breakdown of enforcement of the excess lands provision. Then followed closely reasoned articles primarily in western law journals with meaningful titles that illustrate well the struggle he and others working with and through him were carrying on in behalf of the enforcement of the law:
These essays reveal a penetrating insight into complex legal and engineering problems and clearly show how powerful economic interests have succeeded in subverting and to a very considerable degree setting aside a carefully drafted policy that is still prescribed in the statute books. As an example of how well Paul Taylor succeeded in setting forth his analysis, the United States Supreme Court cited "Excess Land Law: Execution of a Public Policy" in its landmark 8-0 decision upholding the validity of the 160-acre limitation law (Ivanhoe vs McCracken, 1958).

Meantime, Paul Taylor was working with representatives of organizations that believed that farming is something more than inputs and production: the Grange, the AFL-CIO, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Catholic Rural Life Conference. These and other church groups tried to exert pressure on Congress, on the state legislature and on the news media in behalf of the enforcement of the excess lands provision. Time after time Paul Taylor marshaled support before Senate and House Committees and himself testified in detail about the breakdown of enforcement. His trenchant writings and his testimony laid bare the illegalities that had been permitted, but by the sixties he was fighting an enormously powerful combination of economic interests who were benefiting from the "Calculated Circumvention."

It is still too early to judge how far these economic interests may carry their circumvention of the law and how effective the delaying and preventive actions resulting from Paul Taylor's work have been. He has set an example for scholars to have the courage of their convictions, to delve deeply into major social and economic questions of their times, to present the facts, no matter how unpopular this may make them with self serving politicians who play the game of greedy economic interests attempting to monopolize natural resources made valuable and available at public expense.

Paul W. Gates
Professor of History

4 October 1973
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York
I came to know Paul Taylor well during the summer of 1955 when he, Professor Harold S. Adams of Indiana University Medical School, and I were sent as a team by Louis Miniclier of the International Cooperation Administration (now A.I.D.) to evaluate the American contribution to community development programs in India, Pakistan, and the Philippines. This was a memorable experience for the three of us. We learned about rural problems in countries we had not previously known, and learned about each other. For ten weeks we shared the common experience of travelling together, often in great heat, in dust, of visiting villages, and speaking with community development administrators, planners, village level workers, and villagers themselves. I had, of course, known something of Paul's reputation as an economist, as a rural sociologist, as a great fighter for the rights of the little fellow. These characteristics were abundantly displayed in the course of our travels. His affection for the lowly, his disdain for rigid bureaucracy, for pomposity, were apparent for anyone to see.

But what particularly impressed me was his skill in gathering data. He conveyed to every informant his pleasure at being with that person, and his appreciation for the time they were giving him. Then, in a disarming, almost casual way he would begin a line of questioning, working little by little toward the major answers he hoped to get—and which almost invariably he did get. Sometimes I sensed that he disliked or distrusted an official. It was interesting to see him lead such an informant down the road, so to speak, to his destruction. Paul would, with seeming naiveté, draw him into a corner, and then with a single, rapier-like final question, demolish the official picture being advanced, which the informant had believed he was conveying. For the common man, for the honest person, for the ones lacking sham, Paul had unbounded empathy, and he could forgive almost any personal shortcomings. For the pompous, the stuffy, for those that exploited their position, he had unmitigated scorn, and he delighted in letting them know, at the last minute, that they had tipped their hand, that he saw through them.

Paul, through all of his adult life, had trained himself to determine significant data, and to obtain these data. These skills seem to apply to any body of data. Probably few of his friends know a little article, "Making cantaros at San Jose Tateposco, Jalisco, Mexico," that appeared in the American Anthropologist in 1933. It is a model of careful ethnographical reporting: tightly written, complete, with all the data an anthropologist working on comparative ceramics could want.
Paul returned from the 1955 trip convinced that, through community organization and community development, the rural peoples of the developing world could play major roles in working out their destinies. He resolved to do as much as possible to help them do so. His first step was to organize an informal faculty seminar to explore the dimensions of community development, and to determine the range of university disciplines with something significant to offer. His enthusiasm was catching, and we were persuaded that, collectively, we had an important role to play. This role took the form of a Faculty Committee on Community Development which, through University Extension, accepted a contract from the Agency for International Development for training foreign community development workers. This seminar, led by full-time specialists such as Lucy Adams and Jack Mezirow, with interested faculty members giving up to twelve hours or more of seminar time, flourished for (as I recall) five years. Through these AID Seminars a number of faculty members maintained their interest in community development and, I know, our intellectual horizons were significantly expanded. But participation in a program of this type is time-consuming (even though we were paid for out time), and it is to Paul to whom credit goes for maintaining our enthusiasm. He worked his magic on his colleagues, as well as his growing numbers of friends, whom he collected around the world, on many subsequent community development consultation tours for AID and the United Nations.

George M. Foster
Professor of Anthropology

7 April 1975
Kroeber Hall
University of California at Berkeley
Paul Taylor has been characterized as "living history" by those whose present concerns for the environment have led them to the questions, and many of the answers which have claimed Dr. Taylor's interest for fifty years. Recently it was written of him, "Rarely does a prophet live long enough for his world to come around full circle and present him with a new generation of adherents whose parents had been nonbelievers. . . . Now nearing 80 Paul Taylor thrives as the apostle of a new movement."*

The phrase "living history" perhaps does succinctly sum up Paul Taylor but it does not adequately explain this unique social scientist. For that we may look to oral history.

When, early in 1970, I was assigned to interview Paul Taylor as part of the Earl Warren Era in California oral history project, I realized that I would need to divide the task in order to get a manageable handle on the research. Suzanne Riess, having become well-acquainted with Dr. Taylor during the years she developed an oral history with his wife, Dorothea Lange, took on a portion of the interview, taping accounts of his education and family background, his academic career at the University of California at Berkeley, as well as the happy experience of thirty years of marriage and work with Dorothea Lange. The Riess-Taylor interview is Volume I of the Paul Taylor oral history project.

Having thus shared the responsibility, I concentrated on documenting Professor Taylor's research, field work, writing, and political activities in matters of agricultural labor and the rural poor, the excess acreage provisions of the National Reclamation Act, and his years of travel and consultation for community development in countries of Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America.

For me, as well as for the many men and women now seeking him out for background and advice, research began with a visit to Paul Taylor in his office in 380 Barrows Hall on the University's Berkeley campus. On the wall outside the door is affixed a brass plaque with his name incised in both English and cursive Sanskrit, a memento of a trip to Iran on a community development project. Once inside this fairly good-sized but work-filled room, one becomes aware of the fact that Professor Taylor has been and still is a highly productive scholar.

The output of yesterday and today (that of Paul Taylor and others with kindred interests) is spread over the desk, is filed in banks of drawers, is on a table beneath the window, is in cardboard cartons on the floor and

*Mary Ellen Leary, "Paul Taylor, the Power of a Tenacious Man," The Nation, October 12, 1974
atop the files, and is housed in an exceptional library of reference books compactly arranged in the floor-to-ceiling shelves along one wall. On the top shelf, in a neat row, are fifty-two tan-colored volumes representing Paul Taylor's "Works"—a chronologically arranged collection of his articles, speeches, reports, and some related memoranda and correspondence. Inside the cover of each volume is a simple table of contents; the key to the entire set is filed for ready reference. The first few volumes were marked with stars, * ** ***, but after it became apparent that others would follow, Roman numerals replaced stars, the latest being LII. Professor Taylor refers to this extraordinary collection as the "bound volumes."

Filling out the crowded space are a manual typewriter on a stand behind the desk, a large Acoma Indian bowl, a potted Christmas cactus on the window sill, a half-dozen gray stone cores from the Friant Dam construction site, a couple of straight-back office chairs, and a cushioned Morris chair for the use of visitors and Professor Taylor's occasional rest periods.

Because of the limitations of his office space and the demands of researchers, Dr. Taylor, for years, has been depositing in The Bancroft Library an historically valuable accumulation of newspaper clippings, reports, and memoranda on farm labor, water, and associated political activity.

As might be expected, research sources came primarily from Professor Taylor's office, but Clark Kerr, in a brief conference, provided personal insight into his longtime friend and colleague, and later gave proof of that close bond when he and Mrs. Kerr took on the task of raising the funds needed to complete this oral history.

Whenever the facts, the implications, the personal and legal relationships in this whole complex subject of land, water, and labor eluded me, I could always rely on Dr. Taylor's unfailingly accurate memory, and his great patience to help make matters clear. He would pull the needed reference from the shelf (even if he had to stand on a chair to get it), locate a folder in the drawer, sort through papers and books on the desk, or refer me to his cartons in The Bancroft Library. Indeed, at every step of the way throughout the five years we have been collaborating on this project, Professor Taylor has given me whatever assistance I required—whether I asked for it, or whether, sensing a hole in my background, he judiciously proffered it.

We began the recording on February 10, 1971, using the second of my two general topical and procedural outlines, Paul Taylor having softly expressed some doubts about the logical arrangement of the first. From February 10 until December 16, 1971, usually between two and five o'clock, we taped seven interviews. With the eighth interview on February 17, 1972, we began to meet nearly once a week in the mornings between 10:00 and 12:30, completing eleven additional tapes in three months.
Throughout this recording period and in the years following, Dr. Taylor continued to write, testify, prod, advise, consult, and talk to people who came into his office to ask about the 160-acre limit, or about Dorothea Lange and her life and work, a subject of enduring interest. Despite his crowded schedule he took time between June, 1973, and April, 1974, to review, with great care, the bulky edited transcript of the twenty-one tapes. He clarified passages, added factual data and explanatory footnotes. And, as one would expect of so consummate a writer, he revised, ever so slightly, many already well-stated sentences, in order to provide a touch of elegance. Eventually this draft was typed and Dr. Taylor offered to proof it during the summer and fall of 1974. This was fortunate because he caught errors which only he could recognize.

Inserted throughout the two volumes are many examples of the kinds of source material available on the subjects which have been discussed in this interview and which can be found in Dr. Taylor's office, in The Bancroft Library, in the Federal Archives, and in other libraries specializing in these topics. Professor Taylor's up-to-date list of publications and a compilation of articles on the 160-acre limitation prepared by Charles Smith are in the Appendix.

Within the past five years renewed vitality has been injected into the seemingly moribund issue of the administration of the excess acreage provisions of the National Reclamation Act. Developments unfolded during the fifteen months of taping and often took on the nature of an old-fashioned cliff-hanger. Frequently our interviews were interrupted by persons phoning the latest scoop on the Tulare Lake or Imperial Valley cases. During the editing stage, in August, 1973, Judge Oliver Carter in the U.S. district court in San Francisco handed down his decision on a suit challenging failure to apply the 160-acre limit to the California State Water Plan.

As this oral history so well points up, Paul Taylor has had many interests, but it is acreage limitation which has been the most enduring. Throughout most of this lengthy memoir he reveals the drama behind his long struggle to retain what he considers to be the heart of the National Reclamation Act. The issue and its challenge to Paul Taylor is not likely to fade away unless Congress revises the act. In these terms he has explained his commitment:

Acreage limitation is the law today--federal law, and the problem is to get it enforced. It's on the books now, so strategically that is what you hold on to. You see, it makes a lot of difference whether you keep a dog from getting a bone, or whether you try to take a bone away from a dog after he's got it. Well, in the case of acreage limitation, the dog already had the bone. The law was on the books, and the big landowners had to try to take it away, and they couldn't do it. In 1944, and
1947, and 1959, and 1960, we were able to keep them from taking it away. I don't think we could have put it on the books in the first place in those years.

If you allow yourself to be knocked out of the ring, then you're probably not coming back. But I think I learned long ago that this issue has very deep roots. We're dealing with important skirmishes, or rounds, in a battle that's been going on for a hundred years and is going to go on for a lot more.

Malca Chall
Interviewer-Editor

13 June 1975
Regional Oral History Office
486 The Bancroft Library
University of California at Berkeley
Paul Taylor --- Brief Biography

1895  Born, Sioux City, Iowa
1917  B.A. University of Wisconsin
1917-1919  U.S. Marine Corps
1920  M.A. University of California at Berkeley
1922  Ph.D. University of California at Berkeley
1922-1962  Instructor, later professor, on staff of Department of Economics, University of California at Berkeley
1927-1929  Chief Investigator, research project, Social Science Research Council, of Mexican Labor in United States.
1930-1931  Consultant on Pacific Coast of studies of crime and the foreign born: Wickersham Committee
1931  Awarded Guggenheim Memorial Foundation fellowship for study in Mexico: 4 months in 1931; 2 months in 1932.
1935  Field Director, Rural Rehabilitation Division of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration.
1935-1936  Regional Labor Advisor, Resettlement Administration
1936-1941  Consulting economist, Social Security Board
1935-1943  President, California Rural Rehabilitation Corporation
1935-1942  Member, State Advisory Council, California Department of Employment
1939  Member, Governor's Commission on Reemployment
1940-1944  Member, California State Board of Agriculture
1943-1952  Consulting economist, Department of Interior
1950-1951  Consultant, President's Migratory Labor Committee
1952-1956  Chairman, Department of Economics, University of California at Berkeley
Paul S. Taylor, Small Farmers’ Friend, Dies

Paul S. Taylor, 88, a retired professor at the University of California whose studies of Dust Bowl emigrants during the 1930s inspired federal and state aid to those victims of the Great Depression, died Tuesday at his Berkeley home.

The Iowa-born economist, a 1917 graduate of the University of Wisconsin, served as a Marine captain during World War I and was wounded during fierce fighting at Chateau Thierry in France.

His long association with UC began after that war when he came to Berkeley for graduate studies. He earned a doctorate in 1922 and joined the university’s faculty the same year.

As one of the first scholars to study the problems of migrant farm workers, Professor Taylor was asked by the California Emergency Relief Administration to report on the plight of the Dust Bowl migrants who flocked into California during the Great Depression.

He took a leave from UC to complete the study and persuaded Dorothea Lang, a brilliant San Francisco photographer, to join his study team as a typist — photography in those days was not considered a scholarly discipline.

Professor Taylor’s report, illustrated by Lang’s moving photographs, persuaded California relief officials to build housing for migrants and inspired the Franklin Roosevelt administration to provide food, housing and medical care for Dust Bowl refugees.

Lang and Taylor were married in 1935, after their previous marriages had ended in divorce. The couple later collaborated on the 1939 book, “An American Exodus,” generally considered the most moving depiction of the effects of the Depression on rural America. Miss Lang died in 1965.

In 1943, Professor Taylor began the longest struggle of his life: a persistent crusade to protect small farmers’ rights to federally subsidized water.

Although the National Reclamation Act restricted use of cheap water from federal irrigation projects to farms of no more than 160 acres and whose owners lived on the land, these limitations have been routinely ignored by the Interior Department since shortly after the law was enacted in 1902.

In scholarly essays, university lectures, public speeches and legislative testimony, Professor Taylor excoriated the federal government for flouting the law, thereby permitting agribusiness interests to reap the benefit of a law designed to make small, family-owned and operated farms thrive throughout the West.

He argued that land ownership patterns directly affect the quality of rural life. Small farms create schools, churches, community organizations and other adjuncts of a healthy society, Professor Taylor asserted, while large farms create poverty-stricken farm workers.

His arguments eventually led to numerous court decisions that threatened to force the breakup of numerous giant farms, many of them in California’s Central Valley.

These rulings, in turn, generated a giant and successful lobbying effort that led to the Federal Reclamation Reform Act of 1982. The law now allows absentee owners to purchase cheap federal water and raised the limitation for such federally subsidized water rights from 160 acres to 960 acres.

Although advocates of the 1982 federal legislation argue that the law now requires owners of larger farms to pay a fair price for federal water rights, Professor Taylor described it as a victory for “the big guys.”

Professor Taylor was chairman of the Department of Economics at UC from 1952 to 1956 and later headed the university’s Institute of International Studies until his retirement in 1964.

He is survived by a sister, Ethel Horsfall of Oakland, a brother, Arthur, of Appleton, Wis.; two daughters, Margot Fanger of Boston and Katherine Loesch of Chicago; two stepsons, Daniel Dixon of Los Angeles and John E. Dixon of Berkeley, and 11 grandchildren.

Funeral services will be private. The time and location of a memorial service to be held on the UC campus will be announced.
1955-1968 Consultant with AID, U.N., Ford Foundation; field studies in India, Pakistan, Philippines, Japan, Korea, Vietnam, Indonesia, Cuba, Ecuador, Venezuela, Jamaica, Colombia, Mexico, Egypt, Iran, Panama

1956-1962 Chairman, Institute of International Studies, University of California at Berkeley

1970 Research Director (part time) California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO

1971-1972 Consultant California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO
Cotton Strikes in the San Joaquin Valley - 1933

Chall: I thought we'd talk today about the strikes of the 1930s, the people who played a leading role in the settlements; also about some of the union people you might have known.

We can start with the 1933 cotton strike, in which Ira Cross was a chairman of a settlement committee. He, as I understand it, appointed you, and you took along Clark Kerr, to make some investigations in the field.

Taylor: The cotton strike in 1933 was the culmination, in the early autumn, of a whole series of summer strikes that followed in succession the harvesting of the crops. It was, and is, the most extensive strike in agriculture in the history of the United States. The picking of cotton was shut down very effectively from one end of the San Joaquin Valley to the other. Governor James Rolph collaborated with George Creel, then regional head of the NRA, in San Francisco. (He had been the publicity or public relations man for Woodrow Wilson in World War I.) Between the two of them, Creel taking the real initiative and the governor taking largely the front position, they appointed a Fact-finding Commission of three—Archbishop Hanna, as chairman, Tully C. Knowles and Ira B. Cross to study the issues and suggest a solution. I was invited to go down into the Valley as an aide to the commission by Monroe Deutsch, Provost of the University. I assume the reasons I was asked to go were (1) that my field was "labor economics," and (2) that I had recently been studying
Taylor: Mexican labor in agriculture. Also I had visited the strike area only a week or two earlier, after the strike had broken out. I asked if I could take with me my graduate student, Clark Kerr, and the answer was yes.

I instructed Clark to keep close to the strikers and their spokesman, and to report to me on the temper of the strikers at least a couple of times a day; also to form his own estimate of about what terms it would take to settle the strike. The strikers were asking a dollar a hundred pounds for picking; the growers were offering 60¢ a hundred. I stayed close to the commissioners, the hearings, the growers, and the newspapermen at headquarters. That's the way we continued to divide our work until the end.

I drove Ira Cross home from Visalia in my car, and he asked me en route what I thought it would take to settle the strike. From my own and Clark's estimates, I replied, "Seventy-five cents a hundred." The commission, when it reconvened informally in Creel's office in San Francisco, proposed 75¢ a hundred, and that figure did in fact settle the strike.

You asked me about leaders in the strike. There was Communist leadership. That doesn't mean the strikers were Communists. But there was a handful of leaders who took charge and were very effective in maintaining a unified course of action among the strikers. The first leader, Pat Chambers, I visited in the Visalia jail on an earlier trip into the Valley. I also visited the jailed growers, half a dozen of them, who were charged with manslaughter of strikers at Pixley. After Chambers was jailed, leadership was taken over by Caroline Decker, a very effective speaker before any audience whether among strikers, before the commission, or on the Berkeley campus after the strike.* Ella Winter, wife of Lincoln Steffens, spoke vigorously before the commission on the side of the strikers. The Mexican consul, Enrique Bravo, likewise spoke for the strikers, asking "60¢ for 60 pounds." There were other leaders scattered among the strikers from Madera to Kern Counties. The large growers assisted unwittingly in concentrating the strikers within easy reach of the strike leaders by evicting them from their company camps.

Taylor: You understand my use of the word Communist is broad. I don't speak specifically of individuals out of personal knowledge. But I am of course convinced that the leadership was largely Communist; especially at the higher levels. I have no doubt of that. Some, whose names I do not now recall, came from far places. They joined with a small group and kept a very effective position of leadership over the strikers. At the end they tried, on a small scale, to influence strikers not to accept the settlement. But in fact the strikers did accept, and with slight exceptions went back to work at $75\$ a hundred.

Chall: Now I notice that Archbishop Hanna seemed to be a person who was continually appointed to commissions and committees of one kind and another. Why was that?

Taylor: Well, in the first place the Catholic element in California's population is large, and had been for a long time. This was notably true of the immigrant Mexicans, who were an important element in the strike. Besides, Archbishop Hanna's personal reputation was that of a liberal, humane man. As I recall, Governor Rolph, and perhaps even Governor Hiram Johnson before him, had appointed him to the Commission on Immigration and Housing. So it was a natural appointment to make for this fact-finding commission.

Chall: What about Tully Knowles?

Taylor: Tully Knowles was president of the College of the Pacific and a Protestant minister. The latter fact balanced the appointments religiously, and Knowles likewise was a person of civic spirit and humane concerns. Ira Cross was a man of known sympathies with labor and a member of the economics department with a history of concern for such problems, with previous experience as secretary of Governor Hiram Johnson's Industrial Accident Commission.

Chall: I see. Then it was a sympathetic committee, in terms of its response to labor's needs.

Taylor: Yes. By which I do not at all suggest that they went overboard for labor. They got as much for labor as could be got, and get the crop harvested without more trouble than already had taken place with the shooting of pickers by armed growers at Pixley.

Chall: How did you and Dr. Kerr--
Taylor: [gently humorous] He was not doctor then, you know, but a candidate for the doctorate.

Chall: Yes. How did you get along with the strikers and the growers, in terms of your coming fresh from the University and attempting to gain some information from people who might have been hostile to your presence there? Were they?

Taylor: No. Nobody to my knowledge was hostile to either my presence or to Clark Kerr's. We were both experienced in talking to people on all social and economic levels. So neither of us encountered any difficulty speaking to anyone--grower, laborer, official--or whatever. The situation was wide open.

The documentation which we put in, which was published later by the LaFollette Committee, I think shows, notably in the oral statements that were given to us and that we recorded in note form, that there was no trouble in talking with anyone.* The lid was off. I have never known the Valley to be so open. The newspapers gave the fullest documentation to that social situation of any California strike that I know. People in the Valley were just taken aback, almost aghast, wondering what had hit them. The newspapers were the freest in reporting both the growers and the strikers of any time in my experience. That is one reason we wanted to document that particular strike. If a similar situation arose now I would not expect it to be documented either orally or in print as fully and freely as was possible then.

Chall: Why do you suppose that happened?

Taylor: Well, the strike impact was fresh, it was a "first." It caught everyone by surprise. Unions of farm workers were virtually unknown. Now there's more organized opposition to unionization. Cesar Chavez faces highly organized opposition today. He has not been able to conduct a strike on anything like that 1933 scale. His operations are more through use of the boycott. He has appealed to people in the markets outside of the producing area, rather than to people and their interests within the area.

*"Violations of Free Speech and Rights of Labor." Hearings before subcommittee of Senate committee on education and labor, 76 Cong., 2 sess., pursuant to S. Res. 266 (74th Cong.), part 54, 1945-20036. (1940) See also Paul S. Taylor and Clark Kerr, "Uprisings on the Farms," Survey Graphic, XXIV No. 1, 19, January 1935.
Chall: It wasn't too long after that that the Associated Farmers organized. So the opposition came in almost at once.

Taylor: That's right.

Chall: Now when you say newspapers, do you mean all newspapers?

Taylor: The newspapers in the Valley towns: Merced, Modesto, Fresno, Bakersfield—and there were more. The San Francisco Chronicle sent one of its reporters to Visalia.

Cotton Strikes in the Imperial Valley - 1934

Chall: The following year there were strikes in the Imperial Valley. By that time it seemed as though there were some changes in attitudes.

Taylor: Now let's see, there were two investigating committees, followed by official observer General Pelham D. Glassford. The first committee was composed of Will French, Simon J. Lubin and J. L. Leonard.

Chall: That's right. That is the first one.

Taylor: This committee was appointed by Senator Robert F. Wagner, chairman of the National Labor Relations Board. The 1930s were years of great depression, and in 1934 the New Deal was only about a year old. So a great deal of attention was being given to the problems of laborers by those in political power.

Will French was an original appointee of Progressive Republican Governor Hiram Johnson as a member of the Industrial Accident Commission. While I was on leave researching Mexican labor, 1927-29, he lectured on labor economics at the University in my place. Leonard was a University of Southern California professor; I never met him personally. Simon J. Lubin had been chairman of the Immigration and Housing Commission, an appointee of Hiram Johnson. They saw the situation in the Valley and gave their not very friendly report on Valley grower interests. I think the Leonard-French-Lubin Report saw the problems just about right.*

*LaFollette Committee, op. cit., 20043-52.
Taylor: The second commission was appointed at the request of the California State Board of Agriculture (whose members were appointed by the governor), the California Farm Bureau Federation, and the agricultural department of the California State Chamber of Commerce. Its members were Dean Claude Hutchison of the College of Agriculture, W.C. Jacobson, administrative assistant in the State Department of Agriculture, and John Phillips from Riverside County, adjacent to Imperial Valley, a member of the California assembly, next the state senate, and later a conservative Republican congressman.*

Chall: They came up with a different analysis. They apparently thought that it was all a Communist plot and that it would go away, I suppose, if you could get rid of the leadership.

Taylor: Well, I don't subscribe to that view, of course. I did not at the time. The conditions produced the situation. Yes, there may have been some Communists around--probably were. But they were taking advantage of a situation, not creating it.

Chall: Then there was a third study of the same problem and the same area and that was federal. The federal government sent General Pelham D. Glassford in, by himself, to consider the situation. His conclusions were pretty much what the Lubin Commission's conclusions were.

Taylor: Yes. I met General Glassford in El Centro while he was on that assignment. General Glassford had established a distinctive and fine reputation as Washington, D.C. police chief, in the handling of the World War I bonus marchers in Washington, D.C. So it was a natural appointment and I think a very good one. My impression is this, that at first he tried to balance his actions or expressions of attitude, with one statement of the kind that would appeal to one side, and then in his next statement to give something to the other. I'm quite sure that by the time he got through he was much more sympathetic to the workers' side than he was to the growers'. I think he saw what that situation was and that it was very much as the Leonard-French-Lubin report described it.**

*LaFollette Committee, op. cit., 20053-63.

**A recent study reveals the extreme social stratification of Imperial Valley. In contrast to such counties as Cheyenne (Nebraska), Livingston (Illinois), and Kossuth (Iowa) where percentages of farm personnel in the "lower class" are 9.9, 11.7 and 13, respectively, the percentage in Imperial County is 87.3. T. Lynn Smith, "A Study of Social Stratification in the Agricultural Sections of the United States," 34 Rural Sociology 508, (1969.) PST
The Lubin Society

Chall: Could you talk here a little bit about Simon Lubin himself. Did you know him?

Taylor: No, I did not know Simon Lubin personally. By radio I heard him speak to the Commonwealth Club in '34, which I believe was shortly after he participated in the Imperial Valley investigation. The title of his address to the Commonwealth Club, as I recall it, was "Can the Communists--" or "Can the Radicals Take Over the Farms of California?" Of course we have the words of his address in The Bancroft Library. As I recall, his opening sentence was "No, the Communist cannot take over the farms of California. The banks need fear no competition from that source." The reaction this produced soon manifested itself in the loss of his position with the State Department of Commerce. The general impression at the time was that he lost his position because of what he had said at the Commonwealth Club and reported on Imperial Valley.

Chall: Mrs. Lubin, whom we interviewed, said that his health generally began to fail and also his morale, after the Commonwealth Club speech, although she didn't think the incident contributed toward his illness. I wondered just what she meant by that.*

Taylor: I am fully prepared to believe the Commonwealth Club address was a milestone in his life and that what I have said to you fits with what she said.

Chall: It certainly does.

Taylor: Simon J. Lubin was a very public-spirited man. He'd been chairman of the Immigration and Housing Commission. He made and published a study of large land-holdings in Southern California. He was very progressive and public-spirited. He ran up against the most conservative and powerful interests in the state.

Chall: Mrs. Lubin said that her son turned all of his father's papers over to you, but I gather that that means that you got them into The Bancroft Library?

Taylor: Well, I never had them personally. I encouraged placement of those papers in The Bancroft Library and I'm sure that that is where they are. I was an intermediary and if she remembered that I had had a hand in it, that's very nice.

Chall: She discussed very briefly although she didn't know very much about it, the Lubin Society. She said it was organized after his death by some people who wanted to commemorate his work and maybe carry it on and she credits a Mrs. McWilliams with being instrumental in organizing it. She was the wife of Judge Robert McWilliams, do you remember her?

Taylor: Oh, I remember her. I had not thought of her for a long time.

Chall: She is noted (in the LaFollette Committee reports, I think) as being with the California State Federation of Labor and her address is Hillsborough.

Taylor: Well, she was the wife of a judge, which suggests social position. Hillsborough confirms it. She was public-spirited in concerning herself with social situations.

Chall: Why would she be listed as a spokesman for the California State Federation of Labor?

Taylor: I didn't know that she was and I have no comment as I don't know. But I'm not at all surprised that she could share viewpoints of the labor federation on questions of public policy.

Chall: I see. Now further, Mrs. Lubin says that the society was formed by a group of young people who didn't have the means and probably didn't know how to go about it, so that the organization just died a natural death. That was her feeling about it--from her place.

Taylor: Now, let's see if I can throw any light on that. Among the people active, particularly active was Helen Hosmer (incidentally, author in the 1966 American West of an article on Imperial Valley and its history). At that time she was on the information division staff of the Resettlement Administration. Many persons both inside and outside the Resettlement Administration were interested in problems of agricultural laborers, and choice of the Simon J. Lubin name was natural. You have the file of the Simon J. Lubin Society publications in The Bancroft Library.

Chall: Yes, you mean the Rural Observer?
Taylor: That's right. Helen Hosmer worked with such persons as Father Charles Phillips of the Catholic Church in Oakland. He was of peasant stock from Colmar in France, a man deeply concerned with the problems of people. He was spokesman for family farmers around Sonoma who were losing their farms early in the Depression. A very fine man. I believe they worked together particularly on the issue of the Rural Observer devoted to the Associated Farmers, which came out here, just on the eve of the election of Culbert Olson as governor. What's the date on it?

Chall: September--October, 1938.

Taylor: That's just over one year before the LaFollette Committee came to California. So the Lubin Society was concerned with the sharpening conflict between the interests of laborers, and growers, and landowners. That thread of conflicting interests, in fact, runs all through California history. I've forgotten just what brought about the end of the Lubin Society--probably it was World War II, which turned public attention in other directions.

Chall: I never checked that but that's very likely.

Taylor: There came a change in the general character of social and economic conditions, including a temporary relative improvement in the conditions of agricultural laborers, so that the sense of necessity for campaigning to do something for them was diminished, and the open opposition between growers and laborers, for the time being, also was diminished.

Chall: I noticed the name of Samuel Yorty as one of the sponsors of the Lubin Society.

Taylor: Well, in '38 Samuel Yorty was a member of the legislature and, as I recall, the leader of the assembly Democrats. Nineteen thirty-eight is when Culbert Olson was elected governor and Yorty was a quite far-left liberal, to use the language of the day. Apparently now he has swung as far to the right as then he was far to left--something like Governor Ronald Reagan then and now.

Chall: And of course Carey McWilliams is on the list among the others. Did you know him well?

Taylor: I wouldn't say I knew him well. I certainly knew him, especially by his work. I met him personally a couple of times, once in Southern California, as I recall, at his home for an evening.
Taylor: I knew his work, his writings, his service as head of the Immigration and Housing Commission, a position to which Culbert Olson appointed him. I assume that he prepared Governor Olson's statement given before the LaFollette Committee.

Chall: He says he did.*

Taylor: Well, I thought at the time it sounded like him. He was a very intelligent researcher, writer, thinker, and actor on problems, notably those of rural California. And of course he aroused great opposition to himself from the growers' side. As I recall when Olson was defeated and Warren came into office, the first act of the new governor was supposed to be at 12:01 A.M. McWilliams' political head was delivered on a platter. That story may be apocryphal but it expresses authentically the intensity of opposition to him at the time.

McWilliams would do such things as encouraging commissions to consider, at a time when the growers proposed a certain wage, at what wage was it proper to cut farm laborers and their families off welfare and oblige them to go to work for the growers. That was a very sensitive position for Carey McWilliams to be in.

Chall: Like establishing a minimum wage.

Taylor: Yes! Of course!

Labor Leaders

Chall: Now in terms of some of the other labor leaders in California at the time, who were not part of the radical leadership of the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union, the name Ed Vandeleur comes up from time to time. He was with the State Federation of Labor.

Taylor: Yes, he was the secretary-treasurer, which means the executive of what then was called the California State Federation of Labor. He was a member of the Streetcarman's Union. During

*An interview with staff of the Regional Oral History Office in process.
Taylor: his term of office the 1934 general strike took place in San Francisco. I wrote an article on that with Norman Leon Gold, published in the Survey Graphic, which doesn't speak especially of Vandeleur, but he was there formally at the head.* He was not a leader out in front of the crowd like Cesar Chavez, but rather one who operated behind the scenes.

Chall: Was he concerned about the agricultural problem?

Taylor: I don't remember that agricultural labor was any special concern of his. But organized labor as a whole always has been concerned about land and labor in California. It has tried to organize agricultural labor beginning before World War I. Its early sporadic attempts were small-scale and unsuccessful. But whenever the attempts were made by anyone, organized labor has been generally friendly to the effort.

Chall: Were they friendly to the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union attempts in the fields?

Taylor: I have a little trouble answering that in a specific sense. The Cannery and Agricultural Workers Union was Communist-affiliated, under the Trade Union Unity League. In a sense, like the IWW, it was not an AFL effort but the AFL would never put itself in the position of being against the organization of agricultural laborers, even though they might not approve the particular leadership. They would prefer organization under their own leadership, but they wouldn't wreck another union. They wouldn't go that far although their position might be non-support of the particular leadership.

Chall: What about Julius Nathan? He was active, I think, in some of the agricultural labor strife in Alameda County.

Taylor: He was active particularly across the hills in Brentwood and I believe his activities are documented in the LaFollette Committee report.

Chall: Did you know him?

Taylor: Yes. I knew him. Not intimately, but I knew him. He was dedicated to organization of the workers, without any question. In later years--I've forgotten how much later--wasn't he

*Survey Graphic, XXIII, No. 9, 404, September 1934.
Taylor: arrested, tried, perhaps imprisoned for entirely unrelated acts?

Chall: I think he was arrested. Some strike; I've forgotten the details but I think he was just kept incommunicado for a few days and moved from community to community and then let go.

Taylor: I was asked at some time, by letter--apparently approved by the sheriff or whoever--to submit a letter, at the request of Nathan, concerning his character. I told what I knew as to his labor activities. As to these he was honest in his sympathies. He was one of the left persuasions but he never, to my knowledge, put that to the fore in his efforts to organize laborers. As I recall, he was a lone Trotskyite, an unorthodox Communist.

He was not organizing his particular doctrinaire group but trying to organize agricultural labor out of a conviction that it needed to be done. Of course, whenever any attempt of that sort appeared there was always the effort by the other side to magnify or to portray it as to convey an impression of factionalism of the wrong kind, and to imply that everything would be all right if that kind of person just wasn't around trying to organize the workers. Emphasis on the character of the leadership obscured discussion of the conditions of the workers and what might be done to improve them.

Chall: Ultimately I guess those whom they considered Communist were tried and convicted under the state's Syndicalism Act--

Taylor: Chambers was. They released Chambers from the Visalia jail the first time he was arrested as a sort of balance--this is my interpretation. They also had jailed a number of growers for the shooting of Pixley strikers. Well, when the growers were let off, they let Chambers out, too. It wasn't long before Chambers was arrested again, tried on the charge of criminal syndicalism, convicted and imprisoned.

The Associated Farmers - 1934

Chall: I'd like to know about the Associated Farmers and their responses to the strikes and problems of housing and labor in the fields.
Taylor: The Associated Farmers were very prominent--both as a spokesman and as an organization.

Chall: They were made up of people in industry, Chamber of Commerce groups, and agriculturalists. So they were really as concerned about what was happening in the field as they were about labor in the canneries and elsewhere, I suspect.

Taylor: Yes. In California farming is in a different position, and is viewed differently than in the middle western states where land ownership is more widely diffused. Industry and agriculture are blended here in California as they have not been in the Middle West and Northeast, certainly not until very recently. Farming very early was regarded here as an industry, rather than as a way of life for families on the land. I recall one of the advertisements reproduced by the LaFollette Committee as early as the late thirties asserting that "Agriculture is an industry." That view, of course, has persisted to the present time; the term currently in use is agribusiness rather than industrialized agriculture.

The Associated Farmers sought to unite the larger agricultural interests with the Chamber of Commerce, which elsewhere represented urban interests. But here, as I say, they were blurred, they were blended. The pattern of employment and the attitudes that go with it are an industrial pattern. The laborer on the land is not the farmer owning his own land, but the man employed by somebody else to do the work. The division between the landowner and laborer on the land came extremely early in California--in fact, virtually from the beginning of statehood it was divided that way. That is one reason why the remedies attempted from time to time have taken on the aspect of industrial readjustments to conflict of interest; for example, unionization of workers met by employer resistance to unionization. Now that's just a brief, quick summary of a hundred and twenty years of California history.

The Associated Farmers was a natural, if excessive, response from the employers' side to labor's feeling that unionization was necessary to protect its interests. This phase had, and to a lesser degree still has, the violent aspects of some of the early efforts of labor to organize in coal mines, the steel industry (the Homestead steel strike of 1892), where there were serious losses of life, etc. So this parallel came along in California's agricultural setting in a familiar chain of labor history.
Chall: Well the response was rather quick, right after the strikes. I suppose that they felt that they had to organize broadly to protect themselves.

Taylor: Oh, the response of the Associated Farmers and even before was very quick indeed. I recall an incident at about the time of the strikes of 1928 in the Imperial Valley. One of the processors' chief men told me that when the strike came, he thought that the natural, effective response was to drive his car around the Valley with armed men, rifles showing ostentatiously, i.e., to curb the strike by a show of force. For him it seemed the natural way to make a showing of his power.

Chall: Some of these people who helped organize the Associated Farmers very early represented all the interests that we were talking about—the wine industry, the peachgrowers, the California Fruitgrowers Exchange, cotton, etc.

Taylor: That's right. All the major crops of the state were involved.

Chall: One of those who was an early organization leader was Claude Hutchison. He claims in his oral history that he was the midwife of the Associated Farmers, not one of the organizers.*

Taylor: In other words, he helped it come into existence.

Chall: Yes, and this grew, he says, out of his understanding of Communist infiltration.

Taylor: I am fully prepared to believe that he saw it that way. I don't see it that way, but I believe him when he said what you have told me. That, of course, produced criticism of the College of Agriculture and the Extension Service.

Chall: By whom?

Taylor: Who criticized them? I do not recall in the sense of being able to give you names of the critics at that time. Of course there was criticism of the report of the Hutchison, Jacobson, 

---

Taylor: Phillips committee, which followed the Leonard-French-Lubin committee in the Imperial Valley. The LaFollette report was not complimentary, and today criticism of the role of the college and service has become more general and open, even on campus.

Chall: There were other advisory members of the state Chamber of Commerce agricultural committee. Mr. Crocheron and Mr. Hutchison.

Taylor: Well those two, of course, were from the College of Agriculture and Agricultural Extension.

Chall: Then Julian McFee, who was at Cal Polytechnic.

Taylor: I didn't know him--except by name.

Chall: Did you know John Pickett?

Taylor: John Pickett was editor of The California Farmer--then The Pacific Rural Press; he was the father of the present editor of The California Farmer.

Chall: And Ralph Taylor--you must have run across him.

Taylor: Yes, I knew Ralph Taylor, who I believe grew out of the College or Extension Service to become executive secretary of the Agricultural Legislative Committee in Sacramento, representing similar interests in the legislature and before Congress. The Associated Farmers, you see, represented one aspect of an interest group's interests. It was concerned with one function, namely, to curb labor organization in agriculture. But the same interests assigned the function of representation at the state legislature to organizations like the Agricultural Producers Labor Committee, and years later to the Council of California Growers. These organizations were, in a sense, children of the same parent, each brought to life to perform a
Taylor: particular function for protection of the same general interest.*

Chall: These Associated Farmers at the time that they were organizing were caught in a bind because on the one hand there was all this extra labor coming into the state because of the migration from the Middle West, and also, at the same time there was a movement for labor organization and benefits for labor prompted by the federal government.

Taylor: Yes. They wanted an almost unlimited supply of labor. That has been their position from the 1850s. But they don't want to be flooded with labor, because then the laborers finally rise up and conduct strikes as they did at the beginning of the thirties. Those years were the only time that I know of in the history of California when farm employers were of the opinion that they had too many laborers.

I remember speaking in Texas with a cotton-grower once and I asked, "Have you got too much labor here?" From my point of view they were drenched with it. His response was, "No such thing as too many laborers." That, essentially, was the position

"During this period the Associated Farmers of California, Inc. was concerned not only with the phases of anti-union policy in agriculture and in the urban areas...but also with opposing legislation and public measures designed to alleviate the hardships of agricultural labor. On many issues, its lobbyists or representatives fought to preserve employer control of agricultural labor, free from government intervention. The organization fought fixing of agricultural wages, whether by the federal or state government; it sought to have relief workers stricken from the rolls during time of harvest regardless of whether or not they were fitted to perform agricultural labor; it opposed the establishment of federal camps for migratory workers; it bitterly assailed efforts of the state administration to fix a minimum wage at which relief workers would be released to work in the fields." Violations of free speech and rights of labor, LaFollette Committee Senate report No. 1150, part 5, 765. 77 Cong., 2 sess. PST
Taylor: in California except for that period when the dust bowlers and others poured in and resulted in strikes.*

Chall: Were they also effective in blocking protective legislation for farm labor? One of the people whom we have interviewed, Philip Bancroft, discussed his work with the Associated Farmers' legislative committee which screened all of the bills in the legislature dealing with agriculture. He claims that they headed off the passage of forty bills during the Merriam administration in 1937, and some 140 during the Olson administration.**

Taylor: Well, without my knowing what bills Philip Bancroft specifically referred to, I believe that he blocked social legislation that would protect labor. The LaFollette Committee attributed that role to the Associated Farmers.

Chall: He said that he blocked one called the Little Wagner Act. I think that was during the Olson administration.


Chall: So they've been quite effective all these years?

Taylor: Of course they've been effective. They're very powerful. Consequently concessions in the form of social legislation in agriculture have come very slowly, and always against very considerable resistance. In about 1940 or '41, representing the Advisory Committee on Employment of which I was a member by governor's appointment, I testified before a Senate agricultural committee of the legislature in support of

*See "Labor on the California Land," in process of publication. The Introduction, by PST, covers a good many of the points discussed in this interview, and is followed by contemporary documentation of the Wheatland hop-field riot of 1913, the cotton strike of 1933, and the Imperial Valley strike of 1934. PST

Taylor: extending unemployment compensation to agricultural workers. We were turned down.

Well, California farm labor is still trying to get what I supported over thirty years ago with the backing of the state advisory committee.

Chall: And basically the same interests as made up the Associated Farmers were behind this?

Taylor: Yes.

Chall: Now Carey McWilliams in one of his interviews with us has said that he feels that the labor unions gave in to the large farmers to the extent that in order for them to gain some of the benefits of the social legislation for the urban workers, they didn't press for the agricultural workers.

Taylor: Are you speaking nationally now?

Chall: I think he was speaking of California.

Taylor: I can answer you nationally more easily than I can in respect to California because the protective legislation generally came first nationally and to some extent imposed itself as a guideline, or condition of receiving federal aid--like Social Security. If the states wanted federal money, they had to pass acceptable state legislation. There were two reasons at least why farm labor was so generally exempted from federal social and labor legislation passed by a New Deal that had such broad sympathy with the distressed lower third of the population. One reason was administrative; proposers of the social legislation thought, 'We'll have enough trouble administering a whole new legislative system without taking on farm labor which is different from industrial labor in so many ways. Let's take on manageable problems now and lay aside the question of inclusion of farm labor until later.

The other was a straight political reason. The Democrats were strongest in the South, and the Southern Democrats were entirely willing to impose effective social legislation on northern industry, figuring it would not affect them very much because the South wasn't very greatly industrialized. Exclusion of farm labor made it easy for Southern Democrats like Senator Joseph Robinson of Arkansas to drive social legislation through Congress.
Chall: Then those were the forces that kept it locked out, by and large, would you say?

Taylor: Yes. Those who want to continue the farm labor exemption yield only step by step; to this day they do not yield when they have power to resist, as in the South, Southwest and California.

Chall: Walton Bean says of this that the farmers or growers always said that they had special problems, but he feels that they just had greater power.*

Taylor: Well I would agree with him on that. There's a nice little example of that, I think, in their protestations that strikes should be banned at harvest time. One can understand why they don't want a strike at harvest time that threatens the last stage of production for market and the returns on the year's efforts.

But it reminds me of the shipowners who complained that if you didn't retain the imprisonment laws against desertion by seamen, it would leave a ship "to rot in her neglected brine." I think the two situations are parallel. If you don't want the ship to rot in her neglected brine, you have a law that says your seamen may not desert; if you don't want your crop to rot in harvest because of a strike, you say there should be no strikes at harvest. But this overlooks the fact that if you have better relations between employer and employed you won't have either the seamen deserting or the harvesters striking.

In fact the ships are not rotting although unionism among seamen came in the 1880s. Likewise, with unionism recognized in agriculture there are very, very few strikes at harvest time, because that is when farm laborers as well as growers make their best income during the year.

Chall: So you think that has always been a specious argument?

Taylor: Well I think so, yes. Employing interests in agriculture have followed the pattern of the early, vigorous, even violent opposition of industrial employers to the organization of their industrial laborers, an attitude now generally abandoned in industry.

Chall: They haven't used the vigilante method so much during the past few years as they did during the thirties, but I guess they have power in the legislature still.

Taylor: Yes, their methods have not been as visible as earlier. How much change of mind has taken place, I don't know. There's been some, but I'm sure that not all of the hostility to unionization so prevalent in the thirties has vanished. See how the Teamsters, with alleged grower support, are undercutting the United Farm Workers AFL-CIO.

Chall: What about some of the other leaders of the Associated Farmers, people like Hank Strobel. Did you know him? He was with Bancroft on the legislative committee.

Taylor: Hank Strobel is a South Carolinian. Coming from South Carolina means coming from a state that originally was one of the principal slave-holding British colonies.

In this manuscript that I'm finishing on the founding of Georgia, 1732 to 1752, one of the reasons that the trustees in England did not want slaves in Georgia is because of the horrible example of South Carolina.* Out of that plantation and former slave environment come people with attitudes that easily fall in line with those of the agricultural employers most unfriendly to organized labor.

Strobel, a lettuce-grower who was squeezed out of the business, then was taken on for legislative and public relations services under Philip Bancroft.

Chall: Did you ever meet him? Did you know him at all?


Chall: What about Harold Pomeroy. Did you ever have any contact with him? He was an administrator of the State Relief Administration under Governor Merriam, and then became executive secretary of the Associated Farmers.

Taylor: His brother, Hugh, was regional representative in the field of public housing. Both Pomeroy's were decent people. I felt closer to the brother who promoted housing, but I respected

Taylor: Harold Pomeroy as an administrator. He gave respectability to the Associated Farmers within the field of his own activities. I don't know how long he was content with doing his work with the Associated Farmers.

Chall: Well, that is interesting because Mr. Bancroft says that they asked him to resign in 1940. He had come on as executive director to the Associated Farmers in 1938 when Olson became governor and by 1940 Bancroft, and Mr. Parker Frisselle and Colonel Walter E. Garrison considered him (that's Pomeroy) too liberal; they didn't think he had the farmer's point of view.

Taylor: Well, I would believe that! I was finding my own way of saying it, probably not so clearly as Philip Bancroft.

Chall: He's very candid about what he thought. He said that Pomeroy had said that he welcomed that investigation by the LaFollette Committee and that these three leaders of the Associated Farmers felt that he was not working in conjunction with the elements of the Associated Farmers who were opposed to the investigation. They really thought he was a radical.

Taylor: I'd call him a decent gentleman rather than a radical. Apparently he was caught in the middle, too decent and too liberal in his social and political attitudes, from my point of view, for Bancroft and the Associated Farmers to keep him in their organization.

Chall: Now during the Merriam administration he advocated (this is Pomeroy) that people not be given relief unless they went to work on the farm. So that he was not willing to give relief at all, as long as there were farm jobs available, apparently at whatever wage.

Taylor: Well yes, he was on the hook. Carey McWilliams could tell you about the problem: At what rate of farm wages do you put people off relief when the farmers want their labors? You see there's a direct conflict of interest. Growers wanted their crops tended at wages they set. People on relief didn't want the uncertainties of employment in the crops and unacceptably low piece rates they often were offered. They didn't want to have to work hard for no more, or perhaps even less than what they were getting on relief.

From the beginning of California's industrialized agriculture, with a high peak of employment at one season and
Taylor: high unemployment at another season, farm employers have had what I call a subsidy. The subsidy comes either from the public which supported their laborers on relief when the employers didn't want them, and kept them ready for the time when they did, or from the unemployed laborers themselves who simply tightened their belts during unemployment.

The position of the farm employers was that since they couldn't support the laborers all year round but needed them at the time of the harvest, they saw no reason why the public and the laborers shouldn't put up with that situation.

Chall: The Associated Farmers had a slogan, "No Work, No Eat."

Taylor: That slogan implies that their laborers sometimes were a lazy bunch of bums. Well, it isn't so simple. I don't say that there were no bums among them, but I think the other side of the coin is expressed in the old IWW song: "Why don't we work like other folks do? How the hell can we work when there's no work to do?"

Chall: John Watson was a dairy farmer who was active for a time in the Associated Farmers and then, as I understand it, joined forces with Adlai Stevenson and became head of the Democratic Farmers, so he had a rather interesting development. Did you know John Watson? From Petaluma? I think he was the fourth president of the Associated Farmers.

Taylor: Yes. I didn't know him well but I do remember him. Well, I thought that was a checkered career also, because I thought Adlai Stevenson was pretty good, and to find myself supporting him alongside John B. Watson was unexpected, but welcome.

The Associated Farmers generally represented an extreme position. Watson, after all was a small operator, not a big operator. I'd say that fact qualified him to front for them. But at some point, apparently, he broke off. As we noted earlier, Harold Pomeroy made a good front for them until they themselves threw him out. Philip Bancroft became a candidate for the United States Senate. His program was essentially an extreme Associated Farmers position. He thought he would make it, I assume, but fortunately from my point of view he didn't go to the Senate.

Chall: How were these people when you would meet them just face-to-face?
Taylor: How did they respond to me?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Face-to-face? We're not talking about behind the back?

Chall: No.

Taylor: We're talking face-to-face. Well, I told you how frankly and freely in 1928 that Imperial Valley grower told me that the way to handle a strike situation was to drive about in his car conspicuously armed to make a show of force. Clearly, he wasn't uneasy about speaking that way to me. When I was beginning my researches and preparing a migrant labor camp program for the State Emergency Relief Administration, Division of Rural Rehabilitation, it was Chester Moore, a growers' representative whom I had met in 1927 in the Imperial Valley, who told me to start my researches on the need of migrants for decent camps at Nipomo, and he was exactly right. I had never heard of Nipomo. My relations with him personally were always friendly and frank.

You understand that when I was interviewing, I did not criticize, because what I wanted was their knowledge, their information, their viewpoint. I was studying them.

Chall: But then later when you made recommendations before national and state committees and you obviously had a point of view...

Taylor: Yes, I was recommending all those things—the elimination of the agricultural labor exemptions from the Social Security Act, migrant labor housing, etc. That's right. While the migrant camp program was being initiated I was questioned from opposite viewpoints. A grower from Santa Clara Valley came to the resettlement office to warn me that large camps facilitated labor unrest dangerously. An American Civil Liberties Union attorney (A.L. Wirin) came to question me whether strikers in the camps would be allowed to hold meetings even at midnight to discuss the conduct of the strike or possible terms of its settlement.

Certainly, from some of the growers' representatives it was plain that they recognized a difference in point of view between us. An Oakland attorney representing California Processors and Growers, Harrison Robinson by name, was very courteous always, and even went out of his way to say cordial things about our book of photographs, An American Exodus. He
Taylor: I didn't have to, but he did, knowing full well our different viewpoints. Of course lawyers are trained to fight their causes without fighting other lawyers representing opposing parties, not to carry over into a personal feud a dispute over an issue. No, I do not recall any face-to-face criticism.

I believe that an opposition which I could feel in various ways--mostly in silences--came because of my sponsorship of the program of federal migratory laborers' camps. They did agree that something had to be done. But their preference was for cheap money from the government to the growers so that they could build and operate the camps themselves. That was the difference between us. But they didn't hold that too seriously against me personally, even though they would have preferred to have a camp program operated privately. The later difference of the forties and after that focussed on the acreage limitation issue, we'll come to later on. That's when the difference came sharply and publicly.

Chall: I see. Do you suppose that the difference then is that in the case of the problems during the Depression, if they felt they had the legislature, both national and state, with them, that they weren't threatened, whereas maybe the issues that you're raising now are a greater threat to them?

Taylor: Enforcement of the acreage limitation law is a greater economic threat to what they would call their "interests," but what I would call their "illegal aspirations." They could lose their expectations which, from my point of view, the law properly denies them.

Chall: In the case of the thirties, there was no law. You were just trying to promulgate it.

Taylor: Yes, I didn't have explicit statutory law on my side authorizing camps for migrant workers. Eventually we got congressional approval for construction of camps--eventually. But as to the 160-acre law, it is on the books where it has been since 1902. Politically it would be very difficult to get a contemporary Congress to enact it now, with the power that large landholders have in the Congress. That is like the dog and the bone. You can keep a bone away from a dog, but just try to take it away from him once he's got it. That's a very different thing from keeping him from getting a bone in the first place.

Chall: I think that is a good simile.
II STUDYING THE BACKGROUND OF RURAL POVERTY: THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
(Interviews 2 and 3, March 10, June 10, 1971)

Field Director, Rural Rehabilitation Division of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (Resettlement Administration) 1935-1936

Chall: During the period of 1935-1936 you worked for the Resettlement Administration on the problems of migrant labor housing primarily. How were you appointed to the Resettlement Administration? Who was responsible for that?

Taylor: I was appointed to the Rural Rehabilitation Division of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. Its California counterpart was called the State Emergency Relief Administration; it was simply the state section of the federal administration. The man who appointed me was Harry E. Drobish. He had been an assistant or associate farm advisor in the Sacramento Valley, and after the Depression was elected to the legislature as state senator. He was the first director of the newly organized Division of Rural Rehabilitation, and one of his problems was to find out what kind of a program would meet the needs of rural California in the distress of the Great Depression.

Someone (I do not know who) suggested my name to him. He came to see me on campus several times, and about the middle of January in '35 asked me if I would be the "field director" of his division, undertake research on rural poverty and distress in California, and come up with a program to meet the needs of the people in distress. Drobish was more familiar with family farmers and their needs than with farm laborers and their needs. It was understood that I would focus on the latter.
Taylor: labor situation--men, women and children! The single men, known as "bindle stiffs," were fading out during these years, and overwhelmed by the influx of families. The need was clear and pressing, and Harry Drobish was very supportive of the camp program.

The program began at Marysville and at Arvin in the vicinity of Weedpatch, Kern County. Drobish came from Marysville. He arranged with the Marysville City Council for cooperation in establishment of a camp there--got a place designated and arranged for, and all the rest. He gave strong support to the program.

Chall: This money came from the federal government?

Taylor: This was federal money. The success in obtaining it for camps was semi-accidental--accidental like the hole-in-one in golf: the better the players, the more likely they are to have the lucky accident. Lowry Nelson, a Mormon rural sociology professor from Brigham Young University, was FERA regional adviser stationed in San Francisco. He had open channels to FERA in Washington. I took Dorothea Lange, Lowry Nelson and his wife Flossie with us into the fields, through the Imperial Valley and as far as Yuma. He saw the conditions, saw the dislocated families from the Southwest streaming across the Arizona border into California at Yuma, and was sympathetic to the need for the proposed camp program.

The accident came in this way: the FERA, under Harry Hopkins, had authorized $20,000 for something or other to be spent in California which then it was decided not to spend for the original purpose. Nelson, having seen the situation, as regional supervisor of rural rehabilitation for the FERA in San Francisco, wired back to Washington, "Here is an urgent necessity. May we use the $20,000 immediately to start two camps instead of sending it back to Washington?" The answer, fortunately, was an immediate "yes." We didn't get any more money for camps for a long time thereafter, because this was a very touchy program in a place and at a time when so many stikes had been occurring and more were in prospect. It was very touchy. But the SERA couldn't stop those two camps, once construction got started.

While there was opposition to the camps, it was very difficult to oppose them publicly. Who could be in public against decent living conditions for families in distress?
Taylor: He asked me (this may overlap what I told Mrs. Riess) what staff I needed, besides stenographic assistance, etc. I told him that I wanted two or three people who would go out in the field with me. One of them was Tom Vasey, a graduate student of mine and friend of Clark Kerr's; another, Edward Rowell, then a graduate student in economics taking his doctorate at Berkeley. Another man, whose name slips me at the moment, who came out of Tennessee or North Carolina had been concerned with rural problems there, and was added to my staff by Drobish. I told Drobish I wanted a photographer. I told Suzanne Riess what I went through to accomplish that unusual appointment, so I don't need to repeat here.*

Migrant Labor Camps

Taylor: Well, we went out into the field, and came back with our reports and recommendations. They concerned the field of agricultural labor with which I had considerable familiarity already, notably in the 1933 cotton strike and before that through my investigations on Mexican labor beginning in 1927. So I knew at first hand a good deal about the labor situation in California, both prior to and in early years of the Depression. So we came in early from the field with a program to establish decent camps for migrant workers, especially for migrant families.

The existing state program, dating from soon after the Wheatland hop fields riot of 1913, provided for inspection of growers' camps. All the growers had to do to escape inspection was have no camps at all. Of course many conducted camps and accepted inspection because camps often were essential to assure the presence of enough laborers to tend the crops. Laborers not sheltered in growers' camps, camped by the roadside, out in the brush of untilled fields, in creekbottoms--anywhere! So very quickly it was apparent that there should be a place where migrants not housed by growers' camps could have decency with washing, toilet and shelter facilities as a base to live in during the period they were working or waiting for work in the vicinity. It was largely families who were in this difficult

---

16 October 1973

Mrs. Chall:

The enclosed letter from Lowry Nelson, dated Oct. 8, 1973 relates to the establishment of camps for migratory laborers in California in 1935. Lowry Nelson was Regional Rural Rehabilitation Advisor for the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, stationed in San Francisco. Later he was Professor of Rural Sociology at the University of Minnesota.

For the situation into which the Nelson letter fits, see Master's thesis by Albert Crouth, Housing Migratory Agricultural Workers in California, 1913-1948. See especially page 79 and Appendix I. The exchanges in telegrams between FERA and SERA in San Francisco do not report Nelson's name, but he was responsible for the McLaughlin wires which brought the $20,000 without which the Federal Camp program, first in California, then nationally, might never have got under way.

PS

Paul S. Taylor
Dear Paul:

We were delighted to hear from you and know of the honors continuing to come to Dorothea.

Of course, I remember the wire to Col. Westbrook and the surprise I felt at receiving the following day approving the funds for material for two DEMONSTRATION CAMPS! I was a bit overwhelmed by the significance of what we were doing, and even more so when I asked you who would operate the camps, and you replied, emphatically: "The Federal Government." I recall meeting with the Ag. Comm. of the Chamber of Commerce, with I think, Mr. Drobisch, when one of the member asked the same question, and when I said the Federal Government, he said:" I want nothing to do with it; this is a "labor government, from top to bottom." The committee, incidentally, was discussing to matters: How to make sure the State had the best possible prosecutors to try the 15 "agitators" who were being held; and how to get a State constabulary motorized to be on call when and wherever trouble broke out.

A wonderful part of working for the New Deal was that we were free to develop programs to meet needs of people regardless of any precedents. No need to go back and see what had been done before. Your own ability to go straight to the heart of a problem and see what should be done was a creative force in helping to save California from itself. What a triumph for you over the piddling behavior of your colleagues in the great Foundation that houses the ag. economists.
I have to smile when I think of their plan to "study the demand side" of the labor problem, when the real side was on the supply.

I am not acquainted with Gibbs Smith of the SLC publishing firm, but it is an excellent idea for you to get together the documents on the famous labor uprisings in Cal. A real service to scholars and to history.

I remember your mention previously of the MA thesis. If I were in better shape for doing reading I would try and get the loan of it, but I have to use a reading glass and it is slow going.

We are both well other than my own defects, and trust you continue in good health.

como siempre

Lowry

Lowry Nelson
Editor, THE NATION:

Your editorial in the issue of May 31 on the Young 
Nex Dealersconveys implications regarding the role of
"Beanie" Baldwin regarding the migrant labor camp that
requires some clarification.

Without desiring to minimize the service he gave to
this project, I must say that he was not responsible for
its initiation. I became regional adviser for the states
of Utah, Nevada, California and Arizona for the Division
of Rural Rehabilitation of the FERA in December, 1934. On
my first visit to California, I met Dr. Paul S. Taylor and
Lorothea Lange, both of whom had been appointed by FERA to
work out ways of relieving the distress of the migrants.
In early 1935 I took a state wagon tour with Paul Taylor
and Lorothea Lange through the midland of California to the
Russian border, interviewing the migrants and observing
conditions. Taylor had worked out a program for two camps
to the extent of getting commitments from two counties
commissions to provide land, and of course, from the FERA
to provide the labor to construct them. There was no money
for materials.

Inasmuch as the FERA was sending funds each month
to the state ERAs to finance the Rural Rehab. Corporations
and separate amounts for administration, I began to wonder
if some of the funds from the latter amount could be used.
I was as green a bureaucrat as ever was, had no guidelines,
beyond sharing the New Deal philosophy that citizens in
temporary trouble should be given a lift back on their feet.
When Taylor asked: "Can we use that money?", I said, "I
don't know, but I'll find out." I wired Col. Lawrence
Westbrppl, director of the Rural Rehab. Division, rec-
ommending that $20,000 be allotted to buy material for
two camps. I was astonished to receive a wire of
approval the following day. Those first camps must be
credited to Paul Taylor.
The FSA was not "born" until July, 1937. It was preceded by the Resettlement Administration, which took over the FERA unit mentioned above as its own Rural Rehab. Division under the late Carl C. Taylor I first met Baldwin during the Resettlement Administration when he was part of the Tugwell staff, along with two other southerners, Dr. Will Alexander, a clergyman, and Milo Perkins, a former bag manufacturer.

The RA had been established by Executive Order, and legislation by Congress had to be enacted. The final Bankhead-Jones Act creating the FSA was based on the Report of the President's Farm Tenancy Committee, which convened under Secretary Henry Wallace in December, 1936. Meanwhile, the construction of camps had continued under RA, and further promoted by FSA.

Larry Nelson
9 November 1973

Professor Paul Taylor
380 Barrows Hall
University of California
Berkeley, CA

Dear Professor Taylor:

I was delighted to learn from Malca Chall of your interest in my modest exhibit of Dorothea Lange photographs, Tom Collins reports and John Steinbeck prose.

The reports that Tom Collins wrote of his experiences in Arvin are the most extraordinary I have seen in several years of experience with government records. I was delighted to find that your wife had visited his camp and produced a series of photographs. They bring the exhibit to life in a way that mere documents could never accomplish.

It would be a great pleasure to have you visit our Center if your schedule permits. In addition to the FSA records which I think would interest you, we have recently accessioned a segment of BAE records of great value. I have enclosed a small introduction I prepared for the FSA exhibit. Also enclosed is the latest edition of Prologue, the Journal of the National Archives. On pages 179-180 there is a brief accessions essay I wrote concerning a segment of our BAE material.

If you are able to visit us, please let me know in advance so that I may be certain to be here. It would be a great pleasure to have you.

Sincerely,

ANN M. CAMPBELL
Chief, Archives Branch
Federal Archives and Records Center
National Archives and Records Service

Keep Freedom in Your Future With U.S. Savings Bonds
Farm Security Administration Exhibit Introduction

In 1939, John Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath* followed the path of the Joad family from Oklahoma to the promised land of California. They were cheated by tradesmen along Highway 66, harassed by border guards at state boundaries and on arrival were burned out of their makeshift camp by police deputies. One night the Joads wandered into 'Weedpatch Camp,' a refuge for migratory workers run by the Federal Government, where they found a sympathetic camp manager, indoor plumbing, Saturday night dances, friendship and hope.

A migratory labor camp actually existed near Weedpatch, California. It was originally called the Kern Camp, and later known as the Arvin Camp. It was one of a series of establishments developed and maintained in California by the Resettlement Administration, later the Farm Security Administration, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Temporary accommodations were provided for some of the approximately 350,000 dust bowl migrants who came to the state in search of better opportunity between 1935 and 1940.

From December 1935 to February 1937, Thomas Collins served as manager of the Arvin Camp. During this period, camp operations were examined by numerous interested persons including Henry Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture; Carey McWilliams, author of *Factories in the Field*; photographer Dorothea Lange and Steinbeck. Direct references to the camp or to Collins are found in Steinbeck's early non-fiction work on the migrant problem, *Their Blood is Strong*, and in McWilliams' *Factories in the Field*.

This exhibit features passages from Collins' graphic weekly narrative reports of camp operations, from the holdings of the Archives Branch, Federal Archives and Records Center, San Bruno; Lange photographs taken at the camp in November 1936, courtesy of the Library of Congress; and excerpts from *The Grapes of Wrath*. 
Taylor: Growers tried to get loans at low rates of interest or maybe no interest at all to build their own "company" camps, but they didn't get anywhere with that proposal. They looked askance at our program, but they couldn't publicly set themselves up in opposition to it, and construction of the two first camps actually moderated their opposition to them. When, at its opening, the first camp was dedicated at Marysville, the secretary of the Farm Bureau Federation, recalling his own early days on the farm, said some nice things about it, such as, "I can see why showers, and a place to do the laundry, and toilet facilities should be provided for working families."

So they had to accept the federal camp program even though there was an undercurrent which was not at all favorable to it!

Chall: Did you ever get any other camps even like these, under the auspices of the Rehabilitation Division or whatever it became later?

Taylor: Oh, yes. On July 1, 1935, the division became part of the Resettlement Administration. Eventually we got a national chain of camps with congressional approval, about twenty or twenty-one of them. There is a U.C. master's thesis on the camp program.*

You spoke of Rexford Tugwell, who was both undersecretary of agriculture and head of the Resettlement Administration. I'm sure he was well aware of the conflicting political undercurrents in the situation. At conclusion of the dedication of the first camp at Marysville I remember being at his side at the railroad station while he was waiting to leave on the train. His laconic comment was, "Well, it works." His remark was in tune with the secretary of the Farm Bureau Federation who said he could understand the necessity for decent living conditions. So we were on solid ground, even though expansion of the camp program was not immediate--delayed in fact until 1939.

Undercurrents of opposition remained. There were fears that camps would facilitate labor organizations. The idea of critics was always to have just a few occupants in each camp.

*Albert Croutch, "Housing Migratory Agricultural Workers in California, 1913-1948."
Taylor: A Santa Clara Valley grower, Mr. Curtner, came to my office to urge that point upon me, so as to avoid concerted strike action among the workers. However, there were financial and administrative reasons for building and operating a camp large enough for a couple of hundred families, letting them go out daily in their cars to their work. At one camp an elementary school for the children of migrant families was built by the Resettlement Administration.

I remember the experience of one of my college classmates from before World War I who was on my staff [Irving W. Wood, University of Wisconsin, 1917]. Some local persons in opposition to the Arvin Camp told him that they were going to take charge of running that camp. Of course it was a federal government camp, but they said if it became necessary for local interests to do so, they would come armed to take it over. Wood, a decorated veteran of the 1st Division AEF, France, wounded at Cantigny, said, "Oh no you aren't!" The response was, "Well, why not?" Wood's answer was, "Because we won't let you."

Then he went to the Kern County American Legion and said, "We would welcome it if you gave a flag for the flag-raising ceremonies opening the camp." The Legion said yes, it would, and came to the opening.

So you see we had to play against the opposition, taking our stand on ground to which they could not take public exception, no matter how much they distrusted the camp program.

Chall: When the other camps were finally built, was there much opposition to them?

Taylor: No. Those camps came along later, in 1939.

Chall: Were they wartime camps?

Taylor: First came the congressional approval of a national chain of camps mentioned earlier. One of the reasons for congressional support was the publication of The Grapes of Wrath, in 1939, which had a tremendous circulation. In one of the congressional hearings, when the Resettlement Administration, then called Farm Security Administration, was seeking funds to expand the program, Senator Richard Russell, of Georgia, referred to The Grapes of Wrath in the hearing and said yes, he thought we
Taylor: ought to do something for the people in that condition.* The appropriation went through. The camp program was extended all over the country from Washington and Oregon around the rim of the country to Florida and up to New Jersey.

The ending of that program, if you want a notation of it, I have written up in Land Economics.**

Chall: Yes. I read that yesterday.

Taylor: The growers wanted to take over those camps at about 10 percent of the cost and some of us were unwilling to have them, in effect, made into company towns, with the public investment going at bargain rates into private hands. We succeeded through the efforts of Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas and Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannon. Brannon had been regional attorney for the Farm Security Administration in Denver. You see we had a congresswoman, and a secretary of agriculture, and a president--Harry Truman--who had their feet on the ground and understood what was then called the "common man."

Chall: So the houses were given to the Federal Housing Authority?

Taylor: The camps were given to the local county housing authority in the counties in which they were situated--and you can go and see them today, for example at Firebaugh! on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley.

Chall: And they are still functioning as public housing units? They've never been taken over by growers?

Taylor: No. The condition on which they were taken over was that they would remain public. I haven't visited them for some time, but every once in a while when I go down to the Valley I stop in one and talk with whomever I find there. Usually I find they are farm laborers, living not in the original metal shelters which were set up for them in the thirties, but in decent permanent housing. Some of the original housing is still in


Taylor: use. A lot of it is still holding up, for example, two-story apartments with common walls between them. You can see them at Firebaugh. One of the designers was Vernon De Mars, architect of Zellerbach Auditorium on the Berkeley U.C. campus.

We talked earlier about opposition to the camps from the growers. There was also opposition, I think I should mention, from the "left." You see, the first report that I sent in to Washington, illustrated by the photographs of Dorothea Lange, proposed a program of camps for migrant laborers. My recollection is that a Washington official of the transient service of the FERA, which built decent centers for transient males, made critical comments of our proposal. The burden of his criticism was "Hold off on it." He was not for our program.

That was criticism from officialdom. On another occasion a letter to the editor of a Sacramento Valley newspaper attacked the program of camps for migrants vigorously. The attack came from a plainly extreme left source. What organization the writer belonged to, if any, I have no way of knowing. But ostensibly in the interests of the migrants, he said, "Don't give them camps."*

Well, there is something peculiar from my point of view in being attacked from both sides.

Chall: What would be the rationale behind that leftwing position?

Taylor: Oh, because the camps would be run by employers, who would have them under their thumbs. Of course the employers were afraid of the camps because they wouldn't have them under their control. You see, we got it both ways.

Chall: In effect, they weren't run by the employers.

Taylor: Certainly not. I think I told you about the ACLU coming to me, wanting to know if the campers could have a meeting to discuss a strike at midnight.

Chall: Yes, you mentioned it briefly.

Taylor: Well, that was A.L. Wirin--I am not sure that he is even yet retired--from the Los Angeles ACLU. He came to see me. So I had to discuss with him whether, in my judgment, in the camps we were recommending the inmates could hold a union organization meeting at midnight. Apparently, I satisfied him. I said that would depend on the circumstances. In operating the camps certainly we would have to remember that there were people who might not be interested in the meeting. That the sleep of women and children should not be disturbed, and that they should be protected. But civil liberties clearly would be preserved in some kind of balance between order in the camp and care for those who were not participating in the meeting. We had no more objections from the civil liberties quarter. In fact, the employers did not run the camps so long as the Farm Security Administration was operating them in peace time.

Well, it is true that later, when the Extension Service took them over during the war, the concern to supply labor to employers very much outweighed the Farm Security Administration concern with elevating the position of people in the camp. The balance between interests was different then. That same split within agriculture was reflected in the USDA and it was reflected in the differing conceptions of the functions of the camps. Sydney Baldwin, in his book Politics of Poverty describes how the American Farm Bureau Federation battled the Farm Security Administration and, during the war, nearly put it out of business. He discusses other aspects of the FSA program helpful to smaller family farmers, but does not discuss the camp program.

Cooperative Farming

Chall: Were some of them built on plots of land so that the people could do a little subsistence farming?

Taylor: Gardening? Yes. In connection with some separate houses and the apartment-type housing space for gardening was provided. This type of housing, adjacent to the shelters designed for temporary workers, was designed for laborers with more stable employment. Here an individual house on a lot was provided, so that there was generous space for gardens. Residents in the apartments had somewhat smaller garden plots. As I recall, initially the rental for individual houses was $8 a month. The
Taylor: problem was to find an agricultural laborer who could afford to pay $8 a month for his house.

Chall: You used to advocate various kinds of housing for the farm laborers, one of which was a true cooperative and the other one was a type of cooperative with an arrangement whereby the people who lived in the houses hired the management or managers to take care of cows and livestock and assist them. I was never sure whether any of this kind of housing became available.

Taylor: That was a part of the original resettlement program. You know Johnnie Cash?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: In the Depression, as a boy, Johnnie Cash was a member of a cooperative farm family at Lake Dick project in Arkansas. Within the last two months I saw on the television Johnnie Cash's return visit to his Lake Dick home.

Chall: I saw it.

Taylor: You saw it, too? All right. That was the Lake Dick version of the cooperative program. In California there was Mineral King project about six or seven miles northeast of Visalia. I think the cooperative farm was set up for about fifteen families--individual houses, common buildings for farm machinery, a granary, etc. At Casa Grande in Arizona was a much larger cooperative farm on 3,600 acres. The story of the Casa Grande project is told by Edward Banfield in his book Government Project. Banfield was professor at Chicago, then Harvard, now at Pennsylvania, and a consultant recently to the Nixon administration.

The story of those cooperative farm projects is very interesting. Minimum attention was given to educating people in what was required for success in a cooperative venture. So they did not, in my judgment, understand sufficiently what they must contribute to its success, and what were their true relations with the manager. Was he running them, or were they running him, or were they to keep in appropriate balance? It wasn't clear to the participants.

During the war there was enormous pressure in Congress on the Farm Security Administration to get rid of those farms and to restrict its activities. Conservative interests in agriculture, represented notably by the Farm Bureau, were bitterly opposed to those experiments. They brought all the pressure
Taylor: they possibly could to put them out of existence by turning the properties over into private hands, and they succeeded.

The cooperative at Casa Grande—and at Mineral King—had made good money for the participants. They took farm people who had been on relief, who had nothing but the shirts on their backs, and possibly a jalopy to get to and from their jobs, and set them up in the cooperatives. They were people who had hit rock-bottom and from there were selected out on the basis of their farming experience and the probability that with help they could do something better. They made money. At Casa Grande probably every family was living in a better house than they'd ever lived in their lives. The participant in the cooperatives had no net worth when he came in; $100 would probably cover everything, and on the project they were moving right up the economic ladder.

Then a firm of attorneys in Tucson or Casa Grande persuaded the members of the cooperative that they ought to cash in on those book values. Coupled with that had been newspaper publicity unfavorable to the experiment, sometimes painting the project as Bolshevik. So the projects were given a very distorted characterization, as "reds" which they certainly weren't.

I remember when one day about a mile across the fields from the project I stopped at a shack of the lowest kind sitting on the right of way. There I talked with an agricultural worker. Pointing to the Casa Grande farms visible a mile away, I asked him if he knew what it was. He thought about it, then in his state of complete poverty, answered:

"Well, I think there your chickens and the other fellow's chickens would get all mixed up."

Of course he didn't have any chickens where he was. He was completely at the bottom. But that answer shows how the campaign of opposition to the project took root and helped in its destruction. The means of destruction of the project was through the sale of the properties. The participants sold out their interests. I understand that the law firm that persuaded them at Casa Grande to do it got, as its share, about half the participants' increase in net worth while on the project. So they lost half of their gains. Also they moved out of the best houses they'd ever lived in. Probably most, if not all, moved into houses that were inferior.
Taylor: One of the stories told me by Banfield is that the father of a family wrote to his son, who then was in the armed services in the Pacific, telling him he was going to sell out. His son wrote back protesting that he should stay on, that those were best conditions the family had ever lived in. The end of the story is, that when it was all over the father said, "We killed the goose that laid the golden egg and then we threw the egg away."

Chall: These people, you say, were prospering in this arrangement, even though they had difficulties with respect to their roles and the role of management? But they still made it.

Taylor: Oh, financially? Oh they were moving right up fast. Yes.

Chall: This was government land, was it?

Taylor: Well, when the government owned it, the government acquired it for the project.

Chall: But it didn't remain government land while these people were...

Taylor: No. They sold out.

Chall: Did the government sell it and allow the tenants then to sell their individual shares, or homesteads?

Taylor: Well the whole thing as a unit was broken up and the people moved off, and the purchasers moved on. Whether any of them remained on it, I don't know, but I doubt it. The details are probably told in the Book, Government Project.

At Mineral King, the results were much the same. The regional director of farm security at that time, Laurence Hewes, Jr., had been the office manager of the Division of Rural Rehabilitation when I was taken on. (Later he saw General MacArthur's land reform program through in Japan, and still later became Ambassador Chester Bowles' consultant on land reform in India.) He went down to the Mineral King project's fifteen families, offered them a chance to buy it out at a very favorable price, and at a low interest rate, and they wouldn't do it!

Chall: So that was broken up, too.

Taylor: So that was broken up, too. Yes.
Chall: All the cooperative projects were disbanded?

Taylor: Yes. Political pressure.

Chall: As far as you know, have people been interested in trying it on their own?

Taylor: No, as a result of that series of experiments, no. Of course you realize that cooperative—even outright communistic—farming has been practiced for a long time in this country and still is. The Hutterites in South Dakota and maybe in Montana and Canada are a leading example. Hutterites are out and out economic communists—religious communists. They told me that the Book of Acts says, "And they had all things in common." They interpret that as a command to have all things in common, so the society owns everything and the individual participants own nothing.

Then there is the Amana Society in Iowa, which was equally communistic from the middle 1850s until 1932, when they changed over to become a cooperative society.

Chall: But people who don't have a religious basis for living in this fashion, have they tried that form in the United States since the experiments of the Depression era?

Taylor: Motivation is lacking.

Chall: There is some attempt on the part of many young people to go out and farm communally. I don't know whether they know how to do it. I suppose that one proposition is that you should know something about agriculture.

Taylor: There is some cooperative farming in the South. I have a paper written by one of my students who took his doctorate with me, and now is a professor at the University of Texas. Some experiments are going on now with actual farming on a substantial scale—with machinery, etc. in the South. How well they are coming out, I don't know. But that is in some sense a revival of the earlier effort, and without religious motive. If they're to succeed they need motivation as well as the resources.

Chall: It was the one theme that I noticed over and over again in many of your speeches and in the statements that you would make before congressional and other committees. Is this type of cooperative farming something that you would continue to advocate?
Taylor: Well, if the conditions were right. There has to be motivation. There has to be capacity--because it takes work to make a farming operation go and it takes enough resources.

Of course there are gestures in the direction of enabling more people to go onto the land. The acreage limitation provisions of the federal reclamation laws were designed to open up opportunity on the land for the landless. It hasn't worked that way, partly because large landed interests forestalled enforcement of the law, and partly because the landless generally did not insist on its enforcement. I don't know any of the young people that you speak of, who have really got down to brass tacks and said, "We want this 160 acres of irrigated land. We want to farm it and live there our own way." You've got to get down to brass tacks to do it, and want to do it, and have the motivation to hold the group together.

There have been lots of attempts at cooperative farming that have failed. Some of them have succeeded, but a lot of them have failed. What has happened, not infrequently, is that among the cooperators somebody finally outlasts all the others who leave. As the only remaining member of the cooperative, he gets the whole business! In some cases they have become very wealthy, possibly even freezing out the others making them uncomfortable until they left. That is, one suspects, what has been the motivation that has turned cooperatives over to a very few persons in the end. The Llano cooperative that began in California and moved to Louisiana, I think, went that way in the thirties or forties. And there were others.

Chall: I suppose there would have to be some kind of regulations which would prevent that from happening.

Taylor: Well, yes. But the membership of the cooperative just dribbled away until one man was the only guy left. So then it was, in law, his. There are legal cases which record that.

California Conference on Housing of Migratory Agricultural Laborers

Chall: What can you put into the record about the California Conference on Housing of Migratory Agricultural Laborers, which met a few times in 1934 and 1935? Mr. Drobish was a member, so was Hugh Pomeroy, who was a field representative
Chall: of the National Association of Housing--NAHO, and Mr. F.J. Palomares. Who was he?

Taylor: I called them the planners.* Mr. Palomares had been for a time with the State Immigration and Housing Commission. Then when the growers wanted to have someone representing them to assure the adequacy of their labor supply to be distributed around the areas of the state at the times when they needed them, they took Palomares on to be their representative. He was of Mexican ancestry, spoke Spanish, got along beautifully with the Mexicans, who were at that time coming in in large numbers. He had Fresno headquarters.

He gave me the idea early during my study of migratory labor, of establishing a year-round count of numbers of vehicles of migrants moving north and south past strategic points. He told me that over a certain period, a day or whatever, he had counted the number of vehicles bringing laborers northward across the Tehachapi into the San Joaquin Valley. That's how I got the idea of establishing a systematic count from him. I went to the Standard Oil Company, which had a station at Gorman on the Ridge Route between Southern California and the Valley. The company agreed to maintain the count for me and I published the results.**

Similarly, years later in 1935 I went to Nipomo and set up a camp for migrants on suggestion from a grower's representative, Chester Moore.

Chall: I think you told me that this group never really came to anything, wasn't able to make decisions.

Taylor: Well, yes. The conference brought together persons of diverse viewpoints and interests, but it was not an action organization. I don't say they had no influence, but they had no power. Harry Drobish's rural rehabilitation division--I was taken onto his staff to shape his program--we had power because we had federal funds.

*Proceedings of four conferences are printed by the LaFollette Committee, part 54, pages 22541-22642.

Taylor: They didn't have the power to do anything. They might have continued, even without power and to some effect, had our Division of Rural Rehabilitation not been in existence with power to do something--i.e., to build camps for migrants.

Consultant to the Social Security Board - 1936-1941

Chall: Now if I have my dates correct you worked as a consultant for the Social Security Board from about 1936 to about 1941--primarily during summers.

Taylor: Nineteen thirty-five I went to the Rural Rehabilitation Division of the Relief Administration. In the summer of '35 I transferred to the position of regional labor advisor to what was then the Resettlement Administration, newly established. That carried me through to the middle of '36. About May or June of 1936 I transferred to the Social Security Board as a consultant.

Chall: You had a long period, about five years or so, with the Social Security Board.

Taylor: I worked 1936-41 actively in the field. I may have been on the rolls longer but that was the extent of my active service to the board, yes. Five years.

Chall: During that time, I noticed from your bound volumes, that you dealt with a number of people who were probably your superiors or at least to whom you were responsible, Milo Perkins and Jonathon Garst being first. I don't know whether they were with the Social Security Board.

Taylor: Well, Jonathon Garst was the regional director of the Resettlement Administration, which became the Farm Security Administration. Milo Perkins was undersecretary of agriculture. But my transfer to the Social Security Board did not remove my interest in the provision of adequate housing facilities of migratory labor camps. So when I was either out here or in Washington, I would take occasion to talk to the other agencies because my work related to their programs.

Chall: Were Mr. Perkins and Mr. Garst experts in any field, farm labor or agriculture? How did they come to the federal jobs?
Taylor: I can't answer you that very specifically except to say that Jonathon Garst graduated from the University of Wisconsin about two years before I did. I believe that he took his degree in agriculture. What he did between then and the time that he arrived in the position of regional director of the Resettlement Administration I don't know. His brother Roswell Garst in Coon Rapids, Iowa, was one of the very large, very capable farmers in Iowa. He was the one whom Kruschev visited, and the visit was reported in Life Magazine. The brother went to visit in the Soviet Union. Jonathon Garst is still living in California. [Died ca 1972]

Chall: It seems that the University of Wisconsin supplied quite a few men to the administration during and before the New Deal administration.

Taylor: Oh, yes! The New Deal was staffed to no small extent from the University of Wisconsin—the students of John R. Commons in the field of labor and social security. Well, the head of the Social Security Board was a senior when I was a freshman in the YMCA dormitory on the Madison campus. His dorm and mine were about a foot and a half apart.

Chall: What was his name?

Taylor: Arthur J. Altmeyer. And the head of the commission that set up the social security system, recommending program, he was a young professor on the Wisconsin faculty. Under John R. Commons, he took his degree. All the way through. Later on Wilbur Cohen, the secretary of what is now [the department of] Health, Education and Welfare, came out of the same institution. So I came along with the rest through a very natural channel.

Chall: Then there was Henry C. Taylor, who was in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and who brought in many of his students.

Taylor: Yes, they came through Wisconsin.

Chall: Eventually you were writing to Thomas Blaisdell, Mr. Ewan Clague and Isidore Falk. What were their positions?

Taylor: Thomas Blaisdell, who now is right here in the political science department of this University of California is the man who invited me to move over from the Resettlement Administration and become a consultant to the Social Security Board. He was at that time the assistant director of research. Walton Hamilton was director.
Taylor: They called me by the telephone when I was in Los Angeles working in the field for the Resettlement Administration and asked would I transfer. I became a senior economist for the summer of '36 and then when the University reopened I became consulting economist. The reason for taking me on was that Congress, having exempted agricultural labor from the Social Security Act, attached a mandate for the Social Security Board to study exempted occupations. Since agricultural labor was a principal exempted occupation, along with domestic service, Hamilton and Blaisdell were carrying out that mandate. The studies which you have before you in these volumes are ones that I made recommending and giving the reasons why agricultural labor ought to be covered, pointing out the difficulties created by the exemption, and showing the administrative feasibility of coverage.

Ewan Clague later became the director. You see, Tom Blaisdell was assistant director under Walton Hamilton. At another time he was with the National Planning Board. In time he and Clague, and later Isidore Falk, became the men to whom I was administratively responsible for reporting. Clague became United States Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

Chall: Were these men trained in research, statistical methods, or were they good administrators, or both?

Taylor: Ewan Clague is another of the Wisconsin men. Falk, I don't know what his training was. But they were all highly university-trained.

Reasons for Exempting Agricultural Labor

Chall: Your problem was with respect to uncovered occupations and I am sure these men had other concerns as directors of research for social security, but were they able to help you with the battles that ensued later in keeping coverage where there were pressures for exemption?

Taylor: The answer is NO! No, Arthur J. Altmeyer, head of the Social Security Board, for reasons (I am giving my own interpretation now) of political pressures, did not support my position. I am talking now about 1939, when there was a revision of the Social Security Act which opened wider the exemption door, to
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PART I.—NORTHWEST TEXAS

By Paul S. Taylor, of the University of California

FARMS in the best lands of the Cotton Belt are beginning to be mechanized and to be industrialized. A process begun a couple of decades ago along and beyond its western fringes is now penetrating some of the most important areas in the entire belt. The old system based on tenant and cropper families on small family-size farms is in process of profound transformation. In its place is appearing an industrialized form of agriculture employing wage laborers, some of whom live on the farm, but many, if not most, of whom live in the towns.

Large-scale mechanized farming, with labor paid by the day or hour; labor swept off the land and into the towns from which it is drawn back only during seasonal peaks; labor which is increasingly mobile and without ties to the land—this pattern is incipient in the Cotton Belt. Even on farms where operations remain in the hands of working families on the land, the acreage, the capital equipment, and the seasonal wage labor bill per farm are all increasing.

There has been much talk about labor displacement in the future when the mechanical cotton picker is perfected. The fact is that heavy displacement of farmers and laborers, as a result of increasing mechanization, is already in progress in several important cotton areas. The cause, however, is not the picker machine, but the tractor.

This study emphasizes power farming, which recently has become disturbing both to farmers and to farm laborers, many of whom are exposed to displacement. The use of tractors, particularly the all-purpose, pneumatic-tired type, is spreading. It is accelerating profound changes in the rural structure, some of which had already received impetus from other causes such as drought and depression. Particular attention was given to sections of the Texas Panhandle and the Mississippi and Arkansas deltas where change is most evident.

Reconnaissance was extended over southwestern Oklahoma, the Black Wax Prairie of Texas, and portions of Georgia and the Carolinas, in order to obtain some idea of the manner and extent to which the changes so plainly evident in the Panhandle and delta sections are affecting other cotton areas. Emphasis here is wholly upon areas of change.

1 Based on researches on the security of agricultural workers in the Cotton Belt (June and July 1937) as consultant, Social Security Board. The author wishes to acknowledge the critical assistance of specialists in several Government bureaus, especially that of Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., of the Social Security Board. The author alone is responsible for statements in the article.
POWER FARMING AND LABOR DISPLACEMENT IN THE COTTON BELT, 1937
PARTS 1 AND 2
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FARMS in the best lands of the Cotton Belt are beginning to be mechanized and to be industrialized. A process begun a couple of decades ago along and beyond its western fringes is now penetrating some of the most important areas in the entire belt. The old system based on tenant and cropper families on small family-size farms is in process of profound transformation. In its place is appearing an industrialized form of agriculture employing wage laborers, some of whom live on the farm, but many, if not most, of whom live in the towns. Large-scale mechanized farming, with labor paid by the day or hour; labor swept off the land and into the towns from which it is drawn back only during seasonal peaks; labor which is increasingly mobile and without ties to the land—this pattern is incipient in the Cotton Belt. Even on farms where operations remain in the hands of working families on the land, the acreage, the capital equipment, and the seasonal wage labor bill per farm are all increasing.

There has been much talk about labor displacement in the future when the mechanical cotton picker is perfected. The fact is that heavy displacement of farmers and laborers, as a result of increasing mechanization, is already in progress in several important cotton areas. The cause, however, is not the picker machine, but the tractor. This study emphasizes power farming, which recently has become disturbing both to farmers and to farm laborers, many of whom are exposed to displacement. The use of tractors, particularly the all-purpose, pneumatic-tired type, is spreading. It is accelerating profound changes in the rural structure, some of which had already received impetus from other causes such as drought and depression. Particular attention was given to sections of the Texas Panhandle and the Mississippi and Arkansas deltas where change is most evident. Reconnaissance was extended over southwestern Oklahoma, the Black Wax Prairie of Texas, and portions of Georgia and the Carolinas, in order to obtain some idea of the manner and extent to which the changes so plainly evident in the Panhandle and delta sections are affecting other cotton areas. Emphasis here is wholly upon areas of change.

1 Based on researches on the security of agricultural workers in the Cotton Belt (June and July 1937) as consultant, Social Security Board. The author wishes to acknowledge the critical assistance of specialists in several Government bureaus, especially that of Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., of the Social Security Board. The author alone is responsible for statements in the article.
Taylor: include agricultural processing workers rather than narrowing it as I thought should occur and recommended. I think that the reason for his doing it was that he gained some political support by going against my recommendation, and thus avoided taking on political opposition from the employing side, had he supported my recommendation to eliminate the exemption.

Chall: Well, what kind of political gains would he have achieved?

Taylor: Why would it have been politically useful to him to do that? It would have freed him from the strong attacks on social security from the employing sector which would be made as a much stronger effort had he followed my recommendations. The employing sector in agriculture, what is now called agribusiness, did not want--and to this day does not want--the elimination of that exemption. They would have fought his bill. I do not remember in detail what he wanted in that revision of the act. It freed him to get some advantages, but from my point of view it was at the expense of the necessities of the laborers farthest down on the ladder. That's of course the way things have gone politically almost every time.

Chall: Have these agricultural workers who were removed from the coverage in 1939 never been re-covered?

Taylor: Not fully, only in fragments. Here and there have been some improvements. In other words, it still remains an issue. The people at the bottom of the scale lack the full coverage that is given to other wage workers. There have been some gains.

Chall: Were you the only person making these reports for the uncovered agricultural workers or agricultural workers in general during that period?

Taylor: So far as I know, I was the only person working under the Social Security Board to make these studies. I made the recommendations in more than one capacity. I made the formal reports, which supported my views that there was need, that it was feasible, and that it would have some advantages politically to the board arguments, which I think are still valid. That was done in my capacity as a consultant to the board.

I was also a member of the California Advisory Council on Employment, by appointment of Governor Merriam. I assume that appointment came because I was on the University faculty and my field was labor economics.
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Chall: Oh, really? You were one of the members who by law had to represent the public.

Taylor: That's right. There was also Monsignor O'Dwyer of the Catholic Church in Los Angeles.

Chall: According to the law at least half the people on the commission had to represent the public. We will talk about that later. When you wrote your reports and you submitted them to the Social Security Board, what were the channels?

Taylor: Simply direct from me to Blaisdell, Clague or Falk.

Chall: Occasionally I noted that you would offer a bit of advice, like "take up the problem of exempted employees at the same time the farmers are considering the farm policy." That was during the New Deal days when they could expect some of their wishes to be granted--the large farmers.

Taylor: Oh, when they were down on their knees asking for hand-outs for themselves, it would make it more difficult for them to oppose benefits for their workers. I had forgotten that I made that tactical recommendation but I certainly concur in it, even if it wasn't accepted when social security legislation was pending.

Chall: Was there any interest in coordination of these two kinds of matters with the Department of Agriculture?

Taylor: Any kind of coordination relating to the agricultural labor?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Well, the answer broadly is this: As long as there was a Resettlement Administration and a Farm Security Administration which succeeded it--the Resettlement Administration being under Tugwell, who was the undersecretary of agriculture, the Farm Security being an agency which was transferred directly under the Department of Agriculture--yes, there was coordination. The department was set up under those circumstances to assume a responsibility for all sections of the rural population--the farmers and their sharecroppers and laborers. The way that turned out eventually is described in Sidney Baldwin's book, Poverty and Politics. In one piece of legislation outside of Resettlement or Farm Security the tactic was successfully employed of requiring protection for labor at the same time the growers and processors were seeking legislative favors from
Taylor: Congress. When the sugar beet industry wanted tariff protection in the late 1930s, a requirement was inserted in the pending legislation that the Department of Agriculture hold hearings and establish wage rates for sugar beet workers. It became law and remains law to this day.

Chall: Tugwell didn't last too long in his job at the Department of Agriculture.

Taylor: I believe the reason he left was a tactical one. I've forgotten the details now. But I was told that on an airplane trip across the country, he spoke unguardedly to the man next to him. Someone seated behind him heard what he was saying, was opposed, let the cat out of the bag and made it politically expedient to let Tugwell go. I've forgotten the exact details. Tom Blaisdell will know, if you want them.

Chall: Tugwell, I was under the impression, was a target almost all the time he was in the Department of Agriculture because of his very liberal views on how to handle the poor farmer, and the poor in agriculture generally, as well as the agricultural problems.

Taylor: Well, the Department of Agriculture at the beginning of the New Deal was seeking to assume a broad responsibility overriding the deep division within the agricultural industry. Historically the farmer and the laborer were one and the same person. Not in the plantation system of the South with slave labor, but in the North and in the Middle West, the laborer and the farmer were the same man. In fact, the farmers used to call themselves laborers. The northern farmers, owning their own farms disliked the slave system because it reduced the dignity of human labor on the land, including their own labor.

For a time under the New Deal the Department of Agriculture was able to do some things for those most in need--the laborers, croppers, and small farmers. Under the department the Farm Security Administration spread across the nation the camp program which we had begun on a very small basis in California.

But then as time went on, the political power of the Farm Bureau Federation increased and the bureau was concerned not with the laborers, not with the tenant farmers, but primarily with the protection of the income of the larger farm operators. The first farm subsidies were given, for example, for not growing
Taylor: cotton. The farm operators let their tenants go, took the allocations of permitted cotton-growing acreage for themselves, and let their tenants go on relief.* That was the origin of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union and was a big split within agriculture. The sharecropping system faded out and the sharecroppers, if they remained in agriculture, became wage laborers. By the end of the sixties the number of sharecroppers had sunk so low that the census no longer published the totals. The political power of the big farm operators spread to the point where, by 1969, one of the California farm operators in the San Joaquin Valley received $4.4 million in agricultural subsidies.** So a device originally designed to protect the livelihood of the working farmer was turned to the advantage of the farm operator against the laborers, and from my point of view, unjustifiably against the interests of the public treasury. (In the early seventies Congress cut the permitted subsidy ceiling to $55,000, then to $20,000.)

Chall: At the time you were working for the federal government at the height of the New Deal, you were fighting, apparently, the interests which were hostile to doing anything for labor.

Taylor: That's right.

Chall: Now, as you pointed out before, there may have been some reason for excluding some of the occupations at the very beginning. The Social Security Board didn't quite know how to handle it.

Taylor: Well, as my memorandum points out, it was the secretary of the treasury who in testimony to Congress, when that subject came up, said in effect, "Well now, you're asking us to take on a tremendous new financial operation in establishing a social security system where there has been none before. For administrative reasons, let's do this one step at a time."

He didn't say it was wrong to enlarge coverage. But for administrative considerations, he said, "Don't do it now."

*See Lange and Taylor, An American Exodus, 80, 81 (1939 ed.).

**J.G. Boswell. When in Georgia in the thirties we were told that Boswell had gone to California in the twenties because of the inroads of the boll weevil in Georgia cotton. PST
Taylor: That was Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau. I have no reason to believe that he wasn't entirely sincere. I also believe he was uninformed.

Taylor: There was congressional acknowledgment that the farm laborers existed. Although they weren't covered, Congress specifically instructed the board to study the uncovered occupations—which was the reason that I was taken on. As one of my studies which I was looking at a moment ago points out, the exemption not only was a matter of administrative convenience but undoubtedly it made it politically easier to persuade Congress to establish the social security system in the first place. For example, as I said, Senator Joseph Robinson of Arkansas was Democratic leader in the Senate in charge of putting the social security bill through. Well, an Arkansas senator; and any southern senator, generally would find it very much easier to vote for a bill to impose social security for wageworkers in northern industry than they would to impose it for workers employed by southern planters.

So politically, it facilitated getting a program through Congress.

Taylor: That's right. There was a political agreement to sacrifice the most needy who were the least powerful, in order to get something for the others. And that section of the wage-earning class that I was most concerned with came out second best because it lacked political power.

Taylor: I have no recollection, at the moment, of going to members of Congress while serving the Social Security Board and the Resettlement Administration. I went to administrative personnel
Taylor: in the executive branch of the government to present my views. I had them handle it from there. Also, I was invited to testify before congressional committees and did so a number of times portraying the needs of the laborers.

Chall: Were you feeling a sense of frustration over the years?

Taylor: I don't think of it that way at all. I certainly felt great unmet needs. But while I spoke a little earlier of losing on the widening of the farm labor exemption that I wanted narrowed in the Social Security Board, at about the same time in 1939 the Farm Security Administration was able to extend the camp program all over the country, which I had helped start in California.

So I didn't feel that my time was wasted. There were gains, although not all that I would have liked. And for me personally and professionally, of course, serving the government as consultant was a very rich experience.

Chall: You've indicated in your report, I think, that the 1939 removal of old-age insurance protection from some 300,000 to 400,000 agricultural workers was done under the leadership of large-scale operators in the West. Did the western large-scale operators join forces with the southern farmers to achieve this result?

Taylor: Well I certainly believe that to be generally true. The Farm Bureau Federation was almost never on the side of what I wanted done and the Agricultural Producer's Labor Committee, with offices in Los Angeles, was the instrument that reduced social security coverage in 1939. That became the spearhead opposing what I wanted done to improve the conditions of agricultural labor, particularly in processing products.

But perhaps we should mention at this same time that while we have been talking about social security--implying old-age insurance, unemployment compensation and other forms of social security--that the maintenance of this exemption of agricultural labor was important to the large agricultural interests in order to retain the exemption in respect to collective bargaining. They, I believe, were more concerned that there should be no extension of the National Labor Relations Act to facilitate collective bargaining in agriculture. So, if they yielded on the exemption in social security that would tend to undermine their position in keeping them outside the National Labor
Taylor: Relations Act. That is an active issue to this day in both Congress and the state legislature.

The gains, from my point of view, in coverage of agricultural labor have been on the side of social security though they're not complete—not at all in the field of labor relations.

Chall: What then was the position of the AFL at the time on social security?

Taylor: As late as 1930, the position of the AFL was they didn't want social security at all. That is, they didn't want unemployment compensation. As late as 1930, they didn't want it but then they flipped over fast.

Chall: When did they flip?

Taylor: Well, I can't give you the exact date but they flipped between '30 and '35 when the act was passed. Doubtless labor was influenced by the coming of the New Deal to power in a period of extreme unemployment.

Chall: Were they actively interested in extending it to farm labor? You weren't active politically then, but I'm wondering if you can recall whether they were concerned with the political battle?

Taylor: At some point, I am sure that they supported it. I have difficulty dating it now. But when you talk to me about the advisory committee, I'll tell you about going before the legislature. State Senator Jack Shelley, who was or had been president of the California Labor Federation, gave us his vote on the committee before which I testified. We got about two votes out of nine or whatever the number was. So I am sure that when they took any position at all it was to include agricultural labor.

Chall: I have a short passage here of yours I wanted to ask you about. You are reading an address, "The Place of Agricultural Labor in Society," to the twelfth annual meeting of the Western Farm Economics Association (June 15, 1939). In dealing with the question of social security coverage, you say, "If political spokesman for agricultural interests decide to oppose the recommendations of the Social Security Board for extension of coverage into agriculture with exemption for employees of small
Chall: farms, the decision would seem clearly to be grounded on misconceptions of the problem, rather than on any valid basis for objection by the majority of American farmers."

What I am questioning is your world "misconception."

Taylor: I was just going to say, it was a mild word. Yes. Agribusiness is not interested in the support of what was then called the family farm. Agriculture has been splitting off, first the laborers, second, the family farmers, and today they come very close to saying, "There's no place for the family farm any more." The family farm is, politically, on the run.

Change of Emphasis with the Impending War

Chall: The last report I've seen of yours, with respect to social security, deals with a study of labor in the corn belt, which you made in July and August of 1940. This dealt with the report to Isidore Falk on the need for old-age insurance in the corn belt. But you were also concerned in that report with the fact that whole picture in terms of labor was changing because of the beginnings of emergency defense situation. You suggested that some studies would have to be made to insure that labor was well used--labor and machinery.

Taylor: I see. You saw a certain change in the emphasis of my report. The reason is that I was specifically instructed, as we moved into the defense period, drawing people from the rural areas into shipbuilding, munitions plants and so on, and in anticipations of demands from the agricultural industry to open the doors to more foreign immigration--notably from Mexico--I was asked to make special inquiry to answer the question, "Is there a need for more agricultural labor than we now have?"

With respect to the problem of agricultural labor and defenses, I do remember on a trip to Washington that I went over to the War Department then--I don't know that the Pentagon was there.

Chall: No. I think you are right. It wasn't there.

Taylor: It was the War Department. There was a group of army officers. One of them was Major Ira B. Cross, Jr., son of Professor Ira B. Cross. I was invited over to lunch and they quizzed me as to
Taylor: the need for more farm laborers. My answer was that there was no need "now"--clearly no need. I probably told them that need would arise if things moved farther toward war industry. This must have been in 1941. Well, I am not quite sure. I probably recommended to them a better utilization of the labor already in the United States, rather than yielding to the demands of those who clearly wanted a flooding of the agricultural labor market.

The Commonwealth Club

Chall: I noticed that you had some correspondence with the Commonwealth Club, in 1949 I believe, regarding a questionnaire that was circulated by its agricultural section on various questions pertaining to social security. You took issue with one of the questions. Since it is all in your collection there is no need to go into the details; but I was interested in the fact that you apparently felt the need to keep continually abreast of this subject.

Taylor: I knew it was a political battle all the time! Well, there were a number of experiences with the Commonwealth Club, you noted that?

Chall: This is the first one I've seen.

Taylor: Well, you'll run across some others. Finally, I gave up. If you want to talk about that, why we'll talk about that.

Chall: I'd like to find out about the experiences and method that the Commonwealth Club uses to study issues.

Taylor: Well it has sections and members may join any section they wish.

Chall: The section is quite autonomous?

Taylor: It is autonomous. It makes its recommendations to the club as a whole.

Chall: I see. And if the recommendations come from, let's say the agriculture section?

Taylor: The section operates in a democratic way. You can have a
Taylor: majority and minority report. Then there is an occasion when those reports are presented to the club. The conception of the Commonwealth Club is fine. It is where citizens gather together to concern themselves with problems of general civic importance. The original motto was: "Let's get the facts." Excellent. The Commonwealth Club has done, and is doing fine work. I don't want to be understood as disparaging it in every respect or, even in general.

At the same time, I am critical of its method of carrying out the original conceptions that underlay the founding of the club. There is nothing wrong with having a democratically organized section so that anyone who is a member of the club may join that section, attend it, participate in its deliberations, participate in a minority report if he doesn't like the majority.

But what happens is, that political forces--we keep coming back to that, don't we everywhere--they operate there. It means that a person with my interests, represented no organization but only myself as an individual citizen going to those meetings. In those days I had to take the better part of a day off, going over on the ferryboat, coming back on the ferryboat, and had to pay for my own luncheon as an individual citizen. But in the same section, there'd tend to be, increasingly, paid representatives of organizations that were spokesmen of economic interests. So they would participate in the club's deliberations as part of their work. From my point of view that meant they could load the section on their side, whereas the citizens' interests tended to be subordinated because they were supported in a different way. Their interests were supported by organization and money. My side of questions in which I was concerned was supported by individuals, who out of their own pocket and out of their own time, spoke their views as citizens rather than as representatives of interests.

Chall: You think the agricultural section was made up of people who were interested in big agriculture?

Taylor: On the whole, yes. Finally I decided that I would not spend my time that way any longer, because here I was meeting the hired men of private interests which, from my point of view, were impeding social progress. It was futile. In other words; they won out over my efforts. So I decided not to spend my time any longer in an area where they were in control.
Chall: Were there not many of you—as individuals—in that section?

Taylor: Not enough, not enough. So I was very critical of some of the proceedings, and my documents show it. I was very critical of the sometimes low intellectual standards of the handling of questions put to members of the sections. That is all spelled out in my files.

Chall: Well, that is an interesting sidelight on the Commonwealth Club.

Taylor: From my point of view the section fell short of the high aspirations of the club's founders. But, I repeat, there are respects in which the club's sections undoubtedly still perform a great service to the community. One of the club's great services is the Friday Luncheon. It is a forum where they do invite speakers with differing points of view. But when I speak of the section work, I mean that when I was a member it tended to go in the direction that I have indicated and a citizen, individually, tended to be submerged by an organized financed system more interested in special interests than in people generally.

Chall: So that the sections are sometimes dominated by interest groups.

Taylor: That's exactly right. They overwhelm those of us who represent points of view rather than organized interests. So it is no use, or so it appeared to me when I withdrew.

Chall: Now let's move on into your state work with labor. Did you leave the employment as a consultant with the Social Security Board in 1941 for any particular reason?

Taylor: I don't recall whether I resigned or whether it faded out. You see, I worked very largely in the field and with wartime gas and tire rationing, it was impossible to put us in the field. I probably was kept on the rolls for quite some time beyond the period in which I actually made any reports to them; as I recall my reporting to them ended with the year '41. In '43 I was taken on as a consultant in the Department of the Interior. So whether there was formally any gap or not, I don't know.
Testifying Before Congressional Committees

The LaFollette Committee - 1938-1939

Chall: The LaFollette Committee hearings lasted twenty-eight days, and were long and detailed. Prior to that, the staff had done, as I understand it, quite a bit of research in the area. Did you assist with any research?

Taylor: Yes. I was a consultant to the Social Security Board, and in those days executive agencies could lend their consultants, and the board loaned me. You saw the letter on my service to the committee, the LaFollette Committee?

Chall: Is that in the hearings?

Taylor: No, not in the hearings. No, but upon completion I was given a copy of LaFollette's letter to the Social Security Board thanking them for the loan of my services.

Chall: How much time did you spend as a consultant on loan?

Taylor: Well, I don't know. But I initiated a lot of studies on my own. Then when the committee staff would come to me in advance of the hearings I would make my studies available; some of these the committee printed.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: I recall one particular item that I supplied in advance of the hearings; indeed before it was certain that hearings would be held. Later the committee printed it in the hearings. But the staff told me that they wanted to take it back to Washington because it emphasized the problem of civil liberties of farm labor. You see, the LaFollette committee was to study violations of civil liberties. The staff said they wanted to use my statement to help persuade the committee to come to California.

Chall: Who was behind the committee being formed? Do you know?

Taylor: Well, the LaFollette committee was formed in the early thirties. The first forty-five volumes of its hearings relate to industry, primarily in the East and Middle West where there was violence from the impact of the Depression, from the strikes it unleashed. Then a lot more violence broke out after passage of the Wagner
Taylor: Act, when employers at first were unwilling to accept its collective bargaining terms.

You want to know how the LaFollette committee got out here?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Well, I am sure there were many pressures to bring it out here to study this rather unique agricultural labor situation. I don't know all of the people who brought the pressure but I know the pressures were wide-spread. I recommended that the committee come. As you know, the senator and I were classmates. On one of my trips to Washington I went to his office and recommended that the committee come to California. Finally, they did.

Do you want to talk about the LaFollette committee now?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Well, for the California phase of the committee's studies the chief counsel was Henry H. Fowler, recently Secretary of the Treasury under the Johnson administration. A very able man. Toward the end of the committee's work in California he told me that when first he came out here, the Senate committee wanted to avoid having an extreme left label pinned upon it. He was told there were two informed people out here that he could go to for help who would not be Communists. My name was one of them.

Chall: And who was the other?

Taylor: The other is Mrs. Hubert Wyckoff of Watsonville, the daughter of a University of California Latin professor, Leon J. Richardson. A very fine, sympathetic, public-spirited woman.

Chall: I think I've seen her name on committee lists.

Taylor: I'm sure you have. One other sidelight: Senator Elbert Thomas, of Utah, joined with LaFollette in holding the California hearings. He didn't say this to me, but I was told later that Thomas believed that they would hold only a couple of days of hearings out here because politically they could not afford to be anti-farmer. Then when he found out from the opening session that the California "farmer" was not the kind of family farmer he knew in Utah and the rest of the country, but instead
Taylor: was the kind now called agribusiness, he was willing to go on right through to the end. Perhaps I helped him change his mind for in my opening three-hour statement I emphasized the unique character of California's industrialized agriculture with lots of statistics and charts.

Chall: The hearings were very long and quite detailed. They certainly let every side be heard; everybody had his say. Did you have all your material prepared to read?

Taylor: Yes, I had it all mimeographed, and accompanied with display-size charts. Do you want to look at it?

Chall: I have looked at it.

Taylor: Yes indeed, it was all prepared, with copies in the hands of the committee, and I read my testimony. I was very careful to have it documented to a gnat's eyebrow, with charts, and all the rest. It was a very academic presentation.

Chall: It's some of the material that you had been covering over the years with the Social Security Board—all the same charts.

Taylor: And with the Resettlement Administration, the Relief Administration, and it drew on my experience before that from the twenties, when I had made studies of Mexican farm labor.

Chall: Careful documentation of the background...

Taylor: Yes, there was more than a dozen years of field experience behind what I presented, plus the library research to bring it up to date and relate it to the inquiries of the Senate committee.

Chall: It must have taken quite a bit of time to get it together.

Taylor: Oh, lots of it. Remember this also, that in Depression it was very difficult to find any academic outlet for publication of research. The University was out of funds. It had published a lot of my Mexican Labor in the United States in the Economics series and in Ibero-Americana. But with Depression the publication funds dried up.

So here the government, through the LaFollette committee, was concerning itself with some of the very problems that I was concerned with professionally. So the two interests came
Taylor: together. The committee provided an opportunity to make some of my researches available in print to scholars and to government officials alike. They printed the doctoral dissertation of Varden Fuller on the history of California agricultural labor. There was no other chance to get that published anywhere! Likewise Clark Kerr's and my documentary history of the cotton strike of 1933. There was no other chance to get that published anywhere. Along came the LaFollette committee, and printed both studies. So the hearings became an academic outlet as well as a public service outlet.

Chall: That's what makes it such a tremendous set of tomes.

Taylor: Oh, the documentation of that is immense! Immense! They start with Part 47 and end up with Part 75 of the hearings, devoted mainly to California and Arizona agricultural labor.

Chall: Then they did a very detailed summary.

Taylor: Then they did a summary that thick, which I have on my shelves here. That's right. Nine parts are printed in the summary reports. The tenth report appeared on October 19, 1942 in the Congressional Record. It includes the summary statement by Senator LaFollette and the draft of four or five bills prepared under Henry Fowler. It was torpedoed easily because on October 19, 1942, we were at war.

The man who torpedoed it particularly was Senator Reynolds of North Carolina, one of the most conservative among the senators. The change from depression to war created a political atmosphere in which it wasn't possible to extend protective social legislation to farm labor, which already had been put on the shelf in the thirties for the two reasons that I gave you earlier. Have I made that clear?

Chall: Yes. These bills drawn up by Henry Fowler would have extended protection to migratory laborers?

Taylor: Yes. There were about four bills to extend labor relations and unemployment compensation and--oh, I've forgotten what all. But generally to extend the social security protections that the New Deal had given to industrial labor, extend them primarily to agribusiness farm labor. Where industrial employment conditions prevail in agriculture, they said in effect, there is no sufficient reason for not extending the protections we extend to labor in what we call industry.
Taylor: One of my recommendations at that time was to exempt any farmer with a wage bill of under $500. Such a bill would exempt the farmer who had an occasional man to help him, or for a very short time had a group, but wasn't really operating an agricultural industry. He was a farmer who did his own work and hired a few others only when he needed help in a rush.

Chall: If the war hadn't come along, do you think that these bills would have passed?

Taylor: They would have come to passage much quicker; of course some have not passed yet.

Chall: The Southern Democrats couldn't have held out forever against the pressure?

Taylor: I think that they would have yielded faster than they have. We had two presidents who were both sympathetic--FDR and Harry Truman? After that, of course, it was different.

Chall: It was such a battle all the way through, up to the time of the war, that nobody of course can ever be sure what might have resulted.

Taylor: Well, the war threw political power in the direction of the most conservative interests. World War II was the first shove in that direction and the war in Korea was the second.

Chall: And the fact that people were employed also allowed them to forget about the special protective legislation.

Taylor: That's right. When everybody is in the soup then most everybody is in favor of doing something. When the number of unemployed is reduced, well, it doesn't seem so important to so many. That's why we go along with--oh, 6 or 7 percent unemployed now. Well, that's too bad, we say, but we've got to put up with it to block inflation or whatever.

I'm not saying that that is what I believe. I am saying that that is how people react to the situation. But let unemployment rise to 25 percent and then it is very different. That reaches way up in the population and the demand that something be done about it becomes very strong.

Chall: Some other professors from the college here also testified and I was wondering whether you got together in making some determination on your testimony?

Chall: Yes. I know you probably didn't confer with Mr. Crocheron.

Taylor: Did I tell Suzanne Riess about Crocheron, when I went to him for introductions to his agricultural extension staff when I began to study migratory labor in 1927?

Chall: You may have told her, but you may as well tell me too--

Taylor: I think I told her he had been spanked, shall I say, by C.C. Teague of the Limoneira Citrus Ranch, who was later a congress-man. From then on it was increasingly clear that the Agricultural Extension Service didn't want to have much if anything to do with the condition of the laborers of agriculture. It became more and more concerned with the condition of the farm operators.

Chall: What did Mr. Crocheron tell you in 1927?

Taylor: He gave me a letter of introduction to members of his service. It said approximately this: "Professor Taylor is studying Mexican labor in California. He may wish to consult you for information on this subject." I never used Crocheron's letter. I used President Campbell's letter with a gold seal, which made it look as though the University was really interested in supporting my research, not that I should be treated coolly.

Chall: What has been the position of Varden Fuller, who was at the Giannini Foundation for quite some time?

Taylor: He's at Davis now. Well, agricultural economics wanted Varden Fuller because they recognized that labor was a part of agriculture. I'm talking now of the College of Agriculture, not agricultural extension.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: As a matter of fact, it was vice-president, later acting President Harry Wellman, who came to me and asked whether I thought Varden Fuller would be a good man to put on their staff in agricultural labor. See, there is no black-white story.

Chall: And what had he been doing prior to that?
Taylor: Well, he had been affiliated with a law firm that represented labor unions in arbitration and mediation. So the interest of agricultural economics in the field of agricultural labor was deliberate and, in my judgment, very commendable.

Chall: Who had a hand in picking these people, particularly from the University, who testified before the LaFollette committee?

Taylor: Well, it was unquestionably all arranged through Henry Fowler, the chief counsel.

Chall: Was he looking for people with a particular expertise?

Taylor: Well, remember he had everybody testify from the Associated Farmers to academic professionals like myself. He wanted the whole range. He wanted a lot of academic personnel to document the investigation to a gnat's eyebrow. And the result was a tremendous documentation indeed.

Chall: So that people like Murray Benedict and Emily Huntington were experts in their aspects of...

Taylor: Yes. I don't remember what their testimony was but...

Chall: That can always be looked up, but they did have expertise. I don't know who John B. Canning and Paul Dodd are.

Taylor: John Canning was a professor of economics in the accounting field at Stanford, who apparently got interested in the farm labor situation. I don't know just why, but it must have been some inner and humane impulse that made him want to appear. I've no doubt that he asked, and was accepted.

Chall: And Paul Dodd?

Taylor: Paul Dodd was—well the most recent public service of Paul Dodd was as president of San Francisco State. At the time of the LaFollette hearings he was in the UCLA economics department. He did a lot of labor mediating, perhaps with the War Labor Board. He's living out in Walnut Creek now, in retirement. By interview you might get interesting things from him.

Chall: Did you all feel a sense of accomplishment while this was going on?

Taylor: Oh, it was a tremendous experience—tremendous. Yes.
Chall: And you felt that something important would come of it?

Taylor: Oh yes. The Senate committee was a congressional challenge to a situation which had become violent and was dividing our society within this state sharply. Oh yes!

A book came out recently on the LaFollette committee. I was asked to review it for *Agricultural History.* They asked for an article-length review.

Chall: Was it a big book?

Taylor: Oh yes.

Chall: Was it a good one?

Taylor: It was a good book, but as I recall he left out the agricultural part. The book was by someone in the Middle West or East, who wrote on the industrial part of the committee's work, with a minimum on agriculture. Naturally, as a Californian with my professional interests, agricultural labor was the chief concern.

Chall: Do you have anything that you'd like to say in summary of this discussion of the LaFollette committee? Is there anything that we haven't covered that you feel you'd like to say?

Taylor: I'll make this comment about California agricultural labor. The conditions, the attitudes, the philosophies, the activities flow from a socio-economic pattern that was developed in the third quarter of the nineteenth century in this state and have survived to this date. So we have potentially the enduring contradictions and conflicts of interest which manifest themselves in ever-changing forms, although, in a sense it is all a reflection of the same pattern. It is like a never-ending prize ring battle in which the participants may change names and change their tactics but they are always battling each other over one thing or another.

Chall: The rules of the game are still there, the actors may change. The conditions, as you say, aren't changed.

Taylor: Well, we shall talk again about the rules of the game when we get to the subject of water.

Chall: We may come across them again when we discuss the on-going problems of the migrant laborers.

Taylor: Yes; at one time you see the issues drawn over the Chinese, then over the Japanese, then over the Mexicans. Parker Frisselle, whom you named, led the 1926 fight for importation of seasonal workers from Mexico, and eight or nine years later was president of the Associated Farmers and the manager of the University of California's own Kearney Park Vineyard near Fresno.

Chall: Mr. Frisselle?

Taylor: Yes. So he embodies much of the enduring conflict of interest right in his own person.

Senate Committee to Investigate Unemployment and Relief - 1938

Chall: I was interested in your testimony before the Senate Committee to Investigate Unemployment and Relief. I read it in Volume 3 of your collection of personal papers.

Taylor: James F. Byrnes was the chairman, and Senators Frazier, Murray, and Lodge were the other senators on the committee. Among the problems they were concerned about was that so many persons were leaving the farms.

Chall: You and others discussed this problem.

Taylor: We described what it was doing to farmers and laborers. Now it is hailed as a triumph and given as an argument—a phony argument, in my judgment—that there should be no acreage limitation in the reclamation law because so many people are leaving their farms.

Chall: You were asked by Senator Frazier, "Is it your opinion that these big farms, so-called 'industrial or chain farms' are a detriment?" You said, "I believe that measures should be taken, so far as possible, to maintain such economies as large-scale methods afford, but to eliminate those aspects
Chall: which provide the strife, poverty, relief and excessive migration which we now see, where that form of agriculture predominates."

Taylor: I'd forgotten that entirely! It sounds all right.

Chall: Then he asks how and you answer: "In some sections of the country I trust and believe the family farm will survive. In the western irrigated valleys it is important that the economies of large-scale production be made available to farm families and I am afraid they cannot be made available on a family-sized farm."

Taylor: Did I say that?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: I wouldn't say that today. I'll have to look at that and see because I'm a little surprised. Perhaps I should note that when I testified in 1938 I had not heard of the 160-acre limitation in reclamation law.

Chall: You did, however, recommend two Voorhis bills to provide federal relief to transients, one while they were going from one state to another before they acquired residence, and the other to provide medical care through the United States Public Health Service to people who had not established residence in a state. Whatever became of the Voorhis bills?

Taylor: I don't know.

Chall: Mr. Voorhis, I take it, was somebody with whom you had some sympathetic contacts over the years?

Taylor: Yes. Not extensive contacts, but always sympathetic. He was the first target of Richard Nixon. Defeating Voorhis is how Richard Nixon first got into Congress. Conservative interests there wanted someone to knock Voorhis out. Voorhis was liberal. Step two was defeating Helen Gahagan Douglas in 1950.

Chall: Did Senator Byrnes incline to be sympathetic to your point of view?

Taylor: I had minimum contact with Senator Byrnes. I had contact with his chief of staff for that committee, whose name I don't at the moment recall.
Chall: Alan Johnstone?

Taylor: Yes. A very fine person. A very fine person of broad sympathies.

Chall: Senator Murray of Montana--

Taylor: Senator Murray of Montana was a very liberal senator.

Chall: Senator Lodge--was he the father of the Lodge that we know?

Taylor: No. He was the Lodge who later was ambassador to Vietnam, and son of the Senator Lodge who defeated Woodrow Wilson's attempt to bring the United States into the League of Nations.

Chall: And Senator Frazier?

Taylor: Frazier, of North Dakota, and voice of the Farmer's Union--a liberal.

Chall: How were you called to that committee, do you know?

Taylor: Well, Mr. Johnstone asked me. He knew of my work for the Rural Rehabilitation Division of the California Emergency Relief Administration, the Resettlement Administration, Social Security Board--all concerned with farm labor and dislocated farmers.

I don't know who suggested to him that he call me, but he did so very early in his preparations. At a preliminary meeting we discussed what might be presented in the hearings. The second time I testified.

Chall: Your testimony was all written in advance and copies given to the committee members and staff? That's the way it is usually done?

Taylor: Yes, it was--and is--a very common method for professional testimony and many witnesses present their case that way. I don't think that the Associated Farmers testifying before LaFollette came with prepared testimony. If they did, I do not now recall it. When I proposed legislation to the LaFollette committee, my opposite, who followed me representing the Agricultural Producers Labor Committee, had prepared testimony.
In 1940 you were again testifying in Washington. This was for the TNEC hearings. Those also were major hearings.

They were. TNEC was a joint administrative and congressional committee. The executive head was Dewey Anderson, a Californian. He is back in California right now, and has just published his autobiography within the last six weeks.

This was in 1940 so I suspect this was probably one of his first jobs after he left the Olson administration.

Yes. He went to Washington. He had been a member of the California legislature, then head of the State Relief Administration under Governor Olson. I had known him from my graduate student days on Berkeley campus.

Oh, I see. In what capacity?

Well, he came once to Professor Solomon Blum's seminar in which I was a student. He came up from Palo Alto when he and his wife were bound for Russia. It was right after World War I and Herbert Hoover administered an American Relief program in Russia. Dewey Anderson went to help administer that program.

So he had quite a background in social welfare. He was the economic consultant to the committee. Was he an economist?

No, his doctorate at Stanford was in education.

Now the reason that this committee was in existence was to study what? The whole problem of the economy?

It's the most thorough study of the national economy that has been made, and people are talking about doing it again.

So it was as carefully prepared as the LaFollette committee?

Oh, yes. And you notice they put me on right behind Mr. McCormack of the International Harvester Company?

Yes, that's right.

That was by design. Here was the representative of the farm machinery industry, and I had been studying some of the social
Taylor: effects of the machinery.

Chall: Yes, I remember that your testimony was contradictory, to some extent, to his--which I suppose you could expect.

You were concerned here, in your testimony, with what the AAA was doing as a displacing agency. You felt that farmers should be given rehabilitation loans, and that they should be provided loans for cooperative purchases of farm machinery, for the purchase of land through reclamation projects, so that more land should be put into cultivation. There was some discussion with you over the Homestead Act. It is interesting that here you said, "In time the 160-acre limitation might not apply, so we can't be too rigid."

Taylor: Who said that?

Chall: You said it. I may be taking that wrongly.

Taylor: No, I have no recollection of that at all. I'd have to--there again is something that I would have comments to make on today. Not that it is wrong, but I wouldn't have said it that way. Perhaps I had in mind that 200 acres in Montana might be more reasonable.

Chall: What was supposed to be the outcome of this committee's work? And what was the outcome of the work?

Taylor: I don't know. It is a tremendous, a massive accumulation of facts with analysis. It is like the LaFollette committee; what came out of it? Well, it is not easy to be specific. A specific piece of legislation? No. Piecemeal a lot of things begin to come out of it. If we asked Dewey Anderson, he probably would be able to tell us what eventually came from the TNEC.

Select Committee to Investigate Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens - 1940

Chall: Now then you testified before the Tolan committee in 1940--this was a Select Committee to Investigate the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens. Robert Lamb was the chief investigator and he had been with the LaFollette committee.

Taylor: That's right. I brought them together.
Chall: You brought Tolan and Robert K. Lamb together? Tolan was a representative from the Oakland area?

Taylor: He was congressman from this district. Yes.

Chall: So you had a long period of contacts with him?

Taylor: That's right, contacts with him, with his son Jack, and with his staff.

Chall: Did he remain sympathetic with the kinds of interests that you had over the years?

Taylor: Yes. He was always sympathetic and that series of hearings is a very fine collection, just as the LaFollette committee hearings are, on their subject. There isn't as much scholarly research in the Tolan hearings, but as compared with many of the committees of Congress, there is an immense amount of careful work in it.

Tolan himself appeared before the Supreme Court of the United States to argue that the State of California could not send back to Oklahoma, or wherever he came from, a person who had moved to California and then needed relief. In other words, American citizenship is national, and a state may not bar migration because of the migrant's destitution.

Chall: He had to be before the Supreme Court to get their opinion?

Taylor: Yes. I think he published his brief and perhaps the Court's opinion.

Chall: He credits you in his opening statement with creation of a resolution under which the committee was appointed. You had convinced his son and his secretary of the need for this study and they in turn convinced him.

Taylor: Oh, I'd forgotten that. Well, I told you I recommended Bob Lamb to them. That must have been their way of telling it.

Chall: Here again you discuss housing, the need for more housing, the need for cooperative ownership of farm machinery and any attempts of this kind to keep people on the land--to prevent their displacement--

Taylor: Well, I talk about that to this day with reference to the 160-acre limitation. They try to use the argument that big machinery
Taylor: requires big landholdings. I say that is a phony argument, because if you are a small farmer you can own big machinery cooperatively or hire it on contract. Both methods have a long history in this country, including in California right down to this day.

Chall: What you were encouraging here then was funding, so that farmers who wished to stay on the land could get the loans in order to accomplish this.

Taylor: The Farm Security Administration made loans of the kind I described! So it wasn't just an idea, it was something that was done practically.

Chall: Apparently there wasn't enough money around.

Taylor: Well, they pinched the Farm Security Administration, turned it into Farmer's Home Administration and squeezed it down. The Farm Bureau Federation exerted its political power on the side of agribusiness. They didn't want the bottom level of the farm population to be protected. Then after the people were removed from the land, they say in effect, "Well, you see, it had to be that way." After they have applied the pressure, whatever results is assumed to be natural and right. In colonial times the necessity for slave labor was explained the same way.

Problems Raised by Agricultural Technology

Chall: In an article which you wrote in Harper's in 1941, Goodbye to the Homestead Farm, you indicated that there is no point in attacking the machine. "The question is not are we for or against farm machines, it is how can we distribute the benefits that more machines in agriculture can confer." I guess that is the question that hasn't yet been answered.

Taylor: Yes, and latent in that, you see, was my belief in the desirability of holding people on the land in the status of owner-workers, avoiding two things: the split which we see in such extreme form in this state between landowners and their workers, and the sweeping of people off the land and into the cities. People don't usually associate the two and say, "Well is that what we want from machines?" They kick
Taylor: about crowding the ghettos, but seldom ask what created the ghettos? The sweeping of people off the land with no severance pay created the ghettos. How are we going to use the land is a really big question. Is the only criterion to be the advantage of big machinery to big land owners?

Chall: I think some recent studies point up the fact that the farm policy itself seems to have caused the large amount of migration from farms to cities.

Taylor: Yes, it swept people off the land—not only by the spreading use of machinery, of course. Tax policies and all kinds of things push them off. A tax policy, you see, can put a valuation on a piece of farm land above what farming will support, because land right next to it is used for urban or suburban development. So the tax assessor's view is: if this piece of land is developed as part of suburbia, well, then why not develop farm land a mile down the road likewise and assess its value accordingly? So the tax assessors, wanting a broader tax base and more revenue, raise the assessment. Then the farm people say, "Well, it is getting more and more difficult to make a living as the taxes go up and up." Finally they say, "Well we got a good offer from a developer," and they sell out.

Chall: Wasn't another problem, too, in people's leaving the land, the curtailment of production which the federal government instituted in the thirties and which has continued.

Taylor: Yes. The Southern Tenant-Farmers Union was organized in 1934, when the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA) came in and allotted a certain acreage of permissible production of cotton, paying the farmer not to plant more. The owner often would concentrate the allotment of permissible cotton all on his land leaving none for the tenant. Without cotton the tenant couldn't make a living; it was his essential cash crop. So he struck against the landlord. The next thing after striking, he found himself out on the roadside with all his belongings, evicted from the tenant's house. So he sank from tenant to laborer. I discussed that in Memphis in about 1937 with the two men who founded the STFU. I said, "You call yourselves Southern Tenant-Farmers Union. You aren't going to be farmers anymore, you're laborers." Not long after that H.L. Mitchell, one of the two men to whom I spoke, organized and became the leader of an AFL Farm Labor Union.
The Philosophy of Agricultural Fundamentalism

Chall: So a variety of policies have been pushing people off the land.

There is a phrase Agricultural Fundamentalism, which I think means that some people feel that working on the land is extremely important to America, its democratic institutions, and its economy, and we should strive to make sure that people stay on the land. This has always been in conflict, I guess, with technological changes.

Taylor: Well, technology didn't begin to be important in American agriculture until about the time of the 1793 invention of the cotton gin, which was a processing instrument. But on the land itself, technology came in on the eve of the Civil War. What is now the International Harvester company grew out of it. The McCormick reaper came first. That came in, was invented in the 1840s, and its use was just beginning to spread in the North in harvesting grain crops. With the shortage of labor, owing to the Civil War, its use increased.

The question is not whether there is to be mechanization, but how are the machines going to be used in relation to people? You can see how we are using machines, enabling large-scale and corporate agriculture to sweep the people off the land. Yes, if you want to talk about agricultural fundamentalism, then you have to go back and see just what is meant by it.

Daniel Webster, did I read him to you? [leafing through the book] Well, I'll read Daniel Webster to you. On the two hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims, this is what Daniel Webster said:

"Our New England ancestors were themselves, either from their original condition or from the necessity of their common interest, nearly on a general level in respect to property."

You see, he is not talking about production, he is talking about distribution of property, as an economic interest of the owner.

"Their situation demanded a parcelling out and division of the lands and it may be said fairly that this necessary act," and he underscored what follows, "fixed the future frame and form of their government. The character of their political institutions determined by the fundamental laws respecting
Taylor: property. The right of primogeniture was abolished. The entailments of estates, long trusts were seldom made use of. On the contrary, alienation of the land was every way facilitated.

"The consequence of all these causes has been a great subdivision of the soil and a great equality of condition, the true basis, most certainly, of popular government."

There is the economic and political basis of agricultural fundamentalism. That is challenged by mechanization in agriculture and challenged also by the growth of forms of property other than land.

Chall: A Jeffersonian ideal, too, was it not?


Chall: Where did you take that quote of Daniel Webster--what were you reading it from? An article of yours?

Taylor: Yes. It is my Excess Land Law on the Kern. (46 Calif. Law Rev. At 155) In California we have a pattern of land ownership comparable to the southern plantation. I call it streamlined plantation agriculture because of the modern mechanization. Its behavior with respect to labor is like the plantations in the South, where you have got to have labor to get the job done and that is what labor means to the planters. And the fact that the laborers are human beings, citizens like yourself, well, that's an afterthought.

You see what we face here? The political instability of our day is related to mechanization and displacement of people from the land. The distribution of property is no longer equal or equitable.

Congressional and Administration Support and Opposition to Agricultural Labor Reform

Chall: You were one of the major experts in the field of agricultural labor laws, and housing. I noticed that when you testified before committees you were always treated with great respect.

Taylor: Well, that is the way I have been received most of the time--
Taylor: not all the time. They don't have to treat a witness that way. I can tell you about one time when they didn't print my testimony.

Chall: Is that right? What committee is that?

Taylor: Oh, that was Senator Henry Jackson's Interior committee, in 1966. Of course I was talking then about acreage limitation and proposing real enforcement of the law through government purchase of excess lands. I have a copy of the entire hearing transcript in my bound file. Five times the presiding senator told me that my prepared statement would be printed. They printed nothing of the hearings at all.

Organized labor was represented at the hearings, the AFL-CIO, Grange, Farmer's Union, Catholic Rural Life. They printed nothing! Which suggests a less than friendly reception.

Chall: Quite. A complete black-out!

But in the days when people were concerned about agricultural labor, you were...

Taylor: Yes, you see those were the days of FDR, and Harry Truman, and a time when the program of migrant labor camps was supported by the administration and by Congress. So the political atmosphere then was friendly to what I stood for. I know it both ways.

Chall: I'm not sure that more housing, or better labor conditions, or higher rates of pay resulted from the hearings, are you?

Taylor: Better housing came. I think they were productive in various ways. They were not productive as quickly as I would have liked. That is to say, I appeared before committees proposing or advocating the inclusion of farm labor in social legislation, a program which still has not been completely accomplished; there has been too much opposition. So the hearings have had some effect--yes. I don't feel that what I did was without effect. But much less was done than what I recommended, and some of what has been done has come along only inch by inch. Of course there has been a general contribution to public education as result of the hearings.

Chall: Do any people in the Congress stand out in your memory as those who consistently supported the efforts for change?
Taylor: Well, Helen Gahagan Douglas was very actively concerned with the migrants herself on her own initiative. She would come up from Southern California into the Valley. She took Eleanor Roosevelt once on a tour through the San Joaquin Valley. I was asked to recommend a route which would show her the diversity of conditions, which I did. I did not accompany the party, but I understand they followed my suggestions, more or less. As congresswoman, Helen Gahagan Douglas prevented the camp program from going into private hands, which I would call company towns. Secretary of Agriculture Charles B. Brannon for the administration, and the Congress supported Congresswoman Douglas' bill to assure that the federal camps would remain in public hands of local public housing authorities.

Earlier, as I told you, Senator Richard Russell, of Georgia, at an Appropriations Committee hearing referred sympathetically to *Grapes of Wrath* and said, "Yes, we ought to do something."* There was administration support; we had the Department of Agriculture's support, R.G. Tugwell first, and then C.B. "Beanie" Baldwin, head of the Farm Security Administration. And of course there was President Harry Truman.

Chall: And Harry Hopkins and others had an ear to the president.

Taylor: Well, Harry Hopkins, you see, was originally in charge of the Division of Rural Rehabilitation under which the migrant camp program started, and then it was turned over to the Resettlement Administration, which was an independent agency under Rexford Guy Tugwell, the undersecretary of agriculture. About 1937 the Resettlement Administration became the Farm Security Administration. It was put under the Department of Agriculture.

If you want to state the issue broadly, the question was, with whose interests in the agricultural occupation is the Department of Agriculture, with its administrative and educational programs, most concerned? The answer has been ever clearer: the USDA is concerned primarily with the interests of farmers and employers of labor in agriculture. The Farm Security Administration has barely survived as a mere shell of what it used to be.

*Relief and Public Works Appropriation Act of 1939. Hearings before Senate Appropriations Committee, 76 Cong., 1 sess., on H.R. 326, 179 (1939).*
Chall: In those first days of the New Deal, I guess if there were people with real social concerns who got into government they were in the agriculture area primarily.

Taylor: The Resettlement Administration was staffed by people with genuine social concerns.

Chall: That made quite a difference in what was going on?

Taylor: Yes, it did. On this subject Sidney Baldwin's book *The Politics of Poverty*, which I mentioned before is very good. In it he has traced, in great detail, with much care and understanding, how the farm security program became overshadowed by the power of those who were concerned more with the larger employing farmers and less with small farmers and farm laborers. It's a part of the story of the industrializing of agriculture which produces a separation of personnel within the industry, and a division of interest.
III STUDYING THE BACKGROUND OF RURAL POVERTY: THE STATE GOVERNMENT
(Interview 3, June 10, 1971)

Advisory Council on Employment - 1938-1942

Chall: In 1938, you have said, you were appointed, by Governor Merriam, to the Advisory Council on Employment, of the California State Employment Service. I think you were there until 1942.

Taylor: I think that is right.

Chall: Did you write the report to the State Advisory Council of June 10, 1941, opposing SB 876 which would have exempted some 100,000 packinghouse workers in California from unemployment insurance?

Taylor: Are you referring to what I have here in my bound volumes signed Monsignor O'Dwyer? Well, I probably wrote it.

Chall: You have indicated on a mimeographed sheet, a couple of pages beyond that you might have. Does the PST mean that you wrote it? Now did you write the report as a member of that state advisory council?

Taylor: Oh, yes. I was a member. Not only that, I presented that as the views of the council before a senate committee of the state legislature in an evening session at Sacramento. We got only a couple of committee votes, including Senator John F. Shelley. That was an interesting experience. They called the other side up first to testify. Their witnesses spoke in the most leisurely, deliberate fashion, taking plenty of time. So we came on last as the hour became late, and when everybody was beginning to squirm in his seat thinking it was getting close to time to go home.
Taylor: This comes, I believe, to a point you asked me earlier about the attitude of organized labor. A member of the senate committee asked me this question: "Isn't it true that what you and the advisory council want is going to impose heavy financial obligations on the fund if it must pay compensation to unemployed farm laborers? They are subject to unemployment to an unusual degree? Isn't that going to have to be paid out at the expense, largely, of the other workers in industry? Do you think that they will like that?"

My answer was: "The organized labor spokesmen are here, I think you should ask them that question." The spokesman for the State Labor Federation got right up and said notwithstanding the financial burden, they did want coverage extended to farm laborers.

Chall: The advisory council was made up of labor representatives as well as employer representatives. I am assuming that you had a unanimous report there.

Taylor: I don't recall who was on the advisory council at the moment. But there was unanimity, there was no division.

Chall: You only got a couple of votes in the legislative committee on that bill. John Shelley's being one.

Taylor: Well, there was something like nine or eleven members. We got two or at most three votes.

Chall: This dealt with redefining agricultural labor and thus exempting about 100,000 packinghouse workers from unemployment insurance. It meant taking away something that was already in existence. These people were covered and the industry wanted to remove from them unemployment insurance.

Taylor: And we wanted to extend it to more workers, not shrink the coverage.

Chall: Well, I don't think you were trying to extend it. I think you were trying to preserve it. It followed just a few years, you know, the federal exemption, so that I think California--

Taylor: Oh, yes. Now I remember. We lost because the Social Security Board in Washington relaxed, and opened the door in national legislation. We didn't want the State of California to follow the national precedent, while of course the employing interests did want it to do so.
Chall: Now did you lose? Do you recall?

Taylor: Oh, we lost.

Chall: So they did extend the exemption in California.

Taylor: Sure they did. It was a political decision. Supporters of measures to meet the needs of the lowest in the labor class didn't have the political power to stop it.

Chall: The Advisory Council on Employment was new when you were appointed.

Taylor: It was part of the federal requirements that there be a state advisory committee.

Chall: How did that work out in practice?--a matter of balancing, to some extent, labor and employers groups, and public men, and veterans.

Taylor: Well, with respect to the issue that I was most concerned with, the employment of agricultural laborers, you see, it worked out fairly well. We got somewhere. We at least had a voice. But as time went on the power was taken over by the other side. I don't recall the names of persons at the moment, but probably by successive governor's appointments.

Chall: There's quite a bit of power in the appointments themselves.

Taylor: That's right. He could appoint whom he wanted to that committee. The employment service--the Farm Labor Service--came more and more under the political influence of the large employers of agricultural labor.

I believe that in the last week or two in the Chronicle I saw an item reporting severe criticism of the functioning of the Farm Labor Service. Well, from my point of view, it has probably been due the service for a long time.
Governor's Commission on Reemployment - 1939

Chall: I wanted to discuss with you the Governor's Commission on Reemployment, the Richards Commission appointed by Governor Olson in 1939.

It seemed to me that the report the committee issued was radical for its time. It might be considered radical for this time, too, if it were to be published today and yet the commission members all stated that they were concerned with protecting the capitalist system, just making some adjustments to it. So I wanted to find out how it ever came to be written and who these people were who put it together.

Taylor: Well, John Richards was a businessman in Los Angeles, I've forgotten what his business was, whether it was investment or what. He was formerly the football coach at the University of Wisconsin--Big John Richards. So remember he came out of the liberal Wisconsin tradition, the LaFollette tradition. By California standards, you see, that is on the radical side because its public concern is with people on a wide, democratic base.

Chall: Had you known him before?

Taylor: No. Richard Sachse was an engineer who later became a member of the Public Utilities Commission. He was definitely liberal. Captain Edward Macauley was a retired naval captain. He had commanded the George Washington which took President Woodrow Wilson over to France and back at the end of World War I. He was a strong, active supporter of FDR. He and his wife were both politically oriented to the New Deal. His wife had been a schoolmate of Eleanor Roosevelt. So the Macauleys were close to the New Deal.

Edwin Booth was a family farmer from near Wasco in Kern County. As I recall when we wanted a farmer member there was difficulty in finding a farmer who wasn't an agribusiness man. From my point of view he had written a good letter in to the Commonwealth Club revealing appreciation of the farmer who works on his own farm. As I recall, I recommended his appointment. Dr. Edward Hardy--I have no particular recollection of him. Herbert Jones was a state senator from San Jose, who had been a liberal member of the state senate, concerned with subjects such as public water and power, in preference to private
Taylor: water and power utilities. Of course the "radical" tradition in that sense has been with us in California for a long, long time.

Chall: How did these men get their appointments to this commission?

Taylor: Well, Governor Olson made the appointments.

Chall: And who helped him?

Taylor: Well, I told you who suggested one appointment.

Chall: Who would have helped him on the others, do you know?

Taylor: Well, people shared Olson's general political persuasion. Remember this: Olson came in on the heels of the New Deal. FDR came in in '33, Olson came in in '38. So Olson's election as governor marked the arrival of the New Deal in California.

Chall: As I understand it, Olson came in pledged to production for use. This commission was supposed to come up with some kind of plan for reemployment on that basis.

Taylor: Well, remember that unemployment was a major issue at that time. Olson wanted to do something about it and he chose men who wanted to do something about it. It's an issue that we have again right today. Unemployment in California has moved up to 7.4 percent as of the present time. Well, the California Labor Federation, for example, now says there should be work for those willing and able to work. That's what the Olson commission said in its statement of general principles in the late thirties. Those willing and able to work should have the opportunity to do it.

The references to the cooperatives are to the extensively developed self-help cooperatives that grew out of the Depression. People said, "We haven't any money, but we'll trade our labor wherever we can perform services for products, rentals of housing facilities for members, food on the farms and be paid without money."

Incidentally, that movement was the subject of a very extensively documented doctor's thesis by Clark Kerr.

Chall: I understand he was also, along with Dean McHenry, field representative for the state division of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration in the early thirties.
Taylor: Yes, under Winslow Carlton. Winslow Carlton whose father was the organizer of Western Union, probably one of the most wealthy families in this country. Winslow Carlton was a wonderful man! I saw him for years, but he was wonderful!

Chall: He was the federal staff person then?

Taylor: In charge of self-help cooperatives for the California Relief Administration.

Chall: I recently talked with Frank G. Taylor, who was on the commission staff. He was also the director of the Division of Self-help in the State Relief Administration here in California and had been concerned with self-help cooperatives for many years.

Taylor: That's right. He was on Winslow Carlton's staff. Walter Hoadley, Jr. was also on the commission's staff. Do you know that name?

Chall: No, I don't.

Taylor: Senior Vice-president of the Bank of America in charge of long-range planning. As I recall, he took his master's degree with me. Took his doctorate somewhere in the East, possibly at Brookings Institution. He is over in San Francisco. I saw him the other day. His father was a labor union official, I believe in the Railroad Brotherhoods.

Chall: How did the committee get to its work? I know that it was organized in March and finished its work in September.

Taylor: Let's make a mention--you notice the acknowledgment to Mordecai Ezekial?

Chall: I wondered about his work for the commission.

Taylor: You know that name?

Chall: Yes I do.

Taylor: He was with the USDA. He came out here. He spoke with us, making a very thoughtful presentation. He was a New Deal agriculture specialist with a New Deal national point of view. Later he went to Rome with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
Chall: Did the commission bring other people out for hearings?

Taylor: I do not recall that there were any public hearings. The report was the product of staff work under commissioners' oversight.

Chall: Do you recall how you worked to come out with this kind of a proposal?

Taylor: The men who worked most assiduously, as I can recall, were Captain Macauley and John Richards. We would have meetings of the commission occasionally and any of us, of course, could go over to the commission offices in San Francisco to confer with anybody we wanted at any time. As I recall it, Captain Macauley in one of our meetings or perhaps a succession of the meetings, would go over the draft with us, right down to the phrasing of each recommendation, with pencil in hand.

You will notice, we spoke of that before, that it founded its recommendations on the principle that work should be available to those willing and able. That is, of course, at issue right today. There is a bill up in the legislature to declare that principle. You see, this is twenty-five years after the Full Employment Act of 1946 which says the guiding principle of the economy is full employment--and now look what we've got!

We're so burdened down with other considerations that the Full Employment Act hasn't very well accomplished its first purpose.

Chall: The commission recommended that there be a state planning board to study the state from every angle. I suppose we are still waiting for that.

Taylor: It is needed today as much as it ever was needed. When we get around to talk about the State Water Project, that is a perfect example of the damage that is done by not having a planning board with overall responsibility for the development of the state. Practically speaking we put water planning in the hands of contractors for the water.

Chall: Now at the time that you were meeting, I think that the state legislature realized that this commission was going to come out with a report on methods for obtaining self-help and giving more help to self-help cooperatives than they already were getting, because that was what the governor's platform had
indicated he was going to work on. The legislature was already undercutting this kind of action.

I am wondering whether any of you on that commission were aware of what was really happening in the legislature which was going to make impossible anything you recommended from the day that the report came out? Were you aware of what was going on?

Taylor: Well you don't expect me to admit that we didn't know what was going on! [Laughs]

Chall: Yes. You could!

Taylor: We did know. I was going to speak to you about it. I wasn't going to put it in terms of the legislature, because I don't recall that phase of it. But I was going to speak against the background of changing conditions of the times, which undoubtedly was reflected in the legislature.

You see, the date of the report is 1939. Well, 1939 marks the outbreak of the war in Europe.

Chall: That's right. September, as a matter of fact, is when that report was issued.

Taylor: Yes. So you see it was a period of a rapid pickup in employment by--well, I was going to say the private sector, but I mean a private sector well-supported by government funds for defense industries. You can see the parallel to the situation right today. There's Lockheed, Boeing, SST. Who's going to provide for employment? So as employment was being provided otherwise, the political weight of our recommendations was greatly diminished. But as I say, times change. Today the California Labor Federation is recommending adoption by the current legislature of a declaration that those willing and able to work should have jobs furnished them, if necessary, by the state. I think that you'll find in this morning's Chronicle the report of a Gallup poll that tells how the people, a large proportion of the people polled (about 2 to 1) favor a Civilian Conservation Corps to employ young people where unemployment is particularly severe. So that is back where we were in the thirties.

Chall: With no plans.

Taylor: With no present plan.
Chall: The report with respect to cooperatives, production for use, and some of the financial measures recommended, seemed as if it had had a certain genesis in the EPIC campaign.

Taylor: Well that is part of the background. Upton Sinclair was defeated for governor, but he made a very strong campaign to end poverty in California.

Chall: Mr. Taylor told me that when Sidney Rubinow was appointed as director of the State Relief Administration, the first act of his administration, within basically just a few days, was to put the Division of Self-help out of business completely, in July, 1940.

Taylor: Yes. Sid Rubinow, as I recall, came out of agriculture--was it the Agricultural Extension or the College of Agriculture?

Chall: He was formerly in public relations for the California Farm Bureau Federation.

Taylor: All right. There you have it. When you get a little farther on to my *Bay Guardian* water project articles of 1967, you will find that who should write a letter to the editor disparaging me politely, but Sid Rubinow. So these things echo down through time.*

Chall: You knew Dewey Anderson, of course, well.

Taylor: Yes.

Chall: Now do you have any recollection of what the problem was with respect to his being director of the State Relief Administration. He came in as an appointee of Governor Olson and then within a year or so had been removed by Olson. Part of it, I guess, was pressure from the legislature.

Taylor: Dewey Anderson is living in Palo Alto now. He had been a member of the legislature for one term. He was a strong political supporter of the candidate Olson. He wanted to become--he wanted the position that was given to the man who was later named chief justice of the California Supreme Court.

Chall: Phil Gibson. Dewey Anderson wanted to be finance director?

---

Taylor: Yes, Anderson wanted to be finance director, but the men around Olson ganged up on him and demanded with whatever arguments--political loyalty, etc.--demanded that he take the relief administration directorship. He felt, one could almost say he knew at the time, that that was a position that would involve human sacrifice. It put him out of business in political life in California. It is hard to see how anybody in that position at that time could have survived. The pressures on relief questions were too strong.

Reflections on Some Plans, Ideas, and Politicians of the Thirties and Forties

Chall: Were you politically active in any way? Starting in 1934 with the Upton Sinclair EPIC campaign, Downey running for lieutenant governor?

Taylor: Downey running as a strong liberal. Yes, I was very much concerned politically. I don't recall the details of what I did or just what organizations we had but I certainly was concerned during the Sinclair election. I shall never forget the evening when the returns came in. I walked into the Merriam headquarters on Shattuck Avenue in Berkeley with the returns showing Merriam was winning. Here was a Merriam staff man--and I never heard Merriam condemned any more in my life than by his own man! I was totally unprepared for it but he had no use for Merriam, the man he was working for.

Chall: Did you support Upton Sinclair? Did you feel that his ideas could work out somehow?


Chall: What about with Ralph Haight, who was supposed to come in as kind of a progressive middle man?

Taylor: Oh, the grandson of Governor Haight of California, that's right. No, I was for Upton Sinclair against Merriam. I don't think Haight had a practical chance and while I preferred him to Merriam, I didn't want to waste my effort. I wanted to put it where it had the best chance of success. Upton Sinclair was a high-grade person. His aspiration was good even though perhaps
Taylor: the exact technique that he had espoused might not work. At least he truly wanted to end poverty in California. Well, that is what we wanted to do—at least to take care of the unemployment aspect of it.

Later on, there was organized the Berkeley Democratic Club—was that what it was called?

Chall: That sounds reasonable.

Taylor: At some time—I am a little fuzzy on my dates—but I think during the war period, I was asked to become president and accepted. I gave it up, as I recall, during a period probably around 1945 when Dorothea Lange became seriously ill with ulcers, was hospitalized; I nearly lost her. So about that time I gave up the presidency. I remember an interesting split within the club which from my point of view meant that the usefulness of my role was finished.

The question was endorsement of someone for, I suppose, the state assembly. One nominee was the sister of Professor Jessica Peixotto—I've forgotten her name. She was a good, liberal, fine woman. I wanted the club to endorse her. The leftwing within the club, in their speeches said, "Now we must have a candidate who can get broad support. Then they proceeded to knife the candidacy of Miss Peixotto and went for a candidate who I was sure was so far to the left that he would not have gained the support needed to elect. I saw that split and that, along with the change in my home situation, persuaded me to leave the presidency of the club.

Chall: How long were you president? A couple of years?

Taylor: Something like that.

Chall: But you were a member of the club prior to being president or did you join the club when they asked you to be president?

Taylor: I am inclined to think it was the latter, but I am not sure. As I recall, they wanted me to succeed Walter Packard. I've forgotten why he wanted out. Oh, he went to Washington.

Chall: What was your position on Ham and Eggs and the Townsend Plan and some of these other issues of the thirties?

Taylor: Well, I thought they were a little impractical. I was not for them. But I thought they were putting their fingers on real
Taylor: problems and politically generating some support. The Townsend movement gave tremendous impetus to the establishment of social security legislation. Social security wasn't his remedy but the political effect in support of social security was substantial. That's the way I saw those movements--as indicative of the problems rather than as dependable guides to their solution. I supported Upton Sinclair in the same sense.

Chall: The Ham and Eggs proposal came up twice.

Taylor: Yes. What was it? Thirty dollars every Thursday? Then of course even President Nixon is talking about something like that now, isn't he--$1,600 for everybody?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: You can see at least a family resemblance to it. So, with some of the ideas that we consider very far out, every once in a while somebody from the other side goes over and takes them and says, "Well, why not do it?" British political history is full of nineteenth century examples of the Liberal Party proposing remedies and the Conservatives opposing them, the Conservatives getting elected and then taking the Liberal programs over and adopting them. They just wanted the programs to be done by themselves in power.

Chall: In 1938 when Governor Olson ran, did you support him in any specific way? Did you vote for him only or did you get out and campaign?

Taylor: I don't recall any formal campaigning but certainly my views were made known. Whether we had a formal organization, I am not sure. Mrs. Henry Erdman--the wife of Professor Henry Erdman--was a leader in the Culbert Olson campaign. I must have been at Olson meetings--I do not recall in detail. I am sure that my position was known and I gave it what effect I could. Doubtless, I put up money for the campaign. At some point in the mid-thirties liberal Democrats began to contribute money for political campaigns.

Chall: Frank Taylor was a political activist in those days and he told me that he had helped write the cooperative plank in Olson's campaign. He was close to the campaign at the time. I wondered if you were.

Taylor: Well, I was not close to Olson personally. If I was close to anybody it was to Dewey Anderson, who was close to his campaign.
Taylor: It was through Dewey, I am quite sure, that I had two appointments by Olson. It was Olson who put me on the State Board of Agriculture.

Chall: I couldn't tell of course whether it was a personal friendship that had put you on these two committees.

Taylor: Well, it was a political appointment through Dewey Anderson, whom I had known since about 1919.

Another of my recollections about Dewey is that when the CDC was formed, we wanted to run him for senator in 1956. He could have had the nomination of the CDC, which was organized by Alan Cranston, you'll remember. But Dewey figured that he would lose in the final election and wouldn't take the CDC nomination.

We got him on the Washington, D.C. telephone from Fresno but he wouldn't take it. He could have swept the convention without any trouble. My recollection was that in a later election he ran for superintendent of public instruction, but lost. He had been out of the state too long to retain his political strength. For him it was sort of a political last gasp. I'm sorry, because he would have been a good senator.

Chall: It takes quite a bit of effort and money and all that goes with it to run a campaign and I suppose you don't want to make that effort if you think you have no chance.

Taylor: Well, in 1956 I think he figured he couldn't win. I've forgotten who was the Republican candidate.

Chall: I want to read a statement which came out of a book on California history on this decade of 1930-1940 that we are talking about, to see how you respond to it. The author states that it was a "confused and unsettled decade for California, a decade of tragedy and widespread despair, of fear, bewilderment and hesitation, of tinsel hopes, of illogical experiments..."

Taylor: Tinsel hopes?

Chall: Tinsel hopes. "...of illogical experiments..."

Taylor: Illogical experiments?

Chall: "...and of leadership, sometimes blind and deluded, sometimes
Chall: shrewdly mercenary, that eventually brought bitter disappoint-
ment to hundreds of thousands of misguided followers and at
times threatened the state with out-and-out disaster."

Is that the way you would characterize that decade?

Taylor: No, I would not.

Chall: That's taken from the book by Cleland and Dumke on California
history.*

Taylor: Okay. Now remember, in that decade first you had FDR, so that
the national influence was New Deal. I do not think that was
a period of tinseled hopes and illogical--what?

Chall: Experiments.

Taylor: We established a system of social security. I remember Secretary
of Interior Harold Ickes at the Press Club in San Francisco,
in, oh, say about '44, when the Republicans of course were
running against FDR again. Speaking as though he were addressing
the Republicans--this isn't quite the words, but it is exactly
the sense--"What are you going to repeal? You're going to
repeal social security?" Repeal was his word. You're going
to repeal the National Labor Relations Act?"

So the New Deal, you see, came to California federally
first. The New Deal came to California in the state administra-
tion in '38, when the decade was nearly over. No, I wouldn't
agree with that at all. What are you going to repeal?

The state voted for the Central Valley Project Act in 1933.
Then they got down on their knees to the federal government
because the state couldn't finance it.

Chall: How would you characterize the Olson campaign in California in
'38?

Taylor: Well, he, in effect, was the embodiment of the spirit of the
New Deal federally and we won. We carried it through. You
see, the trend was that way. The New Deal had the support of
the people in 1938 and it percolated right here into California.

*Robert Glass Cleland, From Wilderness to Empire, Glenn S.
Taylor: In '34, you see, FDR had been in for only a relatively short time so the New Deal forces within the state had not gathered sufficient momentum to win the governorship.

Chall: Do you think it was the times that made Olson's administration so difficult? Or was it partly Olson?

Taylor: Well, of course, it was both. You remember that he became ill almost immediately after taking office, within weeks, and for a time was completely out. His son, whose name I've forgotten, virtually took over and from my point of view fouled things up horribly. I have from Culbert Olson's own sister, long after, the statement that he, Culbert Olson, came to realize the damage that his own son had done.

Chall: Because he was inexperienced?

Taylor: Wrongly oriented. Inexperienced also, doubtless.

Chall: But he had a different orientation, that probably made some difference?

Taylor: Yes. It resulted in appointments that were not in the spirit of Culbert Olson's campaign at all! I'm sure that you could get that story out of Dewey Anderson. I can't give it to you in detail but I can give it to you in its main outline. As for the Cleland-Dumke summarization, well, I don't think it is worth the paper it is written on.

Chall: I was just interested in getting your reaction to it.

Taylor: [Laughs] Yes, I thought so. Well, you got it!

Chall: Have you anything that you want to add about that period, the Depression era?

[Pause]

Taylor: Well, now let's see if I can say something that might be useful in the perspective of today.

That decade afforded an occasion, a necessity, an opportunity for grappling with basic economic problems, and problems of people. People became a concern of government as never before. If the same thing occurred today, say 25 percent unemployment, people of all walks of life going bankrupt and
Taylor: on relief, we would not have the thoughtful, measured, earnest programs that we had then because the demands would be so much more radical. It would be vastly more radical at the present time if unemployment rose to 25 percent. I think the present generation wouldn't take it lying down. The New Deal sought to work within the structure. I think confrontations today would be much sharper—violent, as generally they were not at that time.

Chall: Why do you think there would be a difference in approach?

Taylor: Because of the present generation. Well, I think you can see the outcrop of new attitude. There is an alienation between the people and their government—a spreading of that which there was not at that time. Alienation was minimal, limited, almost, to a few card-carrying Communists. Alienation was minimal, had no power—no power at the polls, no power, well, hardly anywhere. FDR quickly restored the confidence of the people in the government of the United States. Remember his Fireside Talks? Did you ever hear them?

Chall: Oh yes.

Taylor: All right, then you know. When he spoke, the people believed him. Now we have the credibility gap. You take a Gallup poll, "Do you believe so-and-sp?" The people overwhelmingly believed FDR. They elected him four times!

That's my comment.
Evacuation of the Japanese - 1942-1945

Pacific Coast Committee on American Principles and Fair Play

Chall: I thought we would now take up the years between 1942 and approximately 1955--World War II and the postwar years in migrant labor and housing. I wanted to start first with the Japanese internment because you had quite a bit of interest in what happened to the Japanese, as I understand it.

Taylor: I was active as a member of the Committee on American Principles and Fair Play, of which Ruth Kingman was the executive, and Robert Gordon Sproul was the president, and Provost Monroe Deutsch was a prominent figure.

Chall: How did you get involved with that?

Taylor: Well, I don't know just how I became involved in that. It may very well have been through my wife, Dorothea Lange, who was engaged by the War Relocation Authority to photograph the evacuation for the government. Of course I had known Harry Kingman at the University YMCA for a long time, so it took no great push in any particular direction to involve me. I found very quickly, through Dorothea, that students of mine in past years were involved in the evacuation.

Chall: They were Japanese?

Taylor: They were American-born, of Japanese ancestry. That's correct. One further element that may have influenced me was that the Tolan Committee, chaired by Congressman John H. Tolan of this
Taylor: congressional district, brought his Committee on Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens into San Francisco to consider the question of the Japanese and their possible evacuation.* It was before that committee that Attorney General Earl Warren made an appearance which, looking at it from hindsight, suggests that running for the governorship might have been in his mind at the time. The possible evacuation was a question of great public interest and he appeared in support of it.

Chall: Did you appear before that committee?

Taylor: No, I did not appear before that committee.

Chall: Did you become a member of the Committee on American Principles and Fair Play after the Japanese evacuation?

Taylor: I don't remember. When was the committee formed?

Chall: That I don't know.

Taylor: My recollection is that we formed ourselves after the decision to evacuate was announced, and that our premise was, we do not raise the question of the evacuation itself. We do raise the question of the treatment of the Japanese-Americans under the conditions of evacuation. So by this I infer that we didn't come into existence until the decision to evacuate had been made.

Chall: Do you recall how you felt at the time?

Taylor: About the evacuation?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Yes, of course! That it was a great mistake. That there was no substantial justification for it, that it was done under pressure of special interests in California and decided under apprehensions in Washington by people not particularly well-informed. It is my belief that the FBI, long before evacuation itself took place, already had under custody in North Dakota detention camps those Japanese--whether Japanese or American-born--who conceivably might have been injurious to this country. So my view is that it was unnecessary and a great mistake on the part of the government to do it. I remember Tom

*February-March, 1942.
Taylor: Clark, who was in the Department of Justice (later justice of the Supreme Court of the United States), was among those who came out to California to examine into the situation. What his decision on it or recommendation was, of course I don't know.

Chall: So the committee was in existence at least--

Taylor: At least shortly after the decision to evacuate but before the actual evacuation took place. I believe that you will find that we were in existence while the evacuation was in progress. The committee stayed in existence until after the decision to release the Japanese from the detention camps. Now you asked my judgment about it: I would say it was a mistake; they didn't have it coming to them.

If one assesses the results of it, I would say this: the way the Japanese accepted what we did to them has practically eliminated one of the so-called race questions of this country. The Japanese are Asiatics, racially different from the rest of us, who are of European origin for the most part. The Japanese took it beautifully. They made no overt protest against it. A large number of the Japanese cooperated at every point—which with a few exceptions who chose to go back to Japan.

By and large, the American-born Japanese—mostly in their twenties or younger—were brought face-to-face with the question, "Are we Japanese with a future in Japan or are we Japanese-Americans with our future in the United States?" Overwhelmingly they chose the latter alternative.

A large number of Japanese went into the military forces, notably in the 100th Battalion and then the 442nd regiment that fought in Italy and received more military decorations than any regiment in the history of the American military service. Largely as a result of the way they accepted the evacuation, one sees the social merging of Japanese-Americans and the European stock Americans with minimum race questions raised on either side. The author [Morton Grodzins] of the book, Americans Betrayed, I think came pretty close to the truth about the evacuation as close as one can come, observing it at the time.

Chall: What was the work of the committee during this period?

Taylor: The work of the committee was mainly in the nature of public pronouncements, so that the wave of publicity in opposition to
Taylor: the Japanese-Americans was balanced in some respect by our occasional declarations reminding people of this country that the evacuees were not convicted, were not found guilty of anything, and that they were entitled to every consideration under American principles and fair play.

When some of the violent letters appeared in the press, occasionally we would respond with a countering letter to offset the contrary expressions. We were, I think, especially influential at the time when the decisions were pending, "Should the Japanese-Americans be allowed to return to the Pacific Coast?" There were strong interests that didn't want them to return at all. So we supported the head of the War Relocation Authority, Dillon Myer (whom I met for the last time in Korea in '61), against the wave of prejudice that as top administrative officer he faced wherever he went in the West and probably in Washington as well. We gave him the moral support he needed to treat the Japanese-Americans fairly, release them from the camps and so on.

Resolution of the Board of Agriculture

Taylor: My own personal involvement in that phase was in 1944. I had been appointed four years earlier a member of the California State Board of Agriculture by Governor Culbert Olson. As the war was pretty far advanced and the question was rising again about what to do regarding the Japanese, I introduced a resolution at the State Board of Agriculture, the sense of which was this: If and when the government decides to release the Japanese-Americans from detention camps and allow their return to California (you notice I said "if and when") then the California State Board of Agriculture will use its influence to assure that they shall have their full rights as Americans.

Well! Did that blow the roof off! Actually the board stood by me in the majority, but not unanimously. The resolution went through. In no time flat the newspaper reporters were surrounding Governor Warren and asking what he thought about it and making as much trouble for him as possible. It was pointed out, I believe, that I was at that time a lame duck, because this was the last meeting of the board in which I participated as a member. The governor had the difficulty of facing the press,
Taylor: having come into office as a supporter of the evacuation, and now being asked for his views on a resolution an appointee of a preceding governor had initiated which had been supported by a majority of the board. So if you'll look through the files of the press about the time of that last meeting, November or December, 1943, you'll see the explosion.

Chall: I have a note about a press release of the Daily News on December 22, 1943, which says that a resolution leading to the dismissal of Paul Taylor, Grace McDonald and [Stewart] Meigs, who proposed it, was a resolution favoring the return of Japanese to California as soon as military conditions permitted.

Taylor: That doubtless is correct, not as a version of the resolution, but as a report of the reaction. The legislature shortly passed resolutions that members of the State Board of Agriculture should be representatives of the agricultural community or whatever the phraseology was.

In other words, they didn't like Grace McDonald, they didn't like me, they didn't like Stewart Meigs, a small citrus grower from near Carpinteria. The three of us were Olson appointees. They wanted people more representative of what is today called agribusiness. We felt what we were representative more of the people engaged in agriculture, irrespective of their status, and of the general interests of the state.

Chall: So actually, this resolution of yours caused a change in the makeup—at least the personnel—of the State Board of Agriculture.

Taylor: I guess that is right. It brought the issue to a focus.

Chall: Actually, were there any others on the State Board of Agriculture when you were there, who did not represent large agricultural interests except you and Mr. Meigs and Mrs. McDonald? Was it ever balanced much?

Taylor: Well I think we were the only ones. But note that objection was made to the three of us, not as a minority that had proposed a resolution that failed, but as a minority that had supported a resolution that a majority of the board passed?

Chall: In 1944 actually the federal government did propose to return the Japanese. Did you have an idea at the end of December that this was coming up?
Taylor: Of course. The alleged grounds for the evacuation were grounds of self-defense. By that time the war had moved farther and farther toward Japan itself. The outcome was no longer in doubt; it was only a question of how much time would be required to finish it. So we saw the main reason given for the evacuation fading out and no longer existing--if it ever did exist.

Chall: I see. You were preparing the way.

Taylor: American principles and fair play. As I recall it, the head of the board himself was a spokesman for agribusiness. He was a person whom I always found to possess personal decency. I took up with him privately in a previous meeting or two my intention to raise the question, and I asked him whether he thought it was proper or ill-advised to bring it up. He said, "Bring it up."

Chall: That was A.J. McFadden?

Taylor: That was A.J. McFadden. If as board president he voted for it--or whether it was necessary to have his vote to pass it, I don't remember, but it passed.

Chall: I understand that while Governor Warren opposed, at first, the return of the Japanese, once it was the law of the land or the policy at least, he went along and did whatever he could to make their return an easy one.

Taylor: Well, I would be prepared to believe that. I don't know what he did. I never heard of him obstructing the return in any way, and I would be surprised if he did obstruct in any way at all.

Chall: There were some difficulties in some small towns?

Taylor: Oh, there were--including personal violence. No, I have no thought that he gave any encouragement to that at all! Although, I believe, he was not in favor of the resolution we passed at the time we passed it.

Chall: Now in terms of what we are going to discuss in a little while about the importation of Mexicans, I've also heard that there were some people who used, as an excuse for the importation of Mexicans, the fact that the Japanese were not here on the land. I'm wondering whether there was enough of the Japanese working on the land to offset the numbers of Mexicans whom they wanted to import.
Taylor: My belief on that point is that in certain areas there were Japanese laborers who might be numerically important to those areas, to their neighborhood. But from a statewide point of view, most of the Japanese on the land were farm operators of their own farms, either as owners or tenants, and generally not members of the labor force. I think the absence of the Japanese was just one more argument to bring in more Mexican laborers.

I think I told you once before about the people who went out, even from the campus to work on farms during the war, and the word that came back to me, that some of the farm operators didn't want the volunteer services developed any more because it was working so well that it diminished the pressure for more Mexicans. What they wanted was a flooded labor market. That's what they've always wanted, and by and large always had.

Chall: Do you have anything to say about the Japanese with relationship to the large grower, people you call agribusiness and the way they looked upon the Japanese?

Taylor: Well, I can't single out agribusiness but I can speak of the attitude of American farm operators at levels that would go beyond the levels of what we call agribusiness today.

The Japanese came into this country in the late 1890s and early 1900s, before World War I. They worked in agriculture. They were largely of peasant origin, so they were familiar with agriculture and were excellent workers. They quickly displaced a lot of other workers who had preceded them; one of their tactics was first to undercut the wages of the other workers. Once they had obtained the jobs by that device, they shortly turned around and, being a tightly organized nationality group, they then brought pressure to raise the wages in the manner of a labor union. This enlarged the area of opposition to the Japanese. The farmers didn't want them to become competitor farmers by taking the land. As an evidence of that California passed the alien land law forbidding persons ineligible for American citizenship to own land.

Chall: The Japanese, too, bought land.

Taylor: Yes, indeed and some of them became quite large, very efficient operators, if not as owners, then as tenants. One of the large operators that we knew before he left for the detention camps, we saw later in Utah. I don't know how many thousand employees
Taylor: he had on farms in Utah, but probably several, including Navajo Indians.

You saw that? [pointing to framed certificate on the wall]

Chall: Yes, yes. Your certificate of appreciation from the Japanese-American Citizens League. I had read somewhere that the growers in general preferred Mexicans as laborers in their fields to the Japanese because they stayed.

Taylor: Well, I think I've indicated why.

Chall: Yes, because they were content to be laborers.

Taylor: Yes, they were more docile than the Japanese, and less aggressive. Now that the Mexican-Americans are becoming more aggressive in the United Farm Workers, organizing under Cesar Chavez, they are becoming very unpopular. But, you see, the aggressiveness of the Mexicans comes a full generation late, as compared to the Japanese. It is the second generation Mexicans who are becoming aggressive, not the first.

Chall: Were they different people who came--comparing their backgrounds?

Taylor: Their origins? Oh, my yes. Japanese, by and large, were of peasant origin. That is to say, they were farmers who worked on their own lands either as owners or tenants, and did their own work, assumed responsibilities of management, and were industrious and skilled as could be.

The Mexicans came largely from large landholdings on which they were landless laborers--not working for their own interest except at a wage level, not experienced in farm management. The Japanese, on the contrary, had the experience both as worker on the land and as manager.

Chall: So they simply brought their skills here.

Taylor: Yes. Their skills and their ambitions. The Mexicans brought their heritage with them, too, a very different heritage.

Chall: It makes quite a difference.

Taylor: Oh, an enormous difference! The Japanese became landed here, under great difficulties. The Mexicans own hardly any farm land at all.
Return of Mexican Labor to the Fields

Developing an Expertise on Mexican-American Immigration - 1927-1932

Chall: Now I'd like to get into some discussion about the war and the impetus to import Mexican farm workers. Before I do that though, I would like to start with your background as an expert on Mexican migration. You touched on it briefly with Mrs. Riess. You said that you went into the field under a grant from the Social Science Research Council for three years and didn't teach at all here.

Taylor: That's right. I had three continuous years leave of absence, 1927, 1928, 1929.

Chall: Then you spent six months in Mexico--1931 and 1932? Now at that time you were studying what would then have been considered contemporary events?

Taylor: Yes. It was a contemporary phenomenon which I was asked to study. The chairman of the Committee on Scientific Aspects of Human Migration was Dean Edith Abbott of the School of Social Welfare Administration, University of Chicago. I think I told how she came out here and we met by accident. She had published, for the benefit of her students in social welfare, a large volume of historical documentation of the immigrants that had come into the Chicago area and into the East generally. Therefore she was oriented toward an understanding of the importance of immigrant background, and of the impact of immigrants coming into our society. Remember she was close to Hull House. Hull House was a very important institution in Chicago at that time, surrounded by immigrants, wave after wave. At the time she came out here, at the end of 1926, the most recent wave of immigrants was from Mexico. So it was natural for her to want a contemporary study of this latest wave of immigration.

She found that I was trying, at the same time, to obtain research funds to study agricultural labor in the West. I was not able to obtain money for my subject. She, however, had money to give for hers. The subjects overlapped in the West because the Mexicans were the latest of a stream of migrants entering agriculture. So it was a happy arrangement for me, an invaluable opportunity. I spent three consecutive
Taylor: years in the field.

Chall: Now how did you go about this field work? I am sure you weren't away from home for three consecutive years.

Taylor: No. But I would go out into the field for sometimes two weeks, sometimes for a month. The longest that I recall was for maybe two, or two and a half months.

Chall: You went East.

Taylor: And I went East. I worked in Chicago. I think that was about the longest single trip—about two months and a half. Perhaps a couple of months also a couple of times in Texas.

It certainly gave me a familiarity with conditions in my own country at the labor level. A long way from Imperial Valley to Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. I've been gratified that within the last year, some anthropologist studying the Mexicans in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania ran across my study of thirty years or so before, and found it useful. I think some of these same families, perhaps are still there. And I learned about ten days ago that four of my volumes on Mexican labor in the United States had just been reprinted.

Chall: The New York Times?

Taylor: Yes, three volumes, $39.

Chall: It is a three volume work, isn't it? Or are two of them run together in some way?

Taylor: They are reprinted just as they appeared originally.

Chall: Are you ordering one, or getting one free?

Taylor: Yes. I wrote to the publisher who sent me a courtesy copy. At the University Press, I published two volumes and then three short studies in a third volume. Then came a book-sized manuscript and the Press bucked, for financial reasons. I am not blaming the U.C. Press. After all, I was absorbing quite a bit of the University printing budget and there were other professors who had claims upon it also. So I took my manuscript An American-Mexican Frontier: Nueces County, Texas, to the Social Science Research Council. They gave $1,000 to have it published at the University of North Carolina Press. So I have what might be called four volumes.
Taylor: The New York Times (Arno Press) reprinted the three volumes published originally by the University of California Press. Johnson Reprints reprinted the Nueces County volume. The study I made in Mexico entitled A Spanish-Mexican Peasant Community: Arandas in Jalisco, Mexico, has not been reprinted but maybe it will be someday.

Chall: I spoke briefly last year with Manuel Servin, who was responsible for developing a Mexican-American Studies Program at USC. I asked him where he got his basic material to start a course on Mexican-American studies? And he said, "Why, Paul Taylor's material, of course."

Taylor: Well, that's quite a find.

Chall: Yes. I talked to somebody recently who is teaching the same subject at one of the local junior colleges and I asked her whether she was using your material and she said, "Of course!" She had only come across it by accident.

Taylor: May I just put in a comment here?

It was costly for the University of California Press to print my studies. One of the remarks from a colleague on the editorial committee at that time drifted back to me. In a disparaging mood, he remarked to his colleagues on the committee that what I did was go out and talk with Mexican laborers and then expected the Press to print what they said. Unimportant, you see, of low importance. Well, I was using up a lot of the University Press funds, so I can understand it.

Chall: That wasn't considered the proper thing to do in those days?

Taylor: Well, it wasn't considered very important by the man who made the comment. I suppose his view was, since it was neither Greek nor Latin nor even a modern European language or on a subject where the prestige was, my studies couldn't be very important as scholarship. Here was a bunch of laborers at the bottom of the ladder, and how important was it to study them?

Chall: Did you have help when you went out into the field?

Taylor: Yes and no; I went out by myself a great deal. But when I decided I wanted to study Imperial Valley intensively--after seeing it and realizing that there I really was in the middle of the Mexican migration where they made up about a third of the total population of the Valley--then I took a young graduate
Taylor: student in geography with me. Down in the Valley, because my Spanish at that time was inadequate, I found a U.S.-born Mexican whom I took along with me into the field and interpret.

Chall: Did you learn to speak Spanish fluently after awhile?

Taylor: Gradually I learned to speak it. Of course, all the time the laborers were learning to speak English. So it became less and less necessary, although desirable. Actually my greatest fluency in Spanish didn't come until long after. It came after '59, '61 and '66, when I did consulting work for the Agency for International Development in Cuba after Castro came into power, then for the United Nations in Ecuador and Venezuela, and finally in Colombia on a higher education project administered by Dean Reeller of the U.C. School of Education, carrying out studies in Bogota and other parts of Colombia.

You have to live in the country, be immersed in it, to really develop fluency in the language. I can get along pretty well now, speaking not too fast.

Chall: You didn't find this necessarily a handicap then when you were doing these early studies in the late '20s? These first studies.

Taylor: Well, of course, it was a handicap that I couldn't speak Spanish well. Spanish was the one language, you see, that I had never studied in high school or college. In those days anyone studying languages in high school or college studied Latin, French or German. I studied all three. Spanish was barely coming into high school when I was there, and it lacked academic prestige. Of course, nobody accepted Spanish as a foreign language to satisfy the qualifications for obtaining the Ph.D.—that was limited to French and German. So the language that I used most is the one that I studied formally the least, in fact almost not formally at all.

As soon as I knew I was going to undertake the Mexican labor study, I took a very few private lessons with one of my colleagues on the faculty here, and during an intersession of six weeks I attended his introductory class in Spanish, just sitting in the class as though I were a member. Then I took a couple of private lessons with him at the end.

Chall: You found it more necessary to know Spanish when you were in Imperial Valley than you did when you were in Chicago or Bethlehem or Detroit?
Taylor: That's right. You see, in the Imperial Valley the Mexicans made up a third of the population. They didn't have to speak English, so they didn't make a great effort to do so. In Chicago their associations were overwhelmingly with Americans and European immigrants with whom they needed English to communicate—except with Italians whose language was so similar to Spanish that each spoke his own and was understood by the other. Furthermore, in Chicago the Mexicans were, to a much greater extent, single men, whereas in the Imperial Valley they were families. If you are with your family, you don't have to learn to speak English because you circulate mostly within the family where the language is Spanish. If you are a single man in Chicago, you've got to make your way around in English. So that made my work easier in the northern fields than it was in Imperial Valley. That's why I had an interpreter in Imperial Valley. But I learned enough so that I could get along. Of course I wish that I had had better training, but I don't think I missed a great deal by not having better knowledge of Spanish than I did.

Method Used in Field Work

Chall: How did you prepare yourself for working in the field?

Taylor: In the field?

Chall: In the field, questioning people from all walks of life to get the answers that you were seeking? If you knew at the time what you were seeking.

Taylor: It was just like going into a swimming pool and plunging in! I got myself a rough-riding used Dodge roadster, so that I had a car and I could go down the road and stop at a farmhouse anywhere I wanted. If I saw a group of laborers I could stop wherever I wanted, stay as long as I wanted and go on when I wanted. That was the way I did it.

I would try to sample officials, teachers, Americans who had contacts with the Mexicans—get all the information I could from them. Then I would go among the Mexicans and get everything I could from them—their wages, migrations, experiences, problems, history.
Chall: Did you follow some prescribed method already developed for studying immigration?

Taylor: No. The other waves of immigration had not been studied contemporaneously in the field. They were written up historically by someone who examined, after the wave had come whatever historical evidence was available. I don't say that they didn't do any observation at all; the U.S. Immigration Commission of 1909-1911 did a good deal of contemporary field work.

My method developed by the doing of it. I don't know of any model that I was following. I had no training at all in either anthropological or sociological methods. What I did was choose (for the most part) a variety of locations, areas, where Mexican labor was important. That's why Imperial Valley interested me. While I was there I studied a good deal about the structure of agriculture into which they came, which was certainly a strong contrast to the structure of Middle Western agriculture.

I had a strong historical interest and so I wanted the historical background of each area as far as I could get it as related to immigration generally, and as related to Mexican immigration in particular. I also wanted a strong emphasis upon the contemporary scene as I found it. I wanted to ascertain how the Mexicans were fitting into the community of which they were becoming a part, or not fully becoming a part. They were becoming a separate group, slow to merge with the rest of the community.

So I combined an historical and a contemporary interest. I found a strong interest in the background of the communities into which they came. I wanted a cross-section of conditions they encountered in the United States, which explains why I went to places as diverse as Imperial Valley, Colorado, South Texas, Chicago, and the Calumet steel, meatpacking, railroad industry center, and finally the outpost colony of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, steel and coke works. Then, of course, later I went back into Mexico to some of the origins of this migration.

Chall: And how did you work there?

Taylor: Well, in Mexico I chose a particular community in a region known as Los Altos in the state of Jalisco. I was there in '31. The American consul in Guadalajara told me that during the Cristero War a couple of years before, they had noted a
Taylor: great stream of immigrants pouring out from Los Altos (The Plateau, or the Heights). So I decided to study that area, which I did, and I published it under the title A Spanish-Mexican Peasant Community: Arandas in Jalisco, Mexico.

Then, without making as thorough a study of another community, I spent considerable time studying potters who worked in the vicinity of Guadalajara in the little community of San Jose Tateposco.* I worked there with potters who had been in the United States, particularly with the Paulino Ramos family that had been in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Paulino's brother, Victorio, had worked in California. Did I tell you, or did I tell Suzanne Riess the story of that couple and the questions I asked?

Chall: I don't remember seeing it in her interview.

Taylor: Well let me tell you. In these days of women's liberation it has a special relevance.

Here I was, seated on a stump, or a rock, or the ground, talking with these two potters, man and wife, who had gone from this tiny little village of potters to the coke works of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and returned. I said to Paulino as he was shaping a cantaro:

"Paulino, did you like it better there (allá) in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, or do you like it better here in San Jose Tateposco?"

He was working, rotating himself around the pot that he was molding. Without missing a stroke he said, "Señor, (in Spanish, he answered me) I like it better here in Tateposco."

I asked, "Señor, why do you like it better here in Tateposco than you liked it in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania?"

Without missing a stroke, going round and round the pot, he replied, "Here in Tateposco, más libertad (more liberty)."

---

*Making cantaros at San Jose Tateposco, Jalisco, Mexico.
35 American Anthropologist 745 (1933).
Taylor: Then I turned to the Señora, who was kneading the clay like dough, preparing it for Paulino to handle like a pancake to be put over the mold and shaped into a cantaro jar. I said, "Señora, you too were in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Did you like it better there in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, or do you like it better here in San Jose Tateposco?"

Without missing a stroke as she pressed the clay in her hands, she replied, "Señor, I liked it better in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania."

I said, "Señora, why did you like it better in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania?" Her response was immediate: "Allá, más libertad." Then she added in English, "Turn on the gas," making with her hand the motion of turning on the cookstove gas. In Bethlehem, you see, she didn't have to scratch around with little twigs and small pieces of wood to make a fire to cook the meals. Nor did she have to live in an adobe house with one chair and sleep on the ground. They both understood each other's responses perfectly well, that couple did. I got the same logical answer, same explanation, the same support for exactly opposite reasons, depending upon sex! "Más libertad!" [Laughs]

Chall: Very good! I take it you had an interpreter there with you?

Taylor: No, oh no! I am giving it to you here mostly in English.

Chall: You could converse in Arandas in Spanish? In that trip of six months?

Taylor: Not all of it. I did a lot of it myself. I took with me, what they called a cargador. Cargador is a carrier of merchandise on his back, because there were many places where you wanted to carry commodities where no vehicle could go. So he'd rope it onto his back and carry it. He knew the whole community. It was a community in which there had been a war just a couple of years before, and there were still government troops in the little town of Arandas where I was staying. So he was my guide; he knew most all the farmers and he learned pretty soon what I was going to ask and soon did a lot of the questioning himself. He spoke no English.

But I didn't tell the Tateposco story in my report. In fact I've never written it, but I assure you that in memory I've got it just about letter perfect! [Laughs]
Chall: But these people, many of them, did decide to return to Mexico? I guess Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, would have been a rather hostile environment from the point of weather.

Taylor: Yes, a very wintry climate as compared with—well, the climate at Tateposco is like Berkeley. What they say down there at Guadalajara (of which Tateposco is practically a suburb) is that "We have a climate that California thinks it has," and there is some justification for their claim. Of course the Depression had come in '31 when I was there. The steel industry had been shutting down and unemployment spread, so many returned to Mexico.

In Bethlehem in 1929 I went first to the public schools. They gave me an eighth grade Mexican boy, to go around to meet Mexican families in Bethlehem. When I went to Mexico in '31, at the Hotel Regis in Mexico City, who should turn up as one of the bellboys and address me by name? None other than the boy who had taken me around in Bethlehem.

Chall: I found a letter in your Volume VI, tucked into the cover. It was from Norman Humphrey, an associate professor of anthropology at Wayne University. In 1947 he was making some studies in the same area of Mexico where you had been and he says that he is having difficulty in getting official approval to gather statistics and he commends you for your ability to get data for your monograph. So I assume that you were accepted in Arandas without any problem.

Taylor: What I think he refers to is that I got data out of Mexico City, out of the government files relating to the Arandas area where I was making my study—not that I got those data in Arandas. I had the cooperation of Manuel Gamio, one of their own high officials, and most distinguished anthropologist. He took me to the statistics office, opened the doors for me. So they said, "All right, here it is."

Chall: I see. So it apparently made quite a bit of difference.

Taylor: Yes, I had someone to open the doors for me. Apparently, Humphrey had to knock on the doors himself, do as best he could.

You ask about my research method; I had no formal model, but I combined the kind of work that a human geographer would do, an anthropologist, and a sociologist, with my own background
Taylor: as a labor economist having a strong interest in history. I kept asking questions and seeking answers.

Chall: So you had to do some preparation beforehand, too. In looking up the background of the community?

Taylor: No. I didn't do it before. I rushed into communities and decided which communities I wanted to study intensively. Then, after choosing my area, I studied the background. Before choosing any area for intensive study I visited it in person, as well as other areas I decided not to study intensively.

Chall: Writing the reports must have taken quite a bit of time.

Taylor: That took weeks and weeks -- at least as long as the field work itself. I did my writing on campus; then with the draft manuscript in hand I revisited the community to verify questionable points or amplify data where desirable.

Chall: Did your grant allow secretarial assistance?

Taylor: Yes. The field notes and the manuscript were all typed by Elizabeth Priestley, the daughter of Professor Herbert Priestley of the U.C. history department, who was a member of my doctoral committee. She is now the wife of Professor Edwin Morley in the Spanish department.

Chall: And the geographer who helped you?

Taylor: Carl Sauer.

Chall: Oh, is he the person you took with you?

Taylor: No. He didn't go with me, no. I talked frequently with him about what I was doing and he was helpful. He gave me one of his students, Fred B. Kniffen, whom I took with me to Imperial Valley. I believe he is just now retired from the geography department at the University of Louisiana, Baton Rouge.

Chall: But why would you have chosen a geographer?

Taylor: I didn't logically go through a process of deciding that what I needed was a geographer. I was looking for somebody who welcomed going out into the field to make firsthand contact with the conditions under study. Sauer had this graduate student who welcomed the idea of doing it. That's the way it came about.
Chall: I see, Mr. Sauer was a friend of yours.

Taylor: He was a friend of mine. He was interested. We talked about it. He made helpful suggestions and he had the contact with somebody who would go out with me. I did not have contact at that time with students in my own field of labor economics who were available and wanted to go into the field. Kniffen was helpful and we got a young Mexican named Rafael Estrada as interpreter. He lived in Imperial Valley and helped us where we needed it. Of course, a lot of the Mexicans could speak English and we spoke with them; Estrada supplemented, amplified and verified for us.

Chall: Is this method that you worked out for these studies been what you subsequently followed in later field research?

Taylor: My experience in studying Mexican labor was enormously helpful in the later work that I did during the Depression. It was my background for studying agricultural labor generally and the migrants in particular. I got the field experience that I assure you isn't easy the first time that you do it. You walk up to somebody whom you've never seen, you don't know who he is, you don't know what his background is--all that you can see is his face and his clothing and where he is. You walk up to him and what do you say?

You learn a few things doing that. One of them is that he wonders who you are, as you wonder who he is. So as a sort of rule of thumb, I came to the practice of asking what would appear to be to him, as nearly as I could judge it, the most natural question one could ask him, "How far is it to the next town?" If I pulled up the car by the roadside and he was under the trees, I could get out of my car and ask him how far, and by what route to get there. Well, that was a natural question for somebody like me, obviously a stranger to the community.

Or I might comment on the weather--anything except what I really was interested in. I learned first to establish a human relationship on what would appear to be an entirely natural and non-prying basis. Very frequently that worked very nicely. After I'd get a friendly response, then I could ask most any other question and I'd ask the questions really on my mind.

"What are the wages paid here?"

"Where did the people come from before they worked here?"
"After they get through here, where do they go?"

Frequently they would talk to me easily for five or six minutes then ask, "Why are you asking all these questions?" I learned that in the field the answer was not that I'm a professor at the University of California with a research grant from the Social Science Research Council. I learned to say, "I'm a school teacher." They knew what a school teacher was, because they had children who went to school or had been to school themselves. Hardly any Mexican laborers then had gone to college or university.

Chall: And what about your pencil and notepaper?

Taylor: Oh. When I found that I was getting good responses, I would try to ask some question distinctly factual—not their opinion of something but distinctly factual: "When was the first time you came here?" or "What are the wages?" A question, the answer to which I naturally wouldn't remember. Then I would slowly pull my notebook out of my pocket and start to put down that the wages are 25¢ a box or whatever, and say, "Do you mind if I put this down? I have trouble remembering." Usually the answer was, "Oh, no, no. Go ahead." From then on, I could put down the key phrases of the conversation. So when it was useful, I could make pretty full notes in their presence. But if I couldn't do that I would talk to a group and then go down the road. Perhaps I would stop under a tree a half a mile away, pull out my notebook and make my notes. But I would get probably only about 50 percent of the conversation by waiting fifteen or twenty minutes or a half hour or an hour, or maybe 20 percent if I waited until the end of the day. Remember that there were no tape recorders or Xerox machines in the twenties and thirties.

Then when I came back to Berkeley I would dictate my notes to Elizabeth Priestley and those notes now are in The Bancroft Library.

Chall: Your dictated notes?

Taylor: Yes. [In 1974 these field notes were edited and arranged by Dr. Abraham Hoffman, on a year's grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities.]
Publishing the Results

Chall: And from those you compiled the manuscript?

Taylor: And from those I compiled the manuscript, decided what I wanted to put in of the direct quotations, etc. That's right.

Chall: All of this took you three years. You were not teaching, and subsequently you worked for the federal government as a consultant. Did it ever occur to you that you might prefer to work for the government or work continually doing research, and not teach? Did you ever want to give up teaching?

Taylor: Oh, no. Definitely not. I have always liked to teach. I have liked working with students. What I liked best, and I was able to achieve it during my professional life, I think, to a quite unusual degree, has been an alternation between teaching and research. My research was sponsored either by a scientific body like the Social Science Research Council or by the government, both serving me very well. Of course, that is the traditional relationship of research and teaching: the one enriches the other. I believe it thoroughly.

Chall: Was it the same then as you alternated and combined it, as it is today when we hear so much about publish or perish? Is there more of a tension involved today than there was when you did it your way?

Taylor: Well, there was no publish or perish rule in those days. In fact, the trouble was, I was publishing too much. I encountered some criticism from my senior colleagues, as one of them said to me, "Now it is time for you to come back to the campus and be a professor." You see, I was extravagant in my devotion to research--not moderate.

Another one (my chairman) said to me, "Now it is time for you to come back to the center of your field." When I asked what was the center of my field, he replied, "Something like workmen's compensation." He himself had worked on the statistics of workmen's compensation, figuring out what the premiums had to be to pay the compensation, so he readily recognized that as a "center of my labor economics field." What I was doing was going out in the country and looking at Mexican laborers. That didn't look like the field of "labor economics" to him.
Taylor: I published very extensively for a young man. I never heard the phrase publish or perish until many years later. Over quite a few years, that did not bring a reward in academic advancement. It did help in moving from assistant to associate professor, but I think I hold the record in economics of long tenure as associate professor before promotion to full professor. I had nine years as an associate professor. So I had a long publication record but in those days that wasn't viewed as it is now. Publish or perish came later.

Chall: I have the feeling that you did your research in a way that was gratifying. You weren't under a great deal of pressure and tension.

Taylor: I did what I wanted to do.

Chall: Can they do it now that way? As faculty members?

Taylor: Well, I don't know that there are very many who want to do what I did. I think anthropologists like to get out in the field. But I think people in economics don't generally feel the urge to do that now. I think I was a bit peculiar in that respect, partly inheriting the John R. Commons tradition from the University of Wisconsin.

Chall: By sometime in 1932 then, I presume that you were considered an expert on Mexican-Americans and Mexican laborers.

Taylor: Well, [laughs] there weren't any others to compete with me. I don't recall that I was called an expert. After all, with whom could you compare me? There was one other person, but he was not an American. That was Manuel Gamio, the Mexican. Gamio was a truly distinguished anthropologist from Mexico who had received his doctorate at Columbia University. He was financed by the Social Science Research Council, as I was. The University of Chicago published his two volumes. They reprinted one of those volumes recently and asked me to write a contemporary introduction to that volume, which I did.* Have you been in Mexico?

Chall: Briefly.

---

Taylor: Do you know the pyramids of Teotihuacán? Gamio has three authoritative volumes on the Valley of Teotihuacán. He was the top anthropologist of the Mexican government.


Chall: In 1930 there was appointed what became known as the Wickersham Commission.

Taylor: That was Edith Abbott again. She was on the staff of that commission or a consultant to it. You see, her interest was in immigrants. They wanted to put out studies on crime and the foreign-born. So she asked me whether I could prepare studies on crime and the foreign-born, relating to the Mexicans, which I did.

Chall: I read part of it and it seems as if it could have been written yesterday.

Taylor: Recently, I looked for a long time at what I wrote and I am fully prepared to believe what you have just said. The Mexicans remain a separate group. Not as separate as the blacks, but still a separate group. Separate in domocile, separate in philosophy, ambition, with a sense of their separation from the rest of the community; separate economically to a large extent—not as clearly separated as the blacks but still quite separate. You find now they call themselves Chicanos which shows they have a sense of their separation.

Chall: Were you a part of Governor Young's fact-finding commission on Mexican Immigration into California (1928)?

Taylor: No.

Chall: Do you know any reason why?

Taylor: It was Louis Bloch who did that, wasn't it?

Chall: I don't know. I just had come across the information about the fact-finding commission. I never looked into it.

Taylor: Well, according to my recollection the man who did that was Louis Bloch. Bloch was a student at the University of Wisconsin
Taylor: when I was, about one year ahead of me. He worked with John R. Commons in labor economics and labor history as I did. So we came through the same course of sprouts and he had a position with what then they called the Department of Industrial Relations or something like that.

Chall: In California?

Taylor: In the state of California. In Dr. Bloch they had a staff official with a Columbia doctorate, so they used him. As an official he published a lot on California labor. He published some of his studies just before, or about the same time that I made my Imperial Valley study. In fact, he was down in Imperial Valley on at least one occasion when I was there, and I believe twice. He and his first wife were in the field there. We were in touch. He worked in his way on agricultural labor and I worked in mine.

Chall: Is that report one that is used today or is considered valid?

Taylor: Well, I published excerpts of his study in my Imperial Valley volumes before the Young Commission published it; it was a public report, in type, but not in print, and I included it as an appendix to my published study.

Tracing the History of Mexican-American Immigration and its Relationship to Agriculture

Chall: The immigration of the Mexicans in the state seems to be a problem that has concerned Californians for many years.

Taylor: Yes; employing interests first concerned were probably the railroads and employers in Imperial Valley. You see, the Imperial Valley farmers on the Mexican border, with immigration opening up from both sides of the border as irrigation spread over the desert, beginning with no population at all, wanted laborers. White laborers, migrants, went into the Valley first. But very quickly they were displaced or replaced by the Mexicans. Then there was the demand for railway labor, represented by the need of Southern Pacific and the Santa Fe for track workers--maintenance-of-way men.
Taylor: The railroads first used Mexicans as seasonal construction workers. Then they kept some of them as year-round section hands. The railroads transported their Mexican workers free from the border to wherever the railroad needed their labor. The cost of transportation to the railroads was very little. Many of their workers spilled over onto the farms during seasons of work in agriculture. The railroads were content, even glad to have that happen because it assured that the crops would be planted, cultivated, harvested and finally shipped to market on the railroads. So the railroads served as a conduit through which Mexican labor flowed to the farms.

Then came World War I and the cutting off of immigration from Europe. This produced a forced draft here in the West, with agriculture calling for more and more laborers. Mexico was not affected by the cutting off of immigration from Europe because of war. When the quota laws were established at the end of World War I, the Mexicans were not covered by those laws. So with a forced draft, they came in ever larger and larger numbers. Simultaneously, irrigation was increasing in the West—notably in Arizona and in the sugar beet areas of Colorado, Montana, and to a lesser extent in Nebraska, Ohio, Michigan and a bit in Wisconsin. So that was the principal demand for labor that drew the Mexicans in. The railroads took them into Chicago to meet their own needs. Then they spilled over into the meat-packing houses and steel plants. In rare cases, such as Bethlehem Steel, companies brought them northward after they crossed the border into South Texas.

Chall: It has been as farmworkers, primarily, that their problems and concerns have been always associated.

Taylor: That is the principal occupation, yes.

Did I cite you that original study of Mexican labor in the United States by Victor S. Clark?

Chall: No.

Taylor: Well, that's in Bureau of Labor Bulletin 78 (1908). Victor S. Clark was an excellent scholar. He traces the beginnings of the Mexican migration into this country, that is, the Mexican labor migration, from the 1880s when the American railroads put their extensions of lines down into Mexico and tapped those sources of labor. I think I discussed with you what that did to the character of the agricultural society into which they came?
Chall: You've probably written about it, but let's discuss it.

Taylor: All right. Shall I talk about it for just a moment?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: The traditional Northern farm structure is the farm of a family. The members work on the land which they own. The hired man is on his way up the agricultural ladder. He starts with nothing but his wages, saves up his money, becomes a tenant farmer, eventually buys a farm and becomes an owner and works on his land all his life.

In the South, plantation agriculture was built on a different pattern. There the labor was imported, separate from the farm operator. It was slave labor from Africa originally. The viewpoint of the planters was never expressed more bluntly than about 1743 when a Georgia spokesman said: "In spite of all endeavors to disguise this point, it is as clear as light itself, that Negroes are as essentially necessary to the cultivation of Georgia, as axes, hoes, or any other utensil of agriculture."

The Southern farm was characteristically large, owned by the operator—not by the laborer—and there was no agricultural ladder by which the laborer could rise to ownership.

Here in the West, with irrigation, there was a choice between alternatives, the family farm or the plantation. The West developed on the plantation pattern, with the large-scale owner—operators not characteristically workers on their own land, and the workers, characteristically, not rising on any agricultural ladder to ownership.

I am generalizing, of course. So the Western pattern is what I call a streamlined plantation system. The availability of wave after wave of laborers at the bottom of the ladder forestalled break-up of the large land holdings. Large-scale ownership developed first upon dry, non-irrigated land and then expanded in productive capacity as water came to the land, mainly through the national reclamation program.

I've treated the relation between labor and scale of farming in compact form in the Agricultural History, January 1967, under the title "Hand Laborers in the Western Sugar Beet Industry."
Taylor: So the availability of this labor supply is a very essential element determining the character of the rural societies formed in the West. The societies develop on something akin to the old Southern pattern, rather than to the Middle Western.

Chall: Coming, as you did, from the Middle West, as a white American of European stock, did this in anyway upset, or shock, or disturb you, seeing the different kinds of immigrants who were in the United States struggling for a place?

Taylor: The kind of society that was created under these conditions?

Chall: That's right.

Taylor: Why of course! Of course it shocked me.

Chall: It was something that you had never experienced before.

Taylor: Well, yes, that is true.

In the Middle West during my boyhood and youth, while I was not raised on farms, I lived at times on farms. I lived on the family farm of my uncle in southern Wisconsin for many months in 1909. I lived and worked as a member of the family on his farm, performing whatever operations were to be performed--milking cows, husking corn, harvesting potatoes. About fifteen miles from Sioux City where I was born and raised, I worked on what was a rarity in the Middle West, a two thousand-acre farm. It was an Missouri River bottom land owned by Englishmen. There I worked for at least two summers, and I believe part of a third summer, between 1913 and 1915. The Englishman who operated the farm lived in his house and I lived in the bunkhouse with the workmen, where we had our beds and where we were fed our three meals a day. So I experienced the difference between life on the family farm and life on a large-scale farm.

I saw the wheat-belt migrants come through and live in the same bunkhouse with me, coming from Indiana and Missouri; spending about three weeks in Iowa during the harvest, then going on into the Dakotas as the harvest moved north. So I had a close look at the migratory labor of the Middle West on that farm near Luten, Iowa. So you see I had a firsthand comparison of the family farm with the large-scale farm. In 1927 I saw the difference again in exaggerated form in Imperial Valley--exaggerated beyond anything that I had ever seen before.
Chall: You also saw people with a different culture in the United States.

Taylor: That was one of the exaggerations of that situation—people who are not on the ladder economically, socially or hardly any other way.

Chall: You didn't come to this with a prejudice as a result of your own background, against people of a different culture or color, did you? This didn't modify your concern about immigration, what you found to be the development of almost a culture of peonage, in a sense?

Taylor: I didn't like the society that I found developing with the people of a totally different culture dividing it.

On the whole, I enjoyed working with the Mexicans. They were easy to get along with. I found them on the whole, personally likeable. But I recognized the economic and cultural gulf and I saw the polarized society that was developing. That I did not like.*

I grew up with a tradition—there was only one political party in my boyhood in Iowa. Only one party that was even worth mentioning! I did know, I do remember that the father of one of my high schoolmates was a Democrat and he was a very nice fellow. In fact, we bought our coal from him. But I can't recall any other Democrat in Sioux City. There was only one party—the party of Abraham Lincoln. The city was full of Civil War veterans. We were against slavery; we were against the plantation system, and here I saw a revised plantation system building up. I didn't like it.

Chall: There was only one political party but there was also only one accepted religion, too.

Taylor: Virtually that—Protestantism. Catholicism came into Sioux City when I was a boy, brought largely by the Irish immigrants. I knew some of the Irish boys and girls in high school; we were

*A recent study shows that "farm personnel" of "lower class" is 87.3 percent in Imperial County, compared with 10.7 percent in Price County, Wisconsin, and 13 percent in Kossuth County, Iowa. T. Lynn Smith, "Social Stratification in the Agricultural Sections of the U.S.," 34 Rural Sociology 508. (December 1969) PST
Taylor: friendly, but not intimates. Catholics were--well, they were a little different. We kind of wondered how it happened they could be different.

Chall: [Chuckling] It takes a bit of getting used to--

Taylor: That's right.

Chall: --to find out that these other kinds of people are not only human but they also can think, even though they may look differently they can still be part of the culture.

Taylor: Oh, yes. I can remember only one black family in Sioux City. There doubtless were a few more, but I can remember only one. The father was the mailman who carried mail to my home and his son and daughter went to my public school. But there was no group of blacks in the city.

Chall: One of the reasons that I question you on all this is just to get it into the record, just in case somebody wants to write your biography--and somebody may some day.

Taylor: Go ahead, ask anything you want.

Chall: It came up in my mind as I was reading a radio broadcast that you had given on Americanism and the immigration problem--the extent to which this was the result of your thinking, not only as an economist, but how much of it had to do with your background.

Taylor: You are referring, I think, to about a 1933 or '34 broadcast.

Chall: That's right.

Taylor: Well, that was an historic point in the history of migration to this country; depression had raised emigration above the volume of immigration.

Chall: I think that one of your last sentences was that "in the lull of receding migration, we can fully plan our immigration code with reference to our best interests for the future."

Now we'll get into more modern times, with respect to the Mexican immigration.
Chall: When Sheridan Downey brought his Special Committee to Investigate Farm Labor in the West to San Francisco in 1942 was that the beginning of a turning point in the importation of Mexican labor?

Taylor: That's right, except that his hearing was in Los Angeles.

Chall: At that time was Senator Downey still considered a spokesman of the liberals?

Taylor: In holding those hearings he was the spokesman for, primarily, the agribusiness interests. I remember him before he was a candidate for the Senate. He spoke the most liberal language--almost more liberal than I found easy to take. But I did recognize him as a liberal at the beginning.

Then, he moved into the camp of the large economic interests, speaking the piece of what today we call agribusiness. When he went to work against the acreage limitation law, then he went whole hog for them, from 1944 to 1950.

Chall: In that committee hearing, my recollection is that you were one of the few, if not the only person, who spoke against importation of Mexicans at the time.

Taylor: That's right. Senator Downey was courteous to me but plainly I was not speaking the piece in 1942 that he wanted to hear.

Chall: Approximately 100,000 Mexican-Americans came in at that time, during the war years.

Taylor: Yes. The difference is that originally they came in as immigrants with rights to stay, whether as singles or as families. Then came the drive to establish a quota on them in the late twenties. Extensive hearings were held in '26, '28 and '30. I think I told you before how the State Department met that politically by imposing administrative restrictions which impeded the flow. That way they satisfied the people who wanted the quota restriction to check the flow, while at the same time remaining able to say, as a gesture of friendship, that the United States had one policy for Europe but reserved a preferential policy for America, the part of the world in which we both lived. So this wartime relaxation sponsored by Downey was part of a compromise; it gave the laborers to the
Taylor: farmers and farm operators, but it did not allow a permanent addition to the immigrant population, and raised no questions of an immigration quota.

That went, you see, from the early forties to about '65. There were some changes in the law but essentially it allowed them to come in as temporary workers rather than as permanent immigrants. When I came off Downey's witness stand, a member of the staff of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce said to me, "Well, I agree with everything you said except that this is the wrong time to say it." You see, what they wanted was to open the door to labor from Mexico. My urging of a more efficient use of domestic agricultural labor wasn't what they wanted to hear at that time.

Chall: You were about the only one who made that particular plea.

Taylor: That's right. Oh, they just wanted to have told how much labor they needed and how badly.

Chall: Mr. Setrakian said that he hated social reformers, economists, and mildewed braintrusters.

Taylor: You saw his remarks about me?

Chall: [Laughs] Well, he didn't say they were about you.

Taylor: They were.

Chall: They were about anybody who came from the universities, I think.

Taylor: Well, I was the only one from the University, so it was perfectly plain whom he had in mind. As I recall, he followed my testimony and didn't like it.

Chall: Very outspoken.

Taylor: That's right; he was talking about me. My popularity has been at a somewhat low rating in certain quarters for quite a long time. I'm familiar with that. I live with that. I expected when I entered this profession in the field of labor economics that this is something I would have to face the rest of my life, and if I was not ready to face it, I shouldn't go into the profession. It reminds me of President Truman's saying: "If you can't stand the heat, you'd better stay out of the kitchen."

Chall: I see. There has always then been hostility?
Taylor: Oh yes. From the start. The shipowners' spokesmen didn't like my doctoral dissertations which the New York Times Publishing Service has just reprinted forty-eight years later.

Chall: From 1942 to 1948 the United States Department of Agriculture was responsible for the bracero program and their housing. In 1948 the administration was given to the Department of Labor over the objections of the growers at the time.

Taylor: Well, you can see why: their power over the Department of Agriculture was greater than their power over the Department of Labor.

Chall: Is it supposed to mean that now the problems of the farm laborers is in the hands of people more concerned with labor than the farmers?

Taylor: That was the growers fear.

Chall: Did a change really occur in the way it operated?

Taylor: Well, the Labor Department and labor secretaries are more labor-oriented than they are farmer-oriented. They are less under the control of the growers than the Department of Agriculture. That's true. So I can understand their objections. From the standpoint of the laborers I think it is a good thing to involve the Department of Labor. Wasn't it the influence of a secretary of labor in the sixties that threw the weight in Congress to cutting off the bracero program?

Chall: Yes. I think Secretary Wirtz--

Taylor: That's the man, Secretary Wirtz. At the same time, they didn't shut them off so much that the growers couldn't find another law under which they could let someone in. So there you have it. A balance of pressures.
Institute on Migratory Labor Problems - 1945

Chall: What was the Institute on Migratory Labor Problems at Princeton in June, 1945; what was your role in it? You did give a major talk there on the protection of migratory workers through Social Security benefits.

Taylor: There are two major talks, I believe. One by Agnes Meyer, the wife of the publisher of the Washington Post, followed by my talk. I don't know much about the institute. I surmise that it was the New Jersey interest in migratory labor which was a citizens' interest in the first place. Long afterward it expressed itself through Harrison Williams, senator from New Jersey, who became chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

I believe that one of the persons active in the formation of the institute--or certainly in the development of the interest in migrants--was Suzanne Pierce Zwemer, whom I had known in high school in Iowa and who was active for the National Consumers League in New Jersey. But beyond the fact that the institute meeting was held in Princeton itself, I know nothing to indicate that it was Princeton University that was carrying it on. I think it was a citizens' activity, meeting on the university campus.

Chall: So I assume then, whoever was planning the conference asked you to speak on problems of migrants?

Taylor: Yes, I was told what they wanted me to talk about. I remember no follow-up on it at all--which isn't to say there wasn't any follow-up. It is just that I don't know about it.

Chall: I noticed that there was a summary of your talk in The Child of October, 1945.

Taylor: I had forgotten that.

Chall: It was in your Volume XIV. A summary mostly of the bill of rights for children who followed crops.

Taylor: Well, it could have been the National Child Labor Committee. That was the publisher of The Child. That confirms my view that it was a citizen's interest.
Committees on Migratory Labor - 1950

Chall: In 1950 there were two major committees dealing with the problem of migrant labor.

Taylor: President Truman's Migratory Labor Committee?*

The Warren Committee (State)

Chall: Yes. And the committee that Earl Warren set up in March, 1950 to survey the Agricultural Labor Resources in the San Joaquin Valley, which came out with a report on December 15, 1950. So that in 1950 there was a real concern nationally.

In the San Joaquin Valley study J. Earl Coke was the chairman. Did you know Mr. Coke?

Taylor: Yes. He was a member of the faculty here. He became either assistant or under-secretary of agriculture in Washington. He became director of agriculture in California. Later he went with the Bank of America.

Chall: Dr. Paul Prasow was the executive director. Did you know him?

Taylor: He came to see me in the course of the studies, talked with me for I don't remember how long but I'm sure we must have talked for an hour or two.

Chall: There were fifteen members of the committee--a pretty good-sized committee. Except for your discussions with Dr. Prasow you didn't appear before the committee in any way--as a witness or consultant?

Taylor: No.

Chall: Do you think that was deliberate?

Taylor: Of course. These things are highly political. Remember that resolution about the Japanese evacuees?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: There you are.

Chall: I see. You were persona non grata to the interests behind the Warren committee studying agricultural labor?

Taylor: Well, I was a person not to be ignored but not to be included.

Chall: So they didn't ignore you?

Taylor: Well, as I say, Prasow came and talked to me, very courteously, very nicely; it was an easy friendly talk.

Chall: Did he take information from you? Was he here to gain facts, statistics or methods of going about gaining this information?

Taylor: He talked as might be expected of a professor; I believe at USC.

Chall: I think so, yes.

Taylor: Well, he talked as a young professor at USC would. Perfectly all right. Perfectly nice to me. That's politics, too.

Chall: But he was interested in getting information from you? Or was he just here to tell you why you weren't going to be on the committee?

Taylor: Oh, he didn't tell me that. Remember that I had been studying these questions intensively for a long, long time. So I'm quite sure he didn't want to go through his duties with the Warren commission and ever have it said by anyone that he didn't have any contact with me as a source of information. Certainly he could always say that he came to me and that we had a free and easy talk—which we did. I think the governor set up that commission for political reasons, as a show of state concern matching the federal concern with problems of laborers. The federal concern had been shown first by the LaFollette Committee, and then by the Truman Migratory Labor Committee. So Governor Warren showed his concern by setting up a state committee.

Chall: But there was a great deal of concern and agitation in the San Joaquin Valley—if not all over the state at that time—about the plight of the migrant workers, their health and problems of education, that could not really be ignored.
Taylor: Probably that's part of the politics of why there was a state commission. Otherwise people could say, "Look, you have one of the worst situations of migratory labor in the country and you don't even study it!" Well, this answered that question for outsiders and for concerned Californians as well.

Chall: Do you think that, as you recall it, it was a committee that came up with some valid study and conclusions?

Taylor: I've forgotten what they recommended. Was it a bipartisan committee?

Chall: Here are the names of the members and you can decide for yourself whether it was bipartisan.

Taylor: I've forgotten now. [Looking at the names]*

Well, it was bipartisan in this sense: C.J. "Neil" Haggerty, secretary of the California Federation of Labor was a member. That, too, was good political balance. Yes, this was a broadly based committee.

Chall: Their recommendations, as I recall it, were not too much different from the ones that were recommended by the President's Commission on Migratory Labor.

Taylor: Yes, I don't recall this as a bad committee at all.

The Truman Committee (Federal)

Chall: Now would you say that the committee set up by President Truman was also done for political purposes?

Taylor: Well, I would assume that that was so. Surely.

Chall: This treats it nationally, of course.

Taylor: That's right. Migratory labor was one of the hot subjects, yes.

*"Agricultural Labor in the San Joaquin Valley, Recommendations and Preliminary Report." The Governor's Committee to Survey the Agricultural Labor Resources of the San Joaquin Valley (Sacramento, California, December 15, 1950), p. 3.
Taylor: The weight of the Truman committee was more on the side that I personally welcomed.

Chall: Who was Maurice Van Hecke, the chairman?

Taylor: He was a professor of law at the University of North Carolina, a good man.

Chall: Noble Clark?

Taylor: Noble Clark was from the University of Wisconsin Extension.

Chall: And William Leiserson?

Taylor: William Leiserson came through the same course of sprouts at the University of Wisconsin. He preceded me there perhaps nearly a decade. He's the grandfather of the Leiserson in the Political Science Department here. He was, I believe, an immigrant—probably born in Russia or Poland, raised in the environs of Hull House in Chicago. He went to the University of Wisconsin, worked under John R. Commons as I did, eventually became a professor at Antioch College, had important experience as a government official. I am trying to remember just what posts he had, but some of importance. I've forgotten whether he was on the National Labor Relations Board or not. But something like that.

Chall: He was in labor?

Taylor: A labor economist, a very able one. A very broad-gauged man.

Chall: Robert Lucey?

Taylor: Archbishop Lucey of San Antonio. He had been a priest in Los Angeles, a distinctly liberal priest. A very, very fine man.

I'll tell you one little incident. At the hearings in, I believe, Brownsville, Texas, a spokesman testifying for the farm employers turned directly to Archbishop Lucey and said that indeed the Mexicans were poor, but "as the Bible said, 'The poor you have with you always,' as you know, Archbishop."

Archbishop Lucey swung sharply in his chair and responded, "Yes, but the Bible didn't say we had to have so many of them!"
Chall: [Chuckles] And Peter Odegard?

Taylor: And Peter Odegard from this University, excellent.

Chall: Was Peter Odegard from the Department of Economics or political science?

Taylor: Political science. Peter Odegard came as a youth from Montana. He told me when first I met him here that when it came time for graduate work he turned two alternatives over in his mind. One was to go to the University of Wisconsin for graduate work with John R. Commons. His other alternative was to go to Columbia and take work with Charles A. Beard, the distinguished political scientist. Well, he finally decided for Charles A. Beard. But as for the difference between the two—-one was in political science, the other in economics—they were very largely of the same general school. That is, they held entirely sympathetic views although working in somewhat different fields. They were not unlike; they were quite alike.

So this was a strong commission. Peter Odegard put the commission's files in our library.

Chall: And Varden Fuller was executive secretary?

Taylor: I was on his doctoral committee and he took me on for a time as a consultant.

Chall: Did you have something to do with setting up this commission, and did Helen Gahagan Douglas have something to do with it too?

Taylor: Yes, she did; a great deal. I knew that she was setting up the commission. I wouldn't be surprised but that she discussed some of its personnel with me, but I assure you that I did not set up the commission.

Whether she asked me, "What about Peter Odegard?" or not, I do not now recall. If she had asked me about Odegard or Leiserson, I certainly would have said, "Yes, fine." But I was not the hand behind the scenes.

Chall: What do you think prompted her? The needs in California?

Taylor: Helen Gahagan Douglas very early was interested in the plight of the migrants, and was active personally in going into the camps of the migrants. That was before I ever knew her. It was one of her "causes," if you will.
Taylor: As I recall it she went up from Los Angeles to the San Joaquin Valley for a Christmas party there. Later she took Eleanor Roosevelt among the migrants. There I had a hand, not in the party. But she asked me to outline a route for her to take Eleanor Roosevelt where she would really see the conditions in a matter of a day or two.

Chall: In California?

Taylor: In the southern San Joaquin. I suggested places to go and I believe they followed pretty much the route I suggested.

Chall: Your role was as a consultant to the committee. You were on the staff for a time. Is that it?

Taylor: That's right. As I recall I prepared a paper or two for them and discussed questions that arose as they were carrying on the work. I went into South Texas when the hearings were held in Brownsville and El Paso. You see, those were areas that I knew from my preceding work on Mexican labor in the late twenties.

Chall: Most of the people who helped for varying periods of time were from the government but you and Arthur Ross were the only two people who didn't come as consultants from the government; both of you were from the University of California.

Taylor: Well, and Varden Fuller.

Chall: Yes. Who was Arthur Ross?

Taylor: Arthur Ross took his doctorate with me about '41 or '42. He was on the faculty here and became director of the Institute of Industrial Relations. He went from here to become United States labor commissioner in the Department of Labor. He was there for some years, then went to the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, as vice-president. About two years ago he suddenly died.

Chall: Some of your students have done very well in their work. Do you have a feeling of pride in them?

Taylor: The answer is yes, of course!

Chall: Do you think you had anything to do with inspiring and teaching them?
Taylor: [Chuckling] You ought to ask them that question. I worked them over. I didn't ignore them--you can be sure of that. What I used to do with my students was to ask them all the questions I could think of that were worth asking. When they stopped talking I asked them another question--to make them think!

Chall: The two reports are quite different. The California report is preliminary so it's hard to compare.

Taylor: Oh yes! The national report, the calibre of the report of the national committee...

Chall: When you were working on this commission, did you have the feeling that some of the conclusions would ever be implemented?

Taylor: Well, I had the feeling that the work of the commission was worth doing--very much worth doing! That the commission was pointing in the right direction. But of course I had seen the situation long enough to know that you wouldn't turn it over overnight! The problems are very deep-seated. The Truman commission was concerned with the labor aspect of the land and water situation that we are going to talk about later. These all dovetail. They are all a part of the greater, inclusive problem.

Studies on Population

Chall: Somewhat akin to your studies on agricultural labor, has been, it would seem, an interest in population. You spoke at a conference at Asilomar in May, 1953, dealing with population trends.* In 1953, you were greatly concerned with the 160-acre limit, and I wondered how you happened to have time to deliver a speech on population, which, as I read it, looked as if you brought your understanding of population right up to date.

Taylor: In other words, the problem is to figure out why I didn't have what would be expected, that is, a one-track mind.

*Conference on Trends on the Pacific Coast--held at Asilomar May 20-22, 1953--sponsored by the Social Science Research Council, Pacific Coast Committee on Social Statistics. Taylor speech: "Social and Economic Implications of Recent Population Changes on the Pacific Coast."
Chall: [Laughter]

Taylor: That's another way of putting it.

Chall: You had quite a diverse interest, but this comes in the middle of everything else, which was mostly water.

Taylor: You remember, I used to give the course on population, in economics--

Chall: I didn't know that.

Taylor: --up until about that time, I don't remember just when. But I gave it for many years, continuing even after World War II.

Chall: Did you once tell me that you had something to do with the establishment of the Institute for Population and Urban Research here on the campus?

Taylor: Only in a remote sense. On one of my trips East I called on Professor Kingsley Davis at Columbia, and it wasn't long thereafter that he came here. I don't recall that I established or was in on the establishment of the institute as such. Population was one of my interests from the twenties. Professor Walter Wilcox of Cornell, a great population statistician went back to 1650 as his starting point on world population, and did a population work which hasn't been superseded yet. He was on the Social Science Research Council Committee in charge of sponsoring my work on the Mexican migration. You see, population and migration were viewed then as two sides of the coin. My research was on the migration side.

In '29, the Norman Waite Harris Memorial Foundation at Chicago conducted a week-long conference on population. And, because of my current work on the Mexican migration, they invited me to join. Those proceedings have never been published to my knowledge, except in mimeographed form. I placed my copy in the library. The proceedings would be very interesting for anyone looking into population now. They were very lively.

Chall: So this conference at Asilomar just followed the pattern of your interest.

Taylor: One thread of my interests, yes.
I wanted to pick up some more information on the State Board of Agriculture. We discussed it very briefly earlier but mainly with respect to your resolution on the return of the Japanese. You were not reappointed for a second term by Governor Warren.

Well, I probably would not have been reappointed with a change in the administration even if I had not been responsible for the resolution and the subsequent shift in emphasis on the background of appointees. A convenient way of replacing me was to appoint Dean Claude Hutchison of the College of Agriculture as my successor.

Yes, he seemed to feel that there was nothing unusual in his being appointed in your place, because he felt that it was proper for the School of Agriculture to be represented.

It was a perfectly proper appointment. But you can be sure that politically there is a reason in the difference in the two persons.

And Grace McDonald?

She served till the end of her term which I believe was one year beyond my term. About the end of her term the legislature passed a couple of resolutions, the text of which I don't have before me but which, as I recall, emphasized that the members of the Board of Agriculture should represent "agriculture." Of course this fits my analysis that agriculture in California in the view of the dominant political forces means agricultural employers—not all the people engaged in agriculture.
Taylor: concern, naturally, was strongly with those who labored for wages in agriculture, and the smaller farmers.

Chall: Have you noted the appointments over the years since then, to see whether any of the appointees represented the laborers or interests other than the employers?

Taylor: I have not made note of it. But I think I would have known had any such appointments been made. I never heard of any such thing. My present belief is that I wouldn't find any if I went down the list of names of the appointees.

Chall: What is the work of the board?

Taylor: The normal work is to meet once a month and to advise the director of the State Department of Agriculture on whatever may come up.

Chall: I suppose if these people on the board are strongly representative of agricultural interests they would in fact advise the director. It isn't just a committee that allows the director to make all of his own choices?

Taylor: Well, it is a channel of communication between those engaged in agriculture and the administrators of the law, and sometimes the public as well. The intent is very good, in practice. I wish that the interests of agriculture were defined a little more broadly.

Chall: There is no place within the administration--state or federal--where the interests of laborers in the field are represented--that you know?

Taylor: Well, there is concern with farm laborers in the Federal Farm Labor Placement Service. It was not long ago--what, three months ago perhaps?--that charges were made that the Service was operating in the interests of the employers, not the laborers. I am not surprised at that charge. I think it could have been made with some substance at any time from its formation on. Agriculture is divided here--polarized--not united, as it was historically in the Middle West. Of course, conditions have changed by now in many parts of the country including the Middle West.

But in its conception and in its operations, oh, until about the second World War, there was such a thing as an
Taylor: agricultural ladder within agriculture. The man who started as a laborer could move up through tenancy to ownership. But, with some exceptions, it was not generally true here in California. The last laborers in California who rose to ownership, I would say, were immigrants prior to World War I.

Chall: Were they Oriental immigrants?

Taylor: Japanese, Armenians from the Near East, Portuguese--those were three notable immigrant groups, yes. Also Hindustanis from the Indias Punjab advanced fast to tenant operations and even ownership; they were experienced irrigators.

Chall: Are any of them still around?

Taylor: Yes, I understand there are. I haven't seen them for a long time but I understand they are, around Marysville, Stockton and a few in Imperial Valley. In fact, one of them went to Congress representing Imperial Valley, oh, I've forgotten how many years ago. He became a congressman. [D.S. Saund]

Chall: Yes, I remember him. I didn't realize that his background was--

Taylor: Yes, he was a Hindustani immigrant.

Chall: Now if the membership primarily of the Board of Agriculture represents the agricultural interests, the growers, that is to say--

Taylor: De facto, yes.

Agricultural Extension Service

Chall: Has this been a factor too--the role of the Extension Service, with respect, let's say, to their close tie to the Farm Bureau Federation?

Taylor: Let's see if I can rephrase your question.

Has that conception of the divided interests in agriculture and the appropriation of the interests of the operators and landowners influenced the Extension Service? Is that the question?
Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Well, I think the answer is unquestionably yes. If you wish me to recall?

Chall: Yes, if you could recall some examples of it.

Taylor: Yes, I can.

I encountered it personally in 1927 in January, when I began my studies of Mexican labor in California. In their annual convention of the Extension Service staff, one of the speakers was Professor Thomas Nixon Carver of Harvard, professor of rural sociology there. He was a North Carolinian by birth. He spoke very strongly (I did not hear him, but I heard about it promptly thereafter) about the injury to the small working farmers of California of allowing a flood tide of Mexican immigrant hand laborers to come into this state. He gave the analogy of the planters with their slave laborers, later the freedmen, who were competitors of the white laborers and working farmers.

Following that, Mr. Crocheron, the head of the Extension Service, I was informed, received strong protests—notably from C.C. Teague of Santa Paula. He was a large citrus grower who I understand was instrumental in getting protection against foreign citrus fruit but did not see a possible analogy in getting protection for domestic laborers and working farmers against foreign cheap labor. His attitude, you see, from my point of view, was inconsistent. But I understand the pressures were brought very strongly and I believe they were responded to.

Chall: I understand Mr. Crocheron was a highly respected and efficient administrator.

Taylor: I believe that is true.

Chall: Was he caught up in a bind, because—of his position?

Taylor: He was under political pressure from a very powerful representative of the agricultural industry. Sure. Teague later became a congressman.

Chall: And Mr. Coke, J. Earl Coke, who followed him in 1949 would be caught up, I assume, in the same kind of struggle?
Taylor: Well, yes. I don't know that either of them had any compunctions or scruples about it. They might have simply said, "Oh, yes, that's right." I define it as pressure, because I believe that that point of view is backed by exerting strong political pressure.

As an example: About 1932, when the Depression had hit hard, the University was taking budgetary cuts, including cuts in our personal salaries. During the negotiations over the budget the agricultural industry threw its weight toward saving the College of Agriculture and Extension Service from budgetary cuts of comparable severity with those applied to the rest of the University. In other words, within agriculture the University had special friends. "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours."

Chall: The state has been dominated by rural interests for most of its history.

Taylor: Yes, I subscribe to that point of view.

Chall: Is it not expected that they would protect their interests?

Taylor: Yes, with the only modification that the rural and the urban interests merge. You know the old phrase, Montgomery Street Farmer. Never heard that?

Chall: No.

Taylor: That's a common phrase. The offices of many farming operations are on Montgomery Street.

Chall: Has the Giannini Foundation been concerned mostly with assistance to the larger employers and growers, and less with concern to labor, would you say?

Taylor: Well, I think that that can be fairly said. At the same time, I think it should also be said that the subject of farm labor is not ignored and, shall I say, a sympathetic scholarly viewpoint has found its place within the Giannini Foundation or, shall we say, within the Department of Agricultural
Taylor: Economics. I can't exactly separate them, they're so blurred. I'll give you two examples of concern for the kind of interests that I have.

For one thing, when Carl Alsberg was brought from Stanford Research Institute to head the Giannini Foundation he invited me in 1936 to give a course in rural sociology. It had not been given previously. He said he thought it ought to be given. He said, "Give it one hour, two hours a week, three hours, whatever you want."

I said, 'Well let's have a two hour upper division course to start with and we'll see how that goes.'

I gave that until the time of my retirement.

Chall: Is that right! So that was from about 1936 to--

Taylor: Nineteen thirty-six to '62. It is still being given over there by my successor.

Then they took on the staff Varden Fuller, who took his doctorate there. I was on his committee. His subject was the history of farm labor in California. He had worked for some years with San Francisco law interests sympathetic and serviceable to organized labor. No less a person than Harry Wellman asked me whether in my judgment Fuller would be a good appointment as recognition of the importance of farm labor problems; I told him, yes. So I don't think that they meant as a University institution to exclude labor.

I am trying to separate that from the weight of the financial emphasis on marketing and whatnot. Particularly I want to separate that which was campus-oriented from the Extension Service which was oriented to the field. It was the Extension field work that was most sensitive to the political pressures, not the campus; and in the field of rural sociology, not only were these two appointments made but in addition, Carl Alsberg appointed Dorothy Swaine Thomas as a full-time professor of rural sociology. She was here for eight or ten years. Then she went East to the University (I think) of Pennsylvania.

Chall: So there was a concern on the part of the department.

Taylor: Oh yes!
Chall: Do you think then that the Department of Agricultural Economics is fairly well balanced with respect to the concerns of agriculture?

Taylor: As I told you, the three appointments that were made were made sincerely and honestly and I am sure never interfered with in any way. But if you ask me whether I think the weight of agriculture includes a concern for laborers in agriculture and working farmers comparable to the concern for the others, the answer is no. Incidentally, I would add that concern for working farmers and laborers has substantially reduced the potential field of operations of the Extension Service as these elements of rural society have been swept from the land and into the cities.

Chall: When we get into water later and the problems of the 160-acre limitation, the growth of agriculture into very, very large tracts and farming units--

Taylor: What has been their general weight or influence on that issue?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: They ducked it. Ducked it as much as they could. Now that would not be true of some people who are there right now or of David Seckler who was here for one or two years. Seckler didn't duck it. But I understand he did not get his appointment as a permanent associate professor. Whether or not that was the reason, I have no way of knowing. He is the editor of a book from U.C. Press.*

Chall: Oh and what is the subject?

Taylor: California water, and it includes an article he asked me to write on the 160-acre limitation.

Chall: I see. So the concern has really been with the growing of foodstuffs, the marketing of it and the pricing of it, primarily?

Taylor: Yes. Some professors (not only in agriculture) are much more

---

Taylor: sensitive to outside political concerns than others. In my judgment, some who were sensitive to those political pressures avoided subjects such as the 160-acre limitation. If you were to read what they wrote when they had to deal with the subject at all, they touched it very gingerly. I had no inquiries made of me about it. I could have been a source of a considerable amount of useful information at least--if they inquired. With rising interest in the environment recently, I have been invited to participate from time to time by faculty in various departments.

Department of Economics

Chall: Been going off in slightly different directions--you too.

Are you unique in the Department of Economics in your concern for agriculture and agricultural labor?

Taylor: You mean as of today or as of the last decade or as of my lifetime here?

Chall: Maybe all of it.

Taylor: Well, the answers would not be the same, depending on the chronology.

Chall: Well, let's start with today.

Taylor: Well, today in economics there is a strong interest in Southern economic history--not California economic history but Southern economic history, including plantation labor. But I do not find concern in the economics department for farm labor, except on my part and in Southern economic history.

There is an interest in labor, including farm labor in the Institute of Industrial Relations. So that within the University, there is an expression of interest and concern with the problem but it is outside the economics department. I personally regret the decline of concern within the department where the interest is increasingly mathematical, statistical and theoretical.
Taylor: Some years ago Professor Joe S. Bain, Jr. with Julius Margolis, a colleague from Stanford, made a study of the economics of California water development. The acreage limitation is mentioned, but as I recall it's mentioned almost tangentially, not as an issue of primary concern. They were concerned with the evaluation of the balance between total economic benefits from the project as compared with total costs. Their conclusion was that water development wasn't worth what it cost. So there has been that concern with the water development. But how equitably the benefits are distributed is another matter.

At UCLA there has been a great deal of concern with the farm labor, notably through their Institute of Industrial Relations. Varden Fuller is now at UC Davis, and several faculty members there show active interest in agriculture. The Law School has printed several of my articles in its Law Review.

So there is no monolithic or universal answer to your question, in an institution that has as much diversity in organization, in personalities, in interests and academic freedom as we have in this University.

Chall: So that if anybody were interested in taking it up and working on it at this time, he probably would feel free to do so?

Taylor: I don't think that a person would be stopped from doing it if he wanted to do it, no.

Chall: Why do you think this?

Taylor: I doubt if ten people could be chosen with that as a primary interest, but no one would stop them if they did.

Studying Land-Use Issues

Chall: Is there any reason why there are so few who are concerned with this particular question that you have been concerned with?

Taylor: You mean that interests me so much?

Chall: Land use, the 160-acre laws?
Taylor: You used the phrase land use. May I just comment? That phrase comes also out of the College of Agriculture. They don't mean, or over the years have not meant what I mean by land use. Their definition of it is the gradings of soils, for second and third grades of soils and what crops are suited to what grades of soils and where they are distributed. And they map the distribution of soil grade. That is land use.

With me, it is the social aspects of it, the kind of a social and economic structure that is built upon it. The preservation--rather the non-preservation of open spaces and agricultural greenbelts. That's what I mean by land use. The checking of the endless suburban sprawl and slurb. But that is becoming a concern now in another part of the University. Not in agriculture, I believe. It's an important concern in the School of Environmental Design, in city and regional planning and so on.

The College of Agriculture within the last year or two has expressed its concern in environment. Forestry is involved and I don't know what more. So there is a reflection of that. Now how much concern that involves the monopoly of resources of land and water I have no way of knowing. There are inter-departmental courses, but whether they're based in agriculture I am not sure.

Chall: We got off the question of why so few people in the University are concerned with studying the farm labor, and land-use issues. Have you any ideas about it?

Taylor: The question you have asked is not simple or easy to answer. To begin with, there is some interest among students and among some faculty in farm labor, and land-use as I define it. That interest has come fairly strongly during two separate eras of my professional career. During the Depression thirties there was a very great student interest in farm labor. Numerous masters' and doctoral theses were written under my sponsorship within that period. Among the authors were students who majored in history, political science and anthropology as well as in economics. Some of them went on to distinguished careers of academic or public service. At the time the general political climate of the country was hospitable. Farm labor--especially the migrants--was of public concern. The issue of land monopoly was latent, and did not break into general public consciousness until it appeared in the form of congressional debate on water monopoly. I was unaware of the water issue until the early forties.
Taylor: Shortly after World War II the University definition of the field of economics altered. That is to say, the emphasis changed. Mathematical requirements for doctoral candidates stiffened markedly. Graduate students interested in farm labor, or acreage limitation and land tenure, generally found minimum use for mathematically-oriented economic theory. They found greater relevance in a broadened conception of research, one devoted to following the problem in hand wherever it might lead. This implied entering the fields of history, law, political science, anthropology wherever this promised to be useful in throwing light upon the problem under study. Emphasis upon mathematical theory imposed additional burdens upon economics candidates whose primary interest was in farm labor, and in land and water use as I define them. Thus from my point of view the field of economics has narrowed, with greater concern for mathematics and less concern for non-mathematical study of economic and political institutions. Remember that originally our field was called Political Economy. Chaïles A. Beard once remarked to me that splitting it into political science and economics was a mistake. I concur in that view. Now economics is narrowing still farther.

The recent wave of popular concern for environment and ecology has brought with it a growing interest in land and water use, including monopoly, and in planning the environment. (It has not increased interest in study of farm labor.) Logically, this is a revival of the original conception of conservation as conceived at the opening of the twentieth century, which held that natural resources are not to be privately monopolized; and of which reclamation law was a very early example. There is some, perhaps growing, recognition among today's environmentalists of this relationship.

It is relevant to both general public and academic interest in water development that reporting of the issue of water monopoly in the news media is minimal today as compared to the forties when student interest was much more manifest than today. In the forties the San Francisco News, for example, featured the issue of acreage limitation, and in this way students as well as the general public were made aware of its importance. Although today farm labor receives much attention in newspapers, the water-land monopoly issue receives almost none.

Political and economic power lies today neither with those seeking to organize farm labor nor with those seeking to check water monopoly. The power of decision-making lies with those
Taylor: who are opposed. The bureaucracy tends to respond more to political power than to law and conservation principle. At the University there is natural attraction for study of problems and approaches that presume to lead to influencing management and decision-making power.

These reflections may help to explain why there is not greater student-faculty interest in farm labor-water monopoly problems at the present time. They do not mean that student-faculty interest in these problems could not be greater if they wished it to be so. Students and faculty from other universities come to my study door more frequently now than they used to inquiring about these problems. Broadly speaking the University does reflect the character and power structure of our society, but also it is flexible and not rigidly bound by it. The University fortunately does allow inquiry at the social, economic and political periphery, as well as at the center. To do the former is one of its more essential functions; knowledge expands naturally at the periphery.

But the actual "doing" depends upon the interest of students and faculty in particular subjects. Sometimes their interest is greater, and sometimes it is less. As for my own issues of farm labor and water-land monopoly, it is perhaps not important that many faculty members shall specialize in studying them. But it is very important that some shall do so. It is at least equally important that a good many of the faculty who do not specialize in them shall understand their relationship to their own fields, whether these be law, politics, history, business and public administration, environmental design, education or engineering. For these issues touch the heart of our society, and it would be a mistake to allow them to be swept under the rug.
PART II  WATER AND LAND:  THE 160-ACRE ISSUE

VI  FEDERAL STUDIES ON THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, 1942-1944
(Interviews 5 and 7, June 28, 1971 and December 16, 1971)

Paul Taylor Begins a Thirty-Year Interest in Acreage Limitation

Chall:  I think we are ready to begin our review of your work and concern with the reclamation law and the 160-acre limitation.  How did you happen to become involved with this issue.  You had been, up until then, primarily interested in agricultural labor and population studies.

Taylor:  I was appointed consultant in the Power Division of Secretary Ickes' office beginning in '43.  Then, probably in 1946, I became consultant to the Bureau of Reclamation.  In both capacities I was primarily concerned with acreage limitation.

Chall:  How did it happen that you were appointed as consultant to the Power Division?

Taylor:  It was by a fortunate series of "accidents."  Long before, in 1934, I was studying self-help cooperatives among the unemployed on a Rockefeller Foundation grant.  One of Harry Hopkins' right-hand men, Jacob Baker, came out to East Oakland to examine one of their applications for relief funds to support their efforts.  He and I turned up at the same meeting of the Unemployed Exchange Association (UXA) and met there.  I drove him back from the meeting to where he caught the electric train and ferry to San Francisco.

Not long thereafter I went to Washington in the course of my studies where I called on Baker at the Federal Emergency Relief Administration.  He said, "We are going out tomorrow into North
Taylor: Dakota where there is severe drought. Will you go out with us as a dollar-a-year-man? We'll pay your expenses."

So I went out on that expedition, under the sponsorship of Harry Hopkins' FERA. I was assigned with a small group to work in the northwest corner of North Dakota. A young man by the name of Arthur E. Goldschmidt boarded the same train in Washington and was assigned to the same area. He saw me at work in the field, interviewing people and evidently was impressed.* Incidentally, Arthur Goldschmidt is the older brother of Walter R. Goldschmidt, who made the Arvin-Dinuba study. Arthur Goldschmidt, who is also called Tex, later was appointed by LBJ [Lyndon Baines Johnson] to be ambassador of the United States to the United Nations Committee on Economic and Social Affairs. They were good personal friends from the thirties when LBJ was head of the National Youth Authority in Texas. As president, LBJ used to call him from Washington to ask him such questions as what to do in support of water development of the Mekong River in Southeast Asia.

Chall: What was Abe Fortas at this point?

Taylor: Abe Fortas was the undersecretary of the interior under Harold Ickes.

In '43, the Bureau of Reclamation embarked upon a series of, I believe, twenty-five studies of problems of the Central Valley Project, upon which the Department of the Interior was embarked. Arthur Goldschmidt was then head of the Power Division and he wanted his division to be represented on, oh, probably seven or eight of those studies. But he had no staff out here. He was a staff man himself. He had no organization out here as the Bureau of Reclamation did.

So, remembering me from 1934, he asked me to be his consultant, to sit in on those California committee meetings, and to report to him what they were all about and share my judgments with him. So very shortly I told him about the 160-acre law, including those who were interested in abiding by the law and those who were interested in escaping it.

Chall: This division about the 160-acre limitation came out in those hearings, I take it?

*See my report on Drought Situation of North Dakota, June 16, 1934. In Volume XIV of my papers.
Taylor: Well--they weren't really hearings; they were committee meetings, chaired usually by officials of the Bureau of Reclamation. There also were people from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and from citizens groups. So very shortly we saw to it that people like Concerned Catholics became participants. So there was soon, not only a representation on the committee of the growers and the big landowners, who were there from the first in opposition to the 160-acre law, but we saw to it that this was balanced with citizens who wanted that law enforced.

Chall: This was late in 1943, these meetings took place?

Taylor: That was when I was taken on as consultant. Tex Goldschmidt is a very able man. He supported me strongly. So did Abe Fortas.

Chall: And these committees were meeting when?

Taylor: Were meeting in '43 and '44.

Walter Packard's Report on the Central Valley Project

Chall: And you were aware at that time of the 160-acre limitation and the developing problems?

Taylor: Yes, I was. My first awareness of that was one time when I spoke with Walter Packard. He mentioned the acreage limitation on water deliveries. I asked him if it meant that ought to be the law, or if it was the law. He replied, "Oh, it is the law." That was the first I had heard of it, and CVP construction had begun in 1935. You see how that subject had been covered up.

Walter Packard made a study, which was published in 1942, The Economic Implications of the Central Valley Project. He made it on a Haynes Foundation grant. The Haynes Foundation, apparently, didn't want to touch the study after they saw what it was. Dr. John R. Haynes was a prominent liberal Los Angeles physician, a man of great wealth, public spirit, and pro-public power. His nephew, an attorney, I believe, for Los Angeles Light and Power (public), together with the secretary of the foundation invited me to lunch in order to talk with me about what to do about the study.

I took the University view, saying it was supportable as an objective study--not that everyone had to agree with it, but the
Taylor: author was entitled to have his say.

They did two things: from the published study they omitted all that Walter Packard had to say about public power. That part of the study remains unpublished. So here is the situation which I have never quite understood: that administrators of a foundation established by one of the strongest public power advocates of his generation cut out the public power part of the study it financed. Nor can I understand that the founder's nephew, a public-power attorney in Los Angeles, was apparently influential in cutting it out. The concentrated landholding pattern remains in the published study. But the fact that the Haynes Foundation financed the study is nowhere mentioned in the published version.

Chall: Did they finance him while he was making the study?

Taylor: Yes, certainly. By our academic practice, a Ford Foundation or a Rockefeller Foundation grant would be acknowledged in the study. There is no mention of the connection of the Haynes Foundation with the Packard study at all!

Chall: Did you ever see unpublished what Walter Packard had written about power?

Taylor: I don't recall that I did but I had no trouble guessing that it was pro-public power.*

Chall: Did you ever ask him why this happened? Would he have known?

Taylor: Well, I can't remember whether I asked him. But I do tell you that two representatives of the foundation invited me to lunch to talk about it.

Chall: What was their concern? I am as mystified as you are.

Taylor: They were uneasy about Walter's positions on public power and acreage problems, the bigland ownership. But for some reasons they were more sensitive to the public power aspects and excluded those. They allowed him to publish the part on the patterns of land ownership, but they excluded their own name as donors from the study.

*Probably it is in the Walter Packard papers in The Bancroft Library. PST
Taylor: Don't you realize that you are dealing with a subject in which the pressures are enormous?

Chall: A foundation, generally speaking, is supposed to be above and beyond these pressures.

Taylor: That was always the assumption of what was desirable and to a high degree was the fact. [Laughs]

Chall: In what way did Walter Packard inform you about the 160-acre limitation?

Taylor: I have already explained that, to my surprise, acreage limitation is the law. Even more important than so advising me, Walter Packard went to Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes and so advised him. Apparently that was in 1941 while exemptions for the Truckee and Humbolt projects in Nevada were progressing through Congress with help from Ickes' aides, and unbeknown to Ickes until Packard informed him of what was going on.* That is how Secretary of the Interior Ickes became prepared to support acreage limitation against attack in 1944.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics: Central Valley Project Studies

Chall: If I am right, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics was asked to determine, among other questions, whether acreage limitation should apply to the Central Valley Project, and they were assigned this task by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Taylor: Yes, by a transfer of funds. The BAE was serving the Bureau of Reclamation, but as a team of the BAE; that is correct. They made a series of studies with respect to size of farm in the area that was to served by the Central Valley Project, both the size existing and the adequacy of 160-acres. They published the results in mimeograph form and I believe you have them.

Chall: Yes. I have seen a few in your carton in The Bancroft Library.*

Taylor: Then they worked on the Central Valley Project Study Number 19. Do you want to talk about that now? Because chronologically that is dated September, 1944.

Chall: All right. I had been puzzled about the reason why Marion Clawson of the BAE was the director when the Bureau of Reclamation was responsible for that series of studies.

Taylor: They were responsible but they found professional competence in the BAE.

Chall: Was this BAE staff transferred from Washington, D.C. to Berkeley?

Taylor: No. The BAE had already established a regional office here. Presumably that was to bring it closer to the ground problems of the country, to the variations in problems in different parts of the country. And remember that was done, I believe, under bureau director Howard Tolley, who had been director of the Giannini Foundation on the Berkeley campus. In my judgment that regionalization was an excellent move, taking the BAE out of the sterilized atmosphere of Washington and putting the staff in touch with the problems of people in rural society, right on the ground.

Chall: Were these people like Clawson and [Mary] Montgomery and [Edwin] Wilson local or did they move out here from the East or Midwest?

Taylor: Clawson was a Nevadan, a Harvard doctorate. Edwin Wilson, I don't recall his professional or personal pedigree. There were also J. Karl Lee, Cruz Venstrom, and then Mary Montgomery.

Chall: So they were assigned, probably, from Washington?

Taylor: They were assigned from Washington to do the work of the BAE out here, assigned to it by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau of Reclamation financed it and gave them, I believe, complete freedom. The Bureau of Reclamation didn't have the professional competence on its own staff. The BAE staff did fine work. Their projects were good and they told it like it was.

*See also: Mary Montgomery and Marion Clawson, "History of Legislation and Policy Formation of the Central Valley Project," (Berkeley: United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1946).
Chall: Did you have much contact with this group of the BAE as consultant for the power division?

Taylor: I had personal relationships with them; we talked about the problems. I did not work with them professionally. But I was on good terms with them personally and I believe that my views with respect to acreage limitations were very close to their own.

Problem 19: Acreage Limitation in the Central Valley

Chall: Now Problem 19--that laid the groundwork for the controversies that are still with us.

Taylor: That's right. That laid the groundwork for an understanding of that issue. You must realize that the acreage limitation issue was kept under wraps. I don't think that is too strong a term. It was well known by the large landowners that this was a part of the law. They wanted to escape it in one way or another. It had received, so far as I know, no publicity whatsoever initially. In the early forties I believe they did go to the legislative reference service of the state and from an attorney there got an opinion which I am sure they did not like, saying that the acreage limitation law did in fact apply to the federal Central Valley Project.

The question came to a focus when Harlan Barrows of the University of Chicago geography department, working with William E. Warne of the Bureau of Reclamation, set up about twenty-five separate studies. One of them, Problem 19, was to be devoted to study of the acreage limitation. Most of the others, or at least a large number of the others, reached the stage of print. This one never got beyond mimeograph. There was no agreement on the issue. There was sharp division of opinion; study of the problem fell apart because of the division of interest and of feeling. That doesn't mean that the study, although only mimeographed, is not valuable. It was very valuable.

If you want to follow through on the BAE, Clawson had charge of putting the material together for that study. In 1946 Mary Montgomery and Marion Clawson came out with their History of Legislation and Policy Formation of the Central Valley Project Studies. That was produced in multilith form, again by the BAE. But that study also never reached print.
Problem 19

What modification, if any, of the existing statutory limit to the size of land holdings that can receive water from irrigation works constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation should be recommended with respect to the Central Valley Project?

Morning Session

The meeting was opened with a discussion by Professor Barrows of the function of the Central Valley Project Studies. Professor Barrows pointed out that the studies were well under way, for 19 committees have initiated activity and will submit preliminary reports by the end of March. Of the criticism leveled at the studies he wished to answer only that one which accused the studies of being of his own making. For, he pointed out, the problems of the studies were not raised by any one person since they are inherent in the Central Valley Project itself. Mr. Barrows then presented the answers to those questions which he had been most frequently asked.
Taylor: Not long after that the personnel of the regional offices of the BAE began to shrink. I have no documentation for what I am about to say. I have not heard it from anybody inside the BAE. But I remember thinking at the time, and I continue to think now, that there were pressures upon Washington to keep these BAE people out of regional political issues. It was too hot and the pressures too great.

I believe there were changes in personnel in the Department of Agriculture in the higher echelons unsympathetic to the position on acreage limitation taken by Clawson and the other members of his staff. They were under the influence I believe of the large landowners and I believe that the regional offices were shrunk for the reason that I've described--it got into hot political questions. Of course they were doing an excellent service in getting into these questions, in my opinion.

Chall: At that time, did Clawson leave the area, did he leave the BAE? In '46 or '47?

Taylor: I believe he went to the BAE, Washington, didn't he?

Chall: Well, I don't know.

Taylor: Wait a minute, it is coming back to me. The Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior liked his work. He wanted some administrative experience and the position of director of the Bureau of Land Management became open, and Interior nominated him. Because of Clawson's work in support of the acreage limitation law, both his support in the studies that he made and in the testimony that he gave as a government official before congressional committees in 1944, when his name was presented to the U.S. Civil Service Commission, Senator Sheridan Downey, I was told, went to Madame [Frances] Perkins (who had then moved from secretary of labor to the chairmanship of the Civil Service Commission) and tried to keep Clawson from getting the job of director of the Bureau of Land Management. But Downey was unsuccessful. Clawson became the director and he remained there for several years, until he went with Resources for the Future. You see that at every point there were pressures on this issue.

Chall: I was interested to read in Walter Packard's oral history a little story that he told about the cooperation of the staff of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and you on trying to head off the allocation of money to build Friant-Kern canal during
Chall: the war.*

Taylor: Oh, yes. I'd forgotten about that!

Chall: It was presumably important for agriculture during the war.

Taylor: They were using the war as an excuse, world food, but the main crops to be grown were not in short supply and the dam was unlikely to be completed during the war anyway.

Chall: Well, if there was that close an association between people who were politically interested in obtaining a 160-acre limitation and staff members who may have had sympathy with them, one could see why the opposition would take affront and try to whittle them down to size.

The committee that was studying Problem 19 on the acreage limitation was made up of people who basically were on opposite sides of the question--Walter Packard, and Gilbert Jertberg, and Louis Bartlett and Ray Wiser. I was interested to see Lewis Mumford's name among them. Do you know how he got to be there?

Taylor: No, I don't know and have no recollection of that. Although of course I have met Lewis Mumford.

Chall: I think he was at Stanford at the time. Some of the people were members of a group called California Housing and Planning Association. Do you know what that group was?

Taylor: I've forgotten in detail the persons involved.** But I know the kind of people. They were citizens who were becoming concerned over the issue when they heard about it. I think it was already in existence and then turned its attention to this.

Chall: I see. Now a large number of the people refused to sign the report; this is the reason why it never was printed. But I was

---


**Perhaps it was the California affiliate of the National Association of Housing Officials, of which Hugh Pomeroy was western representative. La Follette Committee hearings, part 62, page 22541ff.
Chall: interested in some of the ideas that you people came up with on the acreage limitation. One of them was that since most of the land in Kern-Tulare counties at that time seemed to be in packages of 640 acres, that if a person owned land of that size he could have water brought to it if he had been irrigating it for five years prior to 1945.

Taylor: That was a search for a compromise.

Chall: There was another idea of a compromise that Walter Packard suggested and that Jerry Voorhis suggested during the Elliott Rider debates.

Taylor: On March 22 of '44 on the House floor. That was to limit the date with respect to 160 acres to 1937; to agree that anybody who had irrigated his land prior to that could retain that much land for purposes of farming with irrigation water. In other words, it would be exempt from acreage limitation regulations.

Chall: What about those compromises? Was there a chance at that time for some kind of compromise that wouldn't have been too damaging?

Taylor: That [Packard-Voorhis] compromise came up on the floor on March 22, 1944 in this way:

The House committee concerned with the subject held extensive hearings filling a couple of volumes, without mention of the acreage limitation. No publicity, you see; keep quiet was the rule. They came to the floor on March 22 with what they called a committee amendment. In other words, after the hearings were all over and they'd listened to everybody on the subject of water never raising the issue of acreage limitation, then the committee voted for its elimination from the Central Valley Project. The Bureau of Reclamation learned of that committee action on the morning of the day it was to come up when the House convened at noon.

So the bureau staff and Congressman Jerry Voorhis threw together fast this compromise which they hoped would defeat the demand for complete exemption and so not lose everything. However, the other side, led by Congressman Alfred Elliott, was able to win the House vote for complete exemption. His presentation on the floor is really something to read. If you have any idea of what the facts are you'll realize the gross distortions in what he said. But he was effective, evidently the preparatory lobbying had been done, and the exemption went through. Soon I heard via the grapevine that the opponents of acreage limitation,
Taylor: having been successful in twenty minutes in the House, were of
the opinion that in about three weeks they would have the
exemption through the Senate, too. That was blocked, largely
through the insistence of Senator Bob LaFollette.

You can understand why a compromise would not be acceptable
to giant landowners with scores and maybe hundreds of thousands
of acres on which they wanted to receive water without any
limitation. An offer to give him water on maybe 10, 15 or 20
percent of it would not be very attractive, especially when they
think they've got the power to get a complete exemption for all
their holdings.

Chall: Was the compromise ever really discussed or was it just thrown in?

Taylor: That was the end of the compromise in the House. It was just
thrown in, hoping to stop complete exemption.

Chall: And it has never really been seriously discussed since? Is that
right?

Taylor: That is right. The only compromise that is discussed now comes
from the other side and I think "compromise" is not the word.
It is a "tactic" to circumvent the law. It is the Engle Formula,
backed by such large landowners as the Southern Pacific. They
want to buy their way out dirt cheap, by accepting a little less
subsidy than otherwise. But not by really paying the full project
costs. The National Water Commission of 1973 is for this way out.
daily ed. PST]

I am told now, that on the west side [of San Joaquin Valley]
there are a number of the landowners that would be glad to sell
their excess if they had a market for it. The market has dropped;
the market price has dropped on the west side below their highest
expectations. So when we propose government purchase, their
response is something of this sort: Government purchase, yes.
That would provide a market, provided that they will pay a price
high enough so we come out agreeably to our expectations.

I was asked once by my power division chief if I had ever
considered any compromise at all. I was known as one strongly
in favor of acreage limitation; he wanted to test me out to see
whether I was reasonable and practical, politically versed in the
handling of a sharp debate. Was I too brittle? That was behind
his question.
Taylor: I said, "Yes. I had considered quadrupling the size of the acreage limitation to 640 acres. But do you think that a landowner with 100,000 or 150,000 acres is going to be interested in a compromise that merely quadruples the limitation?" That evidently reassured Goldschmidt that my judgment, politically, was related to the political power of the private interests who were seeking to remove the limitation, and he never asked me again.

Chall: Well, it hasn't been an easily settled matter, has it?

Taylor: No. I'm getting the telephone calls right as we talk, on the same issue. But we got a good court decision last month on Imperial Valley.

Chall: Oh, you did?

Taylor: Oh, yes. We got a good decision. So we now have a bad decision and a good one from two federal judges in the same district of San Diego.

Chall: The decision came out in October? [1971]*

Taylor: November. They are really on the spot now. I don't know if you want to talk about that?

Chall: I think I'd rather wait.

Taylor: We'll go back to it.

Chall: It is very difficult to keep the threads separated--and they really can't be historically...

Taylor: But we have to make some kind of an effort to keep the chronological sequence clear.

Chall: I just wanted to wrap up the problems that were indicated by Problem 19.

Taylor: Well, there you have it--compromise was not possible.

Chall: Compromise wasn't possible. Is that why some committee members

Chall: like Edward Hyatt, R.L. Adams, Roy Wiser and others refused to sign the report, and Grace McDonald and Walter Packard did sign?

Taylor: Individuals guided by principles, yes. The others were guided by interests.

Chall: Did you know Gilbert Jertberg at all?

Taylor: I remember that name. Now where was he from?

Chall: He was from Fresno and he was an attorney most active in matters of water and land.

Taylor: He was an attorney on the other side.

Chall: Yes. He was with the National Reclamation Association.

Taylor: That's right.

Chall: I gather that about the same time that Problem 19 was being studied the National Reclamation Association was also studying the excess land limitation and he was on that committee as well.

Taylor: Well, what was happening, in broad historical perspective, you see, was the move of the large landowning interests to revive in appearance the National Irrigation Congress as a citizens' movement. You remember we discussed that citizens' movement through the 1890s into the early 1900s that opened the doors of the Treasury to finance reclamation. The price of getting irrigation financed was that there would be an acreage limitation, no monopoly, and speculation control.

So they sought to revive a popular citizens' movement in the form of the National Reclamation Association. As this acreage limitation issue was pressed in Central Valley Projects study Number 19, and later in the California Water Conference of the governor and so on, they dominated the National Reclamation Association and made it an instrument of political pressure on their side. You see, what they wanted was the money and the water without the public policy.

Chall: Did you have any particular feeling about the activities of the state engineers, Edward Hyatt and A.D. Edmonston, throughout the years?

Taylor: Yes, of course. I didn't like very well that the state engineer should be opposed to the acreage limitation. What he wanted, you
Taylor: see, was a state water project. What distressed him was that he had to go to Congress asking the federal government to build the project, after the people had voted $170 million revenue bond issue for the state to build the project. But, no one would buy the state bonds. Then he had to go hat in hand and ask Congress to take the project that he wanted to build. That's what he didn't like. Hyatt cooperated with the Army Engineers. You see, there was the landowners' first tactic--have it under state law because there is no state acreage limitation. Second, put it in the hands of the Army Engineers because until 1944 there was no acreage limitation covering the engineers. The Bureau of Reclamation had a legal authorization to construct Pine Flat Dam on Kings River. But the landowners' side, led by Congressman Elliott and supported by Hyatt, said they wanted the Army Engineers to do it. So they took it out of the hands of the Bureau of Reclamation which had a legal authorization but couldn't get the congressional appropriations because the other side blocked them.

So the Central Valley water development was balkanized, fractionated because of this issue of public policy.

Chall: Who was Ralph Wertheimer? You refer to his report in Problem 19 in some of your articles.

Taylor: Ralph Wertheimer is an attorney in San Francisco.

Chall: What was he doing then?

Taylor: Well, he was on the staff of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics which was then serving the Bureau of Reclamation, and he made that legal study, and a very good study it was.

You will note that that study never was bound and printed by the Department of the Interior which bound and printed a lot of the other twenty-five problem studies, but it didn't print Problem 19. The split over acreage limitation was wide and deep. It's a valuable study and for the time when it was made, a very good study.

Chall: Was Mr. Wertheimer concerned with the issues of land and water as a specialty of his in law?

Taylor: No. He came to that because that was to be studied at the BAE. Specialists in water law receive most of their practice from large landowners; Wertheimer was not among them. I don't know if he has any continued interest in that except reminiscent interest.
Chall: When these studies were completed did you or any of the others who had worked so diligently on them have any feeling about what they had or would accomplish in terms of policy setting?

Taylor: You ask me whether they had any impact?

Chall: Did you feel that they would have any impact, and have they had any?

Taylor: The answer to both is yes. They certainly provided strong foundation support for opposition to removal of the acreage limitation. They documented it beautifully. They were stumbling blocks to the other side. They gave confidence to those who opposed removal of the acreage limitation. They could feel reassured that they knew what they were talking about. Sure, they're very important. The studies by themselves don't determine legislative action, but their importance should not be minimized. They bothered the other side very much.

Chall: Because it documented the law and its history?

Taylor: Yes, of course. It exposed what they were trying to do.

Chall: The same divisions that were indicated by the fact that not very many people would sign the final report of Project 19 are still paramount today?

Taylor: The issue is still alive, a paramount issue, as you say, sure. You can add up this as attributable in part to these studies, that the other side feels itself largely blocked in Congress. Since about 1959-1960 they have largely abandoned the attempt to openly remove the acreage limitation through Congress. They have turned their pressures upon the administration, that's where they have broken through, and now they are working on a breakthrough in the judicial branch. Especially now since they have a president opposed to acreage limitation with the power of appointing judges, et cetera, as in San Diego federal district court where Judge Turrentine supported Imperial Valley landowners.
The Arvin-Dinuba Study

Chall: Did you have a hand in the Arvin-Dinuba study? I saw a reference to the fact that you had been one of the persons out in the field responsible for the study along with Marion Clawson, under the general direction of someone named Carl Taylor.*

Taylor: I had nothing, directly, officially, to do with this study.

Chall: How was it unofficial?

Taylor: Well, of course I was deeply involved in the water fight over the acreage limitation. Marion Clawson of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and Walter Goldschmidt of his staff were concerned with it and they talked with me about it. They looked over the field and I looked over the field. They chose Arvin and Dinuba. I recommended they choose Firebaugh or Mendota on the west side, rather than Arvin. Their objection I think mainly was that Mendota and Firebaugh might be criticized as too extreme.

Chall: Extreme, meaning what?

Taylor: An extreme example of a community dependent upon big farming, which, from my point of view, meant that it would show the contrast with a community dependent on smaller farms even more sharply than Arvin. I still believe that. But for whatever reasons they didn't want to take such an extreme contrast as I thought would be good. But the contrast between Dinuba and Arvin, nevertheless, was sufficiently extreme to reveal the issue.

So this study was embarked upon; Walter Goldschmidt carried it out. He is with the Department of Anthropology at UCLA, and was chairman for some time.

Chall: At the time of the study he was employed--

Taylor: --by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. His doctoral dissertation, which he wrote under me, grew out of this study. He took his degree in anthropology, but I was a member of his committee. Professor [Robert H.] Lowie was his chairman and

Taylor: Lowie asked me to take charge of the thesis because I had more familiarity with the general conditions of rural California than he did.

Chall: His thesis was on rural California?

Taylor: His thesis was an outgrowth of the Arvin-Dinuba study, and is called "As You Sow." Most people know that what follows in the Bible is "so shall ye also reap."

Chall: He was working for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics before he took his Ph.D.

Taylor: That's right.

Chall: So your role in this study was as a consultant?

Taylor: I had no official government connection, but a de facto personal and professional association with both Marion Clawson, under whom it was done, and Walter Goldschmidt, who did it.

Chall: And Goldschmidt was out in the field, by himself, doing the study?

Taylor: Well, he had some help. His wife helped him and probably he had other help; I am not sure. His report was submitted to Washington through Carl Taylor, the head of the Division of Farm Population and Rural Welfare in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The study was attacked bitterly while it was in process, and spread upon the pages of the Congressional Record by the hostile congressman from Kern County, Alfred J. Elliott. He attacked it on the ground (among other things) that they were asking crazy, irrelevant questions, such as, I recall, "Was there dust under the rugs?" In other words, how particular were the women in their housekeeping. The study was started in wartime and was attacked as a waste of gas and rubber which shouldn't be tolerated.

Chall: Was that really a question about dust under the rug or did you just make that one up?

Taylor: Oh, it might have been a point that investigators were to take note of; I don't know. Perhaps that was to be noted as an indication of the kind of housekeeping...

Chall: Now who helped Mr. Goldschmidt draw up his questions?
A classic western painting by Frederic Remington, *The Fight for the Water Hole*, portrays five settlers trying to ward off attacking Indians at a pool in the desert. Although the combatants and weapons have changed, the importance of competition for water in the arid land of California and the Far West has not diminished.

A segment of the records of the Western Regional Office of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, recently accessioned by the Archives Branch of the San Francisco Federal Archives and Records Center, relates to research in California designed to help the federal government decide if the principle of acreage limitation on the use of subsidized federal water should be applied to users of water provided by the giant reclamation program of the Central Valley Project.

The Bureau determined to investigate the suitability for California of the 160-acre limitation, a provision of reclamation programs since the National Reclamation Act of 1902 was signed by Theodore Roosevelt. To test an original assumption of the law—that communities of small independent farmers, which were encouraged by acreage limitations, fostered superior institutions and a more democratic rural society—a sociological study was proposed. Two California communities, Arvin and Dinuba, were selected in 1944 for comparison. Both were in the San Joaquin Valley; they differed significantly in size of land holdings. The average farm in Arvin was almost nine times as large as the average farm in Dinuba.

The resulting study, assigned by Marion Clawson, problem leader, to Walter R. Goldschmidt, an anthropologist, became a focus for the continuing economic and political struggle between large commercial farmers, owners of the so-called factory farms, and family farmers and their supporters who viewed such small operations as the “backbone of democracy.” The report, based on substantial field work, concluded that differences between the towns were great and that Dinuba’s superior quality of life was determined by its population of small farmers. Reaction began before the report was published and was predictable, negative in Arvin and positive in Dinuba.
Taylor: Well, I suppose Mr. Clawson worked on it with him. [Leafing through papers] I find here a memorandum which I have--Senator Sheridan Downey's criticism of the study, several pages which I haven't read for over twenty-five years. Downey's attack upon it. The report, you see, posed the issue: which kind of community do you want?

Yes, Sheridan Downey attacked it in his book, They Would Rule the Valley. Senator Paul Douglas told me that one day he said to Senator Downey, "Sheridan, who would rule the Valley?" and Downey answered, "Yes, that's the question." A perfectly true answer if you knew what was behind it--the public through government, or the big landowners.

Downey was objecting to the New Deal officials who had New Deal conceptions of a good society, and favoring the giant land-holding interests. Sure. I can tell you a little more about this.

Chall: By all means. It is an important landmark.

Problems Posed by Publication

Taylor: Senator James A. Murray of Montana was chairman of the Small Business committee. An influential non-governmental official who at various times served in a governmental capacity was Dewey Anderson, whom I believe we mentioned before. Well, Dewey Anderson was in close touch with Senator Murray. He wanted to see this study comparing Arvin and Dinuba. The study had come up as we indicated a few minutes earlier through Carl Taylor, the head of Farm Population and Rural Welfare in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Clinton Anderson was then secretary of agriculture. He was later chairman of the Senate Interior Affairs committee under which proposed water developments are reviewed and to this day, in 1971, is concerned about such questions as the acreage limitation. As secretary of agriculture, he was reluctant to release the study to Senator Murray. I suppose he had received representations from the other side seeking to block it, or perhaps anticipated them. But here was [Murray] a United States senator, chairman of a Senate committee, asking to be allowed to print the Arvin-Dinuba study. The matter was finally resolved when Anderson realized it was impractical to block publication. He gave his consent provided every reference to the Department
Taylor: of Agriculture, which had made the study, was removed.

Chall: How did it come out then?

Taylor: It came out here in print with no references to the Department of Agriculture, printed by the Senate Small Business committee.

Chall: As if it had not been a government-sponsored study?

Taylor: [Reading from report] "This report is the work of Dr. Walter R. Goldschmidt, assistant professor of the Department of Anthropology and sociology at the University of California at Los Angeles. He had had the advantage and advice of professional associates with national reputations in the field of agricultural economics and social studies."

They [Small Business committee] asked Professor Leonard Blum, sociologist at UCLA, for a statement, and they quote a paragraph from him. They asked me to make a statement. They quote a paragraph from me saying it is a worthwhile study. But there is no mention of the Department of Agriculture. The study is by "Dr. Walter R. Goldschmidt, assistant professor of anthropology and sociology at the University of California at Los Angeles." Yet he made it as a member of the staff of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics!

So you see the sensitiveness of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to pressure or anticipated pressure from big landowning interests.

Chall: Were there other events that occurred as a result of this study? Were people removed from office or demoted?

Taylor: Not to my knowledge because of the study. But there were other fights over acreage limitation--oh, there were terrific fights over that.

Chall: If a study like that were made today, taking two communities in the same way, would the results be the same?

Taylor: Sure, sure. Look at how people are piled up in the cities now. We've got an aggravated situation.

Did I read to you what Congressman Oscar Underwood of Alabama said in 1902 when he threw the support of the South to this plea that the doors of the Treasury should be opened for western
Taylor: reclamation? I'll just read a little bit from it; you can put in the whole thing if you want to.

Chall: All right.

Taylor: "These lands are being open to settlement for all the people, whether they now reside in the East, North or West. The farm boys of the East want farms of their own. It gives them a place where they can go and build homes without being driven into the already overcrowded cities to seek employment." Does that have a modern ring?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: "It will provide a place for the mechanic and wage-earner to go when the battle for their daily wages becomes too strenuous in the overcrowded portions of the East. If this policy is not undertaken now, this great western desert will ultimately be acquired by individuals and great corporations for the purpose of using it for grazing vast herds of cattle. They will acquire the waterways and water rights for the purpose of watering stock and become land barons. Then it will be impossible to ever convert the population of this western country. I believe the passage of this bill is in the interest of the man who earns his bread by his daily toil. It gives him a place where he can go and be free and independent. It gives him an opportunity to be an owner of the soil, to build a home. These are the class of men we must rely on for the safety of the nation. In times of peace they pay the taxes and maintain the government. In times of peril and strife they are the bulwark of the nation and it is justice to them that this legislation be enacted into law."

Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose. Well, we've got the people swept off the land now, into the overcrowded cities they talked about in 1902.

Chall: Many are trying to get back on small patches of land to live.

Taylor: Some of them would like to, I am sure.

We had this tremendous dustbowl, depression-migration out here and no land for the landless to settle on.

Incidentally, the Arvin-Dinuba study is coming to life again very much. It was reprinted by Senator Gaylord Nelson last year. I received a Christmas card yesterday from Walter Goldschmidt
Taylor: saying that a Senate staff member had come to him in Los Angeles to discuss the possibility of making modern studies of the same general problem by comparison of small farm-big farm communities on a national basis. So the technique and the politics are both very much with us today.*

Carl Taylor and the Field of Rural Sociology

Chall: Can you tell me something about Carl Taylor? It seems as though he had a very strong feeling for the subject of rural sociology.

Taylor: Carl Taylor is a native Iowan, as I am. The last I knew he was still alive. I would assume that by now he is at the end of the eighties, and might even have touched ninety. He was genuinely concerned with the quality of rural communities. When the Resettlement Administration came into existence in 1936, he was put in charge of the Land Settlement Division under which a whole series of community projects were established. I think we talked about those the other day—the Casa Grande Community in Arizona, for example. Carl Taylor was the head of that division. Then later on he became greatly concerned with rural communities internationally and with what we call community development.

Chall: I see. Abroad?

Taylor: Yes.

Chall: Did you ever have any other contact with him?

Taylor: Not particularly. You see, the difference between Carl Taylor and me was not a difference in aspirations but in experience with different regional emphasis. He was an Iowan who went southward to North Carolina, the University of North Carolina and then into the New Deal. I was an Iowan who came to California, saw the contrast between Iowa and here in California where the labor situation is a conspicuous reflection of the pattern of concentrated land ownership. So my emphasis, you see, was a somewhat different emphasis from his within the Resettlement Administration. I emphasized agricultural labor, and he emphasized small farmers. Not that he

*Early in 1973 Goldschmidt was invited to Washington to testify before Senator Nelson's committee, which he did. PST
Taylor: was opposed to my labor program, but it was something with which he was generally unfamiliar.

Chall: His emphasis was what?

Taylor: His concern was the family farmer, preserving his status upon the land. Walter Packard became one of his right-hand men.

I came into Resettlement with a program of migrant labor camps, so that there would be decency of physical conditions for the migratory laborers and a place facilitating the bringing of community services into actual contact with the migrants who needed them. That was an actual result.

The rural sociologists of that day emphasized the family farm in the Middle West, South or East. They were unfamiliar with the migratory laborer. They had known migratory labor in the wheat belt, I'm sure. But by about the mid-twenties that migratory labor stream had been practically obliterated by the coming of the mechanical combine-harvester.

Carl Taylor was on our side, all right. He was never unsympathetic. The migrant labor just wasn't part of his life experience.

In the national view of agricultural economics and rural sociology, you see, there was no particular place for farm labor. The farm labor problem was regarded as resolved in one of two ways. One, through the agricultural ladder. You started as laborer, and became tenant, then owner. Or else the farms became mechanized and put laborers out of agriculture altogether. Here in California the laborer was still very much in business, and there was no agricultural ladder. So in a sense, when I came into Washington and spoke with rural sociologists I was a stranger to them, always dragging in a problem which the national plans had not taken into account.

They weren't opposed to me. The laws I think we discussed. The New Deal protective laws exempted farm labor. So officials didn't have to administer labor laws--just the camps for laborers. So I was always kind of off on the national program edges, even in the view of people whose general sympathies I shared.

Here is what always struck me as anomalous: here we had the number one agricultural state in the country but the national outlook was shaped by people who had grown up and were experienced and lived in the other types of agriculture, not in this one!
Taylor: Well, it is just what James Bryce said, that California's agricultural labor and landownership was different from the rest of the country.

Chall: At this time, in terms of viewing agricultural rural sociology, is the picture changing?

Taylor: I don't think there is very much rural sociology left in the government officialdom, or has much influence.

Chall: I see. And are they still looking at agricultural labor in terms of the family farm? Or is that changing?

Taylor: Well, I don't speak with too much assurance but I do notice from time to time that some official in the department, some staff official, a professional, will come out with a study which says the family farm will survive. Well that is a different way of putting it from saying that the family farm is our national embodiment of the national ideal. It is cliff-hanging. They reassure, you see, that the family farm will become larger. There will be fewer of them but it will survive. Or will it under present tax and other government policies?

Chall: Are they recognizing the problems of the migrant laborers?

Taylor: Oh, they recognize them in a way. They take a swipe at it. Yes, both the departments of Labor and Agriculture put out statistics on it. Both of them started those statistics in the New Deal days and they've not stopped them.

Handling Controversial Subject Matter

Chall: You have mentioned the problem of publishing the Packard report, and the Arvin-Dinuba study. These issues, it would seem, are considered too hot to handle, or at least to print. Public scrutiny isn't really wanted on some matters, is that what is involved?

Taylor: You're not far off. Read a book on The Administration of Water Resources in Arizona by Dean Mann--a political science doctoral dissertation at UC, Berkeley in 1958. Do you find any mention of the 160-acre limitation or any discussion of it? There may be just a bare mention, but I don't think there is a paragraph on it.
Taylor: Here is Arizona which has violated the acreage limitation from around 1912. They talk about the politics of it and no mention of utter failure to observe the law.

I have read manuscripts on water in Arizona for the University of Arizona Press in the last two or three years. Some of them have been very good, as Mann's study is otherwise very good. Mention of the 160-acre limitation? None. That subject is simply avoided. Of course these latter studies, I suppose, are mostly financed by the research funds from the Department of Interior. Oh, this is far-reaching in its implications.

Chall: I am under the impression that sections of archives can be destroyed, if you want to destroy something.

Taylor: Well, yes. You are probably familiar with the obliteration of one of the important government studies of land acquisition in California. [Looking through volume]

Chall: What is this book that you are looking into?

Taylor: It is a binding together of my law journal articles. So it isn't a book.

Chall: It is well-used.

Taylor: Yes, as reference work. See if I can pinpoint this. I heard years ago of the disappearance of a document which I'll describe in a moment. I'm reading from my own law review article.*

"The early concentration of ownership on the Kern River was the subject of official inquiry by Secretary of the Interior Carl Schurz in 1877. He suspended all land entries at the Visalia Land Office pending investigation. The first investigator he sent out was caustically critical of the methods used to obtain land, according to probably the only account of his findings extant." Then I quote from the scandal that he reported, published in the San Francisco Chronicle extensively. His report is not in The Bancroft Library. It is an official government report.

A few years ago I went to my friend and former colleague, Robert Calkins, who later was president of the Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C. When I told him I was looking for the original

---

Taylor: report he sent an inquiry to the national archives. The report came back, which he gave to me, that the archive records showed that Mr. Newcomb had gone out to California to make the study. His bills for transportation and subsistence, or whatever, showed that he had gone. But archives could not find his report anywhere. As I say, I heard probably from my history professors back in 1920s that there was such a report which had disappeared—not accidentally, apparently.

I don't think for one moment that Carl Schurz, the secretary of the interior, made the Newcomb report disappear. I suspect that interested parties made it disappear. It was a period of one land scandal after another! The land scandals preceded the current era of what I think may well go down in history as an era of water scandals. Oh, there is lots of money up on this—and power.
The Elliott Rider: HR 3961 - 1944

Chall: Congressman Elliott, you mentioned before, was very hostile to the Arvin-Dinuba study. Was this in any way responsible for his Elliott rider? [Attached to the 1944 Rivers and Harbors bill.]

Taylor: You're asking what touched off the Elliott rider?

Chall: Yes, that was the beginning, wasn't it, of very active congressional work against the limitation?

Taylor: Correct. Let's see if I can put together the steps as I know them.

There was concern on the part of interests in this state over whether the federal taking-over of the Central Valley Project at the request of the state would apply the acreage limitation to the project.

The first step toward an answer was in the late thirties or early forties when someone asked the legislative counsel of California if it applied under the 1937 Rivers and Harbors Act that authorized Central Valley Project as a federal undertaking under the federal reclamation law. The answer of the legislative counsel of California was yes, it does apply.

Kern County interests particularly had been concerned about that. You'll find that reported in the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee hearings in 1947 on S 912 [p. 1310]. Then the tactical problem of those opposed to application of the law was what to do about it. They had gone along with the state's appeal to the federal government to undertake the construction of the project because the state couldn't market the bonds that the
Taylor: people had voted in 1933. In 1943, under Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, there was an internal reorganization of the Bureau of Reclamation. Its Sacramento office was made a regional office in charge of the Central Valley Project. An Oregonian, Charles Carey, was appointed regional director. In those days interest in public power was very strong in Oregon and Washington and Carey was strong for public power.

Remember that the New Deal was constructing great dams on the Columbia River? Two dams, Bonneville and Grand Coulee. So the amount of power available in the Northwest was about to be increased many, many fold.

I met Charles Carey one afternoon in his office in the old Post Office Building in Sacramento. I was consultant to the Power Division of the secretary's office in Washington, and Carey was in Sacramento on his first trip to take over his new position. The office was in complete lack of order. The telephone was still on the floor because there was no desk, but there were two chairs. We talked for a long time. He told me the story of public power; I told him the story of the acreage limitation of which he had never heard. His response was fully in sympathy with it. And, as I said, the state legislative counsel had just given his opinion that the federal law does apply to the Central Valley Project.

Not long after—in weeks or a month or so—Carey was invited to speak before the California Farm Bureau Federation convention and was asked the question: would he apply the acreage limitation? His response was, yes, of course; it was the law. Apparently that touched off public action by the opposition which had been latent from the beginning.

I remember attending a meeting in San Jose of the Irrigation Districts Association of California late in '43, I believe. That body adopted a resolution proposing that the Central Valley be exempted from the acreage limitation. You'll probably find a copy of it among the materials that I plan to leave with The Bancroft Library to cover that period. So the signals were given on both sides. One side said, "The law does apply and we shall apply it." The other said, "We shall seek an exemption."
In the House of Representatives

Taylor: There were extensive hearings in Congress on the 1944 and earlier Rivers and Harbors bills in the early 1940s on various projects.* There was no mention of the acreage limitation problem until the administration insisted in 1944 to the Senate that acreage limitation law be attached to the 1944 Flood Control bill.**

On the March 22, 1944 morning when HR 3961, the Rivers and Harbors bill, was to come up before the House it became known in the Department of the Interior in Washington that the Elliott rider was attached to the bill by what is called a committee amendment. In other words, they had given no notice whatsoever to the friends of acreage limitation or even the officials charged with enforcement of the law that they were going to seek an exemption. They slipped it through the committee at the last minute and it hit the floor with only a few hours of warning.

The Department of Interior officials arranged a compromise measure which would have yielded substantially to the large landowners, redefining the law so that it would not apply to any lands previously cultivated, which would have opened the door very widely. That, it was hoped, would retain at least something of the acreage limitation in Central Valley.

The department's case was handled by Congressman Jerry Voorhis. But the strength of the Elliott rider's supporters had been well arranged so that complete exemption sailed through the House. The Voorhis compromise was rejected. That, I believe, was on March 22, 1944.***

The word that came down to us in the Department of the Interior was that they expected to have the law wiped off the

*Hearings before House Flood Control Committee on HR 4911, 77 Cong., 1 sess. (1941); Hearings before Senate Commerce Subcommittee on HR 4485, 78 Cong., 2 sess. (1944); Hearings before House Committee on RH 3961, 78 Cong., 1 sess. (1944).


***90 Cong. Rec. 2921-2924.
Taylor: books, as far as Central Valley was concerned, in about three weeks. They needed concurrence in the Senate. They did not get concurrence of the Senate. Under Secretary Ickes, testimony was given by the officials of the department, including himself, which meant that the Roosevelt administration was backing the acreage limitation. He testified before the Senate Commerce Subcommittee on the House Bill HR 3961.

Do you want me to tell my part in it?

Chall: Yes, indeed. I want you to go right ahead. May I just interject one thing? When Secretary Ickes came before the Senate and was talking about the retention of the 160-acre limitation, was he concerned with retaining the acreage limitation as it had been originally?

Taylor: Oh yes, entirely! No compromise. Just retain that. No compromise.

Chall: I see. But the compromise that had been worked out, presumably with Jerry Voorhis working for its passage in the House, did that have the blessing of the Department of the Interior?

Taylor: Well, I don't know whether it had Secretary Ickes' blessing or not. It was handled by the Bureau of Reclamation people. They probably asked as high as it was necessary to get consent. Whether they went up as high as an assistant secretary, I don't know. Time was short then. I doubt if they went any higher.

Chall: But he was aware of this compromise?

Taylor: Well, someone in the secretarial level but I doubt that Secretary Ickes knew it.

Chall: Is that right? So that this compromise was not really--

Taylor: It was an expedient, it was an expedient to meet a situation in the House—anything to blunt the complete exemption. So it was a temporary tactic in so far as it was accepted by the administration or proposed by the administration through Voorhis. It was a tactical maneuver not a statement of department position. No, Secretary Ickes, once he knew about the acreage limitation, he was solid from then on. The department was not committed to the Voorhis compromise.
Taylor: I should put into this record that the man who informed Secretary Ickes of the nature and importance of the acreage limitation was Walter Packard. Walter Packard is the man who informed me that there was such a thing as a 160-acre law.

Chall: If you hadn't informed Charles Carey there might have been a slightly different turn of events. It wouldn't have happened quite so quickly perhaps.

Taylor: Well, I am telling you how it happened, without telling you how it might have happened otherwise.

Chall: Yes. The chain of events is always intriguing.

Taylor: Yes, yes.

In the Senate

Chall: So you were prepared for the battle in the Senate?

Taylor: That's right.

Chall: What did you all do?

Taylor: Well, in the first place we saw to it that the department's position was solid. I took that up with my immediate chief, Arthur Goldschmidt, the head of the Power Division. He took it up with undersecretary Abe Fortas. His response was solid. He took it up with Secretary Ickes whose response was solid in support of the law.

I was interested in the support of the law and I decided that I would inform people in whose interest I believed it was to retain that law. I still remember the hot June days and the hot pavement as I went from place to place in Washington. I went to the AFL, American Federation of Labor.

Chall: Whom did you see there?

Taylor: I saw Mr. Hushing, their legislative representative. He got in touch with the California AFL whose head was Neil Haggerty with whom I had spoken prior to that occasion. Neil Haggerty was solid in his position. Mr. Hushing was solid in his. When he testified, as I recall, Congressman Elliott tried to make a
Taylor: monkey out of him by showing that he didn't really know the
details of the project--to which Hushing responded, no, but the
people out there in California did, and there was no question
about their position.

Other places--the Grange was already advised; a friend of
mine, Marion Clawson, went to the Grange.

Chall: In Washington?

Taylor: Yes. I didn't go into all the places myself. I had friends
who went, some of them. And the Grange responded both
nationally and through the California State Grange. Then
veterans organizations--Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American
Legion (remember it was during the war) and they made the point
that their interest was to preserve the interests of returning
veterans, and the historic policy of our government from
colonial days on down, that land should be made available to
veterans of military service. So they appeared before the
committee and said, "Keep this law."

The CIO, separate from AFL at that time, responded as the
AFL responded, by supporting the law.

Chall: The Farmers Union?

Taylor: The Farmers Union, yes. James Patton, president of the Farmers
Union, and various church groups, including the National Catholic
Rural Life Conference. At the Cosmos Club, where I had stayed,
was Monsignor O'Grady of the National Catholic Charities. At
dinner one evening I spoke to him of this. I recall him saying,
"You've got a story, you've got a story!" You see, I gave him
the historical background of it. When it came to the hearings
he was very effective, particularly with Louisiana Catholic
senators.

So the line-up of supporters of the law was well-filled.
The Senate committee omitted the exemption when it reported
the bill. In other words, we won that round. But still there
was a House-passed bill with the exemption, as well as the
Senate bill without the exemption. What would be done in
conference? The pressures of the large landowners was sufficient
to retain the Elliott rider in the conference report. So when
the bill came back to the two houses the exemption was part of
the bill.
Taylor: At that stage I went to one of my classmates—I didn't tell you this?

Chall: No.

Taylor: Senator Robert M. LaFollette, Jr.

Chall: Oh yes. I think I read it in your interview with Mrs. Riess. But I think it should be part of this one, too. I think we should keep this interview complete in itself. So you can go into it.

Taylor: If there is any point in editing, that can be done later.

Chall: Yes, I'd just as soon you told the whole story here, even if it's repetition.

Taylor: I went to Bob and told him this story and he said to me... Well, I should interject here that Senator Sheridan Downey in the Senate was carrying the ball that Congressman Elliott was carrying in the House. Bob said to me, "I have told Sheridan Downey that if he presses that bill in the Senate I shall deliver a three-hour speech against him on the floor. Then he said, "and I want you to write me that speech!"

So I worked hard on a draft. It never became necessary to do it. The entire bill failed in the Senate. As Senator LaFollette said to me later, "We stalled the gravy train!" That was hard to do because the Rivers and Harbors bill carries the gravy of public appropriations to projects all over the country. And of course the congressmen and senators like to be able to say to their constituents, "You see the appropriations that we got to build this project for your locality!"

The result of Senator LaFollette's stand was that the bill failed of passage and died with the 78th Congress.

Chall: So you really did stall it.

Taylor: LaFollette stalled the whole bill! That's right. And when the new session opened in January the same bill, minus the exemption, went through without any question. So the whole issue was the exemption and LaFollette saved the day.

Chall: So when they started over again at the following session the forces were strong enough to delete it?
Taylor: Well, the people who wanted those appropriations for their home district must have said something like this:

"We don't want to be hung up by your demand for an exemption, and have a big fight over that. What we want is those authorizations and appropriations."

I understand that when the Senate refused to act that the House recessed for about twenty minutes to give Elliott and his people a little time to think up what to do. The answer was, they couldn't do anything. They had to give up.

Senator Sheridan Downey: Committee Hearings

Chall: Now during this fight, too—if I have all my facts correct—didn't Sheridan Downey hold hearings on that bill? Or was that another one?

Taylor: Yes, he held hearings.

Chall: In Washington?

Taylor: No, he held them in California. About two weeks after passage of the Elliott rider, Downey was in San Francisco as member of the Military Affairs Committee. On April 7 he held a session on the acreage limitation, the proceedings of which were taken down and mimeographed by the regional office of the Bureau of Reclamation under Charles Carey. Downey announced no position of his own on the issue. But hardly had he received the Democratic party renomination to the Senate than he went before the Senate Commerce Subcommittee hearing on HR 3961 in Washington on May 18, 1944, to announce that he favored exemption. However, the Commerce Subcommittee struck the exemption, as I said.

Senator Downey's next move was to obtain an authorization under S. Res. 295 to hold California hearings as subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. His belief was that by holding hearings in California he could show the United States Congress that the people of California really wanted no acreage limitation here.

Well, he found out otherwise. Of course the supporters of the Elliott rider were all there—the Farm Bureau Federation people and the spokesmen for the interests of the large landowners.
Taylor: But the people who wanted to preserve the acreage limitation also came to the hearings, and they snowed him under. After that, back in Washington, was when LaFollette said to Downey, "If you press for that acreage exemption, I will deliver a three-hour speech on the floor of the Senate against you."

Chall: That's why he backed down?

Taylor: That's why Downey backed down. I have copies of the San Francisco hearings. They are mimeographed and I trust they are in The Bancroft Library. They are in my bound volumes.

At the April 7 Military Affairs Subcommittee hearing in San Francisco Downey announced that he had not made up his mind but he wanted to consider what his position should be. Charles Carey, regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, testified, and he was followed by opponents of the acreage limitation, notably Russell Giffen. His was very interesting testimony, very frank testimony at that April meeting. Anyone studying this question must go to that source.

Chall: I see. Who was Russell Giffen?

Taylor: Well, he is still active in the Valley. He is one of the very largest landowners in the Valley and one of the most active. He is a giant of a figure in the development of that Valley. He has developed it, you see, trying first to remove the acreage limitation, participating in all of the tactics to remove it— including the putting down of the expensive underground wells to tap the water from underground, which I may have told you about before.

Chall: I read about it.

Taylor: Where the surface of the ground is subsiding at the rate of close to one foot per annum over an area of what--1,100 square miles, according to testimony of an assistant commissioner of reclamation.

Chall: That was one of the tactics, I understand.

Taylor: And still is.

Chall: Do you have anything else to add on Mr. Giffen?

Taylor: Mr. Giffen, member of a leading family long resident in Fresno, is certainly the most outstanding land developer on the west side
Owner of Huge Valley Farm Holdings to Sell Excess Land

By FRED GARRETTSON
Tribune Staff Writer

Russell P. Giffen, 72, sometimes described as the largest individual farmer of irrigated land in the United States, is selling off most of his property, including a collection of parcels almost as big as the City of San Francisco which will be subdivided into scores of 160-acre “family farms.”

The story came to light when the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation announced it has approved the proposed sale prices for parcels totaling 27,192 acres of Giffen’s land. The bureau described it as “the largest single sale of excess lands in Reclamation history.”

Giffen’s decision to sell his land was prompted by four recent heart attacks, according to Jack Woolf, his right hand man.

At various times in the past Giffen is reputed to have owned or managed as much as 100,000 acres of land at a time, most of which was devoted to growing cotton.

Estimates published in 1946, at the time he disposed of 54,000 acres of land in the San Joaquin Valley, described Giffen as the largest individual irrigated land farmer in the United States. There are a number of much larger farms owned by corporations and there are bigger individual holdings of land on ranches in Texas and Nevada, but these are devoted to grazing.

Giffen is one of the individual farm giants still working his own land in this era when “agribusiness” is being run by corporation boards of directors in the nation’s financial centers.

Regarding the reports of Giffen’s status as the nation’s biggest farmer, Woolf said, “Mr. Giffen never laid claim to the honor. If it is an honor, and we’ve never investigated to determine whether the claim was correct.”

Woolf said the 27,192 acres whose sale is subject to approval by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation represent “a substantial part of his (Giffen’s) holdings in western Fresno County.” He said Giffen also owns some hill grazing land which isn’t included in the transaction. In the past Giffen’s holdings were reported to include other large tracts in the San Joaquin Valley and in Arizona.

Giffen has long been the chairman of the board of directors of the Westlands Water District, a 800,000-acre domain of newly irrigated desert land on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley which has frequently been the storm center of California’s sometimes Byzantine water politics.

Under a 1902 federal law the owners of giant tracts of private land, which are due to be enriched by delivery of irrigation water developed by construction projects of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, are allowed to get the benefit of “federal water” for only a maximum of 10 years.

On the day that irrigation water arrives on his land the farmer signs a contract agreeing to subdivide his land and sell it off as 160-acre “family farms” within 10 years. If he doesn’t sell then the government auctions off the property.

Giffen had years to go before reaching that 19 year deadline. The Reclamation Bureau said land being sold represents 108 separate water contracts signed over the past six years since the California Aqueduct started delivering water to western Fresno, Kings and Kern counties.

Under a complex formula the owner can sell buildings, equipment and vegetation (such as fruit trees) for market value, but the price of the land isn’t supposed to reflect the increased value caused by the availability of irrigation water.

The bureau said Giffen’s land was being valued at $475 to $575 per acre as part of a $32,200,575 deal involving about 180 individual buyers. Federal law allows one person or corporation to buy 160 acres of irrigated land. A man and wife together can buy 320 acres. Federal regulations seek to insure that the buyers are bona fide farm operators and not dummy corporations set up by a large holding company.

The excess land law was designed to preserve the Jeffersonian ideal of the family farmer. Many economists say 160 acres isn’t an economically efficient size for modern agriculture.

There were numerous political charges in the 1950s and 1960s that the major landowners—particularly the big corporations—in the San Luis Project would somehow escape the provisions of the excess land law.

Ralph M. Brody, manager of Westlands Water District, noted that Giffen, speaking as the president of the agency that is buying the water from the San Luis Project, promised repeatedly in testimony to congressional committees that the big land owners intended to obey the law. Brody said most of the land in the San Luis Project is now covered by excess land law contracts.
Focus on farm ‘dukedoms’

Jury probes land-deal maze

By Lynn Ludwig, Examiner News Staff

FRESNO — A federal grand jury has reconvened today to investigate a tangled web called Cantua Agricultural Partnerships.

The case offers some nasty implications for the farm counties of California.

Parties to the panel’s investigation are corporate farmer Russell Giffen, land owner John Bonadelle and a chunk stack of documents from the Fresno County Recorder’s office.

In the background are heavy questions about the public’s multibillion-dollar investment for cheap irrigation water. It’s brought abundance to once-arid lands owned — for the most part — by oil companies, railroads, corporate farmers, Texas conglomerates, cotton processors and a group of high-income absentee investors looking for tax harvests.

The issues include:

• The government’s failure to enforce the National Reclamation Act of 1922, a neglected law that set residency rules and a 160-acre limitation (320 acres for man and wife) on farms irrigated by federal dam and canal projects.

• The argument by most landholders, political leaders and banks that Thomas Jefferson’s vision of yeoman farmers is impractical, romantic and inefficient in an era devoted to farm technology.

• The claim by such groups as People for Land and the Land Reform Coalition that large landholders are evading federal law, piling up profits, obtaining vast sums in subsidies and forcing small-farm owners to sell out.

• A growing trend toward something called “tax-loss farming.” That means farms are broken up on paper, into parcels of less than 160 acres, sold to partnerships of investors and leased back to the same big operators.

The list of subpoenas indicates that the jurors will take a close look at two 1973 farmland sales by Giffen, Inc., which once owned or leased more than 130,000 acres in the Westlands Water District.

Bonadelle was the middleman in both transactions. They were approved later by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation as complying with the 160-acre limitation.

The 73-year-old law says, in part:

“No right to the use of water in private ownership shall be sold for a tract exceeding 160 acres to any one landowner, and no such sale shall be made to any landowner unless he be an actual bona fide resident on such land, or occupant thereof residing in the neighborhood.”

At the time speeches in Congress and remarks by President Theodore Roosevelt indicated they wanted to make sure public investment in federal water projects didn’t become a gold mine for land monopolists.

Congress modified the law in 1926 to prohibit windfall profits by landowners compelled to sell off excess acreage under the 160-acre limitation. The sale price is supposed to be set according to pre-project land values.

George Ballis, spokesman for People for Land, said the two Giffen transactions violated all three provisions of the law — acreage limitation, residency and sales price.

The properties lie near Cantua Creek, a crossroads near the California Aqueduct west of Fresno. Worth $200 to $300 an acre before irrigation, the land is valued now at $500 an acre up, mostly up.

Like other corporate farmers in the 600,000-acre district, Giffen had contracted to sell his excess property within 10 years. Ailing and ready to retire, he began breaking up his empire last year.

The grand jury has subpoenaed documents relating to the sale of a 397-acre parcel in six pieces, each under 160 acres, to six partnerships formed by Bonadelle’s corporation, Land Dynamics. This is the form taken by most tax-loss farm deals.

General partners in the six partnerships were Robert Pryor, who is associated with Bonadelle, and Larry Perry, who worked with Bonadelle at the time.

Each Cantua partnership listed a single limited partner, each of them named Pickett: Joseph Jr., Margaret, D.V., Linda, Rachel and the late Joseph Sr. They listed their address as 4303 E. Ashlan Ave., where three of them and Pryor shared offices in the real estate and construction business.

Trust deeds to the properties were held by the Bank of America, Land Dynamics and Sequoia Vineyards. Officers of the latter two firms were identical. Their address was 4224 N. Ashlan Ave., where three of them and Pryor shared offices in the real estate and construction business.

The mortgages were held by C. R. Shannon, a Visalia cattleman.

Nine days after the Nov. 15, 1973, transaction, the grant deeds were reassigned to Shannon’s relatives and associates. The price was $1,222,400, an increase of more than $300,000 in less than two weeks, or about $597 an acre.

Shannon is now operating the property.

The federal law doesn’t attempt to regulate price after the sale around it irrigates, and the federal panel presumably is investigating to see if the Shannon transaction was a deliberate effort to evade the acreage limitation law.

The Bureau of Reclamation hasn’t attempted to enforce the residency requirement, in spite of a court decision, now on appeal, involving the Imperial Valley.

The grand jury’s investigation is expected to produce any indictments immediately, and its proceedings will remain secret unless it issues a report or recommends action.
Taylor: of the San Joaquin Valley. He fits together the problems of agriculture, of water development, of government subsidy programs, of financing, and of politics that relate to land and water development. He certainly is an historic figure in the development era.

When Senator Downey came in July with a subcommittee of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, they held hearings in Sacramento and two or three other places in the Valley. I apprised various people here. One of them was Catherine Bauer, later Catherine Bauer Wurster, at that time a writer and consultant on housing and community planning. She handled Senator Downey, as I recall, very beautifully and quite upset him. I'll see if I can find that passage. Yes, here is the closing passage which just really upset him. She said:

"And so there is just one thing that I hope for and that is that the Senate with wisdom and foresight will prevent our admirable but shortsighted senator and this great but immature and heedless state from making a mistake the whole country will later regret."

Chall: Even with all of his support he was upset by this statement?

Taylor: Yes. He had been so courteous to her, and here she handed it right back to him like that.

Well, you see, we spread the word of their drive for the exemption around to Granges, to Grace McDonald and her people in the Farmer-Labor-Consumer Committee. The 95% Committee was established to serve the immediate need to block the exemption.

Chall: That was established then by Samuel E. Wood?

Taylor: Well, Sam Wood, who had taken his doctorate with me, came back in Navy uniform from World War II, and I told him about this issue. He promptly spread the word around and mobilized people to appear before Senator Downey. You see, one can almost generalize that political action against the general public interest is possible or impossible largely as people know or don't know what is going on. When they don't know what is being done to them, then it is easy to put things over on them. When they do know, then it is much harder. So that is the political moral from this episode of the attempts to obtain exemption of Central
Taylor: Valley Project from acreage limitation.*

Another activist was Father Charles Phillips of the Catholic Church, then in Oakland. I recall when I first met him and apprised him of this issue. He understood it right away; he made a little tour down through the Valley, the result of which was people there knew what was going to happen. When Senator Downey came to hold hearings on S. Res. 295 witnesses appeared to testify at the hearing and were very effective in countering those who wanted to eliminate the limitation. So here is a volume of around five hundred pages of testimony and Downey couldn't do anything with it, because the people of California had reacted in just the opposite way from what he thought they would once they were informed. They were informed simply by finding a few key people and letting them know the issue. Then they went around their neighborhoods and informed others. They then appeared at his hearings.

Chall: Basically the controvery was whether one would have ultimately smaller farms--160 to 320 acres with Central Valley water--or allow the very large farms to have that water and speculate on the land. Are these the issues?

Taylor: Yes, those were all involved: the subsidization of water and its monopolization by a few. The slogan that was most effective down in the Valley was "Preserve the family farm against the corporate farm."

Chall: I had come across some notation that Senators Hatch and Cordon had worked out a compromise.

Taylor: Yes. Senators Carl A. Hatch, of New Mexico (and apparently Senator Guy Cordon, of Oregon), introduced S 1948 as a sort

*"Certainly, any suggestion that supplemental water projects should be exempt from the excess land laws by Congress would engender great controversy. When such an attempt was made back in the middle forties, involving principally the Central Valley Project, it was rejected by the Congress but the turmoil that ensued plagued the reclamation program for many years." Senator Clinton P. Anderson, chairman, Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources, to Mitchell Melich, Solicitor of Interior, March 26, 1971. PST
Taylor: of a compromise.*

Chall: In the Senate?

Taylor: Well, they proposed it, and hearings were attached in part to that.

Chall: Is this the same kind of compromise as worked out in the House?

Taylor: I've forgotten now the exact details. I would have to look it up and see exactly.

Chall: But it was attached?

Bureau of Reclamation - Different Opinions

Taylor: No, it was not attached, but it would weaken it. You see, the position of the Bureau of Reclamation people within the Department of the Interior was not the same as Secretary Ickes'. Within the Department of Interior the Bureau of Reclamation people wanted the appropriations needed to develop the project. They found the wholehearted support of the large landed interests useful. These would send their men to Washington to tell Congress what a wonderful project this was and why the federal government should put up as much money as possible to carry it forward. The Bureau of Reclamation wanted the jobs and wanted the business. Their concern with the acreage limitation was minimal. As one of them said to me, "Well, we would like to preserve the acreage limitation in principle." That is his statement of it. My equivalent words would be, "preserve the shadow of the acreage limitation." The Hatch proposal, I believe was prepared from that point of view.

Chall: So that within the Department of Interior itself this has always been a matter of argument and controversy. You never could be sure you were on solid ground then.

*See Central Valley Project, California. Hearing before subcommittee of Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, 78 Cong., 2 sess., on S. Res. 295, 3-17 (1944).
Taylor: You see, internally we had a Bureau of Reclamation that was disposed to cave in and yield, and Senator Downey used to talk with them. They were politically sensitive. It was their bureau. We wanted them to stand on principle. So the way that I was able to make my views effective in the Department of the Interior was to convince my chief, Arthur E. Goldschmidt, that I knew what I was talking about, that my principle was right, and that to stand firmly on principle was politically a proper tactic. Then he, and very occasionally, I talked with Undersecretary Abe Fortas who was at the elbow of Ickes. Fortas was very solid on this issue. He convinced Ickes.

I was called in to speak to Ickes a couple of times, so that he could get his personal impressions of me as a source of information and as a guide to what the position of the department should be. He responded beautifully. The Bureau of Reclamation thought, I believe, that we would lose the battle to keep the acreage limitation on the statute books.

This incident will give you a clue. In May 1944 during the Senate Commerce Subcommittee hearings on the Elliott rider Michael W. Straus was assistant secretary of interior and William E. Warne was assistant commissioner of reclamation. Into the executives' dining room one day at lunch time came Arthur Goldschmidt, head of the Division of Power in the Office of the secretary, accompanied by me, his consultant. At the moment this issue was very, very hot. Straus and Warne were about ready to leave the table as we came in. We sat down and of course this hot subject was immediately uppermost. We were fighting it out internally, you see, within the department to determine what the department position should be.

You remember on the Elliott rider the bureau, through Congressman Voorhis, offered a concession on the floor of the House. It was rejected in favor of outright exemption from acreage limitation. Now the question was: should a concession be offered in the Senate? Or should there be an out-and-out no compromise fight to retain the law. With that as the issue, this is what Straus said, "I tell you boys, you're right--if you can win." Bill Warne put his hand to his mouth and muttered, "But I don't think they can," and got up from the table scowling. I think that is very revealing. We killed the Elliott rider. If you were interviewing Bill Warne today he might say, "Well, who was right? The law isn't well enforced."

Warne was a protegé of Straus. He came from Imperial Valley. He didn't think we could win, so he was going to play with those
Taylor: who had the power.

Chall: Hasn't Warne gone on into the state...

Taylor: Oh, yes! He's up in Sacramento now as a consultant. Yes, until Governor Reagan's election he was head of the State Water Project. Oh yes.

I remember when I arrived in 1958 in Korea as his consultant. He was then head of the U.S. International Cooperation Administration mission to Korea. He invited me to Korea and treated me beautifully. We have always got along very well personally. Upon my arrival I told him of Pat Brown's Democratic primary victory for the governorship. I shall never forget Bill Warne's excitement as he stood up in his office over there in Seoul. After the fall election it was only a matter of weeks or a few months until Warne was over here in California, first in the Fish and Game Department. The next thing I heard soon after was his transfer over to the Water Department, where soon he became head of the State Water Project.

Chall: The Department of Water Resources.

Taylor: Yes. So these issues have long histories. I just got little flashes of them from time to time. But they all fit.

Chall: Yes, I think that's interesting about the careers of these people. Could you describe Secretary Ickes--how he worked, his relationships with others in the Department of the Interior, how he impressed you, the times that you met with him?

Taylor: Secretary Ickes was a man who relied upon his own judgment, after careful examination of the subject and consultation with those in whom he had confidence. As I recall, he had been a Bull Mooser, a Chicago progressive, and was highly regarded as a man of principle. He learned of acreage limitation from Walter Packard, and was kept informed by Abe Fortas, his undersecretary. After learning the meaning of the issue, and that his subordinates had been allowing its circumvention during his absences from Washington, he became a staunch and effective supporter of the law and its enforcement, resisting exemption in Central Valley successfully, and insisting that reclamation law be applied to Army Engineers projects serving irrigation purposes. As I recall, I was called to his office twice. The interviews were not long, but served to give him opportunity to "size me up," as a source doubtless referred to by Fortas and Goldschmidt.
Chall: Abe Fortas is reputed to be a brilliant man. His government career ended somewhat abruptly after President Nixon took office. Since you knew Mr. Fortas, could you describe how you worked with him and how you assessed his qualities as a government servant.

Taylor: Fortas is an extremely able man, and would have made an excellent chief justice of the Supreme Court, a post to which he was nominated by President Johnson. As I recall from current accounts, he became vulnerable by continuing to serve as a consultant to President Johnson on public affairs after receiving an appointment to the bench, thus contravening the "separation of powers" rule, or ethic, or custom. I worked with him primarily through Arthur Goldschmidt, my immediate chief. A few times I conferred with Fortas directly. He was very staunch and principled, and, through Secretary Ickes, kept the staff--sympathetic to the Bureau of Reclamation's willingness to give in and compromise the acreage-limitation issue--from having their way and yielding to Senator Downey's pressure upon the bureau. He held them in line, and knew what he was doing when he did it.

Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Excess Acreage Law

Taylor: Along with the factors involving differences of opinion within the Bureau of Reclamation, there was one more reason why the bureau officials were ready to yield on the acreage limitation. There are two water construction agencies in the government--the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Until late 1944 the Army Engineers were not governed by acreage limitation laws. The large landowners on the Kings and Kern Rivers therefore went to the Army Engineers to get them to build the dams on these two rivers in order to circumvent reclamation law. So there was an internal competition for the job of constructing. The advantage of the Army Engineers to the big landowners was that they offered escape from the acreage limitation law. Well, all this was going on in 1944.

Chall: With this strong push to have the engineers build Pine Flat, Isabella, and Folsom dams, how is it that Harold Ickes managed to get Congress to compromise in such a way that the Army Engineers could build the facilities, but the Bureau of Reclamation would administer irrigation under reclamation law [HR 4485].
Chall: That must have been a coup for the 160-acre limitation side; it looked at that point as if you were going to lose entirely on that issue. How did you manage to accomplish this? I say, you, broadly, of course.

Taylor: Well, my immediate superior, Arthur Goldschmidt, was informed on what was going on and so were Abe Fortas and the secretary. Remember, it was during an FDR administration, and FDR supported his secretary of the interior. So one day Goldschmidt personally, under the mantle of the administration, went to Lister Hill, senator from Alabama. Then on the Senate floor Lister Hill asked the senator from Louisiana in charge of the Rivers and Harbors bill [Overton] (this colloquy is in the Congressional Record), "Will the acreage limitation of reclamation law apply under the Army Engineer's projects in California?"

The answer came back, yes, not only in California but everywhere else where there are irrigation uses of the water. This provision was put in as section 8.* So this was New Deal pressure from FDR, Ickes, right on down that forced that in. That is at issue in federal court in Fresno today with the large landowners from the Tulare Lake basin getting water from the Army Engineers construction on the Kings and Kern Rivers. They are claiming the exact opposite of what I just told you.**

---

*"The President wrote me and the chairman of the subcommittee in this regard. However, in view of the fact that the Senate amendment made not only the California projects but all such projects subject to irrigation laws, and in view of the fact that the House concurred in this action by agreeing to section 8 of the Senate bill, I am sure that the President will feel that we have met the problem that he raised.... No project in this bill which may include irrigation features is exempted from the reclamation laws.... As I stated a while ago, section 8 of the bill clearly places reclamation uses of waters from all projects authorized in this bill under the Secretary of the Interior and under the applicable reclamation laws." Senator John H. Overton, of Louisiana. 90 Cong. Rec. 9264. (1944) PST

**The federal district judge in Fresno decided for the big landowners. The Department of Justice, under pressure from Senator Fred Harris, of Oklahoma, and Congressman Jerome R. Waldie, of California, has appealed the case to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. It helped in getting the Justice Department to appeal that at the moment Harris and Waldie pressed, Kleindienst [Richard G.] was awaiting confirmation as attorney general. PST
Chall: Would section 8 be applied to past waters, to past building?

Taylor: No. They had an amendment saying, "provided it would not apply to previously constructed or previously authorized projects."

I don't know exactly the effect, but one place that amendment helped them would be in Florida, at Lake Okeechobee. But I am under the impression that there is an ignoring of the law in Florida, too. No Floridians, as far as I know, know the score or if they do possibly, they don't care. But as for Kings and Kern that issue is up right now in federal court. One would have believed it impossible to have any doubt with that colloquy between Senator John Overton, of Louisiana, in charge of the bill, and Senator Hill representing the administration, that it applies.

Kings River Litigation - 1971

Taylor: This was a well-planned tactic of escape from acreage limitation. You remember my reference to Business Week of May 13, 1944? They told the tactics there. The big landowners went to the Army Engineers because at that time they weren't covered by the acreage limitation law. On the Kings River there were two authorizations. One was the congressional authorization of the Army Engineers. The other was a Bureau of Reclamation authorization permitted by law on the condition that a study approved by the secretary of the interior found the project feasible economically. So the Department of Interior had its own legal justification to build the project but needed congressional appropriations. The large landowners cut in at that point, opposed appropriations to the bureau for constructing Pine Flat Dam, and instead proposed and succeeded in getting congressional authorization and appropriations for the Army Engineers to construct the dam. Then the Department of Interior came back: if the Army Engineers construct, the same acreage limitation law applies, as I have described, with the Lister Hill-Senator Overton dialogue, applying reclamation law in section 8.

That telephone call a few minutes ago was from an attorney for small landowners, whose clients want standing as intervenors, so that if the government, under the present administration loses the case, it will not throw it away by declining to appeal—as they declined to appeal the Imperial Valley decision. You see, that's another way to let big landowners out from under reclamation laws.
Chall: I see.

Taylor: So in talking about escape from acreage limitation you are today in 1971 as well as back in '44.

Imperial Valley Litigation - 1971

Chall: Do I understand that the government has declined to appeal that very latest Imperial Valley decision? [January, 1971]

Taylor: Yes. You want to talk about that one?

Chall: All right. Then let's bring it up-to-date. [This interview took place on December 16, 1971.]

Taylor: Well, it is something that I am turning over in my mind how to write up. I think that I will write it up under some such title as "The Majesty of the Law."*

You see, here is a 1933 lame-duck administration, the Hoover administration with secretary of the interior Ray Lyman Wilbur. It was defeated for reelection and waiting for FDR to come into office on March 4. In 1930, three years before, shortly after the Boulder Canyon Act was passed, Secretary Wilbur's righthand man, attorney Northcutt Ely--do you want me to talk from my documents?

Chall: You can refer to them, then anybody doing research can go and get them.

Northcutt Ely--he was then with the federal government?

Taylor: He was the executive assistant to Ray Lyman Wilbur.

Chall: I see. His name comes up again from time to time on water-related matters.

Taylor: Well, his name is also in the 1944 hearings; he's there all the time.

I just received a letter when I got home last evening from a congressman to whom I sent some of this information that I am going to tell you now. He wrote back to me a single word: "Incredible!"

Chall: Who was the congressman?

Taylor: The congressman was Jerome Waldie.

[Reading] "Dear Paul, Thanks for the letter on Griswold's failure to act in the Imperial Valley matter. Incredible!"

Chall: Now Griswold is?

Taylor: He's solicitor general of the United States. Former dean of the Harvard Law School. If you will go to Who's Who and look up Mr. Northcutt Ely you will find that he makes note of the fact that he negotiated the Imperial Valley and other contracts under the Boulder Canyon Act--that includes the Imperial Valley contract.

Now Solicitor General Griswold under Attorney General Mitchell in the Nixon administration writes a letter to a Mrs. Stover in Kansas, in Manhattan, Kansas, who sends him the May 8, 1971 article in The New Republic critical of Solicitor General Griswold's failure to appeal the decision, and entitled, Water, Water for the Wealthy. Griswold says, among other things, "I considered the matter carefully and thoroughly and over a considerable period of time. As a result of my consideration I became convinced that (a) We would not win the case in the Court of Appeals, and (b) We should not win it." That's Griswold in 1971.

Now here is what Northcutt Ely said in 1930, three years before Secretary Wilbur let Imperial Valley escape acreage limitation: "The Reclamation Law's limitation of 160 acres to a particular owner presents a serious problem, in view of the fact that this being an existing project, includes many farms with larger area. I see nothing to do but enforce it, unless the Imperial Irrigation District can get new legislation. In any event enforcement of this requirement would undoubtedly have a salutary effect on suspected speculators' activities in that locality."
Taylor: In other words, to use the opposite of Solicitor Griswold's 1971 words, the law does apply and it should apply. Three years later, as I told you, Mr. Ely negotiated the contract which did not apply the law. In '33 here is his instruction to prepare a letter for the secretary's signature which does not apply the law.

"Will you be good enough to have a letter from the secretary to the board prepared, along those lines."

Chall: What are you reading from?

Taylor: I am reading from the government document which Northcutt Ely signed or responded to. They are both in the record. They are in print in the 1964 opinion of Solicitor Frank J. Barry of the Department of the Interior.

All right. Now let me give you another one. [Leafing through papers.]

Now let me read from the testimony of Mr. Northcutt Ely representing the California Water Project Authority in 1944. Remember, in 1930 he said the law does apply and to apply it would have a salutary effect on speculation, remember? Just the opposite of what Mr. Griswold says. Here is Ely after he had let them out of the acreage limitation. He says, "If no action were taken at all as to Central Valley," (this is in discussion of the Elliott rider to eliminate the acreage limitation from Central Valley) "I imagine that the course would be exactly as it has been on the Salt River Project and in Imperial Valley, that the law would remain on the books, the prohibition of delivery of water to holdings in excess of 160 acres, and that somehow lands now under cultivation would continue to be cultivated. In those projects the holdings in excess of 160 acres have not been prevented from coming into the district. If they were prevented here, the loss through non-participation would fall upon those who do participate."

Then, listen to this:

"If they were permitted to come into the districts the law would simply have to be ignored as it has been ignored on these other Sacramento water projects." [Underlining to indicate PST's emphasis.]

In other words, in 1944 he says that what he and Secretary Wilbur did in 1933 was simply to ignore the law.
Chall: And to whom did he deliver this testimony--this one you just read?

Taylor: This was the testimony before the Senate Commerce Subcommittee on the Elliott rider in 1944. (Hearings on HR 3961, 78 Cong., 2 sess. 632) In other words, he ignored the law in Imperial Valley in 1933, and in 1944 he said that he had ignored the law.

Chall: Which was the reason that he was giving the subcommittee members for eliminating the law from the books?

Taylor: The implication was that if they left it on the books it would be ignored anyway, and he implies--what I think is an invalid argument--that if the law was applied in Imperial Valley the owners of the excess lands would not take the water, so there would be fewer to pay. This is not realistic in Imperial Valley because without the water they've got nothing. In addition, under the Boulder Canyon Project act they didn't have to pay anything for the All-American Canal. The meaning, apparently, is that if they couldn't get the water for their excess lands from the project then they wouldn't join the irrigation district and the poor little fellows would have to pay for all of it, which in my judgment is horsefeathers because without the water, the excess lands aren't any good at all. I don't believe them when they say, or imply, that any Imperial Valley landowner could afford to remain out of the project to escape acreage limitation.

So here is Mr. Griswold in 1971 relying, standing firmly on the 1933 position of the man who said in 1930 and again in 1944 that this position violates the law!

Chall: How did Mr. Ely happen to be with the Water Project Authority in 1944?

Taylor: Ely was originally an appointee of Secretary Wilbur. He was a Stanford law graduate who has become a very prominent water lawyer in Washington ever since he left office. I've heard repeatedly (this I have not personally verified) that he was put on the payroll of the Imperial Irrigation District as a consultant not long after Secretary Wilbur said acreage limitation did not apply there. The State Water Project Authority was standing for exemption of the state Water Project from the acreage limitation, and they wanted a spokesman before Congress. He was a counsel for them. Also he represented California water interests against Arizona. He is a very useful water lawyer when you want
Taylor: done what he can do, because he knows this subject inside and out from 1930 on.

Chall: So, in other words, the Imperial Valley 160-acre limitation controversy is now ended, legally?

Taylor: Well I wouldn't say it is finally closed. You see, there are 123 landless people in Imperial Valley who were amicus curiae. They asked Judge Turrentine to transfer their status to intervenor because they saw coming around the corner the decision not to appeal the case that actually came from Solicitor General Griswold and the Nixon administration. Judge Turrentine rejected their request with interesting arguments, one of them being that there was no showing that they had the money to buy land if the law was applied. This was a law, you understand, passed under the slogan, "Land for the Landless." A second reason was there was no obligation on the part of excess landowners to sell to these particular people. So why should he give them the standing to sue with no legal rights at stake? They were just landless, probably unable to buy. They were not preferred customers and if the law did apply there probably would be a veterans' preference, the veterans would get land ahead of them anyway. So why listen to these people pleading in court?

That is being appealed in the circuit court of appeals in San Francisco.* That is why this telephone call a few minutes ago of an attorney who wants--not the Imperial Valley parties--but small farmers in the San Joaquin Valley to be made intervenors in the Fresno case so that the rug won't be pulled out from under them the same way in Tulare Lake Basin on the Army Engineers' Pine Flat-Isabella Project.

I might say this just to cap the climax, this is from the Los Angeles Times on February 22, 1971. This is before the government's decision not to appeal was announced, but after the decision saying the law does not apply. It says: "But if you are planning to make the trek to this improbable valley, you'd better hurry. Lifting the 160-acre limitation is going to send land costs soaring." Remember what Northcutt Ely said in 1930, about the rumors of speculation if the law was not applied?

*In 1973 Circuit Court of Appeals granted intervenor status with right to appeal. PST
Chall: That was one of the bases for the 160-acre limitation, to prevent this kind of wild speculation on land.

Taylor: Yes, of course, that was what the Supreme Court said.

Chall: Isn't speculation in land an old American custom? Hard to root out?

Taylor: Yes, you can see how hard it is to root it out. Speculation in land values has been an enormous issue in this state going back to the days of Henry George in the seventies and the Constitutional Convention of 1878-79. It echoed down through the sessions of the National Irrigation Congress in the 1890s. So the 160-acre limitation resulted in 1902, and here it is today in the courts!

Chall: In California it can be 320 acres, and probably in most cases, is.

Taylor: By administrative interpretation the wife is called an individual entitled to her own 160 acres. So the "family farm" measure is stretched to mean 320 acres. This interpretation was made under pressure to remove the law entirely.

Chall: Considering all the pressures that have been going on over the years the results have been to try to do away with the 160-acre limitation, or ignore it, or try to apply it rigorously.

Taylor: Nowhere has there been effort to apply the law rigorously, I think it is fair to say. Or rather almost nowhere. It was applied to lands open to veterans after World War II in Klamath Basin. No question there and they came out and did beautifully economically.

Chall: Then it has generally been ignored?

Taylor: Ignored or circumvented. Yes, sure. Power of the large landed interests is too great. One aspect of Pine Flat we haven't mentioned. Are you interested in the power side of it?
The Electric Power Issue

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: It illustrates, I think, the collaboration between the private power interests and the big landowners. Congressman Alfred Elliott, who pushed through the appropriations for Pine Flat Dam to be constructed by the Army Engineers, was embarrassed on the floor of Congress or in the hearings with the question, "You are asking for only $19 million for a dam with no facilities to generate power from the impounded falling water?"

He said, "Yes, that's right." And he was a bit taken aback when they pressed him as to why he didn't want power facilities. He couldn't really explain except it was cheaper and in wartime.

So, down in the heart of the Valley, the landowners and private-power interests allied themselves with the Army Engineers, each for their own motive--escape from the acreage limitation, or to have no power generated carrying by law a public power preference.

So if you go down to Pine Flat today you can see the tubes in the concrete of the dam but no water flowing through them to generate power. That is a waste of the fall of those waters for about the last twenty years. No power; but we hear all the time that 'We've got to have more power!'

Chall: Even if it had the public-power preference attached to it there might not be districts that were set up to take it. There might be the same battles over transmitting it as there were around Shasta.

Taylor: Of course. There were battles trying to form public power districts in the Pine Flat area long before Pine Flat dam. The mayor of Berkeley, Louis Bartlett, was active in that in the 1920s or thereabouts. The private-power interests wanted to avoid any revivals of those fights.

Chall: I see. It was that long ago.

Taylor: I don't know how much per vote the private power companies reported that they spent to defeat that public-power proposal or others in the Sacramento Valley.

Chall: Don't the ranchers in that area need power for their pumping?
Taylor: Yes, but the big ranchers get the power. The bigger the user, the cheaper the power per unit. So they work together.

The Downey Bill: S 912 - 1947

Chall: Well, now, let's talk about S 912. This is generally known as the Downey bill and its intent was to repeal the 160-acre limitation in Texas, California, and Colorado.

Taylor: They got six senators onto it with projects in three states. Yes, in order to build up its strength. That's right.

Chall: So you had two senators in this state who were strongly opposed to the 160-acre limitation.

Taylor: We faced not only two California senators in an 80th Republican Congress, but four other senators as their allies from states that had no background of information on the meaning of the acreage limitation issue. By coincidence a Berkeley friend showed me an article in, I believe, The New Republic by a man who was with the Texas Observer. The article showed that he was sympathetic to the kind of position that the acreage limitation represented, but that he was uninformed about it. His name is Hart Stillwell, I believe. So I took steps to advise him, as a result of which Texans appeared at that S 912 hearing and said in the face of their own senators, "We don't want an exemption in Texas."

You see how enormously important it is that people shall know what is being done in Congress. Otherwise the wool is pulled over their eyes and they never know what has been done to them until it is too late. That's the way a large part of government business is done by special interests in the presence of an ill-informed public.

Chall: Now was the battle on S 912 pretty much the same as it had been on the Elliott rider, the issue was the same?

Taylor: Yes, the issue was the same.

Chall: The people were the same, except for the addition of the Texans and the Coloradans?
Taylor: Yes, and the Texas opposition blew up in their face. Richard Boke, regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, stationed in Sacramento, was solid, because he believed in what he was doing in enforcing the 160-acre law. Michael Straus, commissioner of the bureau and William Warne, who was also in Washington in the bureau office, would have yielded in whole or in part.

I have been told that Straus was ready to go down to the Senate committee and make a showing, but shortly give in. That to prevent this Boke went to Secretary J.A. Krug and persuaded him that they should adhere to the department's position adopted under Ickes and fight against any exemption. So under instructions from the new secretary, Straus and Warne could not yield.

Chall: In an issue of this kind when the senators from the affected states are pushing a bill, isn't it the inclination of the rest of the Senate to say that this is what the people in the state want and you probably should let them have it?

Taylor: That is true. You'll find an interchange almost exactly on the point you've made, between Senator Kuchel and Senator Paul Douglas in 1959, in which Kuchel said just about what you have, viz., Who speaks for the people of California if not I?

Douglas said, "No, I don't believe on this matter you do speak for the people of California."*

Chall: That would mean that Senators Downey and Knowland would have to go to other senators in order to get the help they needed.

Taylor: They may not have gone personally but plenty of people are running around--lobbyists who take care of these things and hook things up, you see. The landed interests have people in Washington watching these things like hawks, lining up support for their interests.

*Mr. Kuchel: ...Who, in God's name, speaks for the people of California? Does a Democratic governor? Do the two senators from California?

Mr. Douglas: No.

(Manifestations of laughter in the galleries.) 105 Cong. Rec. 7851. May 11, 1959. PST
Chall: Then on your side it would be the Farmers Union and the Grange and the labor unions and others.

Taylor: Yes, and on the other side representatives of the large-landed interests.

Chall: So you were all going around to other senators, not you necessarily, but I mean all the opponents and the proponents must have been quite busy.

Taylor: Yes.

Chall: On the side of those trying to retain the 160-acre limitation who could you work with? In the Senate? Paul Douglas?

Taylor: No, he wasn't there in '47. It didn't come to the floor of the Senate. This was the 80th Congress, a Republican Congress, the one that Harry Truman called the do-nothing Congress. This hearing went on for 1300 pages, from May 5 to June 2. It was carried out by a subcommittee on irrigation of the Public Lands Committee.

I remember an item in the Oakland Tribune close to the end--remember, Senator Knowland of the Tribune was on the bill--saying it would come out from the Public Lands Committee. But the committee didn't put it out. What I think is that Republicans having broken through the Democrats and gotten control of Congress in 1946 thought that they would have a pushover in the 1948 election. So why try to drive the exemption through against Truman administration resistance when they expected to have increased strength in the next Congress? Well, it turned out that the Democrats won, and Harry Truman was reelected. [Phone interruption]

Chall: What issue was this one? [phone call]

Taylor: This one is about Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26, which proposes approval of government purchase of the excess lands in order to allow public planning of open spaces, preserving agricultural green belts and recreational areas. It sets up a Reclamation Lands Authority to administer the lands and plan the environment, which brings the windfall of profits into the public treasury instead of to the corporate big landowners, and it assigns a reasonable portion of them to the financing of education--the water grants for education in the tradition of the land grants. That, we got unanimously through the assembly. The question is now, can we get it through the senate?*

*It did not receive state senate approval. PST
Chall: That means that the state would be purchasing the excess--

Taylor: No. This is a resolution telling Congress, "We think it would be a good idea if you did that." You see in Congress there is an identical bill. It has been introduced by six California congressmen and Congressman Robert Kastenmier of Wisconsin. There are six people on that bill and this resolution attempts to see if we can get the legislature of California in both houses to say, "Yes, go ahead and do it, it's a good idea."

Chall: It gives added emphasis and push in Washington if Sacramento can be got to approve it.

Let me see, where were we? We were on S 912.

Debating the 160-Acre Issue

Taylor: Yes. There used to be public debates on this issue. Now public debates are avoided as much as possible. Have you noticed that?

Chall: There's been a little discussion on KQED, but you can't really call it a debate.

Taylor: That is right. Well, speaking from my personal experience I debated it three times in public.

Chall: When were these?

Taylor: On August 10, 1944, America's Town Meeting of the Air was "barnstorming" in Fresno, with national radio coverage. The subject was: "Should the government use its authority to break up large land holdings into family type farms?" Affirmative speakers were Harvey R. Solberg, president, Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, and Paul Taylor. Negative speakers were Roland Curran, secretary-manager, Central Valley Water Project Association, and Leroy McCormick, attorney; mayor of Visalia, California.*

*Published text of the broadcast is in Paul Taylor's files. Town Meeting, Bulletin of America's Town Meeting of the Air (American Education Press, Inc., Columbus, Ohio, Vol. 10, No. 15.)
Taylor: I debated again in '47 in Berkeley before the Berkeley League of Women Voters. Opposite me was the legal counsel for the California Farm Bureau Federation. The Berkeley league went on record in favor of the acreage limitation. Later in the same year, again under the League of Women Voters sponsorship, I debated with the president of the Farm Bureau Federation in the Los Angeles Philharmonic Auditorium.*

Chall: So it was you against the spokesman for the Farm Bureau Federation in both cases?

Taylor: That's right.

Chall: Were there large audiences?

Taylor: Well, the League of Women Voters was not large in Berkeley. It might have been thirty or forty but it was probably four hundred or five hundred in Los Angeles. The Philharmonic Auditorium is a sizeable auditorium.

Then in '48 in San Jose the Rural Life Conference of Protestant churches held its national meeting. They asked for a debate and the man on the other side at that time was a national director of the Farm Bureau Federation. A year or so later he became president of the California Farm Bureau Federation. I was told after the debate that when he left, there wasn't a man in the hall on his side—not even his own pastor.

Chall: Are these debates recorded any place?

Taylor: No. No tapes.

Chall: Press coverage?

Taylor: I doubt it. There might have been press coverage in 1947 in Los Angeles, I never looked. But I told you the results. The results of the state League of Women Voters action favoring acreage limitation is recorded in the San Francisco News. The later story of how they undid them--

*The text of my address was inserted in the Congressional Record on March 20, 1947 by Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas. PST
Chall: How they undid their support, when they took a stand in favor of the State Water Project?

Taylor: That's another story.

Chall: That's right.

Were these all attempts to back up the 160-acre limitation arguments during the S 912 hearings of that time?

Taylor: These were during the Downey days, and Downey was trying to build public support. He and other opponents of acreage limitation originally thought that by appealing to the public they could win their case. After experiences in public debate they must have concluded that they couldn't win their case in debate. To this day you'll notice on television or otherwise they have allowed themselves to be interviewed and shown on a tape, but not in the presence of another person who can ask questions and call attention to the omissions or misstatements.

Chall: What was the general thrust of your testimony or debate and that of the representative of the Farm Bureau Federation?

Taylor: They have changed their grounds between then and now. In those days in the forties--you'll find this argument in Downey's talk--the argument was, this land is all going to break up anyway. Therefore, why go through all of this unreasonable legal business to force them to break up?

Chall: Why did they say the holdings were going to break up?

Taylor: Because it was tactically good to say it; because they recognized the strength at that time of the family farm argument favoring the widespread distribution of landholdings. So they said, "You're going to get it all naturally anyway, so why demand it by law?"

They don't say that now. Now their argument has shifted to an alleged efficiency of large-scale farms. Everything bigger is more efficient. Large-scale machinery and all that, with the implication that the community, including or perhaps most of all the consumers, benefits from this efficiency. Of course I don't believe that. I don't think they are interested in the consumers except incidentally to keep their good will while they are eliminating acreage limitation.
Chall: I know in '45 and '46 and '48 during the Downey battles there were figures used about the efficiency of various farm sizes.

Taylor: In 1944 they did not argue that the smaller farms are inefficient. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics made studies.*

Chall: What brought about the writing of Thirsty Land? Did Robert de Roos just decide that this looked like a very timely subject. It was as hot as it could be in 1947 and 1948.

Taylor: I've forgotten why he started to do it. I remember he came to us--to several people, Marion Clawson, and Mary Montgomery, and myself--to talk about it. He'd been down to Fresno and he got the other side. So he asked us about this point and that. I remember saying, "And did they tell you this?" "Did they tell you this?" "And did they tell you this?" His answers were all, "Yes." They gave him their whole line and we answered them, apparently to de Roos' satisfaction.

He had talked to a man in Fresno who about one year ago (I could locate it) in a report to the Public Land Law Review Commission, recommended no acreage limitation.

de Roos reviewed that in the Chronicle about a year ago under the title, "The Land-Grabbers are on the Loose."**

You've seen in the papers that Dr. George Dean of Davis points out the coming problem of oversupply? And President Lyndon Johnson's Commission on Rural Poverty says "no more reclamation," and "enforce the 160-acre limitation." Reclamation in the West adds to rural poverty of the South and East. The reclamation subsidies program has been supported by carefully tended propaganda and public relations from way back.***

*J. Karl Lee, Economies of Scale of Farming in the Southern San Joaquin Valley, California (1946). (In my bound volume XXXIX. PST)

**San Francisco Chronicle, "This World," August 16, 1970.

Chall: Do you recall that particular set of hearings in September, 1947, when Richard Welch came out to California with the Subcommittee on Irrigation of the Public Lands?

Taylor: I recall the San Francisco hearings. Richard Welch, congressman from San Francisco, was oriented toward organized labor, which of course, was strongly in support of acreage limitation. The California Labor Federation position was presented by its president, John F. Shelley, soon to become a congressman, himself. I supplied him with data on labor's historic position from the 1870s which he put into the hearings record. Shelley made a strong presentation in favor of acreage limitation.* The presentations were made before a sympathetic committee chairman, in contrast to the Downey hearings of '44 and '47, the latter in Washington.

Chall: This committee came out because it assumed that the issue was going to get to the House ultimately?

Taylor: Well, of course it had been there before and it might come again. Welch apparently was glad to respond to his labor supporters who wanted to retain the limitation, so the hearings, from that point of view provided a good arena to produce testimony as a counter weight to the Downey hearings.

Chall: One of the people who spoke, I think it was at Fresno, was a person named Hubert Phillips on the faculty of Fresno State College. Who was he, aside from being a faculty member?

Taylor: Hubert Phillips, as I recall, was a product of Columbia University, one of the ablest professors at Fresno State, whom I had known over the years. I remember him in '33 at the Corcoran camp of the cotton pickers during the strike. We both turned up there to

---

*Public lands committee hearings, 80 Cong., 1 sess., on H. Res. 93, 37 (1947). See also Congressman John F. Shelley's insert in Congressional Record on "The 160-acre limitation and the Santa Maria Project" on February 4, 1954. On that project the acreage limitation was removed from project ground waters. Later, in 1958, the U.S. Supreme Court cited this removal as evidence that "Congress has always made such exemption by express enactment." Ivanhoe Irrigation Dist. v. McCracken, 357 US 275 at 292. PST
Taylor: view that struggle. He was a man interested in the social, economic, and political problems of his own community and time. I'd forgotten that he testified, but that would be completely in character.

The Grange

Chall: And of course George Sehlmeyer testified. I don't know if we've discussed George Sehlmeyer yet.

Taylor: Would you like a few comments on him?

Chall: Yes, I would

Taylor: George Sehlmeyer was master of the California State Grange for a number of years. He was from an old California family. He had a family farm. My own contact with him began in '44. American's Town Meeting of the Air--a radio program that you might remember--

Chall: Yes, indeed.

Taylor: --came barnstorming out to Fresno travelling across country instead of broadcasting from their usual urban headquarters in the East. And in barnstorming they were glad to feature local issues. The Downey effort to remove the acreage limitation was a hot issue at the time and they picked it up, inviting Sehlmeyer to speak. For whatever reasons, he declined, and I was asked if I would speak. I accepted.

The broadcast was held in the civic auditorium of Fresno. The Chamber of Commerce after the broadcast made the gestures of being host to us. They were not exactly pleased by my presentation. As I recall, only two persons spoke up with questions friendly to me. One of them was Winston Strong, on the faculty at Fresno State; the other, I was told later, was a member of the Musician's Union. I was asked a very unfriendly question by someone, apparently a farmer, who evidently had had the question written out for him. I remember that he had trouble in reading it. It was decidedly unfriendly. That was one of the very earliest occasions on which our side of the acreage limitation was presented in the valley. It was just after the Downey hearings of '44.
Chall: So that this was really just gratuitous, the fact that Town Hall came to Fresno?

Taylor: Oh, yes, they came out as part of their barnstorming program to come to the country.

Chall: And the broadcast, as I recall, was nation-wide.

Taylor: The broadcast was nation-wide.

Chall: Was there anything that came out of the broadcast nationally that made any difference, do you think? Could you tell, or could Sehlmeyer, did you discuss this with Sehlmeyer?

Taylor: Sehlmeyer came and heard us speak, but he had declined the invitation, himself, to participate. So I was asked to speak.

Chall: Did Sehlmeyer think that this kind of thing was more than he could handle?

Taylor: Well, I don't know why he didn't speak. He was a quiet, reticent man, but stuck to his principles. The Farmersville local Grange near Visalia passed a resolution in favor of the acreage limitation. Armed with that George Sehlmeyer went to Washington and testified in May of 1944. Sehlmeyer was rather a closed-mouth kind of a person who gave little indication of what his position was going to be. He would listen to one without expressing his opinion or what he would do. He did not easily cooperate with other people. He was what you might call a loner. But when he did work on the issue, he was effective. He was consistent and he was effective.

Chall: He was returned to office as Grangemaster for many, many years.

Taylor: Until his death, yes.

Chall: He must have been effective or they wouldn't have returned him to power.

Taylor: He was followed by J. Blaine Quinn, whom I found much easier (in his personal characteristics), much easier to cooperate with. He was strongly in favor of the acreage limitation.

Chall: Has the Grange taken any other position than favoring the 160-acre limitation?
Taylor: The only change in Grange position that I know of—and this is National Grange—was to say they were for 320 acres. That does not detract from their support of the 160-acre law, because the administrators of the federal law have interpreted the 160-acre limitation to mean 160 acres for a man, and 160 acres for a wife. I do not believe that was intended by the originators of the law in 1902. The law said "individual ownership of 160 acres." Well, a man and his wife are an individual in the family sense, and families on the land is what the lawmakers had in mind. The administrators raised that to 320 under the political pressure of the 1940s. Perhaps the National Grange may also have had in mind that on some far northern reclamation projects 160 acres may have been a bit small for a family farm. So the National Grange position with respect to the principle is essentially the same as always.

Chall: They haven't changed the basic unit of 320.

Taylor: No. But the other side, the large-landed interests, in public argument, want very much to talk about the alleged inadequacy of 160 acres anywhere, and omit the fact that administratively it is being interpreted as 320 acres. The average size of irrigated farm in California was just under 142 acres according to the 1969 census.

Chall: Is that right?

Taylor: Yes, what they do habitually in argument is cite as average farm size a figure including both irrigated and non-irrigated farms. That practice I hardly regard as intellectually honest, because we're discussing irrigated farms only.

Chall: So they're all using the same figures but in a slightly different form, or context.

Taylor: They use the ones that look best from their point of view. Going back to the Town Meeting of the Air in 1944 in Fresno, there was the same kind of use of figures. I picked up a Fresno Chamber of Commerce pamphlet inviting investors to come and buy their family farms in Fresno. Here they were, you see, hostile to the defense of our 160-acre limitation, making the argument that 160 acres wasn't enough to support a family. But here is the Chamber of Commerce pamphlet that I picked up down there on Fresno County's principal crops: economic unit, figs, 60 to 80 acres; peaches, economic unit, 30 to 40 acres; oranges, economic unit, 20 to 30
Taylor: acres; apricots, economic unit, 30 to 40 acres; cotton, economic unit, 120 to 160 acres; alfalfa, economic unit, 80 to 120 acres; grapes and raisins, economic unit, 30 to 60 acres; grain and flax (which are hardly grown there anymore, or if they're grown it's as a second crop) 320 acres for the economic unit.*

Chall: How do you account for the conflict?

Taylor: Oh, they wanted to sell the land to families. They weren't thinking about the 160-acre limitation when they put out that leaflet. They had a different motive. In one case they wanted people to come in and make farm homes in Fresno County. In the other, they wanted to protect the big landowners. So they used whatever argument was convenient to the immediate purpose. They devise their arguments according to the position they want to convince people of the validity of.

Straus-Boke Rider - 1947-1950

Chall: The immediate aftermath of Senator Downey's failure on S 912 was the Straus-Boke rider?

Taylor: Yes. This rider was attached to the 1947 Interior Appropriation bill which declared that none of the funds being appropriated shall be used to pay the salaries of any commissioner or regional director of reclamation who is not an engineer. In other words, the assumption was that water development was an engineering matter to be handled solely by engineers.

Of course what they did was ascertain that Michael Straus was a journalist and public relations man and Richard Boke had no previous engineering experience, but had done field work in the bureau. Neither of them were engineers but both were supporting the acreage-limitation law, which Harold Ickes, secretary of the interior, and later Julius Krug insisted that they do! So it was a pretext. I describe this in my article in

*See "Fresno County's Principal Crops." (Exemption of certain projects from land-limitation provisions of federal reclamation laws. Hearings before subcommittee of Senate committee on public lands, 80 Cong., 1 sess., on S 912, 149-152. (1947) PST
When President Truman signed the appropriations bill, he included this statement:

"This rider is designed to effect the removal of two men who have supported the public power policy of the government," (See, that's another aspect of the battle over the reclamation law) "the public power policy of the government and the 160-acre law, which assures that the western lands reclaimed at public expense shall be used for the development of family-sized farms. Its results will be to serve the purposes of special interests desirous of monopolizing the rich farm lands of the West and intent upon stopping the construction of transmission lines for the delivery of power from federal dams. These same interests tried first to get the law changed but failed and having failed, then sought to get the management changed." You see, he unites the private-power interests, meaning especially the P.G. and E., Southern California Edison, etc. and the large landowning interests. That was the political alliance.

Straus and Boke served at urging of Secretary Krug even without salary. Secretary Krug requested that if they could possibly withstand it, that they remain, so they performed their official functions for seven months with no salary checks. After Truman's reelection Congress put them back on the payroll and restored back pay.

Chall: Did this upset the people who had attempted to get them out of office entirely? There was a certain circumvention going on here which they couldn't have been unaware of.

Taylor: Well, I suppose they didn't like them kept on. They had done about everything that anyone could do politically to get them off. After Eisenhower became president, then both Straus and Boke were eased out of their posts within a few months.

Chall: So they were still in a period of testing one another's forces at this point?

Taylor: Oh, yes. They still are to this day! Right now, this month. Sure. In 1947 they found what qualifications Boke and Straus didn't have and then wrote into law that they must be engineers.

Taylor: Back in about 1923 they rode out in somewhat similar fashion Arthur P. Davis, the head of reclamation because he was an engineer and not a businessman. Davis was a very distinguished engineer. So you see, the tactic they do is to find some pretext and then put it on the law books.

Chall: I have seen material on the Straus-Boke rider which indicates that this whole matter actually began in July, 1947, even while S 912 was being debated. At that time, Senator Downey asked the Civil Service Commission to investigate Boke's qualifications. Then from April to June of 1948, Congressman Forest Harness, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda, held hearings to investigate the Bureau of Reclamation, and Senator Downey spoke before that committee during almost the entire time of the hearings. Out of these hearings, came the plan to attach the rider to the interior appropriations bill, and Alfred Elliott was responsible for doing so.

Did this quiet maneuver of Elliott's take the bureau by surprise? What were you, personally, able to do while the rider was going through the Senate, and during the Harness hearings?

Taylor: The Harness hearings were a surprise in the sense that they revealed reliance on outside-of-California allies of the large landowning and private power interests within the state. I remember that Frank T. Bow, general counsel of the committee and later congressman from Indiana, came to Sacramento in advance of the hearings. I doubt that the regional staff of the bureau realized how they would be put on the spot in the almost savage questioning that finally took place.

I had no role in this phase of the attack nor in the defenses, neither in Congress nor in California. My consultant role was uninvolved. The title of the Harness hearings is: Investigation of Bureau of Reclamation Department of the Interior. House subcommittee on publicity and propaganda of committee on expenditures in the executive department, 80 Cong., 2 sess. April-June, 1948. Twenty-seven days of testimony were taken.

President Truman's comment on the Straus-Boke rider in the appropriations bill, which he could not veto without closing down the operations of the Interior Department, closed with this passage: "This type of legislation does great harm to our democratic principles. It is contrary to the spirit if not the letter, of those provisions of the Constitution which guarantee the separation of legislative and executive functions and afford protection against bills of attainder. This type of action
Taylor: subjects federal officials to the risk of being legislated out of office if they incur the wrath of special interests as a result of enforcement of the law." (Engle, Central Valley Project Documents, Part II, 685. House Document No. 246, 85 Cong., 1 sess. 1957.)

The text of the Straus-Boke rider appears on page 685.

Chall: Senator O'Mahoney spoke against the rider on constitutional grounds. Was he a strong supporter of reclamation laws but felt that he and others on his side were powerless at this time?

Taylor: Senator O'Mahoney represented a reclamation state, and was a supporter of the Truman Democratic administration. I do not recall him as a special supporter of the excess land provisions, nor as an opponent. I believe he was serving party and Wyoming interests. I do not know whether or not he felt "powerless."

Chall: Even after the 1948 election Senator Downey seemed to be able to hold the Senate in check on this matter of removing the rider, and reinstating Straus and Boke. What were you, as consultant to Straus able to do at this time when the attacks by Downey against Straus, Boke, and Krug seemed to get quite vicious?

Taylor: Congress restored Straus and Boke to the payroll, and gave them back salaries. I was part-time consultant to Straus and Boke, but uninvolved on this matter. It was handled by those in Washington mainly, and I was remote, in California—not where the action was.

Chall: Were Straus, Boke, or Krug willing at any time, in any way to capitulate to Downey during this year or more of attack on themselves and the reclamation laws which they were trying to enforce?

Taylor: I assume this refers to the year 1947-48. The rider, as I recall, came after the conclusion of the hearings on S 912, in June, 1948. On the day of the S 912 hearings in May, 1947, so I was told, Boke went personally to Secretary Krug to insist there be no yielding or compromise. I heard that Straus had been leaning towards a show of resistance, then to a search for a compromise. This would be true to his general attitude on acreage limitation, as I knew him when we had personal contact. I know he was proud to serve when his salary was cut off, and after restoration placed a framed replica of the restored salary on the wall of his office.

I do not think Krug was ready to compromise on the issue. I spoke with him once in his office, and had every impression that he would not yield.
Chall: I don't think I have ever asked you how and why you were appointed as a consultant to Mr. Straus. What also were your relationships with him. Were they mutually cordial, despite what I assume were differences of opinion on the matter of enforcing the 160-acre limit.

Taylor: As I recall, my consultantship in the Power Division of the office of the secretary that began in 1943, ended, I do not recall just when, but probably around 1945. As I recall, it was Boke who wanted me taken on as consultant to the Bureau of Reclamation. I consulted with him frequently in Sacramento, and he called on me when he came to the Bay Area and we went together to the office of Neil (C.J.) Haggerty of the California Labor Federation, and perhaps to other organizations that gave support to the acreage limitation when support was needed.

Relations with Straus always were friendly, despite that I did not go along with his readiness to compromise. I was dinner guest in his home at least a couple of times. Once I was invited there especially for conference on the subject of compromise. I know I disappointed him because I was unwilling to yield. But we continued to have friendly relations. It was Boke who was staunchly in support of the law under all the pressure.

Boke called me into conference with staff in Sacramento when, under all the pressures, they were beginning to feel they must yield. He sent me into the field especially in the vicinity of Tulare Lake Basin. My report was that he should not yield. The administration did not yield either in 1944 on Tulare Lake, nor later. (The issue is in the circuit court of appeals in San Francisco right now, with a federal district court (Fresno) decision that Congress in the 1944 Flood Control Act had not applied reclamation law to Pine Flat Dam on the Kings River. My own view is that this recent district court decision handed down about sixteen or seventeen years after water for irrigation began to be furnished, is all wrong.)

Chall: You had been close to the bureau since 1943. Did you note whether there was as much feeling against Mr. Bashore when he was commissioner as there developed against Mr. Straus?

Taylor: Mr. Bashore is the man who told the large landowners, "My hands are tied." He would have yielded. He told them in effect, sorry, boys, I can't. Well, they could hardly blame him for that. In other words, higher up. Don't shoot me down, shoot
Taylor: the higher-up. Ickes, FDR, Harry Truman.*

Chall: But Straus and Boke were going to apply the 160-acre limitation. Did they feel it strongly personally?

Taylor: You're asking about Straus now?

Chall: Yes, Straus, as opposed to Bashore. Why did they react differently to him?

Taylor: Straus, bureaucratically, from his point of view, was caught in the middle. Here he had me as a consultant, he'd accepted me as a consultant. I have told you the story of Straus, and Bill Warne, and Goldschmidt, and me in the dining room when they questioned whether we could win on the Elliott rider, which we did.

Chall: When Michael Straus then did come in as the commissioner, in 1946, was he willing to take a strong stand for the 160-acre limitation? Is that the reason they wanted to put him out in 1948?

Taylor: Yes, Straus supported acreage limitation, but not in the sense that Richard Boke would take a strong stand. Boke believed in it and he would fight for it. Not Straus.

Chall: What kept Straus from yielding?

Taylor: He was kept from it by both those above him--Ickes, Abe Fortas, Krug, Truman, and those below him such as Boke and me.

Chall: Then was it really Boke they were after?

Taylor: They were after both, because Straus, although personally more willing to yield, did not do so publicly, so they were after Straus, too.

Chall: Can you compare Charles Carey and Boke? Would Carey have evoked the same kind of opposition? Was it a matter of personality as much as policy differences between them?

Taylor: Carey stood for acreage limitation. It was the law, and he would enforce it. He was against private-power monopoly from his

*In 1947 Bashore submitted to Congress a statement personally supporting acreage limitation. Hearings on S 912, 1297. PST
Taylor: experience in Oregon. When I explained water and land monopoly to him he understood immediately, and agreed both privately and publicly. The congressional battles came after his death, when Boke succeeded him as regional director. Boke was a principled and tough battler for the law.

Chall: I wonder if you can assess what drove Senator Downey to his position on this reclamation issue? His opposition seemed quite intense.

Taylor: It was intense indeed, and it cost him his seat in the Senate. On April 7, 1944, he said, in San Francisco Military Affairs Committee hearings that he hadn't made up his mind yet. But when he made up his mind very shortly, just after he won the Democratic primary renomination, he espoused its opposition and was extremely active. In so doing he went against the platform of his own party. Mrs. Frederic T. Bioletti, wife of a University of California agriculture professor, went up to the Sacramento meeting with liberal Democrats and got it written into the party platform.

The first time I ever saw Downey was at the Faculty Club. It was in the days when he was regarded as an outspoken radical. Well, the worst conservatives are the ones who are radicals and switch over. That is my experience. Ronald Reagan and Sam Yorty are others.

Now what inducements he had, financial, supporting his campaigns, I don't know. At the time I heard that he had unlimited funds. "They" published his book They Would Rule the Valley and it doesn't say who published it, who paid the costs, or even who helped him write it. It features Downey, builds him up, builds up his ego. I guess he thought at the time that it built him up politically as a figure through the state and nationally. I think he thought he was on the make--must have.

Then he saw increasingly, you see, that he was on the spot with the people. What was he going to do, drop it? He didn't drop it. So he clung to it harder and harder, and he clung to it almost to the very end, when finally he decided not to run. Those papers I put into The Bancroft Library deal with this last phase. He inquired of my friend, Dewey Anderson, two or three times, whether I was a Communist. Apparently he thought my opposition was troublesome to him. Anderson assured Downey that I was not a Communist.
Chall: It may have been an easy expedient at that time. Did he really believe, do you know, that his opponents were Communists?

Taylor: Well I think he would have liked to believe that and be able to prove it publicly. Then look what he could do. He could do a McCarthy.

Chall: Do you think he considered Straus and Boke to be Communists?

Taylor: I doubt that; no, I don't.

Chall: There seemed to be some talk during this period of the forties about the Bureau of Reclamation being totalitarian. Let me quote to you a little from a statement of Senator Bradford Crittenden at the California Water Conference in 1945. He claims that the bureau's proposed program 'will relegate the agriculturalist to the lowly level of the European peasant of a thousand years ago where he toiled with crude instruments all through the day and his bowed head was relieved only with the chimes calling him for a simple evening meal.' [PST: chuckles] 'The people cannot within a state by a vote approve or disapprove effectively. If they can't, it is totalitarianism.'

Was this just convenient rhetoric for the period?

Taylor: Well, I didn't really know Senator Crittenden. It surely was convenient rhetoric. Oh, I suppose that in a way he believed it. If you sat down and talked with him, I guess he would recede from a good deal of it. That is what I believe to be true, not what I would say from personal knowledge is true. After all, the family farmers were Grangers. They didn't talk that way, did they? They talked exactly the opposite from Crittenden. Exactly the opposite!

One of the famous passages is by a man who is still living, I believe in Fresno County, A. Setrakian.* The same tone.** I would call it rhetoric and not believing it. I think they believed it was convenient to say it; people halfway fool themselves into believing it, so that they get a semblance of sincerity. It is sincere in the motivation. It is a convenient argument for what

---

**See investigation of western farm labor conditions. Hearings before special Senate committee to investigate farm labor conditions in the West, 77 Cong. 2 sess., on S. Res. 299, 246, 247. (1942) PST

*Mr. Setrakian died July 1, 1974. MC
Taylor: they want at the time. They're sincere about what they want and they find something they think will be effective. I think that is probably the way to say it. But that they intellectually believed what Crittenden said—well, I have grave doubts about that.

The Truman Campaign - 1948

Chall: We haven't talked about how Truman was elected president in 1948. You said that Truman was in California, that you had talked to him about the 160-acre limitation. What was his basic stand on the balance between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers?

Taylor: Oh he would really have liked to have abolished the Corps of Engineers, put its work in a civil agency under the Interior Department. That's what his Morris L. Cooke water commission recommended.

Chall: He had I have assumed from the preceding discussion a strong feeling for reclamation and the 160-acre limitation laws.

Taylor: Oh, yes!

Chall: Coming down, let's say, from the Roosevelt philosophy or Ickes?

Taylor: I suppose it came from the fact that he started out on a Missouri farm. He'd walked behind the plow.

Chall: So he was a supporter. His appointment of Secretary Krug carried on the Ickes tradition.

Taylor: Secretary Krug stood with us. He held the reclamation people in line in '47 in the S 912 hearings. They say that Boke went to Krug in the morning when the other bureau fellows had prepared to go down and make just a little showing, then give in to some compromise. Krug said, "No, you don't." And Boke gave the hearings his utmost. There's the record.

Chall: When he came out to campaign in California against Dewey and Warren, were the stands that he took on acreage limitation and things of this kind startlingly different, on the record, from what Warren and Dewey were saying, or didn't they discuss it.
Taylor: I quote Tom Dewey in one of my articles here, I think it was in Seattle his one-sentence reference to the Straus-Boke rider which was to this effect: that it wouldn't be necessary for the Congress to force his administration to appoint qualified men to the bureau or any other post. It was made in a way so the other side would understand that he was committing himself to their kind of appointments in interior and reclamation. Most people hearing it would just regard it as well, he was going to appoint good men to the office. [See "Excess Land Law: Execution of a Public Policy" 64 Yale L.J. 477 at 509.)

Chall: But you all knew and they all knew what he meant? Then if Truman were going to campaign in the Central Valley--

Taylor: He campaigned in the Central Valley and he carried the Central Valley and the state by about 18,000 votes. Truman was what you might call a little man, not a big corporate man but a man right down-to-earth with people. Dewey was "official," a pompous New York district attorney. The president is always greeted with "Hail to the Chief?" They even played it for Dewey before the election. Well, that kind of personality the people didn't like, but they went for little Harry. He was more like them, down closer to them. Truly he was. And Harry stayed solid on this acreage limitation issue until he went out of office.

James Patton, the president of the National Farmers Union, went personally to Harry Truman in the last weeks before Harry was going out of office [1952] and in this way made the Interior Department straighten out its record on points where it was beginning to yield on acreage limitation.

I told Patton about it and Patton went to Truman. Certainly that caused confusion in the Interior Department because he made them straighten out the record.

Chall: Did you tell me when you were in my office the other day about some article that was written about your meeting with Harry Truman during his campaign here which wasn't completely clear?

Taylor: There is a paperback by Irwin Ross entitled The Loneliest Campaign. The author tells my part in President Truman's coming to Berkeley in 1948, where he gave the commencement address (page 79) but he tells it in reverse. My version is this: At the request of Oscar Chapman, then assistant secretary of the interior, relayed to me through Max Stern, of the regional staff of the Bureau of Reclamation, Sacramento, I was asked to ascertain whether President Sproul would be hospitable to a visit to the
Taylor: University from President Truman. I called upon President Sproul's assistant, George A. Pettitt. Shortly I received a telephone call from President Sproul personally, saying cordially that he would welcome such a visit from the president of the United States. I relayed this answer to Max Stern. The commencement address by President Truman at the University followed.

Helen Gahagan Douglas: Campaign for the Senate - 1950

Chall: Let's talk about the big election campaign of 1950. Senator Downey decided to retire from the Senate. I could tell from reading the materials you had placed in The Bancroft Library, that Senator Downey had been criticized for many years by labor and political leaders for his stand on reclamation and his lack of interest in other issues. Even as early as 1944, someone had suggested that he resign because of his stand on the Elliott rider.

Taylor: Well, as I told you, he was against his own party platform.

Chall: Did Senator Downey have the support of a faction of the Democratic party? Was there a strong conservative wing which supported him?

Taylor: I don't know how strong it was in terms of votes. You see they got our liberal Democratic votes in '44 because we weren't going to go for the Republican, whoever it was at the time. Downey came out for the Elliott rider within about a week after he won the Democratic primary, and he had our votes right in his pocket. So we swallowed him; we had to vote for our own man in spite of it. Then we followed him for six years at his succession of hearings in 1944 and 1947. Labor, Grange, veterans, church social action groups—all turned out against him at these hearings. The San Francisco News exposed his position on acreage limitation repeatedly. So he had hard going in his own party. Finally, Helen Gahagan Douglas opposed him for the Democratic nomination to the Senate. Seeing defeat ahead, Downey at the last minute withdrew. He let people think it was his health, but that was not poor enough to keep him from running, had he thought he could win.

Chall: By 1950 was it pretty clear to Downey that he had lost whatever party, liberal, or other support he had had in the past? Was he
Chall: afraid he'd lose in the primary to another Democrat, or even a Republican under existing cross-filing?

Taylor: Yes, certainly he anticipated loss to Helen Gahagan Douglas. I do not have an opinion on whether he thought Nixon could beat him in the primary through cross-filing. Nixon was against acreage limitation, as was Downey.

Chall: Did you have anything to do with the decision of Helen Douglas to try for the Senate?

Taylor: I certainly helped to educate her on the issue. Dorothea Lange and I drove her around the San Joaquin Valley, showing her the difference between large-scale and family-farm communities. She would have accepted me as her campaign manager, I think. Instead I gave her one of my ablest graduate students in economics—Harold S. Tipton.*

Chall: Were you an official or un-official consultant? I have seen some exceptionally well-prepared material on the reclamation issue which you prepared for her campaign. How did this come about?

Taylor: It came about naturally and easily. Sometimes I offered it; sometimes she invited it.

Chall: Do you have any idea why the Democratic party induced Manchester Boddy to run against Mrs. Douglas during the primary? What had been his stand on issues with respect to migrant labor, water, and land which were important to you? Did his stand change during or before the primary?

Taylor: Manchester Boddy was a liberal Democrat. Before the primary he sat me down at a typewriter in his Los Angeles newspaper office, asked me to write a pro-acreage limitation editorial. I drafted one. He edited it, improved it, and ran it in his L.A. News. I suppose conservative interests wanted anyone less liberal than Helen Gahagan Douglas, and knew that her Democratic opponent would have to be fairly liberal to have any chance at all of defeating her in the primary. In the primary Boddy didn't fight for the 160-acre limitation, nor against it. He didn't make an issue of it.

*Have you seen the magazine Ms. for October 1973? "The First to Know the Real Nixon: Helen Gahagan Douglas"? PST
Chall: What do you recall about the Voorhis-Nixon election in terms of those issues in which you were vitally interested?

Taylor: I didn't know much about the Nixon-Voorhis campaign at the time. I don't think that acreage limitation was (at the surface, at least) an issue. I have no doubt that underneath, those who wanted to remove Voorhis were of the kind that would want to oppose enforcement of the acreage limitation. But, it wasn't, to my knowledge, on the surface at all. However, remember that Jerry Voorhis fought the Elliott rider in the House on March 22, 1944.

Chall: Was it more on the surface during the Nixon-Helen Gahagan Douglas campaign?

Taylor: Yes, of course it was. Nixon told the people in Imperial Valley that he was against acreage limitation and, of course, she campaigned strongly, but strongly on the acreage-limitation issue. That was her big issue north of the Tehachapi, and she did a tremendous job on that.

Chall: Did you think that Mrs. Douglas could defeat Nixon?

Taylor: Well, we certainly wanted her to. But right after the primary came the Korean War.

Chall: That changed the whole basis of the campaign; the state issues didn't have the paramount importance.

Taylor: I went to San Francisco to hear Nixon's opening speech. He gave that speech four times in one day---in San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Sacramento. The whole temper was closely akin to the McCarthy attitude. I mean, he conveyed an impression that in those days of renewed wartime, we had to have people whose patriotism could be depended upon---meaning of course himself, and not Helen Gahagan Douglas.

Chall: It was certainly a bitter battle to say the least.

Taylor: A dirty one. It was like his 1970 campaign in which he had the same adviser, Murray Chotiner. In other words, play upon people's fears and prejudices. Well, he's gone far on that tactic.

Chall: So that although Sheridan Downey was out in terms of support for the 160-acre limitation and things of this kind you didn't gain anything, did you?
Taylor: No, we didn't in that election. We got a man who was, and is, on the other side. But what we did gain was this advantage: that our opponent now was in the other party. The most difficult thing in sustaining an issue is to have your own man buckle on you. That's hard. Well, later we had Democratic Clair Engle give in on it, also.

State Politics and the Reclamation Issue

Chall: Eventually we'll talk about Engle. But it just brings up a question that I had in my mind about whether it is possible to be a senator in the State of California and take a strong position against the large land interests.

Taylor: Well, that's a good question and so far the answer would appear to be no, although today Senator Alan Cranston sponsors a bill to strengthen acreage limitation.

Did I tell you about an incident down at the CDC convention in Fresno this morning when Engle was getting ready to run for the Senate? It was a contest there between him and Peter Odegard. I'll tell you what he said to me when we met crossing the street, and what I said to him. What Engle said to me was, "Paul, you can't wrap the Southern Pacific around my neck." I responded and he rocked back as though I'd hit him when I said, "Clair, the Southern Pacific has wrapped itself around your neck." Exactly true as became clear as daylight after he became senator.

We almost won with Odegard in the CDC, but didn't quite make it. I think I know why. Odegard almost won. It was our own people who kicked in.

Chall: Why was that? Was this over other issues or just the hope that a man well-known already would win?

Taylor: Well now here I am giving you what I believe to be true. You don't get this down on paper. I am talking now about some of my good friends. Some of the people who had been on my own side detached the Santa Clara CDC people, Grace McDonald more or less, a Henry Georger who had done beautifully in '44 against Downey, but who now came out for Engle. I don't know just what they sold her. She was not corrupted, you understand, but she was manipulated. I think what they told her was they would get for her a canal down into the Santa Clara Valley which would replenish the ground waters
Taylor: which were going down, down, down. So they promised her a unit of a project. I've forgotten exactly the details but her stance was pro-Engle. And I know from other good friends that right down to now she doesn't really stand behind me on the acreage limitation. If she had come over on our [Odegard's] side, with the people that she could influence, I think we could have won over Engle at the CDC convention.

Engle made himself an eligible candidate for the Senate and was elected, having done some things like getting water from the Trinity River for the CVP. So appearing to be at least partly on our side, he had the big landowners wanting him to be senator. After becoming senator he served them well, seeking exemption of the State Water Project from acreage limitation.

Chall: Well the intraparty struggles, of course, are never easily documented.

Taylor: Yes. Dewey Anderson, who is from Santa Clara County, and knew Grace McDonald very well, said to me at the CDC convention, "I just can't do a thing with her. You've got to talk to her."

Chall: I see. She was a pivotal person there, you think?

Taylor: Well, between Odegard and Engle we were running neck and neck and just missed.

Chall: What about Alan Cranston, to bring things up to date in our discussion about whether it is possible to be a senator and be for acreage limitation--at least a Democratic senator.

Taylor: Well, I'll tell you one--at a Fresno CDC convention that year he ran against Pierre Salinger. I went to him. I think a couple of us went up to his room. Who was with me? Maybe Dewey Anderson. I asked him about the acreage limitation and he said, "Paul, you write me a letter and I'll write you a letter for the acreage limitation on condition that you put it in a strong box."

I said, "You give me your word, that's enough for me, I'll not ask you to do that." I believed him then, I believe him now. Now he is a senator. He is not carrying our ball, but if a constituent likes him, he will say, "I am for the acreage limitation." I believe if it comes to a crucial vote he will vote for the acreage limitation.

You remember he was running against Max Rafferty who had knocked out Kuchel in the Republican primary. Kuchel had been
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Taylor: on-guard largely--largely acreage limitation. He wouldn't ever call himself that. He would say he was for it. But he led the fight for an exemption for the State Water Project, which is a big but. He was playing for it on the federal, but not on the state level.

Well, what I heard was that Cranston gave to the people whom he wanted to win over--Kuchel votes that were sore at Rafferty--an impression that although he was for the acreage limitation, he would not press the issue.* So you are coming pretty close, I think, to my answer to your question "Can a United States senator from California be for the acreage limitation?" Well, the answer up to now is, well, he can't make it. We have congressmen.

Chall: Yes, congressmen can probably deal with it because they come from different areas.

Taylor: Certain districts.

Chall: It depends on where they come from. Jerome Waldie can certainly do it without great harm.

Taylor: Waldie is running on the acreage limitation for governor of the state.

Chall: Oh, he is?

Taylor: Oh, yes! Waldie is going to try it. Whether he'll make it I don't know. He's a very good man.

Chall: Well it will be interesting to see the issue raised.

Taylor: He thinks he can sell this event to people in Southern California. But you put your finger on a very important question. California is not a Northern, Eastern, or Middlewestern state. It is in this respect much more closely akin to the old South with its large plantation holdings--much more. That brings you right down to the Nader Report.**

---

*Cranston is now among the sponsors of a bill to strengthen the acreage limitation. PST

Chall: I have been reading newspaper accounts which vary considerably. There is a tremendous amount of criticism about the report. I saw yesterday that Unruh had said, that eighty percent of it is correct. The twenty percent that was incorrect he felt provided serious questions about the whole report. The headline dealt with the errors.

Taylor: I understand the Bee was quite savage in its reportage. The L.A. Times--I haven't seen an editorial but I have their news report--they did very well. The New York Times did very well. It [this issue] hurts people. It hurt Jess Unruh on the acreage limitation. I've told you haven't I what he said?

Chall: Not Unruh.

Taylor: All right. This is 1959 in the legislature. There was a bill in by a Democrat to adopt a state 160-acre measure. I am reading now from the June 12, 1959, San Francisco Chronicle, Earl Behrens, the political editor:

"At one stage in the bitter debate Assemblyman Jess M. Unruh (Dem. Los Angeles) declared, 'At times we have to rise above principle.'"

"He had been twitted by Assemblyman Lloyd W. Lowery (Dem. Rumsey) for opposing the latter's water-acreage amendment as part of both the state and national Democratic platforms."

About a year and a half ago when he was running for governor, up in the Berkeley hills he appeared before one of the Berkeley Democratic clubs. I quoted that back to him. It rocked him all right! He said, 'Well, it is a complicated subject. How could you explain to people in a paragraph what it was?' You see, he tried to confuse the issue. I got a round of applause from everybody in the house. The Unruh story of 1959, I think, testifies again to the political power of the large land-ownership interests which we have been discussing.
The Press and the Reclamation Issue - 1944-1950

Chall: One question that I meant to ask you earlier was about the San Francisco News and its reporter, Ruth Finney, who certainly seemed to be knowledgeable about water issues in her columns.

Taylor: The free press and the non-monopolized press is extremely important. The editors of the News during that time were liberal editors. Ruth Finney, their Washington correspondent, was the wife of Robert S. Allen. Remember the Washington-Merry-Go-Round? He was partner of Drew Pearson for a long time. Ruth Finney was definitely on our side and in preparing her weekly letter to the News, she would go round and gathered up the latest news and rumors in the air on this issue, then the News would print her letter, and that was how we kept informed of what was going on in Washington. It was enormously important. Now nothing like that is possible.

Chall: Her columns were quite informative.

Taylor: They were very dependable. What we were told--this is again, in the air, but it seems to fit the fact, that the other side had gone to Roy Howard to close off what the News was doing that was so helpful to us. I know that the News was supporting Helen Gahagan Douglas through the primary. They did not support her for the election. I was there when they told her politely that they could not support her in the final campaign. I don't think the editorial people who said this to her were enthusiastic about having to say it, but were following orders. That's my impression.

Then the News was merged with the Call. Now we have only the Examiner, Chronicle, and Oakland Tribune. So on this subject it is almost true that if you want to read anything on this the only place you get it today is in the underground press, e.g. the Bay Guardian. This issue is dodged by the press, blanketed, occasionally, even distorted.

Chall: The Sacramento Bee doesn't cover this in great detail anymore?

Taylor: The Sacramento Bee went for the State Water Plan. The Los Angeles Times had something, had one article on the Imperial Valley, from which I quoted to you. The Sacramento Bee ran a series on Imperial Valley which was handled capably and honestly. The Nader Report which was critical on the water situation, I haven't seen it but what I understand is that the Bee was almost savage in its attacks on the Nader Report.
Taylor: So it is very hard when you have a press that is either against you or muffles the news or both.*

Chall: Many people face this problem with the press.

Taylor: Congress let the newspapers out from under the anti-trust act, which means that we can have virtual news monopolies.

Chall: This often makes it very difficult to get another side's approach.

Taylor: Yes. How are you going to inform people if they don't get what you have to say?

Chall: When I was poking around in your box downstairs, I noticed that there was, of course, a considerable amount of press coverage of those hearings in 1947 and 1948.

Taylor: In those days there was a lot of press coverage, which is in contrast to the situation today. The San Francisco News was particularly generous in its coverage, and it was in sympathy with the acreage limitation law. Through the grapevine I was advised that the other side had closed the San Francisco News to us. The course of events confirmed it. The Washington Post, the New York Times are not completely closed, but they are closed off from taking our side. The Post was originally strongly pro-acreage limitation in the mid-forties, but that changed as a matter of policy adopted from above. I was so advised by one of its top editorial writers who had written strong editorials for acreage limitation in the mid-forties. He could do so no longer.

Chall: I see. In that period, too, I found clippings from papers all over the country; it wasn't just the local papers. Many of the articles had by-lines, and some of them were editorialized--

Taylor: Remember those were New Deal days, and the Department of Interior under Harold Ickes was supporting the limitation. And we had an

*See Memorandum from Bruce Brugmann: Commentary on Water in the News. Hearings on the newspaper preservation act before subcommittee on antitrust and monopoly of Senate judiciary committee, 91 Cong., 1 sess., on S 1520, 58ff. PST
Taylor: information division which was active in the East. Where any of
us had contacts—I personally knew the editor of the Des Moines
Register and Alan Barth of the Washington Post—we availed our-
selves of whatever personal contacts we had.

Chall: Some of the articles were in a series in papers around the
country, and they mentioned the Arvin-Dinuba study. So that they
brought it into the context of the hearings and the basic
controversies of those days.

Taylor: Oh yes, there was a recent study on that by Richard Kirkendall of
the University of Missouri. I believe that within weeks, Professor
Goldschmidt will be testifying again in Washington on the subject
of the Arvin-Dinuba study and its possible implications in other
parts of the country for facing the destruction of homogeneous
rural communities. The newspapers in Chicago, the Washington Post
the New York Times are all writing about the agricultural
revolution, the entry of corporations into agriculture on a
large scale, and the destructive effects on the characters of
the rural societies. It's becoming a live issue again in a
broader area than ever before. I have not noticed that either
the Post or the New York Times pick up the acreage limitation
issue which suggests to me that they remain closed in taking a
position on that.

Chall: I see, but the acreage limitation issue is--

Taylor: With respect to other parts of the country, they pick it up.

Chall: Did you remember from the forties the people who were writing in
the Christian Science Monitor--Roscoe Fleming and Mary Hornaday--
were they your contacts?

Taylor: One of the men, Ray Brunn did graduate work with me and responded
very well.

Chall: And he was on the Monitor?

Taylor: He took my side, and he was on the staff of the Christian Science
Monitor. I haven't been in touch with him for some years, and I
don't know just where he is now. The last I knew he was in the
vicinity of Boston, and I think I heard that he had gone to
Washington. I also met Saville Davis of the Monitor.

Chall: Did you know the "Old Timer" of the Orland Register who wrote
regularly of this 160-acre limitation?
Taylor: No, I didn't personally know him. Of course Orland was the first reclamation project in California. In order to get the federal government to put a reservoir on Stoney Gorge Creek, the Orland landowners voluntarily agreed to a forty-acre limitation. It was the giant corporations, you see, who resisted any acreage limitation at all in the forties.

Chall: Why forty acres?

Taylor: Because that was regarded as adequate for a family farm.

Chall: I see, has that been changed there?

Taylor: Yes, it has been raised by law to 160 acres. I don't know to what extent there has been consolidation of farms.

With respect to this broad newspaper coverage, remember that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior had a strong information division in Sacramento and in Washington, with very active men, most of them with newspaper background. Max Stern in Sacramento had served on the staff of the San Francisco News.

Chall: This was one of the criticisms against them, wasn't it, at the time of the Straus-Boke rider hearings?

Taylor: Yes, sure, Straus and Boke were effective in getting the word out to the public, so of course, the opponents of acreage limitation didn't like them.

Chall: I think Sidney Harding in his oral history made some comments about the public relations aspect of the bureau, and was glad that it was cut out at a later date.*

Taylor: Why shouldn't the public information division support a law that they were bound to enforce? Why shouldn't they tell people about it?

Chall: In the South, in an article that I read in the Nashville, Tennessee press (about 1947), they were concerned about the

Chall: cotton agriculture coming to California because they could get the water to grow huge acreages of cotton.

Taylor: Yes, the cotton interests of the South have from time to time shown awareness of what was happening to them from the spread of reclamation in the West and their irritation at it. It is true that in Arizona, California, particularly, we pulled the rug out from under them. But, they were not sufficiently aware in time to stop it, although at times they made gestures.

Chall: They would have had to stop it through their congressmen?

Taylor: That's right. The original law--the 1902-law--was passed in no small measure because Congressman Underwood, of Alabama, gave his support to the bill. He threw his support, saying that the development of irrigation in the West would open the lands to the farm boys of the East and South as well as the West. Well, of course, the cutting off of the acreage limitation has choked off these hopes that he expressed.

Chall: Cotton is not one of the crops that can be grown on 160 acres or 320 acres?

Taylor: Well, it certainly can be. The large farmers emphasize the advantages of larger acreages relying particularly on the argument about the heavy machinery that they need. But, of course, the truth of the matter is that you don't have to have a large farm to use heavy machinery. Have we discussed that before?

Chall: Yes, we have.

Combining Duties as Professor and Consultant

Chall: How did you manage your University work when you had to take time out for going back to Washington to work during these years?

Taylor: Well, I went back as consultant, and of course it was my responsibility as a consultant to ascertain the views of interested or potentially interested parties, and to report them back to the Interior Department which I did. As for the University, remember there were summer vacations and sabbaticals and half sabbaticals, and a few outright leaves of absences.
Taylor: At no time was there any conflict; if I went back to Washington during a year it would be for a short time and always arrangements were made for the care of my classes. Either someone would take them or I would take them myself, doubling up before and after. There was never any issue over my government public service that I can recall at any time. And of course a great deal of the work was done in the summer. I would add that there was nothing I did in those years as consultant on such a subject as reclamation that did not, in my judgment, add immeasurably to the value of my work as a professor working with students on campus. The experiences were invaluable, and the University didn't have to pay for them. I taught my students better and published more and better.

Chall: Well, you certainly could bring what they call relevant material to the classroom.

Taylor: Yes, I could and did. I don't recall that anyone ever charged my teaching with irrelevance. I'm bombarded with student inquiries even now in my retirement. My door is knocked upon several times a week, and my telephone rings with students who want to talk with me about this very issue on which I was originally a government consultant.

Chall: They find your name--

Taylor: Almost thirty years later.

Chall: It's as current as last month's San Francisco Chronicle. When you testified at the Adlai Stevenson hearings--

Taylor: That advertised my interest in reclamation a bit, sure.

Chall: All these years you were considered a key man in terms of philosophy and action on the 160-acre limitation?

Taylor: You should have read what they considered me!

Chall: During those years when Downey was attacking very strongly those people who stood fast for the acreage limitation, was any pressure put on the University and on you to quit your position as consultant?

Taylor: No pressure that ever reached me. If it reached the University administrators they never transmitted any pressure down to me on this hot and enduring issue. Faculty research funds are made
Taylor: available to me normally, over long years and even now. As for my government consultantships, remember that engineering professors served private landholding interests for remuneration and testified against acreage limitation freely, unrestrained by the University. Together we served the academic community well and freely. The fact that some of my colleagues and I held opposed views on public policy was no reason to restrain either of us. Diversity of views can facilitate the search for truth.
( Interviews 8 and 9, February 17 and 24, 1972)

The Truman Administration

The Water Resources Policy Commission - 1950

Chall: Since there seemed to be an hiatus in major congressional debates on the reclamation issue after 1950, perhaps we can shift our focus to the administration, where the next important action seemed to take place.

First of all the Water Resources Policy Commission established by President Truman. You wrote an article dealing with it.*

Taylor: I didn't like what it did. Here was a commission, formed under a very good man, Morris Llewellen Cooke, who didn't ask me (for whatever reasons, I'm not implying anything)--he just didn't happen to ask me onto the staff of that commission.

Cooke asked others whose views on the acreage limitation were not in accord with mine. They were for giving way in whole or in part, and of course, I wanted to stop that if I could. The New Deal administration and Interior Department under Harold Ickes had held up very well. Secretary J.A. Krug also had held up well. It was getting a bit wobbly under Secretary Oscar Chapman; so I was trying to hold the fort. That's what the article was written for. Actually, I don't think it had any effect on the work or influence of the commission. The giving way of Chapman I think I described in my Yale law article.**


Taylor: One of my colleagues from the College of Agriculture, David Weeks, was appointed to the staff of the commission. He was not as devoted to the acreage limitation as I, so the report took a somewhat more relaxed position which I didn't like.

More than once I've been left off commissions studying subjects in which I've had an active interest. Of course my interest and my strong views may be the very reason I was left off staffs of commissions (or of commissions) such as the water commission, and the Migratory Labor Commission, both under President Truman. He set up a very good commission on the latter subject, whose executive head, Varden Fuller, took his doctorate with me. That commission was very good.

Chall: So you think that leaving you off the commissions is deliberate?

Taylor: Deliberate, oh, yes.

Chall: You think it was deliberate on the part of Morris Cooke?

Taylor: No. I do not know who influenced the appointments. Perhaps Secretary Chapman. Probably I was regarded as the unyielding and controversial.

Chall: The article you wrote was quite detailed and well-researched. Do you think that any of them saw the article? It was meant to reach them, I judge.

Taylor: Well, I don't say for a fact, but my guess is that I sent the commission a reprint. That would be according to my habit, to try to put it right in front of them. I wasn't just seeking to add to my bibliography.

Chall: Could you tell me for whom you wrote that rather lengthy critique of the water resource commission's report? It doesn't cover quite the same material that is in your article. For whom was this intended? You were referring to volume one, chapter eleven of the final published report. I saw it bound into Volume XIV of your personal collection.

Taylor: Well, I think I probably sent it to the commission, to Morris Llewellyn Cooke. I did this in 1951, as a critique of the chapter.

Chall: Well, you've certainly taken the chapter carefully apart and commented on it. I was curious because when you bind material into your volume you indicate, generally, what purpose or for whom it was done. There wasn't any notation here.
Taylor: I did it, I suppose, because I was very critical of that chapter.

Chall: And you think you sent it to Cooke.

Taylor: Oh, I think I did. I made an appointment to see Cooke and did confer with him. Probably I gave him the draft critique to which you refer, then wrote the article in the *Western Political Quarterly*.

Chall: That's all I really need to know because the material speaks for itself. But somebody doing research in the future may want to know, as I did--

Taylor: --what I did with it?

Chall: Yes, how it happened to be there.

Taylor: Well, I did it on my own. I didn't like the way they had written it. The handling of the acreage limitation by the Water Resources Policy Commission is it's weakest point. They had other consultants than myself, and I didn't like what they fed into, or allowed to go into the commission report. I might have supplied a copy of this critique to the Bureau of Reclamation. I was a bureau consultant but I drafted it as an individual commentator.

Chall: That's right. You still were a consultant at that time. This was Truman's commission.

Taylor: I remember calling on Morris Cooke in Washington. Almost certainly I must have presented the critique to him at that time.

Chall: You have respect for Morris Cooke.

Taylor: Oh, yes!

Chall: He was free to pick his own consultants, wasn't he?

Taylor: Yes. I don't suppose that Morris Cooke had any idea of what was going to come up on the acreage limitation issue at all.

Chall: He might not have known what all the issues were, either, when he picked his men.

Taylor: No, I think not. No, I didn't hold anything against Morris Cooke. His specialty had been public power.
A Tough Row to Hoe

BY MICHAEL HANES

SENATOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON III today said that rapid and massive changes to multi-million-dollar farming corporations may be dooming family farms to bankruptcy and sending rural workers onto city welfare rolls.

The Illinois Democrat, conducting three days of hearings in Northern California as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, heard his fears echoed by a series of witnesses who testified in the Federal Building here.

Among the developments in agriculture listed in the first two hearings were these:

• More than half of California's 11.8 million acres of farmland are in corporate ownership - a million of them controlled by Tenncel, a nationwide conglomerate.

• It is becoming increasingly difficult, according to a senior law officer of America's Agricultural Adjustment Agency, to find economic justification for loans to California peach and prune growers.

• The corporate farm, which had been regarded as a California phenomenon, is now bursting into similar growth in such places as Maine, Florida, and even the Midwest.

• Do farm subsidies, tax breaks, wage increases, land reclamation projects and agricultural research work to the special advantage of the biggest and richest farmers? Stevenson inquired.

If that is the sum total of United States farm policy, we must face the fact that we are not helping farmers - we are subsidizing Simon Legree, Stevenson said.

The problem is that reforms don't work," Ballis continued. "The crop subsidy was supposed to keep small farmers on the land, but it has been used for the last 30 years to drive them off."

Paul Taylor, professor emeritus of economics at the University of California at Berkeley, testified he was waiting skeptically to see whether the United States Department of Agriculture would maintain the crop subsidy, limits ordered last year by Congress.

"If the farm operations lose money, the consumer, in the long run, will have to pay for it," Miller said.

"They aren't really interested in agriculture," Miller said. "They're building the land for speculative purposes, and it won't be the small farmer who will be buying those lands, and the big farmer will be buying them."

John F. Kennedy, a close friend and perhaps a political role model for Stevenson, was depicted as the kind of man who would have shared the senator's interests in agriculture.
Chall: When you went to see him to apprise him of your views, did he take an interest?

Taylor: Yes! I think the acreage-limitation issue was entirely new to him. His earlier concerns had been largely with public power.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: But it was too late for him to do anything about it when I saw him. The drafting of the report was too far advanced.

Chall: By and large, how much of the commission's recommendations were taken and put into some kind of practical policy, do you know?

Taylor: I don't remember.

Chall: In areas that you knew about.

Taylor: I don't know. In acreage limitation, as I recall, the commission's recommendations had no effect.

Chall: While you were concerned about the relaxing of standards on acreage limitation by the Truman commission, you felt, by comparison with the goals of the Eisenhower commission on water policies that the former looked good. I'm trying to understand the seeming contradiction between your concern about the Truman commission in 1951, and what you state in footnote 125 on page 21 of your article "Excess Land Law: Legislative Erosion of a Public Policy," published in 1958 in the Rocky Mountain Law Review. In this latter article you indicate the policy of the Cooke commission was a good one. Would you comment on that.

Taylor: The Cooke commission was better than the Eisenhower commission. One weakness of the former was its recommendation (Vol. I, p. 14-15, para. 44) that "supplemental water" should be relieved of acreage limitation upon payment of "full cost." All reclamation, however, is "supplemental." This gimmick was played upon during the drive to exempt CVP from acreage limitation. The "Engle formula" in 1956 employed the "full cost" alternative to acreage limitation. Of course "full cost" in practice was not really "full cost."

Chall: Typically, are commission reports like this ever made much use of?

Taylor: I may have told you before, the comment that Henry Fowler (chief of staff of the La Follette committee in its California studies, later secretary of the treasury) said to me: "Congress usually acts on about the third report back."
Taylor: Well, there's a lot to that. You can see Senator Stevenson and Senator Harris in January of this year of 1972, digging into farm-labor matters that the La Follette committee dug into in 1939, '40, '41, '42. This isn't to say that the work of the commissions is unimportant. It just says that the response comes slowly.

Chall: Sometimes a time lag can be serious.

Taylor: Yes, I didn't say that it wouldn't be desirable to have prompt action. But those reports tend to be an instrument for informing the public, and it takes a while for the public to modify its views, shape its wishes, make these clear to the candidates for whom they vote, and get them embodied in law. That's a slow process; we always lag and always will in most matters.

Recommendations for modifications in policy such as the Morris Cooke report, and the more recent Reagan Task Force on Acreage Limitation, are printed and they're supposed to be influential, but if you can block them when submitted to Congress for action, they're ineffective.

Chall: Do you think President Truman was genuinely concerned about general problems of water in the United States when he set up that commission?

Taylor: I know President Truman was on our side on acreage limitation; no question about it. When he came to speak at the U.C. commencement in 1947 I saw him personally, and his actions before and after confirmed his staunch position.

The Hoover Commission - 1947

Chall: What about the Hoover Commission?

Taylor: The Hoover Commission recommendation that I particularly remember was to consolidate water development in the Department of the Interior, in other words, abolish the Corps of Engineers.

Chall: Still waiting for it, aren't you?

Taylor: I am. An excellent recommendation which at the time I understood Harry Truman would have liked to have put through Congress, but
Taylor: the pressures against him were too strong.

Chall: Were you consulted at all by the Hoover group?

Taylor: No.

Chall: Did you know Arthur Maass?

Taylor: Yes.

Chall: And who was he?

Taylor: Arthur Maass—his book entitled *Muddy Waters* really represents his doctorate at Harvard University. Harvard took him on its faculty. He is there now in Littauer Center, a very good man. He studied particularly the Corps of Engineers at Pine Flat Dam. I drove him down the Valley to Pine Flat Dam the only time that he was ever physically on the ground there. Later, in 1958, I encouraged him to testify in favor of acreage limitation at the hearing before Senator Clinton Anderson of the Senate Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, and that Maass did very well.

Chall: So that even though you weren't consulted by the Hoover Commission—

Taylor: That staff recommendation to consolidate the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation in the Interior Department was okay. I don't recall that the Hoover Commission made any recommendation about acreage limitation.

Chall: But you had some effect on Arthur Maass.

Taylor: Well, he was with the commission and I discussed acreage limitation with him.

Chall: He studied the Kings River project, I think as a member of a task force of the Hoover Commission. At least this is my assumption based on your water commission article, page 440, note 23. I could be wrong.

Taylor: No, I think you are right. His thesis and book grew out of his work for the commission. His book *Muddy Waters* is relevant to the recent court decision on Tulare Lake down in Fresno federal district court. I have told you before about the recent court decision that acreage limitation does not apply to the Pine Flat Dam. There is material in *Muddy Waters* which will be useful if anybody will
Taylor: contest that decision. But we're up against an administration headed by President Nixon who's been against the acreage limitation from the start. Having got a decision that the acreage limitation does not apply, it's unlikely that he'll appeal.* The Nixon administration did not appeal the Turrentine Imperial Valley decision.**

Chall: You wrote two articles during this 1949-1950 period, the one on the water commission and another, "Central Valley Project: Water and Land." Both were published in the Western Political Quarterly. Why did you choose this journal?

Taylor: Because that's where I could get them published promptly. When one writes on a contemporary issue a concern for history is not enough.

Michael Straus-Felix Cohen Correspondence - 1947

Chall: You have stated that you, through James Patton, got Oscar Chapman to tighten up on his stand on acreage limitation before the Truman administration went out of office. I'm curious about whether you knew at the time about the Felix Cohen opinion and the so-called administrative letter 303, which would have permitted water users to—so it seems—pay out the construction costs of bringing reclamation water to the land, and thereby be permitted to retain their land in excess of 160 acres.

The first time you refer to this exchange of correspondence is in your 1955 Yale Law Journal article "The Excess Land Law: Execution of a Public Policy." Had you just come into knowledge of this correspondence, which was so important to your side? Even though you were consultant to Straus, he hadn't let you know about it?

*Attorney General Richard Kleindienst, under pressure from Senator Fred Harris, of Oklahoma, and Congressman Jerome Waldie, of California, did appeal. Kleindienst was facing confirmation at the time. PST

**This is described in detail in my article, "Water Land, and Environment, Imperial Valley: Law Caught in the Winds of Politics," 13 Natural Resources Journal 1. (1973) PST
Taylor: Oh, that was in the two volumes of documentation on the excess land law of the Department of the Interior prepared at the request of Congress. Straus consulted me from time to time, but made his own decision which sometimes I learned about later. I have those two volumes here, which laid out what was in the files for me to see. Those two volumes gave me access to documents which I didn't have before.

You see, my problem first, under Ickes, was to inform him what the issue was. He was solid in his support. Then came successors. Krug was almost solid. He would not take up the Imperial Valley situation, but he did stand firm in 1947 against Sheridan Downey in those hearings on S 912 through which Downey sought to break down the acreage limitation. Krug stood firm on that. Then came Chapman who wobbled on the issue, and it was then that I went to Jim Patton who went to Harry Truman, and Harry Truman told Chapman to correct the record before leaving office.

Chall: And I also understand that there were eight congressmen who wrote a letter to Mr. Truman on the same problem and then Chapman said that 303 really wouldn't apply. The lump sum payment wasn't to apply in California, it was meant for something else.

Taylor: Yes, I've forgotten how that letter of those congressmen was developed, or whether or not I had any hand in that. Our effort was to hold our own administration in line and to leave office with the record clean.

Chall: Were you not aware at the time you were a consultant about Cohen's opinion on payouts? Even though you were Straus's consultant, hadn't he advised you of this? Can you recall your reactions when you first learned of it?

Taylor: Commissioner Straus consulted me sometimes, but by no means always. When he relaxed enforcement of acreage limitation there was no assurance that he would consult me. I've forgotten when I became aware of that particular relaxation. Cohen was an attorney with the Bureau of Indian Affairs when I met him. He was a wonderfully public-spirited fellow, and I've never understood why he wobbled on this water issue, but I had to take that on. I did it in '55 in the Yale article. I had to do that to document the position that I believed was sound, and fortunately the Supreme Court of the United States cited it in 1958.
Taylor: I knew the compromising attitude in the bureau at the time. That's why I had to go to someone above them to hold them up by the scruff of the neck, so to speak. Going to Patton of the National Farmers Union, who went to President Truman, is an example.

Also, I had the wholehearted and effective support of Dick Boke, the regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation in Sacramento, then in charge of the Central Valley Project. Without him below Straus it would have not been possible at important points to preserve the law. He told me later that on the morning of the S 912 hearings he heard that Straus was going to make a brief presentation and weaken the bureau position. Therefore Boke went to Krug and said he wanted to oppose any exemption or relaxation of acreage limitation in Central Valley. Krug then supported Boke. As a result, we have thirteen hundred pages of testimony that blocked the effort to remove or weaken the acreage limitation on the Central Valley Project. That resistance during the forties has been critical to the position and tactics of the other side ever since. They no longer seek outright congressional exemption in California because it would expose them to hearings or open opposition. They resort to tactics of circumvention which you may not want to talk about now.

The Eisenhower Administration

Chall: Well, then, I guess what happened was when the Truman administration went out and the Eisenhower administration came in, there were enough precedent-setting opinions so that Mr. McKay could take what seemed to be a prevailing administration attitude and set it into policy.

Taylor: Yes, he was just going to give away the whole show. When I saw that prospect I sat down and wrote that Yale Law Journal article hoping to block it. A few years earlier Senator Wayne Morse had been put on national television and he spoke about water development and the acreage limitation.

Chall: Under whose auspices?

Taylor: A Democratic National Convention in 1948. I'm unclear on my chronology, but what the Republicans apparently decided was not to keep Douglas McKay as secretary of the interior because he
Taylor: was becoming a national Republican target of Wayne Morse, and they didn't want the entire Republican party and administration to become a target on this issue. So they let McKay out of the office of secretary of the interior, and sent him back home to run against Wayne Morse in the United States Senate, and Wayne Morse defeated him. So that's how we got rid of Douglas McKay. The Republicans reduced the issue from a national to a state level for the time being.

The Lump Sum and Payout Questions

Chall: The battle between McKay and Morse which was really a part of the major, the bigger battle, was over the matter of the lump sum payment in the Central Valley, or were there other problems?

Taylor: I don't now recall the details, but the big landowners were seeking any way to get out of acreage limitation. Lump sum pre-payment was important on the Kings River. A judge within the last thirty to sixty days has given his opinion that on Tulare Lake the acreage limitation doesn't apply.* He's given them what Douglas McKay was ready to give them. This lump sum idea was just one of their inventions. What's payout got to do with public policy anyway? Policy is not a money matter. Besides, the landowners do not ever return what the public paid to build the project anyway.

In one of those bureau letters they were going to allow individual excess-landowners to pay their way out. Well, that was like saying Congress was using this for financial collateral, not as policy, and financial collateral of the excess landowners only, not on the little fellows. The theory was just manufactured in the search for any sort of an argument to let the excess landowners out. If successful, it would free the bureaucrats from responsibility for nonenforcement of the law as well.

Chall: But he did have the precedent of the Cohen opinion that helped him back it up.

Taylor: Well, that's why I took on the Cohen opinion, because I thought

Taylor: it was screwy. Administrative opinions relaxing the law pile up, and if accepted, finally reduce the law to a pile of shavings.

Chall: I want to ask you some questions about this whole matter of the lump-sum payment. You've outlined it very well in your publications and there's no need to trace the history of it, but as a reader with just a superficial knowledge of it—when I first read the 9d contract—I was under the assumption that at the end of the payment years the reclamation law would no longer apply. That's just the way I read it.

Taylor: They may have written it into the contracts, but they wrote other things that were contrary to law in the contracts. That's administration, letting the policy slip through their fingers, and intentionally, responding to the pressure.

Chall: Had somebody devised these—contracts of this kind aren't easy to write, I'm sure.

Taylor: No, the lawyers are up in their offices writing them all the time. [Laughter]

Chall: Do you think that in writing the 9d and 9e contracts that—

Taylor: --they had these things in mind?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Most certainly! Bureau lawyers were generally looking for ways to get out from under responsibility for continuing enforcement of the acreage-limitation law. They are still seeking ways to get rid of it through proper compliance. The contract between the United States and the State of California covering the State Water Project omits acreage limitation entirely. Of course they have this law in mind when they write contracts. Their question is, How can you get out from under this thing?

Chall: So that it isn't surprising that Ivanhoe vs. McCracken would come into the court, or that these questions could still be argued in the courts, because of the way the contracts were drawn up?

Taylor: The Ivanhoe contract was different. It was written under the Truman-Straus-Boke administration. But commonly the question is: How do you get out from the law? You see, the bureaucracy wants project appropriations and jobs. They want monuments to themselves. They want to expand their activities, and the people who
Taylor: help them get the money out of Congress (which is necessary to do it) are the people with money, with lots of land for which they want water. So the bureaucracy is in the hands of those people to a large extent. As I say, under F.D.R. and Harry Truman we pretty well kept the bureaucracy in line and at the end of the Truman administration made them wash their faces.

Chall: But the contracts with items 9d and 9e were written by lawyers in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

Taylor: Sure! We couldn't keep our hands on their collars all the time. Besides, the 9d and 9e contracts were written into law in 1939 before Secretary Ickes was apprised of the acreage-limitation issue and its significance. Do you think the bureaucrats in reclamation liked what I, and what Dick Boke did? No! No, I told you about that session at lunch.

Chall: Do you think you and Dick Boke at the time were the two men with fingers in the dike?

Taylor: Yes! Arthur Goldschmidt, director of the Power Division in the office of the secretary and Undersecretary Abe Fortas were right on our side, and indispensable as channels of influence to the secretary.

Chall: The lump sum payment seems to allow the excess landholders to get out from under the acreage limitation.

Taylor: That is what the Fresno judge said the other day. He said they wanted to make a lump sum payment in advance and get out. They've been working at it since 1944, trying to let them out of acreage limitation on Tulare Lake. That's where there's the "farm," if you want to call it a farm--a hundred thousand acres plus--that received the $4.4 million agricultural subsidy in 1969. The large landowners watch out for their interests at every point. The lawyers of the Bureau of Reclamation were under the continuous pressure of those interests. No, a tactic within the bureau was whenever they could slip something into the contracts that would weaken acreage limitation a little bit, to slip it in.

Chall: With all the agitation regarding those contracts, nobody signed them, and when the administration [Eisenhower] went out, they still hadn't signed them.

Taylor: People like Wayne Morse, of course, had the political pressures put upon them which I discussed.

Chall: Now when Mr. Seaton [Frederick A.] made some changes...
Taylor: Mr. Seaton was under pressure and he was ready to yield, but Mr. Seaton had some respect for law, and so when you put the pressures on him to sign, at some point he wouldn't do it. He wouldn't go through with it. As I recall his last act on one of the contracts was to put responsibility for omission of acreage limitation from the state water control onto the next administration. He signed it, but did not allow it to be effective until the new attorney general of the Kennedy administration approved it. The next attorney general was Bobby Kennedy. In other words, Seaton went out of office saying of the omissions of acreage limitation: "Well, I will go along if you will."

McKay said, "I will gut it." Seaton modified it by saying, "I will if you will, but you've got to go along with me if it's to be effective."

Chall: Seaton seemed to be moving, though, in the direction of allowing them to pay it off, not in a lump sum, but over a forty-year period.

Taylor: And then it was not to apply.

Chall: That's right. Now that looks like a possible reading of 9d, also.

Taylor: Yes, but how about a reading of the law?

Chall: The intent of the law.

Taylor: The intent of the acreage limitation law itself. You remember the title of the last section in my Yale Law Journal article "Excess Land Law"? Here it is. "Water Policy or Collateral Security?" It isn't a money matter, it's a policy matter; Congress wanted these holdings, and the benefits from reclamation widely distributed. Payment has nothing to do with policy at all, under the law. I got that idea from Abe Fortas, so I got it pretty much out of the horse's mouth.

Look, if I subsidize you $1000 an acre on the condition you don't get water for more than 160, what is the relevance of your paying back everything except that thousand? It's irrelevant. No, they'd buy their way out if allowed to do so, and of course the cheaper they can buy it the better--from their point of view. That's the Engle formula. What I say is that payment has nothing to do with policy.

Chall: I could never quite understand the reasoning that within the period of forty years you're apparently a landowner paying within the rules of excess land law. At the end of the forty years the law doesn't apply anymore. I've always been curious
Chall: about what he was supposed to do with his excess land holdings in those forty years. Was he permitted to hang on to them or what? I don't see that spelled out anywhere.

Taylor: Your curiosity is well-founded. By administrative ruling, the excess landowner is obliged to sell the excess within ten years, and if he doesn't do that, then the secretary of the interior can sell them. That was the story of the Di Giorgio divestiture. They signed contracts in '52 and they did not sell by '62. So then the secretary of the interior undertook to pressure them into selling, and it was a grand mess. Although the law says the sale price is to be the pre-project price of the lands the Bureau of Reclamation approved a sale price so high it was above current market, and Di Giorgio couldn't get anybody to buy at that price. Well that gives you a little clue as to how pervasively the law goes unenforced.

Chall: So some people bought 160-acre parcels at a very high price, then.

Taylor: Yes, but they wouldn't pay all that the bureau approved. The bureau was supposed to set a low pre-project price, but instead approved a price so high that nobody would buy it. Preposterous.*

Then if you want to talk about the residency requirement, all right, that's been unenforced for fifty-five years. A visiting federal district judge from Montana, sitting in San Diego, said, "You cannot invalidate a valid law by administrative inaction. Residency does apply." But where have the administrators been all this time? They allowed Di Giorgio, as a recent example, to sell 160 excess acres to a shipping magnate and his wife living in San Francisco--legally ineligible by reason of residence to buy it.

Now this law is torn to shreds by its administrators. The public doesn't know what's being done. They don't understand its full meaning and the repercussions from nonenforcement. It's easy to fool the public. You can manipulate people quite easily

---

Taylor: if you set your brain to it and if you have control of the media. Quite easy.

Chall: In the case of the people on Kings River who have been trying to negotiate a contract with the Bureau of Reclamation since 1955--

Taylor: They just won their decision in federal court in Fresno.

Chall: They are holding their lands. They're getting water. They're apparently under some kind of interim contract of paying into the federal treasury.

Taylor: They've just been postponing the issue hoping time is on their side. As a large-landowner spokesman explained to Ruth Finney, Washington correspondent of the San Francisco News, those who seek to enforce the law must win every time the question is up; the large landowners need win only once. They'll wait for any opportunity that may come around the corner. Hopefully they might get a Congress that would obliter ate the law, that's one way out, but that failed in the forties. Or another way is, wait until you get a favorable judge and then bring the case before him. You've heard of that, that you anticipate the kind of a decision you'll get from a particular judge if you can just get the case before him?

Chall: No.

Taylor: You've never heard of that?

Chall: No.

Taylor: Well, a top attorney of the Bank of America in my presence once said, "I know how just about every judge in this area would decide a case if presented to him." Not, of course, a hundred percent reliable statement. No. That isn't an absolutely sure thing. I think they got from Earl Warren a very different kind of a chief justice than they thought he would be when they put him in, and a much finer one.

Chall: But they do calculate these things so they will let a problem go on until they're ready to bring it up?

Taylor: Oh, surely! I get the echoes of that applied to the acreage-limitation issues. Wait until a certain good Republican judge dies to be replaced by a president who is on record against the
Taylor: acreage limitation, and then the new judge gives the decision you want. Sure.

Chall: You think that's what happened in the Turrentine decision?

Taylor: Yes!

Chall: That could have been foreseen?

Taylor: It was foreseen. I received a telephone call from a very well-informed attorney a couple of years ago. Didn't I tell you that?

Chall: No.

Taylor: He said, "Get that case up before the court in San Diego!" I said, "I can't do it." He said, "Well, get it up there while this judge is still alive!" He was a Republican judge, but he was a good lawyer with respect for the law. My informant, he knew that they were just waiting for that guy to die so they could get a new judge who would do what they wanted, sure.

Chall: By calling you, did he think that you had the where-with-all to get that case into court?

Taylor: I guess he was desperate. He must have been desperate.

Chall: Did you get it before that judge?

Taylor: No, the solicitor's opinion saying that acreage limitation does apply to Imperial Valley was dated 1964. We did not get a court decision until 1971.

Chall: Why does it take so long?

Taylor: Well, I'm telling you, pressure. I can't document every step of it, but it just works out that way. Negotiation can kill a lot of time. You noticed how time stretched out on the Kings River from 1954 until the early seventies. They stretch it out today on the west side. It's stretched out in Arizona from about 1912--no enforcement of the acreage limitation, none.

Chall: At least in the Kings River there's some kind of an attempt at enforcement.

Taylor: The bureau tried to do it, especially under the New Deal and Fair Deal. We had a chance to assert administratively that the law did apply.
Chall: I'm still curious about the interpretation that you can pay off for forty years x number of dollars, and then the acreage limitation will no longer apply. Are you supposed to sell your holdings during that first ten years, and then somehow have the opportunity to re-acquire large holdings at the end of forty years? Is that the intent or is that the way it's supposed to work out?

Taylor: The intent of the law?

Chall: No, not the intent of the law.

Taylor: The intent of the landowner?

Chall: The intent of the people who thought up this particular idea.

Taylor: The enterprising and far-sighted landowners on the outside, and the bureaucrats inside. They look to that as one way out. There is a solicitor's opinion not so long ago--I think it was on the Kings River--which takes up that question point and wobbles.

Chall: I see, so maybe you don't have to sell your holdings.

Taylor: Maybe you can acquire more at the end of the pay period. Opinions sometimes make just slight cracks in the door, then later on others widen them. No, I say that if you want to change the law you've got to go to Congress. Congress often didn't say what administrators say that ends up completely undermining the law.

Political Pressure

Chall: But Congress treats this thing a bit like motherhood and apple pie. There seems to be an unwillingness to tackle this thing head-on in one way or another, yet there seems to be no difficulty in allowing the administration to deal with it.

Taylor: You mean the administration can get away with it and Congress doesn't really call them up on the carpet?

Chall: It would seem that way unless they don't consider it a vital issue.

Taylor: You've got it exactly right. You see you have pressures upon the administration which we discussed, to gut the law in whatever way seems feasible. To write it on a piece of paper and get by
Taylor: with it. In Congress the way you do it is load the Interior Committee with western senators and congressmen. I can't document all of this, but I'm quite sure that I'm right. You might have a congressman let's say in Pennsylvania, for example John P. Saylor. I don't know that he gets any money from a western landowner, but remember that the utilities, the power companies, and the landowners work together on these things, and that power utilities exist all over the nation. So there are many ways of rewarding a public servant for his work. Anyway, Saylor, upon occasion has done what the large-landed interests want done on the acreage limitation. Do you suppose that his constituents in Pennsylvania give one hoot about what he does to gut the law out in California? No, I don't think they give a hoot. They don't even know it. He puts on a mantle of being a conservationist, even may be one on some points.

Or a western senator like Henry Jackson will wear the conservationist mantle, too, while at the same time he goes on record with the Public Land Commission to remove the 160-acre limitation entirely, including the residency requirement, and any discrimination against corporations. So you have pressure exerted on the administration even through the Congress, through campaign contributions, through God knows what all--through any and all the ways of wheeling and dealing.

Congress, except for the resistance in the forties, would have exempted Central Valley Project from acreage limitation. So care is taken not to arouse the people. Removal doesn't readily make a story that goes very well with the public at large. They've got to slip it over, not campaign openly to persuade the public that acreage limitation is just all wrong. You can't persuade the public that way if there are public forums in which answers can be given and heard. You have to cut the corners, misinform the public, use circumspection, avoid public debates, load the interior committees with members responsive to large special interests.

As an example of what supports my position. There's Senator Clinton Anderson, from New Mexico. He's no friend of the acreage limitation, but he is a friend of reclamation. He doesn't mind if they circumvent the acreage limitation if they don't go too far. "Too far" means complete removal of acreage limitation, which is the historic "justification" of spending public money to irrigate private lands. So when the Nixon administration had before it, this last spring, one year ago, the question whether or not to appeal the Turrentine decision in Imperial Valley, it was Clinton
Taylor: Anderson who signed a very ably-written legal argument urging the Nixon administration to appeal that decision because the Turrentine decision threatens the application of the acreage-limitation law not only in Imperial Valley, but logically knocks it out in Coachella Valley and the Central Valley Project in California.

He says that the decision threatens the acreage limitation all over the West. And he could foresee, I'm quite sure, that there would be a hue and cry raised should that happen. Why put out any more public money to bring the water to the land monopolists? You see, in 1902, the only condition under which the western landowners could open the door of the treasury was that the water will not be monopolized, that the benefits will be distributed in accordance with the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals. He was afraid we might have enough power to stop further project authorizations right at the source, which I think we would.

Chall: Yes, since the 160-acre limitation has been not too effectively applied--

Taylor: Leave out the "too."

Chall: All right, hasn't been effectively applied, then one could sense that Clinton Anderson feels, "let's keep the--

Taylor: "let's keep the shadow, even if we don't have the substance."

Chall: Because the shadow has been retained by the Congress, and that's about the extent of it, it would seem.

Taylor: Yes, I told you I have a letter from attorney Harry Hogan who's now doing a research job for the National Water Commission, in which he asks, Why don't the conservationists (people like myself) go out and oppose the acreage limitation, and then say, why put up any money at all? Instead of insisting on its retention and enforcement, why don't we abandon it and then go to Congress on this new platform? Well, I don't go along with him, but the proposal is not utterly outlandish, just mildly outlandish.*

Chall: Here in California, it would seem the water isn't needed so much anymore. I think it was about a month ago that the Department of the Interior withdrew a project that was being considered here, on the Eel River.

*See my statement for Friends of the Earth before the National Water Commission; Congressional Record, February 26, 1973, S 3298-3301. Daily ed. PST
Taylor: Yes, it was public pressure that forced that withdrawal.

Chall: Well, there was the basis that it wasn't economically feasible.

Taylor: Economically feasible--that means just about what you want it to mean, demonstrated by sharpening the pencil. It's not hard to elevate the estimate of benefits, or to cut down the estimate of costs. Ever hear of "cost overruns?" I have no confidence in what they do. Naturally they make it appear on paper that the benefits outweigh the costs. Those who estimate benefits and costs want to build the projects, so they usually arrive at figures showing the benefits exceed costs.

Chall: What's the public pressure against the Eel River?

Taylor: Oh, there's a lot of citizen activity against that! There's strong opposition to it. Locally, the people voted against real estate developments in that area. Opposition is being stirred up all over the place, joined in by conservation organizations.

Chall: It has nothing to do then with the question of needed water for agriculture, which is what the Bureau of Reclamation has always based its points on?

Taylor: Well, the project supporters have got to say the water is needed for agriculture or for other uses elsewhere. But who defines need? President Lyndon Johnson's Commission on Rural Poverty, in its report, The People Left Behind, says there should be no more reclamation of western agriculture, that we don't need it. Worse then that, it aggravates the poverty of the South. Look, by our western expansion of irrigation in California and Oregon, we've gutted many of the cotton-producing areas of the South. These western states are now the two leading cotton-producing states, along with Texas. The old South has been--not entirely stripped, but heavily cut down in cotton production. So the question is, "whose need?" And the program is run largely--not entirely, but largely--by the speculators who, as Secretary Harold Ickes has said, are engaged in the age-old battle over who is to cash in on the unearned increment from a public investment. That's the game as we have been playing it.

Chall: So with respect to the signing of the contracts at the moment you think the large landowners are simply being held at bay?

Taylor: They are held at bay, they will simply bide their time.
Taylor: Corporations have eternal life, the rest of us, well we haven't gotten that yet. You can tell the public anyway you want to observe the law, and the public will swallow it. Corporations watch their interests all the time. They've got the filing cabinets. They've got the lawyers. They've got the lobbyists. Most people don't know that the acreage limitation law is on the books for their possible benefit. A statement by Senator Paul Douglas points that out.*

Chall: Your success, and I say that in a broad sense, although maybe it was yours personally, in preventing both McKay and Seaton from signing contracts in Kings River was taken without too much grace by the Kings River Conservation District president. I quote from him, that "... the small group of do-gooders in the country who have taken out after the contract apparently had enough influence in Washington to stall action on the impending contract since December 1955."

Taylor: Where did you get that?

Chall: Out of Western Water News, of let's see, what's the date?**

Taylor: I'd like to have that when you can give it to me.

Chall: He says that it should be noted that "... these zealots for acreage limitation who mouth their pleadings for the family-sized farm are actually working against the interest of the small farm group when they urge delay. . ." 

Taylor: Well, there you are. What are they doing for small farmers except wiping them out or keeping them off the land?

Chall: So this period of time, during the administration of Eisenhower, you were successful, at least, in preventing this contract from being signed.

Taylor: Yes, and here we are in '72, with an adverse federal district decision in Fresno.

Chall: What did Kennedy's administration do with it? I know from a note that I have that Mr. Udall signed another interim contract


**Western Water News, April, 1957, p. 3.
Chall: in 1962, and he remained on during the Johnson administration.

Taylor: I suppose they went on just the same way.

Chall: How did it happen to get then, from the administration into the courts?

Taylor: Solicitor Frank J. Barry in 1961 said acreage limitation applies to Tulare Lake and the Justice Department brought suit to enforce it. The court's opinion is reported as U.S. v. Tulare Lake Canal Company, 340 F. Supp. 1185, 1972. The Kennedy-Johnson administration did stick to law enforcement on Tulare Lake. The Justice Department was questioned, as of today, whether the Nixon administration will do exactly what they did in Imperial Valley and pull the rug out from under the landless people and those who support the excess land law, by saying, "no appeal." That's the issue on Tulare Lake right now.

There's a small farmer outside of this area whose name is authorized for use to become an intervenor in the case. Will this judge say, "All right. You have an interest. You may intervene in the case and appeal it--if the government doesn't appeal it." Or will he do just what Turrentine did and knock it out and say, "No, you have no interest, you have no standing in court." So there the case sits.*

Chall: What does that mean?

Taylor: That means it's finished unless you can get a new case somehow with standing.

Chall: If it's finished, that means there's no more acreage limitation in Imperial Valley, and perhaps that takes care of the Kings River case, too.

Taylor: Well [laughter], of course the Imperial Valley case has been revived.** It's revived because there was an opposite decision, not on acreage limitation, but on the twin residency requirement

*The Environmental Defense Fund tried to gain standing for the small farmer, but this was denied. Under pressure from Senator Fred Harris and Congressman Jerome Waldie, Attorney General Richard Kleindienst appealed.

**This interview was recorded February 24, 1972.
Taylor: which is part of the same sentence of the same 1902 law. So you've got two judges with two opposite opinions. One says that it doesn't apply under the Boulder Canyon Act, and the other says that it does. One says, "I'm talking about acreage limitation," and the other says, "I'm talking about residency."

That issue is up in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals right now, so this is all coming to a fruition years later. See how it drags on? In the meantime the water goes on the land. The landowners will make the argument, I'm sure, that to enforce the law now would be a hardship upon them after they have relied and acted upon a 1933 secretary's opinion for so long. That's the language of Judge Turrentine--they had acted and relied all this time on the interpretation that acreage limitation doesn't apply in Imperial Valley. People easily think, "Gee, that's tough, taking the water away from them now." Well, what about the landless people from whom opportunity was taken away from the start? The Imperial Valley large landowners have had the use of that water, unlimited. On Tulare Lake the biggest of them also got the $4.4 million in 1969. As the modern phrase is, the large landowners will "poor mouth" it. That's what one can expect; they haven't got to it yet. But one could expect that to come--talk of the hardship.

Chall: That was said in 1945 and 1946.

Taylor: Yes, that's true. But if you want one of the best and truest statements that I know, it is one by the legal counsel for the Imperial Irrigation District, Harry Horton. Speaking to Congress about acreage limitation on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, he quoted a four hundred-acre landowner who said, "Let us lay the cards on the table with respect to Jack O'Neill... .He thinks if he gets water for ten years on there without having to sell it, he can make enough money out of it so he can afford to sell the land at any old price." [Hearings before Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, 85 Cong., 2 sess., on S 1425, et. al. 87-88, 1958.]

Well, there was his land without water. And attorney Horton of Imperial Irrigation District said essentially this: "I'll tell you why he signed. He thinks if he could use that water for ten years, then he can afford to sell the land at any old price." He was telling the truth. In Imperial Valley they've been having a bonanza, and naturally they'd like it continued as long as they can have it.

Chall: We will get into the San Luis Reservoir battle another time.
Taylor: It was with reference to getting San Luis project that Horton was talking.

Chall: When Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson were contesting for the presidency in 1952, did either one of them have any particular opinion on this matter of reclamation that you recall?

Taylor: I don't recall that it came up in their speeches at all. But I knew, of course, that the prospects would be worse under Eisenhower. I don't think Eisenhower personally knew the score. I think probably he had never heard of the issue.

Chall: We'll be discussing the members of Congress at another time in the later congressional battles, but the fact that the congressmen were Democrats or Republicans certainly had nothing special to do with their attitudes.

Taylor: Democrats Clair. Engle and Sheridan Downey were the worst, both of them Californians. Of course the California Republicans also took the large landowners' side.

W.A. Dexheimer Replaces Michael Straus

Chall: I think we'll have to discuss that. Not today, because I would like to stay with the administration. When the Eisenhower administration came in, though, you were out as far as consultation was concerned.

Taylor: Yes, when they came in, shortly before the end of the Truman administration, I sent in my resignation, knowing what was coming.

Chall: It took quite a while, as I understand it, for them to find a replacement for Mr. Straus.

Taylor: It took them several months, yes.

Chall: And Mr. Dexheimer [W.A.] took his place.

Taylor: Well, they didn't want to attract attention to the issue too much, I believe, by turning Straus and Boke out on the first day of the new administration. You see, that could make a public issue if they canned them right away, so instead they kept them on for a while
Taylor: and slowly eased them out. I believe they told Boke, "You take your time now to find yourself another job. When you've got another job we'll replace you." Boke was on civil service, I believe--so a question as to discharging him was, how far in discharging personnel do you move down where they may have the protections of civil service?

Chall: That makes it more difficult.

Taylor: I believe they didn't want to force the issues, so they gently said, "Here's your hat, what's you're hurry?"

Chall: Where did they both go?

Taylor: Straus, I think, retired on independent means. He died about a year ago. Boke went with Reynolds Aluminum Company, now is in Richmond, Virginia. He wanted to develop a public movement to keep the battle going, but couldn't drum up the financial support necessary to keep the fight going.

Chall: I see, nationally.

Taylor: Yes, we couldn't raise the money to do it then, as Ralph Nader and Common Cause do now.

Chall: Did you know Mr. Dexheimer, did you come across him very much personally during the years he was commissioner?

Taylor: I don't believe I ever met him. There wasn't any use.

Chall: How about Mr. Bellport [B.P.], the regional director--later?

Taylor: I am sure I had no contact with him. I didn't see any point because the matter was one of political pressure, and I didn't have it. The pressure was all on the other side at higher level. It was useless to try to bring pressure on the administrators except possibly publicly if an arena could be found.

Chall: Did you then feel that during those years that you--not only you, but all of the people with whom you'd worked during the past decade--that you were without influence and pressure?

Taylor: No. The individuals and organizations were scattered, the administration had changed and it followed through to the junior administrators on our side. Most of them left the government service. What remained was the outside organization support,
first and foremost, the support of organized labor. It has been steadfast on this California land issue since the 1870s.

The Continuing Vitality of the Acreage Limitation Issue

Chall: Have your contacts changed? Well, in Congress they would have to, but outside, do you still have the same organizational contacts? The Grange and the labor unions--

Taylor: Yes, with labor the most responsive of all, the Grange and the Farmers Union have done quite well over the years. Church groups still are active but you have to punch the button to get their action because, of course, they don't keep track of the daily detail of the issue. But if you tell them what's up, and to whom to send their statement, they'll do it.

Chall: It's a little more complex as the years go on when the activities of the administration become, as you call it, circumspect. Then it's a little difficult for the average person to make sure what it's all about.

Taylor: It's hard to make the average person understand what the issue has to do with him. It's so fundamental to the society in which he lives, yet it's hard to tell a Californian who runs California, and what giant landholdings have to do with it. As a Californian walks down the street and breathes the fresh air (when it's fresh) the question doesn't occur to him. He takes it all for granted without examining it. He doesn't understand the power structure that's been built up, nor on what it rests. Just try to tell even a University Colleague that the drive to escape acreage limitation by creating the costly State Water Project is a big factor behind the cutting of the education budget, and a factor in imposing student tuition. They shed it off like water off a duck's back. With most of them there's no use talking. Just try to tell the students why they're socked two hundred dollars a quarter tuition.

Chall: And why? What do you tell them?

Taylor: I tell them the State Water Project is one of the big pressures on the state budget--it isn't the only pressure, but the biggest single pressure, and that its purpose is to escape the federal 160-acre law. We had no $1.75 billion bond issue under the federal Central Valley Project.
Taylor: Under the federal Central Valley Project we had no taking of the oil revenues that had been earmarked for higher education, and turning them into the State Water Project. When I talked with administrators at the University of California they understood what I was talking about, but just try to tell it to your daily colleagues, or just try to tell it to students. As I say, it goes like water off a duck's back.

Chall: And you think this is a great economic drain?

Taylor: On the state treasury? The answer is yes. The pressures come right down here onto the campus. Of course, and it's been manipulated politically, so that it appears to the public and to the victim students and victim faculty, victim institution, in a totally different light. The relation of financing the State Water Project for financing education is not mentioned. The issue is drawn by the Reagan administration as one of keeping education and those unruly students in line. So he goes into office with education as his main target, and the first thing he does is get the head of Clark Kerr on a platter. I saw Reagan on television the night of the day he was nominated for governor. The question was asked him, what were his issues. This attack on education was the number one issue.

He's followed it ever since, and the students by their unruly public actions have just fed his strategy and made it easy for him to come down hard on education. They take the beating and wonder how it happens; they feel frustrated. They don't hit him where he lives and expose him for what he is. If they went to the heart of the matter they'd get him. If they talked to their parents, the taxpayers, who put up the money for their tuition and wonder why their sons and daughters cost them so much, they would get response.

Chall: Do you think that if anybody were to write a finely-detailed article like the kind you wrote in the law journals, this one based upon the issues of water in California, and the Reagan administration, they could be effective? Could they get the necessary facts?

Taylor: Why, of course, they could!*

Chall: Did the Nader reports uncover the facts--prove something?

Taylor: Well, on the whole, yes. There's some sloppiness in some parts of them, but by and large they hit it right. Surely it could be made an issue if properly handled, and if you could have sufficient outlets to reach the public through the media, as we call them today. But we have a controlled media to a very large extent. You cannot expect the major papers of this state to come out with the story that I tell you. They will come out with editorials supporting the other side, occasionally even telling literal untruths.*

Chall: So this must be a frustration.

Taylor: Yes, we used to have the San Francisco News which told the truth freely and often. We were able to fight the battle very well then, in the forties. We don't have that public outlet now. The news on this issue just dribbles through. Right now the Tribune is doing fairly well on the water issue, better than either of the other Bay papers.

Chall: The Oakland Tribune?

Taylor: The Oakland Tribune is now doing fairly well. Although Senator Knowland, as senator, was all wrong on this issue.

Chall: How do you account for this?

Taylor: I can only surmise that they respond to the growing concern in Northern California over the loss of its water to the south. They didn't raise that question when the issue of a $1.75 billion bond issue was on the ballot. I think it's a response to the growth of public sentiment. They want to sell their newspapers. Of course this does not imply that they now share my views generally.

Chall: Must be quite a bit of public sentiment then.

Taylor: Well, yes, there is! The people of Northern California are in a very different mood today than in 1960. I don't think they'd ever get a $1.75 billion water bond issue passed by the voters again.

Chall: They barely got it through the first time.

Taylor: They barely got it through by methods that included concealment and distortion of the truth as guidelines.*
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Chall: I would like to pick up the congressional thread again. But something comes before the Engle bills that I would like to discuss first. I'm thinking of the San Luis Valley (Colorado) bill of 1949.

Taylor: Yes, where they raised the acreage limitation to a much higher figure—480 acres.

Chall: They asked for an outright exemption apparently the first time around.

Taylor: And Senator Paul Douglas was successful in blocking that.

Chall: Yes, and Truman pocket-vetoed it.

Taylor: That shows where Truman stood.

Chall: He had the ultimate control at that point and chose to exercise it. What interested me about this bill though, in terms of what occurred during the next decade, was that Secretary Krug saw some need for flexibility, and he wanted Congress to consider legislation in a general way rather than continuing to argue the issue project by project. At that time, was there any consideration for a general debate on the subject?

Taylor: The question was raised in a general sense at various times. Krug's words furnish one example, Senator Clinton Anderson asked for an Interior statement, at another time, and eventually he got
Taylor: it. But there was no real consideration. They were shadow boxing at each other largely. And when they talked about flexibility, they didn't generally mean up or down depending upon the crop. They meant, practically speaking, raising it, not lowering it for crops such as citrus.

The secretary of the interior probably had in mind that in Wyoming, Montana, the more northern states, there was a stronger case for larger figure than 160 than there was in the states like Arizona and California. Of course, my own answer to that was, how much subsidy are you willing to give to water lands that won't support a family with 160 acres when you're putting in a subsidy with $1500 to $2000 per acre. Is it worth doing it? But you see, there is the fact of political support. Those northern states each have two senators. They may not have many congressmen, but they all have two senators. So that means pressure for lifting the acreage limitation even though it means more subsidy. The Bureau of Reclamation, of course, always wanted more jobs to perform. It wanted the appropriations and the projects.

Chall: Was anybody taking a look in those years at the possibility that by bringing in water for land of any size, 160 acres and upwards, or even downwards, they might be subsidizing marginal land?

Taylor: I do not recall any vocal consideration of that. When you say marginal land, that's what I'm talking about. If you have to have 320 or 640, or 480, or whatever, is it worth doing it? No, the pressure was all for the project, whatever the farm size. Growth, development, build.

Chall: This is, I guess, inherent in the fact that various concerns relating to agriculture are considered by different agencies.

Taylor: You're not raising the question whether they might be subsidizing the production of crops that weren't needed?

Chall: Yes, that too.

Taylor: Well, that is a separate question which has been raised off and on from the time that the reclamation was proposed. That thread runs through the opposition raised in the East from at least 1902 when the bill was under consideration, right on to the present time, when the president's report on rural poverty—meaning especially rural poverty in the South—complains against reclamation of any western lands. Reclamation always had to meet that charge. It is met politically more than any other way. They're answered in
Taylor: debate, and the question is how much power is there behind them. In general there is not enough pressure from the charge of over-production to block the project. Southern senators and others whose states benefit from Corps of Engineers water projects—flood control and harbor—are back-scratched by reclamation states' senators and vice versa.

Chall: So there are two factors here: one is land that is marginally productive; and the other is the fact that you might be subsidizing when the crops aren't needed.

Taylor: When the crops aren't needed. Of course over the decades, the argument has always had the advantage that what we need is more crops, more people, more land, more water, more everything. Do you remember the saying: "To buy more land, to raise more corn, to feed more hogs, to make more money, to buy more land," etc. etc. without end? Now it isn't accepted quite so readily.

Chall: Earlier, in the forties, there had been a possibility of raising the acreage limitation to 640 acres, and that was quickly dropped, and then, in the late forties, there is this possibility of debating some kind of flexibility, and that isn't considered.

Taylor: No, because the political aspect of the issue was central.

Chall: All, or nothing?

Taylor: As a political issue, yes. If you raised it to 640, they would press on and next try to put it at 1280. And the raising of the limitation to 640 was no satisfaction to the owner of 10,000 or 100,000 acres, so it wasn't within the realm of political possibility to arrive at a compromise that way. That was before the Engle formula came along.

If the landowner couldn't get a complete exemption from the 160-acre limit, of course he would try for piecemeal exemptions, project by project. During the thirties when Secretary Ickes was going out of town for a week or whatever, he told an undersecretary, "You're acting secretary." That way they shot a special exemption through for the Colorado-Big Thompson project. In Ickes' absence the acting secretary would sign the letter giving Interior Department approval or acquiescence. That's how the bureaucracy works.

I was told that the undersecretary got his appointment on the understanding that's what he would do if he ever got the chance.
Taylor: That was about 1938, before I went in as a consultant. Their tactic then was, "Well, let's get it project by project," saying, in essence, "this is a special case; this isn't really the situation the law had in mind." The claim of course was phony.

I described this in my Rocky Mountain Law Review article--how they slipped those through.* But eventually we checked this tactic for the time being in the Central Valley.**

The Engle Formula: HR 5881

Chall: Although they didn't like the Engle formula, the big landholders were willing to accept it, even though it meant higher cost of water. I suppose they felt that was the best they could do?

Taylor: I think they figured they couldn't get out completely, so they would try for the next best. Do you want to talk about that now?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Congressman Engle devised this formula: Allow landowners with any amount of total acreage to buy their way out from application of the acreage limitation by paying back a portion of the subsidy. Of course he didn't describe it quite this way. The implication was that the large landowners would repay the interest subsidy to smaller landowners, but of course they were to be given extremely low interest rates to pay. Other subsides were not mentioned. He succeeded in enacting this escape route in the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956.

Chall: I didn't know that there was an acreage limit in the Engle formula. He hit on 640?

Taylor: I don't know who originally hit on the argument that 160 acres was too small for a family to make a living. Members of Congress from


**The tactic of specific exemption was resumed at the San Felipe extension of the San Luis project (CVP) in 1967. 81 Stat. 174. PST
northern states with short crop-growing seasons began to use it. In California in the forties opponents were checked from arguing this line, when it was pointed out by M.C. Hermann, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, that the Fresno Chamber of Commerce was at that time recommending purchases of twenty to thirty acres of oranges, thirty to forty of peaches, etc.* Later on, in 1969, the California State Chamber of Commerce recommended enlargement of the limitation from 160 to 640 acres.**

I have a letter on that that I addressed to Allan Grant, the president of the California Farm Bureau Federation that Congressman Cohelan put into the Congressional Record. Do you have that?***

Chall: No.

Taylor: I'll give you that. Did I read you Congressman Engle's own description of that formula in '55?

Chall: I have read it, yes. You want to read it into the record?

Taylor: Yes. This quotation is from Congressman Clair Engle in 1955 as chairman of the House subcommittee preparing for the Engle formula. Here's what he said:

"I grant you, you start kicking the 160-acre limitation and it's like inspecting the rear end of a mule. You want to do it from a safe distance because you might get kicked through the side of a barn. But it can be done with circumspection, and I hope we can exercise circumspection." The Engle formula was his example of circumspection. The object was to let out the giant landowners by making a small payment--in other words, if the subsidy was $1000 an acre we will say that they would accept $800 and pay back $200 of it, accepting a little less subsidy than the others. That way they'd buy their way out with the entire 100,000 or more acres that they owned per landowner.

The Engle formula was got through Congress by shady means, in the Small Reclamation Projects Act. The hope was to extend it to all reclamation. The idea has been echoed by the Reagan Task

---

* Hearings before Senate Public Lands Subcommittee, 80 Cong., 1 sess., on S 912, 149. 1947.


March 22, 1963

ACREAGE LIMITATION

HON. JEFFRY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1963

Mr. COHELAN, Mr. Speaker, one of the messengers of agricultural and resource policy is the matter of acreage limitations. One of the most able and expert people ever employed to write about this matter is Prof. Paul S. Taylor, of the University of California at Berkeley. He has recently written a letter in which he critically analyzes and opposes the recommendations of the California Governor’s Task Force on the Acreage Limitation Problem.

I think my colleagues will find this letter to be highly enlightening, and I commend it to the readers of this Report by inserting it in the Congressional Record at this point:

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD
OF AGRICULTURE

Sacramento, Calif., March 5, 1963.

Dear Mr. Grant: I urge the Board of Agriculture to reject the findings and recommendations of the Governor’s Task Force on the Acreage Limitation Problem, because I do not agree with presenting my individual views as set forth in the March 7, 1968 meeting of the Board and that represents part of the minutes.

In composing the membership of the Task Force, the Governor apparently chose to emphasize in particular the acreage limitation law, rather than to secure a balance among citizens representing broad public interests. The report of the Task Force is marked by a conspicuous failure to consider the law’s economic effects.

The Acreage Law is an important law. This gulf between special and general interest shows clearly from a comparison between the United States Supreme Court’s description of the 1960’s acreage law and the views expressed by the Task Force.

The purpose of the 1960’s acreage law, as stated by the Supreme Court, is to assure: “That benefits may be distributed in accordance with the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals. The limitation insures that this enormous expenditure will not go in disproportionate ways to the particular interests of individual landowners, or the very large land holdings. More important, the law prevents the land less usage of the federal reclamation service for pecuniary benefit of individuals.” (McDuffie v. United States, 337 U.S. 297 (1958))

On the contrary, the Task Force frankly disagrees with these purposes. “A majority of the members,” says the Report on page 22, “are of the opinion that the Acreage Law was written in principle and should be repealed.” Between these opposing views I prefer, and I hope the Board of Agriculture prefers, the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals. The law requires control over monopoly and speculation by the few.

A second objection to the Task Force Report is the preferred “deficit” method of implementing the Acreage Act, that statute was designed primarily at the developing and settling of the public lands. To borrow from the language of the Acreage Act, this is an effort to qualify it as a “land reform” measure. Certainly that was not the purpose of the original legislation. The 1960’s Acreage Act, that statute was aimed primarily at the developing and settling of the public lands. The Acreage Act’s, or “deficit,” purpose is to bring public land into private ownership by the few. The Task Force has precisely the opposite of the truth. It states: “No right to the use of water for land in private ownership shall be sold for a tract exceeding 100 acres to any one landowner.” 22 Stat. 369.

The 100-600 acre Task Force objection applies to private land receiving government water, and to privately-owned land only.

One wonders how the Task Force could have overlooked the language of the law itself, but also fails to acknowledge the fact that the task force on acreage limitation reformations. For example, Congressman Frank P. Overton, in charge of the reclamation bill, in report of the House:

“It is a strong form of legislation, we have had in guarding against the possibility of speculative landholdings and the public use of water, and it will cause the division into small holdings of any large areas...in private ownership which may be irrigated under its provisions.” 35 Cong. Rept 62.

Admittedly the Task Force opposes the acreage limitation because one of its major purposes is land reform, but this does not excuse the failure on its part to read law and history correctly, and advise the readers of its Report of the facts.

Another example appears on page 5 of the Report. The Task Force says: “Interest-free financing is an example of the subsidy which is recognizable as a purported justification for the acreage limitation provisions of Reclamation Law.”

This claim is crucial to the Task Force recommendations for the landowners be permitted to buy their way out of the policy of the law cheaply, by eliminating subsidies. The theory is that the government should pay large landowners only those property taxes they would pay if they owned the land.

The report is marked by a conspicuous failure to consider the law’s economic effects. This gulf between the state of the law and the views expressed by the Board of Agriculture shows clearly from a comparison between the United States Supreme Court’s description of the 1960’s acreage law and the views expressed by the Task Force.

The purpose of the 1960’s acreage law, as stated by the Supreme Court, is to assure: “That benefits may be distributed in accordance with the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals. The limitation insures that this enormous expenditure will not go in disproportionate ways to the particular interests of individual landowners, or the very large land holdings. More important, the law prevents the land less usage of the federal reclamation service for pecuniary benefit of individuals.” (McDuffie v. United States, 337 U.S. 297 (1958))

One could continue inductively picking holes in the Task Force Report, but it is time to summarize in words that give perspective.

The Task Force draws inspiration from the late Clair Engle for its recommendation of the “Double Formula” or large landowners to cultivate acreage limitation. The true role of the “Engle Formula” has never been better seen than by its author. In 1956 Engle, then Congressman, said to the Congress: “I am for you who are for the 160-acre limitation and it is like inspecting the rear of a mule 10 feet from a safe distance because you might get kicked through the side of the barn. But it can be done with circumspection, and I hope we can exercise circumspection.” (Hearings before Subcommittee on irrigation and reclamation of House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on H.R. 104, 396, and 3817, 84th Cong., 1st sess., 79).

The California Agriculture has a clear choice, whether to represent the public interest in its decision, bearing in mind the requirements of justice, equity, and to what effect those special interests are seeking to circumspection, and the public interest in the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals.

Respectfully yours,

FARIS B. TAYLOR,
Taylor: Force. A tiny interest charge, yes, sure. They wanted to make the smallest gesture they could get away with. That is 1955. Did I tell you about meeting him at the CDC convention in Fresno in '58 when Peter Odegard, of U.C. political science, was running against him for senator?

Chall: Yes, you did.

Taylor: Well, that was in 1958, three years after he spoke of circumspection and the kicking mule.

Chall: That formula didn't pass right away, did it?

Taylor: It was passed by Congress. The story of how it was blocked by Senator Paul Douglas in the Senate is told in my Rocky Mountain Law Review article.* After about a year they got it through the House, and then through conference. When it was brought back to the Senate, Senator Douglas had an understanding—common way of carrying on Senate business—that when the Small Reclamation Projects bill came to the floor he would be called. Well, they didn't call him. Three guesses? Was it an accident that they didn't call him? I don't think it was.

Chall: At least according to your article, Paul Douglas was kind enough to tell Clinton Anderson that—

Taylor: That's right, he didn't blame Clinton Anderson personally, but somebody else was slipping the bill through when Paul Douglas wasn't on the Senate floor. Senator Douglas told the story in the Congressional Record which I repeated in the Rocky Mountain Law Review.**

Chall: Now is the so-called Engle formula different from the small projects bill?

Taylor: No, Engle got his way in the Small Reclamation Projects Act. Well, you see, that opened the door for small escapes from the limitation, and you can imagine how they would use it to make it as big as possible by splitting up the same project into small parts. But


Taylor: that isn't altogether easy. So what they wanted was a complete gutting of the acreage limitation on all projects using the Engle formula, as recommended later by the Reagan Task Force.

Governor Reagan appointed a task force, and whom did he put at the head of it? Burnham Enersen, attorney for the Kern County Land Company, and a couple of other attorneys who had been involved at one stage or another in the San Joaquin Valley on the side of the large landowners seeking escape from the limitation. So Reagan had a committee of five loaded with experienced attorneys against the acreage limitation, and in their report they say that all of them are against it in principle. So that tells you how one-sided the Reagan Task Force was.

Chall: In small projects, now, small reclamation projects, the limitation is 640 acres.

Taylor: The larger ones above 160 acres can buy their way out.

Chall: And larger ones can buy their way out, as you say, through the payment of interest. So would that mean, in effect, there's no more 160-acre limitation operating?

Taylor: In small projects?

Chall: What about large projects, did the Engle formula apply to large projects?

Taylor: No. That figure was originally, I believe, about $5 million loans. They raised that to about $7.5 million a few years later.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: No, if it had applied everywhere, there wouldn't have been any Reagan Task Force. They wanted it to apply everywhere, but didn't make it. The Southern Pacific supports extension of the Engle formula. Senator George Murphy introduced a Reagan Task Force bill, but he didn't even get hearings, and he wasn't re-elected. In Oregon Senator Packwood defeated Wayne Morse, a leading proponent of acreage limitation. He defeated Morse by about only four thousand votes, an extremely narrow margin. No sooner had Packwood got into the seat in the Senate than he put his name on the Murphy bill, which suggests that he knew by whom his bread had been buttered, and was making a gesture of acknowledgement for repayment of favors.

Senator Morse is now running for election again. Whether he will make it I don't know.
Governor Reagan Tackles
160-Acre Issue

THE first step by a state administration to seek to “update” the controversial land limitation provisions of the 1902 Reclamation Law was taken last month when Governor Ronald Reagan named a five-member task force to draft amendments which could be offered to Congress to “afford rational approaches to the different situations which face California agriculturists.”

The Governor’s action was in line with statements which he had made, before and after election, in which he termed land limitations as “archaic and unsuited to California’s contemporary agricultural economy, including large-scale commercial farming.” In these statements, Reagan pledged his support in an effort to lift these limitations imposed on irrigated farms obtaining supplemental water from Federal projects.

Named to the task force were: Burnham Ewersen (Chairman), San Francisco attorney, and Dir. of the California State Chamber of Commerce and Chmn. of its Statewide Water Resources Committee; James F. Sorrensen, Visalia engineer, 2nd Vice-Pres. and member of the Board of Directors of the National Reclamation Association, and Executive Committeeman of the IDA; William H. Jennings, La Mesa, General Counsel to the Helix Irrigation District, Vice-Chmn. of the California Water Commission and an attorney for the IDA; E. Beckinridge Thomas, Fresno, attorney for the Kings River Water Association; and Richard D. Andrews, Fresno, attorney and former minority counsel for the U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

An 18th Century Concept

The 160-acre limitation provisions in the Reclamation Act had their origins in the 105-year-old Homestead Act — a measure passed by Congress in 1862 to stimulate settlement of the West.

Under the Homestead Act, any person who had filed his first papers or was a citizen at least 21 years old and head of a family could enter upon a quarter section—160 acres — of public land. After residing on and farming the land for a stipulated number of years, he was issued a patent to the land by the Federal Government.

Somehow this 160-acre concept became associated with the supply of water by the government to developed farms as well as undeveloped arid public lands.

The late U.S. Senator Sheridan Downey, a leading authority on the land limitation issue, said in his book, "They Would Rule the Valley": "The 160-acre figure bore no particular relevance to any agricultural theory of what an economic unit should be under varying soil, crop and terrain conditions; it was used because it was traditionally associated with the homestead laws in opening up the public domain."

IDA-NRA Views

In recent resolutions adopted by the Irrigation Districts Association of California and the National Reclamation Association, urging that the Reclamation Act be modernized, the directors of the long-established water associations referred to the Act as follows:

“...The Reclamation Act of 1902 applied primarily to undeveloped and unirrigated public lands. Under modern farming practices a farm within that limitation usually cannot be competitively or economically operated to provide full employment and income sufficient to maintain a reasonable standard of living within the farm areas in the Reclamation States.”

Would Expand Limitations

The officials of IDA and NRA pointed out that while the “original Reclamation Act had been amended to permit supplemental water deliveries to lands already irrigated, Federal Administrative Agencies have proposed to impose acreage limitations in areas which would be in conflict with the local reliance upon contracts with the Federal Government and the long-standing announced policies of the Administrative Agencies.” (An instance of this kind is the suit brought by the U.S. against the Imperial Irrigation District to up a 30-year-old Federal ruling and apply acreage limitation within the District.)

At the same time, the Department of the Interior has announced plans attempting to apply land limitation policies in ground-water basin areas receiving only supplemental project water.” (A classic example here is that of the U.S. proposing to apply acreage limitation to all acres in San Francisco and neighboring counties receiving water from the Bureau of Reclamation’s San Felipe Division of CVP. Only a small percentage of water to be used in the area will be supplied by the project, but by following the water into the underground, the U.S. would apply land limitation to anyone who pumps any water in the service area for more than 160 acres.)

IDA and NRA also declared that “the Department now asserts the continuing applicability of acreage limitation in a Reclamation project where the agency is contracting to pay the reimbursable costs thereon to fully repay all such reimbursable costs, thus controverting a basic concept and interpretation of Reclamation law which has been repeatedly recognized and ratified by Congress and has existed and been uniformly applied and relied upon since the passage of the Reclamation Act of 1902.” (A good illustration of this situation is that of Isabella Dam on the Kern River—a Federal project—where the entire Federal contribution to water conservation benefit has been repaid to the government by the farmers owning rights to the water, but the U.S. has told the landowners that land limitations will nonetheless be enforced.)

Governor Reagan’s Committee is expected to bring to his attention these and other examples of impractical and harassing application of the old land limitation law which creates inequity with other Federal programs both on and off the land, causes difficulty in developing much needed supplemental water projects, and has an unsettling effect on great areas of privately owned and developed farm land.
Chall: That would be against Mr. Hatfield.

Taylor: Yes. Of course he will have opposition in his own party. I understand the opposition that he has—the opponent he has in the state senate is a good man. Whether he knows anything about this issue or not I don't know. But my guess is California interests would rather have anybody from Oregon other than Wayne Morse.

Chall: In a Western Water News edition of June 1956, Engle is anticipating that his bill which has been held up for a year will pass.

Taylor: The Small Reclamation Projects bill had been held up for a year. Its supporters were just biding their time, you see. The Senate knocked out the formula. So it took a lot of work to get it through the House the way they wanted it and to get it through conference.

Chall: What were you doing at this time with respect to this small projects bill and the Engle formula?

Taylor: Oh, I guess I was advising Senator Douglas what was going on.

Chall: Did you have other avenues? Were you able to work as effectively as you did in earlier times?

Taylor: No, it was harder to bring pressure to bear on the Congress, because it was a small projects bill. One could mobilize people to oppose big exemptions more readily. I do not recall that I knew about the original hearings on the bill at the time they were held. Besides, I was in California, not in Washington, D.C. So, I do not recall any mobilization, and the fact that Congressman Engle would speak so frankly about the kicking mule suggests that at that committee hearing there was nobody present on my side. Otherwise I don't think that he would have talked as he did about circumspection.

About that time the Ivanhoe case was occupying me, as it raised the question of the constitutionality of acreage limitation and was moving up through the California courts to the state supreme court. The supreme court's 1957 decision was four to three that acreage limitation was unconstitutional, in that it was taking away landowners' property. In 1955, I had published my Yale Law Journal article.* In 1957 I had published in the Stanford Law

Taylor: Journal an article aimed at that state supreme court decision.* So that is probably a partial answer of what I was doing at the time that the small projects bill was limping along through Congress.

Chall: Burnham Enersen, quoted by Western Water News of January, 1957, said that the provision of the small projects bill relative to water for excess lands constituted the first relaxation of the acreage-limit laws enacted by Congress.

Taylor: Well, yes, that could be said. That leaves out two or three outright exemptions. The Small Reclamation Projects Act was a relaxation of the general legislation, that is right.

Chall: The exemptions, as I recall, were each time always said to be not an alteration of policy.

Taylor: That was said in order to diminish the force of the opposition.

Chall: In some of the later debates over the 160-acre limitation a spokesman for the National Reclamation Association says that it should be called the "acreage discrimination provision."

Taylor: [Laughter] Yes, I've heard that argument made by a board member of the National Farm Bureau Federation, who expressed it about this way: Since property owners are permitted to retain the increased land values created by highways or any other public construction, why shouldn't they retain, without limitation, the land values created when we bring public water?

Well, I think that's a comparison from which one could easily draw an opposite conclusion, and every once in a while in these days, someone does come up with that very conclusion. If we're going to have public construction increasing the land value, why not take some of that back by taxation? The landowners want the land values created by public investment without restraint, that's all.

Chall: In an unsigned memorandum--written I think by Mason Gaffney--during the period of the Engle bill debates, he brought up an idea which I noted that you discussed in your articles: If the farms paid for water without a subsidy, the water would become very expensive, and therefore they might be priced out of

Chall: competitive reach of excess lands. But he also added to that the idea that if labor, at the same time, were organized, that cost plus the high cost of making large farms less popular. However, labor was not being organized at that time on the farms. Since it is now, is that an effective kind of an argument?

Taylor: I don't know how that would operate practically. The large farms are making some concessions to organized labor. Also some of them get out of the business of agriculture after getting onto it. But it seems to me that the surest practical way of protecting against private monopolization of unearned income is the acreage limitation. If the government would purchase the excess lands at the presently prescribed pre-water price and then lease them, this "unearned increment" could be diverted into the public treasury. Mason Gaffney, I believe, was a single taxer.

Chall: Yes, I think so.

Taylor: And other single taxers have been interested in this. One of them, whose papers are in The Bancroft Library was J. Rupert Mason. Mason was a leading Henry George representative. He was always interested and sympathetic with acreage limitation to a degree. He was sympathetic about the problem; but he would cling to the idea that the California irrigation district was an effective agency to solve the problem of large farms, and that the district would hold the farms down to small-family size. That's an historical tradition which has come down from the late 1880s and 1890s when a state senator from Modesto devised the irrigation district.

Well, it doesn't do the job. The farms enlarge in Modesto, too, and conspicuously in Imperial Irrigation District. I have never found that the Henry George people would really give full support to acreage limitation although they were sympathetic with the problem it seeks to solve. I never saw their solution to the problem as effective and practicable, although they point to a real problem.

Chall: Their solution was based on irrigation districts?

Taylor: They thought irrigation districts would tax the increased value of the land. But what the irrigation districts have done is tax the city people, so as to relieve the farm-landowners. So these pay relatively less taxes, not more.
Taylor: I'm sympathetic with the Henry George concern for the unearned increment. My criticism is that they tend to be impractical in the sense that they want all or none instead of being ready to go step by step as may be politically practical. The 160-acre limit could be a very effective instrument for diverting uneearned increment into the public treasury, as proposed in the Reclamation Lands Authority bill by Kastenmeier, of Wisconsin, et al.

Chall: Now, what about the argument on supplemental water?

Taylor: Well, that's another gimmick. Paul Douglas answered that on the Senate floor when he said the whole purpose of the reclamation program is to provide supplemental water. Reclamation water always supplements rainfall. Even on Imperial Valley desert there is rainfall, about three to four inches. The argument that acreage limitation should not apply to supplemental water was just a gimmick. In 1944 and all through '47, they hoped that they could use that argument to persuade people that Central Valley was exceptional in that impounded water would simply supplement ground water and rainfall.

Chall: That wasn't an argument that ever was accepted in any major bill?

Taylor: No, the whole reclamation is supplemental; consequently supplementation is no ground for granting an exception.

Some Congressional Responses

Chall: What kind of support for your position were you getting from Congressman Shelley?

Taylor: Congressman Shelley--let's preface that with his presidency of the California Labor Federation. I talked with him, assisted him in preparation of his testimony (and he did a fine job) before Congressman Richard J. Welch's committee in '47 opposing any breakdown of acreage limitation.

When he went to Congress, it became a somewhat different story. There was a proposal to exempt Santa Maria project where the government was building a reservoir to replenish the lowering ground water, but without distribution canals. Well, the absence of canals and the use of the water to supplement ground water was used to justify
Taylor: an exception. Of course the real question is whether the government supplies the water and finances and contributes to the project. Public contribution justifies compliance with public policy. Logically it makes no difference whether the impounded water reaches the benefitted lands via underground channels or by surface canals. Congressman Shelley nevertheless went along with the argument that absence of canals justified exemption. He issued a strong statement in the Congressional Record on the theme that he had preserved acreage limitation intact by allowing exemption only in this special case. That is parallel to the way exemptions have been gotten through in other so-called exceptional cases.

Chall: I noted that you quoted him in your article "Legislative Erosion of Public Policy," and I wondered why he made this apparent change in his position.

Taylor: Of course I don't know and can only speculate. He was getting into political life, first as state senator, then as congressman, then as mayor. The presidency of the California Labor Federation faded out as political ambitions grew. Could it be (and I only speculate) that he had in mind running for mayor of San Francisco, possibly even for governor of the state, and was building political support for his future?

Chall: Did the Federation of Labor take a strong stand in the Santa Maria case?

Taylor: Not to my knowledge. The federation as such has never wobbled on this issue for a century.

Chall: Did Carl Hayden take a position at all on acreage limitation?

Taylor: This is speculation. Hayden, of Arizona, wanted water for Arizona, above all. I don't think he wanted any opposition to acreage limitation from himself to add to the burdens of getting congressional authorizations and appropriations to bring water to Arizona. Besides, acreage limitation had been left on the books covering the Salt River, Arizona, project, and simply unenforced thereafter.

Now this I'm uncertain of as to the fact, but it crosses my mind that he might have been agreeable to standing for acreage limitation in California--like Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall (of Arizona) in 1964--as a way of "digging" California in the ribs when California was fighting against Arizona for Colorado
Taylor: River water. Congressman Donald L. Jackson, of California, gave Arizona a public dig in the ribs in 1949 to help kill the proposed Arizona project by saying truly that there is no enforcement of acreage limitation in Arizona.

Chall: Senator Hayden was never one of the persons to whom you went for support regularly?

Taylor: No, he would accept acreage limitation in the authorization bill, but as Clinton Anderson points out in his very recent letter, the Central Arizona Project has language of the kind that Judge Turrentine in Imperial Valley says is insufficient to apply the acreage limitation. You see, the large landed interests work at undermining acreage limitation in every possible way, and political figures are sensitive. They tap on the boiler plate to see where there is a little weakness. They don't know which tactic will serve next, but they try them all.

Chall: Congressman Sisk seems to appear regularly as a spokesman—or did—as a spokesman on exemption bills, always being for the 160-acre limitation, but occasionally for making exceptions. Were you in contact with him?

Taylor: In my papers in The Bancroft Library, I'm sure you'll find an exchange of two or three letters with him in which I oppose what he's doing and he opposes what I'm doing. You see, he wanted to be for the limitation because he has a large population in his district which is for it, but if he can be both for the limitation in principle, and let them out in practice, that's a wonderful combination for a politician. That is the story of the federal-state joint-use of San Luis facilities on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley for which he was a leading sponsor since it was so largely in his district.

Chall: Was S 1425 submitted to the Senate as a repeal of the Engle Formula? Why were S 2541 and S 3448 considered at the same time in the April 30-May 1, 1958 hearings, and what happened to these bills?

Taylor: Nothing happened to these bills. They were opposed in spirit. At the 1958 hearings, at which Senator Douglas and I testified, the other side was thus also represented in viewpoint.

Chall: In his introduction to you at these hearings in 1958, Senator Douglas says that with respect to your fight for the 160-acre limit, "great pressures have been indirectly exerted on Dr. Taylor
Chall: which he has successfully withstood." What were these pressures?

Taylor: I do not recall any "pressures" upon me personally, either in the government service, or at the University. Of course there were those in the bureaucracy who opposed my views strongly, and acted against my views and even against the law, I believe, as they do to this day.

**Federal-State Partnership**

The San Luis Project

Chall: And Senator Kuchel?

Taylor: Ditto. He's for the acreage limitation except in a specific case. He will make statements like, "The acreage limitation will apply to every drop of water in the federal San Luis unit." Well, look at it.

Chall: Yes, let's look at it. We can start looking at it from here and work backwards in time. Is the acreage limitation being applied at all in the San Luis?

Taylor: Yes, to a very limited extent. I don't know what the figures are now. The bureau releases figures every once in a while. Yes, there are a few who sign. Do you want to talk about San Luis?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Here is a project for which Congress authorizes a half a billion dollars. Two-thirds of the lands that will be served by the construction are ineligible to receive the benefits because of the size of the landholdings. At least two-thirds. Does the Bureau of Reclamation say, "Well, let's make them eligible before we put out the people's money?" No. They say, "We'll start constructing and we think that they will sign." The solicitor of the interior told Congress that they have an unlimited time to decide whether or not to sign.

Chall: How so?
Taylor: Well, you just do it that way. A 1912 statute says there is to be no construction prior to execution of contracts, but the bureaucracy pays no attention to it. We held two San Luis hearings on that, one in '64 and another in '66 before the Senate Interior Committee. The Interior Committee, under chairmanship of Senator Henry Jackson, of Washington, didn't even print the hearings in '66. I've got them in my bound volumes—the entire oral hearing. The legal counsel of the committee, Stewart French, gave it to me. You see, behind this is the question, how do you hold a bureaucracy to its legal responsibilities? Who's going to do that? The big landowners who want to escape the law have the financial resources, the attorneys, and the money stakes to gain from nonenforcement. So their effort is all to escape enforcement.

Well, how about the landless people for whom the law was supposedly passed to give them access to the land? They haven't got the information, they haven't got the money, they haven't got the attorneys. So if you can control the bureaucracy, you can get the law administered your way, and the pieces of paper will be written to make it sound all right.

Chall: The major problems with the Central Valley Project had come about, with respect to the 160-acre limitation because they hadn't signed contracts first.

Taylor: They started to construct before they had any contracts—that's exactly right.

Chall: Couldn't the administration have said, we have plenty of time in which to build the project, we'll just wait until the farmers sign? It could have been considered the other way around. If they had looked at the history of the acreage-limitation problems—

Taylor: Well, Central Valley was started under the New Deal as a "Public Works" project to provide employment.

Chall: They made all kinds of errors.

Taylor: Yes, so staunch a secretary of the interior as Harold Ickes didn't know at that time what he was getting into. I believe that his subordinates didn't tell him. In fact the bureau engineers told the landowners they expected the acreage-limitation law to be lifted. Ickes himself was told about acreage limitation, not by his subordinates, but by Walter Packard, of Berkeley. When I was taken on as a consultant in Secretary Ickes' office, in '43, I told his subordinates, and I was called in a couple of times to
Taylor: see the secretary, and I told him. He acted upon the advice that we gave him and he was staunch, but the project had already started because there was this enormous unemployment problem, the like of which the country had never experienced. It was tremendous!

So a first thing to do was to put up some money under the Public Works Administration of which he was the head, and then start the project, put some of those unemployed people to work. You see, to provide employment was the dominant motive. The large landowners' side played very skillfully from the beginning. There was talk at first of forming a single big district to administer the project, to take care of repayment of the government, and all the rest. The Orange was for it. But the big landowners broke this up because it would have facilitated enforcement of reclamation law. So there were just small irrigation districts here and there. It was part of their tactic from the beginning, to get underground water improvement—largely outside the existing irrigation districts—without paying anything for it, and without complying with the 160-acre law. That was the tactic from the beginning and they tell it—or most of it—in their public testimony.

Chall: Now in the San Luis area you have, I guess, large farming units.

Taylor: Giant landowners.

Chall: And yet they ask for the federal project. There were some long periods when they said that they understood that the acreage limitation applied, but the fact that the water could be made available to them was really what concerned them?

Taylor: There was the question of political tactics. There was a hearing in '56, I believe, that ended when Senator Clinton Anderson told the California witnesses to go back and agree among themselves on what they wanted. You see, the large landowners had been blocked in the forties from getting the exemptions they wanted. The question before them was what to do, and it took them years to work out their tactics.

In 1958 they came up with a tactical compromise. On the "federal" San Luis service area, they said, acreage limitation will apply to every drop of water. That was the facade; they were not attacking acreage limitation, but they want state law to apply to the lands served by the state from the jointly-used facilities of the San Luis project. That exemption dodge is what
Taylor: Senators Douglas, Morse, and Neuberger killed in the Senate in 1959. The large landowners' apparent acceptance of acreage limitation on the federal San Luis service area was only a paper concession; just try to get it really enforced on the federal service area there even now! And, try to get it enforced on the state service area! Both Houses of Congress debated a proposal to exempt the state area service and both said, "no exemption." Nevertheless the administrators of reclamation gave them a de facto exemption. The legality of this failure to enforce the law is now being questioned before the federal district court in San Francisco. This is a case to apply the 160-acre limit to the State Water Project.*

It had to wait until an attorney would volunteer his services and could round up four friendly family farmers in the valley to bring suit. The government is not a party to bringing that suit to enforce the law. The Justice Department isn't there on the side of law observance.

Chall: In the oral history interview that we did with Harvey Banks—he says that he came up with the idea of the partnership project on San Luis; that in '52 and '53 the landowners in western Fresno county, the Westlands Water District, had asked the Bureau of Reclamation to prepare a project for their benefit.** In 1955 they came up with the feasibility report. And then from '55 to '60 they had to work out a suitable plan with the California legislature for agreement. He knew that Douglas and Morse would try to offer crippling amendments but he felt confident that they could be overpowered.

Taylor: Yes, that sounds right, except his prophesy that Douglas and Morse would be unable to defeat the proposed exemption of the state service area. There were four days of floor debate. I am glad Harvey Banks tells his part. Well, I don't suppose you could be state engineer for California or have a high position in water development and be in favor of the acreage limitation.

Chall: It hasn't been done so far.


Taylor: Not so far, and I don't see any immediate prospect. The political power is too strongly on the side of the large landowners in California.

Congressional Allies

Chall: You must have been helping in the background during the San Luis hearings.

Taylor: You're now talking about the big battles of '58, '59, and '60? You're asking what I had to do with that?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: My part goes back to 1948 when my University of Chicago economics colleague and friend Paul Douglas was elected to the Senate. I had first met him in Berkeley when he taught in our summer school about 1921. After that I kept up a professional acquaintanceship with him. In '48 after he was elected senator of Illinois, he came to Berkeley again. He came with his wife, Emily Taft Douglas, who earlier had been a congresswoman from Illinois. We invited them to stay at our Berkeley home. I believe Paul Douglas was giving a talk at the Faculty Club, or something of the sort. I met them at the train, and brought them home.

I found that they were going next to Santa Barbara, and I invited him to let me take them there, down through the Central Valley to their next appointment. They accepted, so I put them in the station wagon, rode them down the west side through Los Banos, Firebaugh, and Mendota, then into Fresno. That gave them a first-hand look at the giant landownership on the west side of the Valley.

Chall: This was 1948?

Taylor: This was 1948. Then I showed him the east side of the Valley. I took him to Pine Flat Dam on the Kings River and to Dinuba. We talked about the Arvin-Dinuba study which had been published by the Senate Small Business Committee in '46, barely two years earlier. Then I took him through Tulare and Kern counties, and across the mountains to Santa Barbara. He never forgot what he saw on that trip. He referred to this more than once on the floor of the Senate. On that occasion I was able to show him, right on the ground, what was going on on the west side, and the meaning of
had been created by the Spanish-Mexican governments before the war of
1846-47, and were not disturbed after the United States took over the
territory. A large part of the big railroad grants in this area after the Civil
War had the same effects. Some idea of the concentration of land owner-
ship of the 4 million acres involved in the joint federal-state San Luis
project is given by the following table, whose accuracy was not challenged
by our opponents when presented in the Senate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Acres Owned</th>
<th>Per Cent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Oil Co.</td>
<td>218,485.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other oil companies</td>
<td>264,678.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern County Land Co.</td>
<td>348,026.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Pacific R.R.*</td>
<td>201,891.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tejon Ranch</td>
<td>168,551.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Ranch</td>
<td>37,555.6</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. government</td>
<td>192,768.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other private holdings over</td>
<td>1,328,821.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 acres for each owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private holdings under 1,000</td>
<td>1,240,648.2</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres, including all state,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>county, and municipal land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Given by the U.S. government in return for a promise to build a railroad which was never built.

Over 68 per cent of the land was held by individuals and groups that
owned more than a thousand acres.

I had become acquainted with these facts during the 1930's through
my friend Paul Taylor, of the University of California, who had become a
tireless student of and campaigner on the subject. On a trip to California
after my election in 1948, he took me on a three-day journey through the
interior San Joaquin Valley from San Francisco to Santa Barbara. There I
saw the extraordinary fertility of the soil when given water, as well as the
social structure that grew out of large-scale landlordism. I well remember
a settlement on the west side of the river that we came into at sundown. It
was peopled entirely by Mexican farm laborers who seemed to be single.
They were quartered in bunks, which reminded me of the Maine
logging camps of my boyhood. They wore rough jackets, high boots, and
overalls, which, in California style, were called "Levis." They were spending
their leisure in a grogshop, drinking beer and whiskey. There was a
general store opposite the saloon, which sold shoddy clothing and a few
military articles and drugs. That was all there was for a camp of several
hundred men. No books or newspapers were in sight. The unpaved street
was thick with mud. I was told that this place was typical of life on the big
estates. No one knew where the owners lived or what they did.

The next afternoon we crossed the river to the east and came to a
typical American town. The main street, with its many stores, had no
beauty, but it had variety, enterprise, and cordiality. The people were all
well dressed; the men wore clean shirts and neckties, while the women
looked immaculate. It was obviously a family town, since there were sev-
eral hundred single-family dwellings. Most of these were attractive, well
painted, and had close-cropped lawns. There were two churches and a
school with an adjoining baseball diamond. One building was marked
"Library," and we saw youngsters coming out of it with books under their
arms. Like the other town, it was based on farming. But, unlike the first,
there were no large estates. Farms did not exceed 160 acres, and many,
particularly in the orange and lemon groves, were appreciably less. All
seemed to be comfortable.

No sharper contrast between the two systems of farming could be
found. They told their own story and pointed the moral.

"But how could this be changed?" I asked. The owners of the big
estates had, at first sight, legal title, and it would cost too much to buy
them out at current prices. Taylor mentioned the Newlands Act and
briefly described it. Back in Washington, I looked it up.

At the turn of the century, when the Senate was presumably the rich
man's instrument, Francis Newlands, of Nevada, under stimulus from Re-
publican President Theodore Roosevelt, was able to get that body and the
House to agree that reclamation water should only be turned on for farms
that did not exceed 160 acres. Taylor had told me that the estates would
soon want that water. With not more than five inches of rainfall a year,
they were getting the needed minimum from pumping the interior pools
that lay below the surface of the semiarid land. The water table was
therefore, falling quite rapidly, and the time would come when added
water from the Reclamation Bureau, drawn either from the Sierra to the
west or from the rain surplus in the north, would be required. Then, in or-
der to apply the Newlands Act, smaller farms would replace the big
estates, and southern California would begin to look like the rest of the
United States, instead of like Sicily and Latin America. I checked Taylor's
figures and statements and found them to be true.

It was ten years before I could put this information to practical use
other than to defend the Bureau of Reclamation from the attacks of the
land monopolists, and to sound warnings from time to time. Then in 1959
my chance came.

For over twenty years Paul Taylor had faithfully worked at the subject
and had early won the support of the AFL, the Veterans of Foreign Wars,
the Farmers' Union, the Grange, and the progressive wing of the Demo-
cratic party. Events had happened as he had prophesied. The waters of
Mount Shasta and the northern Sierras, which had formerly flowed tur-
gidly down the Sacramento River to the Pacific Ocean, were now partially
deployed by a series of canals to the parched lands to the south. But the
Taylor: what they were trying to do in terms of the society that would be created if they were given the exemption from acreage limitation they were seeking.*

Chall: What made Senator Morse such a strong supporter of the limitation?

Taylor: I've forgotten my first meeting with Senator Morse. I had a couple with him, not in the Valley as with Senator Douglas, but I had a chance to talk with him about it. He was labor-oriented, experienced as an arbitrator. Also we had a common Wisconsin background which I brought to his attention. I remember his responsiveness when I told him that in the early 1880s my mother had taught school in Viroqua where he was born, in order to make money to pay her way as a student through the University of Wisconsin. Beyond that, I'm sure that Paul Douglas took care of the rest of alerting him. Morse was a lawyer, Douglas was not, so they had both professional qualifications—in economics and in the law as they worked together.

Chall: And Senator Neuberger, for the short time that he was there?

Taylor: Well, I met Senator Neuberger before he became U.S. senator. He came once to my home and spent an evening there in which we talked about the water issue. He was definitely a liberal person. As I recall, he used to write for the Survey Graphic, which also I did. So he responded, and that made a little nucleus. Neuberger was a member of the Senate Interior Committee.

Chall: And then in the debates in '59 and '60 they were joined by Senator Lausche. How did that come about?

Taylor: My speculation is that Lausche of Ohio, who was not a particularly liberal senator, owed something to Paul Douglas, and this was an easy way to pay back. By asking Douglas a few friendly questions he could gesture in return for courtesies previously received from Douglas.

Chall: How did he vote?

Taylor: The vote in the Senate was an unrecorded voice vote. Doubtless

*Senator Douglas, in his autobiography In the Fullness of Time tells of the battles over the attempt to exempt the state service area, and speaks of me. (369-71) He speaks also of the part played by my former student, Congressman Jeffrey Cohelan. PST
Taylor: Lausche voted with Douglas if he was in the Senate when the vote came.

I was not in Washington at the time of the 1959 debates, but there were two people, in particular, in Washington carrying the ball outside the Senate, but helping our friendly senators. One was Angus McDonald, then legislative representative of the National Farmers Union. He became deeply immersed in the issue and he must have been at the senators' elbows throughout. McDonald remains devoted to the 160-acre issue. He wrote about this issue for inclusion in a case book. Whether the case book was in business administration or law, or what, I do not recall. But for this publication he wrote a history of that Senate battle.

Chall: Is he still with the National Farmers Union?

Taylor: He has retired from the NFU, but when the acreage-limitation issue comes around the corner, he moves. Our latest bill was introduced through the personal intervention of McDonald and Lloyd Tupling, the latter originally administrative assistant to Senators Richard and Maureen Neuberger. I had gone to him in those days. Later he became Washington representative of the Sierra Club. He and Angus McDonald, and I believe George Taylor of the AFL-CIO, went to Congressman Robert Kastenmeier, of Wisconsin, and said, "We would like you to introduce this bill," which Kastenmeier did. Now there are seven congressmen and four senators as sponsors.*

Another citizen active on the acreage-limitation issue in 1959 was George Ballis, who at that time was editor of the AFL-CIO Valley Labor Citizen, Fresno. He was in Washington, so he was there at the senators' elbows. I was out here and I would receive the Senate debates by airmail. I would send back materials that I thought would be helpful to Senators Douglas and Morse. Also, I telephoned to Ballis to give him in time the ammunition that I thought would be helpful in the next floor debate.

Chall: Is that the George Ballis who testified before the Adlai Stevenson committee last month?

Taylor: Yes. When this bug bites, the effects last a long time; Angus McDonald and George Ballis are examples.

*HR 5236 (1971) Identical House bills by Congressmen Danielson, Dellums, Edwards, McFall, Roybal, Waldie, and identical Senate bills by Bayh, Cranston, Harris, Hart.
Chall: Were they able to rally the same group from labor and the Grange and the churches that had been rallied in the forties?

Taylor: Well, the *Congressional Record* shows the evidences that the forties were approximated in 1959. There's a long list—must be two or three hundred names of people down in the Valley who signed a petition. We got telegrams or letters to go in from the California Labor Federation. The record would show what we were able to mobilize. The veterans were not vocal, as they had not been continuously advised of their interest in the issue.

Chall: So you were doing it by communicating with each other?

Taylor: Yes, we worked, and we got results, sure.

Chall: The unexpected thing, at least it was unexpected as I read it, was that the acreage limitation would be retained in the House of Representatives. Your side was used to having it happen in the Senate, but not in the House.

Taylor: How did we kill the proposed exemption in the House?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: The central figure was Jeffrey Cohelan, congressman from this 7th district. Jeffrey Cohelan had been my student, then secretary of the Milkwagon Drivers Union. Before he went to Congress he had been at meetings in California where this was at issue, so he understood it. I was in Washington while House debate was in the offing. Upon one occasion I invited the Cohelans—and at his suggestion, Congressman Al Ullman, of Oregon, and his wife—Ullman was on the Interior Committee—to dinner at the Cosmos Club. There we talked about the issue and the debate in prospect. When the attempted exemption came to the floor in the House, the battle to block it was led by Congressman Jeffrey Cohelan and Congressman Al Ullman. So we won that battle.

Chall: So actually, in 1960, you won the battle to keep the 160-acre limitation applying to all the water that served the San Luis area regardless of whether it was federal or state.

Taylor: That's right, no exemption. That battle in the House was particularly hard to win because the other side had gathered its forces. It had the committee report in its favor on the exemption, but a divided report, so the minority that opposed the exemption bounced the majority that was for the exemption; we had strength, even though in the committee we didn't win. We were just a shade
Taylor: below the majority. And as I recall, the House took two or three vote counts. First a voice vote, and the Speaker said that the move to kill the exemption was defeated.

Then our side asked for a division, which is to go down separate aisles and be counted. We lost on that. But we had such strong support from the national AFL-CIO whose legislative representative said, "Your vote on this exemption is going to be a part of your labor voting record." When labor did that, we got a recorded vote and won. The record vote made the difference between losing and winning.

Chall: You had to go through the procedure of asking then, for a recorded vote?

Taylor: Yes, that is important. The California senate, I believe, just passed a bill requiring that votes in committees must be recorded. Recording often makes a big difference.

Chall: Where were you when this was being done, were you in the gallery?

Taylor: No, I was in Berkeley. No, I did preparatory work, having a couple of congressmen and their wives for dinner at the Cosmos Club for a social evening.

Chall: The effect of this debate and the fact that you were successful in retaining the limitation was nullified, to some extent, by later administrative action of Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall?

Taylor: Yes, we won in Congress but Udall approved a later federal-state contract without any provision for acreage limitation. Getting the law enforced as passed by Congress is very difficult.

Chall: Can you give me some understanding of Secretary Udall's position? Why you think he took the positions that he took on acreage limitation?

Taylor: Probably he was told by the administration, "This is what you do." Probably word came down from the White House, under pressure from large landholders. That's what I think. Remember also that Udall comes from Arizona, a state where the law never has been enforced on the Salt River Project.

Chall: Your group didn't have any special effect or link with Presidents Kennedy or Johnson during this period?
Taylor: I wired both the president and his brother the attorney general, calling attention to the law violation of the federal-state contract approved by Secretary Udall, and to its inconsistency with President Kennedy's very recent visit to Venezuela where he handed out titles to tenants gaining ownership under the Venezuela land reform program. I was told later that this wire changed the attorney general's action from simply "I concur" with the secretary, to an uneasy concurrence and expression of hope that Congress itself would review the contract.

Senate Hearings on Enforcement - 1964, 1966

Taylor: Did I tell you about going to Udall?

Chall: No.

Taylor: It was the day before the July 8, 1964 hearings on Westlands project before the Senate Interior Committee. We were protesting nonenforcement of the acreage-limitation law on the San Luis unit of the Central Valley Project. I went together with Father James L. Vizzard, a Jesuit, representing the National Catholic Conference on Rural Life. Dorothea, in anticipation, showed me a book by Udall on conservation, with his credo on the opening page. She said, "Show him this." So, I did. I said, "Mr. Secretary, this is your credo, and it doesn't fit with what you're doing at San Luis."

His manner was very free and easy, in shirt sleeves. He seated me in a rocker. He sat right behind his desk in another chair. To the two of us he said, "Well, we'll see how the hearing goes tomorrow." Well, the hearing, from my point of view, put the Department of the Interior pretty thoroughly on the spot. As a result the Bureau of Reclamation did make a change in our favor in the government contract with the Westland Water District.

Chall: What specific kind of change?

Taylor: Oh, I'd have to look at the volume to tell you exactly what it was. It appears in the closing pages of the 1964 hearings on Westlands.

Chall: That's all right, it's available for research.

Taylor: It didn't mean a thorough enforcement of the law by any manner or means. That issue is still up, it was up last month and was in
Taylor: during the January San Francisco hearings before Senator Adlai Stevenson of the Senate Migratory Labor Subcommittee. We are still protesting nonenforcement of the law at Westlands. At those same hearings Ralph Brody, the manager-chief counsel on the Westlands Water District, named me about four or five times, attacking me, of course, for saying the law was not being enforced. But I do not mind his attacks.

Chall: Ralph Brody attacked you during the Adlai Stevenson hearings or during the--

Taylor: He was at both the Stevenson and the 1964 hearings, as well as 1967 Senate appropriations hearings at which I testified. I knew Brody back in the forties when he was a member of the legal staff of the Bureau of Reclamation in Sacramento.

Chall: Oh, he was?

Taylor: Yes, but he carved out a subsequent career for himself serving the interests of large west side landowners. I believe that he helped with the development of the State Water Project tactics. He had a state appointment on the water commission--chairman, I believe--which put him in a position to do that. Then he became manager-chief counsel of the Westlands Water District, where, in my judgment, he enforces the law about as little as is possible, and he gets away with almost all the escapes that he tries. He has to give lip service to the law, but that's about all it amounts to.

Chall: Your 1964 article--circumvention--

Taylor: "Calculated Circumvention"?*

Chall: That's right. I was left with the impression that there wasn't very much of the 160-limitation or excess land law that any group in the government was administering.

Taylor: Your impression is correct. We were able to make them squirm a bit, but real enforcement is another matter. I think we made trouble for them because they can't quite ignore us. We don't let them get away with it without a record being made of what they are doing.

Chall: That July 1964 hearing first brought the history of legislative

*"Excess Land Law: Calculated Circumvention"
Chall: activity and administrative decisions onto the record for about a twenty year period. It seemed that the outcome was that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate provided the funds for construction, anyway, regardless of what had gone on in the hearing.

Taylor: That's true, but to have questions of legality raised bothers them very much. As I say, we make the record. And, to take a phrase from S. T. Harding, in 1944, testimony on S. Res. 295: "As long as that acreage-limitation law is on the books, we cannot be certain of continued future nonenforcement."

Chall: I see. So you gather up your forces and needle them a little bit, anyway, for the record?

Taylor: Well, the decision on enforcement vs. nonenforcement isn't final yet. In Imperial Valley in January Judge William D. Murray validated the residency requirement of reclamation law which has been ignored by administrators for fifty-five years. In other words, he says, enforce it now. Administrators cannot invalidate a valid act of Congress.*

Chall: How did it come about that you were asked to present your views at that hearing in 1964?

Taylor: I'm not sure I was asked to present my views.

Chall: You did testify.

Taylor: We wanted hearings, and I wanted to testify. The organization witnesses were put on the stand—first the officials, then the representatives of the protesting organizations like labor, Farmers Union, and Grange I was called on last.

Chall: Were you sometimes able to get into a hearing as a representative of labor?

Taylor: I have never sought that, always testifying as an individual citizen.

Chall: Or have they put you there?

Taylor: No, they have their own system for representation of their views. I have helped labor and other interested organizations by supplying information, e.g. to the Grange, the Farmers Union, the Catholic Rural Life Conference, and others. I have been active in advising interested or potentially interested groups when their interests were up for hearing.

Chall: Is it possible then that an individual can get into a committee hearing and testify if he wants to?

Taylor: Oh, I do it repeatedly. Yes, a citizen who wants to testify will be heard.

Chall: I see. Henry Jackson was the chairman of that committee--

Taylor: That's right.

Chall: How do you consider his record on acreage laws?

Taylor: From my point of view it's not a good record. In 1966 we held further hearings on nonenforcement at Westlands; a copy of which you have available to you, stenographic report and all, in my bound volumes. Senator Jackson's committee simply didn't print them, although labor, Grange, NFU, Jack T. Conway of the Industrial Union Department, Father Vizzard, and I testified. It represented our protests, and they just didn't print them.

Chall: The whole hearing wasn't printed, or a segment?

Taylor: None of the hearing was printed. I was told five times by the presiding senator that my prepared statement would be printed with my oral testimony, but the committee didn't print any record of that hearing at all.

Chall: What was that hearing about?

Taylor: The same thing--nonenforcement of reclamation laws. We were trying to protest that they had not really and truly mended their administrative practices since the 1964 hearings.

Chall: I see. Were you concerned primarily with the Westlands District?

Taylor: The 1964 and 1966 hearings both were devoted to Westlands.

Chall: In a footnote in the 1964 article on circumvention you write that you felt the publication of the testimony had been somewhat tampered with in 1964 hearings. That is, you compared the original
Chall: transcript with the published transcript, and noted that some change had been made.* Do you frequently get hold of the original and check it with the published?

Taylor: Almost never.

Chall: What made you do it this time?

Taylor: I don't know.

Chall: You called it to the attention of the readers in a footnote.

Taylor: I'd forgotten about that, but now that you speak of it I remember. Sometimes, perhaps frequently, the presiding officer gives witnesses an opportunity to edit their testimony. I have seldom if ever had that opportunity. Senator Stevenson gave it to me for the purpose of amplifying my testimony, and I did it. The request was his, not mine, and entirely in harmony with what I had said orally. So there's nothing unusual about giving them a chance to edit. I think I must have mentioned it because I thought the editing showed a little skittishness. I don't remember the exact details.

Chall: Yes, well, it did change the meaning a little bit.

Senator Salinger wasn't in office very long, but was he someone that you had any opinions about in terms of your major concern?

Taylor: Pierre Salinger?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Well, he didn't go along with me; he went along with the other side.

Chall: When he was running for office, did you have an opportunity to talk to him or know what his views might be?

Taylor: No, when he was senator by appointment he told me what side he was going to take. He said, "I know you won't like it." I said, "No, I don't." You see, in California both parties have largely buckled on this issue from my point of view. The Democratic party used to have strong platform planks from 1944 on in support of the

Taylor: acreage limitation. Those statements faded out, and the final collapse was under Edmund G. Brown as governor, when he went the whole way onto the other side, putting through the State Water Project to escape federal acreage limitation.

Senator Cranston--oh, did I speak to you about him on this issue?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: When he was a potential candidate around '60 he offered to write me a letter supporting acreage limitation, provided I would give it no publicity and put the letter in my strong box until after election. I told him that I was willing to accept his word without a letter. Well, he is now sponsoring the government-purchase bill which expresses the views which I hold.* How far he will push it I don't know, but that's already going pretty far.

Chall: Yes, to put his name on it at this point.

Taylor: That's right. I was told by telephone from Washington two days ago that there was apprehension that he would not put into the Congressional Record as an insert, a letter over the name of John F. Henning, executive secretary-treasurer of the California Labor Federation. This was a letter which I drafted for him, the subject of which was the acreage limitation and the Department of Justice. It was addressed to Attorney General designate Richard Kleindienst, whose appointment is a matter of uncertainty right today [March 9, 1972]. I believe he's up for a hearing. I was told that Senator Cranston might not put that in, but again, that he might. I don't have the word, I'll know tomorrow, probably, whether he did. My response to my informant over the telephone is, "He's already put his name on the bill, he might as well do this too;" but I don't know whether he did.

Cranston ran and succeeded in the race for the Senate after Max Rafferty had defeated Senator Kuchel, a Republican, in the primary. So doubtless Cranston wanted as many of the Kuchel Republican votes as he could get, and he got enough of them, certainly, to elect him. I heard by grapevine that he said not that he would not change his position on my issue, but that he wouldn't press it. Well, as I say, that's only grapevine information. But now he goes so far as to put his name on our bill, which I think is fine.

*HR 5236, Kastenmeier.
Chall: In the study of acreage-limitation policy, that the Senate Interior Committee requested in '62, did you have anything to do with that?

Taylor: No.

Chall: Toward the end of the circumvention article you quoted Louis Jaffe. I noticed that that particular article he wrote and from which you were quoting is bound in with your 160-acre limitation publications.* Who is he?

Taylor: I bound Jaffe's article in?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Good! I don't know Jaffe personally. I believe he's a business administration professor at Harvard. His thesis is the difficulty of citizens getting standing in court to sue. He's put his finger on a very grave weakness in our system of law observance and enforcement. We leave it to the bureaucracy to study what laws shall be enforced and what laws shall not be enforced. That's the ITT case. There it is in its most naked form. With respect to acreage limitation, almost from the beginning the government bureaucracy has not been enforcing the law, and this remains largely true right down to today. It costs money to pay lawyers to go into court. Well, who's going to pay those costs? Public officials are paid out of the public treasury to observe and enforce the law, but what can a citizen do when they don't enforce it?

One of the obstacles facing a private citizen, of course, is the cost of going to court, and another is the lack of information among the people in whose interest the law was passed. Generally they don't even know that their interests are at stake, so if the public officials don't enforce the law, who's going to? It's left to those who may be denied standing when they try. For example, early in 1971 came the Turrentine decision that acreage limitation does not apply to Imperial Valley. When the U.S. lost its case, then Dr. Ben Yellen and his 123 landless colleagues in Imperial Valley asked for standing as intervenors so they could appeal the adverse decision in case the Department of Justice didn't appeal. The Department of Justice didn't, and the judge denied standing to the landless people in whose interest the law was passed to enable

Taylor: them to plead their own case.

When you have government by bureaucracy, that's what you get. It's a very serious and wide-spread weakness of our form of government that has developed. Reclamation is a notable example.

Chall: Is this what is known as a class action suit?

Taylor: I think Yellen's suit is not a class action suit, technically. Class actions have developed and become recognized (as far as they are recognized) since the Jaffe article. Jaffe put his finger on a very serious weakness. If the bureaucracy won't challenge its own nonenforcement of laws, then who's going to have the power to bring it before the court? The answer is frequently, nobody. I have been concerned with this issue since the forties. I have watched the nonenforcement on a grand scale in Arizona since about 1912 or thereabouts. The bureaucracy does nothing.

Chall: So there seems to be some movement, then, to getting people into court?

Taylor: Oh, yes! The courts are loosening up now, and allowing actions which they never allowed before. But the exception, of course, is the Turrentine decision that the landless people in Imperial Valley have no standing to appeal.

Chall: A judge then under certain circumstances can determine whether a class action suit can be brought, unless it's stated in the law.

Taylor: That's right. And the only remedy if he says no, is to appeal it to a higher court and hope that the judges then will decide the other way.

Chall: And you've done that?

Taylor: That is being done in the United States appellate court right now. Yes. The way that case goes up is not because Dr. Yellen and his landless people have the money to appeal it and pay their attorney; it goes on up to the ninth circuit court of appeals, and there is now a printed brief which dignifies the effort to get standing. There is a printed brief, made possible because various organizations contributed funds. The California Labor Federation, for example, contributed a $1000. In Washington, they raised maybe $2500 from labor, the Farmers Union, the United Auto Workers. In other words, they have to dig down in their own pockets. I think the Environmental
Taylor: Defense Fund also may be contributing in some way.*

The Administration and Enforcement - 1960-1972

Chall: Various matters having to do with the 160-acre limitation, particularly with respect to enforcement came to a head while Secretary Udall was in office, after 1960.

Taylor: Secretary Udall's record on enforcement of the acreage limitation is about the worst in history.

Chall: He didn't put it off the way his predecessors have done for another administration. It seems that he made decisions.

Taylor: Yes.

Chall: Do you think that, in his time, the nonenforcement of the 160-acre limitation could be considered an idea whose time had come? He simply used it? Because all of these questions were coming to a head at that time.

Taylor: Yes--nonenforcement, yes. There was a convergence of the pressures against enforcement. On the one side was Governor Brown. You see, the Democratic party had been weakened on this issue, first by Senator Downey, then by defeat of Helen Cabagan Douglas by Richard Nixon. Brown abandoned its position entirely, only lip-service surviving. So here was a Democrat, top official on the side of the state saying, we don't want any acreage limitation in the federal-state contract that would apply to the state service area.

Chall: The San Luis decision--

Taylor: I believe that Brown's buckling under on this issue produced, or paralleled a similar buckling at the federal level. Grapevine, again. What I hear is that when the Kennedy people (when Kennedy was running for president) were in Los Angeles, they conferred with Brown. Apparently at that time he counseled them to do what they did; viz. drop this issue. That, presumably, was the way to become president; so the Kennedy administration also buckled. Udall was one of the very earliest Kennedy supporters. It was

*In 1973 the Ninth Circuit Appellate Court agreed to hear the landless and joined the acreage limitation case under Turrentine and the residency case under Murray. PST
Taylor: dropped in every area. Udall came forth on the right side of enforcement in Imperial Valley. He produced a suit by the United States against the Imperial Irrigation District to apply the law, which was decided against the government by Judge Turrentine.

Chall: How do you account for that?

Taylor: Well, I can speculate on that. Udall knew, well, shall I say that there was a divergence respecting the law between the morality, and the politics of it. You notice that he didn't say, "We're going to enforce the law in the Salt River Valley of my state of Arizona." He said, "We're going to enforce it over there in your California."

Chall: Why Imperial Valley instead of the San Luis Reservoir or Pine Flat where he had an opportunity?

Taylor: I can't say for sure except that Imperial Valley is a perennial contestant with Arizona for the Colorado River water. I don't think he minded putting California claimants of Colorado River water in an embarrassing position.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: It was easy politically for him to do right where Imperial Valley was concerned. Secretary Udall is going to be out here on Saturday, isn't he, at the Earl Warren Center? I think he's going to be the speaker on open space. You might go and ask him if my speculation is correct.

Chall: Why did you entitle the 1962 article, "Excess Land Law, Secretary's Decision?" with a question mark at the end of it?*

Taylor: Because I wrote it while his decision was pending, and the question mark meant in effect, "Well, what's it going to be?" You will note in the footnote at the beginning of the article that the editors (and I asked them to do this) said they had sent a draft of my article to the secretary of the interior so that the record would show that he received a draft of what I had to say before he made his contrary decision. I was trying to tell him the reasons why

*"Excess Land Law, Secretary's Decision?, a Study in Administration of Federal State Relations."
Taylor: He should've done what he did. The solicitor's contrary opinion avoids the reasons that I nailed, and conjures up other reasons I had not anticipated.

Chall: Apparently before your article had actually gone to press he had made a decision because you have an addendum attached to your article and it was about the secretary's decision.

Taylor: As to his publicly announced decision, that's right. I read the announcement of his decision in the San Francisco Chronicle. That's right, the record says he had it before him. As I say, the solicitor's opinion didn't answer the arguments that I had nailed. From my point of view, he just invented an excuse to do what he decided to do.

And within the state Governor Brown pulled the props from under us. Now, I might make a connection with the Tulare Lake situation under Pine Flat and Isabella dams, because that project is unfolding now. From the standpoint of action by the secretary, in December '61, when he said, "It doesn't apply to the state project,"--at the same time a solicitor's opinion was issued saying acreage limitation does apply in Tulare Lake under Pine Flat Dam. So politically, the secretary was tossing the bigger one to big landowners and the smaller one to us. The way that is working out is this: in January of this year the federal judge in Fresno decides that acreage limitation doesn't apply under Pine Flat. A decade has gone by. Why does a decade go by with a case like that. That's a tremendous dragging out of the procedures of justice. Well, I don't know just why, but I can think of possible reasons.

A tactic of the other side is to delay as much as possible, because passage of time without enforcement increases the chances of escape from the law. For example maybe you can get the law wiped off the books by an exemption. Or maybe you can get an Engle formula through Congress. Or maybe you can get the case tried before a more favorable judge. Or maybe you can get a more favorable attorney general who won't appeal a lost decision by a lower court.
Reactions of Landowners

Chall: If one reads your articles like "Calculated Circumvention," and your statements regarding the Lower Colorado Basin, in 1965, he gets one point of view about what was going on in the Udall administration of the Department of Interior. If however, you read the press--the Chronicle, the California Farmer, Western Water News, the Sacramento Bee in that period from about 1962 to 1968, you get the impressions that Secretary Udall was really moving against the landowners--that Secretary Udall, Commissioner Dominy, Assistant Secretary Holom, and Solicitor Frank Barry are all on the move.

Taylor: Why do you get that impression?

Chall: From the press I get the impression that the landowners in the area, and the irrigation district people are quite concerned because they claim that Solicitor Barry has written some opinions moving toward enforcement.

Taylor: In the early sixties.

Chall: The early sixties, yes. He wrote an opinion in '61, and apparently another one in '64.

Taylor: Nineteen sixty-four was his Imperial Valley opinion, a really good one. In '61, as noted earlier, Solicitor Barry issued two opinions, one saying acreage limitation applies to Pine Flat project and the other saying it does not apply to the state service area.

Chall: The Department of the Interior started the Imperial Valley case, and the Di Giorgio divestiture. They claimed that 160-acre limit would be applied to the San Felipe project, and the farmers in that area were very concerned. Commissioner Dominy was quoted as saying the 160-acre limitation will be enforced. So, what was going on? On the one hand you were writing that nothing is happening, and on the other side these people were very upset.

Taylor: Well, in the first place, the people on the other side didn't talk much about their victory in letting the State Water Project escape the law. That was a gigantic but dubious escape, so they didn't talk about that in public.

What they did talk about was our much smaller, temporary victory when Barry said the law does apply to the Kings and Kern
Taylor: rivers. He tossed the little one our way, the big one their way. So they didn't talk about the big one, but talked about the little one and griped.

Chall: I guess whoever owns land on the so-called little decision is just as upset as--

Taylor: Well, that's the case in Fresno district court, which they have won and which is hot right now.

We were pressing on them hard, you see, on nonenforcement on the San Luis unit. They wanted authorization of the San Felipe extension to be added, and they were afraid we might be able to block it unless acreage limitation was applied.

It is true that they said at first, "Yes, the acreage limitation will apply." We'd been after them hard, and that would help keep us quiet. The next phase in the story has come back to me via grapevine for which I have no documentation. The grapevine story is that when the Senate hearing on San Felipe was held, we weren't there in the room. Notably, Father James L. Vizzard, S.J., of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, wasn't there. Whether he was sick that day or out of Washington, I don't know. The story that comes back to me is that Senator Kuchel looked around in the room and noting the absence, said, "Well, Father Vizzard isn't here," and promptly put through committee a motion to remove the acreage limitation from San Felipe.

Chall: Is that how it happened?

Taylor: You see how important it is that somebody should be at the right place and just talk to somebody at the right time? That was a defeat. It was not gigantic, but it was a defeat. It shows you also that Udall and the Bureau of Reclamation administrators were not standing very staunchly for the law.

Chall: From the reading of these newspaper clippings, one might get the impression that the Udall administration of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation at that time, was almost like another page out of the Ickes' administration.

Taylor: Well, my response to that is, turn it upside down and you'll have it closer to right. The fact of the matter is that the Udall administration gave the big landowners the biggest victories in the history of reclamation, excepting only Salt River Valley. The major one was letting the State Water Project escape. After

Note: Pages misnumbered. Page 300 follows page 290.
Taylor: both houses of Congress debated exemption, and voted "no exemption," Udall gave them the defacto exemption. So the things you were reading apparently were gripes because they hadn't gotten everything.

Chall: I see. Now, why is it that in Aqueduct Empire, which is quite recently published, Cooper says that when the San Luis is completed in 1968, the prime beneficiaries will be the Westlands Irrigation District; that 600,000 acres have been promised 1.5 million acre-feet of water per year delivered to farms of 160 acres.* Is that correct?

Taylor: That's the federal unit. That is the law on the books.

Chall: But doesn't this give you the impression that the land has been divided and that's the way the water will be delivered?

Taylor: [Laughter]

Chall: That's the impression I get, is that the fact?

Taylor: [Laughter] No, that's the law on paper in the books.

Chall: How then can he make a certain statement like that?

Taylor: Well, at the moment he's assuming that the law is going to be enforced.

Chall: Why?

Taylor: Why does he assume it?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Well, Senator Kuchel told Congress that the acreage-limitation law will be applied to every drop of water in the San Luis unit.

Chall: Have any contracts been written up?

Taylor: Oh, a few, yes, some.

Chall: Divestitures would apply?

Taylor: No, no divestitures. No, on January 11, before the Stevenson

*Erwin Cooper, Aqueduct Empire, p. 161
Taylor: Committee, Ralph Brody, the manager-chief counsel of the Westlands Water District, attacked me by name, I think about four times. No, I have not achieved enforcement there, but on the other hand, Brody is entangled there and has to make some gestures. But as for the law being enforced the way the law is written, I think, no. I think that Secretary Udall, if he viewed the law in spirit as well as letter, wouldn't have spent a dollar on that project until he got those contracts. Actually that is what the 1912 law says.

Chall: I have run across reference to articles written by a man named Beaman in the Daily Commercial News on water in about 1968. What were those about?

Taylor: Those were good articles. I think he left out acreage limitation to control speculation and monopoly--the point that has concerned me primarily. But he made many other good points. I just wish he had latched onto the issue I think is crucial. I see it as crucial because it deals with the motivation, the guiding force for our water development. If you're going to allow uncontrolled speculation and monopoly to determine the projects, the public interest will come second or third.

Chall: Who is Mr. Beaman; do you know him?

Taylor: I do not know him, but he's a competent person, I'm sure.

Recommendations of the Reagan Task Force Commission

Chall: What's happened to two bills that went into Congress, as a result of Governor Reagan's Task Force Committee? Senator Kuchel's S 1111 in 1967, which would have turned some projects back to the Central Valley Project, but without acreage limits for ground water. What became of that plan?

Taylor: I think I understand the point of your question. Kuchel, Engle, Knowland, Brown, all told Congress how much the state was going to do in relieving the federal government of costs to supply water to California farmers. That was to support their plea that the State Water Project should be exempted from acreage limitation. These units--I believe I'm right about this--had been professed to be a part of the State Water Project. Well, the State Water Project was in great financial trouble from the beginning. So,
Taylor: these are examples, I believe, of talking out of the other side of the mouth. Having got through administrative cooperation relief from the acreage limitation on the State Water Project, they then wanted to relieve themselves of as much financial burden as possible, so they began to toss the little projects back to the federal government if it could be got to take them on.

Chall: Did the federal government take them?

Taylor: I'm not certain how many. But the answer as to San Felipe unit extending the San Luis unit of Central Valley project is, yes.

Chall: And is the Peripheral Canal supposed to be a federal project?

Taylor: It's a joint project. In other words, it's another example of maneuvering to get free of acreage limitation and as much financial responsibility as possible.

Chall: What happened to Senator George Murphy's S 1631 (1969) which was also, I think, based on a task force recommendation? It increased the acreage limitation to 640 acres rather than do away with it entirely; they were to apply the Engle formula to all projects, and allow payout to terminate the contract obligation.

Taylor: They didn't really care about raising the limitation to 640 acres; that was just political window dressing. If one owns 100,000 acres, raising the limitation from 160 to 640 acres is trifling relief. What the really big landowners want--if they can't get outright exemption--is cheap payout, i.e., the Engle formula.

Chall: What ever happened to the bill?

Taylor: Nothing. They knew what would happen if they ever held hearings on it. You have my statement, my letter to Allan Grant, the one that Cohelan put in the Congressional Record on May 22, 1968. 114 Cong. Rec. 7420. I tried to tell what kind of a deal the Reagan Task Force report and Murphy bill were. The move to apply acreage limitation to Imperial Valley, represented by Solicitor Frank Barry's 1964 opinion (71 Interior Decisions 528), touched off fresh concerns by large landowning interests over possible enforcement of acreage limitation law.

Robert W. Long, then vice-president of Irvine Ranch, and later senior vice-president of Bank of America and assistant secretary of agriculture in 1973, came up from Southern California to speak at a Sacramento meeting of the State Board of Agriculture.
Taylor: I was invited to drive up with Michael Peevey, the research director of the California Labor Federation, so we both were present. The Grange also had their representative there, Herman Grabow. We sat inconspicuously in chairs up against the wall, and my guess is that Mr. Long never expected that anyone with views such as ours could possibly be at such a meeting, even though State Board of Agriculture is a public body. Incidentally, I had been a member of the board from 1940 to 1944 by appointment of Governor Culbert Olson.

Chall: I see, so you just went up there.

Taylor: We just went up there, and Robert Long told the truth, frankly, as though he were speaking only to his own people.

Chall: Oh, what did he say?

Taylor: He wanted out of acreage limitation. He spoke of Imperial Valley, he spoke about Southern California. This was when the Imperial Valley case was coming to a focus, headed into the courts. Irvine owns land, 10,000 acres or so in Imperial Valley, and of course they have huge holdings in other parts of Southern California that are receiving water from the Colorado River (controlled by Boulder Canyon Act structures) through the California aqueduct.

Well, he put his attorney from O'Melveny and Myers in Los Angeles on the stand to speak for about ten or fifteen minutes. He presented a plausible legal case against the enforcement of acreage limitation in the Imperial Valley. Then, after the attorney got through, Long stepped up, and as I say, spoke frankly and told the truth.

And here's the essence of what he said, "We think we have a stronger Imperial Valley case in the lower courts than we do in the higher." All right, there's the TURRENTINE decision that the law does not apply to the Valley. So the tactic is: Don't let it get up to the higher courts. The Nixon administration declined to appeal, thus abandoning the opposite government position taken by Secretary of Interior Udall.*

*See Taylor, "Water, Land and Environment, Imperial Valley: Law Caught in the Winds of Politics," 13 Natural Resources Journal 1. (1973) PST
Taylor: Then his second statement--this is an aspect which is just beginning to open up in Orange County, the Irvine ranch. He said, "We think we have a stronger Imperial Valley case than a Southern California case." In other words, they didn't have any case at all. And that 90,000-acre Irvine ranch is receiving water in violation of the law; there is no enforcement.

Chall: And he was discussing this with the State Board of Agriculture before Senator Murphy took his bill to Congress?

Taylor: Yes. Long was speaking in '68; the Murphy bill was introduced in 1969. And Long said, "Well, the only real solution of the acreage-limitation problem is to wipe it off the books." Evidently the large landholders' strategists must have come to the conclusion that they didn't want to take on the fights that they had got into in '44, '47, '59, and '60, when they couldn't wipe the law off the books. So, in 1956 they slipped through the Engle formula in the Small Reclamation Projects Act; that tactic got by. I told you how that got by and what Paul Douglas said, what a slick job they did on him.*

Their next step in strategy was the Reagan Task Force. The chairman was attorney for the Kern County Land Company. They loaded it with the kind of people who said in their report, and I quote: "A majority of the members...believe these (acreage limitation) provisions are wrong in principle and should be repealed."

Chall: So, actually, they decided to rely on nonenforcement through the administration, rather than to take it up in Congress again?

Taylor: Well, they put their proposal in bill form, which is a gesture, but there were no hearings. Doubtless they guessed what would happen; they don't want publicity because with publicity they lose. They can best slip by what they want while nobody's looking.

Chall: Sometime in that period, there was a statement from the Grange that they were willing to accept some sensible upward revision.**


**Sacramento Bee, October 17, 1967.
Taylor: They were willing to go to 320 acres.

Chall: Is that it? Not 640, they didn't talk about 640?

Taylor: They were not guilty of double talk, but the other side, when they say 640, really mean 1280. You see, they want husband and wife each to have 640 acres, or 1280 for the two.

They can tell city people, particularly, that 160 acres is utterly unreasonable in modern times. They don't mention the 320 acres for man and wife that they succeeded in getting administratively. Most city people don't know how big 160 acres of land is. My research assistant asked me one day, "Well, how big is 160 acres? Can't you tell me in miles?"

Chall: I'm sure I feel the same way.

Taylor: So it's easy to fool people and get them talking about whether 160 acres is adequate to support a family, and so keep them from talking about what the large landholders really want, viz., to pay a little bit for acreage above 160, and so to buy their way out cheaply for 100,000 acres or whatever they own.

Chall: What was Secretary Hickel's position on any of this?

Taylor: I don't know that it came before him. Yes, it must have. I've forgotten the specifics, but it was substantially this: He took as his undersecretary, Russell Train, who is president of the Conservation Foundation, with high standing among conservationists. I sent in a letter pointing out the nonenforcement somewhere, and I got back a letter brushing me off, signed by Russell Train.

My guess is that his staff put a draft reply on his desk--Bureau of Reclamation people opposed to me--made it look all right so he just signed it, not really knowing what he was signing. That's my guess. I've seen how the staff works. They'll slip into the draft of a letter some little thing that they have been wanting approval of, hoping to get it by their secretary. You see, any tactic that might work, goes. I told you how they got the Colorado Big Thompson exemption by having an undersecretary who bided his time, and when Secretary Ickes went out of town, slipped it through with Interior Department approval.
Paul Taylor Writes on Land and Water Issues

Law Journals

Chall: Your own work, during this period after 1952, was back to the University and the publication of--

Taylor: The series of articles.

Chall: Yes, and from 1949 until, I think about 1965, nearly all were in law journals.* As I read these, they are extremely interesting, especially from a research point of view.

Taylor: They fine-tooth-bombed it.

Chall: Yes, they did. And they're also readable, which doesn't always happen in articles of this kind. You must have been writing them constantly and researching. I wondered how you were able to do that. You weren't on anybody's staff for this.

Taylor: That was done on my own time, researching my field in the University tradition.

Chall: Who were the people who assisted you? Beverly Starika, Klaus Leowald?

Taylor: Beverly Starika was my research assistant.

Chall: Was she paid?

Taylor: The University paid her to assist me. The funds came out of a grant--I believe a Ford Foundation grant, and I had that available over the years.

Chall: You had a Ford Foundation grant to research this topic?

*While this memoir was being processed, between 1972 and 1974, Paul Taylor wrote additional articles for law journals and other magazines. Refer to his publications listed in the appendix. MC
Taylor: The Ford Foundation grant was to the University in the social sciences. Its administration office was called the Bureau of Business and Economic Research. Now it's been elevated to the Institute of Business and Economic Research, and I've had its support from the beginning in the forties. I used a lot of it for my work on the history of agricultural labor in the United States. Of course reclamation is one facet of this subject. It was enacted in 1902 in the first place to provide opportunity for farm youth.

Chall: I see. Is that an institute separate from the University?

Taylor: No, it is on campus on the first floor of Barrows Hall. The office of the original bureau was in the library right where you are on the annex fourth floor, and Frank Kidner was the director. So that's how I had research assistance. Of course legal aspects of reclamation was only one aspect of my researches carried on with my assistants.

Chall: Beverly Starika, Klaus Leowald, Elizabeth Rickerson Huttman?

Taylor: That's right. I had those, you see, in succession.

Chall: Were they graduate students?

Taylor: They were all graduate students. Leowald is at a university in Australia now. Beverly Starika has her doctorate and is at the University of Manitoba, in Winnipeg. Elizabeth Huttman—I believe she's teaching at Hayward State University, and her husband is on the faculty at San Francisco State University. I met Elizabeth Cox on campus the other day. I hadn't seen her for a dozen years. I've forgotten what she's doing now, but she and the others all have continued academic work in one way or another. The work they did with me was evidently a useful part of their training, which it was intended to be.

Chall: They surely must have learned research, if nothing else.

Taylor: That's all I was trying to teach them in that assistance capacity.

Chall: Some of the material must have come from archives and legislative records.

Taylor: Yes, it did, because I had to put in a footnote in one or two of the articles using material that I placed in The Bancroft Library. The documents were generally unavailable on campus. Surely, I
Taylor: took advantage of materials I'd been able to save from my consultantship, from government files, or wherever.

Chall: Did you have to go to Washington, D.C. and look around in the archives?

Taylor: No, as consultant I got them. When relevant materials came out, they generally were mailed to me. The staff at the Bureau of Reclamation at Sacramento used to see to it that I got them.

Chall: I see. So you have a wealth of material here which is archival.

Taylor: I persuaded the bureau in 1952 to give a lot of its archival materials to The Bancroft Library.

Chall: It must have taken quite a bit of time, even with help, to put these articles together.

Taylor: Yes, I worked!

Chall: I was amused by your quoting from the Emperor's--I've forgotten the name of that fairy tale.

Taylor: Yes, I know, the "Emperor's New Clothes" that he didn't have.*

Chall: Right. So there's a touch of humor in your approach.

Taylor: [Laughter] Well, with a wry smile.

Chall: None of it seems to bear your smile. There isn't a sense of bitterness in them either, except occasionally. You stayed within the bounds of scholarship.

Taylor: I took the subject seriously with never a question of motives on the other side. So I was playing the game according to the rules. I knew all the time what the motivation was--and is--great private economic interest.

Chall: I think you brought that out in a later study, the one, "Pressure vs. Principle."**

---


Taylor: Yes, that's it. They would just write the law the way they want to. That's the latest or the next to the last decision in Imperial Valley. If you have the interest and the power you just get the law written the way you want it to be written.

Chall: This isn't unusual in public policy, is it? Where a great deal is riding on it.

Taylor: Well, it conforms to the long history of the disposal of the public lands in this country. The record is not a good one; it's a very bad one. It's a very bad one right here in California, and, as I think I told you the other day, the tactic was first to grab the water, and then the money to get the water to the land. It was all described in a short passage in 1877 in the Visalia Delta, the whole century-long deal. I think I used the quotation as one of my epigraphs.

Chall: I think so. What about the titles that you chose?

Taylor: For those law journal articles? I wanted to zero in. Instead of a scatter gun I wanted to hit a bull's eye.

Chall: I see. These were chosen with a great deal of care. The one that I find somewhat amusing is "Excess Land Law, Execution of a Public Policy," because that seems like a double entendre--I don't know whether you meant it that way.

Taylor: The editor of the Yale Law Journal suggested it be modified--and I think he might have had the same thing in mind as you. He said, 'Why don't we call it 'execution of a public policy by execution?'' [Laughter] I responded I thought it was close enough to that now and suggested it be left as it is. I judge that you so understood it, without change.

Chall: I just wondered if that was your intention.

Taylor: Yes, I had it in mind. Then later in the series of articles I made the meaning less subtle in my '64 article by calling it "Calculated Circumvention."*

Chall: You stopped writing for the law journals and then began to write for American West?

Taylor: Yes, American West and Bay Guardian. You see, law-journal articles are excellent vehicles for a certain type of work. The style is to document to a gnat's eyebrow what you want to document. From that solid base you can build in whatever direction you choose when action is what you want. Law-journal articles themselves don't do the active job, but they provide the foundation and they make a lot of trouble for officials who sometimes when they're called to account, have to meet what you say. Of course I was well rewarded for the Yale Journal article--particularly well rewarded.

Chall: What was your reward?

Taylor: The United States Supreme Court cited it. And on November 23 last, that good Judge Murray decision on Imperial Valley in the San Diego federal court, that decision cited it too. So I've had commendation at the very top in '58, and now in '71, at the very bottom of the federal judicial hierarchy.* That's a reward. Both of them good decisions.

Chall: You really had to write as if you were a lawyer.

Taylor: That's right. I had lawyers' standards to conform to.

Chall: Were you given advice by attorneys on how to set these things up?

Taylor: No. You remember that at the University of Wisconsin I went halfway through law school, so I had the grounding in legal training—not completed, but grounding.

Chall: The basis of careful research, at any rate.

Taylor: You document everything you say, right back to the source, yes.

Chall: These, through the years, I can see, were set up to influence somebody, frequently the Congress.

Taylor: Hopefully Congress and the administrators. I think they did trouble the administrators on the other side who were ready to gut the whole acreage-limitation business, like Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

Chall: You think the McKay-Morse--

Taylor: Yes, I think it had something to do with Morse's defeat of McKay for the Senate.

Chall: The fact that you didn't write any more law journal articles after 1965, does that indicate that you felt there was no more point in talking to the legislature or to the administration through these articles?

Taylor: Yes, I felt that tactically I wasn't getting anywhere further.

Chall: I see, try another area.

Taylor: Yes. Right now--you see these papers on my desk--I'm in the midst of writing an article which I hope a law journal will take on that Imperial Valley situation.* So I write for law journals when I think there may be a practical result from it, and that the recording of the situation may serve as a foundation supporting my side of the law in the courts.

Chall: Have you ever thought of writing for the record the account of the state water plan?

Taylor: I am invited right now to write a book on water in California. I would have done that three or four years ago, but I saw no prospect of publication. Now I have a prospect and I'm so busy, I'm so up to my neck with the revival of interest in this subject. Students and others come and knock on my door or they're on the telephone, asking me this and that. The Stevenson hearings, the Harris hearings, the National Coalition for Land Reforms. The subject again is becoming a matter of public interest now.

Chall: So they now want you to speak, and testify, and to write.

Taylor: Yes, I was invited to speak in Los Angeles today, but I decided I wouldn't take that on. There are others who are speaking. Better not to have too much dependence on me personally. Besides, there is the cost, the inconvenience, the interruption of what I'm trying to do. I can't do everything, and shouldn't.

Bay Guardian

Chall: Now, about some of the later articles you wrote. You wrote at least three, in 1967, in the Bay Guardian as a result of the Reagan Task Force proposals. How did you happen to choose the Bay Guardian as your paper for those articles.**

Taylor: I think they chose me.

Chall: Oh, is that so.

Taylor: I don't remember, exactly, but--Bruce Brugmann, the owner and editor--somebody must have told him about me. As I recall, he came to me and asked if I would write the articles.

Chall: You have a way of being able to write differently for whatever publication you're--

Taylor: I try to write differently. And, of course, as a newspaper man, he helped me in the editing. He's part-time on the journalism department staff at U.C. A very able man, who used to be with the Milwaukee Journal.

American West

Chall: And in the last few years you've been writing for the American West.

Taylor: Yes.

Chall: Why did you choose that journal?

Taylor: I'll choose most anybody who'll give me an opportunity to write for publication. In American West I was able to accent the historical aspects, which carry the water issue back to the 1870s.

Chall: Yes, I noticed that you did. Following your article, "Reclamation, the Rise and Fall of an American Idea" [July, 1970], it seemed that there was some give and take in Letters to the Editor, the last of which was a rejoinder by you [July, 1971], so you stirred up a little interest.

Taylor: Yes, I understand there will be no more articles by me in American West because of the kicks they got. No, I think that particular outlet is finished for the time being.


Taylor: I think they got some more kicks. I don't think it was just one. That was a carefully written letter. I would expect (without knowing the man at all, of course) that that was made the occasion for an answer, using his name. He might have put his hand to the letter, but somebody also put their hands to it who knew a whole lot more than he was likely to have known. That reads like a public-relations job.

Chall: Do you think that the kind of articles that you write are not acceptable to the American West?

Taylor: What comes back to me is that the American West is not disposed to take on more controversial subjects, such as my issue. Apparently more than just one person wrote or spoke to the editor.

Chall: People other than those just simply interested in western history read it, too.

Taylor: Yes. Well, you see they published Helen Hosmer's article on the Imperial Valley, which exposed that situation, and then two articles of mine. Well, I was lucky to get those into print in a reputable journal. You see, all my life I've had the question, how do I get into print? It's catch as catch can.

Chall: You've gotten a lot published.

Taylor: I've got a lot published, but there's more awaiting. I've got some more I'd still like to get in. Look at what the government printing office does for me through Congressional insertions, etc.

Chall: I have two reprints that you had given me from the Congressional Record put in by Lee Metcalf and Jeffrey Cohelan, so that you get them that way.
Taylor: Sure. Jeff Cohelan put in "Reclamation, Aspirations versus Achievements."*

Chall: I haven't seen that.

Agricultural Labor

Chall: In 1968 you wrote an article, "California Farm Labor: A Review," for Agricultural History.

Taylor: I was asked to review a book by Gerald S. Auerbach, who had written an historian's evaluation of what was known as the LaFollette Committee, and they asked me to take off from that and write on the LaFollette Committee, which I did.**

Chall: A couple of years after this?

Taylor: This was '68, or, was it just before? Maybe it was just before.

Chall: I don't know that one.

Taylor: "Hand Laborers in the Sugar Beet Industry"?*** Oh, that's one of the best articles I've written recently. I related the availability of a cheap labor supply to the farm structure, that is, as it contributed to enlargement of farms and to separation of the laborer from ownership of the land on which he worked. I showed how the family-farm pattern was displaced because of the availability of the cheap migratory labor, largely out of Mexico, in part also, out of Asia, notably the Filipinos, the Japanese, and before them the Chinese. How that altered the western farm pattern from the pattern prevalent from New England across through the Middle West. There originally the laborer on the land and the farm owner was one in the same person. Now that split is becoming a big issue all through the Middle West.


**Agricultural History XLII, 49-53. 1968.

Chall: You've written some articles on agricultural history recently for a southern journal, haven't you, a series of them? I think you were tracing the history of the Georgia plantation?

Taylor: Oh, that book on the Georgia Plan? You want to talk about that?

Chall: Yes, if you want to now.

Taylor: Any time!

Chall: [Laughter] Because it indicates that along with the work that you were doing with water, you were still writing on agriculture--from an historical perspective.

Taylor: Well, when World War II came with rationing of gasoline and tires, Dorothea and I could not go out into the field. So, facing what I estimated as four years of war, I came to this conclusion: I can't go into the field for about four years, why not go to the library, and write as much as I can of the history of the academic field in which I have a primary interest, namely labor in agriculture. And, why not go back to the beginning in 1607, when Virginia was settled.

I have accumulated a large volume of primary materials, a portion of which I have been able to use in bringing particular topics to publication. I have planned some volumes which probably I shall never be able to complete, at least as originally I had planned them. What I have done is publish fragments, when I had a chance to do it--fragments of one sort or another in journals. My article, "Migratory Labor in the Wheat Belt," has just been published by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

I completed that in the fifties, but couldn't get it published in a journal in the full-documented form that I wanted. That is to say, the journal would squeeze it way down with the result that the reader would lose half the documentation. From my point of view, the documentation is a very essential part of it, so I waited until I got a chance to give it to the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor. So I am getting my agricultural labor history out in fragments.

My Georgia study is simply this: As I went through the records of one colony after another, when I stumbled into the source documents on Georgia, I found that the account of the founding of Georgia, as I had learned it in high school, avoids the main policy issue on which the colony was founded.
Taylor: The story, as generally told, is that General Ogelthorpe, and a few other well-meaning people in London, felt sorry for the debtors in the jails, and saw a chance to let them out and give them a chance for a new life on the Atlantic seaboard, that their plans were idealistic, utopian, impractical, and bound to fail. That summed up the founding of Georgia as I had learned it.

Well, now I don't believe that thesis at all. It is true that the trustees who founded Georgia, Ogelthorpe among them, had been concerned with debtors. But I doubt if they shipped more than a dozen debtors over to Georgia. So the debtor explanation had relevance only in that it reflects the state of mind and the interests of the trustees who founded Georgia.

The true story can be boiled down to something like this: The trustees didn't like what they saw in South Carolina and Virginia, colonies that preceded them. They were built on slave labor working on huge plantations. But that's exactly what the trustees did not want in Georgia. So they established the colony, with royal permission, on the principle that there should be no slaves, and that there should be a five hundred-acre limit on landholdings. They did allow some persons whom they called "private adventurers" to take up five hundred acres provided they would pay the cost of shipping over indentured laborers with responsibility for their maintenance during the four or five-year period of their servitude. After they were free, these servants could take up fifty acres of their own as a farm.

The Carolinas had been on the frontier, facing the Indians and the Spanish. The white planters of South Carolina couldn't defend themselves militarily, because they didn't dare leave their plantations for fear the slaves would revolt and take them over. So, when they had wars with the Indians, the Carolina people had to call on the other Atlantic colonies, and even from England, for troops. So, the slave-based society was indefensible, as well as a socially questionable society.

The trustees of Georgia said, "We don't want that," and their view fitted in with the British defense plans. They were given twenty years to build a frontier of working farmers who would take up arms to make sure that the Spaniards wouldn't invade the British colonies.

In my volume you will find that William Byrd of Virginia has a very interesting analysis of the injuries that slavery did to
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Taylor: the white society of Virginia of the early eighteenth century. So I struggled to get the documented Georgia story published as I wanted it.

Chall: Tell me about the problems with the press.

Taylor: Well, I think there were about three presses that could have printed my Georgia manuscript. But their readers had a different view than mine of the importance of first-hand documentation to the reader. They wanted me to squeeze the documentation down by 20 or 25 percent, which I refused to do. So finally I got it out in photo-offset printing. It's beautifully typed. I had to pay over $2900 to finance the publication, but I preferred to have it out my way rather than to squeeze it down by paraphrasing in my words what Pastor Bolzius wrote with all the flavor of a hot Georgia afternoon in the 1730s or 1740s. I wanted to take the reader right there and enable him to know exactly what Bolzius said in the language he used in saying it.

Anybody can go from that primary documentation and make any use that he wants of it. But the conception of the proper way to write history has changed over the years, and I belong to an older school. I had fine support for my way of presenting the subject from two of the best colonial historians.

Chall: Is that right?

Taylor: Yes, one of them has written beautifully the story of the rejection of the manuscript as I wanted to publish it.*

Chall: Who are the two colonial historians?

Taylor: W.W. Abbot of the University of Virginia, and Douglass Adair, of Claremont Colleges, recently deceased. They gave me excellent help. Douglass Adair particularly, who was the first one that I encountered. They were, in succession, editors of William and Mary Quarterly. [Shows flyer announcing publication.] They both encouraged preparation of the study and really helped me. The best critical letter that I ever received at any time, on any study that I ever made was from Douglass Adair. I got it about 1950, after I sent him a manuscript of about seventy-five pages. He encouraged me to enlarge it, so it ends up with about 330 pages.

BOOK NOTES


The Georgia colony was planted by a group of highly moral and enlightened trustees in England who conceived a noble plan to guide its development. They gave too little regard to geography, human frailty, sustained financial support, or the problems of exercising remote control. The Georgia Plan proposed to settle the English-Spanish frontier with thousands of compactly settled small farmers drawn from the destitute people of England. It prohibited slavery and discouraged the staple crops of tobacco and rice that were associated with slavery. Rum and brandy were outlawed. And land distribution was limited to fixed allotments of fifty acres. However lofty the intentions, the trustees’ plan was almost quixotic and predestined to fail. There were all those thorny people, all that open land inviting the loosening of controls, and all those resources and available slaves to be exploited by eager developers and the get-rich-quick bunch. The reasons for the plan's failure contain some of the essence of American history.

The Georgia Plan and its overturn is a fascinating, even tragic, lost cause. Its charm captured the attention and devotion of Professor Taylor who saw that “the founders of Georgia wrestled consciously with four fundamental issues that endure to this day as perennial problems of our Nation.” The problems are race, labor, land, and capital. Had the humane and visionary design been made to work, it could have been a model for planning America’s subsequent developments so as to avoid or diminish those “perennial problems.” This is a more fanciful, but nonetheless intriguing, thought than entered the heads of the trustees in the early eighteenth century. Pointing such a moral does not damage the book’s substantial contribution to the history of colony founding, land use, race relations, and economic development. The defects of the book are superficial ones, like the thicket of long quotations from the documents, that could have been remedied with no violence to the author’s purpose which was a detailed study closely limited to the Georgia Plan and its fate. It is regrettable that Taylor’s study did not reach publication as a real book nearly a generation ago.


An abrupt alteration of agricultural labor arrangements forced upon the South by the abolition of slavery is illumined by the author who draws from a wide variety of sources, including the records of the Freedman’s Bureau. Many extracts from contemporary documents show how the freedman became a sharecropper and what it meant.
Chall: When you have a publication that's put out by a photo-offset method, and you have to do it yourself, how do you distribute it?

Taylor: Well, we'll see how widely it is distributed through the Institute of Business and Economic Research. I don't know whether the Black Studies people will do anything to promote it. The Institute of Business and Economic Research got this flyer out and mailed it to a large list. I do not know yet how many copies have been sold. I get my money back if we sell all the copies, and a little more, but that is very doubtful. And, to my knowledge, no reviews of it have as yet come out.*

It's in the style in which I have produced results before, and maybe somebody will come along who'll say, "Oh, gee, that's just what I want." And the others will say, "Why didn't he compress it and make it more readable?" This is my way of doing it; I suppose there's the right way, the wrong way, and my way.

Chall: [Laughter] You don't compromise a great deal when it comes to what you feel is right, do you?

Taylor: No. I guess I don't. On the acreage limitation I've been invited to compromise, but I didn't.

*Reviews have appeared in Agricultural History, XLVI, 451, July 1972; William and Mary Quarterly, XXIX (3a series), 649. PST
X  FEDERAL WATER ISSUES IN 1972
   (Interviews 13 and 14, March 24 and April 13, 1972)

Water Grants for Education: HR 5236

Chall:  I would like to get some of the details about the Kastenmeier bill. We've discussed it briefly before. How did that--the idea for water funds for education, for the government, as such, to buy up the excess land and use the money for various purposes like education and environmental control--come about?

Taylor: Long ago, Senator Paul Douglas told me that we wouldn't really get effective enforcement of the acreage limitation until the government bought the land. As I recall, he also spoke of the land grants for education. After a long while I worked the idea over, got draftsmen to help on the bill, brought people together from the fields of education, conservation, and planning for open space, and labor to support it.

The bill was introduced in Congress through the combined personal efforts of representatives of the Sierra Club, the AFL-CIO, and the National Farmers Union.

Chall: Is that Angus McDonald?

Taylor: Angus McDonald. George Taylor represented the AFL-CIO. The Sierra Club representative was Lloyd Tupling, who previously had been administrative assistant for Senator Neuberger, with whom I had talked over several years. When he became Washington representative for the Sierra Club he took the lead in bringing them all together. I believe I told you that he said to me, "If you want to come to Washington, I will bring together the people that you want." And he did. The bill was introduced and is in Congress, and as of today [March, 1972] has seven congressmen sponsoring it and four senators, and it's going to get more.
Chall: In the Senate right now, who is there who can give you the kind of support that was given you by Morse, and Douglas, LaFollette, and Neuberger for a time. Who's around now on whom you can count?

Taylor: I know of four senators on our bill [S 2863]. Who will be the real ball-carrier, I don't know. I know that Fred Harris took the initiative in introducing it. Today he is holding hearings in Los Angeles in which that bill is one of the items that I am sure is presented at the hearings. He's going to hold a reception tomorrow evening in San Francisco at the home of Senator Stevenson's brother, and Senator Harris will be there. So he is carrying the ball now. There are three other senators on that bill, Cranston, Bayh, and Phillip Hart. Bayh and Hart are not carrying the ball, but they're putting their names to it.*

Paul Taylor's Role in Drafting the Bill

Chall: When did you start working on it?

Taylor: It's a little hard to say when I started working on it. I have the typed drafts.

Chall: In the 1960s, maybe, or earlier?

Taylor: The bill was introduced in April of 1971.

Chall: And was it introduced by Kastenmeier?

Taylor: Yes. Waldie is one of its staunchest supporters. Do you want some of these documents on that?

Chall: Well, I'd like to put them into the record.

Taylor: All right. I'll give you this introductory statement by Kastenmeier. I drafted it for him, he edited it and put it in. That's the way you get things done.

*The sponsors are: Senators Bayh, Cranston, Hart, Harris; Congressmen Dellums, Kastenmeier, Waldie, McFall, Edwards, Roybal, Danielson.
Chall: Why did Kastenmeier pick up this issue?

Taylor: Wisconsin political figures in the LaFollette tradition understand this kind of an issue very well. Senators LaFollette, Nelson, and Proxmire all have spoken on it on the Senate floor.

Chall: Did he introduce it with other co-authors, or just by himself at that time.

Taylor: In the House, you don't have co-sponsors of a bill. You can introduce a so-called companion bill which is identical. So, there are six California congressmen on that bill now.

Chall: When you first introduced it, how many were there?

Taylor: Well, very shortly there were six. The California Labor Federation AFL-CIO wrote the entire California delegation asking them to introduce the bill. The lowest number is 5236, Kastenmeier, and the highest number is 9633, Congressman McFall.

Chall: Who are some of the people Mr. Tupling got together to meet with you?

Taylor: In Washington?

Chall: Yes. Do you recall these people?

Taylor: Yes. You want the names and so on?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: George Taylor of the AFL-CIO.

Chall: National office?

Taylor: Yes. Angus McDonald, National Farmers Union. I've forgotten whether the Grange man attended; he was interested. They were changing the Grange representative about that time. Harry Graham had been their representative. He shifted over to the National Farm Organization; he was injured in an automobile collision, so as I recall he couldn't function at that time, but his successor, Robert Frederickson, did. I'm not sure that he came to the meetings, but he gives support.

National Education Association Clayton Seeber and Frank Mensel of the American Association of Junior Colleges, also give
THE RECLAMATION LANDS AUTHORITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) is recognized.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain the national importance of H.R. 5236, a bill I introduced on March 1, 1971, "to provide for the creation of an authority to carry out the congressional intent respecting the excess land provisions of the Federal Reclamation Act of June 17, 1892." Although physically, reclamation takes place in Western States, it is that it uses and the money that finances the projects both belong to the Nation.

The purpose of H.R. 5236, stated broadly, is to modernize reclamation law so as to fulfill its potential and to nationalize this historic 1892 statute that marked the dawn of the National Conservation movement. Specifically, its proposals are threefold:

One, to enact a long overdue, and long recommended, method for enforcing the public interest provisions of reclamation law effectively;

Two, to finance public education by grants of revenues created from public water development projects as grants of 94 million acres of public land to encourage public education at an earlier point in our history; and

Three, to enable the public itself, through a newly established authority, to participate in the first of the public policy provision in the law that was intended.

President Theodore Roosevelt, who signed the Reclamation Act into law and founded the Nation's conservation movement, explained to the Commonwealth Club of California at a 1911 meeting in San Francisco the philosophy that public water development creates.

"No right to the use of water for land in private ownership shall be sold for a tract exceeding 100 acres to any one landowner."

He said:

If we had a right to dispose of the land, publicly, but in such a way that the requirements are complied with, doing that in the interest of the democracy as a whole, we have a right to dispose of the land with a proviso as to the use of the water running over it, designed to secure that use for the people as a whole and to prevent it from ever being absorbed in an oligarchy.

But, administration of Theodore Roosevelt's "excess" lands has fallen far short of original conservationist hopes.

This has been testified to before congressional committees, declared on the floor of Congress, written into statistical Government records, evidenced by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall in 1964 when, in these words, he stated that administrators had "on occasion" exhibited a "decree of concern for the excess land's..." In other words, the policies enacted with the policies enacted by the excess land law. Hundreds of thousands, yes, millions, of acres received subsidized water above the legal limit. The extent of public subsidies to range from $600 to $2,000 per acre, which remains unpaid to the public treasury. The doorway of the treasury over water and wider. Congress has appropriated or authorized spending $10 billion on reclamation projects.

Meanwhile the doorways of public policy limitations shrinks narrower and narrower. Is it any wonder why giant corporations and large landowners holding many acres want the 160-acre limitation removed? In a 1915 letter to the San Francisco News explaining why the giant landowners wanted the 160-acre law removed, Secretary of the Interior Hiram T.杰克斯 bluntly wrote:

It is the age-old policy of the business man is stuck on in the unincurred increased in land values created by a public investment... Their principal object is to get for the application... of the long-established reclamation policy of the Congress which provides for the distribution of the benefits of great irrigation projects among the many and which prevents speculation in lands by the few.

The principal legal loophole that permits this evasion of public policy is the absence of a provision that the Government itself purchase "excess" lands. That is, the reclamation law requires sale of "excess" lands by their owners. If they refuse to sell, a project price, but provides no ready purchaser. H.R. 5236 creates a ready market by authorizing the Government to purchase such lands at the same preproject price at which the owner already is bound to sell.

The concept that the Government should purchase "excess" lands is well established. As early as 1892, Gov. Joseph Folks of Idaho, proposed that the public "first acquire land to be reclaimed. In 1924, the historic Fact Finders Commission, reviewing the operation of the reclamation program, repeated the recommendation by stating that:

No reclamation project should hereafter be approved whereby a private owners shall have been acquired by the United States or by an enterprise placed under control of the Bureau of Reclamation.

H.R. 5236 formally proposes Government purchase of "excess" lands to make public policy truly effective. It would authorize the Government to buy "excess" land at a preproject market price and lease it back at a postproject market price. The public reclamation itself would be able to reap from public investment the windfall profits that the "excess" land law now gives only to the few, and would have the purpose of this law. As described by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1938, this purpose is to distribute the benefits of reclamation "in accordance with the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals, and to prevent 'use of the Federal reclamation service for speculative purposes.'"

With windfall profits from the public investment once in an "education, conservation, and economic opportunity fund," these funds will be disposal of to serve public purposes. H.R. 5236 provides that 75 percent of the revenues be earmarked as grants to public education, following the tradition of Thomas Jefferson-Abraham Lincoln tradition of financing education with grants to schools for educational purposes as Congress may authorize. It transfers 10 percent of the net revenues to the land and water conservation fund.

The remaining 20 percent of the fund shall be made available upon specific appropriation by Congress for the development of public facilities serving project areas, for advancing economic opportunity for citizens living in substandard conditions, for the development of healthful environments and communities needing open space, and for such other environmental and economic benefits as Congress may authorize.

H.R. 5236 creates a "Reclamation Lands Authority" to administer the program as an independent agency under a board of three members, appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate and responsible to the President.

The Authority is charged with attacking such conditions to lands at its disposal as illegal subdivisions, open spaces and agricultural greenbelts, and in other respects preserve an environment of beauty, health, and attractive quality for now and for the future.

The Authority shall "give due weight to benefits to the revolving funds and the advancement of economic opportunity for persons who have served the Nation in the Armed Forces and disadvantaged citizens seeking such opportunity as ownership, lease, or use of irrigated or irrigable lands afford."

In carrying out the purposes of H.R. 5236, the Authority is charged with encouraging "efficient regional, State, and local planning of land use and environmental adjustment in the areas where excess lands are located.

In these ways, H.R. 5236 reaffirms the "historic purpose of the Federal Reclamation Act, especially as it applies to the development and use of excess lands," and seeks to "make its benefits in the public's interest and not to be reclaimed. In 1924, the historic Fact Finders Commission, reviewing the operation of the reclamation program, repeated the recommendation by stating that:—

No reclamation project should hereafter be approved whereby a private owner shall have been acquired by the United States or by an enterprise placed under control of the Bureau of Reclamation.

H.R. 5236 formally proposes Government purchase of "excess" lands to make public policy truly effective. It would authorize the Government to buy "excess" land at a preproject market price and lease it back at a postproject market price. The public reclamation itself would be able to reap from public investment the windfall profits that the "excess" land law now gives only to the few, and would have the purpose of this law. As described by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1938, this purpose is to distribute the benefits of reclamation "in accordance with the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals, and to prevent 'use of the Federal reclamation service for speculative purposes.'"

With windfall profits from the public investment once in an "education, conservation, and economic opportunity fund," these funds will be disposal of to serve public purposes. H.R. 5236 provides that 75 percent of the revenues be earmarked as grants to public education, following the tradition of Thomas Jefferson-Abraham Lincoln tradition of financing education with grants to schools for educational purposes as Congress may authorize. It transfers 10 percent of the net revenues to the land and water conservation fund.

The remaining 20 percent of the fund shall be made available upon specific appropriation by Congress for the development of public facilities serving project areas, for advancing economic opportunity for citizens living in substandard conditions, for the development of healthful environments and communities needing open space, and for such other environmental and economic benefits as Congress may authorize.

H.R. 5236 creates a "Reclamation Lands Authority" to administer the program as an independent agency under a board of three members, appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate and responsible to the President.

The Authority is charged with attacking such conditions to lands at its disposal as illegal subdivisions, open spaces and agricultural greenbelts, and in other respects preserve an environment of beauty, health, and attractive quality for now and for the future.

The Authority shall "give due weight to benefits to the revolving funds and the advancement of economic opportunity for persons who have served the Nation in the Armed Forces and disadvantaged citizens seeking such opportunity as ownership, lease, or use of irrigated or irrigable lands afford."

In carrying out the purposes of H.R. 5236, the Authority is charged with encouraging "efficient regional, State, and local planning of land use and environmental adjustment in the areas where excess lands are located.

In these ways, H.R. 5236 reaffirms the "historic purpose of the Federal Reclamation Act, especially as it applies to the development and use of excess lands," and seeks to "make its benefits in the public's interest and not to be reclaimed. In 1924, the historic Fact Finders Commission, reviewing the operation of the reclamation program, repeated the recommendation by stating that:—

No reclamation project should hereafter be approved whereby a private owner shall have been acquired by the United States or by an enterprise placed under control of the Bureau of Reclamation.

H.R. 5236 formally proposes Government purchase of "excess" lands to make public policy truly effective. It would authorize the Government to buy "excess" land at a preproject market price and lease it back at a postproject market price. The public reclamation itself would be able to reap from public investment the windfall profits that the "excess" land law now gives only to the few, and would have the purpose of this law. As described by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1938, this purpose is to distribute the benefits of reclamation "in accordance with the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals, and to prevent 'use of the Federal reclamation service for speculative purposes.'"

With windfall profits from the public investment once in an "education, conservation, and economic opportunity fund," these funds will be disposal of to serve public purposes. H.R. 5236 provides that 75 percent of the revenues be earmarked as grants to public education, following the tradition of Thomas Jefferson-Abraham Lincoln tradition of financing education with grants to schools for educational purposes as Congress may authorize. It transfers 10 percent of the net revenues to the land and water conservation fund.

Identical Bills
H.R. 5236, Kastenmeier
H.R. 6758, Don Edwards
H.R. 6900, Jerome Waldie
H.R. 6597, Ron Dellums
H.R. 7863, Edward Roybal
H.R. 7615, George Danielson
S. 2633, John J. McFall
S. 2863, Harris, Bayh
Hart, Cranston
Taylor: support. The latest that I heard, Mensel is the head of an inter-organization committee on the financing of education.

The American Council on Education--of which Roger Heynes is now the president--their legislative representative advised me that he would give it support. He won't take the lead on the bill, but if it's in, he will support.

Chall: So these are the people who--

Taylor: These are the people who will help it along, and if there are hearings, you can expect that they will come down on the Hill and say, "We want this bill passed." So that's Grange, Farmers Union, National Education Association, American Association of Junior Colleges, American Council on Education, the Sierra Club, National Wildlife Federation (their director, Thomas L. Kimball).

When I went to Kimball in Washington, perhaps in 1968, I'd never heard of the National Wildlife Federation. Walking along 16th Street N.W., I saw a big building with birds and critters all over the facade. I thought, well, I'll go in. So I went in, asked to see the director, was ushered in, and was sat down across the desk from Thomas L. Kimball. I'd hardly get the words 160-acre limitation out of my mouth when he said, "Yes, it was a shame that they don't enforce that and they ought to do it."
[Laughter]

Chall: [Laughter] And you mean you didn't know him?

Taylor: No, I just stumbled into the organization that way. Yes, Kimball came through right away, and since then he has written letters to the right people saying the same thing effectively. When testimony was needed before the National Water Commission his representative Louis Clapper testified in the name of the federation. Oh, the National Wildlife Federation has followed right through.

Chall: I see, so you'd begun then to get the environmentalists on your side.

Taylor: Yes. I think I told you about Dr. Roland C. Clement of the Audubon Society?

Chall: No, I haven't heard this story at all.

Taylor: [Laughter] Well, I'd never heard of Roland C. Clement either, and I don't remember the exact date when I met him. It must have been '68, because I think it was when Wayne Morse inserted into the
Taylor: Congressional Record two KPFA broadcasts that I gave on acreage limitation.* KPFA has an affiliate in New York--WBAI.

Well, one day I got a telephone call from the local representative of the Audubon Society. She had received a telephone call from Roland Clement in New York, who had heard the broadcast on WBAI. He asked her to get in touch with me right away. So, I know that he supports me. Not in ways that will affect their tax-exempt status, but he spreads the information where it will do good, I'm sure.

Well, I think that covers most of the group that Tupling brought together, but there were a few others present. There was William Duddleson, of the Conservation Foundation; he's engaged in policy research. He had been the administrative assistant of Congressman Clem Miller from Marin county. He can't function in certain ways because of the tax-exempt status of the foundation, but he can study the issue and advise. Then, through arrangement by Dewey Anderson, Leslie Whitten, who is Merry-Go-Round columnist Jack Anderson's man, came to see me in the Cosmos Club after I got out of the hospital. We spent about three hours together, and he put good items into his column on two or three occasions and spoke over the radio.

After all, this acreage-limitation issue is like the ITT case. You may not be able to get them red-handed, but underneath is the same kind of exertion of influence through campaign contributions, et cetera, that produces nonenforcement of the law in Imperial Valley, and Southern California, and elsewhere. Unfortunately, I won't have any campaign-contribution information to cite, and can't catch anybody red-handed, as they appear to have done with Dita Beard.** The pattern, I'm sure, is similar but a little quieter and a little more skillful in the handling.

Chall: The law has only recently been changed that would make campaign contributions--

Taylor: Oh, the campaign contributions. It is getting now where people are a little more sensitive; they realize its meaning slowly.


Chall: Anything in the past would be a little hard to uncover. But from now on, it might be simpler to know how contributors try to influence legislation through campaign funding, if it can be kept in the open.

Taylor: They'll find new ways of evading.

Chall: Then you worked quite a number of years developing this idea. You have been called the chief architect of the bill by T. H. Watkins, who is the associate editor of American West.

Taylor: Well, I've just described Paul Douglas's suggestion, and finally worked it into bill form.

Effect of the Legislation on Agriculture

Chall: Generally speaking, at this point, what chances do you see of this coming to fruition, either the federal or the state government providing millions of dollars for this sort of project?

Taylor: I'm interested in the way you put it: "the government providing millions of dollars to buy the land." And of course that is what we'll have to face before any serious congressional consideration. Naturally, I prefer to put it another way: If the government really followed the law, it could add millions upon millions of dollars to the United States treasury. We'd bail out the treasury from a lot of its indebtedness and we'd make possible public planning and we'd finance public education in the land grant tradition.

Chall: How do you see this as bringing money into the treasury?

Taylor: Well, the law says that the excess landowners are obliged to sell the excess at the pre-water price. So the windfall profits, or what Henry George called the "unearned increment" would go into the United States treasury instead of into the pockets of large private landowners. We're giving away the water now, not only for nothing, but giving a lot of money to store and to move the water to private lands, besides. Of course the excess landowners' spokesmen tell it just the opposite. They say we want to take their lands away from them. They avoid talk about the subsidy, or about the taking of the public water to private lands.
Chall: Initially, it's the government which must purchase the excess lands.

Taylor: That's right, under the Kastenmeier bill.

Chall: The government must lay out the money.

Taylor: That's right; a marvelous investment.

Chall: And either rent or sell?

Taylor: Either rent or sell, and receive the rent or selling price at the national treasury. I personally think it would be highly advantageous to lease the lands, generally speaking, in the manner of present leasing of grazing land. Of course, there would be continuing pressure on the part of the renters to keep the rental prices way down, as they have done with the grazing lands, but there also would be balancing pressures of benefitting education to keep the rentals up to something approximately market value.

So if the condition of the public treasury represents the true public interest of the government in this, Congress should have no trouble at all seeing the advantage to the public of government purchase of the excess lands. It would mean money in the treasury, and a lot of it. But that isn't the interest of a lot of people. They want money in their own pockets, and the treasury is a good source out of which to get it.

Chall: The sponsors of the bill, a number of them from California--

Taylor: --six out of the seven congressmen--

Chall: --Northern Californians?

Taylor: Not entirely. Don Edwards is from around San Jose. Jerome Waldie is from the Delta. Ron Dellums from Berkeley. These three are Northern. John McFall is from, I believe, around Modesto-Merced, still Northern. But George Danielson and Edward Roybal are from Southern California. Now this is not the full list of congressmen who probably would support the bill if it came to a vote.

Chall: Yes, I see. Before any kinds of public hearings are held, then, I assume that these people are feeling out general support and the possibilities of success.

Taylor: I believe those who sponsor the bill have decided they know how
Taylor: their constituents feel on the issue.

Chall: You're waiting for--

Taylor: I don't think the congressmen--I don't mean to say they're not alert, especially Waldie and Kastenmeier, I think they're alert. But the friends of the proposal do most of the feeling out. This bill was talked about and the subject was elaborated before Senator Stevenson at his San Francisco hearings on January 11, 1971. A lot of relevant material was put into the record at those hearings. Then earlier this month, on the ninth of March, Senator Fred Harris, of Oklahoma, held a hearing in Los Angeles. It wasn't a committee hearing, but he presided at a hearing, the products of which doubtless will get into the Congressional Record.*

The western landed interests have put their spokesmen onto the Interior committees. They want the water and the money. So they load the Interior committees with spokesmen for the hopeful recipients of the largesse from the national treasury. These spokesmen then have control of what goes through the committees, and what hearings are held by the committees, and also what hearings are not held, or not printed if held. So the hearings that I've just described are not of the Interior committees that have the authority to pass on the Kastenmeier bill; the political reality obliges persons of my persuasion or sympathetic interests to get our publicity otherwise than through the Interior committees.

Another way in which we're getting publicity is through Gaylord Nelson's Small Business Committee. He held hearings earlier this month and brought Professor Walter Goldschmidt from UCLA to Washington. Goldschmidt is the man who made the study printed in 1946 by the Small Business Committee comparing two Central Valley communities, Arvin and Dinuba, the former resting on large-scale farms, the latter on smaller, family-sized farms. Remember that?

Chall: Yes, I do.

Taylor: Nelson reprinted that study in '68, and now in '71 he has called Goldschmidt to testify. He gave that testimony within the last--

Taylor: about two weeks--and Nelson's committee is considering making other studies. The idea is to make comparable studies in other parts of the country because the invasion of corporate agriculture is destroying community after community in the Middle West. So the issue is spreading geographically.

Tax structures favor entry by conglomerate corporations into agriculture. They get tax write-offs and various advantages inviting them to buy out the family farmers. So this issue is spreading and growing, not lessening. A question right now, as I've heard it described, is whether Senator Henry Jackson, of Washington, as chairman of the Interior committee, will allow hearings to be held on the Harris-Cranston, et al, bills.

Well, he's running for the presidency, and they can perhaps put pressure on him to hold hearings while he's doing that. He's the man who didn't even print the 1966 hearings on nonenforcement of reclamation law at Westlands. Also he was a member of the Public Land Law Review Commission which recommended no acreage limitation, no residency requirement, and no discrimination against corporations on reclamation projects. So you see the political maneuverings that have to be gone through to give effect to a proposal.

Chall: So that's where it is now.

Taylor: That's where it is right now.

Chall: Basically, you've been able to use the Small Business Committee and the Committee on Migratory Labor.

Taylor: Yes, and I think the family farm bills are likely to let this issue in on the edge.

Chall: You have good, reliable people, then, working with you in Washington.

Taylor: They're all volunteers who believe in reclamation law.

Chall: It must have been quite an effort writing a bill.

Taylor: Yes, we had two or three lawyers work on the draft. I gave the idea to competent people and it was passed around among representatives of organizations who had shown an interest.

Chall: You've been able to add educators to your side, which you didn't have at first.
Taylor: Educators and conservationists.

Chall: That widens the group.

Taylor: Yes, we persuaded the Sierra Club to go for the idea.

Chall: What's become of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference?

Taylor: Well, they are still formally on record, and usually they will write a letter when I tell them "this is the right occasion to do it and I hope you will reiterate your stand."

We're getting into a discussion of the vicissitudes of supporting a proposal and trying to get it adopted. Are you interested in these little details of how things grow out of nothing?

Chall: Yes, I am and I think anybody who's interested in how these kinds of things become accomplished would be interested.

Taylor: I think I've emphasized to you before that things don't just happen. They happen because somebody talks to somebody else at the right time and says the right things. That way you can get a result. The most effective representative of the National Catholic Rural Life was Father James L. Vizzard, a Jesuit. He told me how he got interested in the issue.

Here are the background steps. I had gone to Father Charles Phillips in Oakland about 1944 when the Central Valley studies were in progress. Father Phillips responded fast. I went to him with Walter Goldschmidt, then on the Berkeley staff of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

In the course of time, probably through the influence of Father Phillips, I was invited by the Bishop of San Jose to speak at one of their laymen's dinner meetings, which I did. Some years after, this young man, Father Vizzard, turned up in Washington as the Washington representative of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. When I asked him how he got into this position, he replied that he was a student at the Jesuit theological center near San Jose at the time, had gone down to that meeting, and had heard me speak. The issue really interested him, and in time he became Washington representative of the NCRLC. He was very effective. Then he had illnesses, and no longer is their Washington representative. I greatly regret that, because he was a man who knew how to move things in Washington and he did just that. He's in San Francisco now, and I understand in better health. But I wish he'd

Father Vizzard papers have been deposited in the Michel Orradre Library, University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara, California
Taylor: get back to Washington.*

Chall: He knew how to tap the right--

Taylor: Oh, yes he did! Acreage limitation with him was a moral issue and as he was a Jesuit--

Chall: --he always was given an audience.

Taylor: Oh, yes.

Chall: I guess it helps to be a certain person at a certain time, and in a certain place.

Taylor: Well, I've been telling you how you try and line up the right people from the right organizations on the right subject at the right time. Then you can have some effect. Not always, but nearly always. Well, that's the congressional aspect of it, and in that area, as you see, the issue remains alive.

So when you ask me how the issue will come out, I recall that I have been asked that same question in the forties. People repeatedly have asked me where I was going to get with this. To which I could answer only that I didn't know. But the issue is not declining in the public consciousness, political consciousness, it's rising. It's moving into every branch of government. We've been discussing the congressional aspect, but the issue is in the courts, too. It's taken a long time to get there.

Review of Water Cases in the Courts

Imperial Valley, Tulare Lake Basin

Chall: I think we've talked about most of them, but I'm anxious to be sure we've covered them all, particularly those in courts at this time.

Taylor: Of course the first challenge in the courts was by interests charging the acreage limitation is unconstitutional. They lost that challenge

*In 1972 or 1973 he became interested in the National Farm Workers Union, and is a representative of their interests there. PST
Taylor: by Supreme Court vote of eight to zero in 1958. The cases we are talking about now are efforts to secure enforcement of the law on specific projects. I'll just enumerate the acreage limitation cases here: Imperial Valley, Tulare Lake Basin, the State Water Project. Those three are in court right now, plus the Imperial Valley residency requirement. That makes two Imperial Valley cases. The residency requirement is the second half of the same sentence in the 1902 law, of which the acreage limitation is the first half.

Chall: The basins of the Tulare Lake Basin case?

Taylor: The Tulare Lake Basin case relates to an area receiving waters from the Kings and Kern Rivers. The original tactic of large landholding interests was to get the Army Engineers to construct the project instead of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Roosevelt administration, with Secretary Ickes in charge, acceded to the demand that the Army Engineers do the job, but only on the condition that reclamation law be applied to any waters used for irrigation. Now, all of these years after, in 1972, Federal Judge Myron Crocker in Fresno says, "No, Congress did not apply the acreage limitation to Pine Flat Dam and Isabella."*

In that area the big landowners are giants. In 1969 J.G. Boswell & Company received the largest agricultural subsidy in the United States. The company owns over 100,000 acres, and received approximately a $4.4 million subsidy in that one year.

Well, right now, is the Justice Department going to appeal that case? It fought for law enforcement in the first place, but it also fought the landowners for enforcement in Imperial Valley. Then when the district judge decided against enforcement, the Justice Department under the new Nixon administration dropped the case. Well, the tactic is the same. The landless people in Imperial Valley, led by Dr. Ben Yellen, asked to be allowed to become intervenors with legal right to appeal. They foresaw that the Nixon administration would likely pull the rug right out from under then, which it did. The request is before the ninth circuit court of appeals right now where they had a well-done printed brief.

The other case in Imperial Valley was also brought by Ben Yellen and his people on the residency requirement. The Justice

Ruling Against Big Absentee Land Owners

A federal judge in San Diego has ruled that absentee landlords who own approximately two-thirds of the irrigated land in the Imperial Valley are ineligible to receive water from federal water projects.

The decision, which seems certain to be appealed ultimately to the Supreme Court, was issued Monday by United States District Judge William D. Murray.

The fact that residency requirements of the 1902 Reclamation Act have never been enforced by the U.S. Department of the Interior does not mean they should be ignored now, Judge Murray declared.

VALID

"Congress did not acquiesce (to non-enforcement)," Judge Murray said in his opinion. "Administrative practice cannot thwart the plain purpose of a valid law."

The area affected was transformed from desert into California's chief winter crop area following the construction of Hoover Dam and the All-American Canal nearly 40 years ago.

The distribution network consists of 1,700 miles of canals watering 437,000 privately owned acres.

The judge said the purpose of the 1902 act was to provide irrigation for family-owned and family-occupied farms.

CROPS

By now, Judge Murray declared, annual production on the land amounts to $900 million worth of crops, much of them raised on land owned by corporations and other absentee landlords.

The case was brought to trial by Attorney Arthur Brunwasser of San Francisco, representing Dr. Ben Yellen of Brawley, a nationally known leader of campaigns for social causes, and 122 other landless plaintiffs.

The defendants were the Secretary of the Interior and a group of large landowners.

WORK

"The federal government should now do what the law has long required — make land and water available only to farmers who work and live on the land," Brunwasser said.

No immediate steps were taken, however. The judge ordered the preparation of an order to carry out his ruling, but no action is considered likely until the case is appealed.

The case was part of a two-fold campaign waged against corporate farmers in the Imperial Valley by the National Coalition for Land Reform. The organization has also been trying to force federal authorities to impose a 160-acre limitation on land holdings in the area.
Taylor: Department wouldn't even support them in the first instance. But Yellen, et al, won that case. That was the decision of Montana Judge William Murray, and he not only granted standing in court to sue to the landless people, which Judge Turrentine has denied [in the Imperial Valley case], but he gave them the decision, besides. So that if the landowners have to appeal, the Justice Department has to decide whether they're going to sit it out and have nothing to do with it, or whether they're going to represent the landowners.

Chall: Does Ben Yellen have cases in two courts now? The landless people, as you call them?

Taylor: I don't think the decision has been made on the appeal by the landed interests [on appeal of the Murray decision], but you can be sure that they will. So that will probably go up to the ninth circuit court of appeals.*

Now, the same tactic is being employed on the Tulare Lake Basin case. The Justice Department is on the spot right now. Is it going to do there as it did in Imperial Valley, pull the rug, and abandon its lost case for the enforcement of acreage limitation? An attorney is asking the judge in Fresno who gave that decision to allow the small farmer in the San Joaquin Valley as intervenor to appeal the case, so the Justice Department can't pull the rug.

Chall: I saw a notice in my local paper, the Hayward Daily Review [4-12-72], that a federal judge had denied Mr. Bulbulians' motion to be allowed to appeal the action on the Kings River case.

Taylor: Oh, that's news for me.

Chall: I didn't see it in the Chronicle.

Taylor: No, the Chronicle gives out a minimum of news on this subject---a minimum.

Chall: There had been in the Chronicle an editorial a few weeks ago about the ruling of Judge Crocker on the Kings River case, but that apparently isn't the same as the Bulbulian motion.

*In 1973 the ninth circuit court consolidated the acreage limitation and residency case and allowed both landless and landed to participate. PST
Taylor: No, the Bulbulian motion was to be given standing to intervene in the case in order to assure appeal.

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: So, the question is one of whether Bulbulian's appeal for standing will go up to the ninth circuit court of appeals, just as the Imperial case was taken up.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: Either it will go up that way, or they will find some other way of getting into it. The Environmental Defense Fund, I'm quite sure, made an effort to make Bulbulian an intervenor.

Chall: So they'll carry it on.

Taylor: Well, I think so. You see, what happens is, with a change in national administration (at least that's one important factor in it), they can pull the rug out from under the position taken by the preceding administration. With the government out of the case, they leave the costs of protecting their interests and their rights under the law to be borne by the landless, the poor, and the small farmers, instead of by the government.*

Chall: I wanted to know whether you knew these men who--in Letters to the Editor [4-16-72]--answered an Examiner editorial of several weeks back. [3-26-72]. Mr. Brunwasser and Mr. Jacobs indicated quite some knowledge of the subject. This is related to the question of Pine Flat decision, Judge Crocker's.

Taylor: Arthur Brunwasser is the attorney for Yellen in the Imperial Valley cases.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: This is the kind of propaganda that is commonly handed out to us. The last paragraph reads: "Both this case and the similar Imperial Valley case lost by the government last year were brought in the Johnson administration. They are examples of how a federal bureaucracy, spellbound by an outdated ideology, can pursue a course patently unfair to the citizen." In my judgment, that statement is an exact reversal of the truth. It is the

*In 1972 while Attorney General-designate Kleindienst's Senate confirmation was pending, Senator Harris and Congressman Jerome Waldie joined to urge appeal, and Kleindienst did appeal. PST
Reclamation

Your editorial ("Water Ruling," March 26) attacking the 160-acre limitation of the Reclamation Act is unjustified both in the historical context of the policy of the law and in its practical application.

Although one would never know it from reading the editorial, the Reclamation Act is the vehicle by which the government has spent millions of dollars in the construction of dams, reservoirs and irrigation systems throughout the western states. In order to secure these benefits of this vast reclamation would not insure to the advantage of monopolists, speculators and investors, Congress placed a provision in the act restricting receipt of federally subsidized water to owners of 160 acres and to persons who reside on or near the land.

Contrary to the assertions in your editorial "a federal bureaucracy, spellbound by outdated ideology" has not been in the forefront of enforcing the policy of

S.F. Examiner 4/14/72

. . . There is no quarrel with state-assisted or supplied water. The real issue is whether the water should be supplied to non-family large farms at below cost prices, that is, at prices supported by you and me. Don't you see the real issue?

GERSON JACOBS
San Rafael

Congress. To the contrary, the federal bureaucracy in the Department of the Interior with the help of political manipulators in the executive branch of government has done its best to frustrate the purposes and policies of the Reclamation Act.

NO LESS AN AUTHORITY than the California Farmer, the official publication of the Farm Bureau Federation, reported on Sept. 28, 1971, that farmers of 160 acres are doing quite well in Tulare County, despite the pleas of corporate farmers who protest, as did The Examiner editorial, that "in this era of large scale, mechanized scientific farming, the 160 acre rule makes little sense."

To Southern Pacific Land Company, the Irvine Company, Tenneco and other corporate giants who control 6.1 million acres of California's 11.8 million acres of crop land, the 160 acre limitation does in fact make no sense. But to small farmers and those who live in our state's rural areas, acreage limitation not only makes sense, but its enforcement may constitute one of the few means available for making our rural areas viable again . . .

AS FOR THE RECENT decision by a federal court in Fresno refusal to apply acreage limitation in the Tulare Lake region, you might be interested to know that both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman approved and supported the applicability of acreage when the Flood Control Act was before the Congress. The large landowners who receive their water from Pine Flat Dam and Reservoir have the benefit of regulated water: without regulated water it is extremely difficult if not absolutely impossible to plan the harvesting of crops . . .

As for the reasons why the government did not appeal the Imperial Valley case and why they probably will not appeal the Tulare Lake case the best person to ask is Richard Kleindienst, Attorney General-designate of the United States.

ARTHUR BRUNWASSER
San Francisco

Western Water News, June 1972. Page 3

ACTIONS AND REACTIONS . . .

The federal government filed notice on May 12 that it will appeal a federal court ruling which permitted 1.1 million acres of rich farmland "to escape the 160-acre limitation." US Attorney Richard Boulger said the Justice Department would challenge the March 15 decision of Judge M.D. Crocker of Fresno, which held that land irrigated by the Kings River from Pine Flat Dam is not subject to the 1902 reclamation law. Judge Crocker's carefully documented decision probably will not be upset but this appeal will impose thousands of dollars of new legal costs on Kings River landowners.
Taylor: bureaucracy that has violated the law, and the law is not archaic and outdated.

Chall: Do you know Mr. Gerson Jacobs?

Taylor: I don't know who he is.

The California Labor Federation sent a letter which is in the Congressional Record now, asking what is Kleindienst going to do about enforcement of the reclamation law, for example, about nonenforcement in the Sacramento Valley.

Chall: That's the Glen-Colusa--

Taylor: That's right. Well, that suit ought to be brought. We haven't got enough people, nor enough money. Those who are active are doing all they can now. The bureaucracy doesn't readily correct itself. The Department of the Interior would have to say, "We did wrong on the Sacramento Valley, now we will bring a suit to correct what we did." The Interior Department is unlikely to do that.

They did do it finally in Imperial Valley, partly because an administration by the other political party had let the large landowners escape in 1933 in the first place.

Chall: That was the Democrats getting back at the Republicans?

Taylor: Yes, and perhaps also it was a dig by Arizona interests against California interests that have impeded water development of Arizona. It took thirty years for the Democrats to get around to correcting the Hoover Republicans.

Chall: It was under Secretary Udall that the Tulare Lake case was begun, too?

Taylor: Yes, Solicitor Barry's opinion is dated 1961.

State Water Project

Taylor: The State Water Project case is before Judge Oliver Carter in San Francisco. The question is, what will he do with it? I hope he's been watching cases like the Tulare case and can see this heating up. I hope so, but you never know.
Chall: He's been a firm believer in the past in the Bureau of Reclamation and the Central Valley Project, hasn't he?

Taylor: Yes. But I don't know that he has ever specifically supported the acreage limitation. I knew him when he was a state senator during the forties, and he was certainly never against us, but I don't know if he ever came out for us. His father, as I told you, was a member of the supreme court of California, who when the case was before him, wrote the dissenting opinion on our side, and quoted from my Yale law journal article at length.

Chall: Is the case against the California water plan, now in the San Francisco court of Judge Carter, the one referred to in this full-page ad in the Chronicle of June 16, 1970? It is sponsored by Alvin Duskin, The Legal Committee to Stop the California Water Plan.

Taylor: Yes. It says "We will be backing two and possibly seven other suits against the state." Well, I think that is right, that he's supporting a suit in federal court under Judge Oliver Carter. I don't know that any further suits have been brought, but I guess it's true he raised money for it all right. The attorney in that case is James D. Lorenz, Jr., the man who organized the California Rural Legal Assistance, and who is handling the case as a private attorney.*

Television Surveys the Issue

Chall: As we've said before, some of the ideas, and the research that was done at that time, are coming back into public view. I'm thinking of the two television programs that were presented, I think it was, March 28. They showed the issues and the people we've been discussing.

*In an opinion (No. C-1274) filed August 2, 1973, Judge Carter declined to reopen the question of applicability of acreage limitation to the state services area, saying he was bound by the previous legal opinions of the executive branch and the actions based upon those taken by the state. Apparently Alvin Duskin is not financing further legal action, but some other sources have appeared. February 1974. PST
Taylor: Oh yes, KPIX?

Chall: Yes, KPIX and KQED.

Taylor: "The Advocates."

Chall: Did you see those?

Taylor: I did.

Chall: And how did you feel about the presentation of the issues on both of them?

Taylor: I thought they did very well! It's a question that in the past has not been very well presented to the public, but I thought that now they did very well.

Chall: I suppose it was a coincidence that, in the Bay Area the programs were presented on the same night.

Taylor: One was national, the other was local.

Chall: How does it happen that programs like this are achieved at all?

Taylor: I don't know how either one of them happened. I can guess. Usually those things happen when somebody speaks to somebody and says the right thing at the right time. My guess is that somebody like Peter Barnes of the New Republic, who travels East and who organized the National Coalition for Land Reform—my guess is that he spoke to somebody in both places. I don't know that he did, but I do know that Senator Harris, who is a sponsor of our Reclamation Land Authority bill to make acreage limitation law effective, appeared on "The Advocates" program. I know that at least three, and maybe four of the people who were shown on the KPIX program were people down in the Valley whose names I have given to others as likely sources.

Chall: Do the people who put programs on like this attempt to assess what they might accomplish in terms of public understanding?

Taylor: I don't know whether they do that or whether they don't. I know that sometimes when subjects are presented through the media there are complaints, as I understand there were complaints about my articles in American West. There was a former quote rebuttal unquote to one of my articles, and I understand that pressure was put on the American West to confine its history to less controversial matters.
Chall: In these two programs, however, the other side...

Taylor: The other side had its opportunity to speak, that's correct.

Chall: And that makes a difference.

Taylor: Sure.

Chall: I thought that they balanced the two sides as well as they could.

Taylor: They gave both sides fair hearing.

Chall: This gave me an opportunity, at least to see who Dr. Ben Yellen was. I'd been going to ask you about him several times. Tell me about Dr. Yellen, I assume that you've known him for many years.

Taylor: Some years ago he telephoned to me, and then he came over from San Francisco to Berkeley to see me. He said he was given my name by one of the members of the staff of the Bureau of Reclamation--I believe he said it was Gilbert Stamm, now commissioner of reclamation. I have been in touch more or less with him since that time. He went down to Imperial Valley during the period of the coming of the braceros, which means probably in the fifties. He became interested in the social structure there, making his living as a physician. The Mexicans, I assume, are his main source of patients.

He puts out mimeographed leaflets which he distributes in the manner which you saw on television. I'm on his mailing list, and eventually they'll find their way to The Bancroft Library. He's a very shrewd person.

Chall: He's a strong man.

Taylor: Oh, yes! He's unique. I never heard or saw anybody like him.

Chall: Where does he come from?

Taylor: He came from Brooklyn. The only time I've ever encountered the name Yellen, and I've never asked him about this, was someone I believe in the preface to Brissendon's IWW, by the name of Yellen, from Brooklyn. I wonder if it might not have been his father; if so, it would indicate an inherited awareness of social problems. It's an unusual name. That's the only other time I've seen it.
BENJ. L. YELLEN, M.D.
128 SOUTH EIGHTH STREET BRAWLEY, CALIFORNIA
Office Phone: 344-2244, if no answer call 344-2242

NAME: M. S. RIESS DATE

ADDRESS: CALIFORNIA

P: I DO NOT DENY THAT THERE IS A PLACE FOR ORAL HISTORY.

BUT MY COMPLAINT IS THAT YOUR STUFF GETS BURIED LIKE MOST DOCTORAL THESIS. NOBODY SEES THEM EXCEPT SOME OTHER CANDIDATE FOR A PH.D.

ATTACHED IS MY VERSION OF HOW TO BRING THE ATTENTION OF (OVER)

PEOPLE TO THE EFFORTS OF PROFESSOR PAUL TAYLOR.

I HAVE MAILED THIS NEWSLETTER TO THE NUMBER OF 2,500 ALL OVER THE U.S. TO PEOPLE IN UNIVERSITIES, POLITICIANS, NEWS MEDIA, ETC.

IT HAS BEEN MAILED IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER NEWS LETTERS THAT CONCERN THE MATTERS Prof. TAYLOR IS INTERESTED IN.

[Signature]

BENJ. L. YELLEN, M.D.
THE HONOR BELONGS TO PROFESSOR PAUL S. TAYLOR

On Dec. 31, 1972 and Jan. 14, 1973, the MIKE WALLACE program entitled "60 MINUTES" was shown by the Columbia Broadcasting System coast to coast. One segment of this program was about the battle for the land and water in Imperial Valley, California. Depending on the outcome of this struggle, it will be determined whether the small farmers who live on the land will get the irrigation water necessary to be able to farm in the 17 Western States.

At present, big absentee corporations which I claim to be in violation of the U.S. Reclamation Law, are getting the water and squeezing out the small farmers.

In this Mike Wallace program, I was featured as the little man fighting the big corporations. I had asked the Mike Wallace people to interview Professor Paul S. Taylor, retired Professor of Economics at the University of California at Berkeley, Calif., or without his great aid to me, I would not have been able to accomplish anything. But there is an important time limit in these expensive television programs, and no interview with Professor Taylor was shown.

Professor Taylor is 78 years of age and has spent 40 years trying to get the U.S. Reclamation Law enforced. He is an international authority on land and water problems and has been called into consultation by foreign governments. His knowledge on these matters is so vast I know that I can not approach him since most of my time is taken up by my physician duties.

Yet I am given the credit for this fight without mention of Professor Taylor in the NBC-TV NEWS broadcast of Feb. 6, 1972, in an article in IRRIGATION AGE magazine of March 1972, in the books THE MEGASTATES OF AMERICA and THE PACIFIC STATES OF AMERICA, both by Neal R. Peirce, in THE NADER REPORT "POWER AND LAND IN CALIFORNIA" and numerous newspaper articles, e.g. THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR (April 5/72) article.

To set the record straight, this Newsletter will give the circumstances of what led me to Professor Taylor and how without his help, I could not have accomplished anything.
In the 1950's, Mexicans living in Mexico were imported under Public Law #78 to do farmwork in the United States and especially California. They were paid 70 cents an hour. So our domestic farmworkers who could not make a living on 70 cents an hour were squeezed out of Imperial Valley. Many of the domestic farmworkers were my patients, and I lost them.

The merchants were also badly affected and many stores closed. Yet no merchant or businessman had the courage singly or as a group to fight what was going on. I began to fight for our domestic farmworkers. Then I found out that the imported Public Law #78 Mexicans were being swindled in various ways. There is too much to tell, so the emphasis will be given to the medical swindle. Most of them earned only $14.00 per week. They had to pay $12.25 weekly for food which consisted of beans three times a day. Then they paid 90 cents weekly for medical insurance. So when the food and medical premium are added, the sum is $13.15. When this is subtracted from $14.00, it leaves the Public Law #78 Mexican 85 cents after a week's work. I used to make photocopies of these paychecks for 85 cents and send them all over the United States to inform people.

But most important, notice that the Mexican was paying 90 cents out of $14.00 for medical insurance which is 6% and this so-called medical insurance applied only to him and he was in the age group of 19 years to 35 years, the healthiest part of one's life. But even so, the Mexican could not get medical treatment, for physicians did not want to treat them for $2.00 per visit. Those of us who took pity on them and tried to treat them had a bad experience. For instance, Dr. Nathan Wolf had to sue to get payment for 2 dollars a visit.

I, who taught the Mexicans and loaned them money to go to the Justice Court to sue for the injustices, was forbidden to treat them. When a Mexican sued in the Justice Court, the big growers got the U.S. Border Patrol to catch the Mexican and run him out of the United States. So that was the end of the lawsuit.

I sent many complaints to F. Britton McConnell, State Commissioner of Insurance of California but he did nothing. So in 1958, I filed a do-it-yourself lawsuit against McConnell in the Imperial County Superior Court (Docket #32023) charging him with being in a conspiracy with the Continental Casualty Co. of Chicago and/or the PanAmerican Underwriters to swindle the Public Law #78 Braceros and the physicians in this medical insurance racket. It was particularly pointed out that in violation of the State insurance law no brochure had been given to the Mexicans so that nobody, the Mexicans, physicians, or hospitals knew what the benefits of the group policy were.

The local newspaper chain known as PINKLEY'S PROSTITUTED PRESS would not print the news of this lawsuit. I wrote letters to the Editor, Dr. Dwight Wilbur, of CALIFORNIA MEDICINE, the official Journal of the CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION. These letters told how the Mexicans and the physicians were being swindled. He would not print my letters. So I sued him in 1959 in the Superior Court (Docket #32652). PINKLEY's papers would attack me on behalf of the big farmers.
Then the big boycott started against me. I was kicked out of the Imperial County Medical Society and the California Medical Association and the American Medical Association. I was prevented from operating in the Pioneers Memorial Hospital and the opposition tried to kick me out of the hospital. Space limitations prevent me from giving the many other ways that I was boycotted. My practice fell to less than 50% of what it was. It is interesting to note that Dr. Dwight Wilbur became the President of the American Medical Association in 1968-69. Also interesting is that the stock of the Continental Casualty Co. of Chicago (one of the big ten in the insurance business) rose from $17.00 to $115.00 during the period it insured these Mexicans, on the New York Stock Exchange. In 1960, this NEWSLETTER was started to fight Pinkley.

I was desperate as I was being ruined. I had heard vague rumors about the U.S. Reclamation Law. I thought that if it was true that the U.S. Reclamation Law applied to the Imperial Valley, I would fight the boycott by ruining my boycotters. In the summer of 1961, I went to Washington, D.C. to the U.S. Interior Dept. and began to ask questions. I was told, "Why ask us when the biggest expert is in California?" I was told about Professor Paul S. Taylor. This was a fatal mistake by the Interior Dept.

When I found Professor Taylor, I was astounded. He had written articles that had been printed in the most reputable Law Journals like the Harvard Law Review. He had given tremendous amounts of testimony before Congressional Committees. I found out that the big landowners influenced the Interior Dept. to not enforce the law. Once I learned all this, I began looking for a lawyer who was not connected with big farmers or water districts controlled by big farmers. I found Arthur Brunwasser and convinced him to be my lawyer after I pointed out to him that the research had all been done by Professor Taylor who was ready to help. Without Professor Paul Taylor's research and efforts, Arthur Brunwasser and I could have done nothing. THANK YOU PROFESSOR PAUL TAYLOR
Chall: That comes through when you see him on television—even without ever having seen a leaflet!

Taylor: Yes, indeed.

Chall: He's a dedicated man.

Taylor: Oh, my! That's putting it mildly! He's not only dedicated, he's sharp.

Chall: Does he have a group within that area with whom he's--

Taylor: Well, he's mobilized about a 122 landless people for his court suits. I assume that they are Mexicans or Mexican-Americans.

Chall: I see. Otherwise he's kind of a one-man leader of a cause.

Taylor: Right. It's a one man show and effective.*

Chall: Yes, I guess he is as far as he can go by himself.

Taylor: Well, he's up in the ninth circuit court of appeals right now. That's getting up pretty high, and it won't end there, because if he wins there it will go up higher, the other side will take it up.

Chall: Mr. Bulbulian [Barge]—I saw him on the television program. Have you known Mr. Bulbulian for any length of time?

Taylor: Yes, I've known him since the later fifties. He is the son of an Armenian refugee after World War I. He's a college graduate, he took over the family farm which began with twenty acres between Fresno and Sanger, and enlarged it to 150 acres. He and his father personally work it. He is a very intelligent and a very fine, public-spirited citizen.

Chall: How did he come by his interest in the 160-acre limitation cause?

Taylor: My recollection is he came by his interest through George Ballis, of Fresno. These things happen because somebody speaks to somebody.

Earlier Court Cases

Chall: I have notes about other cases that have been started. I don't know what became of them, and I thought I'd check with you. There was a case begun in 1971 by the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee--

Taylor: That's what I thought you were going to speak of.

Chall: --against Delano-Earlimart Irrigation District.

Taylor: That's right. My understanding of it was when those growers against whom they brought the case agreed to bargain collectively with them, they dropped the case. In other words, they used it as a trade-union weapon in the limited sense.

Chall: The Grange in 1962 started a case against some west side land owners. What's become of that case?

Taylor: The Grange did? I didn't know about that.

Chall: Well, let me see; I'll find my sources. I can't come here without my sources, because I'm always likely to get caught.

Taylor: Oh, excuse me! You're absolutely right, and I know what you're talking about now.

Chall: From newspapers clippings and other sources, I find that so many suits were started, and I'm always rather confused about whatever happened to them. Let's see, this comes out of the Chronicle, December 2, 1962: the Grange attacked the first water delivery contract, wants to test the state water plan's constitutionality and the validity of the contract between the state and the Metropolitan Water District.

Taylor: And you want my comment on that?

Chall: Yes, what happened to it, if you have any idea, and why.

Taylor: J. Blaine Quinn was the master of the Grange who succeeded George Sehlmeyer. Both of them were very alert to this issue, and very active. I brought together J. Blaine Quinn and John Sutter, an attorney in Oakland, who's now a member of the city council [Oakland], and who was for seven or eight years the organizer and president of People for Open Space in the Bay Area. He prepared the brief.
Taylor: The state supreme court rejected it. They validated the contract with no acreage limitation, nevertheless. The supreme court opinion tells in it somewhere—I think I have it, but I can't recall what they said about it. They didn't exactly say it was wrong, they didn't do that; but they didn't recognize its relevance to the contract, or considered it insufficient to invalidate the contract, so we lost out on that one. We didn't get a single vote on the supreme court. We'd hoped to get at least one or two.*

Some Favorable Administration Decisions

Chall: Now before we leave the issue of water, primarily as it relates to the federal government, what's your general opinion of the new plan of the government to raise the interest rate on the reclamation projects from 5 3/8 percent to 7 percent?

Taylor: I think it's a good idea to cut the subsidy. Cut the subsidy and use greater discrimination in choosing between one project and another. From my point of view, since the landowners are violating the law wholesale, I say, "Down with the projects at least until they observe the law."

Chall: I see.

Taylor: You saw that the Boston Ranch, with over 22,000 acres has signed recordable contracts to break up?

Chall: No, I didn't.

Taylor: That's in that same general area, not Tulare Lake, but the west side, Westlands Water District.

Chall: Is that right. May I take this and copy it, or have you already made a copy?

Taylor: I'll give you a copy.

*Metropolitan Water District of Southern California v. Marquardt 59 Cal. 2d, 159; 379 Pac. 2d 28; 38 West's Cal. Rep. 724. 1963
Biggest Farm Breakup Slated

By FRED GARRETTSON
Tribune Staff Writer

The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has signed the largest contract ever recorded under the 160 Acre Limitation law which requires that landowners sell off their holdings as "family farms" within ten years after federal irrigation water is delivered.

The bureau said the Boston Ranch Company has agreed to break up 22,374 acres of its land in Fresno County into at least 140 separate parcels during the next ten years.

Robert J. Paiford, the bureau's regional director, said the document establishes the eligibility of Boston Ranch Company to receive irrigation water from the federal San Luis Unit of the U.S. Central Valley Project.

The Boston Ranch Company property is within the boundaries of the giant Westlands Water District which encompasses 544,000 acres of arid land on the western side of the San Joaquin Valley in Merced, Fresno and Kings counties.

The bureau identified one of the main owners of Boston Ranch Company as J. G. Boswell, whose name frequently appears on lists of the largest landowners in California.

In addition to 22,374 acres in Fresno County, the company signed a similar contract agreeing to break up 1,337 acres of adjacent land in Kings County.

The 160 Acre Limitation law, passed in 1902, aims at preventing large land speculators from monopolizing the benefits of federally-financed irrigation projects.

It requires that within ten years after signing the contract, a large land owner must dispose of all "excess" land. A person or corporation is allowed to hold only 160 acres although a man-and-wife combination can own 320 acres.

The bureau interprets the law as prohibiting the purchase of a big land owner from setting up a lot of dummy corporations to evade the law.

Major corporations have waged a bitter battle against the 160 Acre Limitation over the years which provides, among other things, that the bureau may auction off land as "family farms" if a big landowner refuses or somehow fails to break up his holdings within ten years.

In such a forced sale, land values are depressed because the Reclamation Bureau can't consider the irrigation water contract as a land value. In a forced sale, rich farm land is sold off as if it was arid desert land. No such restrictions apply to private sales by cooperative land owners.

The west side of the San Joaquin Valley — mostly desert — is now being brought under irrigation by waters from the California Aqueduct which was jointly constructed and operated by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the California Department of Water Resources.

The 100 acre limit applies only to "federal" irrigation water. Nothing requires the breakup of big ranches in those areas designated as recipients of state water.

Paiford said that within the Westlands Water District, 430,000 acres were classified as "excess" land ineligible to receive federal water unless the owners signed a 160 Acre Limitation contract.

With the signing of the Boston Ranch property, Paiford said 249,000 acres have been placed under recordable contracts, including 7,000 acres which have already been sold off as "family farms" under the provisions of the law.

Big owners who refuse to sign aren't getting water, or are being offered enough only to irrigate a single 160 acre family farm.

Within the whole of the Central Valley Project — of which the San Luis Unit is only a large portion — Paiford said 340,000 acres of land have been placed under recordable contract and 72,000 acres have been sold off as family farms.

The controversial San Luis Drain, which is designed to get rid of the salty irrigation waste water from desert irrigation, originates in the San Luis Reclamation Project.

With irrigation water now flowing to the San Luis Unit, the controversy of the drain is still unsettled. Bay Area leaders say the drain will pollute the Delta and San Francisco Bay.
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Boston Ranch To Sell Land

FRESNO — The Boston Ranch Co. has agreed to break up 22,374 acres of its land in Fresno County into at least 140 parcels.

Bureau of Reclamation officials say it is the result of the largest single recordable contract in the history of the bureau's enforcement to federal acreage limitation laws.

The document established the eligibility of the Boston Ranch Co. lands to receive irrigation water from the federal San Luis Unit of the Central Valley Project in accordance with the requirements of the reclamation law.

In return for the right to use project water, the company agreed that it will sell 22,374 acres, covered by the contract, to at least 140 new owners in parcels of 160 acres or less.

Prices will not reflect increased value resulting from the reclamation project facilities or availability of project water.

The land is located in the Westlands Water District, which covers about 544,000 acres in Merced, Fresno and Kings counties.
Chall: That's quite an accomplishment for your side, isn't it? How did it come about?

Taylor: I regard that as a straw in the wind. If they thought there was a way of escaping the law, if they thought that there was a good chance of putting through the Engle formula which the giant landowners have wanted, they wouldn't be executing recordable contracts.

If they saw a real chance of that, I think they would have held off. Of course, it is my position that the Department of the Interior should not have begun construction on a project with about 70 percent of the lands in excess, without knowing whether they were going to comply with the law or whether they weren't, and supplying water both by surface and underground. In other words, I believe the Department of the Interior has been and is violating the law, and this Boston Ranch compliance is a lagging compliance.

Chall: That's a quite interesting development.

Taylor: Yes, as I say, it's a straw in the wind.

Chall: So, there's been what could be considered bad news and good news in our interview today.
XI THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND THE 160-ACRE LIMITATION
(Interview 12, March 17, 1972)

California Water Conference - 1945

Chall: Let's begin our discussion of your activities with respect to the water issues in California with the California Water Conference of 1945.

Taylor: Yes, that conference was organized, programmed, by Edward Hyatt, the state engineer, who was anti-acreage limitation, and it was prepared, loaded with speakers all heavily on the other side, either not talking about it, or talking about removing it for other reasons than their real ones. As I recall that, the war was about over. What was the date?

Chall: December, 1945

Taylor: All right, the war was over. Sam Wood was a lieutenant commander in the navy, and on his way back home he came to see me, in uniform. He'd taken his doctorate with me. Although he was in political science, his thesis was done under my direction. So I apprised him of the issue which he grasped very quickly and was interested in. Sam saw to it that people from all over the Valley poured into that conference in Sacramento. They had the scheduled speakers and formal program all in the control of Edward Hyatt and his side. However, they had allowed place for discussion groups. At the discussion groups, our people simply took over.

Governor Earl Warren

Taylor: I shall always remember Earl Warren as governor. He came to the meeting and rode the crest of the waves beautifully, laughing heartily and smiling at everybody, instead of taking a position
Taylor: and saying, "Why did you upset the plans of this program?" He rejoiced openly in the public participation, in the discussion and airing of an issue of public policy.

I think he did it honestly. I think he may have learned a lot from it politically. I've never found him against acreage limitation, although he helped the State Water Project along a little bit and gave Hyatt more leeway than I wished. On the contrary, he joined in the eight to nothing decision by the Supreme Court in 1958 which supported the 160-acre law, and strongly.* Somewhere in the files, among my papers, I have a very brief letter from Earl Warren years later, which says in effect, that the west side of the San Joaquin Valley should be developed similarly to the east side. I don't know why he wrote it to me but he did, and it can have no meaning other than he didn't want the west side permanently controlled by the big landholdings.

I don't say that he didn't allow some things to be done in his administration that the other side wanted, because he did at least two things, maybe three. He approved and signed (I assume) the bill, in 1951, that authorized a State Water Project. He approved, as I recall, the bill in the legislature setting up a Kings River Water District, which was a device that the other side wanted in order to keep the separate districts from Pine Flat Dam and from Kings River, from jumping to signing contracts with Bureau of Reclamation recognizing acreage limitation. You see, the Tulare Lake people with giant holdings didn't want to be undermined by the actions of other Kings River districts accepting contracts containing acreage limitation provisions. They would have been undermined.

That's quite a story as to the lengths to which they would go. They didn't want to be isolated. In court they are isolated as the only one that the Fresno decision concerns and let's out acreage limitation. They staved it off by this device of forming the all-inclusive Kings River Water District.

Chall: There was another water district in that area?

Taylor: There are a number; Fresno Irrigation District, Consolidated Irrigation District, I don't know how many others, Alpha Irrigation District, a string of them.

Chall: They were separate organizations--separate districts?

Taylor: Separate districts.

*Ivanhoe Irrigation District v. McCracken 357 U.S. 275.
Chall: And then they all amalgamated into one large district?

Taylor: They didn't disappear legally, but they consolidated their operations into the Kings River Water District, which never did sign the contracts. When it came to the contracts, the contracts were signed back again by the original ones that were there in the first place. It was a political maneuver to hold them together so that they wouldn't have one or another of the districts signing contracts. You see, the big landowners feared the Bureau of Reclamation would break the otherwise solid [KRWFD] front by getting one or two districts to sign. Eventually the districts with small amounts of excess lands signed contracts. But Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District, with huge holdings, did not sign, and eventually went to court. In 1972 the federal district court in Fresno gave a decision that acreage limitation does not apply under Pine Flat Dam on Kings River.*

Chall: What else did Warren do that you recall? These were two; you thought he made three moves that were opposed to acreage limitation.

Taylor: Yes, one other move. I don't think his name was on it, but he allowed Hyatt to do it. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineers both wanted to build Pine Flat Dam. The big landowners wanted the engineers to do it. There was no support from the state for the Bureau of Reclamation to build the project for which it had a legal authorization, but no appropriation of funds. When the alternative proposal of a congressional authorization for the Army Engineers to build Kings River Project came up, right away went the wire to Washington endorsing it. There was no similar state support for appropriations for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation.

In other words, Governor Warren made or allowed some tactical concessions to the other side. I have no doubt that his own inclinations were on our side. Perhaps one of the events helping him to sympathize with our side was that in '48, I believe, the Warren state Republican delegation slate was opposed by a delegation led by the Kern County congressman. In other words, Warren was challenged in his own Republican party at the center of giant landholdings. Well, I don't suppose he liked that very well.

---

Taylor: Apparently their interests were not satisfied with Warren's performance on acreage limitation.

Chall: Sam Wood was executive director of the Central Valley Projects Conference. He must have been a good organizer.

Taylor: He's a very effective man.

Chall: You were concerned with problems of the Congress, primarily, during these years. Was he the watchdog at the state level?

Taylor: Well, that would be a fair description of his role. The activities of his that I described were performed as a private citizen. He went at a later time onto the Bureau of Reclamation staff; I don't remember exactly when, but probably in 1946.

Chall: It certainly had to be before Mr. Eisenhower was elected president.

Taylor: Yes. Of course the pressures were put on the reclamation staff even before Eisenhower became president. The Straus-Boke rider to drive them out of office because they weren't engineers came in 1947. It was a tactic which Harry Truman opposed but couldn't stop. When Harry was elected in '48 he got them back on the payroll.

Chall: So Sam Wood may have been part of the bureau between about '47 and '50.

Taylor: Probably from 1946 to 1952. Then, as I recall, he went onto the staff of one of the state legislative committees. At that time our fortunes were particularly at a low ebb. I think he had to do some things because of the pressures, which he didn't like very well.

Then much later he went with the Cry California organization for which he's a consultant. He has an office in Sacramento. It's pretty hard, you see, for a person to persist in support of an issue such as acreage limitation which has very powerful forces opposed.

They drove Dick Boke out of office after Eisenhower came in; also Mike Straus. I think I told you what Dick Boke said to me, about that time: "I can't understand how you keep your job." Well, the University is a different institution than the federal bureaucracy. Pressures, you see, can be kept on people in political life, and they are more vulnerable than academicians. They get officials in ways that generally don't attract much
Taylor: public attention. When the Eisenhower administration came in, Straus and Boke were eased out, but were allowed a few months time to find other jobs.

Chall: You at least had the protection of the University.

Taylor: Of course, of course!

Chall: For anybody else it would be difficult.

Taylor: Of course, from the University I had protection which I value greatly, as you know from my article.*

Edmund Brown as Attorney General

Chall: I wanted to talk about--just briefly now because we'll probably be talking about Pat Brown at quite some length later--his election as attorney general in 1950. His election was rather important to the water issue.

Taylor: He defeated Frederick Napoleon Howser.

Chall: Did you or anybody else know what his interest would be or the tactic that he would take in this acreage-limitation matter?

Taylor: Not at that time, I did not. You see, Frederick Napoleon Howser wanted to put the state in opposition to acreage limitation before the U.S. Supreme Court. Pat Brown made an important change. When was he elected attorney general?

Chall: In 1950.

Taylor: 1950. When he went in he made the important change of supporting the acreage limitation.

Chall: The Ivanhoe case.

Taylor: The Ivanhoe case, that's right. That was a big, crucial decision

For California Farms

Supreme Court Upholds 160-Acre Water Aid Limit

By David Perlman

The 160-acre limitation law, cornerstone of Federal water project policy throughout California and the arid West, was upheld by the United States Supreme Court yesterday.

The decision will have tremendous impact on the $12 billion California Water Plan and on this State’s vast farm economy, with its $3 billion annual crop income.

The High Court ruling gave history-making approval to a 50-year-old Federal Government policy: When public funds are used to build big dams the water must go to small, family-sized farms and not to large landowners.

WARREN’S VOTE

The decision was 8 to 0. Chief Justice Earl Warren, who as California’s Governor had attacked the 160-acre law, joined in the ruling. Justice Felix Frankfurter did not participate.

The tribunal reversed a narrowly split decision of the California Supreme Court in which the Federal Government, in effect, was told that its water in California must be distributed to all farmers without regard to the size of their land holdings.

Yesterday’s ruling upheld the validity of a series of contracts between the Federal Bureau of Reclamation and three local water districts—the Ivanhoe and Madera irrigation Districts in the Central Valley Project, and the Santa Barbara Water Agency in the Cachuma Project.

FARM SIZE

In 1951 and 1952 local courts refused to validate Federal contracts with the Ivanhoe and Madera districts that included the 160-acre limitation. The courts held the irrigation districts could not sign such contracts because they violated State law.

The State Supreme Court, by a 4-to-3 decision upheld the lower court action, asserting that water in California was held in trust by the State for all the people, and that it must be distributed without “discrimination” to any farm that needs it—even those larger than 160 or 320 acres.

The State’s high court held that the Federal government could not over-ride this doctrine of “non-discrimination” in applying water policies here.

The irrigation districts, defending the validity of their contracts, asked Attorney General Edmund G. Brown to take their case to Washington. Deputy Attorney General B. Abbott Goldberg argued the successful appeal before the U. S. Supreme Court.

CONGRESS CITED

Justice Tom Clark, speaking for the Supreme Court yesterday, said it was beyond challenge that the Federal government has power to impose reasonable conditions on the use of Federal funds.

Congress has reaffirmed the 160-acre limit “again and again,” Clark said.

“It is reasonable,” he said, “to limit the amount of project water available to each individual in order that benefits may be distributed in accordance with the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals.

“The limitation insures that the enormous expenditure (of Federal funds) will not go in disproportionate share to a few individuals with large land holdings. Moreover, it prevents the use of the Federal Reclamation Service for speculative purposes.”

Clark said the high court could not agree that restrictions on the use of water and land ownership were discriminatory.
Federal Water for State’s Farms

High Court Upholds 160-Acre Limit

Continued

STATES’ RIGHTS
Harry W. Horton, counsel for the Imperial Valley Water District and one of the attorneys who argued against the 160-acre limit, attacked the decision bitterly.

“There is no limit now to Federal control,” he said, “and there is not much left of the Constitution as far as states’ rights are concerned.” He attacked Brown, too, saying: “Pat Brown has turned over the State’s water rights to the Federal government. He has done California a disservice and some day it will come home to roost.”

STATE SECURITY
Attorney General Brown called yesterday’s decision “a great victory for California” and “one of the most gratifying accomplishments” of his seven years in office.

“California’s future security under the reclamation program of the Federal government is assured,” he said. “The integrity of contracts between State agencies and the Federal government had to be maintained if we hoped to enter into other contracts for Federal aid.”

OTHER APPLICATIONS
Legal authorities here said yesterday that the ruling’s effect goes far beyond mere confirmation of Federal water law.

It will apply, they said, in all cases where the Federal government imposes conditions on states or localities receiving Federal funds — in highway projects, school aid programs and public health services, for example.

As for water, the decision settles a big question that has been hanging over California water projects for years: Would the Federal government continue financing multi-million-dollar dams and reclamation works here if the 160-acre law were abolished?

Reclamation Bureau officials in Washington indicated yesterday that the way is now clear for continued Federal construction.

California’s network of Federally-financed dams, canals and pumping stations is the largest in the nation. More than two million acres of farmland are served by the projects, and their annual crop value is nearly $350 million.

Throughout the 17 so-called “reclamation states” of the water-short West, Federal projects irrigate more than 7.5 million acres with an annual crop value of over a billion dollars. The 160-acre limitation law applies to almost every project.
Taylor: to throw the support of the state on the side of the constitutionality of acreage limitation.

Chall: It was crucial, and he did it immediately because there was a statement to a legislative committee dealing with water--a very strong statement by Brown--as to why he was going to completely change the course that the state would take. I just was curious to know if anybody at that time knew that he was thinking in this direction.

Taylor: I did not. I did know that anybody would be better as attorney general than Frederick Napoleon Howser. Brown walked out on us later, and Brown did not personally go before the U.S. Supreme Court. He sent one of his deputies to do that.

Chall: Abbott Goldberg?

Taylor: B. Abbott Goldberg, whose ultimate reward was a judicial appointment at the lowest level.

Chall: Yes, he's a superior court judge now in Sacramento.

Taylor: That's right. He handled the case beautifully.

Chall: The decision was made in 1958 and I suppose it was argued the year before. It occurred to me--and I don't know if this is relevant--but Pat Brown was running for governor during that period and he might have been otherwise busy.

Taylor: Of course that's why Abbott Goldberg represented the attorney general, and why Pat Brown did not appear personally. He was carrying water on both shoulders.

Chall: It wasn't just that he was busy? He had to be careful?

Taylor: And then he flipped over to lead the way to the State Water Project, a chief purpose of which was to circumvent federal acreage limitation law. That way he carried water on both shoulders.

Chall: At the time that he was running for governor were you aware that...

Taylor: He invited me over to a small round-table meeting. There were four or five other people there and Pat Brown talked with me directly. My recollection is that he said he'd be disposed to move ahead and get water developed. Well, that didn't say anything about acreage limitation, except it made me uneasy at the time.
Taylor: Of course, what he did was to support the State Water Project without acreage limitation, but I had no clear understanding of that at the time. If you want to go into the matter of the position that he took, aside from the fact that it undoubtedly helped get him into the governorship, I can fill the holes in there for you.

Chall: Can you recall who were the other people present at that round table meeting?

Taylor: No, I cannot. I do not remember that any were particularly concerned with the water-acreage limitation issue except myself.

The State Water Project - 1950-1960

Chall: I'd like to get into the California Water Project now, because it seems that with the controversy and decisions about San Luis, the federal and state governments are really joined in the 160-acre issue. I guess San Luis might have been built without the California water plan, but not vice versa.

Taylor: Well, there would have been federal construction instead of state. I think I gave you the statement of Senator Kuchel on that. As early as 1956 he claimed that if the state had not expressed its interest in Oroville there would have been a federal dam there long before the '55 flood. *Aqueduct Empire*, you see, takes a different point of view. I think the writer, Erwin Cooper, must have been unaware of what I just told you, which is part of the public record. Both Cooper and Brown give as their justification that the state built the dams to save lives. And I tell you as a matter of historical record that you can accuse the interests that held out for a state-built Feather River Dam of losing lives and property by impeding earlier construction of a federal dam.

Chall: In Robert De Roos's book *Thirsty Land*, he indicates that future plans (he was writing this in 1948) for the Central Valley Project include the use of San Luis Reservoir, filling it with northern water, to feed the San Luis west side canal.*

*Robert De Roos, *Thirsty Land*. 
Taylor: It's part of the Bureau of Reclamations Central Valley Project plan. In Washington I was asked to see Clark Clifford first, then vice-president Alben Barkley, to recommend printing of the bureau's plan as a public document.

Origins of the Project

Chall: I want to review some of the literature about the origins of the State Water Project with you. Cooper, in Aqueduct Empire, says that the issue of the 160-acre limit was so hot by the early fifties that the Bureau of Reclamation announced no plans to extend the Central Valley Project to the southwest side of the San Joaquin Valley, and that's where the large landholdings were. And since the landholders didn't particularly care for the Bureau of Reclamation, they tried to interest the Corps of Engineers in the project at San Luis, and the Corps of Engineers refused to enter where the Bureau of Reclamation refused, thus leaving a vacuum, so the big ranchers devised the Feather River Project. That's one aspect of it.

Taylor: That's the maneuvering as to how and why you get it done or when you don't do it. It does not mean that it was not part of the bureau plan.* It was. The record shows it perfectly plainly in the Central Valley plan.

Chall: Do you think that the Bureau of Reclamation would have gone ahead with it?

Taylor: I think so and I cited Senator Kuchel and George Sehlmeyer, the state Grange Master in support.** Also as a consultant to the bureau I

---

*Central Valley Basin, a comprehensive report on the development of the water and related resources of the Central Valley Basin for irrigation, power production, and other beneficial uses in California, and comments by the State of California and federal agencies, U.S. Dept. of Interior. 60. Also S. Doc. 113, 81 Cong., 1 sess. PST

**Senator Thomas H. Kuchel: "I would venture the guess that if the state had not indicated its interest in Oroville, we would have had long before last year's flood a federal dam at Oroville." Hearings on S. 178 before subcommittee on irrigation and reclamation of Senate committee on interim and insular affairs, 54 Cong., 2 sess., 179. (1956). PST
Taylor: heard that they were holding back on Feather River because the state pressed them to do it.

Chall: The state moved in with the plan about 1951 when the legislature authorized it.

Taylor: That's right, they authorized it but they didn't do anything to build it until 1960.

Chall: Now these same San Joaquin landowners who apparently pushed the Corps of Engineers for the Feather River Project, again according to Cooper, tried to interest the Metropolitan Water District at that time, and the Metropolitan Water District wasn't particularly interested.

Taylor: Cooper tells that?

Chall: Yes, and he adds, what I guess is a well-known fact, that the Metropolitan Water District was an implacable foe of the Feather River Project until the last minute.

Taylor: He tells that?

Chall: That's what he says, yes.

Taylor: Do you have the page reference?

Chall: Pages 201 to 206.

Taylor: Thank you.

Chall: Now, Harvey Banks, in his oral history interview says that in 1952 and '53, the landowners in the western Fresno County, the Westlands Water District, asked the Bureau of Reclamation to prepare a project for their benefit. And the Bureau of Reclamation, in 1955, came up with their feasibility report. The rest, of course, we know as history that in one way or another they finally developed the idea of a partnership between the two groups, the federal and state government.

Taylor: Yes, I think I referred you at that point to the two hearings before Senator Clinton Anderson in '56 and then in '58. The hearing in '56 resulted in Congress saying in effect, "We aren't going to do anything until you fellows get together on what you want." Mayor Norris Poulson, of Los Angeles, was totally opposed to federal construction of San Luis Project, which Governor Goodwin
Taylor: J. Knight supported.*

Chall: My question is this: Was it the same group of large landowners who were working for the Feather River Project in early 1950 and who, in effect, prompted Mr. Edmonston to draft plans for it, who asked at approximately the same time (in the fifties) the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the Metropolitan Water District to approve it? Would they be the same San Joaquin landowners?

Taylor: The western and southern big San Joaquin landowners wanted army or state construction. But financially the state couldn't swing it alone, and the Army Engineers could build only on the east side of the Valley under "flood control" justification. The Metropolitan Water District interest finally developed and was voiced to Congress in 1956 by Mayor Norris Poulson of Los Angeles. Behind him probably was principally Chandler interests which owned El Tejon Ranch on the Tehachapi Ridge. Probably there was support also from Newhall family interests just south of the Ridge, and Coachella Valley landed interests, and perhaps Irvine and San Diego landed interests. There was even talk of moving state project water into Imperial Valley.

Chall: In other words, at the same time, they were asking both the state and two agencies of the federal government to come up with water plans?

Taylor: That's what they got together on, really three agencies--the bureau, the army and the state. The biggest problem from the big landowners' viewpoint was how to get the state to finance construction. Well, the cost of taking over the already-constructed Central Valley Project was so great that they didn't want to take that on. They probably couldn't have sold it to the people of the state. In fact they couldn't have sold the State Water Project to the people of the state in 1960 if they had told them really what it was going to cost and what was the real reason for rejecting federal construction to complete the federal CVP plan. So they public-related the state plan to the people of the state.

Within the few months, as I recall it, they talked first about a bond issue of maybe $600 million, and then they revised it to $1.75 billion. I'm quite sure that they figured that was about as

---

*Hearings on S. 178, 86. (1956).
Taylor: high as they better go in asking people to approve the bond issue. They squeaked by with a small margin of votes.

Chall: The material that we looked at prepared by Verne Scoggins, in 1956, for the group of farmers in San Joaquin County asking for federal assistance, claimed that they were aware of the fact that the 160-acre limitation was involved here, and they were willing to go along with that because they would get their water at a cheaper rate than they would if the state built it. They were quite upset with the fact that they were being stymied by groups concerned about water for Southern California who urged them to wait for the Feather River Project.*

You indicate in your article, "Secretary's Decision?" that you think that Kern County Land Company was behind the foot-dragging.

Taylor: I can't believe it was otherwise. But that company was not alone.

Chall: From a reading of the "Economic Evaluation of Water" by McGauhey and Erlich, one might assume that the Metropolitan Water District was responsible for holding up the resolution of the issue with respect to the San Luis reservoir.**

Taylor: Who?

Chall: Professor Percy McGauhey, director, and Harry Erlich on the staff of the Sanitary Engineering Research Laboratory here at Berkeley, have written a multi-volume study on the economics of water. The first two volumes trace the history of water and land development in California, the others are statistical. They indicate that opposition came from Southern California. They wanted the Feather River Project water to go into the Los Angeles area, but felt that if the farmers on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley benefitted from San Luis water, they would be satisfied, and they then would not vote funds for bringing any Feather River water to Southern

---


SAN LUIS PROJECT

Sponsors of the San Luis Project are a group of realistic farmers in the San Joaquin Valley who are up against an immediate and costly water problem.

They believe they have found the answer to that problem. After 15 years of work and study they have developed a plan that has won the formal approval of the United States Bureau of Reclamation and many other agencies. They are now waiting their chance to tell their story to the Congress of the United States. With Congressional approval the project can be operating within five or six years.

The San Luis Project has been brought to the drawing board stage by a compelling economic force. It is not just a threat that confronts these west side land owners. It is an established trend - a trend caused by a falling water table and rising water costs. No amount of sweat, skill or imagination can bring water at reasonable prices from their failing wells. They must find supplemental water or go out of business.

They believe their plan for introducing supplemental water to be sound and feasible in every respect. And, they believe they can offer engineering proof that the project will improve water table conditions over a wide area in the San Joaquin Valley. To reduce pumping from deep wells and to add supplemental water in any area in the Valley automatically improves the water supply of adjacent areas. Also they believe their plan can readily be made to fit into any state-wide plan that contemplates the movement of waters from northern water-surplus areas to southern areas of deficiency.

Yet, in the face of all these encouraging developments these same farmers have run into difficulties of a disturbing nature. They have suddenly found
themselves caught in the center of a controversy over whether there should be any new water projects developed in Northern California until Southern California has fully established its claims upon Northern California water. They find themselves being labeled "out-of-step" because of their insistence that urgency in regard to water development means now instead of 15 or 20 years from now. They find themselves mentioned reproachfully because their interpretation of urgency permits the utilization of help from all available sources, including the Federal government.

Can't Afford To Wait

These San Joaquin Valley farmers welcome the interest in water conservation which is being generated by all this controversy but they are much more concerned with action than with discussion. They are face to face with grim realities. They are confronted with facts that daily emphasize the dangers of further delay. They know delay can bring ruin to the economy of half a million acres of the best land in the San Joaquin Valley. The area involved is almost as large as the Imperial Valley. It is also just about equivalent to what California agriculture is reported to have lost to home subdivision developers during recent years.

To understand the plight of these San Joaquin Valley farmers it is necessary to examine their project from both a local and a state-wide approach. It is necessary to understand the urgencies involved and the hopeless aspects of delay. It is necessary to understand why the Federal government is involved, why the Feather River Project is mentioned so often and where the Trinity River Project fits into the program. And, it is important to know something of the reasons why Southern Californians have suddenly developed an interest in the project.

How Project Got Name

The project in which these San Joaquin Valley farmers are willing to invest their future, draws its name from San Luis Creek which flows intermittently each year down the East slope of the Coast Range Mountains just west of the City of
FEDERAL-STATE ACCORD
SEEN ON SAN LUIS PROJECT

REPRINT FROM THE SACRAMENTO BEE
Jan. 26, 1956

Proposed federal-state integration of the San Luis Water Project received a boost following meetings by United States Reclamation Commissioner W. A. Dexheimer with state officials yesterday.

Dexheimer conferred with Governor Goodwin J. Knight, State Director of Public Works Frank B. Durkee and State Engineer Harvey O. Banks.

"In talking with Durkee and Banks", Dexheimer stated, "they didn't see any reason why we couldn't have integration."

The federal official said he agrees the federal government could build the San Luis Reservoir and provide for joint use with the state in the state's proposed Feather River Project.

KNIGHT AGREES

Governor Knight concurred in this idea.

Backers of the state's Feather plan last year opposed federal construction of the San Luis Reservoir in the west San Joaquin Valley, contending it would freeze out the state project.

But Dexheimer said the federal reclamation bureau's plan calls for a reservoir of an initial capacity of 1,000,000 acre feet and provision for later enlargement if and when the state is ready to build the Feather Project.

The bureau's proposal is before state officials for comment, due about March 5th.

NOTES NEW SPIRIT

Dexheimer noted a new spirit of cooperation among state and federal officials.

"I do feel we are working very much closer with the governor and state officials in planning necessary flood control and water projects," he said.

"Because of the recent floods and this closer cooperation we are making more progress than in the past."

Governor Knight agreed to this statement.

"For example, I assured Mr. Dexheimer," Knight commented, "that we will give every help in his request before congress for $8,350,000 for the Trinity River Project.

"We need the greatest possible development of California's water resources. There is not enough money from any one source to meet the needs.

DISCUSSED DEVELOPMENT

"We discussed the possibility of integration of the San Luis and the use of it and development of it. I have been consistently in favor of integration of the San Luis or any other water developments in California."

Dexheimer, reflecting the harmony theme, said he believes the state and federal officials can negotiate agreeably on working out the details of building and using the San Luis Reservoir.

He noted if the federal government developed the initial 1,000,000 acre feet storage capacity of the San Luis Reservoir this would be subject to federal reclamation law. But if the state financed added capacity that would be used under state law.

NO STATE LIMIT

Federal reclamation law includes a 160 acre land limitation in water users' contracts but state law has no limit.

Dexheimer said he hopes the present congress will authorize the San Luis and give the reclamation bureau enough leeway to negotiate for possible state use on terms the state may want.

He added federal funds for going forward with San Luis can be requested the day after congress authorizes the project.
Chall: California: "this little Southern California clique, led by the Metropolitan Water District."

Taylor: That's all in their study?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: I'll have to get hold of it some time?

Chall: So we have these various little tags that I thought I would see if we could work out together.

Taylor: On the details of that I'm not much help.

Chall: Between 1951 and 1958, really, very little was able to occur--because of the problems of financing, and because of the north-south controversy.

Taylor: You'll find some of this in the Nader report.

Chall: I haven't seen that.

Taylor: They're preparing to come out with something before long. Here's a preliminary draft which I just got a matter of days ago.

Chall: A summary, as it were, that the average person could read?

Taylor: Oh yes, oh yes! They're apparently planning to have it come out as a book.*

Chall: Cooper thinks that, up to 1958, the real impetus for the Feather River Project which became the California Water Project was irrigation-oriented, but by the time it was passed, California had changed to an urban society, and that there were industrial and urban needs for the water. This was one of the reasons, he writes, that it was successful--it was able to be sold successfully to the people.

Taylor: Yes, I suspect that goes into what supplies the water for Orange County. Is that it?

Chall: Well, he didn't discuss that. He states that it wasn't just the farmers and ranchers who were going to get the benefits.

Taylor: That's right. If you urbanize you get bigger incremental values, don't you? That's where you make a lot of money, not just a few hundred dollars an acre. The sky is the limit. But the Feather River Project had irrigation interests behind it, too.

Chall: He feels, too, that both Banks and director Warne were men who felt seriously that they were agents of all the people of the state rather than of any pressure group or dominant agency. Would you agree?

Taylor: Warne came out of Imperial Valley. I think he was interested in getting water as far south as possible. I think he felt the powers behind water development were large landholding interests. He was of the opinion in 1944—he may still be—that my point of view on acreage limitation couldn't win. He played with those who could, so he probably would say he was practical, and that I am impractical. *

Chall: Governor Knight called a citizens conference on water projects in 1956. Were you involved in that in any way, or do you recall it?

Taylor: No, I don't.

Chall: It wasn't as major, do you think as the one that Governor Warren had in 1945?

Taylor: No. The proceedings of the Warren Conference make a substantial volume.

Chall: In 1957 there was an amendment attached to Governor Knight's request for money to do some preparatory work at Oroville. The senate attached a rider to apply the 160-acre limitation. It lost, but the Democrats cast all twenty-five votes in favor of that amendment.

Taylor: I'd forgotten that. Well, you see, the Democratic party was on

Taylor: record in favor of acreage limitation at that time.*

Chall: At that time.

Working for Acceptance Within the California Democratic Council

Taylor: Brown pulled the rug in 1960 and perhaps earlier on the CDC. They worked very hard. Brody was acting in that.

Chall: Ralph Brody?

Taylor: Ralph Brody, sure, and Gianelli.

Chall: In the CDC?

Taylor: Sure.

Chall: I don't think I know that story.

Taylor: Well, Brody spoke--I've forgotten exactly what year it was; I think it was about '58 or '59, along in there. You see he had to appear reasonable in order to gain CDC support that was Bureau of Reclamation oriented, for a State Water Project. There were other people who came and worked inside the CDC--I can still see the shadowy figures. Did I tell you of my experience with two of the subcommittees in CDC, and how they worked to gain support for the State Water Project.

Chall: I don't remember that.

Taylor: Well, I'll tell you two successive incidents. I can't remember the years exactly now--but they were two successive years, probably 1958 and 1959, or maybe 1960. Of course they knew my position; in the earlier of these two years they asked me to be the consultant to the chairman of one of the CDC workshops. Well, that took me off the floor of the worship, by placing me under the wing of the chairman, you see. He was, I think a member of the legislature, and he was trying to put something through that I did not like. So once when something was said by him from the floor with which

Taylor: I disagreed, I spoke right up, sitting beside him. Well, the first time I got by with it all right. The second time I started to speak up the chairman reminded me that I was a consultant to him as chairman of the committee, and I was to speak only when I was spoken to.

Chall: Is that right?

Taylor: Yes.

Chall: Even though you were also a member of the CDC?

Taylor: Why, of course! So this is what I did. I walked down the floor into the audience (I don't know how many were there, but I'd say twenty-five or thirty-five--something like that) to Marilyn Stout from Northridge, who had been active on my side. I told her she'd better ask me a question because I'd been told that I couldn't speak unless I was spoken to. So, she promptly asked me a question. So then I was able to speak my views. That tells you something of the maneuvers engaged in to divert the CDC.

Chall: Was this a resolutions committee meeting?

Taylor: It was a workshop discussing the water business. They didn't want me talking. Then another year, I don't remember exactly when, but it must have been '58 or '59--they were two succeeding years that they set up committees. In this particular year they set up a committee on the acreage limitation and, either by design or whatever, they divided it into four separate rooms to keep it--this is my interpretation--to keep the audience small that would hear me. So, there I was in the morning with a group that never exceeded an audience of fifteen, so hardly anybody heard me. And, to take care of me on the other side were William Gianelli and a state senator from the Sacramento Valley. So every time I would say anything one or the other, or both of them would talk, and then I had to come back. I had two people on my neck all the time, and an audience, as I say never above fifteen. A few people would come in and go out. The discussion was scheduled to go on all day. We went to lunch. Game the afternoon, without any notice, they did not return, nobody returned. There was no meeting in the afternoon to continue the discussion. So, you see, the subtlety with which that meeting of the CDC was handled to damp down the strong position that CDC had taken on acreage limitation.

Chall: What finally was the stand of the CDC on the California water plan?

Taylor: Oh, I don't remember what they finally did.
Chall: They didn't take a stand on acreage limitation, or they reversed their stand?

Taylor: They never took a stand that they were against it. They never did anything like that. But they damped down their opposition. It was at one of those meetings, I think, when Alan Cranston was down there. I'm not absolutely sure; it could have been a third meeting to which I went. In the fifties I used to go fairly regularly to those sessions in Fresno.

Chall: Were you the only one there to speak on behalf of the acreage limitation in the CDC?

Taylor: No. Marilyn Stout was there. The latest that I heard, the day before yesterday, is that she gave fine testimony before Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma in his hearing in Los Angeles on the ninth of this month.*

Chall: What is her background, and why is she still involved in this?

Taylor: I don't know how she got involved in the CDC.

Chall: Or water and land?

Taylor: Well, you see, she was in the CDC at the time that water and land was an issue in the Democratic party. In the forties Sheridan Downey was going contrary to the platform declarations of the party, and Helen Gahagan Douglas, up to 1950, had made this a big issue. So the issue appeared large in the minds of the members of the CDC, and Marilyn Stout was among them.

Chall: Was she a private individual?

Taylor: Yes. She was what we used to call a housewife before we called them "Ms."

Chall: [Laughter] I see. She's a political activist, then.

Taylor: I suppose she's a political activist. She is sympathetic to the views of Henry George. But I don't think she's at all rigid in her views. She organized, about two or three years ago, a meeting held under church auspices in the Los Angeles area--invited me down to

Taylor: speak, and arranged other speakers. She's very capable and effective. She has put burrs under the saddle blanket of the League of Women Voters which washed out on this issue at the time the State Water Project was used to circumvent acreage limitation in 1960.

Chall: That's an interesting lady.

Taylor: Oh, she! She's a dandy!

Chall: Especially to have retained this enthusiasm for so many years. It's very difficult to do.

Taylor: She does it!

Chall: I have what I think are contradictory notes on the position of the California Democratic Party in 1958. I'm not just sure where I got them. One is from your article "Excess Land Law" that, in 1958, there was support for the 160-acre limit in the Democratic party platform.

Taylor: That's my recollection, and I think I have it documented somewhere.

Chall: I haven't, unfortunately, labelled my next source which says that in August 1958, the state Democratic party convention defeated, by a close vote, a resolution unanimously adopted by the resolutions committee, calling for enactment of the 160-acre limitation on irrigation benefits, with public agency preference in the distribution of power, prior to state construction of any water and power projects.

Taylor: I would be interested in the source. It would seem to be contrary.

Chall: Yes it would, and I really don't know where I got it.

Taylor: I wish you could find that.

Chall: If I can't, we'll just have to assume that when you were writing your article you had your facts straight on the Democratic party.

Taylor: I hope I did!*

Taylor: Is it possible that they could have supported the acreage limitation on federal projects but that this was related to the State Water Project? That occurs to me.

Chall: It would be easy to do it that way.

Taylor: Tactically that's right, to say, "we're for the acreage limitation on federal projects, of course."

Chall: Because we always have been.

Taylor: Yes, that is exactly the tactic that was employed by Kuchel and Engle in 1959. Oh, the federal acreage limitation will apply to every drop of federal water on the San Luis unit. But for the state project, then state law should apply. So it fits. But if you can find that source, I would like it.

Edmund Brown as Governor

Chall: Let's talk now about Governor Brown when he came in in 1958. A couple of sources indicate that he was determined the Feather River Project would be successful, and that he came in prepared for a bond issue with details for water delivery, but not policy.

Taylor: In other words, his policy was not to have the federal policy on a state project. He would leave that out.

Chall: He would leave out anything that dealt with the controversial matters of policy.

Taylor: That's the way Brown behaved. His predecessor as attorney general, opposed the position argued in court by the Ivanhoe Irrigation District in favor of acreage limitation.

When Brown came in [as attorney general], he supported the Ivanhoe Irrigation District before the Supreme Court of the United States. Then after he became a candidate for governor, Brown allowed J. Abbott Goldberg to handle the case before the court instead of representing the state in person. So in essence he faded out as a shadow supporter of acreage limitation while he was moving toward the governorship and the state project as a device to escape acreage limitation. Thus he carried water on both shoulders, with the biggest bucket full on the side of water monopoly.
Taylor: I think I told you he invited me over to a meeting at which there were perhaps a half a dozen of us talking with us around the table about the water issue. We were there to counsel him, and I knew then that he was not going to be solid on the issue. I didn't know how far he would go to weaken the law, but I knew that he wasn't solid when he remarked "something that would develop our water resources." That meant he would give priority to development over policy. That was the implication, and that's exactly what he did when he put through the State Water Project in 1960.

That would fit with the piece of information that you got.

Chall: Also the Democratic party resolution?

Taylor: Yes, because presumably he was--about '58--influential and didn't want that done, and by a narrow vote, apparently, he defeated it. So it's all of a piece.

Chall: In May of 1958, this was before the election, the California Water and Power Users Association filed an initiative constitutional amendment to place the 160-acre limitation onto the State Water Project. I never saw any information about what happened to that amendment.

Taylor: What year?

Chall: This was 1958. They had to gather up about 300,000 signatures in order to place it on the ballot, and apparently they didn't succeed.

Taylor: Was that not an occasion in which the California Labor Federation worked with them?

Chall: I assume so, yes.

Taylor: I think so. As I recall, they obtained something over 90,000 signatures, and then decided not to put more money into it, and they let it drop.

Chall: It was too difficult to get the signatures?

Taylor: The man who could tell you exactly about that is Don Vial, who is on campus with the Institute of Industrial Relations. He was handling that for the federation at that time. As I remember I got a hundred signatures for them personally.

Chall: That's been the only attempt, then, to place that through initiative?
Taylor: Through initiative--it's the only one I know. There have been attempts on the floor of the legislature.

Chall: In 1959 there was an attempt to include the 160-acre limitation as an amendment to a bill, which also failed.

Taylor: That's one where I gave you the quotation from Jesse Unruh. "At times we must rise above principle." *

Chall: The East Bay Labor Journal [June 22, 1959] noted the Alameda County legislators who are Democrats who voted against it: Carlos Bee, Robert Crown, Byron Rumford, and Nicholas Petris. Jerome Waldie and S.C. Masterson, both of Contra Costa County, voted for it according to that same article.

Taylor: Petris voted against it? I think Petris would support it now.

Chall: I think he might. In fact he intimated this--if he didn't in fact say so--in that first April Earth Day meeting in which the two of you spoke.

Taylor: I think he would now. I'd forgotten that he had ever gone the other way.

Chall: There was, then, a considerable amount of erosion in the state legislature?

Taylor: The erosion was in the CDC, also. As an organization, this particular fight was a part of the erosion of the CDC. It's never since been what it once was.

Chall: I see. Since then?

Taylor: No, never.

Chall: What about the legislature at that time? You were busy working with Congress and writing on the San Luis controversy. Who was working at the state level?

Taylor: Well, if it was anybody it was Don Vial for the federation.

Tactics for Success of the State Water Project Election

Chall: Apparently you didn't have either the people to work with or the organization that would be effective.

Taylor: No. You see, there was tremendous power on the other side. I don't know that I've commented on this aspect of the battle of the acreage limitation, but from the beginning, I realized that we had a chance to win in the national legislature, and very little chance to win in the state legislature. We had to nationalize the issue to win it.

The other side's tactic is to make it appear that it's a state matter, not a national issue. That's the tactic right down to today of senior vice-president Robert W. Long of the Bank of America. According to him, it's political tyranny on the part of the eastern states against the West.* You see, ignoring whose water it is and whose money it is, and where people are coming from to California, along with the water.

Chall: You once told me when we were discussing this briefly, that -- let's see, how did you put it? "They took us by surprise," I think you said, with respect to the final resolution of the Feather River Project bill. I think you meant the bill, but you might have also meant the campaign and the winning of it. What did you mean?

Taylor: I think what I must have meant was something like this: That they cooked up their plans without much informing of the public. What they did was to hand to the public the proposed State Water Project without public hearings and debate. They waited. You see, when Brown gave me the little tip off that becomes perfectly clear to me now; at the time, it was less clear. I knew that he wasn't devoted to my issue, but it wasn't clear that he was going to carry that banner for the other side. Besides, he was my Democratic candidate for governor. The hardest situation to meet is when your own people cave in on you.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: Then there came the Charles T. Main report for which the state paid something around a third of a million dollars. It was in print and available in the state only about five weeks before election day. That was too brief time to study and analyze it. The newspaper reports, as I recall, said at first that a bond issue of about $600,000 was under consideration by supporters of the project. Then, within two or three months, that figure was boosted up to $1,750,000 billion. That isn't exactly taking the public into your confidence. The public was simply manipulated. The initial and throughout a leading purpose of this was to escape acreage limitation, and promote water monopoly and private speculation. That side of the project was concealed.

Chall: However, they did seem to feel a concern about what was called "unjust enrichment" toward the end.

Taylor: Brown had to say something, you see, to try and cover himself. So, he told Congress that he was against unjust enrichment, but he was pretty weakly opposed to it. All that there is is an administrative declaration that acreages above 160 acres receiving state water, will pay a higher differential price. That isn't even a legislative decision, and I don't think that there is even a vestige of its enforcement at the present time.

I have somewhere in my files the latest correspondence on it furnished by the Department of Water Resources. As I recall, within the last year and a half, Director Gianelli wrote to the purchasers of the water, asking them if they think there's any point in following through on this weak control over unjust enrichment. The Water Department doesn't even know the extent to which excess lands above 160 acres exist in the areas where they're going to furnish the water. If they were serious about enforcing the administrative declaration favoring a higher charge for water furnished to excess lands, they would want to know the existence of excess lands, owner by owner, square mile by square mile.

Chall: How can they not know it?

Taylor: They know it in general, but not systematically. That's one of the things that the Nader report has pointed out, that nobody, nobody in California has any comprehensive information on who owns the private lands within this state.

In the irrigation districts, there is some knowledge of size of landownerships. But the state officials don't even know in the areas they serve. So, the Brown administration's declaration is
Taylor: an empty gesture that is being tossed in the wastebasket. If it isn't already in the wastebasket, they can toss it there when nobody's looking.

Chall: The two-price system would permit reductions in rates to small landowners through the sale of project power at market value. How long could that power profit last if ultimately all power would be needed to pump the water over the Tehachapis?

Taylor: Well, there would be an input of power revenue into the state treasury for a period. Some of the 1933 revenue bonds were sold recently to pay for power development at Oroville dam. But the future of power net revenue is uncertain if more and more water is lifted over the Tehachapi.

I don't know all of the book juggling that took place, but there was plenty of it. They told the people the sale of water would pay project costs. But the water rate was set so high that the landowners said they couldn't pay it. So they suddenly discovered that they had "surplus water." This enabled them to say that for this "surplus" water you don't have to pay but a fraction of the originally set water price. Juggle the books is one way out. Another is to tax Metropolitan and Kern County taxpayers whether they receive any water or not. The Nader report tells some of the devices. Take the oil revenues away from higher education construction, to which they had been assigned.

Chall: They were expected to pay for the project too?

Taylor: Yes. They have been used to pay for the project.

Chall: You think then there might not have been any way that the legislation could be stopped once it got going with the passage of the Davis-Grunsky Act which brought the northern people into some kind of harmony.

Taylor: I've forgotten the details of that. No, this State Water Project was cooked up with the greatest thought given to it, and, from my point of view, how to pull the wool over the people's eyes.

Chall: Mr. Cooper, in his *Aqueduct Empire*, has said that I think many people in the state felt and may still feel at this time, "that seen in the light of that polarization, the fact that Governor Brown successfully welded California's warring halves together long enough to synthesize a workable water formula looms all the more as a remarkable feat of statesmanship."

*Cooper, *Aqueduct Empire*, p. 240.
Taylor: Well, I would substitute "politicianship" for "statesmanship." I think public support for the project is pretty well falling apart now, and public opposition is rising, which I think supports my suggestion that it be characterized as politicianship rather than statesmanship.

Chall: When you say it's falling apart now, what do you mean?

Taylor: The popular support of the state project is, I would say, at a low ebb, which doesn't suggest that it can't get even lower. Here's the battle in the legislature to forbid them from taking any of the wild rivers' waters.

Chall: And the battle over the drain and peripheral canal?

Taylor: Yes. They'll be picking up the pieces for a long time.

Chall: That means that it cannot, perhaps, be carried to what they would have considered its logical conclusion, but still the water is flowing.

Taylor: They got it started. Now they are not pushing hard. My explanation of why they're not is because it is inexpedient to push hard now. The public reaction--the people--are waking up to the deal that was put over on them. So this is not a good time to push. You don't push a project when your opponents are on the alert to block you, which they are at the present time. The environmental movement is potentially very effective. I don't say that they never will resume their efforts to enlarge the project, but they will wait until they think strategically it's a better time to put it through than it is now.

Chall: There have been some studies by the College of Agriculture, too, have there not, regarding the fact that much of the water is going into land which is producing surplus crops.

Taylor: Yes, there are studies indicating that the crops being grown on the west side will reduce the prices, the market prices for farmers on the east side of the Valley, yes. The national report on rural poverty entitled "The People Left Behind" points out the injury to easterners from expansion of western irrigation.
The Bee Chain

Chall: Were the farmers on the east side of the Valley particularly concerned about the Feather River Project enough to oppose it? Could they see that there would be this competition?

Taylor: By and large the answer is, no. They had no information. Sacramento and the chain of Bee papers went for the State Water Project, and that's the principal source of information for the people in the Valley including the farmers there. The California Farmer certainly didn't help inform them. The Bee didn't help them. Did I tell you that I understand that the attitude of the Bee papers is in the process of changing?

Chall: No.

Taylor: Well, here I got this two or three days ago. [Shows newspaper clipping] This is from the Fresno Bee of January 17, 1972. Here's a cartoon of men in their rich man's bankers' club. At the bottom it says, "Our banker says I may have to move to the San Joaquin Valley, wherever that is." That's a reference to the residency requirement of the reclamation law. Perhaps two or three months earlier the Bee had another cartoon of a man standing up in his car filled with members of a board of directors. He asked a man on the tractor in the field where the board meeting for their 5,000-acre ranch is to be held.

The Bee papers were built by James McClatchy whose tradition was strongly to support the squatters and small landholders. I went to Walter P. Jones, the managing editor of the Sacramento Bee in 1944, and I think for the first time, brought the acreage-limitation issue to his attention.

Chall: Is that so?

Taylor: Yes. Well, they didn't really take up the cudgels on our side, but they were all right. Then came the State Water Project and they went for that, notwithstanding it was designed to circumvent acreage limitation. I went to Jones and Eleanor McClatchy and talked to the two of them together about the dangers to the acreage limitation, and I can still see the flush of red go from his collar up to his cheeks when I raised the question. This must have been sometime in the early fifties. I said I would like to go down and talk with the Fresno Bee men in the paper in the Valley. That's when the flush went way up. When I said, "I would appreciate having word go down from here that they may speak freely with me," and made clear that I wasn't going there to attack him, then the
Taylor: flush receded and he grabbed my hand hard. He did open the door for me to speak with the Fresno staff, and they did talk to me freely. What I understand now (this is just grapevine) is that the young C.K. McClatchy shortly is going to succeed Walter Jones, and that he's going to go back into the old tradition. So I say that printing cartoons like I described suggests that is the way the Bee may be heading.

But the Bee papers were not doing that in 1959, when the battle was on in Congress to refuse to exempt the State Water Project from the acreage limitation. The Bee carried hardly any news, just a little bit more than Bay papers, which gave the California public virtually nothing of those four days of extended debate in the Senate. Since the Bee backed the State Water Project, that is not surprising. The debates told why the state project was foisted onto the people of California.

My Washington friends, Senator Paul Douglas, for example, used to ask me, "How about the Bee papers?" counting on the Bee papers to support, reasoning from their traditional position favoring small farmers. I had to tell them, "No support."

Chall: In the 1960 water project election, you received no support for the 160-acre limitation, but there was the opposition of the Chronicle, at least for the project, as such.

Taylor: Yes, there was the fact of taking northern water down, and I believe the Chronicle's recent position was "at least, if you're going to take the northern water down, the south ought to pay for it."

Chall: The Feather River Project people felt that the users were going to pay for it. They insisted they were going to pay for it.

Taylor: Do you remember the statement of the Nader's Raiders? Keith Roberts, particularly, in January of '72 in San Francisco, pointed out the deception of the public on exactly the point that you have raised.* The difference between the agency that paid for the water, and those who actually use the water. The taxpayers of districts will pay for the water, and the water-users will get subsidized water. In other words, the taxpayers in the tax districts like Metropolitan Water District of Southern California are paying

Taylor: what is specified on their tax bill, regardless of whether they receive any water or not. So they tell the people that the water-users are going to pay when they are going to pay only a part, and the taxpayers pay the rest.

Chall: The fact that they claimed that the water-users were going to pay for the water was the reason that they gave for not wanting to use the 160-acre limitation.

Taylor: All right. The whole thing, you see, is a rigged deal, full of double talk from start to finish, for the support of gigantic land speculation by big landowners, giant landowners.

Differing Views of the Project

Chall: I'd like to talk to you about the people who were opposed. There weren't many at that time.

Taylor: No, not many.

Chall: The AFL-CIO was, of course, opposed all the way, is that right?

Taylor: Yes.

Chall: And what about the various locals, the ones in the Valley? Do you know whether they were also opposed, or was it primarily at the state level?

Taylor: By and large, throughout organized labor there was opposition with hardly an exception. Under the local pressures of the late forties and early fifties, the Kern County Federation, and later on Fresno, were muffled on the issue of acreage limitation. In '44 both of them spoke up. Then, before long, the Kern County people were silenced, and then the labor people in Fresno. As I recall it, the Los Angeles unit of the federation was in opposition to the State Water Project all the way.

Chall: Even at the end, after the Metropolitan Water District had signed that contract?

Taylor: Well, I don't know if they ever have changed their views.

Chall: Now, the League of Women Voters as you've told me dropped out along
Chall: the way. Do you have a way of assessing the reason for that?

Taylor: Well, I can speculate on it. They wrote to me asking for my analysis of the proposed State Water Project, which I sent them. My view is that, at the time, the state league was dominated by Southern California women receptive to the Brown statesmanship, or rather politicianship, as I would say.

And, they clung to the verbal assurances of "no unjust enrichment" that I told you actually was so flimsy. The league's support of the project is fading out now. Marilyn Stout was at that meeting I told you about in Southern California trying to wake up the league, but they've not been really successful. I don't know the inside of how the league was swung over to the side of the speculators, but I think it was done by interests whose over-riding consideration was to get northern water for Southern California. So, they keep their skirts clean by saying "no unjust enrichment," but the means of ensuring no unjust enrichment on the State Water Project are useless, totally ineffective.

Chall: Do you think that only way of ensuring no unjust enrichment is through the 160-acre limitation, or would there be other ways?

Taylor: Other techniques are possible; acreage limitation is the most politically feasible one. Acreage limitation is the law today--federal law, and the problem is to get it enforced. It's on the books now, so strategically that is what you hold on to. You see, it makes a lot of difference whether you keep a dog from getting a bone, or whether you try to take a bone away from a dog after he's got it. Well, in the case of acreage limitation, the dog already had the bone. The law was on the books, and the big landowners had to try to take it away, and they couldn't do it. In 1944, and 1947, and 1959, and 1960, we were able to keep them from taking it away. I don't think we could have put it on the books in the first place in those years.

Chall: Or since?

Taylor: No. Because we didn't have the background of an informed public, outraged by the way the lands had been grabbed. And in 1902 that was the background. The whole irrigation movement of citizens in the 1890s said, "We want the water, but we don't want it to go to the big landowners of arid and semiarid lands.

Chall: Part of the shift, probably, is that there is a change in where people are, and urban people see this differently--
Taylor: Urbanization makes a difference. Yes, and control of the media, and their change of position. The San Francisco Chronicle in the 1870s was outraged by the land grab. For an historian that's an excellent source of the exposure of what was done at that time. Just go to the Chronicle. I've quoted them on the land grab page after page. Now, virtually no mention of acreage limitation to control the grabbing of water. It takes a while to educate and arouse the public.

Chall: You told me something about the Santa Clara people and Grace McDonald. Did you know Ed Levin and John Thorne?

Taylor: Levin I don't know. John Thorne I knew.

Chall: John Thorne was very active in the California Water and Power Users Association.

Taylor: And the CDC.

Chall: Did he retain his opposition to the Feather River Project?

Taylor: I can't answer that. Grace McDonald, I remember.

Chall: Grace McDonald went for the Feather River Project, didn't she?

Taylor: Yes. What I think was that she was regarded as vulnerable by advocates of the State Water Project. They promised water to Santa Clara County. I saw this particularly as it was manifested in promoting the candidacy of Clair Engle for the U.S. Senate. That was when my candidate at the CDC convention was Peter Odegard. I was told by Dewey Anderson, who is from the peninsula and a very well-informed man, that he couldn't do anything at all to move Grace McDonald, who had always been on our side, away from supporting Engle. She was adamant.

I think they sold her on the State Water Project saying, "We're going to get water for Santa Clara County and San Jose."

Chall: I had read that the people in that area were quite divided for many years over whether they wanted water from the Feather River Project, from the Bureau of Reclamation, or from some other source--like Hetch Hetchy.

Taylor: I'm not informed on that in detail. Grace McDonald washed out on us, on acreage limitation, and supported Clair Engle. His formula
Taylor: for undermining acreage limitation is what the Reagan Task Force wanted.* In other words, she tossed into the wastebasket the issue in which I had special knowledge and interest.

Chall: And has never come back?

Taylor: And she has never come back. I was told within the last year by attorney James Lorenz that he went to Grace McDonald for financial support and was turned down. He is handling the case which is trying to apply the acreage limitation to the State Water Project by saying that Congress didn't exempt it for acreage limitation. If Congress didn't exempt it, how come the law is not being applied?

Chall: I see. She's retired now.

Taylor: Yes, she must be eighty-three or eighty-four, and she's retired from her organization. I've wondered about this if you want me to just speculate.

Chall: Oh, do.

Taylor: I'd have liked to have The Bancroft Library get her files of her organization. I may be misinformed, but I heard that they were going to Oregon. I was just wondering if the things that we are talking about moved her to keep them out of Berkeley. I might have done Bancroft Library a dis-service in that respect. That's stretching it out pretty far.

Chall: You contacted The Bancroft Library to try to get her files? I wouldn't take any blame for that.

Taylor: A California organization, yet not put files in a California repository?

Chall: That's strange. You feel certain that they went to Oregon?

Taylor: Well, I've heard that.

Chall: I think there was an attempt to get them, I'll check.

Taylor: I think I went to Bancroft and said, "Try and get them, but the use of my name wouldn't be altogether good." At the same time, oh,


Grace McDonald papers have been deposited in the Michel Otradre Library, University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara, California
Taylor: every three months or so, I used to get a telephone call at home from Grace. So she didn't want to let go of me or our relations entirely, and I continued to send my annual check in support. But, I didn't get the support there.

Chall: But you didn't know what happened to John Thorne on the issue?

Taylor: He's still in that area. I see his name from time to time. But what part he played, I don't know. John Thorne was for Peter Odegard.

Chall: I noticed that he was the first vice president of the California Water and Power Users Association, soon after it was organized. Robert Rivers was the organizing secretary for California Water and Power Users Association, among other things. Tell me about Robert Rivers.

Taylor: Robert Rivers had been with the Corps of Engineers. He was active in the manner that you described, and as I recall, he was pressured into abandoning his activities on our side. Now, where did the pressure come from? Well, I think it was a question of his getting a government job to be able to support himself.

Chall: Oh, really?

Taylor: It was maintained that he would have to lay off what he was doing if he was to be employed.

Chall: You mean at the time that he was so active with the Water and Power Users Association he was employed by the Corps of Engineers?

Taylor: He had been previously; whether he still was or not I'm not sure. So whether it was a new employment or a matter of continuation of his employment, or re-employment, I'm a little bit fuzzy. But I am correct that in one form or another there was job pressure which obliged him to fade out on activity on our side.

The source of one's support is important. Deter a man by threatening his job, or by offering him another; by such means you can buy him off. Sheridan Downey, after we defeated him to the point that he didn't dare re-run for the Senate, was paid off. He was put on the Huntington Beach public payroll, as I recall. So if you control a public job, you pay him off with I think a $17,000 public salary. That was money in those days.

Chall: What was Harlan Trott's position as a writer for the Christian Science Monitor?
Taylor: Harlan Trott was a Henry Georgist. The outright Henry George people--Marilyn Stout was just on the margin and Grace McDonald a little more--they were interested in the acreage limitation issue because Henry George got his start watching the land grab speculation long before the acreage-limitation law was passed to control it in 1902. In an effort to control speculation, Henry George's solution was to tax all the "uneearned increment" in land values for the benefit of the public treasury. That's the meaning of "single tax." I never had any open opposition from any of the land-tax people. Relations were personally friendly, but never wholehearted support. They didn't want to be caught against what I was doing, but not very much help. Minimum help.

They had an alternative remedy which I would say politically speaking was pie in the sky. But I had the bone and the dog.

Chall: Well, Harlan Trott wrote some articles in the Christian Science Monitor and he also spoke on the NFPA symposium, in which you spoke, which took place just before the election.

Taylor: He and who was that other name who spoke? I've forgotten who that was.

Chall: It's in the volume there.

Taylor: There was another name. He was a Georgist, I think taught in the school. One of them came to me maybe just three months ago. Very friendly, very nice, very interested. The main trouble with me and my position is that I'm not what I would call doctrinaire. I'm not perfect in my position.

Chall: What about the position, then of the Henry George people on the Feather River Project. Would they have been opposed to it in general?

Taylor: I do not know what their position was. I don't think they had much influence. Harlan Trott was the west coast correspondent, I believe, for the Christian Science Monitor, and I would have liked to have had support from him that I never got. I had more support from Ray Brunn and I believe the present managing editor. They supported me. Harlan Trott didn't oppose me or support me in my position.

Chall: When you say they supported you, does that mean they wrote articles in favor of your policy, or editorials, or they just gave you personal support?
Taylor: I've forgotten the tangible support. I remember an invitation, for a dinner, a social gathering in which this was a discussion, and all of the discussion was favorable. I do not recall that they put anything in the paper.

Chall: And Dewey Anderson.

Taylor: Yes, Dewey is now in Carmel, retired but active.

Chall: He was what? The executive director of the Public Affairs Institute.

Taylor: In Washington.


Taylor: That's right. I've got another of his pamphlets here.

Chall: He was analyzing very carefully the Knight policy of getting money from year to year to develop the so-called California water plan for the Feather River Project at that time.

Taylor: Dewey was always on my side.

Chall: In this pamphlet he doesn't talk directly of the 160-acre limitation. He talks about giving priority to small farms and small farmers, and having large owners pay the costs.

Taylor: That's right. It was covered in broader phrases, but he was on my side. He did not work like Angus McDonald and the National Farmers Union, who really worked, and has continued right down to this day to work at ground level. If it's a matter of going to see a congressman, he goes.

Chall: Still going?

Taylor: Well, I heard that Angus was still going. I heard that three days ago. I think he regards acreage limitation as his issue, quite as much as I regard it as mine.

Chall: Who was Senator Virgil O'Sullivan who also wrote for the Public Affairs Institute. He wrote an evaluation of the California water plan. Was he a California senator?

Taylor: Yes. He was one of my students back in the twenties. He was on our side, but softened during his last term in the Senate. There
Taylor: was a re-apportionment of his district, and he let me know that he'd have to modify his activity on the 160-acre issue. He was from the Sacramento Valley, and there are a lot of big landowners in the Valley. So for a time he was just all-out on my side, and then he pulled back. He never went over to the other side, but withdrew his really effective support of my side.

The State Legislature and Acreage Limitation - 1961-1972

Chall: After the California water plan is a fact, there was in 1961 a bill, AB 1326, in the state legislature. You were asked by Mr. Z'berg to testify. I think the plan was to put the 160-acre limitation into the state water plan.

Taylor: Here is my prepared statement which I started to read to the Assembly Water Committee. After a few minutes they asked me if I could summarize it, saying that I had distributed it already to all the members of the committee, which I had. So I summarized. The entire hearing was taped by KPFA. They never ran it over the station, but they gave me the tapes. I think that they should go to the Library.

Chall: Yes. Now, Mr. Burton, Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Elliott, and Mr. Z'berg, I guess, were concerned about this matter, but I understand that the bill died in that [Assembly Water] committee.

Taylor: That was a murderer's row, the committee was—and is. I'll tell you in a moment about my last experience giving testimony before the same committee a few months ago.

Chall: Have any 160-acre limitation plans gotten out of committee at all that you can recall?

Taylor: No. They came up again in 1971. That bill was introduced by Assemblyman John Miller at the request of the California Labor Federation. That's where I testified again before Carley Porter, chairman of the Assembly Water Committee. I was cut off in the middle of my short typed statement, three and a half pages, by Assemblyman Corey of Orange County who wouldn't even let me finish.

Chall: I see. And that was John Miller's bill?

Taylor: That's right, AB 2224.

Tapes on file in The Bancroft Library,
University of California, Berkeley
Chall: That never got out of committee either.

Taylor: It was rudely turned down.

Chall: Were you the only person to testify for this bill?

Taylor: The only people who testified at all on it, were representatives of the California Labor Federation. Michael Peevey, of the federation, simply introduced me as the one who would give the statement for them.

Chall: This is an article out of Western Water News [September, 1971] on that bill, in which the editor indicates that nobody on the committee would second the motion to take it out.

Taylor: That is right.

Chall: How were you able to get John Miller to introduce this bill?

Taylor: Well, I didn't arrange that. The Labor Federation did. He has labor support so he did it for them, and he knew he had no chance.

Chall: It isn't a particular commitment of his, is it?

Taylor: So far as I know, that was the only time that he has taken it up. I'm sure he was doing it because they wanted him to, which doesn't imply that he wasn't for it.

Chall: No, not at all. I was just wondering. He's an urban man and I believe black, and I wouldn't think that this would have been one of his major concerns.

Taylor: If blacks really got interested in really working on this, they could undermine Carley Porter, because he comes from a district that is heavily black. If they would really go after him right at home, they might do something. But the steps to accomplish that, so far as I know, have not been taken. He's from Compton in Southern California. If I had a little more time, I'd work on that.

Chall: That would be a major project.

Taylor: Dellums, of course, is on the federal Reclamation Lands Authority bill. So we have the "makings," but the job of putting the pieces together hasn't been done.
Chall: That would mean that it's either a commitment of his--160-acres--or again labor support. What does it mean, do you think?

Taylor: His liberal and labor supporters wanted Dellums to sponsor the bill.

Chall: There is a cooperative, I think, Strawberry Growers in Salinas--

Taylor: There is.

Chall: I think mainly Mexican-Americans. Are black people, do you think interested in agriculture and going back to the farm, and would they if the opportunities were given?

Taylor: They have not been alerted to the opportunity in California. In the rest of the country, they are very interested. They have established a number of cooperatives through the South, and are really trying. So, potentially, the demand is there. They want access to the land in the South, and to hang on to whatever foothold they've got.

I have in my files here a thick manuscript on the cooperatives by Ray Marshall, a professor of economics at the University of Texas who took his doctorate with me. The potential is there. It's being kept alive by organizations--supporting organization--such as the National Sharecroppers Fund and the newly formed National Coalition for Land Reform with headquarters in San Francisco. We're getting into the decade of the seventies now, and Senator Fred Harris is a leading person in that movement. He's very active, and has accepted the headship of it.

Water Grants for Education

Chall: Wasn't AB 2224 exactly like the Kastenmeier bill in Congress except that it applied to land getting water from the state project?

Taylor: That is essentially correct. The bill was introduced at request of California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO. I testified as described below.

Chall: What about Assembly Joint Resolution 26? Was this simply asking the legislature to approve the Kastenmeier bill, but not AB 2224? Would that presumably have been easier to get through the legislature?
Sierra Club, Grange & NEA Back Fed Bill

The Sierra Club, the State Grange and the National Education Association have joined with the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, in urging State Senate approval of an Assembly-passed measure to preserve open spaces and greenbelts and provide grants to education to ease local property taxpayers by authorizing the federal government to purchase excess lands on federal reclamation projects.

The measure, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26, introduced by Assemblyman Edwin L. Zberg and sponsored by the State AFL-CIO, came before the Senate Agriculture Committee Tuesday and was put over for one week following some amendments offered by Senator Fred Master (R-Redding).

In a joint letter sent recently to Senator Howard Way, Chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, the four organizations declared that "the varied and broad public purposes of AJR No. 26... justify giving it more than ordinary attention."

Emphasizing that the State Legislature's endorsement of government purchase of lands to be watered by federal reclamation would "lay no obligations upon agriculture beyond present law," the four organizations pointed out that it would offer financial relief to the national treasury, to education and to local property taxpayers by permitting the treasury to recover federal investments in water developments and by providing "water grants for education" similar to the "land grants for education" that provided 34 million acres of land for public education purposes during the past century or so.

"AJR No. 26 offers to agriculture and to those whose living depend upon it, a constructive way to save prime lands for permanent agricultural use, protecting them from pervasive encroachments of urban sprawl and slurb and thus assuring agricultural greenbelts, open spaces, recreational areas and an environment of quality," the letter said.

It also pointed out that AJR No. 26 won unanimous approval of the Assembly Committee on Planning and Land Use and passed the Assembly without a dissenting vote.

It was signed by John F. Henning, executive secretary-treasurer of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO; Michael McCluskey, executive director of the Sierra Club; Chester Deaver, Master of the California State Grange; and Monroe Sweetland, western representative of the National Education Association.

Copies of it were also sent to the other six members of the committee, namely: Senators George N. Zenovich, vice chairman; Anthony Beilenson, William E. Coombs, Fred W. Marler, Jr., H. L. Richardson, and Walter W. Stilln.
Taylor: Assembly Joint Resolution 26 asked Congress to support the Kastenmeier bill. A counterpart in the state legislature was procedurally irrelevant to this resolution, however logically relevant. Joint revolutions go before committees other than Water Resources, and approval is often easier to win. We got AJR 26 through the assembly without dissenting vote. Did I tell you how it was killed in the senate?

Chall: No.

Taylor: In the assembly, it went before the Planning Committee, and was approved unanimously, and was approved without dissenting vote by voice on the floor. When it went to the senate, it was referred to the Agriculture Committee, and the nearest account I can get from sources in Sacramento, is that Senator Fred Marler, the Republican floor leader, didn't like the bill. He proposed some amendments to it without committing himself as to whether he would vote for it even if they were adopted. One of the principal amendments was, he wanted to deny the government the right to lease any property that it acquired, which would, of course, hamstring any manager of property, and the government, perhaps, most of all.

I am told that at the committee hearing, he absented himself, and almost everybody absented themselves, and there were only two or three there and they killed it. They noted that Senator Peter Behr wants a recorded vote in committee. We don't have the record, so that's why I'm having trouble answering your question. Because nobody will admit to what he did. When I wrote up to the chairman of the committee, Senator Howard Hay to ask him how the members voted, I got no response at all. So that's how they can kill a measure in the legislature and you can't find out how they killed it.

Chall: Was it necessary that it go before the Agriculture Committee, or could it have gone just as well before some other committee?

Taylor: It might have gone before some other committee. I think if we had alerted friends in the senate, it might have been placed somewhere else. I believe it's the Rules Committee that assigns it, and Senator Mills, who is a liberal Democrat is on that committee. Now, whether he didn't know what was going to happen or wasn't alerted or what, I don't know. But I know when I wrote to him asking for support, I had two very nice responses. They were not direct committals, but they showed that he was more than a little concerned to see it that I would think that he cared about it.
Contrasting State and Federal Committee Hearing Procedures

Chall: Is it more difficult working with the state legislature than it was and is with the federal?

Taylor: Yes, of course. When the federal Congress has a hearing, with the exception that I told you—when Senator Henry Jackson didn't print the '66 hearings—they are regularly printed. But even if they're not printed, the public stenographic record of the hearing is on file with the committee. A staff member of the committee gave me a copy. So I know I have the full record of that hearing, even if it isn't printed.

There is no such stenographic record in the state legislature. They can treat you any way that they can get away with in a crowded room, especially when it's crowded with their own supporters. I might contrast two experiences: one, in 1961 before the Assembly Water Committee with Carley Porter as chairman. There was strong support then for an acreage-limitation bill. There were members including Edwin Z'berg who were supporting it. Z'berg was in charge and invited me to come to Sacramento and testify. KPFA took its equipment up there and took down the whole record on tape, for about an hour and three-quarters. The room was fairly well filled with citizens listening to the testimony. I have the tapes of that, myself, which I'd be glad to put in a public archive. I'm sure Carley Porter didn't like what I was testifying, but he allowed me to do it, nevertheless.

However, my prepared statement is not on tape. I have it, and that, of course is in my bound volumes. That becomes public record through me, not through them. Their interrogations are not part of the legislature's public record. But they were privately taken down on tape by KPFA. So on that occasion I was treated courteously, even by a not particularly friendly committee, which voted down the bill.

Less than a year ago I testified before the same committee, same chairman, Carley Porter. I had about a three and a half page typed prepared statement, which I gave them as I came on the witness stand. And I was a little more than half through when the assemblyman from Orange County cut in saying that he had read the entire statement, there was no point in hearing any more, and it should be filed. Well, from extensive experience I don't think that would happen in Washington, D.C. before the United States Congress.
Taylor: I testified repeatedly as an individual before committees which are not particularly in sympathy with my views, but I've always been treated courteously, had an opportunity to say everything I've wanted to say, and had my statements printed, with the one exception that I told you, and even at that hearing, I was treated very courteously.

No, the legislature can be very high-handed, and unless someone is around to tell what they do, there's no word of it leaks out of the room.

Chall: The basic difference is then that on a national level it's a public record.

Taylor: The people can see what is being done, and in the legislature you can't see what is being done. They're operating in the shadows. The floor debates are not recorded. We have a Congressional Record and every word spoken on that floor is recorded and printed. (They allow editing, but the printed record comes pretty close to what was said.) But you can't get it here unless a newspaper man is around; sometimes they catch them up.

Earl Behrens is a Republican reporter; he's a noted and excellent political reporter from a Republican point of view. He's the one who, on the 1959 acreage-limitation bill debate, quoted Jesse Unruh as explaining his opposition by saying, "At times we must rise above principle." That's the only way that the public can find out what actually goes on. Otherwise, the legislature is a club with a small membership.

Chall: That makes it very difficult, then, for the public to know.

Taylor: Yes, of course. In the Congress there is a tendency to arrange and arrive at understandings, if not formal decisions, outside of the floor of Congress, where it doesn't all get into the record. Paul Douglas spoke of that in 1959, and he said that is one of the advantages of the four days of debate on acreage limitation that he, and Morse, and Neuberger conducted against Kuchel and Engle.

Chall: I see, to get it out.

Taylor: To get it out so that it isn't a matter of quiet internal agreement

*47 Cal. L. Rev. 513. (1959)
Taylor: between a few people. If you air a subject long enough you can sometimes get a different decision than otherwise. But the opportunity to do that is not facilitated in the legislature at all.*

Analyzing Current Arguments

Chall: How did you feel when that water bond issue passed?

Taylor: [Laughter] Well, I didn't feel very good! I worked against it at the time.

Chall: But you usually come up with a certain amount of optimism after all of these battles.

Taylor: If you allow yourself to be knocked out of the ring, then you're probably not coming back. But I think I learned long ago that this issue has very deep roots. We're dealing with important skirmishes, or rounds, in a battle that's been going on for a hundred years and is going to go on for a lot more.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: You noticed that Senator Harris called hearings in Los Angeles on March 9, came up here for the meeting March 10, of the National Coalition on Land Reform, so that body is formed which is trying to nationalize the issue. I think you're going to see an increasing awareness that access to the land is an issue, that it does make a difference who owns the land. It makes a real difference in the character of our society.

The Chronicle gave perhaps ten inches to the San Francisco evening reception at John Fell Stevenson's home which was an organization and fund-raising meeting for the National Coalition on Land Reform. It said, as I recall, there were about fifty there. I think the figure was nearer seventy-five to one hundred. They raised $500 net, which isn't a huge amount, but it is something to start an organization on the subject of land reform.

*This interview was recorded on March 9, 1972, before legislation was enacted requiring the recording of votes for public record.
Chall: And this is something that Senator Harris plans to devote his next years to. He's not going to run for the Senate again, I understand.

Taylor: That's right. The subject of land reform is right in line with his "populist" activities. I asked him about retiring from the Senate, and expressed regret over that decision. He responded that he was going to devote all of his time to his institute. I don't know exactly what his institute will be called--neo-populist or whatever--but of course this water issue is the kind of an issue that people were aware of in the populist days. And they were so effective that it spread over to the Republicans. Indeed, it was the Republican president, Theodore Roosevelt, who insisted upon a strong acreage limitation provision as a condition of giving his signature on the bill. He called the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation over to the White House to tell them this.

Chall: Is the National Coalition on Land Reform going to be pushing for the 160-acres?

Taylor: Of course. They will be pushing for additional measures: for example, the Farm Security Administration was set up to help people stay on the land or get access to the land. Well, it was smashed by the large landed interests in agriculture. The agricultural subsidies that were initiated in the New Deal, and support prices to keep the farmers in decency on the land were then turned into gigantic subsidies of $4 million plus per annum to a single huge landowner in California.*

So, giving help to keep and place farmers on the land would be a revival of something that we've done before. In other words, it's very much in the American tradition, whether you want to call it populist, agrarian, or whatnot. You can call it the homestead tradition of Abraham Lincoln.

Chall: Who are the people--I wouldn't imagine that you'd know all one hundred or more of them--but what kinds of people were present at this latest--

Taylor: --at this latest meeting? On March 10? It was held at the house of John Fell Stevenson, the brother of the Senator Adlai Stevenson III, who held the San Francisco hearings on migratory labor in

Taylor: January. They were young people, for the most part. Nader's Raiders—that type—Office of Economic Opportunity and war on poverty people. I met some old-timers who'd been in the battles with me back in the fifties, whom I hadn't seen in many years. They came up to me and we had a reunion, so to speak.

Chall: They were on your side in various political actions?

Taylor: Oh yes! Oh yes! That's how I heard first of Jerome Waldie because they were over in his district.

Chall: On the Contra Costa side, then.

Taylor: They were on the Contra Costa side of the line, right. So there's some revival of those who've been concerned with this before, together with the new, younger people, stimulated by such things as war on poverty, Nader's Raiders, etc.

Chall: Do you think that it's going to occur that, even if given an opportunity, many people will go back to the farm as farmers?

Taylor: Well, you're asking me whether we can win our points. Is that the question, or if we could win, will anybody go?

Chall: Yes, that's really the question. I'm not asking about the first part. I don't think one knows whether you can win? Do you know?

Taylor: No, I don't know. I've faced that question since the forties when I first came into this.

Chall: So you're willing to go on on the strength that it's a principle that continually needs to be worked on—toward winning.

Taylor: Sure, they haven't taken the bone away from us yet.

Chall: This of course is highly speculative, and the only reason I ask it is because of the problem that Di Giorgio had, and still may have, of divesting his property. It took several years and nobody—no little farmers—individual people—except perhaps one, came in to buy the land. So I'm wondering, even if all goes well, and you can cut up the large acreages, will people farm it?

Taylor: My answer is, "Yes, they will." I don't think they will be yours and my associates from the campus. I think our family traditions are far enough removed. My grandfather was a pioneer farmer on the land, broke the sod with a yoke of oxen and plow. No, of course,
Taylor: I'm not going back on the land. I don't think any of my children, or to my knowledge, any of my grandchildren are likely to do it.

But I think there are people who would do it if the door were open to them. After all there is a whole new generation coming up whose values are different from the values of my kind. I value them for it. I don't want to do it myself. But I think that there are a lot of people who would be happy to do it, or be enabled to remain on the land.

You mention the Di Giorgio divestiture and the difficulties they had in selling their excess lands. Well, those sales were carried out under the auspices of a government bureaucracy that (just to give one aspect of it) approved prices so far above the market price of land that nobody would pay them. So Di Giorgio cut the price down below the approved price to make the sale.

The approved price under law is the pre-water price. You can reimburse the excess landowner for his improvements, such as the leveling of the land, the planting of the grapes, etc., but the value added by the water--under the law you cannot include that into the selling price. So you see how far off the bureaucracy was in allowing prices above the market price. Clearly the law intended it to be way below the market price.

Chall: So that Di Giorgio himself dropped the price?

Taylor: It was so far out of line that the Di Giorgios themselves dropped it.

Chall: Now, from the accounts that I have read, even after the price had been dropped, certain other limitations had been taken off that had been originally placed there by the Bureau of Reclamation, like having to live on the land and farm it for five years, not being allowed to purchase it as an investment and things of this kind.

Taylor: You are right, the bureaucracy has not supported the residency requirement for over a half century. It took this Judge Murray decision in San Diego federal district court to support it. For fifty-five years anyway the Bureau of Reclamation hasn't enforced it.

Chall: It seemed though that people were willing to buy the land in small parcels, but primarily to use as an investment. That made me wonder who would farm land even if it were divided into 160-acre or 320-acre parcels?
Taylor: The question is whether the public wants to encourage that manner of farming and the form of society it sustains, and to assist it. With the Farm Security Administration they did this in the early New Deal days. The government could again assist in those purchases of excess lands by the people who wanted to farm, if Congress wanted to do it.

Chall: So it's a matter of assistance--banking help, mortgage assistance, and not just providing land as such?

Taylor: Yes. Now we subsidize the larger farmers.

The Criterion: Unit Pricing or a Democratic Society

Chall: At the time of the Reagan Task Force, a study was made by two professors, an economist, and an agricultural economist from Davis, who indicated that water was only one factor in this whole matter of the beneficial uses of land. People were concerned with how much the land was re-valued upward because water was brought in. They considered that rather nonsensical, that this was just one factor. Other things were just as important, or more important. Highways, and so on, paid for by the taxpayers.

Chall: Yes, and they indicated that in order to be economical, one had to farm rather large pieces of land, that you couldn't do it on a small piece.

Taylor: Yes, there were studies made in agricultural economics that would point to advantages of three hundred or even up to six hundred acres. Well, of course, that depends on what is your crucial criterion. Now, how much difference would it make whether the acreage were six hundred for an individual owner or family, or 160? How much difference in the unit cost of production? Well, I don't know. With some crops it might matter, with others it wouldn't.

What are your criteria? Is it the unit cost alone, or is it the kind of society that you're building when you're doing it? A family farmer tends to get more crop production from his land per acre than the larger operator. Well, do you want more production per acre? Or do you want the unit cost to be the lowest possible? How important are those things? Will lower costs be passed on to consumers? I think that they are of not primary importance. They
Taylor: are not unimportant, but look at the kind of society that you get when you go to a big-farming community. You no longer have a homogenous community. It's gone. You don't have the basis for a democratic society.

That's the conclusion from the Arvin-Dinuba study. That's why interest in that is being revived, even in Congress. That's why within about the last two weeks, Senator Gaylord Nelson asked Walter Goldschmidt, who made that study in '46, to come back and talk to his committee about a repetition of that study. That's why you have editorials in the New York Times about the agricultural revolution and what it's doing to destroy our rural communities. Now, how much weight do you attach to that, or is unit cost to the producer more important?

How much of the cutting of the unit cost goes to the consumer? The producer? The producer gets it if you let him monopolize. He'll control how much is marketed--when the pride would crash if otherwise more produce hit the market. They even have, under the laws of the state, marketing orders, where if you can get a certain proportion of producers to agree, you can force all the rest to keep produce off the market. The consumer doesn't then get the low prices that the consumer might like to have.

Chall: So it's a question of philosophy rather than agricultural economics?

Taylor: Yes indeed, and political power. Interests and values are more involved than unit costs of production.* Look at Imperial Valley. It's a polarized society, a lot of landless people and a handful of landowners, largely corporate. It's the base of an egalitarian democratic society that is at stake.**

It's interesting, I think, also that the praise of large operation that you get from certain quarters on the economic side fits with the Communist argument. They're both for the big-scale operation. Well, you don't get a democratic society out of it there,

---


Taylor: and I don't think you do here, either.

Chall: You wouldn't favor making some kind of a change in the acreage limitation? We've discussed this before. I know that it was in the Reagan Task Force, that Murphy and others discussed it in the Congress and it didn't get anywhere, but what about raising the legal limitation to 640 acres?

Taylor: I think they've got less chance now than they ever had.

Chall: It's 160 or nothing, still.

Taylor: Well, that's the bone we've got. You see, they talk so many ways about this. If you're raising citrus do you need 160 acres? Do you need 640 acres or do you need 60 acres? What do you need to support a family? As I testified before the Senate committee, and which they didn't print—I said that the support of a family is the criterion. When they urbanize on reclaimed land, how about giving them a one-acre limit. They can live off the rentals of one urban acre very nicely. In other words, a lot of this is intellectually dishonest. They aren't talking about support of a family. And the talk about raising the limit to 640 acres is primarily "public relations." Landowners of 100,000 acres are not satisfied with the prospect of a 640-acre limit. They want no limit at all.
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XII COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF AMERICAN FOREIGN AID
(Interview 14, April 13, 1972)

Defining Community Development

Chall: What is community development?

Taylor: Well, community development is involvement of the people in the solution of their problems, whatever their problems may be-whether their problems are those of an economically submerged population of health, sanitation, excessive numbers, land tenure, or lack of participation in government.

Chall: Now in emphasizing people and their place in rural societies, what was your aim?

Taylor: I think the character of especially rural societies in underdeveloped countries is the concern of persons interested in community development. The concern also is with who gets the benefits from the crops produced, who owns land, who is tenant, who is landless laborer. The concern is with the structure of rural society. You can see the problem of the structure of rural society right here in California, a developed agricultural society where efficiency of crop production is not alone sufficient criterion to assure a stable, balanced society.

Chall: What kind of a program would you have in mind?

Taylor: In community development within underdeveloped countries?
Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Well, it would concern itself with health programs, sanitation, improvement of the conditions of the village, streets, housing, recreation facilities, whatever would enrich the life of the inhabitants. As consultants in community development we were not technically health or population control specialists, but we raised the questions for the people to think about and to find ways of meeting them. Agricultural specialists would raise questions about how to get better yields of better kinds of rice, or pork, or wheat, or whatever. They would place less emphasis upon inequitable land tenure and we would place more emphasis upon land reform. Our concern was less with the techniques of efficient production and more with the equitable distribution of the benefits from it.

Chall: Where did the AID stand relative to this particular difference of opinion?

Taylor: Which came out ahead?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Oh, the agriculture specialists overwhelmed the community development program and virtually squeezed it out of existence. That doesn't mean that they squeezed out population control measures, it doesn't mean that they squeezed out health measures, but the concern over measures related to what I regard as the essentials of a democratic society, that latter concern received less attention than the techniques of agricultural production. Vietnam, which we will talk about, was an especially dramatic case.

AID and the Agriculture Bureaucracy

Chall: Is there still a community development program in the government, in AID, or whatever agency there is now?

Taylor: Not to my knowledge. There are some few people still on the staff who have been in community development, but whether they have any particular latitude for their operations--well, I doubt that they have very much. I don't know that anyone is really in charge of community development in AID anymore. In my judgment what squeezed it out internally was primarily the influence of the agriculture bureaucracy. In the United States the disappearance of a large number of farms has been reducing demand for Agricultural
Taylor: Extension Service specialists. The foreign service opened up good jobs for people who had been in the U.S. Extension Service. By itself, that was good. There was, and is, a real need to spread knowledge of better agricultural production abroad.

But the concern of agricultural extension with community development in the rural United States has declined greatly since its foundation in 1912. Agricultural production practices have loomed up as of primary importance, the quality of rural living of secondary importance. Nevertheless, they felt that in rural society that we were invading their precincts. They had a priority, you see, experience of working with rural people, and they did not welcome community developments, where the concerns were with the people and their programs directly, and where, perhaps, the agricultural techniques would be subordinated, or they would have regarded themselves as being subordinated. So that was one opposition that they faced.

Then, a second one was that within AID an increasing importance was given to economist planners with a strong mathematical bent. And the school emphasizing GNP was having growing influence in distribution of the AID budget funds for the purpose of increasing GNP. Working directly with people in their community had a low rating with technicians so oriented.

So there were two sets of technicians—competitive with community development in a sense—neither one placing a high value on working with people except in certain technically limited ways, but not involving the community generally.

Chall: Could you feel from the people whom you met in the field and in Washington that agriculture and the statisticians were looking at the problem differently from the way you were?

Taylor: Well, I encountered it in the field when I'd talk with the former agricultural extension men. I could understand what their outlook was. A strong orientation in the technique of growing better crops, which is certainly not objectionable in itself. I think I pointed out that only the other day Indira Gandhi said, "Too much emphasis upon GNP."

It's a question of the object of the focusing of attention. The difficulty is that the production techniques loom so much larger than the manner of dealing with people. After all, working with people, to teach them to help themselves is slower than telling them what you want them to do. People can disagree with you; they
Taylor: can counter you. So, both on the bureaucratic side within our AID and out in the field, for somewhat different reasons, there was a lower appreciation of the importance of dealing with people.

Culture as a Factor

Chall: I understand that some of these projects to increase agricultural production failed often because of the lack of appreciation for the culture and the needs of the people in the rural areas. Did you think that the cultures of the people were being overlooked in attempts to deal with agriculture, or the GNP?

Taylor: Well, I don't know that I can answer your question directly. The technicians have the disposition to work with those who reach out quickly for the new techniques--the most aggressive. I think it satisfies them if they can get somebody who really wants to do it the new way--quick. The result of this means that the others who lag behind--well, the gulf between them and the more advanced ones increases.

Now that result is not, in my judgment to be dismissed, just by saying, 'Well, if they're not smart enough to catch on and do it the new way, let the devil take the hindmost.' Look at the divisions that are created within those societies, political and social, and the instability that results if you allow the development to proceed that way. I don't think that it's acceptable to say, 'If they don't do it, it's their own fault.'

A very explicit explanation that I think is relevant, is that (and this I encountered frequently) the lower the level of living of the man on the land, the less he dares experiment with a new technique. He knows what he can do the old way, but that is right close to his margin of subsistence. He doesn't have an extra acre of rice land on which he dares experiment with new methods, the results of which he's unsure of.

Chall: And you found this to be so?

Taylor: Oh, yes! That I ran into frequently. They couldn't get the lowest group to cooperate with the experiments because they couldn't risk the change. And, it was the man who had more who said, 'I'll try your new methods with an acre over here, and if it works there, I'll increase the acreage next season.'
Chall: What would be your answer to this kind of problem, when you would go out into the field with technicians and take note of it?

Taylor: What is the answer?

Chall: Yes, what was your recommendation?

Taylor: Well, I don't know that I made specific recommendations, but what was in my mind was that somehow the public should take the risk and do the experimenting, just as we have set up our Experiment Stations here. A way should be found for the public to bear the risks without putting these burdens on persons who can't afford them.

Chall: And let them see what the results are?

Taylor: That's right, and to a degree, that was done. No generalization holds everywhere. To a degree that was done, and when they saw it done successfully, they were more prepared to take the risks.

Chall: Did you think that the people you were meeting took sufficient account of the problems, the cultural problems, of the areas?

Taylor: You mean the U.S. people or the foreign people?

Chall: Well, any people who were foreign in an area. The British—I'm sure you must have seen some of them. The United States, the UN, even the nationals of some countries, depending on how they've grown up, I suppose, might have a different point of view from the rural people they're dealing with.

Taylor: I found people of varying points of view. That is to say, in Korea, I found both those who were devoted to community development, and those who were on the side of the agricultural technicians. It worked both ways. In India, in '55 they had set up a community development ministry, and certainly they were devoted to community development. The pressures of the other ministries, perhaps for other reasons, closed that one down. The inner bureaucratic rivalries were effective in some of the countries to which I went in throttling down community development.

Chall: Community development is supposed to take into account the need for changes in hygiene—in health and nutrition—other things beside growth.

Taylor: That's right. Agricultural and animal husbandry improvements are included. The community development workers themselves generally
Taylor: were not very competent technicians in crops and animal husbandry, so there was conflict as to who among the bureaucrats would get the jobs and have the leadership. As I say, U.S. agricultural technicians were used to having pre-eminence in the rural field. And a new group coming in under the name of Community Development appeared to them to be an invasion of a domain in which they regarded themselves as experienced and successful. They largely worked themselves out of jobs in this country, so naturally they wanted jobs to be available in foreign service.

The Effects of the Green Revolution

Taylor: You've heard of the green revolution, where you can produce three bushels of rice where you produced one before, and so on. The manner of increasing yield in this country--and I think it goes back to our Agricultural Extension Service, and our Department of Agriculture--is to assist those who are most alert in grabbing on to the assistance offered. As for the rest, let the devil take the hindmost. We are seeing the obliteration of our rural societies because of an overemphasis of that sort in the way we spread improvement in technology.

The inscription on Hilgard Hall, "To rescue for human society the native values of rural life" has had minimal emphasis, whether in California or over the United States, generally. So, we're seeing land and technology in the hands of a few, and a polarization of our society.

Well, we face the same issue in countries like India and Pakistan--are we going to make our technology available to the handful who are most alert to grab it and who will employ the others as laborers as they may need them, letting the others pile up in the cities?

I don't think we or they see these results--the polarization of their societies. I think the price that we and they may pay for underestimating and undervaluing the involvement of the people in the handling of their own problems can be enormous.

Chall: You feel that if people in these underdeveloped countries are permitted to work out, in some fashion, their own problems, with whatever assistance they need from the outside, that they would be able to handle it?
Taylor: Well, that's their only chance. I think the people in the villages should be helped. The inquiries that I made about handling the population problem, for example, indicate that the people do respond when they understand. The population problem is so immense that the responses to date are merely straws in the wind showing what could be accomplished if greater effort were made. Population is but one example. Another example is land tenure.

Examining Differing Ideas in the Bureaucracy Toward Community Development

The State Department

Taylor: The people with whom I found I could talk and get the best understanding were the people in our State Department, rather than those with agricultural background. The former were more sensitized to the importance of human attitudes than the latter.

Chall: These are State Department people abroad?

Taylor: In Washington as well as abroad. I got understanding responses from them, because they were accustomed to think that the attitudes of people are important.

Chall: Is that so? Did you deliberately go into the State Department to talk to them about your ideas?

Taylor: The arrangements were made for me to talk with State Department personnel. Of course AID is a subsidiary of the Department of State, but agriculture has an upper hand in AID.

Chall: Were you seeking out people to talk with in the State Department, or did you just find them as a result of...

Taylor: The appointments were arranged for me with ambassadors, assistant secretaries, and lesser officials. One of the highest State Department persons was Adolph A. Berle, who I believe was an assistant secretary of state and one time ambassador to Brazil for a time.

Chall: He's been many things.

Taylor: Many things.
Chall: I think he started out in the Roosevelt period, didn't he?

Taylor: Yes. Berle and Gardner Means together authored *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*, a monumental work in its day. In Manila I spent the better part of an hour with Ambassador Bohlen on land reform slowdown in the Philippines. Both Berle and Bohlen were understanding; the latter I found perhaps more so, perhaps because he was facing problems in foreign areas directly at the time, while I spoke with Berle in Washington, D.C.

I've had a good look at American bureaucracy on both its international side, and on its domestic side especially the Department of the Interior.

Chall: Yes, did you ever feel that you could have as much influence in the Department of State as you had in the Department of Interior—if you feel you had any.

Taylor: Well, they haven't been able to shake off the subjects that I kept before them.

Chall: What about the people who were in AID, who were concerned about community development. Were they eased out?

Taylor: Eased out, or went out?

Chall: Either.

Taylor: At first there was a New Deal generation. C. David Anderson, whom I met in Iran in 1953 as head of Community Development there, was younger than a New Deal generation. But right after World War II, a lot of the people who had been very active in the New Deal went abroad under the AID (which had another name at that time) as part of the Truman Doctrine. At first we sent people abroad who by and large shared the New Deal bureaucracy's concern for people.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: They were oriented that way. William E. Warne, the head of the mission in Korea in 1958 when I consulted there, I had known in the Department of the Interior in the middle forties, working more or less parallel to him in another sub-agency. Then came a younger generation, and a generation which was less concerned with people and more with investment of money and techniques.
Taylor: FDR and Harry Truman both had a very great appreciation of the importance of people, and the people responded to them. And then we had other administrations less responsive to people. At the present time I would say that we have one of the most manipulative but least responsive (Richard Nixon).

Chall: But the changes in the early sixties came about during a Democratic administration.

Taylor: Yes, they came out under the Kennedy-Johnson administrations, which did things (from my point of view) of both kinds. Their administration of the acreage limitation of reclamation law, was about the worst in history, although it had some good sides, notably the Imperial Valley and the Tulare Lake cases. Whether domestically or abroad, it's the technicians getting in control of decision making that's bad.

Chall: And they're still there, as far as you know.

Taylor: Yes, they're still there.

The Military

Taylor: The military, of course, is in an increasingly important role. When you get the military technician, then you have perhaps the worst combination that you can get. Which isn't to say that a lot of military don't understand people. Some of them do extremely well. I will give you beautiful examples of it. When they do understand it, they are good.

Chall: But it's a minority, you feel, among the military whom you've met?

Taylor: Well, yes, I suppose they're the exceptional ones, but when they do well they can be very good. It was General Douglas MacArthur who put through the highly successful land reform in Japan! On the contrary it was Major General Hodges who blocked land reform in Korea, alleging it was communistic. Later there was a change in military command there, and after that a reform was put through.

I talked with the military in Iran. I talked with them in Colombia, and I found them responsive in both instances. In Vietnam at first hand I found the military strongly for land reform at field level, and at second hand I found the CIA indifferent to it.
Chall: If they were indifferent, were they opposed, or was it just beyond their scope, interest?

Taylor: Low appreciation of its importance, so why do it? As an example a young State Department fellow attached to our research team said to me, referring to the landlord-based Vietnam government, and inactive on land reform, "Well, you know, we depend on them." I replied, "Why do we have 400,000 soldiers over here? Who depends on whom?" I got no answer. When I asked the West Point colonel in the field who was eager for land reform, "How far do you get with your superiors with this kind of talk?" He answered, "About five minutes at the cocktail parties." So, it's uneven in the military as it is in the civilian.

The economists devoted to GNP, I think, have more power in AID than desirable. I think I told you about the time when I was in Washington, was sent to them, and they brushed me off?

A Frustrating Experience with Bureaucracy

Chall: No, not fully.

Taylor: Well, arrangements were made for me to see people in the various sections of AID and related bureaucracy. This included the economists in charge of drawing up the budget program. Although the head man in community development tried to make the arrangement, the head economist was too busy to see me, and his subordinate gave me the most perfunctory attention. In contrast, as I told you, when I saw Assistant Secretary of State Berle, and others in the State Department, they gave me full attention and the most sympathetic understanding.

Chall: Was this the same time when you saw Berle and these other people, was this the same venture?

Taylor: It was in November 1962 on my way via Egypt to Iran, which I reached in June 1963. I spent a week in Washington trying to explain the importance and nature of community development to the bureaucracy there. Here's my report on it.

Chall: I see, and you wanted at that time to see the various officials in the hierarchy.
Taylor: They arranged it all through the head of community development. He's out of AID now by resignation. He's given up hope of community development having any strong position within AID.

Chall: Who is that?

Taylor: Louis Miniclier.

Chall: Did they send you around because they felt that you could influence the...

Taylor: Yes, it was in the hope of educating the broad bureaucracy.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: That is one of the opportunities that you have anywhere, whether it's in Washington, or the bureaucracy in the foreign country. If they have someone coming into their office emphasizing the importance of something, presumably they have to think about it a little bit. Some of them will be influenced, much or some, when they have the subject presented to them by someone who thinks it's important. In the same way, although the program may not be formally recognized in a foreign country, you see their own bureaucracy from their minister of interior down to their lowest people in their provinces. Hopefully (and to a degree I'm sure it does) give them a greater appreciation of the importance of people and the problems of people. It dignifies their work when they're doing something relevant, and makes them think about it a little if they aren't.

Chall: The change was apparently coming in '62 and you could see it.

Taylor: Oh yes. The change came right after our 1955 visits to India, Pakistan and the Philippines. Three teams were sent out, some of us into Latin America, others in various parts of Asia. When we returned, the assistant director of what then was called the International Cooperation Administration, held an all-day session with us. He was much impressed, and was going to go forward with a community development program. In about three months he died, and his successor was not so favorably impressed. For whatever reasons, community development didn't get its merited place in our foreign program.

Chall: And who was that official who was concerned about community development?

Taylor: A former dean of education at Columbia University, whose name I do not now recall. He would have oriented the ICA program more
Taylor: strongly for community development had he lived. The disposition in earlier days was to give more attention to people in the foreign countries and their attitudes and their problems, and our program then was less in the hands of technicians of our own country.

Chall: So the philosophy of the man at the top is sometimes crucial.

Taylor: Of course. The people at the bottom respond to it.

The Peace Corps

Chall: Did you have any sight of the Peace Corps at all during your travels, or was it just beginning?

Taylor: That program began under the Kennedy administration. Yes, I saw something of the Peace Corps. I saw it in Colombia and Panama.

Chall: What did you think of their efforts?

Taylor: I had mixed feelings, but on the whole, good impressions. I'm sure that had I seen more of it I would have seen some of the program's limitations. Every program has its limitations; I have heard more of these since I saw the Peace Corps in action. I have heard that young people frequently go into it mainly to see the world, but not really motivated to do something among foreign people. But I saw evidence of those living in rural communities who were doing good work. I think the Peace Corps was a good effort.

I know that Peace Corps persons were frequently able to capitalize on their experience upon return to the U.S., which means that they must have gotten a good deal out of it; and the people who got a lot of it are probably people who put a lot into it.
Preparation for Trips Abroad

Chall: Were you briefed before you went to any of the countries about what it was that you were going to see? What the problems might be that you were asked to look upon?

Taylor: Yes, but very briefly.

Chall: Was it enough, do you think?

Taylor: Yes.

Chall: What kind of briefing?

Taylor: In 1955, when I went to India, Pakistan and the Philippines, it was relatively early in U.S. involvement in a community development program. Before that I had gone to Haiti in 1952 for the Export-Import Bank. If I had any briefing there it was minimal. The subject was the people on an irrigation project. In 1958 I went from San Francisco to Korea directly, not via Washington. I knew the man who sent me, Louis Minicier, who was the head of the community development division and had sent me to Asia three years earlier. So remember that I'd seen him before, and that we had had a full day session in Washington when we came back from India, Pakistan and the Philippines. The head of the AID mission in Korea was William E. Warne, whom I had known in the forties in the Interior Department. In the late fifties he was head of the U.S. Operations Mission in Iran, and had launched a community development program there.
(Interviews 15, 16, 17, 18; April 21, 28; May 5, 12, 1972)

Haiti - 1952

Chall: Well now, I think we are ready to delve into your work as a consultant. I have a long list of countries where you have been, and two organizations which I think sponsored some of this travelling--AID [Agency for International Development] and Ford--but I don't know how they all fit together, and I don't know the dates.

Taylor: Add the Export-Import Bank and the UN. The first assignment was in 1952, when I went to Haiti for the Export-Import Bank. My report is in one of the volumes here, illustrated by my photographs. Have you seen that?

Chall: No, I haven't.

Taylor: The Export-Import Bank was financing the development for irrigation of the Artibonite Valley, and you can well imagine, with my concerns for acreage limitation here, that I looked to see what was being done down there. What I noticed was the rapid agglomeration of the land by those with foresight to see its value enhanced with a dependable water supply. That is to say, the same problem was developing there that acreage limitation law was designed to control here. So, I reported on the desirability of control in Haiti. Whether my recommendation had any effect or not, is another matter; I doubt that it changed anything.

Asking me to go to Haiti was a sort of afterthought. All the other preparatory studies had been made and the loan was ready for final approval. Somebody apparently said to the bank, 'Don't
Taylor: you think a study should be made of the farm population of the valley?" I am afraid that my report came too late, and was presented to people who didn't attach primary importance to the problem I studied. I haven't been back there to see the result, but I can guess it wasn't much. However, I learned a lot from the assignment.

Chall: That was your first trip. How long did you stay there?

Taylor: I wouldn't have missed it. I did the whole thing in about ten days. They were concentrated, and I think it was enough to get the score.

Chall: Did you have to speak French?

Taylor: I spoke a little French there. Remember, I was in France fifteen months during World War One.

Chall: I just wondered how you were able to use French after several decades.

Taylor: I could speak as good French as they could, if not better.

Chall: What do they speak in Haiti?

Taylor: It's a sort of French patois. I still remember the way they tried to sell me their little hand-carved wooden bowls (two or three of which I brought back home--they're my centerpieces on my table to put flowers in). I remember they presented it to me and would say, "Achtez, Achtez" meaning "buy, buy." The price was, as I recall, six cents. So, I bought two or three; they were well worth it.

Chall: You usually speak to the people in the area where you're doing your field trips.

Taylor: I learned to do that; I worked at that wherever I could; and I believe in it.

Chall: You did that in Haiti, too?

Taylor: Oh, yes! I talked to people about people, including talking to people at the bottom. You get the problems straight from them, and you get some things that you don't get from the officials, et al.
India and Pakistan - 1955, 1958

Chall: What followed Haiti?

Taylor: The next travel was 1955. My colleague in anthropology, George Foster, came to me saying that he had been asked by Louis Miniclier, head of the Community Development Division of the ICA (now called AID) to make a three months study of India, Pakistan, and the Philippines; so I went. You've seen my reports, or our reports on that?

Chall: No.

Taylor: They're in the bound volumes, and they're in my bibliography. You won't find my name on them except that I am noted as one of the three authors. I wrote portions of the report; so did Foster and so did Harold S. Adams, our colleague from the University of Indiana.

Chall: Three months.

Taylor: Yes, it was a tremendous experience.

Chall: Summer?

Taylor: Yes, June, July, August. I did a volume of photographs. Dorothea made the prints for me. I cannot find that volume. And I cannot understand why I can't find it. I don't know whether somebody lifted it from me or what. But a copy exists. It's George Foster's, and I suggest that The Bancroft Library indicate its interest in that copy when it's right for him to place it there. I photographed extensively in each of those three countries, and not too badly, either. Dorothea, as I say, did beautiful printing.

Chall: She didn't go with you?

Taylor: No, we couldn't take our wives. She was having a little health problem, but she was ready to let me go. We took the risk, and she made it all right, but it was a little of a wrench to leave her in less than really good health.

Chall: It was a long time. What kind of a camera did you use when you were out doing your own photography?

Taylor: Rolleiflex. I told you the story of getting the Rolleiflex in Mexico, and how I got into photography?
These words well describe—and well justify—from both academic and practical points of view, the holding of the Symposium. As for my own inclusion in the program, the reason given was in this single sentence: "We are inviting you to participate in the symposium because of your revolutionary combination of words and pictures in An American Exodus."

How did An American Exodus happen, representing a "revolutionary combination of words and pictures"? The answer is that it grew step by step, bifurcated, up two separate ladders, until finally produced by the closest collaboration of a photographer and a social scientist.

I note in the identifying small print that the Arts Center poster has listed me, alone among the participants, as a "coauthor." That fits my case exactly correctly, and reveals properly why I am here. Close collaboration between Dorothea Lange and myself was essential to achievement of our result. We were not unique in the employment of such collaboration. It was so also in production of You Have Seen Their Faces by Erskine Caldwell and Margaret Bourke-White.

Neither Dorothea Lange nor I could have produced An American Exodus by ourselves. Beyond that, the "revolutionary combination of words and pictures" was enhanced by obtaining informally the collaboration of many of the persons photographed, who on the spot spoke to us from their inmost depths. As we stated in our foreword to An American Exodus:

This is neither a book of photographs nor an illustrated book, in the usual sense. Its particular form is the result of our use of techniques in proportions and relations designed to convey understanding
easily, clearly, and vividly. We use the camera as a tool of research. Upon a tripod of photographs, captions and text we rest themes evolved out of long observations in the field . . . Quotations which accompany photographs report what the persons said, not what we think might be their unspoken thoughts . . . This rural scene was viewed together by a photographer and a social scientist. All photographs, with the few exceptions indicated, were taken by Dorothea Lange. Responsibility for the text rests with Paul Taylor. Beyond that, our work is a product of cooperation in every aspect from the form of the whole to the least detail of arrangement or phrase . . .

Many whom we met in the field regarded conversation with us as an opportunity to tell what they are up against to their government and to their country. So far as possible we have let them speak to you face to face.

That is how we viewed our work as we handed it to the publisher. But this product of collaboration rested upon long years of two lives, lived mostly separately and before either knew of the other's existence. Professionally, one devoted to field studies in social science, the other devoted to photography.

Looking into the rearview mirror and speaking for myself, I cannot remember that anyone in my profession oriented me toward the use of visual images. My undergraduate training at the University of Wisconsin was at the hands of unusually able and even innovative professors of economics, history, and sociology, but none of them made use of pictures or
suggested it. That I stumbled into gradually, not as a social scientist but as a young human being.

World War I—the war to save the world for democracy—broke out during my senior collegiate year. I do not recall that I knew then of the Matthew Brady photographs of the Civil War to free the slaves; certainly I never thought of that as my role in my own war.

But about that time a new convenient instrument came onto the market—a small vest-pocket Kodak it was called. In it I saw a chance, if I took it with me to France, of recording and bringing home some memorabilia of my military service with the American Expeditionary Forces. My success as a photographer was meager, but even so, returning to my Belleau Wood battlefield in 1912, 57 years later, I was able to leave in the hands of the local schoolteacher at my regimental headquarters a 1918 photograph of the village church, roof caved in by enemy shells. The film had been poorly processed, but a 5 by 7 print still could tell of the horrors of war better than my handwritten letters.

After the war, my graduate training was again in the hands of first-rate professionals in the social sciences, this time at the University of California. Again, so far as I can recall, visual images had no place in my study program.

But then came another step toward change. Not long after the granting of degrees and joining the faculty, opportunity came to my door to do field research on the contemporary migration of laborers between Mexico and the United States. This time I bought a postcard size Eastman Kodak to take into the field. Why? I wanted some kind of a visual
record of what I was about to see. I remember no clearer urge than that. In retrospect, I think it likely that I was stimulated by familiarity with Paul Kellogg's *Survey Graphic* magazine which every month presented contemporary social situations throughout the country, combining both text and photographs. At any rate, it was Paul Kellogg who, within a very few years, was to publish an illustrated summary of my researches, and eventually give Dorothea and me the title to our *An American Exodus*.

Then once again, still before I knew of Dorothea Lange, came technological change to prod me. In Mexico in 1932 I was shown a new kind of camera, one that enabled you to see what you were going to take before you took it. The new Rolleiflex transformed my own relation to photography. I took more pictures, and with the products found ways of persuading academic publishers to print some of my photographs along with my text. This they did a couple of times, one to show the people and countryside where emigration to the United States originated and the other to show every step in the process by which potters worked clay into water jars. Even now, more than 40 years later, I have not entirely let go. With one of Dorothea Lange's photographer apprentices I am participating in assembly of visual images to show the history of American agriculture.

I have been describing my own slow steps up the ladder towards an appreciation of photographs, and eventually of combining them with words. Dorothea Lange, if she were here in person, would speak more directly. By age seventeen she knew that she wanted to become a photographer. In the early thirties she knew that she wanted to photograph unemployed
Taylor: I wanted a camera when I went to study the Mexican migration in '27. In '31 I was in Mexico City with Professor Lesley Simpson, also a Guggenheim Fellow. At his apartment one night we met a Dutch importer, who brought a camera of a kind no one had ever heard about before. You could see the photograph before you took it. Nobody had ever done that before.

Chall: You mean, twin lens Rolleiflex?

Taylor: Yes.

Chall: We take it so much for granted.

Taylor: That camera transformed my own photographing.

Chall: You bought a Rolleiflex from him, then.

Taylor: I bought a Rolleiflex from him for $44, yes.

Chall: That's interesting.

Taylor: It makes all the difference in the world.

Chall: Are you still using that same Rolleiflex?

Taylor: No, it was past repair a few years ago, so I have another one. Dorothea used a Rolleiflex a great deal. Toward the end, she used a 35 millimeter camera after the film quality improved to permit good enlargements.

Chall: What impressions do you have of these three countries? What were you there to study?

Taylor: We were there to study community development. The government of India had just established a ministry of community development, so our ICA wanted to establish contact with them. We saw their beginning efforts to reach their own people through a ministry specially devoted to that objective.

We went first to India, and we worked around three places. First we went to New Delhi, then quickly to Hyderabad. From there we went to Calcutta, and the northeast up in the foothills. If you had that report which George Foster has you would see a lot of what we saw. Around Calcutta is the most massed human misery that I've ever seen--there and in what now is Bangladesh and then was East Pakistan. The only place that approaches it, and it's

Village trainees in woodworking (Community Development Program). Near Ranchi, Bihar, India. Photograph by Paul S. Taylor.
Taylor: only a fraction numerically of the persons involved, is in Egypt among the fellahin. They are at the very bottom of the ladder, also.

Chall: You were mostly in the cities, then, or in and around the cities?

Taylor: No, we got out into the country.

Chall: Into the villages?

Taylor: Yes indeed.

Chall: What was your assignment in 1958, and how much time were you in India the second time?

Taylor: Two weeks in the autumn of 1958, consulting on community development.

Chall: Do you have any impression whether anything that could be developed for improving the lot of the Indians could be successful, particularly if brought in as ideas from the outside?

Taylor: Yes. I don't know if I have it on my desk, but if you'll look at the Chronicle for March 26, 1972, you will see a news item about the fact that Indira Gandhi decries the emphasis on GNP, and says that we must focus our attention on the problems of the poverty of the people. All right, that's coming back to an emphasis on community development.

You see, our ICA-AID turned its interest increasingly to GNP. I think that is a very understanding statement of hers. Community development has been practically run out of our AID. The emphasis, as I told you, was increasingly on GNP, technology, the green revolution, and so on. I don't say that a raise in technology and GNP is unimportant. I say that there is a gross underemphasis on the importance of people, and their involvement in solving their own problems. There is no more community development in AID, or virtually none. There's just a trace of it left. But Indira Gandhi put her finger right on it on March 26.
Vietnam - 1958, 1967

Taylor: Then we jump to my 1958 and 1967 work in Vietnam. Here the problem was land reform rather than population. I think you have my article "Communist Strategy and Tactics of Employing Peasant Dissatisfaction Over Conditions of Land Tenure for Revolutionary Ends in Vietnam."

Chall: I haven't read anything yet that deals with your outside consultation. I'm getting it all first hand.

Taylor: Those show you the emphasis I carry over from my domestic studies--whether contemporary or historical--into the international field. I think we're paying a price in Vietnam right now for underestimating the importance of the problems of people at the bottom level.

Chall: When did you go to Vietnam?

Taylor: 1958 the first time; the second and third times in '67.

Chall: Under whose auspices?

Taylor: I went in '58 under AID auspices. My reports are in the bound volumes.

Chall: And in 1967?

Taylor: In 1967 I went under the auspices of Stanford Research Institute, then under contract with AID. AID, or whoever made the decisions, declined in the sixties to move farther on land tenure than the beginnings that I had witnessed in '58, which were very impressive in quality. But, in extent, they only cut the top of the peak of the big landholdings for distribution to the tenants. I suspect that AID gave a $500,000 contract to SRI, so that AID could answer critics in Congress by saying, "Yes, we're studying the problem." In my opinion AID should have been doing something to advance land reform. That's a story when you want me to go into it.

Chall: We should get it now.

Taylor: Well, briefly my story is this: In '58 I had a couple of weeks as a consultant in Vietnam after leaving Korea and the Philippines. In Vietnam I recommended that they push the land reform program much farther. I witnessed the formalities of the distribution of titles, talked with presiding officials, the tenants receiving their titles, and so on. Did I tell you about that?
Response of Tenants to Land Reform

Chall: No, you talked through an interpreter?

Taylor: Of course; I didn't know their language. At Vinh Long, not far from Saigon, I attended the ceremonies of the distribution of land titles in that area. The tenants receiving titles were invited to a beautifully arranged buffet luncheon at the Provincial Governor's palace, along with landlords, officials and US foreign visitors. I took the opportunity to talk with the tenants through an interpreter.

I said, "Please tell them that I was in Mexico, in the early 1930s, in the middle of their land reform program. What happened there frequently when the tenants got title to a piece of land was this: the man who got the land sat down and did hardly any work any more, and produced hardly anything on his land. So production fell way off as a result of land reform there. Ask them if that's going to happen here now that they've got their land titles?" Well, when that was translated to them, they crowded around me, and not around the interpreter and talked. Of course, I couldn't understand a word. The interpreter explained that what they were saying was how they were going to increase the productivity of the land now that the full value of it went to themselves rather than dividing it with the landlord. I'll never forget that response. They just piled up around me fast, to assure me that that wasn't going to happen there.

In Vietnam, in 1958, I had my sole experience with having an obstacle put into my way as I did my field work--and that by only one person.

Chall: Was he with the State Department?

Taylor: He was with AID.

Chall: And what was his problem with respect to you?

Taylor: For some reason or other, he didn't like it when I wanted to get out of the car and talk with a person right in the field. I felt his resistance. He was always in a great hurry to get me back in the car; there just wasn't time to stop and talk with a Vietnamese. It was as though I was violating something or another; he never said what or why. He was the only AID official that I ever complained about, or had any reason to complain about, and
Taylor: when I got back to Saigon I did complain to the local official to whom I was assigned, and I did tell him that it was the only experience that I ever had in any country where I felt unsympathetic treatment and efforts to obstruct my work.

Chall: How was that taken, that criticism?

Taylor: Well, he listened to me all right. I would have disciplined him and canned him. I wouldn't have allowed such a thing, but I know that he was kept on for years thereafter.

Chall: Do you think this showed in him an attitude about...

Taylor: Oh, my! We rode in that jeep, he and his wife, and I and my wife, with an interpreter-driver. And when I got back and described the trip, I said, I hoped that our interpreter didn't understand English and the disparaging way that he talked about Vietnamese in whose country we were travelling--I just hoped he didn't understand it. My U.S. guide despised the Vietnamese, yet here he was, working among them.

Chall: As a community development man?

Taylor: He called himself that. I wouldn't call him that. And there was no community development program there, not really. There was a United Nations experiment station in community development a few miles out of Saigon. That United Nations man was a Belgian. He was very good and he understood community development. I talked with adjacent Vietnamese who, I think, understood community development, and responded very well. I got along with them all right, talking very frankly with them. They took it all right when I asked them what might be regarded by some as embarrassing questions.

Chall: I see, about politics?

Taylor: Yes. I never hesitated to do that. I did it politely, but I didn't polish my questions down when I really wanted to know. If you do it in the right way, you can ask a person almost anything.

Chall: And did they answer the question as frankly as you asked it?

Taylor: Yes, when I got right down to it, they did.

Chall: Did you keep field notes on these questions and answers as you did with your work in the United States?
Taylor: Well, I kept a lot of notes, and of course, I have my reports which didn't necessarily quote an individual.

Chall: I see. So this information that you got in the field was always a part of your report.

Taylor: Yes. I didn't always identify the specific person who said the specific thing to me.

Land Reform - 1967

Taylor: That was '58. I went back in '67 twice.

Chall: What had happened?

Taylor: Hardly anything was happening in land reform.

Chall: Of course the war was going on, and that's a pretty difficult time.

Taylor: Well, why hadn't they moved in '59 and '60, before our troops went in in such huge numbers? When I was there [in 1958] there was only a handful of military advisors. I saw them. I asked one of them, a Marine major, "How are you going to protect yourselves, how are the Vietnamese going to protect themselves? I have just come up via this interior frontier road or a large portion of it, I couldn't see beyond fifty or a hundred yards to the left of the road. Anyone could creep up on me anywhere and I would never know it. How are you going to know when anybody's coming?" The answer was, and I think it was a correct answer, "We have to depend upon the people to let us know."

Well, I think that Marine major had it straight. How can it be that all over that country the Viet Cong can rely on enough of the people to keep their movements so largely secret until they strike? I know that part of it is terror of the V.C., but a lot of it is not terror. That's a landlord country on a vast scale, particularly in the Mekong Delta, and if the people were truly loyal to the government instead of the V.C., you wouldn't have a condition like that.

The V.C. are aware of the landlord problem, which I saw back in '58. The V.C., where they could control an area, relieved the
Taylor: tenants of the necessity to pay rent to the landlord. So to the tenant, the coming of the V.C. meant cutting off his payment to the landlord. The V.C. might ask him for taxes, or for contributions of rice, which they did. But the tenant was freed of the landlord who came around to collect his share of the crop as rent. So it was the Viet Cong who freed the tenants, not the government of Vietnam. In the Diem program that I saw in 1958, it was the government of Vietnam that gave them the land. But the program didn't go far enough. Do you want me to go with this?

Chall: Yes. Yes, I do because you're giving us a personal account which you probably haven't given in your report. That's what I'd like to get. The purpose of oral history is to get around and behind the written report.

Taylor: Well, I may be repeating myself. There was a young State Department man sent along with us out in the field in 1967, for whatever reasons you can think of. Anyway, when I raised with him the question of why we hadn't done more on land reform since 1958, the answer I got was that the Vietnam government was run by the landlord class. He said, 'Well, the landlords—you know, we depend on them.' To which I responded, 'We have 400,000 soldiers over here now' ('67—the number later went up to over 500,000). I said, 'We have 400,000 soldiers over here now, who depends on whom?' To which I got no answer.

We went down to Can Tho, the largest provincial capital outside of Saigon. There—-and now I am giving you the background—we were taken by the U.S. military commander in that area, a West Point colonel from South Dakota. He came before us for about ten or fifteen minutes, spoke and answered questions, and what he said was this: 'I want enough forces here to secure this area,' and he indicated a big area on the map. He said, with emphasis, 'But secure it! Then I want a land reform program in that area. It will be a demonstration. The word will go all over the Delta, and the need for military action will greatly decrease.'

I said, 'Colonel, how far do you get with this kind of talk with your superiors?' His answer was, 'Oh, about five minutes at the cocktail parties.' That little State Department fellow was right there and heard the words. I don't think it phased him at all. You can understand how traditionally the State Department people are concerned with getting along with the people in the offices—in Vietnam the landlord class. Nobody but a landlord could educate his sons and daughters to read and write, do the office work, run the government. One view is that you get along
Taylor: with whoever is there. Well, I'm still of the opinion that the West Point colonel at Can Tho had it straight. What he was saying was the same impression I got in 1958 at the Vinh Long ceremonies when I saw the landlords and tenants and heard their speeches. (I have translations in my Vietnam report in my bound volumes.)

Chall: Did you get a chance to talk to any of the Vietnamese in '67?

Taylor: Of course I did. One of the hard things to arrange, when you go to study a problem in a foreign country, is to get right down on the ground. The U.S. military men in Can Tho arranged it for us. They asked us what we wanted to see in the countryside. Then they asked us, "What kind of people do you want to see?" We told them, "Tenants"--we wanted to get right down to the bottom. They got us down to the ground, helicoptering us to within fifty yards of the kind of people we wanted to see, and then walking us right to them with interpreters.

Chall: Was it because he was sympathetic with your point of view?

Taylor: [Laughter] Well, I don't think that hurt any. The colonel probably said to his staff, "You get them out wherever they want to go." In fact, the junior officers encouraged us. They said, "How long are you going to stay?" Well, we didn't know if we could get out of the city, so the chief of our team said, "Well, I think maybe we'll go back after tomorrow." They said, "If you stay over longer, we'll get you out to the tenants." So we said, "All right, we'll stay." Their attitude was fully in support of the colonel, and fully in support of my interests.

Now, let me tell you another incident. Well, I got cut to a little bit of a Delta podunk--to a dirt floored bamboo thatched hut. Outside, about fifty feet away, was a sentinel in a watch tower. In the hut was a tenant on oh, perhaps an acre and a half rice paddy. I said to my interpreter, "Ask him if he would like to have the title to the piece of land he's farming now from the government of Vietnam." So he asked the question. The tenant said, "Yes." Then I said, "Ask him why he would like to have that title from the government of Vietnam."

The interpreter asked him, and here's what came back: "He says he would like to have title because his ancestors lived on this land, and because title will secure his future." There is past, present and future. What more reason can you give for wanting to own your own land instead of having a landlord. It's all very fundamental.
Taylor: My report on Communist Strategy and Tactics Employing Peasant Dissatisfaction over Conditions of Land Tenure for Revolutionary Ends was printed by the House Committee on Government Operations. You say you don't have it?

Publishing the Report

Taylor: All right, here it is. Now, why is it not published on the SRI reports? They've got five volumes. I wrote this for them.

Chall: Well, why not?

Taylor: The head of the Stanford Research Institute team liked my work, and he liked this particular study, but he found in Washington when he submitted this particular draft of mine that AID staff wanted it left out. So, it was left out. With my chief's consent I went to Congressman John Moss, of the Government Operations Committee. He and his staff liked what I had done, so they printed it. I told them that AID was against its publication and they responded, "Yes, but the U.S. Information Agency is for it, and so are we."

Chall: I see. They took it to the U.S. Information Agency?

Taylor: They asked them to comment on it, yes. Then they got it approved by the entire Government Operations Committee.

Chall: Oh, that's a good-sized committee. Here, I have a copy.

Taylor: It says, "For the Foreign Operations and Government Information Operations Subcommittee."

Chall: John Moss was the chairman of the subcommittee.

Taylor: That's right. You can guess why there might have been objection by AID. The powers that be in our administration in Vietnam have dragged their feet on land reform. It took a lot of prodding by a professor at the University of Washington, Seattle, who was also part of our SRI team.

Chall: Who is he?

Taylor: Professor Roy L. Prosterman. He was active in publication of articles on Vietnam land tenure in law reviews, and apparently in many other ways, and eventually he had an effect in getting
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HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE
OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. William L. Dawson,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: As you know, for the past several years, the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations has studied the economy and efficiency of U.S. foreign aid activities related to agrarian reform in Southeast Asia and Latin America. The committee has approved two reports since 1968 which have expressed constructive criticism and recommendations aimed at increasing the effectiveness of American operational involvement in such programs.

Our effectiveness in this area must be improved if other development goals are to be achieved—especially the building of strong democratic institutions in all sectors of the underdeveloped nations. By far, most of the people in these countries depend upon agriculture for their very existence.

However, to be really effective, Americans—especially those who are on the foreign aid “firing line” seeking to help the rural populates of these countries attain their aspirations for a better life—should understand how the communist movement has used false promises of agrarian reform to achieve power and control.

This exploitation in Vietnam has been particularly cruel and deceptive. The Vietcong have recruited the sons of poor farmers to be guerrillas by promising families ownership of the land they have tilled for others over generations. Yet, history shows that instead of benefiting, the peasant only suffers more when communist governments actually win power.

This is the story documented in this study by Dr. Paul S. Taylor, distinguished Professor Emeritus of Economics at the University of California. Dr. Taylor’s manuscript was written before the recent adoption of a new land reform program by Vietnam in March of this year which, if carried out, will help to transfer real economic and political power from the hands of the few to the hands of the many and speed the building of a more truly democratic nation. That is the hope of all Americans.

Sincerely,

John E. Moss,
Chairman, Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee.
Taylor: some shift in favor of more land reform in Vietnam. I pushed in my own way; he did it effectively and publicly, and incurred displeasure on the part of some of our staff people in Vietnam. I think he was exactly right about what should have been done.

Chall: And he took the story out into the public?

Taylor: He took it out into the public, that's right.

Chall: How?

Taylor: By publishing in law journals and elsewhere, and--I believe--by talking to influential people who could bring pressure on our administrators in Vietnam.

Chall: What was the basic objection to your report?

Taylor: What came back to me was the AID staff comment, "Oh, everybody knows that." That is to say, everybody knows how the Communists use discontent over land tenure. When I told that to one of my economics colleagues he said, "Well, if they know it, why don't they do something about it?" That was the sore point. My study implied that they had dragged their feet, which they had. I told you the story of my field work?

Chall: Yes, with the colonel?

Taylor: There you have the crux of the issue, yet our top officials ignored it.

Chall: I suppose the main point, however, is to show, as you did, what the Communist plan was, but that we weren't necessarily doing things any better.

Taylor: I didn't attack our government for not doing anything except by implication. A good deal of my other work for the SRI went into the published reports, so I wasn't by any means exorcised from the whole operation. They didn't want this published as part of the SRI report. So, we got it published another way. It's an interesting commentary that at lower levels our government officials in Vietnam got in touch with Vietnamese land reform levels just below the top, and that produced some action for more land reform. It got both the Vietnamese government to push for doing something, and our own government to allow it to be done. My criticism, however, is that it produced too little, too late.
Chall: I guess it's very difficult to give peasants a piece of land and then bomb it shortly thereafter. I imagine that happens.

Taylor: I think the normal peasant reaction would be to raise the question, "To whom are we indebted for the land, the Viet Cong who gave it to us first, or to the government of Vietnam which gave us title to it later?"

Chall: I see, we're dealing with the same pieces of land that had been distributed first?

Taylor: Well, the V.C. simply relieves the peasants of the obligation to pay rent to their landlords.

Chall: What about land that the Viet Cong hadn't gotten around to distributing?

Taylor: Well, they didn't distribute where they didn't have power. But where they had de facto power they distributed, stopping rent payments.

Chall: Has the Viet government distributed land on its own where the Viet Cong hadn't power?


Chall: Your general feeling is, though, that this was too little and too late, that it's not going to have too much effect on the outcome of the war?

Taylor: That's what I mean by too little and too late. I think one way or another the peasants will have the land. Of course, the manner in which they will hold the land will vary greatly depending whether it's under the South Vietnamese government or under a Communist government. That difference is described in my study printed by the House Government Operations Committee.

The Philippines - 1955, 1958

Chall: Let's see, we've talked to some extent about your trip in 1955 to India. I don't think we've discussed the Philippines, though. That's been a thorny problem for so many years.

Taylor: They have a land reform problem, too, on which I reported in both '55 and '58.
Chall: Did you go back in '58 under the same auspices?

Taylor: AID, correct. In '55 I went down to Mindinao, where they had a project for clearing forest and developing settlements. It was part of Magsaysay's program to undermine the HUK movement by giving the land to landless. I met two HUKs on the project. We talked together, and they were pleased with the opportunity there. But in the Philippines later on, the program bogged down. You'll find that story in my report. The government slowed it down. The government, as in other countries, emphasizes the physical production from the land, the green revolution, at the expense of better land tenure. They bypass the relation of the peasant to the land, assuming that the problems of unrest will be resolved by an increased productivity. Actually there is danger that it will widen the differences between larger landowners on one hand, and smaller landowners and the landless on the other hand in the process of increasing productivity.

Chall: In your reports, and the reports of others who've gone with you, have you attempted to bring this out, the relation between a bare subsistence level of farming and the green revolution?

Taylor: I think I have. About a year ago I corresponded with Ambassador Henry A. Byroade in the Philippines. I sent him copies of my '58 land tenure reports, noted the revival of HUK insurgency, and related the two. I probably said to him something like what I've said to you.

Chall: Has he responded yet?

Taylor: Yes, I had a very nice letter from him. It's in the files.

Chall: In 1958 then, you were still accepted and acceptable by AID?

Taylor: Oh, yes. I was accepted in 1968 to go to Panama, and I believe I would be acceptable now. I don't think I'm ostracized. I think it's just they didn't want that particular Vietnam study published. I didn't make it an issue with either SRI or AID. SRI was glad to have it published, under other auspices. The head of the team liked it.
Korea - 1958

Chall: In 1958 you went also to Japan and Korea. Was that a similar swing with the Philippines for AID in the same trip?

Taylor: Yes, it was all for AID.

Chall: And what were the conditions in Korea?

Taylor: I was in Korea for about seven or eight weeks, assisting in getting the community development program underway. A most interesting experience.

Chall: With whom did you work in Korea?

Taylor: Well, I worked as a temporary consultant on the AID staff. The head of the Korean USO mission was William E. Warne, of whom I've spoken in connection with the reclamation program in this country. He received me very well, supported me in every way, helped me meet members of the cabinet of South Korea, opened the doors in every way that he could. Under him was Mrs. Lucy W. Adams, who later worked with the U.C. community development program here in Berkeley for many years, and resides here, retired. William Warne and Lucy Adams had worked together to establish a community development program in Iran in the middle fifties.

There were Koreans on the staff of AID mission in Seoul, and they facilitated my travels about the country. Then I met Korean officials by appointment arranged by Lucy Adams and the mission staff. I was enabled to travel over most parts of South Korea, usually accompanied by another American and by Koreans, so that everything was facilitated in every way possible. I was given access to meetings of the people in the villages who knew of our coming, so we were usually shown the village, shown the projects of which they were proud, shown their problems such as irrigation, et cetera.

Chall: Were there irrigation specialists on the team, or was this just a matter at that time of organizing the villagers?

Taylor: In some cases there were irrigation projects under way in the villages. They used a great deal of irrigation. Our coming was made an occasion for the people in the villages to put on their best bib and tucker, present themselves in the best light they could, to present their problems. Our irrigation specialists were on our mission staff, cooperating with, but not a part of the
Taylor: community development staff.

Chall: And your object then was to try to see that some kind of organization was developed so that these people could communicate with their own government?

Taylor: Yes, administration of program was their own, with whatever counseling help we could give. The AID gave financial help, and counseling from regular staff and temporary consultants like myself.

Chall: The hope was that when the consultants left, these people would be able to handle their problems.

Taylor: That the program goes on, yes.

Chall: And how well does it, would you know?

Taylor: I'm sending a letter to one of my Korean friends in the next two or three days to ask them questions in which that will be one of them. The answer is, I think, it varies, but does go on.

Chall: They have to find their own leaders and accept them, I suppose.

Taylor: Yes, community development has to compete with other interests and other agencies within their own government. That is to say, our community development assistance is only one program among a number. The most closely related and most competitive is the agriculture program.

Chall: Was there a land reform movement going on to any extent in South Korea?

Taylor: Yes. Shall I pick up that story with relation to Japan?

Chall: Yes, good.

Taylor: General Douglas MacArthur, before he won the war in the Pacific, laid plans for a land reform in Japan. If memory serves me correctly, among the people he had working on it was Henry Fowler, later Secretary of the Treasury, who had been chief counsel under the La Follette Committee on its California studies. So a good deal of thought was given to it.

When our army finally occupied Japan, among the early acts of General MacArthur was to have prepared a directive, telling
Taylor: the Japanese government they were to have a land reform. I understand that the directive was prepared by William Gilmartin, who took his doctorate with me in '42. He became a captain in the artillery during the war, but the personnel records must have shown his interest, his background, in economics.

Gilmartin later told me that he was asked to prepare the MacArthur directive and that he took a draft of it to a brigadier general who said, "Oh, we can't do that. That's communist." The response of Captain Gilmartin was, "Sir, General MacArthur has asked me to do this." The response was, "Oh well, if General MacArthur told you to do it, all right."

After the Japanese land reform program got in motion, Gilmartin was sent to Seoul, Korea, where General Hodges was in charge, but he had no luck in Korea. The army officers there, apparently not under MacArthur, thought the program to give the peasants the land was too communist. So, nothing was done for quite some time, but eventually it came.

By the time I was in Korea in 1958 they had had an effective reform with widespread land distribution. But I was told that already some landowners were beginning to enlarge their holdings at the expense of people who were losing their holdings. You know, illnesses, misfortunes of all kinds involve getting into debt, and the final way out is, "Give me a piece of your land and we'll clear the debt for you."

Chall: Without some kind of government program that would help the small farmer...

Taylor: Yes, without some continuing program, you can't be sure how long land redistribution will last. But Korea did get an effective land reform.

Chall: Did you know Mr. Wolf Ladejinsky at all when you were travelling around?

Taylor: Yes, I met him at Madison, Wisconsin at the World Land Tenure Conference in '51, and I saw quite a bit of him in 1958 in Saigon. He was an advisor on land reform to President Diem, who initiated the first land reform there. Ladejinsky now is in New Dehli, India.

Chall: I see. He was under a cloud at one time, was he not?
Taylor: He was in the McCarthy era; then he was handsomely cleared, and then, what I heard was that he committed the indiscretion of buying stock in companies, or a company doing business in Vietnam. Something of that sort, so after he had been cleared, they let him out of AID. I'm not sure that that's the full story, but that's what became public.

Chall: Yes, I remember that now.

Taylor: You can see that his standing with our government is all right now. He's with the World Bank, a U.S. sponsored institution. Gilmartin is with the bank, too. Gilmartin's doctoral dissertation written in 1942, I hope I'm getting published in the next two months. It deals with the rise of industrial relations in the vegetable industry. He traces some of the earliest accounts of development of migratory labor in the vegetable industry.

Chall: In California or in the United States?

Taylor: In the United States. One of the stories he tells, and he records from the documents, is that a former slave owner said that after all emancipation was a pretty good thing, because now they didn't have to support the Negroes in the off seasons. They just got them cut when they wanted to use them in the vegetables, and let them shift for themselves thereafter.

Chall: How are you going to get Mr. Gilmartin's thesis published?

Taylor: Senator Stevenson's committee on migratory labor.

Chall: When they publish it, is it published by the U.S. Printing Office?

Taylor: Yes, printed in a volume of the hearing on migratory labor. I believe that I will get published also a master's thesis, an excellent master's thesis by Margaret Cooper on Land, Water, and Settlement in Kern County, California. I've had considerable success in getting work published, either my own or my students' through government committees. The university presses, I'm sure, like it because then they don't have to finance the cost, and I like it in a permanent printed record where it's available.*

*Later: my hopes for printing were not realized. PST
Chall: And it goes into bibliographical files and becomes useful.

Taylor: I have some other theses on hand. If I had thought about them, I'd have submitted them.

Japan - 1958

Chall: What were the conditions that you found in Japan when you went there in 1958?

Taylor: I had two weeks in Japan, and primarily my concern was with the response of people to the land reform program of General MacArthur. I went into various parts of the country, and was unable to find any person, landlord who had lost his land under the reform, or anybody else, who would say that the land reform program was anything but a good program.

Chall: And was it still functioning as expected?

Taylor: Yes. I remember one large landowner in a beautiful Japanese style home, like a medieval castle; he was able to retain only 1.6 hectares of rice land on the condition that he work that himself. So, he and his wife get out, bare legged, and plant the rice and harvest it, and do all the rest of the work in order to keep that plot of land. It changes his role in the community. He still has the great warehouses which the former tenants, now peasant owners use, so he doesn't lose his living, or his place of importance in the community. But, he lost plenty of land.

He took me around personally and introduced me to his former tenants. One was building a lovely home. So the man who lost, took me to the man who had gained. They were neighbors.

There were others who lost the land with whom I spoke. I never was able to get a single person who would criticize the land reform except in one respect. They said what they were paid for the expropriation was unfair. I am perfectly willing to agree with them, the reason being that the price at which the land was expropriated was set prior to a rapid inflation. So they got only nominal sums, whereas, it would have been desirable to have the program on a basis that could generally have been regarded as fair to all.
Chall: Do you know how the Japanese land reform has succeeded, whether it's still in effect as such, or whether large operators...

Taylor: I don't know whether there's any re-consolidation. That I don't know, but I'm sure that the effect has been enduring and has promoted political stability in that country, I'm sure of that.

Chall: I suppose that the tenants in any of these countries have farmed the land, and so know about farming, but they probably have to learn other matters such as marketing, and storage, and things of this kind.

Taylor: I'm sure that there are problems. As I said, on that particular large estate, the same family continued to do it, only instead of warehousing its own rice, it warehoused the rice of the peasants who now owned the land.

Chall: There would be a possibility of some kind of exploitation on that kind of storage, wouldn't there?

Taylor: Yes, I suppose there's always a possibility, but I doubt if it is taking place on any scale, because the peasants have the alternative of constructing their own warehouses. That would be a check upon any great exploitation.

Chall: Did you find the life and culture in these Asiatic countries interesting?

Taylor: Fascinating. Japan is like a garden. The people received us beautifully. One is aware of the fact that Asia is a cultured nation. It isn't our culture, it's their culture, but it's a cultured nation, and I'm sure that is reflected back here in a subject we have mentioned, the Japanese-Americans.

The Japanese-Americans come from a cultured background, and that helps solve the race problem. The young Japanese girls and Japanese men have a cultured background, so the racial difference—the physical, biological differences—are minimized. The difference in culture, I'm sure, can be even an element of mutual attraction between races.

I think that the relationship of the Japanese women to the young American men is an easier crossing than between the Japanese men and American women. The reason is largely because the position of women in relation to men in Japan has been a lower one than prevails in the United States. So American men let them come up—"women's liberation"—just naturally.
Chall: Either that or they accept their subservience, if that's the way the American men like it.

Taylor: By Japanese standards, the American men do not insist on subservience, so the natural result of relationship with an American man for the Japanese women is more freedom. Of course, the Japanese women, they make it very nice for the men in their own country and here--so the young men here like it. It's a little harder, I think, the other way, but I've known the crossing that way and been successful, too.

**Indonesia - 1955, 1958**

Chall: When were you in Indonesia?

Taylor: I was in Indonesia twice, '55 and '58.

Chall: I see. With AID?

Taylor: No. The Ford Foundation let it be known that they were interested in an educational contact between the University of Indonesia at Djakarta and an American university, including the prospect of California. It was part of their program and they had a man in Indonesia (Michael Harris), and that was one of the things he thought of doing. The Dutch were fading out in Indonesia, and he saw a chance to invigorate their university with an American contact and to influence the quality of training there by American participation on their faculty. He wanted also to train some of their people through graduate work at the University of California.

So I went out to Indonesia and made the preliminary inspection. Thomas C. Blaisdell, then in India, joined me. I spent three weeks in Indonesia and we opened the door to a program. After my report on that trip the Ford Foundation made a grant to the University of California. The plan had been originally that I would go there and be the officer in charge for U.C., Berkeley. But then Clark Kerr asked me to become chairman of the Institute of International Studies. So I shifted to that, and let one of my colleagues take my role in the field.

Chall: Who was that?

Taylor: Leonard Doyle at first. Later Malcolm Davison succeeded him and carried it through--it's about tapered off now. People that we
Taylor: trained are now high in the government of Indonesia, and I'm sure that we've done a great deal to improve training at the University of Indonesia. I'm sure that our program has been influential. When I was there in '55, the University of California Medical School in San Francisco already had a similar arrangement financed by AID. They did an excellent job, excellent! They took a medical school with a terrific turnover of students who would come to school when they could, and be out working for an income when they couldn't, then would come back when they could. So the medical school turned out very few doctors. Well, with the financing, and the organization from our people, they concentrated the training by providing enough subsistence grants so that medical students could stay in school and go right through until they got their M.D.'s. They had been turning out very few in a country that had probably fifteen hundred M.D.'s for eighty million people. They were then enabled to turn out, say, 150 M.D.'s per annum on a conveyor belt system.

So, we tried to do something comparable to that with our economics program.

University of California Program in Economics

Chall: You were concerned with economics.

Taylor: I was concerned with economics. When I went there I spent a little time with our people in medicine to gain the benefits of their experience and learn how they did it.

Chall: What does a department of economics in a country like Indonesia teach? What did you expect that the students would learn and use?

Taylor: Well, we wanted to bring them into contact with the best modern thought and training in economics that we could. On my first expedition there I asked could I see their library resources? I estimate, from inspecting their library resources in economics, that they had about two hundred books, which is nothing, nothing.

Chall: Did you attempt to achieve some kind of a balance between the economics as you know it and like it, and the mathematical approach more common today?

Taylor: No, I didn't get into that. I left that to work itself out.
Chall: Then if you had gone over there as Mr. Doyle did, would you have had to hire the faculty and develop the curriculum?

Taylor: No, they would hire the faculty. We would engage in teaching. We would engage in teaching and some research in order to get them to learn, by example, what you did as an academic in a modern university.

Chall: What was the language they were using?

Taylor: They were switching from Dutch to English. World War II spread English all over Asia.

Chall: Was this during the period of the Sukarno leadership.

Taylor: No, he wasn't the dictator at that time. He was then the man who had helped them win their independence. I've forgotten what his position was at the time of my visit, but he was a leading citizen.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: The dean of the school [Sumitro] was also a minister in the government. They're very short on educated people. A few years later--was it when Sukarno was in?--Sumitro was with the insurrectionary forces trying to put Sukarno out, but Sumitro, driven out, took refuge in Singapore.

Sumitro was a very capable man. And he was, as I say, both the dean of the school and a minister in the government. Well, so he was in exile from his country for a number of years, but after Sukarno was driven out of power, he came back. I understand he's there now, so I believe that at least two of the people that I dealt with in 1950 are either ministers or the equivalent of ministers in their government--both of them very able. (Sumitro, Dutch-educated, and Nitisastro Widjojo, now a U.C. Ph.D.)

Chall: I see. What did you do in 1958 when you went back?

Taylor: In '58, between my work in Vietnam and my consultancyship in India, I went to Djakarta to oversee and evaluate the project. Malcolm Davison was there at the time. We spent a month at the university and around. We went to Jogjakarta where the University of Wisconsin had a contract and spent three or four days there, and we went to Bali, which you can judge as close to university work or not, depending on how you want to look at.
Chall: It was getting you out in the field.

Taylor: It was getting me out in the field. It was a fascinating and unforgettable experience.

Chall: I think I read your discussion of Bali in your interview with Suzanne Riess. You talked about Dorothea's taking pictures. Now, the problems in Indonesia are, of course, great as they are in all developing countries.

Taylor: Java is one of the most densely populated parts of the world.

Chall: Did you get out and see the way people were living?

Taylor: You didn't have to get out to see it. They were just crawling all around you in Djakarta. They were just all over the place.

Chall: Do you have a feeling when you see countries like Indonesia, and India, and Egypt where the poverty is so great and the people are densely crowded in the cities and even in the country areas, that they may not be able to catch up fast enough.

Taylor: Well, that's one of the great problems. That's Indira Gandhi commenting on India. The gulf between the developed and the undeveloped countries often widens. One aspect of it is the population problem. There are just too many people there for the country to be able to support them in decency. And it's a problem in stability as well as poverty. Sure, it's a terrific problem.

Chall: I learned one time that in Indonesia they have attempted to give some people pots and pans, and a few grains of rice, and then sent them off into a very far away part of the domain to settle on land of their own.

Taylor: I saw that in the Philippines, if you want to talk about that.

Chall: Okay, does that work out?

Taylor: Sure, it can. The island of Mindanao--did we talk about Mindanao and the Huks?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Well, that was out in the middle of the tropical wilderness. Those people cut down the trees and they built their homes, and the lands were enormously productive. Their rice fields were rich and the people were making out all right. The Morros (who
Taylor: were Muslims) resented the coming in of the government, because their own method of production was to burn a place off, farm it to rice crops for about three or four years, then burn another area, and then after a while come back to the first area. That's the old method. And the government changed that to plots where the productivity could be maintained, which was supposed also to stabilize the population. The Morros were very resentful at first. The people there told me they were afraid at first. They felt they were encircled as in an armed camp. They didn't know but what they might be annihilated by the irate Morros. They talked with them, and they told them that upon coming in they would bring health services to the Morros. They had government doctors with the project. So, the Morros were mollified, seeing that there would be some project benefit for them, after all. So the settlers and the Morros were getting along all right in 1955 when I was there.

Chall: There is right now--I don't know exactly where, some real civil strife going on between the Muslims and the Philippine nationals in some part of the Philippine Islands.

Taylor: Yes, I don't know about the fight between the Muslims and the Christians. The Hucks are involved, which means a land reform problem. It's too bad that Magsaysay died in that airplane accident. He was a very farsighted and good president.

Chall: You think somehow the people of these underdeveloped nations are going to be able to handle their problems despite the fact that they look so overwhelming to us, and probably to them, too?

Taylor: Well, they've got to struggle with them. I mean, there they are. Optimism? Well, it's hard to answer yes-no to that kind of a question. Look at Bangladesh. People by the millions die of famine and disease and disaster. Well, that'll help solve the population problem temporarily, but that's a sorry way of looking at it. No, their problems are simply terrific, and apparently they are in India, too, although not as extreme as in Bangladesh.

What will they do? Will they go communistic? Well, I don't know. I don't think anybody can answer that question for sure. Here's Southeast Asia, the North Vietnamese driving in on Vietnam so that we don't know from day to day how far they're going to get. Maybe they'll solve it that way. If the Communists take control, there will be more rigidly disciplined programs. That is, there will be their solutions. And some of them, in some aspects, we doubtless would call our solutions, too. For example, if they
Taylor: solve the population problem. But the first response of the Communists is not to solve that—in both Russia and in China after their revolutions they very quickly favored population increases. So from our point of view, they enlarged the population problem rather than diminished it, but that policy is not necessarily permanent.

Chall: Just wait and see.

Taylor: Yes, you'll have to get somebody else's oral history on that one some day.

Chall: You're observing. Anything else about Indonesia you want to comment on? How did you feel, in the three year interim, that the program at the university was going?

Taylor: Oh, it was going. There was no question about that. I think it was a successful program.

Chall: Was the Ford Foundation sending students over here as well as our teaching them there?

Taylor: Yes, one of them who took his doctorate here [Nitisastro Widjojo] is now a minister in the government—either a minister or the equivalent of it—in their planning office, or whatever they call it. That means a top position of responsibility. Others are in their diplomatic service. I'm sure that University students are in a number of leading positions of the government.

Chall: Do they tend, because they're educated and become part of the government, to take a different point of view from the average citizen who is so poor?

Taylor: Well, they work with a government that wants what they can do. Sukarno did not want them so much, but the present government wants them. You can't separate the problem from the political. I have no doubt that the Communists did not find their effort to gain control of Indonesia any easier because of the training that we were giving. That doesn't mean that we were giving anti-Communist training, but the kind of training and the general orientation doubtless was not conducive to thinking in those terms.
Touring the Soviet Union - 1958

Chall: Did you cover other parts of the world in 1958?

Taylor: After I finished my consulting work in India and Pakistan in 1958, we came back through the U.S.S.R. It was not part of my assignment, it was just a change of routing; instead of coming back through Rome as originally planned, we came back through the U.S.S.R. I was put in touch with that possibility and urged to do it by William B. Hussey, our consular in Ching Mei, in Thailand. The possibility had just recently been opened by arrangements between India and the U.S.S.R. Each of them had airlines, so when I got to Karachi, I went to the Russian consulate, and asked could I return to Western Europe and the United States via the U.S.S.R. They said, yes I could. So, my wife and I went back that way. We left Karachi on Christmas morning, flew to Kabul, Afghanistan, and the next day flew to Tashkent. Most interesting!

Chall: Did you go on a busman's holiday, as they say, and go to the collective farms to see what was going on agriculturally?

Taylor: [Laughter] I wanted to do that, but there was a little complication which I don't entirely understand, which now I think was more or less accidental. The tourist literature on U.S.S.R. invites you to visit a collective farm near Tashkent. So, when I was asked, "Where do you wish in Russia to spend a bit of time?", I said, "Tashkent, Moscow, Leningrad." When I was given my passport with the papers allowing me to enter Russia, the man said, "I have put in on your route the--" and he named the port of entry before our arrival at Tashkent. I didn't understand that I was not to stop for a day or so at Tashkent.

When I arrived at Tashkent in the afternoon, about five o'clock, the Intourist representative looked at my papers, and he said, "Let's see. You're going to Moscow tomorrow." I said, "But I asked to stop in Tashkent." He said, "You're papers don't say it." I said, "I asked for it, and I understood that my request was granted. Is there anyone here to give authority for my wife and me to stay?" He said, "I could call the chief of police." I said, "I would appreciate it if you would do that."

He came back and said, "The chief of police has gone home at the end of the day--five o'clock." I said, "Is there any other way that I could ask for permission to stay." He went back and talked with, I suppose, the assistant chief of police,
Taylor: and the word came back, "Well, you can stay overnight and go to the chief of police in the morning at nine o'clock." I said, "But my plane to Moscow goes at nine o'clock." He said, "Yes." I said, "How can I be both places, and what if the chief says, 'Your papers don't allow you to stay here and we can't allow you to stay here and we can't allow you to do it.'?" He said, "You'll have to decide."

By that time I was a little miffed. I've had some after-thoughts about it because I think I understand it now better than I understood it then. I said, "I appreciate that your police would see me at nine o'clock, but if their decision was 'no,' I wouldn't want to be locked up in the jail for a day until the next plane went out. I've heard that your police are very efficient." He said, "You'll have to decide." I said, "Well, we'll go out in the morning at nine o'clock." He said, "All right, we'll give you a room right here in the airport." I said, "I'd appreciate it--is there a hotel in Tashkent; could we at least go in while it's still daylight, and in the morning at least see the country between the airport and the town?" He said, yes, we could do that.

So they did that, and we got to the hotel. I shall never forget the central square with what we would call a county court house, and the electric line, and so on. I'm very glad that I asked to go into town. In the evening they asked us what we would like for breakfast, and took our orders. But when morning came, they said, "Your car is ready," before we had breakfast. [Laughter] So we got into our car before we had our breakfast, and were taken to the airport. It was all very nice.

My judgment is that no one wanted to take the responsibility for saying, "Yes, you can stay." I'm quite convinced now, that had we gone to the police chief at nine o'clock, the plane would have just left, the police would have said, "I have no authority to grant you permission, but your plane is gone, and the next plane will be at nine o'clock tomorrow, so you can spend the day as you wish about the town and visit the collective farm." So, maybe I cut my nose off to spite my face.

Chall: Those were days when no one was sure how he'd be treated.

Taylor: That's right, but I think I learned something about their unwillingness to accept a responsibility for giving a decision in advance. Probably they knew perfectly well that the chances were nine out of ten or better that I would have my day, only the Intourist man couldn't say so.
Chall: Is this kind of bureaucracy typical in many other countries that you've come across.

Taylor: Well, I didn't run across it in the other countries. You see, I was taken care of by the AID, so they took us right through the bureaucracy entering and leaving the country without any trouble. In Moscow, I remember a young woman, who got us tickets to the Bolshoi, and did many courtesies for us. At the end I went to her, held out my hand, and told her that I wanted to thank her particularly for how very nice she had been. All she would say was, "I just did my duty, I just did my duty." I said, "Well, but there are some people who do their duty more gracefully and thoroughly than others." "Oh, I just did my duty, just did my duty." She brushed off any effort of mine to give her special thanks.

There was one lovely incident. I went ahead of my wife from our hotel room, carrying the two suitcases, and stepped into the elevator. When Dorothea followed me into the elevator she said, "Did you see that?" I said, "See what?" "The chamber maid in charge of the floor threw her arms around me."

Chall: How interesting. Did anybody know who Dorothea was?

Taylor: No, the chamber maid behind the desk responsible for the floor just threw her arms around Dorothea at parting. She was garbed beautifully--beautiful lace over the shoulders--exquisite.

Chall: The chamber maid?

Taylor: That's how the chamber maid was beautifully dressed in, I suppose, an official uniform, and that's the way she showed her personal friendliness to these American strangers.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: They were very nice to us, they got us tickets to the Bolshoi, tickets every evening somewhere, and during the day we went out to some place or another with guides. We went to the Moscow University. I went out to the new one, then to the old one. I was conducted by an American who was a graduate student there on the international interchange; they send so many students over here and we send so many other there.

I had my passport and a letter with me, but the woman at the door of the old university said she couldn't let me in, that she
Taylor: would have to get authority from somebody. I got a little miffed at that, turned around and walked out. So, having just been denied permission to go into the first university building—not finally denied, but denied and no appeal—I walked about seventy-five yards over to the old university library, a library going clear back to czarist times. I was taken in without any questions or requests for papers or anything else—I and my American student who spoke Russian—he was a Czech-American as a matter of fact. I was received as though I was a visitor of importance, taken personally through the library stacks by the librarian. We had a very nice time of it for as long as there was something to see and talk about.

Chall: How interesting, and it was just a matter of how a particular bureaucrat felt about what his duties were?

Taylor: Yes, the Intourist man—he couldn't give me the word as to what the chief of police would say, except that he got it half way—come at nine o'clock and then we'll tell you. At nine o'clock they would have told me. Well, in both cases—at Tashkent Intourist and at the first Moscow University building—I turned back instead of waiting to go through with their unfamiliar procedures. At the library, she apparently didn't have to ask anybody else, so she just welcomed me although she had never heard of me before, and personally took me all around, including into the stacks.

Oh, let me tell you the last incident when leaving Russia. We flew on a plane from Moscow which came down at Vilna in old Poland. It was the last Russian port. An official came as we were finishing lunch and said, "Inspect your luggage." We put our luggage before us. When I opened the first one, to my surprise there wasn't a thing in it. Dorothea, for what reason I don't know—she had not told me—had packed everything in the other one.

Chall: [Laughter] That takes a bit of doing!

Taylor: I still don't know why. [Laughter] So, I was as surprised as the officer; when I opened it, I just stood and looked at him. He looked at me, and then he ran his hand all around the four sides of that case [motioning how the officer felt around the plywood edge of the suitcase] to see if anything was concealed there. He looked at me and I looked at him. Then he motioned to open the second case. So I opened it. It was chuck full. Lying on top of it was my metal glasses case. He opened that; you know how thin that metal is, and he ran his fingers all around and into
Taylor: that. [Laughter] Again he looked at me and I looked at him. Then, there on top was my wallet--my absolutely empty wallet. You see, my wallet wasn't the right size to take the large paper money of Asiatic countries, so I had discarded it, and there it lay on the top of our clothing. [Laughter] He took the wallet and felt that inside and out the same way. Again he looked at me and I looked at him. So, I asked him, "The next piece?" He answered, "No." [Laughter] So that was the last of that luggage inspection.

Touring Germany and France - 1958

Taylor: In East Germany, we arrived at East Berlin, and then we were to be taken by bus from the airport to the border of West Berlin. That was before the wall was erected. We were in the airport for a while, and inadvertently Dorothea left her notebook behind, a little eight and a half by eleven notebook in which she kept all her field notes for her memories of the trip. We were able to get that book back, yes, by a telephone call from our West Berlin hotel. We called the airport, and the airport said, "Yes, we found it in the waiting room." They brought it into East Berlin on the bus and they told us where on the road to come.

We got a cab in West Berlin that took us to the right crossroad at a particular time. In a few minutes the bus came, and the driver handed us her notebook. Those are very little things, but I think they show something as to attitudes different than what is seen sometimes in the daily press. At the personal level they were fine to us.

Chall: You had to go through checkpoints between East and West Berlin. How did that feel?

Taylor: We didn't even have to get out of the cab. I don't remember it in detail except that we didn't have to get out of the cab. That meant they just looked at our passports through the cab window and sent us right on. Then, you see, we went back again. We made, I think, at least two trips back into East Berlin. No problem.

Chall: You just went through East Berlin; you didn't stay there any length of time?

Taylor: No, we stayed at a hotel in West Berlin.
Chall: And from there you came home. Had you been travelling much in Europe as you went from one place to another?

Taylor: I had not been in Europe since 1919, when I was with the American Expeditionary Forces. We bought a VW in Stuttgart. Dorothea's ancestors came from Stuttgart about the same time that mine came from Germany, Switzerland and England. So we had arranged in Berkeley to buy a VW there. We drove around South Germany, and then to the little village of Morbach, near Kaiserslautern, from which my great grandparents and grandfather had come in 1848. Then we drove through France. I drove Dorothea to a particular Bouresches-Belleau Wood battlefield where I was gassed in 1918--no change, just like I left it except that they had repaired the houses. I knew exactly where I was. I stopped the car, and I pointed to a little wood across the creek, and I said to her, "There is where I was gassed."

Chall: There wasn't any move to suburbia there, apparently. You could never find locations in the countryside here exactly as you saw them forty years before.

Taylor: And in the barnyard of La Cense Farm, a small but a larger one among the small farms, they were shoveling manure, sending it out to fertilize the fields. They paid hardly any attention to me, just minimum. They were not discourteous--but, I suppose they had had a stream of veterans come back there. Also I had a German VW and they might have been unsure at first that I was American. I looked at the swinging door of the wine cellar--that had been our first aid station, because it was protected from artillery by the structure of the house. It was half underground. So, the countryside was all very familiar.

Well, when I was there I thought of this: In 1919 I had gone to Napoleon's Waterloo battlefield. Looking that over, I saw the little farms around about, where they were still farming. They had even preserved orchard walls with the holes that had been made to shoot rifles through. This was 1919 and Napoleon had been there in 1815; so it was 104 years after the battle. I remember wondering at the time whether I was seeing anything like what Napoleon and Wellington saw, minus the troops. Well, when I got back forty-five years later to my own battlefield, I could answer, "Yes, it's all very much the same as it was."
Cuba - 1959

Chall: Now where did you go on your consulting tours after 1958?

Taylor: In '59 I went to Cuba.

Chall: What was the situation in Cuba? Under whose auspices to Cuba?

Taylor: AID.

Chall: Same kind of program?

Taylor: No, the Cubans asked for a consultant to their newly-created ministry of Social Welfare who could speak Spanish. This was shortly after Castro came into power.

Chall: How long after?

Taylor: He came in on New Year's; I got there for the month of August.

Chall: I see. We were still friendly with Cuba and Castro.

Taylor: Yes. One of the first things Castro did was to establish a ministry of social welfare as a gesture of thanks to liberal Cuban women who had raised funds to support him in his opposition to dictator Batista. The new ministry asked for an American consultant to come down for three months. They wanted one who could speak Spanish. Well, I'd worked in Mexico in 1931 and 1932. I won't say how well I could speak Spanish, but compared to most Americans, I could speak Spanish.

I went to the Oakland Naval hospital for medical clearance. They took an X-ray of my chest and would not clear me. I'd been cleared previously for all these other assignments, but this time they wouldn't clear me. There was some peculiarity down here [motioning to chest area].

So I had to telephone the news back to Washington to Louis Miniclier, my friend in AID, saying, "I have no more symptoms of cancer than you have or of anything else." Well, we lost two months. Finally AID said, "You come to Washington; we won't assure you of taking you, but we'll examine you here, and pay your way both ways; if you're cleared, you'll go on to Cuba."

So right from the plane they took me to a naval or public health hospital where they had their medical examination done.
Taylor: In the meantime I'd gone to Kaiser Hospital, Oakland, which had my health records. I had asked the Oakland Naval Hospital for the plate to take to Kaiser. With the plate in hand, I asked Kaiser, "Do you see what the naval hospital says that I have?" The Kaiser doctor said, "Yes, you had the same thing on a plate in '49, and the same thing in '56. Sure, we have a record of what you've got. We think you're all right." In Washington they started to put me through tests, but they cut them off very short when I presented all of these negatives for the examination. The doctor said, "Well, I see what you've got, and I think you'll have it the next twenty years. Go ahead to Cuba."

Because of the incident that cost two out of the three months of the assignment, they unwound some red tape, I was told. They had been imposing the same physical standard for me as a temporary consultant as though I was to go there for two years or more. I had only one month in Cuba instead of three. I wish I'd had the three. It was a very fine month. I met fine people. They couldn't have been better. They took me right away out into the Oriente Province where Castro had had his base of operations.

Chall: What were you supposed to do in Cuba as a consultant?

Taylor: Well, they were setting up a social welfare program, and they wanted my suggestions as to what to do. So in my bound volumes, you'll find my report. The minister of social welfare, who was a woman, said she wanted to arrange for me to meet Castro. And I remember now the comment of the U.S. ambassador [Philip Bonsal] whom I saw a time or two. He said, "I've been trying to see him for six weeks."

Chall: Did you ever see him?

Taylor: No, it didn't ever work out.

Chall: You didn't have time enough?

Taylor: I think that Castro was busy, first consolidating his power, then spreading his controls more tightly. The story that I had from our embassy staff was that our ambassador to Cuba [Bonsal's predecessor] wasn't even in Cuba when Castro came to power. Our people in the embassy were very critical of our ambassador at that time.

Chall: Did we have the same ambassador there after Batista?
Taylor: No, they changed fast, fast, bringing in Philip Bonsal.

Chall: What was the attitude of the American officials, the State Department officials, toward the Castro government at the time you were there?

Taylor: They were doing everything possible to mend relations. The staff was fine. They welcomed my coming, cooperated in every way. They were critical as could be of their past ambassador and wanted to get out from under the relationship he had developed with the Cubans. Among other things, they said [of the former ambassador], "The munitions we were sending down here for the protection of the Americans was being used against Castro, and the ambassador said, 'Oh, no, it wasn't.'" But the staff said, "We took and showed him photographs showing it, and he just tore them up."

Cuba is an example, I think, of the importance of the land problem. I've not seen any studies showing that, but I recall going on the estates, largely foreign-owned, U.S.-owned, Canadian-owned, Spanish-owned, some Cuban-owned. There were some of latter, too, among the big haciendas. There's your land reform problem again, with no land reform, and a landless population employed only about six months in the year harvesting sugar cane.

Chall: They did give land to the landless in some fashion, I think.

Taylor: Castro did some of that, but the big haciendas, I think they operate as state farms, or collectives. No, I don't think they distributed the land. Communists do not do that. But they take advantage of the disaffection with landlessness of the people under the preceding regime. They don't say, "We'll give you the land and it will be yours." They don't say it quite that way, although they imply it. They say, "We'll get rid of the landlords," which they do.

Chall: Yes. And, I suppose the collective--the success of the collective in one regime or another depends--as you pointed out in your Vietnam Communist strategy report--depends on which Communist government is in charge. It seems different with the Chinese than with the Russians. I don't know what pattern the Cubans are using.

Taylor: I don't know either.

Chall: You've never been back to Cuba since?
Taylor: No. I met Eduardo Menendez, in Colombia, one of the Cubans with whom I had travelled around over Cuba. He had been educated at George Washington University in Washington, D.C. I had sent him (to Cuba) a book or something of the sort as a courtesy gesture, but never heard from him until a year or so later. Then I ran right into him on the streets of Washington--on the sidewalk.

He explained that he had stayed under the Castro regime as long as he had, but would stay no longer, because he found that they had begun putting guards around his house. So he felt uneasy. He said he stayed as long as he felt he was keeping a Communist out of the particular job he was holding. When they put guards around his house he began to be apprehensive. So, he went to Bogota, where he worked with an international agency, CINVA, they called it. The international center for building housing. Menendez was an architect engineer.

When I met him in Bogota, he told me about a Negro woman who had been named supervisor of social welfare in the southern half of Oriente Province. We had travelled around that part of Cuba with her. She was a fine person, a very fine person. He said, "She wants to get out of Cuba, too, but they won't let anybody pay their way out with Cuban money, or take any money out of the country." He said, "I have paid for about ten members of my own family and relatives, to get them out." He said, "She'll have a job when she comes out, I've arranged that." So, I gave him enough to cover the fare from Cuba to Bogota, and something to tide her over until she got her job. She did get out, and I got letters from her thanking me. The last I heard of her she was at Henry Street Settlement House in New York.

Chall: That was good.

Taylor: As they told me in Cuba more than once, by the end of the Batista regime 90 percent of the Cubans were against him. Cuban women, on Sunday in the Catholic churches, would collect money and send it to Castro to support his operations in Oriente Province. I remember a high official, whether he was literally in the cabinet I don't know, but he held an equivalent rank, whose son became a lieutenant under Castro. I met him. Another son was a physician. I met him, too, when he was still a major in the Castro army, out in the field. The whole population practically was anti-Batista and pro-Castro. I think we mishandled that situation very much, and got ourselves into the mess with Cuba that we're in.

Chall: Pushing Castro into--
Taylor: Yes, Castro came up to the U.S. after he got in power. I think we gave him the brush-off. Instead of helping with reconstruction of the country, we opposed him. And he turned against us.

Chall: Changed the whole movement.

Taylor: Yes, I don't think we see things right. We're so trained in our foreign service that the idea is to get along with whoever's there. Their business is not our business. It's not our country. We'll get along with whoever they've got there. So we overlook the internal problems which produce the explosions.

Chall: Did you leave Cuba thinking it was going to move in the Communist direction? Did they seem willing to work toward rural development?

Taylor: You will find in my report in the bound volumes that within days before my departure from Cuba I picked up a newspaper and read what Castro's brother had said at a public meeting. He attacked the Americans including the technical assistance through AID (of which I was a part, as consultant). I showed this to my Cuban friends, saying, "But I am here under our foreign aid program. I am one of those he is talking about." "Oh," they said, "don't pay any attention to that."

I reported it to the ambassador within a few days when I saw him in Washington, and included it in the report. So, I was in Cuba when the evidence of the turn in policy first appeared in the press as a straw in the wind. I said to our officials, "This is what is coming, an anti-foreign, anti-U.S. move."

Chall: That must have been a discouraging end to the trip.

Taylor: The social welfare ministry had received us beautifully. They were fine people. I did not meet the brother-in-law of the minister of social welfare, who was minister of agriculture. But about a year later, I saw in the news that he had been assassinated. He had been one of Castro's earliest supporters. That was another evidence of the break in policy. I've never heard what happened to the minister of social welfare, to whom I was a consultant. She was a fine young woman.

Chall: So, there was a real struggle for power going on.

Taylor: You asked me if I saw it before I left, and the answer is I saw the beginnings of the break and reported it.
Ecuador and Venezuela - 1960

Chall: And where did you go after 1959?


Chall: Now, how did you happen to go for the United Nations, to these countries?

Taylor: Oh, if you want the unofficial account...

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: An official in the United Nations bureaucracy, in the division of social welfare or its equivalent, was the man who had been my immediate chief in the 1940s as consultant under Secretary of Interior Harold L. Ickes. We had met originally on the North Dakota drought reconnaissance of 1934 for FERA. We had kept in touch, so in 1960 he opened the doors which led to my going for the UN to Ecuador and Venezuela.

Chall: Who was that, Mr. Goldschmidt?

Taylor: Arthur Goldschmidt, who later, under L.B. J.'s presidency (they had been friends in the New Deal days), was made our ambassador to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Chall: Now, what was the project in Ecuador and Venezuela, and how long were you there?

Taylor: I was in each country for a month. The subject was community development, and of course I tied land reform into it. I took it along with me.

Chall: [Laughter] I see. It's part of your briefcase.

Taylor: No matter what they say.

Chall: No matter what they call it.

Taylor: No matter what they call it, that's right. [Laughter]

Chall: What was the situation in these countries?

Taylor: Well, you can read my reports, they'll outline it.
Chall: With whom were you dealing when you got down into these countries?

Taylor: I was customarily met at the airport by the local UN officials. I surprised them in Ecuador because they had hardly any warning of my coming. They wanted to look me over and see what I was likely to be doing down there, but I was well-received. I was taken out into the country through Ecuador by a Jamaican who was on the staff of the UN, a very fine man. We would call him mulatto. We met him and his wife, and they were very fine to us, travelled with us, took us out where we really got into the country and saw the people on the ground. That's one good thing about community development; because of its emphasis on people you can get out into the country. Usually you've got work to get out of the city offices, but you can do it--get your feet really on the ground and really talk with people.

Chall: Could you speak Spanish to the people in the country?

Taylor: I was doing better after the gap between 1932 in Mexico and 1959 in Cuba. I'd had my refresher course in the latter country. I hadn't spoken Spanish for twenty-seven years before going to Cuba. I'll tell you, it was hard to pick it up again. In Cuba they wanted me to give an opening speech, which I did, half way writing it out, half speaking from notes. Fortunately they gave me "E" for effort.

Chall: [Laughter] Where was this, Cuba?

Taylor: Havana. When it came to Ecuador I could do better, and of course, the UN people could speak English.

UN-FAO Jurisdictional Concerns

Taylor: There was an internal bureaucratic UN program in Ecuador. While I was sent down there under the auspices of the UN, the operating community development program in Ecuador was under the auspices of the FAO [Food and Agriculture Organization] with headquarters in Rome. The FAO is part of the UN but it's a separate part.

Chall: It's been there longer than the UN.

Taylor: It came from the League of Nations, and before that from the
Taylor: initiative of founder David Lubin of Sacramento (Weinstock Lubin Dry Goods). I still remember an evening we were invited as guests (Dorothea and I and the Jamaican UN couple). The local FAO man in charge was an Englishman. As he handed me a drink, he made a very challenging remark implying: Was I sent down there by Julia Henderson of the UN to take over the community development project from the FAO for the UN? To which I responded, "Why, I didn't know what Julia Henderson had sent me down there for because I'd never met her. So I didn't know what my mission was, maybe he did."

[Laughter] Well, we became friends and between us it was all right after that. These are the little things that you can run into.

Chall: Was there a difference of opinion between the social welfare division of the UN and the FAO as to what was to be done?

Taylor: Not to my knowledge. It was the FAO official who raised the question of jurisdiction. You see, FAO had gone into community development there. He'd seen Ecuador, thought that the people there were in miserable condition, and that something should be done for them. So, the FAO responded, "All right. We'll have a project over there."

Chall: And you were sent down...

Taylor: I was sent down by the UN from New York after the FAO had initiated the project.

Chall: [Laughter] Well, it does look a little conflicting.

Taylor: Yes. He saw me as an agent of the UN to take that away from the FAO.

Chall: That's not an unlikely assumption to draw, it it?

Taylor: Well, it was like the unstable position of community development in AID which in a way had the rug pulled out from under it, and principally by the agricultural extension bureaucracy. Yes. They regarded community development as a competitor.

Chall: I see. And so that left the field open to a UN agency if someone was going to walk into the vacuum.

Taylor: This is how it must have looked to the FAO official when the UN sent me down to Ecuador: What is going to happen to him? Is he going to lose his job and lose the project for which he is responsible?
Taylor: Wasn't it his business to nurse that project along rather than give it up?

Chall: Was there any difference of opinion in the UN agencies, FAO, social welfare, about what the meaning of community development was, and how to go about achieving it?

Taylor: No, I don't think there was any difference. He was carrying that project on, supporting it on a shoestring. He'd get a half a dozen automobiles as a gift from either the French government or the manufacturers of the automobiles. He would spend his time equipping himself, doing the simplest work himself to keep the project alive. That also meant that he was greatly involved in his project. After our first encounter there was no issue between us. So, that's the way I was received.

Experiences at the Grass Roots Level

Chall: Is there anything that isn't in your record about Ecuador or Venezuela that would be interesting to know with respect to this trip?

Taylor: Well, I don't know if there's anything of importance to go into this record. Of course I remember very much the differences in the conditions that I encountered in different countries. Everything from the tribal Indians of Ecuador, who still paint their faces with red clay everyday. As an Indian, that's the way you dressed, that's the way you presented yourself. So, I saw the people of Ecuador from the top to the bottom.

One little incident. Coming up from seeing those Indians—the Colorados, they called them—on our way back up the steep Andes, we came up to a point where there was a one-way road. We had to wait awhile before we could go on because temporarily the cars coming down had the right of way. A young fellow in his late twenties stood there with a revolver strapped to his thigh. As we waited he walked back and forth as though he had charge of the place. When they removed the chain to open the way for us to drive on, this young fellow wasn't going to let us go. We talked with him a little bit. What he was, apparently, was a Castroite going down to work in the sub-tropical regions, you see, and build power. It was just one year after and there we met him. Probably a forerunner of Che Guevara. After a few moments of talking with
Taylor: him my UN Jamaican companion put his foot down hard on the throttle, and we drove off.

If you want to find out about a country, go right down to the ground. Don't stop with the offices and the paved streets. No, get out and you'll run into what you cannot know before you go. You can have some ideas of what you're looking for, but you'll run into so many other things that you never thought about that as a way of learning it's indispensable.

Chall: Were you able to talk to the people the way you usually like to on the grass roots level?

Taylor: Oh, there was no difficulty. Of course there were Indians who didn't speak Spanish so I couldn't talk with the Colorado Indians.

Chall: Is this a problem with respect to community development? Is there a difference in culture that would require different kinds of development?

Taylor: There are very different levels of culture and development, but the principles of community development are the same for all—participation and self-help from the bottom, with assistance from the top. There were those tribal Indians with their own government come down from pre-Columbian days. At another place in Ecuador we found an African settlement that had been there for two or three hundred years.

In the days of slavery they had been brought down the west coast from the Isthmus of Panama as slaves to work the low lands of Ecuador. They were shipwrecked and so they got free in the coastal wilderness, with nothing there to receive them but the animals and the vegetation. But they had laid hold, and in 1960 were living a very primitive, illiterate life. The government of Ecuador was just beginning to make contacts with them.

We saw the two things the government was doing; they opened a school so the children were, for the first time, receiving some simple education and literacy. And the government was bringing some measures of public health. I remember a screaming child about to get an immunizing shot, terrified, grabbed hold of and just forced to take the inoculation.

Chall: Like children all over.

Taylor: Yes, that's right.
Chall: Well, it's not easy to solve problems with that range of cultural differences.

Taylor: No, you have to adapt the program to what the needs are and the level of understanding of the people.

Chall: Is it your feeling that the United Nations is better equipped to do this than any other agency of a national government—the Ecuadoreans own government, or the United States programs of foreign aid, for example?

Taylor: You mean as between an AID program of community development, or what we call a bilateral arrangements, or a UN arrangement?

Chall: Right, you could put it that way.

Taylor: Well, I think it depends on each particular situation. I would be happy to see it all done through UN, but there are many situations where it works very well between the U.S. and the receiving country directly given the conditions and the diplomatic relations of today. So, each arrangement for cooperation has its values. The UN doesn't have enough financial support to cover the underdeveloped nations. We finance a large part of the UN ourselves, but we also support our bilateral arrangements. So, the arrangements each have their advantages.

If you want to say on principle an international agency is better, idealistically there are advantages in that. I would like to see that, but I don't have any feeling that the other is wrong. It can be, under favoring circumstances, more effective, with more resources behind it.

Chall: What about a possibility of duplication of effort? Did you ever come across that kind of thing.

Taylor: Not really, no. When I was in a country for the United Nations on community development, I would always make it a point to call on the U.S., AID. No, I never found any real competition between them, usually because one was financed pretty well, and the other wasn't. I went to Venezuela for the UN because Venezuela asked for consultation from that source. But I was under no disadvantage because I was an American. I was very well received.

Chall: Was FAO working in Venezuela, too?

Taylor: No, so there were no internal incidents within the UN, as in Ecuador.
Chall: I see, they were just setting up something new there?

Taylor: Yes, they were setting up their own program under President Bettencourt with a very able woman in charge, Doctora Carola Ravel.

**Jamaica and Colombia - 1961**

Chall: Then what followed?

Taylor: Well, in '61 I went to Jamaica. That was arranged through AID. Jamaica was just in process of forming an independent government within the Commonwealth, involving Jamaica and Trinidad, and I think a couple of the other Caribbean islands. We were asked to come down for a weekend seminar attended largely by cabinet members and their top officials. So, with one or two colleagues, I went down there to address and confer with them.

Chall: How long did you stay?

Taylor: I stayed there about two weeks. But I got there a little before the conference, and stayed a little afterwards, travelling about the country.

Chall: Was land reform their problem, as it has been in these other undeveloped countries?

Taylor: I do not recall land reform as any particular problem there, no.

Chall: What followed Jamaica?

Taylor: Well, I was sent to Bogota, Colombia, for a week.

Chall: 1961? AID?

Taylor: Yes, AID sent me on. They had funds to use up at the end of the year, so they could have me for a week of consultation in Bogota with minimum cost to the mission budget there. In 1958 the various country missions obtained my consultation services by sharing air fare costs that same way. They got me over to Korea with a stop in Japan, and then the Philippines mission said they'd take me for two weeks, and Vietnam mission said the same. Then the University of California project at the University of Indonesia
Taylor: took care of my living costs for a month. Then AID picked me up again for consultation in India and Pakistan.

Chall: So you packed your bags for a couple of weeks, and you didn't know if you'd be gone for three months?

Taylor: You don't know when you start out but there's always a chance the consultantship may be extended.

Mexico - 1961

Chall: What about the Mexican work. Did you say that that was about two weeks?

Taylor: The Mexican work came on the way back from Jamaica. Well, as I said, I went to Jamaica in '61 for a short session with people at more or less cabinet rank, and when that was over, I was given the chance to go around the island to see the different conditions there. Then they arranged for a week's consultantship in Colombia. A man on the U.S. mission in Mexico, with whom I had worked on AID staff in Cuba in 1959, asked would I spend three days in Mexico City. He said they couldn't pay salary but would pay my expenses; he took me into his home so I had no expenses.

Well, that was an interesting three days among the high-rises, the glass and steel buildings in Mexico City. That was thirty years after I had been in Mexico studying emigration to the United States. From the new high-rise where the mission was housed, I could look down at the Paseo de la Reforma, which is a park, like the Golden Gate Park panhandle. There was the same old primitive, stone statue of Cuauhtemoc. Looking down the streets bordering the park, when I saw a tile roofed building, I said that must have been here thirty years ago. But everything except the street pattern, and the old statues, and trees, and the few buildings new in 1931, had been obliterated by redevelopment. They have preserved the Zocalo, which is their famous square surrounded by theater, cathedral, and the old parliamentary buildings that go way back to colonial days. They have had sense enough to preserve that, while elsewhere much of the city has changed enormously with time and population growth.

Well, my U.S. community development friend from Cuba wanted to take me to what they call CREFAL, a UNESCO center for training in community development. Our AID man in charge in the mission,
Taylor: however, wouldn't allow us to go. I thought this a great mistake, his thesis being that CREFAL had been taken over by subversive elements tainted by communism.

So we shouldn't go and learn for ourselves. I would have said, maybe that's a second reason for going to see what the Sam Hill they're doing. But the mission officer didn't see it that way, so although we had the train tickets ready to go, I hardly got out of Mexico City beyond a few villages in the environs.

Chall: I see. CREFAL...

Taylor: CREFAL, those are the Spanish initials of the training center. Whether UNESCO is continuing it today or not I'm not sure. I have not heard of it recently.

Egypt - 1962-1963

Chall: Why did you go to Egypt for that year, 1962-1963?

Taylor: That really came about through Ford Foundation grants and interest in U.C. and in Egypt. Ford Foundation gave us our largest single grant at the Institute of International Studies on the Berkeley campus. I was chairman from '56 to '62, when I retired. As a part of the Ford grant, we brought persons to U.C. from Asia. There was one exception, Mustafa Elgabaly, whom they wanted to bring here from Egypt. He had taken his doctorate at Berkeley in soil science with Professor Hans Jenny. Later, the Ford Foundation started a project in Egypt and wanted to finance him to come back for an additional training year with Jenny. So Elgabaly was brought to Berkeley as a fellow in my institute. Perhaps as a return courtesy, he invited me to come to his newly Ford-financed Land Reclamation Institute at the University of Alexandria. With retirement in prospect, I decided to go and went in the fall of 1962.

Chall: And you were going to be there for their academic year, is that right?

Taylor: Yes. I was delayed in departing. There were uncertainties with Dorothea's health. I departed first, and she came about a month later. She had hoped to do field work in the United States where we had worked in the thirties, so she wasn't enthusiastic about going to Egypt, but she went anyway, photographing there instead of here, and took it all right.
Chall: And now her pictures of Egypt are well acclaimed?

Taylor: Now her Egyptian photographs are exhibited and re-exhibited.

Chall: I saw yesterday that Life Magazine book on photography in which there are quite a few of her Egyptian photographs.

Taylor: Yes. Do you want to know about the work there?

Chall: Yes, I do. You went directly, I suppose, from here to Alexandria?

Taylor: Well, the airline terminal was at Cairo, and I was met there. Then after a day or so, I was driven by car to Alexandria where I was put up first in a hotel, later in an apartment.

Teaching at the University of Alexandria

Chall: What's the institute like, and what work did you do?

Taylor: My work was to give a course in community development to persons who were largely oriented toward soil science or related to it. There were about fifteen or eighteen Arabs who came to my class several times a week. We had a class or seminar, consisting primarily of my lectures with discussion. You will find the outlines of my lectures in my bound volumes, so you can tell from them what it was that I gave them. I found the students had minimum background outside of the physical sciences. So, this seminar was, in a sense, a first for them in my field of land reform and community development.

Second, I found the students expected me to dictats my lectures to them slowly, so they could take them down nearly verbatim. As soon as I learned that, I included more and more materials--quotations, data, etc.--in my syllabus, and had it mimeographed, so I could give them lectures without their having to take down so much detail. It also facilitated adding notes right on the syllabus sheets which I handed out to them.

Chall: Did that force them, in a sense, to think about what you were talking about and then discuss it? In the European tradition people aren't used to that.

Taylor: That's right, I saw different procedures in teaching and learning there. Well, that emphasis on learning by rote was interesting.
Taylor: There were some very able people among my students, and others who plodded. But they all appeared interested and did their part, and for me it was a very new and interesting experience.

Broadly speaking, I didn't find much community development in Egypt. Their society didn't appear to invite it. There was minimum contact between the agricultural technicians and the people who labored in the fields. A wide gulf exists between the educated classes and the fellahin in the villages who live in vast poverty.

Conference on Community Development

Taylor: One thing I was able to do with the help of Elgabaly. Incidentally, I had fine support from Elgabaly and those in charge at the Institute of Land Reclamation. I proposed to Elgabaly that we have a two-day conference, nation-wide, with people to be invited according to his suggestion. The subject was to be "What can the academic community do to assist in the community development program of the UAR?" Well, the fact of the matter is that they did not have any community development program, but I assumed it as a conference theme nevertheless.

Elgabaly liked the idea, moved on it right away, got the approvals that were needed, and we held the conference in May, 1963. I think by any standard it was very successful. Officials came down from Cairo and elsewhere, perhaps partly to see what was going on, and because it was a chance for them to speak. A member of our consulate in Alexandria remarked that it was an occasion on which the Egyptians really spoke freely in public. Apparently they were really impressed, judging from the way they took hold of the occasion. The more they took hold, the more my own role receded, as it should have. The more they did, the less I had to do and the greater the success of the conference.

Chall: That's the conference you're talking about?

Taylor: Yes. If you want further report on it you could ask our former consul general in Alexandria.

Chall: What's his name?

Taylor: His is Harlan Clark and he now lives in Littleton, Colorado.
Taylor: He asked me later if I'd ever seen the report on that meeting that the consulate sent to the embassy. I never saw it, but gather that it was quite favorable.

Chall: In this conference were you attempting to bring together those other areas of community development that you always felt were important, like public health, and education, and administration, to work with the soil sciences people? Were you attempting to indicate this need?

Taylor: Let's see, shall we look at the program of that conference?

Chall: Oh, yes.

Taylor: Its title was: "The symposium is planned as a 'workshop' focused upon a theme, How can the academic profession contribute to the improvement of community development programs in the United Arab Republic," May 1963. Nasar came into power with land reform. He distributed a lot of the biggest estates of people surrounding King Farouk. Since the institute was called Land Reclamation, and land reform coincided with my interests in community development, I emphasized land reform pretty heavily. They had some community development in the UAR. An agency of the United Nations located in UAR was devoted to it. I invited its representative to come to Alexandria and speak to our people.

But as I say, the method of my teaching was determined largely by the absence of immediate background on the part of my students. They were intelligent people, but had no background in this kind of problem, and their method of learning was largely copying down what was dictated to them.

At the symposium there were panel discussions on population, social affairs, education, agrarian reform, housing, local government, and likewise these were topics of conference talks.

One of the very capable persons in attendance was Dr. Lila Hamamsi of the American University in Cairo, who had taken her doctorate in anthropology at Cornell. The educated Arabs, such as Hamamsi and Elgabaly, are very capable people. But you know quickly from contact with them that they come from a culture quite different from our own. You never quite forget that, because it shows up in so many little ways.

Training whom for what—whether university students or government officials. These are topics on which the participants talked, so we were accomplishing our aim to considerable degree
Taylor: in getting them to talk about something that probably most of them had not thought about very much. And they had a committee on recommendations.

Well, that was the conference, and as I say, so far as I know, everybody thought it a considerable success. Living in another culture and carrying on work in it is an experience that I wouldn't have missed for anything. It was not altogether easy, but it was not to be missed.

Understanding Egyptian History and Culture

Chall: Alexandria, itself, is, I guess an interesting city.

Taylor: Oh, my yes. Interesting historically. The Greeks, of course, had occupied it. It was named for Alexander the Great.

Chall: And the Romans had as well.

Taylor: Today you can walk into the excavated underground called the Alexandria library, which was said to have been burned. You go back centuries and centuries, just by walking a few blocks and knowing where to go to the particular archeological site--fascinating. Out on a quay is a castle built in 1496, practically the same year that Columbus discovered America. Alexandria is a beautiful waterfront city. The light on that waterfront and the buildings along the waterfront is superb. You are reminded of Omar Khayam's "shaft of light"--do you remember?

Chall: I don't know that.

Taylor: "Sun striking the sultan's turret with a shaft of light." Of course when you got close to the buildings they didn't look quite so shiny and heaven-like as at a little distance, but that would be true here, too, I'm afraid.

Chall: Especially if they're several hundred or a thousand years old.

Taylor: Yes.

Chall: How close were you able to get to the Egyptians. You did have a friendship with Mr. Elgabaly. What about some of the students and the other faculty members?
Taylor: Well, we brought them to our apartment for social occasions so that we had some contact that way. The Elgabalys also invited members of the faculty to their home on social occasions. And opportunities presented themselves one way and another so that we had friendly relations. One of the cultural differences that I observed was the role of women. A long ways from Women's Lib.

Chall: Yes, I should say.

Taylor: They came from a society where traditionally, if you wished to divorce a woman, you did it by telling her so three times, "I divorce thee, I divorce thee, I divorce thee." Then she was divorced. Historically, second and third wives could be taken on. That privilege was not being exercised at the social levels at which I associated; the practice had fallen into disuse.

I observed a number of Arab men who had married American women. They'd come to the United States to take graduate work here. They were presentable people, they were intelligent people; the American women married them and pretty generally had a baby by them. But when the American women went to Egypt they were taken into a society where the status of women was very different from here. My inquiries led me to believe that it was not the Arab man who married them who wanted it that way, but the society was such that they could live hardly otherwise than in conformity to its traditional ways. The family and cultural pressures were such that frequently the American women couldn't take it. I met or heard of a number of them who came back with the child to the United States. They frequently remain married to their Egyptian husbands. Sometimes the husbands would come back to the United States upon occasions when they could, and temporarily rejoin their wives. Then, often they would have to return to Egypt to carry on their professions.

One University of Minnesota Ph.D. with whom I worked very closely was married to a very lovely Scandanavian-American, Minnesota-born girl. They had three lovely children. The husband did everything possible to shield her from the pressures of his family and the society. He protected her virtually at the doors of the household--protected her in every way he could. They were getting along, the children were growing up, and theirs was a happy family. They were not a free family in our sense, but certainly they were not an oppressed family. My point is that it took effort and cooperation to resist the pressures of a different culture in which the position of women is very different from here.
Chall: When you had faculty social groups, were the women of the faculty, the wives, invited?

Taylor: Oh, yes.

Chall: Did they bring their wives?

Taylor: Oh, yes.

Chall: Because that was not usual, too, I understand.

Taylor: Oh yes, they did it.

Chall: If they were Arab wives they brought them?

Taylor: Oh, yes. And they came in European dress. That would not have happened out in the villages, but at the educated level it happened.

Chall: There were not times that you couldn't take your wife some place, or other men didn't bring theirs?

Taylor: No.

Chall: Were you the only American in the institute teaching or working that year?

Taylor: No, there was Geoffrey Bodman, retired U.C. professor of soil science or something related to it. He and his wife Helen also were there. Then there was a professor, a specialist in citrus from the University of California, Riverside. And the latter half of the year Professor Perry Stout, of U.C., Davis, was there. We were a team, financed by the Ford Foundation. I was the only social scientist, balancing agricultural and soil science with attention to the human side.

Chall: Did you feel you could reach these people, these reclamation people and soil people with your message about the human side as you would call it?

Taylor: I reached them intellectually. How much change it made in their reactions I don't know. After all, I gave one course. Our relations were fine. They treated me very well, and as I say, I wouldn't have missed the experience for anything in the world. Our personal relations were entirely friendly. I left them with some new ideas, but I don't know of any organized movement that
Taylor: sprouted from it. You can't change a whole culture and a whole society easily, and you can't do it with one professor and one academic year. But I don't think it was futile, either.

Chall: No, of course not. Do you get the idea that the message, or the ideas that you were bringing on community development, which apparently the Ford Foundation wanted brought to Egypt in some way or another, were a sort of unique concept to the academic people at that particular time?

Taylor: Well, it was a new concept at the University of Alexandria, but remember that Egypt also had that Middle Eastern regional UNESCO community development center. An intelligent Arab was in charge. As I said, he participated in our Alexandria symposium.

Chall: He understood.

Taylor: Oh yes, very well.

Chall: The problem then was to develop the ideas across the lines of specialization.

Taylor: To make a community development program move. Well, we have the same difficulties here. I have spent my life working on problems and pointing out the ways to go. To get the state and nation actually to go that way is something else. I don't say teaching is useless because you don't change the world overnight. By no means.

Chall: Now working with the people in Alexandria presupposes that they all knew English.

Taylor: That was required for enrollment in my course.

Chall: So you were dealing with a better educated, middle and upper class group of men?

Taylor: Oh yes, I was working with their educated elite.
Field Work

Chall: How did the elite get along with the uneducated fellahin?

Taylor: They didn't figure they had much to do with them or responsibility for them. They saw their role as technicians in agriculture. The fellahin were just there. They arranged for me to go out on field trips. I was very glad because it took me out to where the people were living in their own communities. But I was the only one of our California group who was provided with an interpreter, and who tried to talk with the fellahin digging in the ground and cultivating the crops. The Egyptian technicians weren't used to that.

Chall: How could they...

Taylor: They were just there incidentally.

Chall: Let's assume you have a project on citrus. The fellahin have to plant.

Taylor: If you are a citrus expert you talk with the man in charge of the citrus orchard. The fellahin may be around to dig holes, etc., but it's unnecessary for a technician to talk with them.

Chall: Aren't they the ones who plant, and tend, and irrigate?

Taylor: Yes, but as a technician you leave it to the man in charge to tell them how to do that.

Chall: Then what does land reform mean?

Taylor: Well, the Egyptian land reform meant that they took over big estates from Farouk and his chief supporters, and continued to operate them as units on a cooperative basis, that is, with a sharing of the proceeds.

Chall: But the fellahin didn't get his own bit of land, did he?

Taylor: No, he didn't get the land. He got a share of the proceeds.

Chall: And he did the work and someone told him how—still managed?

Taylor: Yes. You might say it was something like a state farm. I have never seen a Russian nor a Mexican state farm, but I can imagine
Taylor: what they are like. So, the manager keeps the books and the fellahin gets his share of the proceeds. I'm sure that there is a different relationship between the management and the fellahin at the bottom than before the reform. But the reform didn't create an independent peasantry.

Chall: What did you talk to the fellahin about when you went out?

Taylor: Well, I didn't have as much of a chance to talk to them as I would have liked.

Chall: Was this frowned upon?

Taylor: There were no pressures, but I couldn't--with the language barrier--go into things as well as I could in this country. It's always hard where you have a language barrier. I have interviewed rural people in other countries. I did it in Mexico. I did it in Vietnam where I wanted to ask peasants very pointed questions; with the aid of interpreters I was able to do it.

Chall: Why did you feel you couldn't in Egypt?

Taylor: Well, I wasn't engaged primarily in research projects, so I didn't keep at it systematically.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: I didn't spend enough time at it. With more time, more might have come out. My assignment really was working with the educated elite, trying to reorient them. So my seeing and talking with the fellahin was an activity on the fringes. Another difficulty in Egypt is this: If you go into a village and start to talk with anybody, in about two minutes you're surrounded by a crowd. They're all interested in this stranger who's obviously not an Egyptian. What's he doing here? Had I been doing research primarily, I would have produced more contact. I could have done it. But there were undercurrents of suspicion. Not so much suspicion of me as suspicion of Dorothea and her photographic work. Did I speak of that?

Chall: I think you did with Suzanne. She always went out with her camera, and that drew suspicion?

Taylor: Yes, and the suspicions mounted so it became very difficult for her to carry on her work. She was at times in tears. I saw women try to knock the camera out of her hands. But that suspicion was political, not personal. That occurred close to the
Taylor: coast in the Nile Delta, where agitation against Israel had been strongest. When she wanted to photograph in villages in the upper Nile Valley south of Cairo, there were no such difficulties. Where there had been minimum or no political agitation, no problem.

Hostility Against Israel

Chall: What was your feeling about the hostilities with respect to Israel?

Taylor: Well, hostility was extreme, almost a phobia.

Chall: Was this shared by your colleagues?

Taylor: Pretty much. Egyptians generally went along with it. I don't think the fellahin cared. Anti-Israel sentiment served as a rallying point for people in political power. It enabled them to cast themselves in the role of defender of the people. So from my point of view, they magnified the dangers. They have kept it going, off and on, for a couple of thousand years. They enslaved the Israelis and Moses took them out of Egypt, so there's been friction ever since.

Chall: How did you feel they would be ever be able to accomplish their social aims if so much of their gross product was going into war? Was that ever discussed?

Taylor: I don't suppose it bothers them anymore than it bothers us.

Chall: They just have less of it.

Taylor: Yes, and a lot of their missiles, and equipment and materials of war, are furnished from the outside. They get them from the U.S.S.R. On the highway out of Alexandria toward Tanta, were two huge missile shells pointed up to the sky like monuments or pillars.

Chall: Just serving that purpose, symbolic?

Taylor: Yes, purely symbolic.

Chall: Was there evidence of Russians at the time you were there, or was this a little early?
Taylor: They were there. Of course they were building the Aswan Dam. They had what I suppose we would call a consulate in Alexandria. I saw them occasionally on the street, but had no direct contact with them.

Oh, Egypt was a tremendous experience for me. What I got out of it was enormous—a real look at another culture from living and participating within it.

Chall: I see. This you hadn't really done for such a long period of time.

Taylor: No. I'd been in Mexico doing research for six months. That, too, was an experience. When I was with the American Expeditionary Forces in France for fifteen months in 1918-1919, I had some direct contacts with the French people. But, of course, most of the time was either with my regiment, with very few French people anywhere around, or in the hospital. There were times when I lived in a French home, billeted in a peasant's home, or with a family in a small town. So, I had some direct contacts. But in Egypt I had a role to play, working within their own university organization, and that was fine.

Did I tell of going out into Kharga-Dacla oasis?

Chall: No.

Taylor: Well, this one little incident will, I think, be illuminating on the Arab-Israeli conflict. There I was out in the remote Kharga oasis, reached by flying across the desert. Walking around I passed by what was plainly an elementary school that had been there a long, long time. It was so worn and weathered that it must have been there for forty or fifty years.

I thought I'd like to see what the school was like, so the principal conducted me around. As in other elementary schools in Egypt, there were drawings and paintings around in the patio walls. Out of the corner of my eye I noted a drawing of a man driving a spear into the back of another man, like that [demonstrating the thrust]. Well, I saw in an instant that the shirt of the man receiving the spear thrust in his back bore the yellow Star of David. I just glanced at it, got the point, and went on. But my teacher-guide drew me back a couple of steps to make sure that I would see it, calling my attention to the fact that this man with the Star of David was Ben-Gurion.

Chall: I see.
Taylor: That showed me how way, way out in the middle of nowhere, and technologically way, way back in time, they're up-to-date in their politics--or else back in the days of Moses--I don't know [laughter] which way to put it. The propaganda is carried right down through the schools and across the desert. That isn't the only place where I encountered it, but there it was as visible as any place I was.

Chall: It's rather frightening.

Taylor: Yes. But, if you ever have a chance to go to an oasis, go. Oh, my, that will take you back in time, farther than you've ever been. Marvellous! To see it--unbelievable!

Chall: How many people are housed on an oasis of that kind?

Taylor: Thousands.

Chall: Out in the middle of nowhere.

Taylor: Not a huge number of thousands, but thousands. Yes.

Chall: Cultivating mostly what? Dates and grain?

Taylor: That's right, dates on palm trees. In the old days, the camels would come in and freight the dates out. Now trucks and airplanes do it.

When you go to those oases you will see a Pharonic Temple, from 3000 B.C. So Pharaoh and his culture and his stoncutters got around over the desert without any trucks, without any airplanes--doubtless on camels.

Chall: Yes, I think for many years they didn't even have the wheel; I think that came rather late.

Taylor: Yes, I don't know just when the wheel came.

Chall: The Pharonic temples were there as well as the Muslim mosques, I suppose, side by side.

Taylor: I don't recall seeing mosques at the oasis, but I'm sure they were there. They arrived in the seventh century.

Chall: Were the temples used as relics, or something to look upon as part of their own culture, or were they being used?
Taylor: Well, they were cherished. The oldest mosques in Cairo go back to a thousand A.D. The Muslims swept over that country after 622, and they built their mosques. Some of them are in use today. Others are preserved like museums. In Cairo you can go up the minaret of a mosque dating from the year 1000, and overlook Cairo as if it were a new suburb between the mosque and the ancient pyramids. So there you are, standing at 1000 A.D., looking at pyramids built before 5000 B.C., with this little modern Garden City section of Cairo equipped with a Hilton hotel. Time is spread out dramatically before you.

We made an unforgettable trip to Siwa oasis near the Libyan border. That's where Alexander came to the oracle and was assured he was the son of Zeus, that is to say, the son of God.

Chall: Did you acquire your knowledge of Egyptian and middle eastern history while you were touring around in the country, or had you acquired it before?

Taylor: I bought a copy James Harvey Breasted; so we read that, which gave us a good cultural background of the country. If you're in a country, learn all you can about it while you're there. You will see so much more if you study it. Another way is go to the public market places. If they've got museums, go to the museums, and the Egyptians have museums.

Chall: Oh yes, I should say they have. Were you ever able to translate, in some way, the experience of knowing this kind of culture, to the work that you've done since in community development here? In other words, did it change or broaden your own understanding, expectations...

Taylor: It gave me more understanding of the problem and an appreciation of it not to be missed.

Chall: Was anything altered in your work with the community development organization here as a result of this understanding?

Taylor: Well, yes. I was closer to the ground, closer to the problems, so when I talked about them in class I could do it not remotely and academically, but with a firsthand knowledge of the countryside. Of course, the same thing would be true of my work in Iran, Vietnam, Korea, and the other places. In each country I had a look at what the rural situation was really like.

Chall: And it's slow moving.

Taylor: Yes, it's moving altogether too slowly.
Closing the Culture Gap

Chall: But they have to change their own cultural attitudes within the country to make any changes.

Taylor: Yes, we have to change ours, too. I referred to Indira Gandhi the other day; well, here's the Chronicle April 24, 1972, "UN Study on Gap Between Rich-Poor." [reading] The study, says a review of national and international development strategies of the 1960s, shows that an excessive and unbalanced emphasis on growth of the domestic product is an end in itself, and not enough consideration [is given] of production and consumption patterns and effective use of labor. Growth strategies fail to take sufficient account of the fact that the greater part of the population in many of the less developed countries is engaged in farming and other activities at a low level of productivity." Which is another way of saying that the stratum of society that community development focuses most attention on isn't getting sufficient attention.

Chall: Did you have that feeling while you were there?

Taylor: Certainly. That symposium on "What can the academic profession contribute to the program of community development in Egypt." We phrased it that way knowing they really didn't have any program.

Chall: They hadn't thought, really, about it.

Taylor: No, but I assumed they wouldn't want to propose a conference saying "Why don't you fellows do something?"

Chall: Were the people with whom you were dealing Muslims, or were they primarily Arab-Christians? Did it make any difference?

Taylor: Oh, only a small fraction of them were Christians.

Chall: Most of them were Muslims?

Taylor: Oh, ninety percent.

Chall: Did it make much difference in terms of their attitudes?

Taylor: Yes, it made some difference--cultural differences, yes. But the barrier is not uncrossable. That is, a person like Elgabaly crosses the line--he remains at heart an Arab, but he's also a
Taylor: citizen of the world. After I left he was elevated to become head of the land reclamation program of Egypt, and then he went on a UN-FAO assignment to Bucharest in Romania, and I understand he's back in Egypt now elevated to a very high position, I think secretary of agriculture. In other words, he's one of the really capable people in the UAR.

Chall: And does he have the insights that are needed to develop the agriculture program as you think it needs to be developed? That is, the community development idea?

Taylor: I wouldn't say that he's imbued with the community development idea, but he has some appreciation of it. Yes, he has an open mind, although he has not been oriented toward people. But, he's aware of them. I always had very good cooperation from him. As soon as I proposed a symposium to him, he took it right up higher and got the authority to do everything necessary to make it succeed.

Chall: Have you been in touch with him over the years, seen him?

Taylor: He's been back here in Berkeley. I saw him of an evening about three years ago. He keeps in touch with Professor Hans Jenny, with whom he took his doctorate, and the Jennys went to Bucharest, Romania at his invitation, returning less than a year ago. So, he keeps touch with this University.

Chall: That's good.

Taylor: Perhaps once a year a note is exchanged either between myself and Mustafa or his wife, Nabila. Nabila and Dorothea became fast friends. I know each tried to cross that cultural gulf and understand each other. Dorothea told me that she really made efforts to do it, and I know that Nabila felt very warmly toward Dorothea; I'm sure that she tried likewise.

Chall: It really is a major cultural difference.

Taylor: Yes. Well it showed. I think I spoke of the difficulty Dorothea had photographing, and the Elgabalys--well, they understood the difficulties, translating them in terms of the Arab-Israeli rivalries. Here were photographs that showed how poor the people of Egypt were living, and it might be taken as a reflection upon Egypt to see these photographs.

Chall: That might be so.
Taylor: I think I told how we got Dorothea's negatives out of Egypt because we were afraid they would be confiscated. Now I believe they would not have been, but then we were truly afraid they would be.

Chall: I don't remember reading that in Suzanne's story.

Taylor: We told our consul-general the problem, and we said these are negatives that should go to an institution like the Museum of Modern Art. Either he had a chance to carry them there, or some friend of his with diplomatic immunity did so. Actually, they wouldn't have done anything because they didn't inspect our belongings as we left Egypt.

Chall: There was, you feared, a danger.

Taylor: Well, we were afraid that they would. The Elgabalys--well, Nabila spoke to me after the Museum of Modern Art posthumous show, saying, "We didn't understand. We didn't realize." She apologized in the nicest way.

Chall: Is that so. By letter?

Taylor: She was back here and did it orally. But I have sent her, on one or two occasions, books on Dorothea's work.

Chall: They probably, even if they knew that she was a prominent photographer, may have had no idea of the extent of her prominence, or the use to which her work would be put.

Taylor: Well, yes. They liked her, but when the issue came up and it appeared to be an international issue, they could understand the criticisms of what she was doing. I think I told you how, in the central park in Alexandria, a man in European dress came alongside our car carrying a lawyer's briefcase. Dorothea was going to take a photograph of the facade of the buildings looking out from the car window. He came by, said sharply, "Why don't you photograph something beautiful?" pointing to the beach.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: That's what he said just as he went by. Then the children around threw pebbles at our car.

Chall: I understand, from people I've known who've been in Egypt on academic work, that the Egyptian people--at least in the cities--when aroused can be quite dangerous. You simply don't arouse them
Chall: because the crowd, itself, gets out of control completely.

Taylor: Yes! You don't know what they'll do.

Chall: It isn't just an ordinary problem.

Taylor: No! Not just an ordinary crowd like one on Sproul Plaza, no, no. I think I told you of the time when we were going to drive from Alexandria down to Luxor. When we got to Cairo the Egyptian on the Ford Foundation staff didn't want to let us go because of the hazards. He was afraid bandits would assault us, and finally settled when we agreed that we would end the driving each day by four p.m. He said they'd be coming out of the sugar cane breaks with their guns. Fortunately, we had no such experience.

Chall: So you went out by yourselves driving.

Taylor: Dorothea and I with our chauffeur-guide who spoke English, yes. When we got to Luxor, ours was the only car at the hotel aside from the cars used to take us with guides over the river to the Valley of the Kings and around.

Chall: That must have been an exciting tour.

Taylor: It was a tremendous experience.

Housekeeping

Chall: Altogether then in Egypt—you were there one academic year?

Taylor: Yes. I arrived around the first of November, and we left around the tenth of June.

Chall: Is there any such thing as a winter in Egypt, or is it all hot summer—hot and hotter?

Taylor: No, there is a winter, no snow, but there is a winter. Our apartment was unheated. They did bring us a butane or methane gas stove for the living room of the apartment, so that made it liveable. Except for that, you'd just freeze of an evening.

Chall: How did you handle the cooking and all of that?
Taylor: We had a man from upper Nile assigned to us who did the cooking.

Chall: He was brought all the way down from there?

Taylor: I guess he had come down on his own from Nubia. In Alexandria he was like an immigrant, politically in the same country, culturally very different. He didn't regard himself as an Egyptian. The "Egyptians"—he would make fun of the "Egyptians."

Chall: That's most interesting.

Taylor: He was a very likeable fellow and did very nicely by us.

Chall: He spoke English?

Taylor: Yes, he did.

Chall: Did you eat native fare that he cooked for you?

Taylor: Yes. I have no clear recollections of a particular style, as one would remember from, say, Mexico. He did it his way, and it was good.

Chall: And he went off to market everyday and brought back what was necessary for the day?

Taylor: Of course.

Chall: Did Dorothea go to the market ever? I know that she liked going off to markets and watch the people.

Taylor: I don't recall. She might have done it, but he went daily. That's the way marketing was done.

Chall: At this point can you think of anything you'd like to add about your impressions in Egypt that we haven't covered?

Taylor: Well, I've touched the main points. It was a fascinating experience. One was aware all of the time that one was in a different culture. It wasn't that they meant to be different and at times seemingly oppressive of each other. They just were different.

Chall: You just used the word "oppressive." Did you feel under pressure because of the problems of culture?
Taylor: There was a sense of relief when we got out of the country.

Chall: And you think it was due mainly to the Arab-Israeli hostilities?

Taylor: Yes, I think a lot of it is psychological. They were sometimes pretty rough on each other, too.

Chall: How did your American colleagues feel? Did you get together occasionally and discuss your general individual feelings as Americans over there?

Taylor: No. We were there trying to do our best, and I think were appreciated. We were well treated. But things like the objections to Dorothea's work, troubled us. We were relieved when we got on the plane to Beirut, which doesn't mean that we weren't glad that we had lived in Egypt. It doesn't mean that we didn't leave behind friendships, for we did.

Here's another little example. We went to some of the music shops, the record shops. We wanted some of the recordings of the spoken Koran. It's like a chant, beautiful. We bought quite a number of those records, and there were some other things that I don't now recall, but I do remember those in particular. Well, all kinds of things that we arranged with our staff people to have shipped to us back home arrived, but those records never did. Somebody, somewhere subtracted those records. We experienced little things like that.

We had contact in a couple of cases with American women married to Egyptians. We saw the situation I mentioned earlier in which they were living, where the wife and three children were shielded within the house by the husband from almost all outside contact. During the period of warfare about 1956, he took his wife to his family, covered by shawls, because of the danger of outrages and even violence against Europeans, the French, and the British. Remember the British attack back in about '56?

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Well, his wife from Minnesota was there, so he garbed her in black and shielded her so the mobs wouldn't see her European face, attack her, and tear her to pieces.

Chall: If it was a predominantly Muslim area than I suppose it would be three times a day that they stop for prayer. Was this done in the college and wherever you were?
Taylor: No, I don't recall seeing it at the university. In the mosques and minarets they would call the people to prayer; around the university I have no recollection of that at all.

Touring: Beirut, Damascus, Baghdad

Chall: Well, then we'll travel on. You say you left Egypt and went to Beirut?

Taylor: We were in Beirut for a couple of days and on one of them drove over to Damascus and back.

Chall: That was just part of a tour?

Taylor: As I recall, our embassy in Beirut met us, took us to a hotel, and gave us a car and chauffeur.

Chall: Had you thought at all of going into Israel?

Taylor: Can't do it.

Chall: Not from the Arab countries. You'd have had to go out and then go in another way.

Taylor: It would have been obstructed, sure. From Beirut we went to Baghdad in Iraq. We were there for a day or two. Most interesting with a fascinating museum. Relics of carvings, little carvings from way, way, way back. And the most famous surviving arches of all time. You'll find its photographs in the encyclopedias. This high arch goes back to about the year 800.

Chall: Is that 800 B.C.?

Taylor: No, A.D. It's a very famous arch and well worth going to see.

Chall: At Baghdad?

Taylor: It's about fifteen miles out of Baghdad.

Chall: Did you get out into the countryside?

Taylor: Well, about fifteen miles. And we went to the museum and the market places. I have some things that we brought home from Baghdad. Oh my, are they beautiful. I can't give you any exact
Taylor: name for it. Call it a blanket--it is underrated enormously.

Chall: You must have a treasure trove.

Taylor: Oh yes.

Chall: Did you get an opportunity to meet with any people from Baghdad, American consulate officials, faculty--

Taylor: Yes, there were some American people; yes, they took us in. The Americans do that when their countrymen come along. It doesn't make any difference who they are, they just take you in. We were at the hotel, but they invited us for the evening for dinner, so we were never left with nothing to do and nobody to talk to.

Chall: How did you find the general attitude towards Americans in Baghdad compared to Egypt?

Taylor: I don't remember any particular contacts there with the people that would enable me to answer. But I remember thinking of Sinbad the Sailor, and not realizing that he was a sailor on the river.

Chall: Oh, you think of him as on the ocean.

Taylor: Yes, I thought a sailor was out on the ocean, but it's not so at Baghdad.

Chall: They have quite a river system in Iraq.

Taylor: Oh, yes, beautiful river.

Chall: They just need to develop it and they could make the area bloom.

Taylor: Their markets are just treasure troves if you value the handcrafts. The only problem is how to get them home. It costs you more to get them home than to buy them in the first place.

Chall: Of course, but then they're worth more when they're here than when they're there.

Taylor: That's right.
Iran - 1963

Chall: Then where did you go?

Taylor: From Baghdad we went on to Iran.

Chall: Now, did you have an appointment in Iran?

Taylor: Yes, I was a consultant to AID--it might have been called ICA then, but they were the same thing.

Chall: I see, and what were you supposed to do there?

Taylor: Community development.

Chall: And what did you do?

Taylor: Well, I went out into the country. We went first to East Azerbaijan, to Tabriz.

Chall: That's a long way north, isn't it?

Taylor: Yes, we flew up there. It's not far from the Caspian Sea. And there Dorothea had a reoccurrence of what we later found to be malaria, so that all the time I was there, she was in the hospital.

Chall: Oh, what a shame! That must be interesting countryside up there.

Taylor: Yes. They are intelligent people. It's a-it's one of the places of origin of our western civilization. Biologically, too, the western population is supposed to have spread from there. When you see the people, you notice that they look like our kind of people.

Chall: They look caucasian.

Taylor: They look caucasian. They don't however look like Scandanavians.

Chall: They are dark skinned?

Taylor: No, they're quite light skinned. So you don't have the feeling that you're in another civilization.

Chall: What about their culture?
Taylor: Its roots are way, way back. For centuries they've done beautiful Persian miniatures.

Chall: Yes.

Taylor: Well, they did those in Tabriz centuries and centuries ago, so you have at one and the same time, this backwardness in what we'd call economic development, and a tremendous cultural heritage.

Chall: Is that something that they're aware of?

Taylor: Oh yes, they're aware of it.

Military Program

Chall: In terms of the community development--the kind of things you were interested in--what was going on, and how did you deal with it?

Taylor: There was some going on. I remember going to the American major general in command of our military mission. I asked him about "civic action," which is a form of community development. That is to say, it is action by the military with consciousness of the importance of building good work relationships with the people. The old idea of the military was that they should keep away from civilians. That is to say, you have your own world, civilians are all right and have theirs, but the military has no business building relations with civilians. But there's been a growing awareness on the part of our military that the relations between the military and the civilians can be very important, at least in the developing countries. So, I found that the major general and the staff officer I talked with knew about civic action. They knew that they had some responsibilities, and they were doing some things to make it effective.

For example, the military are apt to have at their command bulldozers and trucks. Well, instead of doing nothing with those when they weren't used for immediate military purposes, they would make them available to the civilian agencies for road building, opening up the countryside. But I found that among our own civilian American agencies, that the community development program was being faded out, rather than elaborated and given an infusion of new life.
Chall: Were FAO or any United Nations agency taking up the breach?

Taylor: Well, I went over on a UN mission to Iran later in the year.

Chall: Oh really?

Taylor: Yes, I was head of a small mission, four of us.

Chall: For the United Nations?

Taylor: Yes.

Chall: I see. So in the first trip then you were up in the Azerbaijan region primarily?

Taylor: Yes, and at Mashad and vicinity in the northeast.

I think I should say that while I found the American military interested in community development in the form of civic action, that our AID mission had a contracting rather than an expanding interest in community development. They were courteous to me, but the program was not expanding. But I think the cause of that goes back to our AID program in Washington, more than to the program in a particular country. I think the budgeters who allocated the funds at that time gave a low rating to community development.

I think Indira Gandhi and this UN study are reviving an appreciation of the importance of people's concern for the people. An administrative staff tends to seek a simpler solution at some vital point to which to apply resources. They overdo it, because in that oversimplified way it looks as though you can get growth readily. To a degree you can, but also it may widen the gap between the rich and the poor, make for instability, and then the chickens come home to roost.

Chall: So this was happening at the time that you were there?

Taylor: It was happening internally within our AID program. There is virtually no community development program in the AID at this time.

Chall: I think you discussed this as taking place in the other countries you visited—that it was gradually being phased out. Did you have the feeling, then, when you were in Iran in '63 that it was being phased out—even though you were sent there to look it over?
Taylor: Well, I didn't have the feeling that it was being given impetus.

Chall: Were the people in AID at the time sympathetic with your point of view; were you getting your points across?

Taylor: Well, I didn't have any feeling that I was being downgraded or that they weren't giving me every opportunity. I think they were interested in my report. We had about a two-hour seminar session to wind up my presence there, and to hear my recommendations.

Chall: You had been sent there by an AID--some of the staff from Washington--because they knew you were around the area?

Taylor: No, the mission in Iran paid for it.

Chall: Yes, but they knew that you were in the area.

Taylor: They knew I was in Egypt not very far away so it didn't cost the Iran mission very much. Probably they had to pay from Cairo to Iran and salary and expenses for the two weeks that I was in Iran.

In Iran you knew you were in a country with a cultural history from way back. And while there are poor people there, you didn't have the feeling that they were overwhelmed by poverty, as were the fellahin in Egypt. There you get the feeling of vast poverty. Of course one of the reasons is that the area under cultivation is so slender. Except in the Delta of the Nile, it may be only a mile or two, or three miles on either side of the river. Beyond that it's just dry desert. So the people are concentrated in that small area.

Problems of Community Development and Land Reform

Chall: What specifically was the first assignment in Tabriz?

Taylor: Well, my report is entitled "Village Human and Institutional Development, Land Reform and Rural Development."

Chall: Were they developing a new community there? Expanding an existing one?

Taylor: There was a recommendation in Iran that the government launch a
Taylor: national community development program through a revised administration in the Ministry of the Interior. That recommendation was made through C. David Anderson, who was a member of our faculty, very recently in our last program of community development training for foreign participants sent to this campus. He's now at the University of Missouri, in Columbia, but he comes here when we need him on special assignments.

In Iran I was invited to report formally to their Minister of Interior. The important question is the impact of the report, its educational effect, if any, on the people in the country in which you're working. After all, you come and you go. And if they don't do anything, then your report has value for you, yourself, but not for them. I have had a tremendous education personally from making these reports. That way I've been handsomely repaid. The question is, what do they do in the country visited beyond what they might have done had you not been there? You never know the full answer to this, but you are pretty sure that it's less than you wish. My first report to AID in Iran, I have been told later, came after an internal decision had been made in our mission or in Washington, that they were not going to push the program. So in a sense, I must have come as a postscript in terms of getting something done.

Chall: You mean Washington at that very time wasn't planning to push community development through AID any more?

Taylor: Right. So I was given every opportunity and ever courtesy, but the decision apparently had been made before I came that they were not going to push it.

Chall: Did you have contact with the members of the Iranian group so that they might carry it on without AID?

Taylor: Oh yes, and toward the end of my study, there was a meeting with the Minister of Interior and all of his staff and our AID community development counterparts. We sat around a big table and they listened to my recommendations and discussed them back and forth. I had no feeling at the time that AID was not going to do anything. David Anderson on the AID staff is a very live, very energetic, very effective person. But apparently it was his program that they were not going to push harder, which I think was unfortunate.

After all, I talked with a lot of people, and there may have been an effect at various levels, even though there wasn't a formal program. I talked with a good many persons in Iran, both
Taylor: American and Iranian. Among them a major general of the U.S. Army, a general of the Iranian army, and a major in the U.S. Army who was concerned specially with the civic action program. There were a number of both civilian and military people, and I suspect talking with them left traces. But you never know just how much.

Chall: What's the American military doing there? Is that a NATO post?

Taylor: I don't know if it's formally under NATO, but it's doubtless part of our general effort to have the military influences in foreign countries pretty much around the world.

I also talked with a series of people in the Iranian community development program, the director of agriculture, the chief of land reform, and three land reform people.

I went to Mashad. Mashad is in the eastern part of Iran, the territory from which Omar Khayam came. There is a beautiful monument to him there.

Chall: Were the people who were out in these areas--had they been farmers or some kind of land workers who were now being given an opportunity to develop land of their own?

Taylor: There was a limited land reform program. In one of the areas which I visited, there had been an uprising. I was told that the Shah was uncertain about what his attitude should be, but when he went to the village area that I visited, he decided land reform was a banner he should carry. So he promoted land reform. But on the discouraging side, I learned later that under one of the big dams, on an irrigation project which we financed, they decided not to put small farmers on the land, but to have large holdings instead. I think probably that decision was under U.S. influence, and in my judgment the decision was socially and politically undesirable under the prevailing circumstances in those countries.

In U.S. AID, you see, unfriendly influences have practically driven out community development, and while AID talks also about land reform, the Congress sees more clearly than the bureaucracy the advantages of both land reform and community development. The agriculture bureaucracy sees the technological side of increasing production, but I have never found much evidence that it appreciates the importance of keeping people on the land, and as owners of the land they till. On the contrary, they measure efficiency in another way, their argument being that fewer people are necessary to raise
Taylor: food, so fewer people on the land and more in the cities is an advantage.

I think they undervalue the character of a society that more people on the land would support. It's not a matter of just food. I don't mean that it would be desirable if 90 percent of our people were raising food on the land, which prevailed in early colonial days, but I think there's a balance in between. I think that our social unrests would be diminished and our social and political problems would be moderated if we took a few steps backward toward the land.

Chall: But in the developing countries there's no place for people in the cities. There's no industry to absorb them, so that moving people off the land has created a serious problem.

Taylor: Of course. Well, we've overdone it in this country. Our people are unemployed in the cities, and we're up against that problem of how to find them work if we can, and how to feed them if we can't.

Chall: Yes. At least we have the capital in this country to wrestle with the problem—to some extent. I think in Africa and Asia they don't have that.

Taylor: No.

Chall: Or Latin America.

Taylor: No, the level of living is extremely low. Their population problem is much more acute than ours. We may have a population problem here too, but it's not extreme in the sense that theirs is, where the average annual income per capita may be under a hundred dollars. Well, that's just barely, barely eating.

Chall: Yes. Did you tell me that you went back to Iran the same year?

Taylor: The same year of 1963 I went back to Iran for the United Nations.

Chall: What was the reason for a return visit so soon after the first in June-July?

Taylor: I went back in November. I was to report to the managing director of the special fund of the United Nations on land reform and development in Iran. I turned in my report in December.

Chall: I see, about a month again.
Taylor: Yes.

Chall: Were you studying a special section again; where were you located the second time?

Taylor: Well, the headquarters were of course in Teheran. Let me see, where did we go? Details of these things get a little blurred.

Chall: Yes, I'm sure. Well, perhaps we can leave the details out since they may be in your report.

Taylor: Yes, they're all here.

Chall: We can consider the difference between United Nations program and AID. Why, for example, after you'd just been in Iran and made a report on community development, did the United Nations want you to go back and consider it once again?

Taylor: That's a good question, because the subjects that I dealt with the second time were essentially the same as the first. The difference is the auspices, and whose pressure can be put behind the project. As I say, our AID didn't put much pressure behind it. The UN mission had more support from headquarters. I was the head of a small mission of four persons. One was a Englishman, one came from Honduras, of Rumanian origin, and one came from Taiwan. We were trying to infuse the country in which we were working with a sense of the importance of the problems, and to encourage it to do something about them.

In the one case, dealing with the officers of the home government, you're saying implicitly, "The United States is concerned about these things, and about helping you to realize the importance of certain problems." In the second case it's the United Nations.

Well, in neither case was any great program launched because of our studies. I don't say that the missions accomplished nothing, but unless you have the government or the UN strongly behind the program, it doesn't move much. It's just an accumulation of more knowledge and appreciation of the nature of the problem, and a clearer definition of it. You influence the thought of the concerned people in the country to which you go.

I don't say that our effort was wasted by any means, but if you look for a formal result each time, well, you don't always find it. You find, I think, usually improved relations. I think
Taylor: it is an educational experience not only for us who make the programs but also for the people in those countries, to have someone come from the outside and say, "What you're doing is important." Also to give those in the country visited an opportunity to ask questions and to receive suggestions as to how the local program can be improved.

I think there's a lot of good result to the local hierarchy from top down to the bottom. I'm quite sure that a man out in the provinces who is visited and asked to take around foreign visitors whether from U.S. AID or from the United Nations, has an increased appreciation of the problem he's trying to deal with on the ground. I'm quite sure that he gets ideas that he finds useful and puts into effect, even if there is no formal change in the program.

Chall: Even if the reports were very good--still the problem of making them practical lies within the political influences of the country itself, and I suppose there are factions there that would move against or for some of these ideas.

Taylor: That is true. There are landlords as well as potential acquirers of the land, sure.

Chall: And neither U.S. AID nor the UN can do anything about those political factors?

Taylor: Yes they can.

Chall: If they want to?

Taylor: Yes. In Vietnam I think we paid a very high price for not doing more in land reform.

Chall: Vietnam has been almost a province of ours over the years. What about Iran? How much affect can U.S. AID have, in a very independent country like Iran, on land reform?

Taylor: Well, if they thought it was politically advantageous to do it, and if the United States were behind it, they would do it--they would do something. When the United States says, "We'll build you a big irrigation project and you'll have big land operations instead of putting the people on in smaller holdings," they do it our way. Our way was not the way, I think, that was politically desirable in Iran. I was not on that project, but I'm speaking in principle. And I saw the projects where they had land reform by way of comparison.
Culture

Chall: Did you like Iran?

Taylor: Yes! It's a fascinating country. Iran is close to the center of the origins of civilization. People spread out from there all over the western world. The human race spread out from there. Today you can see the evidences of a finely developed culture at one and the same time you see a backward technology. Those beautiful--what is that beautiful work that we call--

Chall: The minatures?

Taylor: Yes.

Chall: The fine paintings.

Taylor: Yes, very fine, delicate painting. Well, they were doing that centuries ago in Tabriz. And you go to Persepolis, which the Shah refurbished to celebrate the twenty-five hundredth anniversary of the home of Darius and Xerxes. Well, when you go to a place like that out on the edge of a desert, it's tremendous to see--the beautiful stone carvings in that place. It was Alexander who came over from Greece and tore the palace down. The woman he was travelling with, I understand, gave him the idea that if he wanted to prove how great a person he was, he should tear down what the Persians had done, so he tore most of it down. But the foundations are left, and these are beautiful and enormously impressive. You can stroll about for two or three hours, and still be fascinated by everything you see. Fifteen miles away you go to a village, as we did, and the people are living in mud huts and weaving beautiful Persian rugs.

Chall: Is that right?

Taylor: Yes, I brought a small one home in my suitcase. You know how beautifully made they are. Well, another example of a fine, developed culture is centered around Isfahan. The handwork that comes out of Isfahan is perfectly beautiful. And yet, a lot of poverty is visible, too.

Chall: Probably only a few people are able to do this beautiful work.

Taylor: No, no!
Chall: They all do.

Taylor: The villagers—the children whose parents live in the mud huts and work the farm, they do it. No, the culture permeates the population.

Chall: I see. They work with fairly precious metals, don't they? Where do they get them?

Taylor: I don't know where they get the metals, but they've worked with copper and brass and silver, too. The women's necklaces are very lovely. Not done with the smooth finish, but with raw beauty—real beauty. Crudeness would be the wrong word because their handiwork is very beautiful.

We saw that in Egypt, too. We would go into an oasis there and came back with a few beautiful things—a silver breast plate, a necklace—out of this community that really didn't know it was in civilization until the Italians overran it in World War II. First came the Italians, and then the Germans, and after that the British drove both out of this Siwa oasis. And that's what really told the inhabitants that they were in the modern world beyond their borders. That was their introduction to the twentieth century—war.

Chall: I guess that takes care of Iran to the extent that we can take care of it here in our survey.

Taylor: Yes, the reports are here. I've given you a little perspective.

Chall: That's, I think, what we need.

Taylor: That would apply pretty much to all the reports, and to the educational influence of our missions on the personnel of the home government and to the influence (if any) on the U.S. government. As I told you earlier, our AID has squeezed out community development. Our technicians, including our economists developing the budget, in their concern for the gross national product gave a low rating to community development. The agricultural technicians ditto; community development was to them an intruder in their area of agricultural specialization.
Panama - 1968

Chall: You had a period when you didn't go anywhere, apparently. Then, in 1968 you went to Panama.

Taylor: Panama was my last foreign AID assignment. (In 1966 I went for three months to Colombia as member of our Higher Education team.)

Chall: What was going on in Panama, and who wanted you there, in 1968?

Taylor: [Laughing heartily] Well, I'll have to tell you about that.

Chall: That must be a good one.

Taylor: You asked the right question, "Who wanted me there?" I was met by the question from the Panamanians, "Why did I come down there and who did want me down there anyway."

Chall: Hadn't you met that question in Ecuador, also?

Taylor: Yes, in Ecuador I had a cool reception from the FAO. You see, within the United Nations there is the New York UN and there's the FAO in Rome, and the FAO is jealous of its prerogatives and its area of operations within the United Nations. Yes, I think I told you the story about that in Ecuador.

Chall: Yes. But in Panama it was even more of a question?

Taylor: Yes. We have a Canal Zone within the Republic of Panama. And some of our youthful Americans, by their violent tactics, incurred the wrath of Panamanians, and violent demonstrations against us followed. So one thing done by our government to help restore good feeling was to give them a chunk of money in the field of community development—to develop a program. To my surprise, when I got down there I found that I was financed out of that fund upon the order of the U.S. AID mission.

The Panamanians thought it was their fund, and they had other uses in mind for the money than to bring a consultant down there on community development. So the first meeting I had with them [laughter] I sat around the table with at least a dozen of them. One after another they indicated that there was nothing personal about this directed at me, except, what was I doing down there, and why had I come? My mission wasn't what they had at all in mind as something to meet their needs.
Chall: For goodness sake!

Taylor: [Laughter! I remember, in responding, I said to them "No somos enemigos--We're not enemies." I didn't send myself down, so I wasn't responsible for that, and couldn't we go on and work on the subject?

Well, I had uneven response. One person in particular was most vigorous in explaining that they had not asked me down there, and didn't want me down there. When I went in turn to interview him separately for an hour, I couldn't get him for most of that hour, to talk on the subject. He would talk about anything else. I kept saying to him, "Now can we get down to the subject of the report which I am asked to make, and discuss your views on it?" Well, I got a little bit out of him, just a little bit. He was a capable fellow, but resistant to me--resistant right to the end.

Well, eventually I presented my final report. To their surprise, I gave it in Spanish, and I'm sure they appreciated that, although they're bilingual. Then what pleased me most, was that no sooner was I through and the meeting ended, he took me into the coffee shop next door, sat next to me, and was as nice to me as he could be. So, on the diplomatic side of it, I think I healed the breach.

Chall: Were you there alone? You were the only member of U.S. AID to go down on this particular mission?

Taylor: Yes. Another consultant had been brought down, but I was the only one on this specific mission. I went down as a consultant to the Office of Urban Community Development of the Republic of Panama to make an evaluation of the urban community development of Panama. I was selected by James W. Green, whom I had known in Pakistan and the Philippines in 1955 and 1958.

Chall: How many errors like that come about, where the American government sends a man down to a foreign...

Taylor: Well, I didn't know what I was getting into. I thought I was perfectly welcome. But there was a hitch somewhere; someone had not obtained their consent, and apparently just decided to do it on their own in Washington. So, I caught the brunt of it, but things worked out all right.

Chall: Did you wire back a report to AID when you got down there that there was a certain amount of hostility?
Taylor: Well, I was in touch with the AID community development official in Panama, whom I had worked with in Pakistan and in the Philippines in 1955. In fact, they always sent along with me a man on the local AID staff.

Chall: I see.

Taylor: They had a very, very good man who went to the meetings with me. AID wanted to keep in touch both with the Panamanians and with what I was doing—not in the sense of any oversight of what I was doing. I never felt any pressures from AID. When they asked to see a draft of my report and I told them what I was doing, one or two people on AID wanted me to change certain things, to which I responded, "Remember, I am not reporting to AID. I am reporting to the Panamanian office on community development." Well, that answer was all right. So, my mission had its diplomatic aspects, you see.

I searched the history of their program, including the predecessors of the present office of urban community development. I found statements that were fully in accord with the spirit of community development. Then, in effect, I said, "This is your own program. This is what you said you wanted to do; this is what you're trying to do now. And I think these are lines along which you can improve your program and get the most results." I recommended enlargement of their program, and so on.

Chall: But you based it on their own plans previously made.

Taylor: Yes, you can almost always find someone around who has foreseen the advisability of doing something of this nature. Certainly, instead of saying, "Well, why haven't you been doing something?" my intent was always to find out what they had been doing, that I could build on, and say, "This is what you started, fine. Keep going. Enlarge it. Here are suggestions of what you can do."

Chall: You think they had something going that was workable? Was this a plan that was going to be developed because they had some money?

Taylor: Here was the trouble, and it goes back to AID. As I told you, it cost a chunk of money after this violence in Panama. Well, we waited until it's too late, like in Vietnam with our land reform program, too little and too late. So, in setting up the program, they assembled a group of Panamanian officials who didn't know what community development was, who didn't know what to do, what had to
Taylor: be told by our staff members what they ought to be doing next. Our people had to play altogether too big a role in the formation of the office that was going to spend the money and carry on the work. So, you see, the Panamanians had reasons for feeling it wasn't really their own program; rather, it was our program, so everything that went wrong with it, of course, was our fault, including bringing me down there. But diplomatically we finally got over that hurdle.

Chall: Have any of the Panamanians come up here to your school?

Taylor: No, I've never met any of the Panamanians again. AID hasn't sent them.

Chall: So that was Panama. You were down there about a month?

Taylor: I was down there six weeks. It was as interesting as could be. Well, all of my programs as consultant have been interesting. I've come to wonder if there's any part of the world that I wouldn't find interesting. I'm sure there are parts of the world that I like better than others. But I've never been anywhere yet that I didn't find interesting, maybe because there are always people in the different types of societies.
XIV COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
(Interview 16, April 28, 1972)

Faculty Committee on Community Development

Chall: What about the Faculty Committee on Community Development which you have been working with, I think.

Taylor: Yes, I'm working with it right now on an evaluation.

Chall: What is it supposed to achieve?

Taylor: Well, that is an outgrowth of the original 1955 travels to India, Pakistan and the Philippines, which established my relations with George Foster, and our relations with Louis Miniclier, the Washington head of community development who sent us. We saw him from time to time because he had California roots, and came out here occasionally.

When I became chairman of the Institute of International Studies, one of my undertakings was to prepare a program so that we could invite foreigners here for training in community development. We had a nucleus, you see, of people who had been abroad. George Foster in anthropology, public health people, some in other departments, and others who were interested in having foreign experience. So we gathered them together to set up a program.

I think by 1959 or 1960 we received our first contingent of trainees. We had the only inter-disciplinary training program. We've had them almost annually, right down to the present time. The last ones left us in January of this year [1972]. Now, we're engaged in evaluating our program, and I'm sure, looking to the future, hoping more trainees will be sent to us. We brought together faculty people from agriculture, public health, public administration, political science, education, anthropology,
Taylor: economics, social welfare, sociology, engineering, and maybe some others.

The Curriculum and the Students

Chall: What kind of training, then do these people get? Are they given a broad training or a specialized training depending upon their interests?

Taylor: They're given a training, not through a single professor present daily throughout the course--although one person is responsible throughout--but from a succession of presentations of ten or a dozen facets of community development, covering the kinds of problems it faces, its objectives, the ways of doing it that have been found workable in one or another country. And, of course, the trainees, coming from different countries, teach each other.

Chall: Have they had experience themselves? Are they young or old?

Taylor: They vary in age, experience, rank within their own services. We are discussing right now whether we would like to have them all about the same age, and from the same or adjacent countries, or whether we prefer diversity. Those are debatable questions; there's something to be said for both views. I like to have people from a variety of countries; there's a lot they teach each other. When out of class they talk over their own problems and learn from each other, which is a perfectly good way of learning.

The program also has had the advantage that it has stimulated our own University faculty to get experience abroad. A lot of our people have worked in other foreign countries, who had not done so before. Louis Minicier of AID, facilitated that. It's given us a body of professors qualified for the job and interested in doing it.

Chall: These people are devoted to the ideals of community development?

Taylor: Yes, not in a doctrinaire sense, but in general harmony, each emphasizing his own special interests.

Chall: How many students are there each year?

Taylor: Usually about fifteen in each class. We'd like to have about
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Last month a new group of twenty adult students from far-flung corners of the world were enrolled at Berkeley in an international educational program that is exceptional on the campuses of American universities. Now in its second consecutive year, the Special Program in The Principles and Practices of Community Development is an experiment in international cooperation for the encouragement of democratic action at the local level in newly developing countries.

The students are all officials charged with responsibility in community development programs, mainly in outlying and rural areas. Perhaps typical is Mary Alice Hopkirk, who works for the New Zealand government as Women's Interest Officer in the Cook Islands, 1700 miles from the mainland. In her work of raising living standards through vocational training and cooperation with other welfare officials, Miss Hopkirk makes her island rounds over 265,000 square miles of sea area by means of unscheduled private boats.
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The other 19 students are drawn from 13 countries: Afghanistan, Brazil, British Guiana, Cambodia, Haiti, Jamaica, Jordan, Korea, Libya, Nepal, Pakistan, Thailand, and the United States (the two Americans enrolled are community development advisors serving in Korea and Iran). All but two are sponsored by the International Cooperation Administration of the U.S. government, which finances the study program.

The students undertake a broad but integrated course of interdisciplinary studies under the guidance of a volunteer group of University faculty members who have been responsible for the development of the program. The faculty group, under the chairmanship of Paul S. Taylor, professor of economics and chairman of the Institute of International Studies, includes members of twelve departments of the University: Anthropology, Agriculture, Agricultural Extension, Business Administration, City and Regional Planning, Economics, Education, Political Science, Psychology, Public Health, Sociology, and Social Welfare.

THE HUMAN SIDE

The purpose of the studies is to provide the officials with a comprehensive grasp of the human side of community development problems. Fear and distrust are frequently the initial reactions of local populations to efforts at community development in areas where the government has hitherto been a remote and forbidding entity. In addition to possessing technical knowledge, the community development officials must be experts in the skills of motivating people to voluntarily participate in self-help activities in cooperation with government technicians. The great value of community development approached in this way, according to program coordinator Dr. Jack Mediorow, is that "it helps people acquire the attitudes and skills necessary to establish democratic traditions on a grass-roots level."

In addition to classroom study, the group will make a number of field trips to observe voluntary community development and self-help projects in operation.

CROSS-DISCIPLINARY

The Special Program in The Principles and Practices of Community Development is presented by the Institute of International Studies in cooperation with University Extension. Its creation by the broadly cross-disciplinary group of volunteer faculty members reflects a shared sense of humanitarian obligation as a concomitant of the scholar's acquisition of learning. Furthermore, according to chairman Taylor, the experience gained by the teachers in the program significantly advances their own knowledge of the problems and characteristics of communities in the less-developed countries. "If the program is successful, we learn quite as much from the students as they learn from us," he says.

SERVED ABROAD

Several of the teachers on the volunteer committee have served as consultants or technical assistants abroad. Chairman Taylor has served on many occasions as a consultant for the International Cooperation Administration, the Export-Import Bank and the United Nations on community development programs.

Besides developing the Special Program described here, the committee has presented other programs and courses for foreign and American community development students since 1959 and has stimulated academic interest in curriculum planning which will prepare American students for assisting in this nation's continually widening participation in community development programs abroad.
Taylor: twenty; it gives us a little more revenue to enrich our program. We invite speakers from outside the University. We take them out on field trips. We want them to see American conditions as we see their conditions in their countries when we go there. We like many of them to have perhaps a weekend at the residence of some farm family so that they'll have one or more nights in an American home. We take them down the San Joaquin Valley so that they see both the large-scale agriculture of the west side and the smaller family farms of the east side.

Chall: Are the conditions in this country such that they can be translated and transferred to some of the countries that these people come from, that are developing?

Taylor: The conditions, in general, are quite different, but seeing those differences at first hand can be very advantageous to them. They can see, I'm quite sure, some conditions that they do not want to repeat in their own countries. I think perhaps they can see the importance of land reform in their own countries more sharply when they see the extremes in this country. They can see what a family-operated farm can be under favorable conditions, and that is more within reach of the people in those countries at the present time.

And it establishes a better relationship between them and ourselves, I think, because unfortunately we may give the impression abroad that we have no problems, that we've solved everything in our own country. I think it puts us on a level with them in the sense that we recognize that we all have our problems and we're all working on them.

Chall: And then they see urban slum conditions and things of this kind?

Taylor: Oh, yes. We take them to depressed areas, and bring to them speakers from such areas.

Chall: What countries are represented in this group of fifteen?

Taylor: Well, it varies from year to year. We've had most Asians, quite a few Latin Americans, fewer Africans.

Chall: Who pays?

Taylor: AID pays.

Chall: Are there any strictures put on what you do, what you teach, whom you'll accept?
Taylor: We accept who comes in. No, they don't put any restrictions on us.

Chall: Who chooses who comes in?

Taylor: The missions in the various countries. They decide whom they want to send here, so they can have many reasons for their selections. But it has raised no problems that I know of. There are problems when in the same class there are people of both very low and very high rankings from one country. If the gulf is too great it makes something of a problem.

What we like, generally speaking, is to have people of experience in their own country, while they're still young, and before they've come into positions of real power and high responsibility. We want to catch them just before they arrive at top positions in their own countries.

Evaluating the Experience

Chall: In your evaluation, have you been checking to find out what becomes of these people after they leave?

Taylor: We're doing that right now. We're sending out letters, and I'm sure we're going to recommend that some of our faculty people here be given assistance to travel to the countries to find out what our participants feel they got from our program after they're back on the job. We want to know whether they say, "That Berkeley experience is a closed chapter," or whether they say, "That opened up doors to us, and we were able to see new things we could do here, things we hadn't seen so clearly in our own country before."

Chall: You haven't been following the graduates of the program here through the years. You really don't know for sure?

Taylor: We've had no means of direct follow up. We've sought it, but were never given it.

Chall: I see. Well, it will be interesting to find out. Some people think that nationals are better taught in their own countries these aspects of community development--where they are brought to see the problems within the context of their own cultures.
Taylor: Well, I don't feel it's either or. I feel it's both. We should have on our missions people who can teach there. After all, on my own consulting trips, in our limited way, and with limited time, we did that. That is, when I travelled I always had contact with nationals of the country where I was making studies. When I had a chance to talk to them about it--sometimes with persons fairly high in the government--I had good, frank talks with them. My observation was not that we had obstacles in the effort to speak with them, but rather that there wasn't enough follow up from our own AID. It varied from country to country.

Chall: You don't think that we tend to train these people out of their own cultures?

Taylor: We can't do it?

Chall: Can't do it?

Taylor: No. That can be done--if I grasp your point--I would say that the British occupation of India may have had that effect; whether it was intended or not I don't know. But, to a large extent, I've observed a gulf develop between the academically educated Indian and their own countrymen--a larger gulf in outlook than between ourselves and the Indian peasants when we had contact with them. As an example, I now recall off-hand that the Indian community development workers were reluctant in personally showing villagers agricultural techniques, reluctant to pick up a shovel. They told the other fellow to use the shovel, because it wasn't fitting for themselves to do it. That would not be characteristic of any American agricultural technician that I know.

Not that I grabbed shovels, but I wanted to talk with the man right out in the field, right in the village, right at the bottom, as nearly as I could. That wasn't always easy to arrange. The bureaucracy was such that when you go to study the people, you've really accomplished a lot when you manage to get out of the capital city and into the smaller communities and actually talk with a peasant. But when you do it it's very rewarding if you do your part. If you ask them the straight questions, you'll get the straight answers.

Chall: Is this a comment, then, on the fact that the bureaucracy doesn't like to leave its office. How well then can they deal with the problems in these areas?

Taylor: Well, that is a problem. Bureaucracy has an awful lot to do in the offices, and it's so easy to fill your time with that. I
Taylor: wouldn't say that is universal. I knew personally members of
the bureaucracy who really got out into the field very, very
well, especially those in community development. They would
really go out.

Chall: So then it was a question of the emphasis of the program and
the personnel who were hired, whether it was done or not.

Taylor: That's right. I never felt that I knew a country until I'd been
way out in the country, and talked with somebody I met along the
roadside or in a little village. Then you knew who they were.

Chall: And somehow you always managed to do it with a little push and
pressure?

Taylor: Yes, you could generally do it if you would. I never had any
obstacles imposed on me except one as I told you in Vietnam in
'58.

Chall: In trying to put together this Faculty Committee for Community
Development and the course structure, did you meet any
resistance among your colleagues here or in Washington with
respect to this kind of a project?

Taylor: As long as Louis Miniclier was in AID we had cordial cooperation
from Washington. I had fine cooperation from my colleagues
many of whom wanted to participate. And the group that is doing
it up to now is composed largely, not entirely--but largely of
people who were doing it from the beginning in 1959 or 1960.
The decline of interest was on the part of my successors at the
Institute of International Studies. They gave it lip service.
They were interested in their own researches and writings rather
than in an enterprise of this kind. But the professors who were
involved from the start saw to it that the community development
program was kept going one way or another. It's not attached to
the institute anymore, but is administered through University
Extension.
Institute of International Studies

Chall: Oh, I see. What's the Institute of International Studies and how did you get involved with it?

Taylor: The Institute of International Studies was founded in 1955 by Chancellor Clark Kerr, my student. The first chairman was Covey Oliver, a professor in the U.C. Law School, who left here at the end of the year to join the University of Pennsylvania Law School. I saw him next when I went to Colombia in 1966 where he was U.S. ambassador. He was a Texan.

When Oliver left Berkeley, Chancellor Kerr asked me to switch from chairman of economics to chairman of the Institute of International Studies. I was very glad to accept.

Chall: What did it mean to be chairman of this group?

Taylor: Well, here was formation of a new group to encourage faculty interest in international studies. Also to assist in raising outside funds to facilitate the research work, and to distribute those funds among persons who would do the research work. In developing the centers, they would focus upon various areas, like Latin America, Southeast Asia, Africa, or whatever.

In the traditional ways of doing things, our faculty members hadn't expected to do any work that would require a lot of unavailable funds. We, through funds of the institute, could hold out the carrot, inviting more research. "You want to do something? Well, perhaps we could facilitate your work. In some cases, with a sabbatical, we can pay the costs of your travels abroad." So one way or another we enlivened the activities of our colleagues in international studies.

Obtaining the First Funds

Chall: You would certainly feel the importance of that.

Taylor: Yes, we got results. Our biggest single grant at first was from the Ford Foundation. They gave us a sizable grant. Tom Blaisdell had been head of the Bureau of International Affairs or whatever it was called, and so he and I worked together enlarging the
Taylor: possibilities of doing work in international studies. We went to the Ford Foundation. It was intimated that we could have funds. We had minor hitches on that. Somewhere--the letters on that are in my files.

We found it most useful to find out what was in the back of their minds so that we could present something that fitted their general intentions and conceptions. I suppose part of the reason was that they had boards of directors, and their staffs knew the minds of the boards of directors and what they would be likely to support. So we reasoned that if we could present a plan that would fit what their staffs and their boards would support, then we might get the money. There wasn't enough difference of opinion between us so that I do not think that it injured the quality of any of our work. I'm just describing the process. We thought that our job was to give them proposals that they thought they could put through the board.

Chall: I think times haven't changed any. [Laughter]

Taylor: [Laughter] You've heard this before.

Chall: How long were you head of the institute?

Taylor: From '56 to '62, when I retired. Those were happy years.

Chall: You were helping to shape something that you felt was important?

Taylor: Yes, my years of chairmanship of economics were, as I told you, not happy years.

Chall: Were these happy years because you were doing something that you felt was important, and also because you were working with people who had a sense of community development?

Taylor: Yes. I felt that there was result from my efforts. I brought those programs in community development into being. As I told you, my successors were uninterested in them. They had interest of their own.

Chall: I see. But you had brought it enough into being so that it could be carried on.

Taylor: It's still going on, right up to 1972.

Chall: Just had to put it someplace else.
Taylor: Yes.

Chall: Were you responsible for putting it into extension?

Taylor: No, that was done after I had left. Of course, extension really handles only the administrative paperwork—the dispensing of the salaries, etc.

Dispensing Grants

Chall: What else did you do in the Institute of International Studies when you were chairman? One was getting major grants from the Ford Foundation, and starting the community development project. Anything else?

Taylor: The dispensing of research grants among colleagues.

Chall: That must be a chore. How do you go about making decisions?

Taylor: Through sending bulletins around inviting applications. I suppose that the applicants had the problem of figuring out what we were likely to give the money for. But I assure you that we allowed a good deal of latitude. We did have to exercise judgment, which meant that we didn't give grants equally to everybody. The growth of interest on the faculty, and their participation in work in international studies was something for which the institute was responsible in no small measure.

Chall: Were you satisfied with the results of the grants that you dispensed; the studies that went on?

Taylor: Yes, on the whole we were very well pleased. One is very unequally pleased, because faculty members produce research results very unequally.

Chall: Do institutes like this evaluate the results of a grant?

Taylor: They evaluate in this way: if the same person comes back for another grant, then you wonder what he did with what he had been granted before. It's somewhat like the Guggenheim Foundation. Once the grant is made, that's the end of it. They welcome it if you send them your published work; they're very pleased, but they never ask you what you did, never. They know that a percentage
Taylor: of their grants will be unproductive. They try to keep it to a minimum, and their record, incidentally, is one of the best foundation records in the country.

Chall: They screen, carefully, at first. Is that it?

Taylor: I think they screen pretty carefully.

Chall: How careful is the IIS screening done, or how carefully was it done when you were on that end of it?

Taylor: Well, we couldn't screen it as to personalities quite so carefully as an off-campus foundation. We were charged with stimulation of research on campus. We could screen it as to the relevance of studies to the increase of international understanding. That is to say, we were not receptive to an engineer's desire to make technological studies. We could define our field, as to relevance of the subject. But if a person was in a department position, it was not easy to refuse him because we thought him a weak scholar.

It might affect the amount we would grant to a colleague, but I think we made some grants on little more than the fact that the subject was international, and the applicant a tenured person. We thought hopefully that he'll be better for the grant than without it. But if he didn't produce, he didn't get a second grant, and there were some like that.

Also, the results were very scattered, because the faculty interests are scattered. The institute didn't have a record as a series of institute publications. But that's probably all right. I think the same generalization applies to the Berkeley Research Committee, which finances the most widely different sort of studies that you can imagine. I get support from the Research Committee to this day. They've been very good to me. The subject of my work has minimum relation, I'm sure, to a lot of work financed by their other grants.

Chall: Would the objective always be a published paper, or could it just be an enhancing of teaching?

Taylor: Well, my recollection is that we didn't draw a sharp line between the two, but we did look for publication which I think is a good thing, because publication requires focusing of attention on results from the research.

Chall: And the grants would cover what--a year, six months?
Taylor: They were usually made annually, but a person with a half-sabbatical would probably have a grant geared to a half-year.

Chall: And usually abroad?

Taylor: Usually abroad because of its international aspect.

Chall: Well, I think we've...

Taylor: We've exhausted that field?

Chall: Probably we haven't really. [Laughter]

Taylor: If you want to know more about the institute, you'll get it from Cleo Stoker. She's over on Channing and Bowditch.

Chall: I really wanted your impressions of it.

Taylor: She'd give you hers, and they'd probably be pretty worthwhile.
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Conference on Mexican Immigration

Chall: Who sponsored your recent trip to Texas to talk on Mexican immigration? [April, 1972]

Taylor: That was sponsored by Professor Arthur F. Corwin of the Department of History of the University of Connecticut, who has a grant from the National Humanities Foundation to study Mexican immigration to the United States. In the course of his studies in Mexico he ran across my work through Mexican officials who knew it. A session with some of his colleagues presenting papers on one aspect or another of the Mexican migration was planned to be held at the meetings of the Southwest Social Science Association held in San Antonio.

Corwin asked me to come. I participated in the program session along with his colleagues who were reporting on their current work, where I presented orally my perspectives on the migration. I spent the time out of session talking with one or another of those persons currently studying the migration, about the work that they have undertaken, throwing what light I could from my own past experience. Their problem was very largely the difficulty of getting documentation on the historical aspects of the migration. Of course, what now is the historical period is what I was working on contemporaneously in the late 1920s and early thirties.
Chall: So yours is the only material that deals with migration at that time?

Taylor: Not the only, but in intensivity and the extent of the coverage, it was the principal study now available. A contemporary study also was made in the United States for about a year by Manuel Gamio, a truly distinguished Mexican anthropologist. His studies are in two volumes published by the University of Chicago Press. One of them has just been republished. I was asked to write an introduction to the new edition, which I did. So, as they say, "everything comes to him who only stands and waits."

Chall: What do you think of the studies that are being done now?

Taylor: They will be competent studies. One of the things in which they expressed an interest was my unpublished field notes. Those will go into The Bancroft Library. Corwin said that he would like to print those raw field notes now if he can find a publisher.* Corwin thinks those notes tell so much that the present historians would like to know and about which they are having difficulty finding relevant documentation. I travelled by auto throughout the southwest, and I talked to all kinds of people—labor contractors, employers, farmers, Mexican officials, Mexican immigrants, U.S. officials, educators, social workers, clergy, et al. The notes provide a contemporary record of what they said and what they gave me of what was historical background at that time. So it's just what they want. The unpublished notes show a difference over the years in interest in what is worth printing. We shall see. I printed intensive studies, but left a lot of what I learned, unpublished.

Chall: I guess that's why you don't throw anything away. [Laughter]

Taylor: [Laughter] Because someone will come along, you mean, who will see it differently than now. Yes. I think I told you that one of my colleagues on the U.C. editorial committee commented on one of my studies, "He talks to the Mexican laborers out in the field, then he wants us to put what they say in print, when he should have documentation of his research." To this I responded, "Well, when I get what they say in print it will be documentation."

*The field notes were edited and arranged by Dr. Abraham Hoffman through a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities in 1974.
Chall: You must feel quite gratified.

Taylor: Yes, it's rewarding to find present interest in work done so long ago, of course. Also I made contemporary documentation, with which you're familiar, during the thirties when Dorothea and I travelled through the country at a time when farmers and share-croppers were being rapidly displaced. Well, I tried to provide close to the ground views of what was happening that somebody, sometime, might find useful.

Interview With Fortune Magazine on California Agriculture

Chall: Did you have your interview with the reporter from Fortune magazine last week?*

Taylor: Yes, I did.

Chall: How did that go?

Taylor: I don't really know. He listened attentively. I had an impression of less sympathy with my viewpoint than I had with the CBS man who called me by telephone from New York.

Chall: For what reason?

Taylor: Well, CBS is considering a program on "60-Minutes," and so he called me to get some background judgment on it. He spoke as though they might have a program on it in September. He was very, very quick. Very smart. Very intelligent. Very responsive.

Chall: Does that indicate that one has done more homework than the other or that they have different points of view to start with?

Taylor: I think the latter. Fortune apparently has decided to deal with corporate agriculture in California, not elsewhere. They are apparently separating it from the invasion of agriculture by corporations in the Middle West. This I regret. So those are the straws in the wind that suggest to me that the Fortune articles may not be as effective in presenting the issues as I think they should be, with a broad public point of view.

*This segment was taped on April 28, 1972.
Taylor: They grab onto the fact that Cesar Chavez's union is a balance, shall we say, to my side or the public's side. Yet Cesar Chavez finds it easier to get contracts with corporate farmers than with family farmers. That apparently is not offset by any consideration of the fact that the corporate farmers are anything but sympathetic to unionization and impede it in every way they can. The fact that some labor concessions can be wrung out of corporate farms is likely to be emphasized.

Chall: I see. I know that this was an argument that was used in the Stevenson hearings, too. [Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor]

Taylor: Correct. But, as I say, that does not mean that large corporations in agriculture are friendly to unionization of field labor. Acceptance of corporate farming tends to overlook the subsidy issue entirely; it leaves out also the demise of access to the land entirely.

I didn't have the impression that the Fortune man was particularly responsive to my description of what happens to a rural community based on large-scale agriculture, as shown by the now famous Arvin-Dinuba study of the forties. Arvin and Dinuba are just two examples. There are lots of other examples. Just go down to Imperial Valley, and you see the imprint of corporate farming all over the place.

Chall: Do you get around to looking at these things in the field anymore? Do you go down to Imperial Valley or the west side of the Valley, as you used to?

Taylor: Well, not as much as I used to do. I think it's a year or a year and a half since I've been down to the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. I haven't been to Imperial Valley* for considerably longer.

Chall: When is this Fortune article due to come out? Is there a deadline on it?

Taylor: Not to my knowledge.

Chall: Well, it will be interesting to see how they handle it; but they're trying to get both sides, obviously.

Taylor: Fortune has a fairly good record; when it handles a subject it usually does it pretty well. You don't feel that you have just a loaded treatment.

Chall: Have they done much with this subject before, in the recent past that you can remember?

Taylor: The last article that I recall on this subject was at the time of the La Follette hearings. There may have been others since, but that's the one that jogs my memory at the moment.

Chall: I see. That was a long time ago.

Taylor: Yes, but the subject was the same and the article was pretty good.

Interest by Young People in Land Use

Taylor: Recently young people call me on the telephone all the time.

Chall: And they're asking the same questions?

Taylor: Yes. But there were all the many years when they didn't call me on the telephone.

Chall: Is it a new development that the younger people are asking questions which were being asked by professionals at one time?

Taylor: Well, that certainly is part of it. It isn't all of it. The question is still raised by one old timer, Dr. Ben Yellen down in Imperial Valley. He has taken the issue to court. The youth is nibbling at the land question, but hasn't really grabbed onto it yet.

Chall: But if they're grabbing on at all, it's probably the first time they've done it, isn't it?
Taylor: That's right. A young woman from the law school came to see me recently. When I asked her if she had heard of the $1,750 billion bond issue for a state water project, she said, no, she hadn't heard of it. That bond issue was voted on in 1960, twelve years ago. She was probably twelve years old then.

Chall: That's interesting isn't it?

Taylor: Yes.

The Latest Word on Tulare Lake

[Phone interruption--Another call about the Kleindienst plan to appeal the Tulare Lake decision.]

Chall: And Kleindienst is actually going to...

Taylor: He's done it, he's appealed! We got to them! [May 12, 1972]

Chall: Official. Is he上诉ing both cases?

Taylor: No, no.

Chall: Just Tulare Lake?

Taylor: Yes. The attacks we have been making on the Justice Department for not appealing its own Imperial Valley case were unsuccessful. But the fact that Kleindienst's appointment as attorney general has not yet been approved by the Senate creates a point of vulnerability. Congressional protest over refusal to appeal the Tulare Lake case might block confirmation of his appointment. Yes, law gets caught in the winds of politics.

Chall: So how long does it take when a case like this is started until it gets into court again?

Taylor: Well, it will be up probably in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco. This action by Kleindienst puts it there.

Chall: This is apparently official. These calls indicate...

Taylor: Yes, this is corroborating. The first was the report from the
Taylor: Fresno Bee reporter who said that they had word that he was going to appeal. Now the report from Washington confirming that Kleindienst has done it.

Chall: Well, that should make your day. [Laughter]

Taylor: [Laughter] Well, it makes it a different day, all right.

Chall: I should say.

Taylor: It's like that to work on so controversial a subject. You never know what the result is going to be of what you do. But you always have a chance that your efforts will add up. I have worked on this water issue from the late forties--worked hard!

Chall: And now are you assisting in supplying new information for the attorneys?

Taylor: Not for the attorney now, although the Justice Department Land Division attorney, David R. Warner, called at my home when he was waiting for the Tulare Lake decision. He brought two of his young men to my home, and stayed for a couple of hours. What I've been doing right now is feeding them the information on the basis of which they could bring the pressure to appeal. I put his finger on the very good Kings River opinion of former Attorney General William Rogers, a Republican, now Secretary of State, who took my side. In other words they knew that now we could say, "How come?" As an attorney general designate, Mr. Kleindienst, how come that you're turning your back on Republican Attorney General William P. Rogers? Rogers' opinion of years ago is exactly our opinion today.

Chall: The Harrison article that was in today's Chronicle [May 12, 1972] was just a fragment you say?

Taylor: Yes, that's what he told me--that AP put out a big story on it, of which we got only a fragment.

Chall: Where do these big stories end up? In the New York Times or the Los Angeles Times?

Taylor: Yes, it's what they furnish to all of their customers all over the country.

Chall: And they can pick out what they want?
Taylor: Yes. You see, in Washington, they saw the story that was sent out by Associated Press and it's a big story, but people in California will get only a tiny bit.

The Role of the Professional Social Scientist in Politics

Chall: I wanted to take a little time to sum up in a general way some of what we've been spending so many months talking about. In 1947 you wrote a little article in the Journal of Social Issues [Fall, 1947] on "The Relation of Research to Legislative and Administrative Decisions." You were apparently going to bring together the meanings of the number of articles that had been written on that subject. There were a couple of things that you said then that I'm just interested in knowing--

Taylor: --if I still believe what I wrote then?

Chall: Yes, or would speak or write in the same way. You wrote that, "One may build from facts to principles, but the attempt to reason first from the principle to the facts is likely to prove ineffective in producing action."

Taylor: May I see that?

Chall: Yes, page fifty-two [hands Professor Taylor the article].

Taylor: Yes, it's facts that have weight rather than principles. Yes, I will stand behind what I wrote.

Chall: That doesn't mean you don't...

Taylor: You don't fail to relate them to principles, but it's the facts that carry the weight.

Chall: This is something that you've continued to find the rule?

Taylor: Yes, this was written in 1947. Yes, I would continue to hold the same view. I'm glad you picked this article up, because I wrote it out of real experience. It's a gut reaction.

Chall: That's what I thought.

Taylor: I got the migrant labor camp program started by bringing the facts to the decision makers, visually as well as in text--making those
Taylor: reports of my text and Dorothea's photographs. There they were showing field conditions, and they couldn't dodge them. What were they going to do about it? It's not enough to say, "There are an awful lot of people out there in the greatest distress. They really need some help. They ought to have a place where they can at least wash up, and where their kids can have some kind of stability and care." But if you amass the facts--words, numbers, maps, graphs, photographs--then they're uncomfortable if they don't do something about it.

Chall: And then apparently you follow it with a certain amount of pressure.

Taylor: That's the basis of your pressure. Yes, if you want to get something done, the best way is for somebody to say something to somebody else at the right time and place. Present them with the facts and make a personal contact. Most people just say, "Oh, my," and wring their hands. "Why isn't something done?" But things happen because somebody does something. And those somebodys, if they know what to do and when to do it--those somebodys can be the kind of people that often are considered nobodys. Most people haven't the faintest appreciation of the potential power they have if only they would use it. Yes, I'm glad you picked this up because I really wrote it out of experience.

Chall: The last paragraph, on page fifty-five which goes up to page fifty-six, I think tells again just what you now told me, which is that you still believe that is the effective approach.

Taylor: Yes. [Reading] "The profession of social scientists can contribute much to make political decision intelligent, and its potential power is very great. If that power is ever to be exerted fully, the profession will have to come closer to grips with the processes of decision, in order to understand the rules of that game, and to know the obstacles to acceptance of its professional services. Its members will have to find the many ways, informal as well as formal, personal as well as official, by which our capacities to gather facts, analyze and interpret them, can be used to clarify issues and to raise intelligent alternative courses of action to the level of practical politics in those arenas where decisions are made."

I can put what I just read to you alongside the telephone message that came in just a few minutes ago. The fellow that called me--Dave Weiman--he isn't a college graduate, but he knew what to do to get action. He called me to get the facts which he
Taylor: needed for his presentation of the subject, then telephoned them to Washington. The facts were effective, and we got our decision.

Now most of our professional social scientists don't do that. They'll talk about the situation without going to the decision-making process. They will accept the decisions of those who make the decisions. They accept them without trying to influence them. But if you want to change the decisions, you've got to do something.

Chall: Yes, knock on doors and walk the streets.

Taylor: That's right! You don't have to break the windows. That, I think--I won't say it never has an effect. In Panama it was their violence against the U.S. that got me invited to come down there. But violence is the poorest way of operating, and is generally reprehensible. I don't say that it never gets results, but I do not recommend it at all. If you use your other powers, you won't have to use violence. For example, we've just got the Nixon administration--Nixon has been on record against acreage limitation from at least 1949--just today we've got them to appeal that Tulare Lake case because we kept after them. The ammunition we had--they had an idea of what it is. Kleindienst is not yet confirmed by Congress and could be questioned why he did not appeal. Also the presidential political campaign is ahead with people like Harris, McGovern, et al, looking for vulnerable points in the Nixon administration. So we got them to do what I'm sure at the very top they did not want to do. Yes. I'm glad you picked that article up.

That's what I believe, and I think I've got experience supporting it. Acting on this belief, I have been able to learn more about how my society really operates than from almost anything else that I have ever done.

Paul Taylor Assesses His Role in Keeping the Water Issue Alive

Chall: From time to time, as we've been leaving the office, you'd say, "I wish I knew then what I know now." I wondered what you had in mind?

Taylor: Well, my first response to that is that I could have been much more efficient and have had more effect than actually I have had.

Chall: By doing what?
Taylor: I would have had at my elbow facts which I got later but didn't have for use at the time.

Chall: Were they available?

Taylor: Sure. But I didn't have them, and the understanding they would have brought me. Life is an unfolding situation, so that the resources upon which you can draw grow with experience. Sometimes it is difficult to keep up with the resources from day to day; sometimes they are not created at the time when they could be most useful. But with hindsight you can be more effective but you may be too late.

For example, in answering this telephone call that came this morning, I was able to draw upon work I did in the late forties as consultant to the Reclamation Bureau. I made use of what came to me through to the early and middle fifties. I drew on one of the principal sources, the opinion of Attorney General William P. Rogers. Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, inserted it in the Congressional Record in '59 in the great debates. I told you I took Senator Douglas, as senator-elect, down in the Valley? You see how one thing can lead to another. You never know just when you're going to use what potential brickbat is lying around. That's what I mean when I stress the importance of knowing facts and relating them to the decision-making process.

Chall: You feel that there might have been other sources available that you didn't tap at the proper times? Is that all you regret not doing? [Laughter]

Taylor: That's an unfair question. You've really got to give me more time to...

Chall: It doesn't really seem that there could have been that much that you didn't know about.

Taylor: There's a lot that I didn't know about. I have just barely opened up the failure to observe the reclamation law in Southern California. It concerns notably the huge Irvine Ranch. I know the general outlines of the situation. That could be a marvelous case study. It's a very hot issue, but it's kept under wraps. It's a 90,000-acre ranch, watered from the Boulder Canyon project, upon which they are building cities. There are many aspects of this water problem that I know about in a way, but so far have not been able to develop.

Chall: Is that a result of time, not having time?
Taylor: Yes, after all, I've been doing a number of things, not working on just water issues. I've been travelling around the world, too. So if I had been assigned, or assigned myself to the water issue solely, there are acute problems that I could have got into. I suppose I should say,-humanly speaking, I should be satisfied that I've helped to keep the 160-acre issue alive in the halls of government. Had we not been able to do battle on this issue from the New Deal of FDR and the Fair Deal of Harry Truman, the monopolists and speculators would have had the law wiped off the statute books.

So long as the law remains on the books, the bureaucracy can't quite ignore it altogether. Now we have a couple of bad judicial decisions on Imperial Valley in the lower courts, but we've also have one A-1 decision on residency and I think they're going up to higher courts and eventually to the Supreme Court. It is significant that carrying the Imperial Valley cases forward was left to the landless. The bureaucracy, charged with enforcing the law, walked out on it. If the appointees of Nixon to the Supreme Court haven't ruined it, we might come out all right in the end. I wish we were back in the Warren years. It was the Warren Court that in 1958 approved the 160-acre limitation by a vote of 8-0.

An Enduring Memory

Taylor: In closing our long interview, may I add the recollection of one of my Wisconsin professors? One of my most enduring memories is of my sociology professor, E.A. Ross, for whom I named my son. Ross gave me the best counsel in 1919, counsel that guided my choice of an academic life instead of going into law.

What he said to me was that if I chose law, probably I would join a New York law office and, by the time I reached my middle forties, would have a case going up to the Supreme Court that would really be of absorbing interest to me. On the other hand, if I chose academic life, I could work on problems that really interested me from the time I entered the profession.

Ten years later, in 1929, when he was sixty-five (he lived to be eighty-seven), we were together at the Norman Waite Harris Memorial Conference on Population, held at the University of Chicago. Strolling along the sidewalk he remarked his advancing years and said, "Just about the time when you begin to get the hang of it, then you have to shuffle off."
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PAUL TAYLOR

THE POWER OF A TENACIOUS MAN

MARY ELLEN LEARY

Berkeley

Dr. Paul Schuster Taylor is a phenomenon among academicians. Some think that what makes this University of California economist remarkable is the faith he has sustained in the small family farm in the irrigated West, despite the national decline of home-centered farming and despite the increasingly corporate pattern that converts agriculture into industry.

They are wrong. The size of a landholding is not the essence of the stubborn crusade Dr. Taylor has been carrying forward. True, he has been talking with singular concentration about 160-acre farms in reclamation districts. But what he has really focused upon is integrity in government: obedience to the law by the bureaus that administer the law. For thirty years this modest, gentlemanly scholar has been admonishing the public about a governmental flouting of the law which he considers as serious an abuse as Watergate.

With the U.S. public alerted these days to the consequences of governmental distortion of the law for special, private advantage, Dr. Taylor’s alarms over land monopoly are enjoying a more hospitable reception than they used to get. He has been heard and heeded in Congressional circles in past crises. He has been published in academic journals and cited by the U.S. Supreme Court. But there are signs now that many of the politically alert among the general public have caught his concern for the National Reclamation Act, which was meant to prevent, or break up, vast corporate landholdings in areas of the West where government subsidy has made water available. Taylor’s effort to keep alive the early American reverence for that finite resource, land, and to fit its use to the scale of man, matches the concern of present-day environmentalists.

Mary Ellen Leary has been a West Coast political writer for more than twenty years, most of them on the Scripps-Howard San Francisco News. She is now a free-lance writer.
It is common these days for professors to be summoned to roles of political influence, where the power is in the leverage available. But it is rare that a habitue of the classroom deflects the course of history by what he says. Dr. Taylor has become a force by the sheer tenacity of his ideas and by the relevance of those ideas to the life of this nation. His influence is most recently attested by three critical lawsuits moving toward district and U.S. appellate court hearings in San Francisco and ultimately, it seems sure, to the U.S. Supreme Court. In addition, a spate of related legislation is proposed in the present Congress to grant special protection to the family farm and to set in motion an agency responsible for coping with "excess" landholdings. But what most profoundly reveals Paul Taylor's influence is the impetus toward new land policies in the United States which the environmental movement is shepherding.

Rarely does a prophet live long enough for his world to come around full circle and present him with a new generation of adherents whose parents had been nongrowers. Dr. Taylor is in that happy circumstance. He emerged as a labor economist in the late 1920s and early 1930s, a time of deep concern for the rural poor and the immigrant poor. But that spirit was inundated by the postwar urban bustle. Through the long, bleak, uninterested 1940s, 1950s and 1960s, Dr. Taylor pursued a cause which even supportive friends thought was lost. Colleagues grew sensitive about the loneliness of his vigil; it had become absurd, many feared.

Now nearing 80, Paul Taylor thrives as the apostle of a new movement. His phone rings constantly. Strangers knock at his study door to ask for his articles. Colleges and universities ask permission to reprint his early studies. He has become an unofficial teacher to a dynamic group of young people knit together through the National Coalition for Land Reform, with headquarters in San Francisco. He is revered by the Sierra Club. He is dispatched to public hearings on behalf of Friends of the Earth, interviewed for television, invited to speak to new, inevitably young audiences. His name is known among Indians, Mexican-Americans, Japanese-Americans and dirt farmers from Maine to Oregon. He is a catalyst for an assortment of determined "poverty" lawyers pursuing justice for the rural underdogs. Only a few weeks ago University of California Law Review editors asked him for an article on the Chicano and the 160-acre limitation. "I've recycled myself," he chuckles. "I go out into the streets and talk to anyone who will listen."

He pours out upon this accumulating multitude his conviction that America can, if it will, stop the accretion of political power in the hands of a wealthy few, and that the place to start is in reform of land policy:

Who owns the land is not something trivial to a nation. It is central to our society, to our economy and to our political power system. Our New England ancestors were committed to a belief that widespread distribution of land ownership was necessary for the kind of society they wanted to create. Concentrated land ownership, the monopoly of land, was the essence of a feudal Europe which they had fled, an undemocratic Europe, a Europe in the control of an elite.

The prohibition against monopoly of land... the insistence that land be cultivated by people who live on it—these two elements are deeply rooted in the American system. This is what this country is all about.

But he will acknowledge that his view is not universally accepted. "Most people don't know anything about land. They will. They'll come to it. They are beginning to wake up to it now." And he says:

If the facts get out, if people open their minds and understand what is involved, they will see that the benefit of public spending must be spread to the largest number of people possible. Even urban people who don't have much instinct for land can see the justice involved.

This issue isn't as remote as some think from urban problems. Much of the population pressure and discontent which distorts our cities has been caused by carrying into modern times the plantation-style farming of the South and the style of farming in the West left over from the immense rancherias of the Mexican era.

We have fostered an agricultural system which has driven the modest family man off his farm. We pride ourselves on the efficient large-scale agriculture which replaced him. And we reap the social consequences in our cities.

Dr. Taylor's name has become synonymous with the term "160 acres." Around this figure of 160 acres, the quarter section of land which was the family development pattern in frontier and homesteading days, his arguments have rung through successive Congresses since the early 1940s, through corporation board rooms, through top councils of the American labor movement, and through pivotal cases that earlier reached and persuaded the U.S. Supreme Court.

Quite commonly, smiles break out over so quaint a concept: that a land ownership scale suitable to the ox team and hand plow could have pertinence today. Modern agriculture is a complex international marketing enterprise attuned to the computer and to mechanical pickers. In some parts of the West one ownership can stretch from horizon to horizon. Small farms in the United States have dwindled by half in the past thirty years, to a present total under 3 million. Of these, the largest farms—representing about 2 per cent of the owners—dominate a third of the total produce sales.

But Dr. Taylor is not arguing that the small family farm in the irrigated West, 160 acres per owner or, if you join husband's and wife's allotments, 320 acres, is his academic configuration for the wisest system of land distribution. Nor is it his own unique view that families should live on the land they till. What he has been saying for thirty-five years in lectures, legislative testimony, academic journals and private exhortation is that Congress holds this view. Congress ordered the 160-acre norm and family residency. Congress laid down these provisions for areas receiving water under the National Reclamation Act, and has repeatedly reaffirmed them. Congress said its huge reclamation expenditures were intended to help the largest number of people on the land, not to bring unearned increment to corporate interests.

The explicit conditions apply to lands enjoying the advantage of water made available by dams, reservoirs, aqueducts, pumping stations and other elements of the immensely costly water projects which have been pro-
vided by U.S. tax money. The precise language (Section 5, National Reclamation Act): “No right to the use of water for land in private ownership shall be sold for a tract exceeding one hundred and sixty acres to any one landowner, and no such sale shall be made to any landowner unless he be an actual bona fide resident on such land, or occupant thereof residing in the neighborhood of such land.”

Recognizing that there would be landowners with larger holdings in areas where reclamation water would be channeled, Congress in 1912 provided that such owners might secure water if they formally signed a recordable contract with the government to sell land in “excess” of their 160 acres within ten years. In 1926, it was specified that the sale price must be at pre-project levels and that the transaction must be under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior.

In more than a dozen instances, from 1906 through the 1960s, sometimes when Republicans were in power and sometimes with Democratic majorities, Congress has engaged in fierce conflict over attempts to scuttle this policy, and in each instance Congress has concurred with the original terms of this law. In the 1940s, Sen. Sheridan Downey (D., Calif.) battled repeatedly with Secretary of Interior Harold L. Ickes in an effort to curb or abolish the limitation, and at the critical point: Sen. Robert M. La Follette, Jr. of Wisconsin came to the rescue. In the 1950s Paul Douglas of Illinois and Wayne Morse of Oregon were defenders against interests seeking to erase acreage limitation. In the 1960s, new champions were on hand to scotch yet another effort, raised by Gov. Ronald Reagan and Sen. George Murphy.

Through those years a band of stalwarts stood guard over the original purpose of the law. They included the National Farmers’ Union, the Grange, many church groups and, consistently, vocally, the organized labor movement. It has supported the fight against land monopolists since the 1870s, and the AFL-CIO today is a staunch advocate of the 160-acre limitation law. In each of these epochs, Dr. Taylor, quietly behind the scenes, rallied supporters, found witnesses, alerted the unwary and provided the documentation. He saw to it that the case for acreage limitation and the historic principles behind it were laid before Congress so openly and so explicitly that the legislators could not dodge the choice between corporate interests and the small farmer. Each time, the small farmers won—at least as far as the law reads.

Repeated assaults and the passage of time might be expected to grind this cause into oblivion. Many people today assume that its basic objectives are, as Governor Reagan termed them, “archaic.” Opposition to the 160-acre limitation thrives. It was strong enough to persuade President Nixon’s National Water Commission last year to term family farming “an agrarian myth” and to propose blue-penciling the whole concept, letting farmers “buy out” for any size acreage. Fresh encounters in Congress over this issue are brewing, but the remarkable fact is that support for the 160-acre limitation and for the principles it represents has been rejuvenated recently and is steadily gaining adherents. In 1968, the National Wildlife Federation wrote Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, “It is our belief that a groundswell of public opinion is developing for support of strong enforcement of the Reclamation Act.”

However, enforcement is the crux. The law has been retained on the books. But what Dr. Taylor insists has occurred, what he has spent his time documenting, is a pattern of evasion by which the purpose of the National Reclamation Act has been thwarted, circumvented or “modified by administrative interpretation,” for the benefit of wealthy special interests and to the disadvantage of persons with modest means.

Over the years, owners of large holdings have sought in one way or another to overcome the law’s restrictions. In some regions they failed, and the law has been applied. Owners of “excess” land have received water because they signed contracts committing them to sell off acreage beyond their family holdings at the end of ten years. Some of them stalled when the time came or found devices such as trusts or partnerships by which to evade the law. Others have indeed sold, and their surplus land formed new farms. Family farms dot a considerable portion of the federally irrigated West. Ten years ago, a Department of the Interior report claimed that only 3.5 per cent of the land within some ninety-five various projects remained in excess ownership, but this claim is subject to interpretation. The department has tolerated many corporate-sized buildings under legal devices which Rep. Jerome R. Waldie (D., Calif.) calls “circumvention” of the law. In 1972 the General Accounting Office undertook a detailed analysis of supposedly compliant areas and reported so many abuses that it advised Congress that the intent of the law had been foiled. It found 14 per
cent of the property in excess holdings, ranging from 1,744 acres to 40,404 acres. Government subsidy bringing water to the areas examined amounted to about $1.5 billion, the GAO reported.

On lands which enjoy water through systems built in whole or in part by federal reclamation money, there are now under legal challenge in California such holdings as the Tejon Ranch, 54,000 acres; Standard Oil of California, 101,120 acres; Tenneco Corporation, 162,000 acres. In the Imperial Valley, seventy-five property owners hold 1,000 acres or more each, some of them 5,000 acres; the Irvine Land Co. owns 9,000 acres there.

In the current lawsuits, argument is advanced that California’s semi-desert valley regions increased in value by sums ranging from $577 to $750 per acre when water became available. Thus, merely measured by the real estate market, a family farm of 320 acres lifted from its natural aridity to agricultural productivity is blessed with an instant subsidy of at least $184,640. The holder of 1,000 acres is endowed with a subsidy of $500,000 and up. Beyond that, the figures mount astronomically. It was to justify spending public money on projects offering such large direct subsidy to individual property owners (along with advancing the region’s economy) that Congress thought it necessary to establish a policy that would spread these benefits to as many individual families as possible, and to require that families in fact live on the land that was to be so generously helped.

But a network of exemptions eroded this principle. Now three lawsuits in California are designed to force the courts into a thorough analysis of two of the most significant “exemptions.” They bring to focus many of the contentions Dr. Taylor has raised in a lonely alarm for so many decades.

Two of the pending court actions oppose the intention of Congress to an exemption granted to Imperial Valley landowners by a private interpretation of the law which then lame-duck Secretary of the Interior Ray Lyman Wilbur penned in February 1933, ten days before the Hoover administration expired. The result of Wilbur’s interpretation is that in California’s opulent, low-lying valley inland from San Diego and adjacent to the Mexican border—one of the most fruitful agricultural areas of the world and flourishing because Boulder Dam regulates the flow of the Colorado River—most of the land is in large holdings and nearly 50 per cent of the owners are nonresidents. Secretary Wilbur’s letter of exemption has been assumed to be adequate authority for ignoring reclamation law. Now, this exemption is under legal challenge. In 1964 the U.S. Department of Justice finally confronted the situation in the Imperial Valley and held that the “plain intent” of the law was indeed applicable there. A long series of rulings within the Department of the Interior over a thirty-year period had reflected growing dissatisfaction with Wilbur’s opinion, and finally Solicitor of the Interior Frank J. Barry came right out and said the law should apply. Justice concurred. Then for three years the government went through vague maneuvers aimed at winning voluntary compliance from Imperial growers; finally it went to court. Four years later, on January 5, 1971, in a distinctly different political climate, U.S. District Court Judge Howard B. Turrentine ruled that the acreage limitation does not apply to Imperial Valley landholdings. As proof of just how changed was the climate, the federal government, which had initiated the suit, did not appeal Judge Turrentine’s ruling. Instead, a band of landless residents of the valley intervened and were permitted to appeal.

This same group instituted the second legal action. It includes a number of Mexican-Americans who would like to own their own farms and a spirited physician, Dr. Ben Yellen, an ex-New Yorker, who has been active in support of Chicano interests. This second suit challenges the waiver of residency by landowners in Imperial Valley. On September 27, 1972 in San Diego, U.S. District Court Judge W.D. Murray ruled that Secretary Wilbur’s interpretation “is not now and never has been reasonable.” Administrative fiat cannot erase a law passed by Congress, Judge Murray said. Failure to enforce this law, he continued, “is destructive of the clear purpose and intent of national reclamation policy.” In this case, there was no doubt about an appeal being sought. Imperial growers went hastily to court. These two directly contradictory judicial opinions, which deal with two phrases in the same sentence in the National Reclamation Act, have been linked for purposes of hearing and are calendared for argument soon before the Ninth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco.

A third lawsuit still at the U.S. District Court level, also in San Francisco, involves acreage irrigated through the California State Water Project. It has not been generally considered a federal undertaking and in fact there is some evidence to suggest that the state program was conceived to avoid the constraints of federal reclamation law. But now a group of small farmers who receive their irrigation water through the federal system in California’s Central Valley and are therefore bound by the 160-acre limit have challenged this separate water system which flows along the west side of their valley. They claim that the state plan, lacking acreage restrictions, affords “enormous speculative gain” to the landowners involved and encourages “a frightening concentration of land and of power. . . . posing a substantial and unfair competitive threat” to small farmers who are under federal limitation.

But the nub of the legal argument, strongly supported by evidence Dr. Taylor has accumulated, is that joint use by state and federal systems of certain reservoirs, canals and backup reserves of water, as well as joint spending for certain facilities, so commingles the product of the two projects that the twin federal restrictions of residency and acreage should apply in both state and federal areas.

The Sierra Club and a number of other environmental groups have filed supporting amicus curiae briefs. Said the Sierra Club, “Failure to apply the 160-acre limitation has created and will in the future create grossly and artificially inflated demands for irrigation water for the benefit of speculators.”

Whether the courts will agree with the litigants who urge that holdings beyond 320 acres for a family, either in the Imperial Valley or in the California State Plan service area are in fact violations of law remains to be seen. It is worth remembering, however, that the U.S.
Supreme Court, in June 1958 (Ivanhoe Irrigation District v. McCracken, 357 U.S., p. 297) held that the reclamation law’s limitations created “a reasonable classification,” adding that “The project was designed to benefit people, not land.” This ruling recognized Professor Taylor’s singular efforts to protect the principles of the Reclamation Act, and cited his writings.

Whether the pending litigation will break up large holdings and reverse the trend toward land monopoly in the future. But out of some early research by Dr. Taylor, which uncovered proposals made more than sixty years ago that the federal government itself ought to buy up “surplus” land in reclamation districts, there has developed a plan for an agency to enforce the 160-acre limitation, purchase the excess land at pre-water prices and then resell or lease it at current prices, the profit going into a special fund for education and conservation. This could lead to a more aggressive policing of the law than the Department of the Interior has managed to date. A bill proposing such a national land conservation program (H.R. 5236) has been introduced by Rep. Robert Kastenmeier of Wisconsin and endorsed by six California Congressmen. Sens. Birch Bayh, Alan Cranston and Philip Hart have proposed parallel legislation. So far, no hearings have been held, but conservation and education groups are building support for this kind of land-use reform.

Sen. James Abourezk of South Dakota who has drafted a “family farm antitrust act” expressed a sense of debt to Dr. Taylor’s “admirable” battle. He feels that the growing concern over land use leads inevitably to a revival of support for small farm ownership. Michael McCloskey, executive director of the Sierra Club, also thinks that family farming places less burden on the environment than does quick-profit corporate farming.

Meeting Dr. Taylor, one is beguiled by the gentleness of the man. He has a delicate, whispery way of talking and the courtesy of an earlier day. The years have slowed his gait—he has been professor emeritus since 1962—but his bulky frame still suggests a strong man who belongs out of doors; his fleshly, freckled hands designed better to guide a plow than to leaf patiently through historic documents. Beneath his abundant, unruly and still brown hair, peering from under bushy, russet eyebrows, his eyes sparkle with the interest and responsiveness of a youngster. Very round, very ruddy cheeks, inherited no doubt from a Swiss grandfather named Schuster, reinforce the impression of boyishness—not mischievous, not puckish, but naive. He seems a kind of innocent, and some Western growers and their, stylish corporation lawyers made that assumption before they learned how tough in combat a man can be who is inflexibly in pursuit of the facts.

Paul Taylor has been at the center of successive great social movements for more than half a century. He was one of the first to propose and bring into being federal labor camps, when no other housing was available for the rural destitute. He saw the tremendous hope for displaced dust bowlers in the great reclamation programs which opened up new farmlands in the West, and he has been the indefatigable champion of the National Reclamation Act: to succor small farmers, not corporate absentee owners. When the Japanese were herded into relocation camps during World War II, Dr. Taylor was one of the first to denounce the program for flouting legal protections and native humanitarians. When the environmental movement grew past the anti-pollution stage into a positive concern for natural resources, its advance men found Paul Taylor already on the scene.

It is a curious—perhaps a logical—coincidence that Paul Taylor was drawn into the reclamation-law controversy because of his concern for Mexican migrant labor. From the late 1920s he was deeply involved in a detailed study of Mexican immigration into this country. His principal writings have been on this topic. His major work, Mexican Labor in the U.S., 1928-34, has been republished lately by the University of California Press.

He came to write about this issue after a youth spent in the Midwest, where he was thoroughly imbued with the prairie farmer’s pride in his own labor and his own land. Born in Sioux City, Iowa, of parents who had both graduated from the University of Wisconsin, Paul Taylor attended the same university during that golden era when the “progressive” spirit dominated the campus. There he soaked up an intellectual compassion for the oppressed among workingmen that has been the driving force of his life. When he returned from World War I, with lungs damaged in a gas attack, doctors discouraged his intention to take up graduate studies at Columbia University, suggesting instead the milder climate of Berkeley. He earned his Ph.D. in 1922 at the University of California, and stayed on to teach.

All through his work, Professor Taylor had felt the need for photography to put the record of conditions in bolder and more irrefutable terms. He bought himself a second-hand Kodak, and was constantly searching for illustrations by others to illuminate his articles. Thus it chanced, in 1934, that he came upon a particularly eloquent photograph taken during the general labor strike in San Francisco. He went to the telephone to track down the photographer. It was Dorothea Lange, wife of the artist Maynard Dixon. He hired her to work with him on the California Rural Rehabilitation project. She had to be identified as a typist, photographers being too novel for public payrolls. They went first to Nipomo, Calif. Photographs of “Starving Pea Pickers” sent a shock wave across the state when they were published in August 1935, in the San Francisco News. Taylor’s report—and the Dorothea Lange photographs—caused national attention. They went to Rexford Tugwell, national administrator of the Farm Security Administration, who was in charge of the Roosevelt administration’s commitment to do something practical for the destitute in the rural areas. This led Dr. Taylor to take a year’s leave from the university to serve as labor adviser to the Resettlement Administration in the Western states. He and Dorothea, having divorced their respective spouses, were married.
After returning to the university he worked with the research division of the Social Security Board until 1941.

During Gov. Culbert Olson's Democratic administration in California Dr. Taylor was busy as an adviser to the state Department of Employment, a member of the Governor's Committee on Re-employment in 1939, and from 1940 to 1944 a member of the State Board of Agriculture, a service to send shivers down the backs of present members on the Ronald Reagan board, whose loyalties lie largely with the big growers. In 1943 he became a consulting economist with the Department of the Interior. His work on self-help cooperatives had made him many friends in the Roosevelt administration, one of them being Arthur Goldschmidt, whom Lyndon Johnson later made U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO. Goldschmidt headed the power division in the Department of the Interior in 1943, when that department was sizing up responsibilities it had assumed in building Shasta Dam, one of the earliest massive public-employment projects of the depression. Some twenty-five problem areas had been designated for study and Goldschmidt asked Paul Taylor to represent the department on a number of these "task forces." Problem Area No. 19 concerned acreage limitation. It was Paul Taylor's introduction to the subject.

One day he was casually discussing it with his neighbor and good friend, Walter Packard, with whom he had served on the Farm Security Administration. Packard, one of the key men in Tugwell's Resettlement Administration, an extraordinarily advanced social thinker in agriculture, gave Dr. Taylor strong encouragement over the years. He said on that day: "It's perfectly clear what has to be done about the size of acreage entitled to receive water. Each parcel should be limited to 160 acres."

Musing back upon his own grandfather's homestead plot, Dr. Taylor agreed that that might, indeed, be a good idea. "Good idea! It's the law!" said Packard, "I had never heard of it before," Taylor says today, with an air of astonishment.

There was reason. Growers in the West who had for years pressed the state and then the federal government to build Shasta Dam to bring water to their lands, saw to it that the question of acreage limitation reeced as far as possible toward infinity. They hoped to obliterate it from the law. That they didn't, through all the years since, is due almost singly to the perseverance of Dr. Taylor. He likes to note that in those early days when he first became involved in the struggle to retain and enforce the 160-acre limitation, people would ask if he didn't think it was a lost cause.

"I told them then that I didn't know. I still don't. But I'll say this, it is a cause that is getting a lot more attention these days."
California Historical Quarterly

A writer’s pride, one might expect, would keep him out of the attic headquarters of the University of California Regional Oral History Office, that inconspicuous research group tucked under the eaves of the main library on the Berkeley campus. Especially if that writer were at work on a subject alive and well and quite willing to be interviewed, he might think he had no need of the vast interview material on California subjects which have been collected and systematized by these “oral historians.” But curiosity can overcome pride.

Last summer, when I was developing for The Nation magazine my article about Paul Taylor, that delightfully independent-minded agricultural economist who champions the small farm, I took to walking from his office on the Berkeley campus over to ROHO, to dip into their recently bound set of interviews with the same man.

After years of hearing about oral history, I decided to test its yield against my own interview perceptions. I began out of sheer curiosity. The enthusiasm of these scholars about their work is tempting. But I returned often. The aid this material provided astonished me.

Anyone who has interviewed at length has experienced the problem of forward pace versus detailed accuracy. The subject has warmed up to one line of thought. He is talking easily. There emerges some particularly revealing recollection or, at long last, just the concept pertinent to the shape of your own work. The stumble comes when you realize you will not have time to re-walk this pathway again, so you must interrupt: how do you spell that name? can you be specific on that date?

Not all interviewees have the phenomenal memory which Dr. Taylor enjoys. But even he could be deflected by a question. It would turn him to his library, to pull out some old volume aflutter with research notes, in pursuit of an exact quotation. Our line of inquiry would hang in the air unfinished and disintegrating. A new dimension of freedom in these interviews developed when I discovered that the necessary specifics marched in orderly sequence through the work of ROHO’s Suzanne Riess and Malca Chall, in their carefully prepared interview reports. They had earlier talked with Dr. Taylor in great detail, Ms. Riess on his early life and migrant farm-worker research when he traveled the country over with his photographer-wife, Dorothea Lange, Ms. Chall on the reclamation law and 160-acre limitation.

This does not mean that ROHO’s work substitutes for your own. It can’t. These free-flowing interviews, rich because they permit digressions, present a wide landscape. Your own path must have its separate structure. But this oral history gives a tone, a personal flavor, and an orientation which immensely lightens the writer’s task. Of course the interviews and transcripts are particularly valuable in those cases where personal interviews are no longer possible. More and more scholars are discovering this growing collection of biographical material, recollections, and individual viewpoints from Californians who have been major factors in the life of the state the past half-century. It is my hope journalists will learn of it, too.

What oral history provides is a human link to history so lively and so pertinent to today as to be particularly comprehensible to journalists. Our California journalism could do with some dipping into history.

Mary Ellen Leary
Bibliography on the 160-Acre Anti-Monopoly Water Law
by Charles L. Smith, Jan. 1974

Congress passed the National Reclamation Act of 1902 to help water development in the West by federal subsidies. These subsidies to privately-owned lands are now running from $1,000 to $2,000 an acre, according to studies by the U. S. Bureau of the Budget.

In order to prevent monopoly by the few, water, of subsidies, and of unearned increment, Congress included provisions in the National Reclamation Act to limit the benefits any individual may legally receive. These protections against monopoly of the government-supplied water are sometimes called "excess land law," "acreage limitation," or "160-acre law."

The U. S. Supreme Court, in 1958, described the law's purpose in these words: "The limitation insures that this enormous expenditure will not go in disproportionate share to a few individuals with large land holding. Moreover, it prevents the use of the federal reclamation service for speculative purposes." 357 U.S. 275, 297 (1958)

Bibliographies related to 160-acre law (see also items 277, 278, & 301)
8. 78th Cong. 1st Sess., S. Rept. 396, pts. 1-5.
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U. S. Documents, continued,

19. Acreage Limitation (Reclamation Law) Review, Hearings on S1403, S2541, S1440, Subcommittees on Irrigation and Reclamation, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 86th Cong. 2nd Sess., April 30 and May 1, 1959, 271 pp. and appendix.
22. Westlands Water District Contract, Hearings, Senate Committee on Int. and Insular Affairs, July 8, 1964, 57-104, 8812.
24. Construction of San Felipe Division, San Luis Unit, CVP, ground water improvement, Senate Insert, July 10, 1967. (113 Cong. Res. 88257-60)
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U.S. Documents, continued,


California Documents


34. Proceedings, Governor's Conference on Water, 1945, Sacramento.


36. California Assembly Interim Comm. on Water, Hearings, 1959, Statements by landowners and their representatives, 75 pp., mimeo.


Constitutional Record


42. 105 1959 Senate 7483-7498 San Luis (Westlands) 68.

43. 106 1960 House 7665-7691 10441-10471
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Constitutional Record, continued


110 Aug. 5 & 7, 1964 17495-17503 Westlands Debate

111 Aug. 23, 1965 17915-17922
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34. Proceedings, Governor's Conference on Water, 1945, Sacramento.


36. California Assembly Interim Comm. on Water, Hearings, 1959, Statements by landowners and their representatives, 75 pp., mimeo.
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34. Proceedings, Governor's Conference on Water, 1945, Sacramento.


36. California Assembly Interim Comm. on Water, Hearings, 1959, Statements by landowners and their representatives, 75 pp., mimeo.
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