Richard O. Barnes

An Oral History

Washington State Oral History Program
Office of the Secretary of State

Richard O. Barnes

An Oral History

Interviewed by Dianne Bridgman
Washington State Oral History Program

Office of the Secretary of State
Ralph Munro, Secretary of State

First edition 1994

Washington State Archives Accession No. LOHP91-29dwb

Library of Congress Subject Headings
1. Barnes, Richard, 1921-1992
2. Legislators—Washington—Biography
3. Washington—Politics and Government

Washington State Oral History Program
Office of Secretary of State
Legislative Building
PO Box 40243
Olympia, WA 98504-0243
Telephone: (360) 586-4477

To my wife Sylvia
and children
Roy Douglas
Richard Brian
Cynthia Marie

I LIVED MY DREAM

An Ode to Dick Barnes

I dreamed of a family and God gave me more than my dream
For he gave me a fine loving wife and sons and a daughter, and more—
He gave me daughters-in-law and grandchildren and I lived my dream.

I dreamed of music and God gave me a song to play — a trombone
And bands and musicians and the joy of full chords and harmony
And a song in my heart. I lived my dream.

I dreamed of the game and I played and I heard the silence
Of the crowd when the goal failed as well as the spontaneous roar
When the goal was reached and the day was won. I lived my dream.

I dreamed of designing great products and God gave me
the best aircraft design company in the world to build with
And I worked with the great minds of the day. I lived my dream.

I dreamed of my country and the great state of Washington
And my friends and neighbors sent me to help shape that state
And in the legislature in Olympia I lived my dream.

I dreamed I could fly like the eagle and I have flown even higher.
I have reached up to heaven and like the poet have
"touched the face of God."

I shall always fly with the angels for God has always been with me
and I am with God
And I shall live my dream forever.

By Jerry Denbo
September 18, 1992

CONTENTS

Preface

Acknowledgments

Biography

Introduction: Interviewing Dick Barnes

1. Family Background....1
   Tape 1, Side 1

2. Childhood....5
   Tape 1, Side 2

3. School Years....9
   Tape 2, Side 1

4. The Great Depression....15
   Tape 2, Side 2

5. World War II Service....19
   Tape 3, Side 1

6. Analysis of Foreign Policy....23
   Tape 3, Side 2

7. Military Training....27
   Tape 4, Side 1

8. College Education 31
Tape 4, Side 2

9. Boeing Employment 35
Tape 5, Side 1

10. Aircraft Design 39
Tape 5, Side 2

11. Family and Leisure 43
Tape 6, Side 1

12. Ideas on Postwar Politics 47
Tape 6, Side 2

13. Views on Race Relations 51
Tape 7, Side 1

14. Legislative Concerns 55
Tape 7, Side 2

15. Energy and Utilities Issues 61
Tape 8, Side 1

16. Perceptions of WPPSS 65
Tape 8, Side 2

17. The Spellman Term 69
Tape 9, Side 1

18. Education Legislation 73
Tape 9, Side 2

19. The Ray Term 77
Tape 10, Side 1

20. Memorable Achievements 81
Tape 10, Side 2

21. Political Change 85
Tape 11, Side 1

22. Predictions and Advice 89
Tape 11, Side 2

Appendix:
Chronology: The United States, 1900-1994 91

PREFACE

The Washington State Oral History Program was established in 1991 by the Washington State Legislature. It is located in the Office of the Secretary of State and guided by the Oral History Advisory Committee. The program's purpose is to document the formation of public policy in Washington State. This is done by interviewing legislators, state officials, staff and citizens who were involved in state politics. Their recollections provide unique perspectives on the elusive activities of politicians.

Producing oral history transcripts involves several steps. First, an interviewee is selected by the advisory committee. Oral history program researchers gather background material from newspaper articles, journals, personal papers, government documents and consultations with people closely associated with the interviewee. Then a series of taped interviews lasting twelve to twenty hours is conducted. These interviews emphasize the subject's political career. Achievements, disappointments and important events are discussed, and the interviewee is encouraged to talk about early experiences which may have led to public service or helped define his or her political values. When the interviews are complete, a verbatim transcript is prepared. Both the interviewer and the interviewee correct grammar and punctuation. Repetitions may be removed, but no substantive editing is done. Finally, the transcript is printed and distributed through the Washington State Library to other libraries and archives.

It is the hope of oral history program staff that this work will help citizens better understand their political legacy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Washington State Oral History Program owes thanks to many.

Members of our advisory committee have been not only loyal, but also invariably friendly and cheerful. The 1991-92 committee included Senators Alan Bluechel, Ray Moore, Sid Snyder, and Peter von Reichbauer; Representatives Rosa Franklin, Ken Jacobsen, Eugene Prince, and Shirley Winsley; Secretary of State Ralph Munro, Secretary of the Senate Gordon Golob and Chief Clerk Alan Thompson. Ex officio members were Mr. Warren Bishop and former Senators Robert Bailey and George Scott.

Fiona Buzzard deserves special recognition for first suggesting that we interview Dick Barnes. She was encouraged by Dave Mortenson, then Republican Caucus staff director.

We depend on Secretary of State Ralph Munro for his consistent support. We commend Assistant Secretary of State Donald Whiting for his patience and willingness to offer advice.

Our contract transcribers, Russ and Tina DeMaris, were quick, accurate and willing to work on weekends. Our volunteer researcher, Janet Fisk, knows the scope, quality and location of available resources. She also understands the subtleties of the legislative process.

We particularly appreciate the help of Sylvia Shelby Barnes, Richard Barnes wife of forty-nine years. She was a gracious and welcoming hostess, and added valuable details and anecdotes during the interviews. All this was done with gentle tenderness.

All of those named gave more than we asked. It is a privilege to acknowledge them.

BIOGRAPHY

RICHARD O. BARNES

June 29, 1921 - September 17, 1992

Dick Barnes was born on June 29, 1921 in Burlington, Iowa. He met his wife Sylvia while they were attending the University of Illinois. They were married August 28, 1943 in St. Angelo, Texas, where he was stationed at Goodfellow Air Force Base. They had three children, Roy Douglas, Richard Brian and Cynthia Marie.

As an air force pilot, Dick was on active duty for a total of twelve years during World War II, the Korean War, the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Vietnam War. He also served twenty-one years in the reserves as a fighter, bomber and transport pilot. He attained the rank of colonel.

The Barnes family moved to Seattle in 1955 after Dick received his degree in geophysical engineering from the Colorado School of Mines. He began a career with Boeing which was to last for thirty-one years. Most of these years were spent as an analyst in air traffic control and air transport economic studies.

Dick and Sylvia were active Republicans. Dick was elected seven times to the state House of Representatives. Dick and Sylvia worked closely together during those years. He retired from the legislature in 1989.

Dick Barnes had many skills and talents. He loved music and was an accomplished trombonist. He organized and directed several bands. In recent years he has enjoyed playing with a Dixieland jazz group. He was an enthusiastic sportsman who stayed in condition throughout his life. He played semi-pro football for thirty-two years, 1956 through 1988, with the Cavaliers. For twenty years he also played rugby with the Seattle Old Guard.

Dick was a family man. He was proud of having two great-grandfathers who served in the Union Army during the Civil War. He loved and admired his older brother, W. Ray Barnes. He and his children enjoyed music, Scouting and sports activities together. He cherished his three grandchildren.

Dick Barnes will be remembered for his ability to do so many things, so well.

INTRODUCTION

INTERVIEWING DICK BARNES

It is always disquieting to begin interviewing someone who is dying. Even those who are prepared, who await their leave-taking calmly, have trouble. A question will call up a memory of ambitions unachieved, plans put aside, friends unvisited. There follows instant recognition of the absence of hope, of future. Unspoken, both the interviewer and interviewee know it is there. Quick glances are exchanged, and then both are silent. No words can bring ease.

It seemed there would be many such moments interviewing Dick Barnes. He had much to leave behind. Although he had retired from the Boeing company and the legislature, he had great pleasure in the occasions of family life. Other interests remained. I knew he had been unable to imagine his life without playing football and rugby, without flying, without music. Did he yet wish for afternoons on the field, hours in the cockpit, evenings hearing applause for "Bill Bailey"?

My concerns were unnecessary. No regrets or sorrow emerged. Instead, I learned how Dick balanced all his activities. Better, I came to understand something about how this balancing let him live well, and approach dying with poise.

When he answered the door the day of our first interview in November, 1991, Dick looked robust and handsome. He had prominent cheekbones and a wide smile. He moved slowly and his eyes were a bit watery. Otherwise, I saw nothing to indicate he had just finished chemotherapy. We talked in a dining room with polished hardwood floors and sleek Scandinavian furniture. The large windows overlooked a tidy, graceful garden. It was a quiet and pleasant room, good for talking and thinking.

We sat at the table with the tape recorder between us. When I asked a question, Dick did not hesitate: he considered. He would look down, or across the room. When he was ready to speak, he leaned forward and looked into my eyes.

This was not just a pattern of our conversation. Readers of this volume will realize that the events of Dick's life followed from his thinking things through. His reliance on reason is evident in an early interview, when he speaks of the influence of his "thoughtful" aunts. Later, he explains how his thought processes changed when he was a legislator. He learned that he must consider opposing opinions, and he came to value the necessity of compromise. Most striking is his account of his decision not to give up football, music, flying or family time for his career. "I really chose that kind of lifestyle... chose to sacrifice brilliant success in a career to take part in other activities," he said.

This ideal of an examined life is as old as recorded thought. Most of us, perhaps, believe our lives are guided by rational choices. Oral history interviewing leads to a different conclusion. Most interviewees attribute much to chance and little to deliberation. Dick Barnes was an exception. I can remember only one other who consistently thought about and planned the course of his life.

At each successive interview, Dick looked better. He moved briskly, his eyes became clear, he smiled and gestured more. By April, 1992, his cancer was in remission. He was again playing rugby.

In the end, we did have our troubling moment. We finished our interview series on July 22, 1992. I remember shaking Dick's hand and thinking, despite his vigor, that I would not see him again. I had tears in my eyes, and I think that I saw tears in his. He died less than two months later.

Printed on a previous page is a poem written for Dick's memorial service by his brother-in-law. It is a tribute to a man who lived his dreams. We hope this volume is a tribute to how he lived them.

Dianne Bridgman

1 FAMILY BACKGROUND

Ms. Bridgman: We will begin with a discussion of your boyhood, family history, home town, and elementary school. We'll try to emphasize the kinds of beliefs and patterns of thinking behavior which you think carried through to your political career.

Let's start with your immediate family—your mother, father, and brother—and your life together in your home town of Burlington, Iowa. What is your earliest memory?

Mr. Barnes: I think my earliest memory was when my mother sent me off to kindergarten dressed in a little pinafore suit. It embarrassed me somewhat. I remember that it hung out in front a little bit, and I was embarrassed by it. But I had to wear it.

A similar memory of about the same time was when a neighbor boy threw a brick and hit me in the head. These are the earliest things that I can possibly remember.

Ms. Bridgman: How did you react—what did you do —when the neighbor boy threw the brick?

Mr. Barnes: I think I cried. We were planning on going to the neighbor's house and seeing some puppies that had just been born. I don't know why—I was standing down the alley and the neighbor boy was standing on a retaining wall up a little bit higher than me. He just heaved a brick, and it hit me in the head. No malicious intention or anything, it was just thoughtlessness, I guess. Evidently it didn't hurt me because I've been all right ever since.

Ms. Bridgman: What did you do then, after the brick hit you in the head?

Mr. Barnes: That I can't remember.

Ms. Bridgman: You don't remember going home to your mother?

Mr. Barnes: No, this was in our backyard. I can't remember what happened after that.

Ms. Bridgman: What was your mother like—this mother who dressed you in the pinafore suit?

Mr. Barnes: She was rather young at the time. She had only an eighth grade education, I believe. And she was a typical homemaker. That was her purpose in life—to be a homemaker.

My father was a teacher. My father was rather intellectual. He had a master's degree in teaching. He did a lot of studying and was rather quiet. My mother was rather talkative, and really, not so intellectual as my father.

Ms. Bridgman: What would you say were most important to each of your parents?

Mr. Barnes: To my mother the most important thing, I imagine, was the keeping of the home and the raising of my brother and I.

To my father, the most important thing, possibly, was his job and his teaching career. He did do a lot of reading and a lot of studying. I remember he made a radio. I believe he built one of the first radios in the town. And this was quite a ways back before many people had radios. He was an industrial arts teacher, among other things. He lectured in psychology at the local hospital to a class of nurses, I remember. Since he died when I was nine years old, I really can't remember a whole lot—I didn't really know my father too well.

Ms. Bridgman: From the things you said about him, can you characterize what his beliefs about human nature were?

Mr. Barnes: This would be real hard for me to do since I was nine when he died. So I guess I could hardly venture into that.

Ms. Bridgman: How about religious affiliations?

Mr. Barnes: We did go to a church. I think it was a Congregational Church at the time. And I believe we switched to the Presbyterian Church because my brother switched—some of his friends attended the Presbyterian Church. Since we weren't really passionate religionists, we attended the church that he preferred to go to. My brother was about eight or nine years older than myself, so he had a little more influence in the family than I did.

Ms. Bridgman: How did the two of you get along—you and your brother?

Mr. Barnes: We got along fine. Of course I was much smaller, and younger, and my brother would

play with me and entertain me as an older person would a child.

Ms. Bridgman: How much rivalry and competition was there? That sort of thing that one expects between brothers?

Mr. Barnes: Since there was such a difference in our ages, I don't think there was any competition or rivalry between the two of us. My brother being so much older than me—it was more of a situation where he would entertain me or play with me or take care of me. So there wasn't the competitiveness that there sometimes is between children who are closer to the same age.

Ms. Bridgman: What kind of things did you learn from his playing with you and entertaining you?

Mr. Barnes: This goes back an awful long way. My brother left home when I was around nine or ten because he received a nomination to the naval academy—it was the year my father died, actually. I was nine, perhaps I had reached my tenth birthday, about the time he was eighteen or nineteen. He then went to the naval academy and was away from the home.

He did send money to my mother, because when my father died he [Barnes' father] left a bit of insurance. But it wasn't a whole lot, and my mother had quite a struggle. She started rooming and boarding teachers in our house. We had a large house that we rented, and she kept teachers and brought in some income this way. And my brother helped a little bit with money that he made being a student at the U.S. Naval Academy.

Ms. Bridgman: This was 1929-1930 when your father died?

Mr. Barnes: About 1930, yes.

Ms. Bridgman: What sorts of things do you recall about the event of your father's death and the Great Depression occurring right at the same time?

Mr. Barnes: I can remember the fact that the depression occurred. It began a little before he died. And I remember being personally involved because I had been given a five-dollar gold piece and had put that in the bank. The bank failed and my five dollars was gone. I can remember this—just barely. And our savings—what we had—was gone because the bank failed. This was true of nearly everybody.

My father kept his job as a teacher until he died. He didn't lose his job. After he died, and during the depression, our teachers were paid, and therefore, they could afford to room and board at my mother's house.

It wasn't very long, though, before she could see that the insurance money that my father had left was gradually disappearing, so she then bought a house in Normal, Illinois, and set it up to keep girls—room and board students from the Illinois State Normal University.

Ms. Bridgman: How did she make that decision?

Mr. Barnes: I can remember her searching around for a job as a housemother at various schools. I can remember one school that she traveled to and looked at a job as a housemother, but finally she decided to buy that house at Illinois State Normal—which was the school that my father had gone to. Actually, my grandfather had taught there also.

So, how she came about making the decision, I don't know—but I do know that she did search a little bit for jobs as a housemother.

Ms. Bridgman: Who do you remember her talking to about this decision and the difficulty? Do you remember?

Mr. Barnes: I remember her talking with the housemother of a school in Iowa—talking about the job. I can remember her interviewing with this woman, but I can't remember much about her decision to buy a house instead at Illinois State. I imagine it had a lot to do with the fact that her mother and father lived in the nearby town of Bloomington, Illinois—Bloomington and Normal being twin cities—so that she was close to her mother and father.

Ms. Bridgman: I'd like you to go back to families losing their savings. That was after the crash of 1929, but before your father died in 1930?

Mr. Barnes: I believe it was, although my memory isn't too good on that. I believe the crash came before my father died. And whether we lost our entire savings then, and what the savings were, I don't know either. Being a teacher, I don't imagine the savings were too extensive. Then when my father died, there was insurance money which we didn't lose. That came along, I guess, after the crash.

Ms. Bridgman: How was the loss of the savings explained to you at age nine or ten?

Mr. Barnes: I'm not sure it was explained to me. I understood it, and I understood that my five dollars was gone. I think I was just told that the bank had failed and all the money was gone.

Ms. Bridgman: How did you feel?

Mr. Barnes: I'm not sure that it affected me all that much. I was maybe seven or eight years old, and I'm not sure that I was upset much by it.

This may have something to do with my later attitudes, though, toward economics. Later on, as I got into college, I did consider the study of economics quite important.

Ms. Bridgman: What did your family think about the New Deal and the government efforts to help people out during the depression?

Mr. Barnes: I don't have much memory of that. As the depression wore on—and we really didn't get out of the depression until we got into World War II—I can't remember much in this connection. I do know that I became a Republican. I did have a feeling of sensitivity toward the Republican Party as I got old enough to become embroiled in the war.

Ms. Bridgman: You would have been a teenager through the depression. Is that when your sympathy towards Republican values and views of the world developed?

Mr. Barnes: I think that was probably a little too early. I think those values developed later on while I was in the service during World War II.

Ms. Bridgman: If I may, I'd like to go back to your boyhood in your early memories when your father was still alive. How were things decided in your family?

Mr. Barnes: That's a hard one because I can't really remember any family conferences or anything of that sort. I imagine that my father just made decisions. As I say, he was rather quiet. He was not a very bombastic individual, but I think that mother respected his intellect, and of course, we children did. I think that we accepted his decisions as he made them because he was the thinker of the family.

Ms. Bridgman: What kinds of things did your family do for fun when your father was still alive?

Mr. Barnes: Again, it's pretty hard to remember. I remember we had this old Mitchell car that we used to drive around. And we would go on picnics. Yes, I can remember we would go nutting. This was in Iowa, and there were groves of walnuts out past the edge of town. I remember, with other people on the faculty of the school, we would drive out and have a picnic in a walnut grove, for instance, and pick up walnuts. And I can remember the stain from the walnuts getting on our hands and being very hard to wash off.

Ms. Bridgman: What place did reading have in your family life, considering your dad was a teacher and an intellectual, as you've said?

Mr. Barnes: He did get me the type of study materials—game-like things that a child would use—to make study and reading more interesting. I can remember a mathematical game that would give you a problem, and then you would write the problem in a slot, and then you would move the paper and see what the correct answer was and know whether you got the right answer or not.

Ms. Bridgman: In what ways did your mother and father participate in the community activities?

Mr. Barnes: They were active as members of the faculty of the school district. I can't really remember much about their activities, but I think they were very social people. The faculty of the school district was a rather social type of organization, perhaps more than it is now.

Ms. Bridgman: What kinds of talk do you remember within the family, or on these nutting picnics, or even later, after the crash and the depression, about the country and what it was to be an American, and to be a citizen, and that sort of thing?

Mr. Barnes: I think that was just accepted, and I can't remember any discussions of that type.

Ms. Bridgman: How about your father's political affiliations?

Mr. Barnes: I'm not aware that he was active in any political party sense, and I really couldn't answer whether he was attracted by one party or another or not. I believe that he was active, as far as the school board was concerned. I had the impression that he was a member of the school board, even though he was a teacher. I may be wrong in that, but I have the impression that he did serve in that capacity.

I also know that he was a member of the Masons. He went up the ladder in the Masons, the degrees, orders, that they have. He was active in that organization.

Ms. Bridgman: And your mother?

Mr. Barnes: My mother probably wasn't as active in things like that as my father.

Ms. Bridgman: What's your first memory of a national holiday?

Mr. Barnes: Oh boy. My first memory of a national holiday. I just can't remember what my first memory must have been. It must have been Christmas or Thanksgiving, though.

I maybe have dim memories of Armistice Day. November 11th used to be Armistice Day. My father had not been involved in World War I because he had been married at the time. I guess I just can't answer that question.

Ms. Bridgman: You've raised another interesting point here, though. Did you know other veterans of World War I? And how did you feel about that?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, I can remember one of the teachers, a male teacher that boarded with my mother after my father died. He was an ROTC teacher—no, he was a commander of the National Guard, I think, in Burlington, Iowa. I remember he gave riding lessons using the National Guard horses. They allowed them to get the public involved in riding lessons, and he was a veteran of World War I. That did fascinate me. I used to try to get him to tell stories about the war, but he was quite reluctant to talk about it. I really didn't get much out of him.

Ms. Bridgman: Where did your interest in the war come from?

Mr. Barnes: Perhaps from him and from a school nurse that also boarded with my mother. She had been a nurse in the war—World War I. I can remember her telling a little bit about her experiences as a nurse during the war. Perhaps, through these two people, I did have some interest in World War I, and then the fact that soldiers, weapons, and so forth, do have a natural attraction for young boys sometimes.

Ms. Bridgman: What was your impression at this time in your childhood of America's role in that war—World War I?

Mr. Barnes: My impression is rather vague, I believe. I remember that we were rather late in getting into the war. And I remember that we won the war, or at least came up with a favorable armistice.

Ms. Bridgman: You've said that after your dad died your mother moved back to Illinois, and you think that it was partly to be near her parents. And you told me when we were chatting, earlier, you were closer to those grandparents, Gus and Elizabeth Snyder.

Mr. Barnes: Yes.

Ms. Bridgman: Will you describe them please?

Mr. Barnes: Both were rather overweight and not very intellectual, I'm afraid. They were rather ordinary people.

Gus, my grandfather, worked in the machine shops for the railroad. My grandmother was quite quiet, not very talkative. They were both religious. They belonged to a little church nearby, and I used to take them to church occasionally, after I was old enough to drive.

I'd say they were not very intellectual. Rather quiet. My grandfather Gus was dogmatic, perhaps, in his beliefs, and didn't bother much with careful reasoning in his opinions.

Ms. Bridgman: What kind of beliefs did he have about being American?

Mr. Barnes: I think he appreciated being American. I can remember his reference to Russia as "Rooshie." Russia to him was "Rooshie." And to him, Canada belonged to England. His ideas of the world were not too well thought-out. I can't remember a whole lot of his discussions, or if there was much in the line of discussions. I think he just expressed dogmatic opinions and that was it.

Ms. Bridgman: How did you feel about these opinions when you were that young?

Mr. Barnes: I was aware that he wasn't too rational, wasn't thinking things through. There is a contrast between he and my father in that way. Of course, my father died early, and I became more acquainted with my grandfather and grandmother a little later in life as I became a teenager.

Ms. Bridgman: Now grandfather Gus Snyder was an alderman? In Bloomington, Illinois?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, I think that's something similar to a precinct committee person in our state of Washington, I believe. I can remember...

[End Tape 1, Side 1]

2 CHILDHOOD

Ms. Bridgman: Dick, you were just talking about your Grandfather Snyder and his position as alderman in Bloomington, Illinois. And you compared it to being a precinct chairman in Washington today.

Mr. Barnes: I believe that's what it was, although I wouldn't be sure. I can remember seeing his business card as an alderman that he passed around in the process of campaigning for the position.

Ms. Bridgman: How did he talk about his position?

Mr. Barnes: I really don't remember him in any conversation about that position at all. All I can remember is seeing the card that announced that he was an alderman of a certain ward. I can't remember the number of the ward.

Ms. Bridgman: What kind of influence did these grandparents, your mother's parents, have on you?

Mr. Barnes: I did know them, and we stayed with them quite often in their little house. I remember that they thought playing cards was wrong. My cousin, who was more like a sister sort of, I can remember she and I playing cards in the front room, or the bedroom which is off the front room. When it sounded like my grandmother or grandfather was approaching, we'd cover the cards up with the bed covers so that they wouldn't know that we were playing cards.

As far as influence is concerned, I don't think that except for the fact that they were church people, and perhaps they tried to influence me to be religious. I can remember a preacher that they invited to the house once; they had me over to dinner with them in the hopes that some of his goodness would rub off on me, I believe.

Ms. Bridgman: What age were you at the time of this?

Mr. Barnes: Probably was in my early teens, maybe thirteen, fourteen, or fifteen. Maybe I was old enough to drive about that time.

Ms. Bridgman: You indicated on the Family Information Form we sent you that your grandmother's father, William Ewers, was a drummer boy in the Union Army.

Mr. Barnes: Yes, that's my impression. And I can remember my great-grandfather, William Ewers, and my great-grandmother, his wife, visiting my grandparents in Bloomington, Illinois. When I was rather small, I can remember my great-grandfather sitting in a rocking chair and throwing a little, toy football to me. I would run across the living room, he would throw the ball to me, and I would catch it. So, I could say that I played football with my great-grandfather.

Ms. Bridgman: What do you know about his war experiences?

Mr. Barnes: Unfortunately, I was too young to appreciate that or quiz him on that. Now I wish that I could have done so because it would be fascinating to have heard the stories of his young life.

Ms. Bridgman: Then what were the sort of general attitudes about the Civil War on the Snyder side of the family?

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember any attitudes. I suppose that we were all Northerners and had been sympathetic to the northern cause. But the war was accepted as a fact that had happened and was over with.

Ms. Bridgman: Now your other grandparents, your father's parents, the Barnes, you say you didn't know them well. But your great-grandfather, David Barnes, also died in the Union Army. What do you know about that?

Mr. Barnes: It was my understanding that he died within days after being inducted, and that he lived in what is now a wheat field near Forest City, Illinois. He was inducted and was gone for a matter of days, and then, was brought back and buried up on a hill overlooking this field—what is now a wheat field—where their houses were. Again, I wish I had more information because it sounds like it could be very fascinating to know.

Ms. Bridgman: By inducted, you mean he was drafted rather than volunteered?

Mr. Barnes: I imagine he was, although I don't know. I imagine he was inducted because he was

probably older—he had children at the time. Probably, he was beyond the age where he would have been excited about the war and wanted to volunteer.

Ms. Bridgman: Since you didn't know the grandparents well, do you remember any stories of your father's about his childhood?

Mr. Barnes: No, I really don't remember much except that my grandfather, my father's father, spent some time in Texas as a cowboy. I understand that he wore the big hat, the gun, and everything, just like you see in the movies. But then he moved back up to Illinois later. My grandmother did own some property in Texas, I believe, that was divided up among the grandchildren after my grandparents died.

Ms. Bridgman: You have numerous aunts and uncles. Will you explain which of them were important to you, and how?

Mr. Barnes: On my father's side I didn't know my uncles very well. I knew my Aunt Pearl quite well. After my father died, my mother and I used to stay on the farm with my Aunt Pearl and her husband, my Uncle Elmer. And so my Aunt Pearl probably had some influence on my life. She was a very nice person, thoughtful and intellectual. I can remember that she played the piano. In their farm home they had a baby grand piano, actually. My father's family had been musical, and she was a part of that.

I also knew my mother's sisters quite well. My mother had two sisters that had lived to maturity. They were my favorites, I guess. They had some influence on me and I knew them quite well.

Ms. Bridgman: How often did you see them?

Mr. Barnes: We used to see them pretty often, particularly after my father died and we moved to Illinois. One of them lived in Chicago with her husband. The other lived in Peoria. The one in Peoria we used to see quite often. I can remember, after becoming a teenager and being where I could move around on my own a bit, that I went up to Chicago and would visit with my aunt and uncle. We spent quite a bit of time with my aunt and uncle in Peoria, also.

Ms. Bridgman: Looking back, what about the way they lived and the attitudes they had—what had lasting influence on your life?

Mr. Barnes: My aunt that lived in Chicago, my Aunt Esther, I think she was quite intellectual and a reasonable person; perhaps that influenced me to be a thinker, to assume that everything didn't just happen, that people had to reason things through.

My aunt in Peoria was not quite as intellectual, but she was very sociable and a very happy-go-lucky type of person. I can remember her husband, my Uncle George, teaching me how to play golf when I was a teenager. I knew them quite well.

Ms. Bridgman: What was their reaction to the political events of your boyhood, the Prohibition and [ ] the depression and FDR's plans to change the [ ] and that sort of thing?

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember much of their reaction to that at all. I can remember my own reactions, I guess, as I got a little older. I felt that perhaps the government was getting involved a little bit too much in the business and so forth. I remember Roosevelt's National Recovery Act, which was declared unconstitutional. And I can, barely, remember being glad that, that was declared unconstitutional because I felt that it was wrong. Then I can, barely, remember Roosevelt's attempt to pack the Supreme Court, also. I can't remember my family's reaction to those things—mostly my own.

Ms. Bridgman: Did you talk these things over then with people outside your family?

Mr. Barnes: Not a whole lot. As I got a little older, I got involved in World War II where I was in the Army. I can remember a good deal of sympathetic thoughts among friends of mine on the subject.

Ms. Bridgman: Sympathetic to your point of view? Or sympathetic to FDR?

Mr. Barnes: Sympathetic to my point of view.

Ms. Bridgman: How did you come to these conclusions that the government was interfering too much?

Mr. Barnes: Perhaps at an early age, when I was a late teenager and went to the University of Illinois—I studied economics there. I took a couple of courses in economics. I was imbued with the capitalistic system, the competitive pricing system, the laws of economics, the laws of supply and demand, the laws of diminishing returns, and so forth. I learned these things, and it appeared to me that our government was not following these laws. Instead there were attempts being made to control the economy which would upset the economy and not let things take their natural course.

Ms. Bridgman: What kind of effects from the depression did you see around you? You'd moved to Illinois.

Mr. Barnes: I had friends that couldn't find work, and it was tough finding a job. I can remember myself trying to find a job. I can remember working in a gas station for something like fifteen dollars a week—and I worked ten hours a day for five days a week. I also had a job as a technical assistant in a railroad engineering department for a while. I can remember that in order to get a job such as this you had to know somebody, or had to be at the right place at the right time. And I can remember friends that didn't have jobs and were having a tough time making out. This was my impression of the depression at the time, I guess.

Ms. Bridgman: How many families did you observe in the town who you would say were having a difficult time because of it?

Mr. Barnes: There were several families that I knew that were having difficulties. It's been a long time, and I can't remember how they handled their difficulties or what the situation would be in how they lived. I just can't remember too much about that.

Ms. Bridgman: How big was Bloomington?

Mr. Barnes: Probably around twenty-five or thirty thousand people.

Ms. Bridgman: And the economic base was?

Mr. Barnes: There wasn't much there. There was a farm implement factory, I believe. It was an agricultural area and there were seed companies.

I remember I had a job for a while at the Funk Seed Company, shelling corn. This was after the war began, really—before I went off to the service.

But even after the war began it was kind of tough there in Bloomington.

Ms. Bridgman: What sort of union organization efforts was there in Bloomington in the thirties?

Mr. Barnes: I don't remember the union situation at all. I wasn't involved. The jobs I had evidently were not union jobs.

Ms. Bridgman: I'd like to go back again and start with kindergarten and the pinafore outfit—get you to recall your schooling, both in Burlington, before your dad died, and later on. Did you get to wear other clothes after the pinafore outfit?

Mr. Barnes: I imagine I did. I imagine after I got in first grade it was a little different.

Ms. Bridgman: What did you like best about school?

Mr. Barnes: I think I liked school. I had some teachers that I felt were pretty nice. Then the association with the other children. I think I was a sociable person, and I enjoyed having friends among the other students.

Ms. Bridgman: What was your role among your friends?

Mr. Barnes: My what?

Ms. Bridgman: Your role. Were you—did you organize a lot of the games? Did other people organize? Did you join in enthusiastically? What kinds of things...

Mr. Barnes: It seems like, on occasion, I was the organizer. I can remember that in about fourth grade we played basketball during every recess. We went out and had basketball hoops outside in the playground, and we would play basketball. I think I was involved in organizing that.

After school, quite often, we would play baseball or go down to the school grounds and play on the swings and slides and so forth.

Ms. Bridgman: Who were your very best friends?

Mr. Barnes: Let's see. Probably my best friend, early on, was a little boy named John Ball who lived across the alley from me. Later on, as I got into junior high school, a boy named Robert Frieger was my best friend—through high school he and I were good friends.

Ms. Bridgman: What kind of things did you do with these very special friends?

Mr. Barnes: Let's see. With John Ball we'd play baseball after school. We might sleep over. And play in the yards—we played various games. We'd play cowboys and Indians, of course. That was a favorite game in those days.

Later on, in junior high and high school, with my friend Robert Frieger, quite often we would play basketball. We had a little basketball hoop on his driveway and would play basketball there. Or we would adventure around the neighborhoods on our bicycles.

Ms. Bridgman: How did you settle disagreements?

Mr. Barnes: Let me see. Robert Frieger was kind of a domineering person, and he was very smart. He probably carried the day on disagreements. Probably his influence, his decisions, were what settled disputes.

Ms. Bridgman: How did you feel toward other boys and young men, and young women who weren't your friends?

Mr. Barnes: I guess that's kind of hard to say. I enjoyed my friends, and I think that I liked people in general. I was sociable. I can't say that I had any kind of feelings particularly toward people that weren't my friends—except that I liked them.

Ms. Bridgman: In grade school how much teasing, and ignoring, and bullying, and that sort of thing, do you remember among the children?

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember much in that line.

Ms. Bridgman: You mentioned sports: baseball and basketball, and football with a Civil War veteran. How did you first get involved in sports?

Mr. Barnes: When we were in grade school and junior high school I'd play sandlot football with my friends. And I can remember doing that an awful lot, every night maybe, after school, we would play sandlot football.

When I got into high school I went out for the football team. For three years I went out for the team. I did make the team and played a little bit. I wasn't all that very good, but I was quite enthusiastic about it. From then on, anytime I had a chance I played football. I also played a little basketball in high school, but not a whole lot. Mostly it was a club sport rather than varsity. I did go out for the school boxing team once. I fought one fight and was knocked out.

Ms. Bridgman: Did that end your career in boxing?

Mr. Barnes: That ended my boxing career.

Ms. Bridgman: How much was competition emphasized among your friends, and in your sports activities, and then in high school?

Mr. Barnes: I think competition was part of the everyday life. It was part of the enjoyment of the teams. I was never a star or anything, but I was sure enthusiastic, and I think I was enthusiastic about the competition.

Ms. Bridgman: If you could, I'd like for you to recall the kind of training you got in citizenship, if we might call it that, in school. From grade school on, what sorts of patriotic things were included?

Mr. Barnes: I can remember that we did have the civics classes in school, throughout school. And we were taught that our government worked, and I think we must have been taught our responsibilities as citizens. I believe that in those days we were taught our responsibilities as citizens, and how our government worked, and the way that we should act, and the fact that we should vote, and that sort of thing.

Ms. Bridgman: What kind of impression did this make on you?

Mr. Barnes: It's pretty hard to say. But I think it impressed me with the fact that a person should think about his government and should vote.

Ms. Bridgman: Do you remember the Fourth of July celebrations? In Burlington or Bloomington?

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember any specific celebrations, no.

Ms. Bridgman: Parades or—

Mr. Barnes: No, I can't seem to recall any specific patriotic type celebrations. Perhaps it was because in the summertime school was out, and my family was generally off visiting with relatives, or something of that sort. My father, during the summer break, would teach or take classes in various school extension courses. So we were usually out of town.

I guess I can remember one Fourth of July. It was in another town in Iowa where my father was teaching in a summer school. And the faculty of this summer school...

[End Tape 1, Side 2]

3 SCHOOL YEARS

Ms. Bridgman: Today we're going to talk about your high school experiences, college, and if we get to it, the events that lead up to World War II and your entry into the service. Also, we'll try to talk about your interest in music, sports, friends, and anything else that occurs to us as we go along.

On the last tape you were telling me about a Fourth of July celebration in an Iowa town where your father was teaching. Can you continue with your recollections about that?

Mr. Barnes: That was in Clinton, Iowa. The reason I remember it is because somebody dropped a sparkler into the box of firecrackers and they went shooting off in all directions. I can remember skyrockets coming whistling past us in the yard and my mother taking me and going behind the house so we would be out of the line of fire.

Ms. Bridgman: What do you remember, except the fireworks, about it?

Mr. Barnes: I remember it was a social gathering. We had a sociable group of the faculty, a sort of traveling summer school that my dad taught in for about three summers. Each summer they would have a summer school for teachers, to advance their skills. It would take place in a different town in southeastern Iowa. This one happened to be in Clinton. This is about all I can remember of this occasion.

Ms. Bridgman: Did you enjoy the summers in different towns?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, they gave me a little broader view of things, and I made new friends in each town. I can remember some of the friends in some towns. It was a change of scenery from our regular home in Burlington, Iowa.

Ms. Bridgman: How did you go about meeting these new friends that you made?

Mr. Barnes: Well, you know how kids are, they'll wander around neighborhoods where they live and just stand around until they're invited to join in the games. Of course, that happens rather easily among kids. So there would be a gang of kids in each of the towns that I would get acquainted with and become a part of. We would play together.

Ms. Bridgman: At that stage, what kinds of games did you play?

Mr. Barnes: This is pretty hard for me to remember, but I suppose baseball was one of those, and exploring around the neighborhood. Just, in general, the things that kids do.

Ms. Bridgman: Were you one of the group? Did you think of new things to do? How would you characterize your participation?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, I can remember thinking of exploring the house we lived in. We lived on one floor, and the upper floor was sort of closed off. We didn't use that [upper floor] for the summer. We rented the lower floor of the house. I can remember the kids and I going up the stairs and exploring the upstairs in this house and being afraid of ghosts and things of that sort.

Ms. Bridgman: This was while you were still in grade school?

Mr. Barnes: Yes. It had to be before I was nine years old because my father died when I was nine. We were at these places because he was teaching at the summer schools.

Ms. Bridgman: In these towns, did you get a different idea of what community life was like, or what American life was like, than you had in the town where you grew up?

Mr. Barnes: I suppose so, but you know all small Iowa towns are pretty much alike. Different set of kids, but very similar in the things that we did.

Ms. Bridgman: I began by asking you about the Fourth of July to try and get you to recall how you might have felt about being an American, or what America was. Can you reflect a little on that?

Mr. Barnes: I presume that association with my parents and with other kids did infuse me with the idea of what life was like in America. Of course I was too young to be thinking seriously about it. I did have some run-ins with bully-type kids, too, during these summers, as I did occasionally in our own home town of Burlington. So we got a little microcosm of

life, I guess, meeting with children that were friendly and fun to be with and meeting with those that were anti-social.

Ms. Bridgman: How did you handle the situations with the bullies?

Mr. Barnes: I usually ran.

Ms. Bridgman: Were the bullies part of the group?

Mr. Barnes: No. No they weren't. The times when I can remember running into bully-types, they weren't part of the group that I knew.

Ms. Bridgman: In the groups of these new children that you played with and in your own town, can you remember certain children being leaders and certain ones being followers?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, this is true, I think, in whatever town you're in. But of course, at different times different kids will be the leader. It depends on what kind of an activity you're in.

Ms. Bridgman: How would you remember yourself?

Mr. Barnes: I suppose I was a leader in some kinds of activities, but most of the time just one of the group.

Ms. Bridgman: In what kinds of activities, other than exploring the scary upstairs, were you a leader?

Mr. Barnes: I think, maybe, I instigated a couple of games of capture the flag or something like that in which I knew the rules and would lead the others into the game. But actually, you're pushing my memory a little bit here. This all happened well over a half century ago.

Ms. Bridgman: I wonder if kids still play capture the flag?

You mentioned baseball, and you talked on an earlier tape about football and basketball. I'd like to go on now to junior high, and especially high school. Can you tell me about your interest in sports?

Mr. Barnes: In junior high I remember I went out. In my first year I went out for football, but the coach told me not to bother. I was kind of small. So I didn't go out for football until I went to my first year at high school, which was in ninth grade—no, tenth grade. I played sophomore football. I was on the sophomore team for that year, and then I played on the varsity team my last two years in high school.

Not having had the junior high experience, I wasn't one of the leading players, and having trouble with hay fever at the beginning of the season, I was really handicapped when the season started. I was never able to impress the coach very much. But I did enjoy playing.

By this time my dad had passed away, and my mother was struggling to make a living for both of us. My brother had gone off to the naval academy, and he was helping by sending some money back. Of course he was someone my mother and I were both proud of because he was a cadet at the naval academy at Annapolis.

One other sport I did participate in was boxing. One year during my high school career I did go out for the boxing team. I fought one fight and got knocked out, and after that I decided that boxing wasn't my sport.

Ms. Bridgman: Aside from being knocked out, what were some of your best and worst experiences in the sports you enjoyed?

Mr. Barnes: It's hard to remember now, but the best experience, I think, is that football was a release for me. I was under tension, I believe; my mother, struggling. I had never accomplished myself in life yet, and like all teenagers, this weighs upon you, and you want to do something that seems to be acceptable in society, and football, of course, was. So it was sort of a release to me. And I would be anxious to get to football practice every night after school, I can remember.

Also, at this time I was learning how, or gaining skill in playing the trombone. I played in the band and took lessons from the band leader. Other than football season, I would spend my evenings after school practicing. I got pretty fair at that [the trombone] and did represent the school in the trombone solo contest at the end of my senior year.

Ms. Bridgman: Did your music have a similar kind of place in your life in that it gave you a sense of accomplishment, or release, as you describe it?

Mr. Barnes: I think so. And then I did like to play just for the sake of playing music itself. And I do enjoy it, so I worked hard at it. Later in life both the sports and music were something of interest to me—throughout my whole life.

Ms. Bridgman: You didn't tell me about a worst experience in football. Were there, then, no worst experiences?

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember anything that would have been a worst experience, as you want to call it. I was never injured seriously. I did have minor injuries that were a nuisance at times. But I really can't re-

member anything negative about football, except, of course, that I really wasn't one of the first-string players until very late in my senior year. Again, I had been bothered by hay fever at the beginning of the season; therefore, [I] wasn't able to impress the coach when the season was starting.

Ms. Bridgman: What position did you play?

Mr. Barnes: I played tackle. I probably should have played in a backfield position because I was quite fast and was not very heavy, but my father and my brother had both played tackle, so I thought that I should continue the family tradition.

Ms. Bridgman: Looking back, then, would you say your family tradition was important and part of—how would you describe it?

Mr. Barnes: I think it did influence in the position I played in football. I don't think that this was very important as far as the family tradition was concerned. This is something I just assumed. I think I did pretty well at it, once I was over my hay fever and got into the season a little bit, in each case, I mean, in each season.

Ms. Bridgman: Can you recall other areas in your life—academics, other activities, church—where family tradition seemed important to you?

Mr. Barnes: No, not really. I can't remember being influenced by family tradition. I know that in the church my family had gone to I belonged to the youth group for a while, and I would play in the Sunday school orchestra.

I can't remember the other part of your question.

Ms. Bridgman: My question was just, "Was family tradition a part of the way you operated?"

Mr. Barnes: Not very much, I believe. Except that I was proud of my brother who, at the time I was in high school, was the cadet at the U.S. Naval Academy. I did assume that was an important thing to do, and perhaps this had something to do with forming my background.

Ms. Bridgman: Other than church and Sunday school, and football, and the band, did you belong to other organized activities?

Mr. Barnes: All the students in the school, in our high school, had to belong to a club of some sort. We had a period set aside once a week for club activities. I was elected president of the radio club. It didn't involve a whole lot—we put together a short-wave radio, I believe, with the help of a teacher, mainly. Perhaps that showed my leadership in that I was elected president.

Ms. Bridgman: What were your tasks as president?

Mr. Barnes: Again, this pushes my memory a little bit. I think I chaired the meetings. I believe that was about it.

Ms. Bridgman: Did you have to campaign to become president?

Mr. Barnes: No. Just Monday, I think the first day we met, there were nominations and a paper ballot or something of that sort. I don't remember any kind of campaigning. I don't remember actually caring much whether I was elected president or not, either.

Ms. Bridgman: How about other youth organizations, like Scouts?

Mr. Barnes: I had belonged to the YMCA and I did play a little basketball in connection with that, and did act as a lifeguard at the lessons where they taught small children to swim. This was on a volunteer basis.

And Scouting—after my father died I can remember one of the other teachers at the school was a scoutmaster of a troop. With his encouragement I joined his troop and spent one year. But I really didn't go very far—I think Tenderfoot was as far as I went—and [I] only spent one year in the troop. Although I've always appreciated the scouting experience I had and am quite appreciative of the scouting experience that boys get, I really didn't get very much myself.

Ms. Bridgman: Why did you quit after a year?

Mr. Barnes: I don't know. Probably because I was very busy in other activities. In music, perhaps, and perhaps because during the summertime, after my father died, my mother and I spent our summers on the farm with an uncle and aunt, away from our hometown of Burlington. Of course this spending summers on the farm, my uncle's farm, was another addition to my background because we spent about three summers there. There was a set of kids my age that I was involved with there, too. I can very fondly remember that experience.

Ms. Bridgman: What kinds of things did you do with them?

Mr. Barnes: Quite often we'd play games in town, regular child games, hide-and-seek and so forth. When we got a little older, we'd go to the band concerts in town, once a week. I can remember riding

into town on Old Ted, which was one of my uncle's plow horses. It wasn't a riding horse, but I could climb up on top of him without a saddle and just walk him into town. If he'd have started to run I'd have been scared to death!

Also, I can remember, very well, the harvest activities where they'd have the harvest crews come in with—not the combine, but the machines to cut the hay and to thresh it—threshing crews, that's it. And the big lunches they'd have with these crews. The crews, which were made up of all the neighbors around, would go to all the neighborhood farms and do the threshing and take the grain into town. I would usually ride with the water boy—usually a boy a little bit older than me that would drive a buggy and carry the water jugs around to the men in the field.

Ms. Bridgman: How old were you when you spent these summers on the farm?

Mr. Barnes: I think about ten, eleven, or twelve. Thirteen. It was after my father died. And because I was away in the summer, this is probably the reason I dropped out of Scouts.

Ms. Bridgman: When you lived on the farm, did you have certain chores assigned to you?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, I fed the cats. And I would go drive the cows in for water and feed in the evening. Little things like that.

One of my favorite activities there—I had a little .22 single-shot rifle. I would go out and set up targets in the field and shoot. I'd be accompanied by the farm dog, old Shep, a shepherd dog that had just wandered into the farm one day and became a part of it. I learned to be careful with a rifle with Shep's help because he stayed away from the muzzle. I can remember knowing that if Shep was that smart, then I could be smart too about handling a gun.

Ms. Bridgman: You shot only at targets?

Mr. Barnes: Yes. I never did any hunting.

Ms. Bridgman: Was that by choice? By chance?

Mr. Barnes: Not having a father, I didn't have anyone to show me how or to get me into that activity. I did a little hunting when I was in high school in Burlington. A friend of mine and I had a canoe. We would take it across the river into the bayous on the Illinois side. One day I remember we did shoot a duck with rifles, that is—and a rabbit, and we brought them home, and my mother fixed a big dinner for us out of those. So that was one of my memories I can point to.

Ms. Bridgman: But hunting wasn't a regular autumn or winter activity?

Mr. Barnes: No. Neither hunting nor fishing did I do very much.

Ms. Bridgman: I just asked you about the tasks you had on the farm. Did you have part-time paying jobs then, at some age?

Mr. Barnes: No, I never did.

Ms. Bridgman: During high school?

Mr. Barnes: No—well let's see. Yes, two summers I worked washing dishes in the summer "Y" camp—Camp Hauberg up near the tri-cities, Davenport, Moline, and Rock Island, on the Illinois side of the river.

I visited the camp just recently, too. We were driving by, going back to visit—I think for my fiftieth high school reunion. We went by Camp Hauberg and drove in, saw the old mess hall where I'd worked and so forth.

Ms. Bridgman: What kinds of memories do you have about that washing dishes job?

Mr. Barnes: Very pleasant memories. That was fun. I liked the kids that I was working with, the other boys that I was working with who turned out to be very good friends. We had our own little cabin where we lived. I can remember our activities there. It was really great fun, although we missed out a lot of the regular camp activities because we had to work.

There were times when we did get in on activities. One particular time I remember one of my roommates, cabinmates, was the bugler, and he decided to blow Reveille one morning at about three o' clock in the morning. That upset the camp a little bit. The next night while we were sleeping, just as dawn was breaking, I think, I heard a commotion in the cabin, and there was a group of guys taking the bugler, my friend, and carrying him out. I protested, whereupon they carried me out, too. They took us down to the dock and they threw us both in the river. I can remember waking up by being dunked into the cold Mississippi river.

But all this was fun. That was a pleasant part of my life.

Ms. Bridgman: Who supervised the dishwashing?

Mr. Barnes: We had a cook named ma Moon. She was an elderly woman and quite wide girthed. She was our boss. And it was a "Y" camp, so it was run and administered by YMCA officials.

Ms. Bridgman: How did all of you young men dishwashers get along with her?

Mr. Barnes: We got along fine. She was a tough taskmaster, and she made us do what we had to do, and the other times, when we were free, why we could go canoeing or sailing or whatever activity was available to us at the camp.

I don't believe we were paid for that job. If I remember right, it was that we got our camping free.

Ms. Bridgman: Now this was in high school?

Mr. Barnes: Yes.

Ms. Bridgman: How about the academic part of high school?

Mr. Barnes: Well, I was kind of an average student; although, because of my music activities, I was generally included in the group of kids that were leadership types, I believe. I never was a class officer or anything, but my friends, the kids that I did associate with, were those that were involved in music or drama or journalism or whatnot. I have fond memories of the young people I was involved with and associated with. I met some of them at our fiftieth reunion.

[End Tape 2, Side 1]

4 THE GREAT DEPRESSION

Ms. Bridgman: We were chatting off-tape and Dick, you made a remark about the significance of the depression in your life and those of your contemporaries.

Mr. Barnes: I think that the fact of the depression did teach kids of my age some of the realities of life. That is that everything doesn't come for free. Your family doesn't have a home and two cars just automatically. These things. You have to have a good job and you have to do some saving. Perhaps this is the difference between my generation and the generations that followed because we learned that, like I said, things don't come for free; you have to work for them and you have to be able to hold a good job, and that means that you have to have certain skills. And that means that your schooling and your education and training, whatever training you might get, it is important.

Ms. Bridgman: Did you consider that as you were growing up?

Mr. Barnes: No, I wasn't a very deep thinker.

Ms. Bridgman: Did you or your friends talk about it? How much did you all, in retrospect—would you say you were worried about it?

Mr. Barnes: I don't know that we were. My mother, of course, was worried somewhat because she had to support myself and her. But she kept a nice home and she supported us by having teachers room with us. And have room and board with us.

But our furnishings were somewhat tattered, you might say. I can remember there was a hole worn in our living room rug and I can remember when I had a group of the kids over to our house for some kind of an affair, a party or something. There must have been about eight or ten of us. And I can remember one of the girls that I thought was pretty nice noticing this hole in the rug, and her folks were quite wealthy. And I can remember maybe being a little—well, I don't believe I was embarrassed by it; it was just one of the facts of life.

Ms. Bridgman: How do you think this significant characteristic of your generation was observed or acquired? You said you didn't talk about it much.

Mr. Barnes: Yes. It was something that happened and caused all of us to face the realities. I remember banks closed and people lost their savings. Shops disappeared and people were living without a job. It was tough. And people had trouble hanging onto their homes.

I can remember that the schools would not hire a married woman as a teacher because they felt that the jobs should be distributed among those that were not married, because the feeling was that at a time of job shortage it was unfair to have two incomes in one family and none in another.

All in all, I think the depression probably developed character in all of us. It made all of us face realities, and perhaps, this is the generation that after World War II created a lot of economic progress for our country.

Ms. Bridgman: Do you remember reading a lot about it in the newspapers?

Mr. Barnes: No, I can't remember too much. But it was something that we were all very well aware of because many of our friends' fathers lost their jobs. We knew there was economic problems all around us. I don't think we had to read about it. We were living it.

Ms. Bridgman: I'm still interested in how young people acquired experience and information that then characterized that generation. Am I remembering correctly that you said you didn't talk about it a lot with either adults or your friends?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, that's right. The depression was not a subject of conversation very much. We were all aware of it, and we all realized what the problems were. But as young people we were more interested in-like young people now—we were interested in the music of the times, which was the Glenn Miller type. We were interested in the music of the time, and we were interested in sports, and we were interested in getting together and having a good time. Which we did.

Ms. Bridgman: And yet it still permeated your lives so that, as you put it so well, yours was a generation that was responsible for prosperity in post-war.

Mr. Barnes: Yes, I think that's true. Like I say, we had to face the realities of life. We had to realize the necessity of an education or training. And after World War II, great numbers of us went to college. The GI Bill had a lot to do with that. We had, then, a generation of people who were educated, and who had been through the depression and realized what could happen. I think we had a motivated generation then.

Ms. Bridgman: How, then, would you, in the broadest terms, describe the effects of the depression on your generation of Americans?

Mr. Barnes: In broadest terms? It made us realize the necessity of education and training. It made us realize the need to work. It made us aware of the work ethic, and it made us aware of the realities of what could happen if the economic situation turned bad. I think, in general terms, that could describe what it did for us.

Ms. Bridgman: You've talked about all the difficult times and bad things, and yet, what you just said is not a negative effect.

Mr. Barnes: Well, there was a negative effect on people that were really in trouble, couldn't heat their homes or couldn't find enough to eat or couldn't have a home; although, I didn't know of people who were that bad off. Somehow or another most people managed to hang onto something and to find something to eat. We didn't have the welfare programs that we have now.

In our town, at least, we weren't hit so hard as perhaps in some of the big cities where there were bread lines and so forth.

Ms. Bridgman: How much, in your town, did neighbors help one another out?

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember too much about that. I think there was some help going on, neighbor to neighbor.

Ms. Bridgman: What would you say about the attitude of people who weren't so well-off toward those who weren't having a difficult time?

Mr. Barnes: I suppose I was one of those that was in a family that was having a difficult time. And I suppose this young lady that I mentioned, the one that noticed the hole in our rug, her parents were not having a difficult time. I can't remember that I had any kind of an attitude toward her at all except she was a cute girl. And she wasn't my girlfriend, by the way. She was a little part of the crowd and one that the people liked. I can't remember that there was any attitude of jealousy or anything of that sort. I just don't believe that existed.

Ms. Bridgman: And you said she pointed out the hole in your rug.

Mr. Barnes: No, she didn't point it out.

Ms. Bridgman: Oh, she didn't point it out.

Mr. Barnes: I saw that she noticed it.

Ms. Bridgman: So how would she, and others like her, have looked at those of you who were having a tough time?

Mr. Barnes: I don't think it made any difference to her, either, because she was friendly to me and always was a part of the crowd. It was a very flexible type of crowd, by the way, it wasn't a clique of any sort. It was just young people who would happen to be together for things.

I don't think there was any feeling of superiority in her or any of the others in her situation. The fact of economic problems or financial problems was just accepted by all of us, and nobody was considered inferior or superior determined by their economic status at least that I knew of.

Ms. Bridgman: And that held true in all the towns that you knew about during those years?

Mr. Barnes: Yes. In the towns that I visited or that I lived with my father, when my father was teaching, especially before the depression. I was staying in the summers on my uncle's farm during the depression. The farm people, they had food to eat, and many were losing their farms. That was really tough on some of them, but I can't remember that the kids of my age were too aware of that unless their own family was involved. Many that lost their farms stayed on them as tenant farmers so there wasn't a lot of change in their lives.

Ms. Bridgman: When we were talking about the girl who noticed the hole in the rug, we'd begun to talk about the academic part of high school and your friends. You mentioned some of them were in journalism and drama. Were you in those things? And what were your favorite subjects?

Mr. Barnes: I think I liked mathematics and physics and the science-type subjects. I didn't do real well, but I did fair. I, perhaps, got C pluses or B minuses, average, throughout my high school years. This was possibly because I wasn't too highly motivated at the time until a little later.

My father had been well educated, and if he'd been alive, probably, he would have helped me, but my mother had not even finished high school. She stayed strictly out of my studies and academic life. So I really didn't have the encouragement at home or the help at home. But I did get, perhaps, above average grades, but not very brilliant grades. There was enough that I could go to college when I finished high school.

Ms. Bridgman: On the earlier tape you described not only your father, but your Aunt Pearl and your Aunt Esther, as intellectuals, as thinkers. During your high school years did that family influence—what kind of effect did that have?

Mr. Barnes: Perhaps the fact that my Aunt Pearl, who was the aunt whose farm I lived on in the summertime—she was a thoughtful person. And perhaps that affected me to also follow her example. And the same with my Aunt Esther, with whom I didn't have quite as close a relationship at that time. But I appreciated her thoughtfulness, and I could see the difference between her and other people who weren't thoughtful. So perhaps that encouraged me to be that type of person also, later.

Ms. Bridgman: During your high school years, war in Europe was developing. What do you recall about that and how you and your friends reacted to it?

Mr. Barnes: I can remember the Russians' invasion of Finland—our reaction was sympathy to Finland because they were a small country being invaded. We admired them and the way they fought back, and finally, in fact, really repelled the Russian army with their resistance. That was impressive, I think, to most of us.

When the war started, let's see, I can't remember too much. I can remember my own attitude being that this was a mess in Europe and that we should stay out of it. I guess you could call me a peacenik at the time.

Ms. Bridgman: This was in high school?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, and early college. I can remember thinking that this was war in Europe that we should stay away from. It really wasn't until the attack on Pearl Harbor that myself did a turn-around on this, although I had taken the Civil Pilot Training—CPT it was called—in my early college years because I wanted to fly so much.

When I was in grade school, while we were out at recess one day, a squadron of P-26s flew over. This was so exciting to me that way back in grade school it infused me with the desire to fly. When I had the opportunity in college to take the civil pilot training, knowing that it was for preparation for war but not believing that we were going to be into a war, I guess I put aside my feelings that we should stay out of any war to take this training.

Ms. Bridgman: And was it what you had hoped it would be, since boyhood?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, it was. We got about forty hours of flight training and some ground training, and we got a private pilot's license out of it. This was when I was in college, [my] early years in college.

I can remember having an engine failure and having to make a forced landing and being somewhat scared at first. But it [the forced landing] was successful, and my instructor started the engine and I, alone, went right back up again. So I learned something, but I didn't become frightened of it.

Ms. Bridgman: You mentioned your awareness of events in Europe and feeling that we should stay out. How did you feel about Hitler and Mussolini?

Mr. Barnes: Of course we-our generation-thought they were monsters and hoped that the Allies would deal properly with them. But we didn't really realize that their goal was to conquer the world. [We] didn't take them seriously on that. It's a thing, a phenomena or type of feeling, that you could see coming back during the period of the Korean and Vietnam War that kind of worries me a bit. [It is] that people don't realize that there are some people in the world who are of this type and must be dealt with.

I think, maybe because of the Gulf War, there has been a realization that there are this type of people in the world and that they have to be dealt with.

Ms. Bridgman: So the Gulf War to you is affirmation of something that happened earlier? Or not?

Mr. Barnes: It was proof that there still is that type of person in the world, such as Hitler and Mussolini. And I think it's pretty well accepted that we dealt properly with them, although perhaps we should have continued on to where we got rid of the "modern day Hitler" altogether. We'll still have problems as long as he exists and is in power.

Ms. Bridgman: You said Vietnam and Korea concerned you because there was a different feeling. Can you describe a little more about that?

Mr. Barnes: Well, this gets into partisan politics to some extent, but my feeling, in Korea and Vietnam both, is that this was an invasion by a person who

wanted to gain power, by a regime who wanted to build power for themselves, a repressive regime. And this could be compared—they could be compared to the Hitlers and Mussolinis. And they should be dealt with. But by this time, perhaps, that had been forgotten by many people who hadn't lived through World War II. They felt it was not our place to be involved, and as a result, of course, we're involved in the wrong way and did not carry through. We really backed out of Vietnam and really backed down in Korea, where we didn't win. Perhaps if we'd have won in Korea and done the job completely; perhaps there never would have been a Vietnam.

It's hard to say, and it's very controversial, what I'm talking about right now, but I think that particularly Vietnam was a case where obviously many had forgotten, or had not learned, because they'd not been alive in World War II—not learned the reality of what can happen in the world and what some people will do in the world.

Ms. Bridgman: And you volunteered, or you fought, in both Korea and Vietnam. Served.

Mr. Barnes: Well, I was a member of the reserves, and I didn't particularly relish having my life upset. But it was. And in both cases I came out rather easily because I did not have to participate, very much at least, in combat.

As a matter of fact, when the Korean War occurred and I was recalled for that, I had been playing football at the Colorado School of Mines, and I had gotten quite a bit of publicity. The base commander just sort of kept me at Lowry Field, called it active duty, and put me in charge of the football team. In my case I had been a four engine pilot, and many of those who were, [were] put in B-29s and then had to fly in Korea. I flew B-29s in between football seasons but at the Gunnery School at Lowry Field in Colorado.

Ms. Bridgman: What did you do during those wars to express these feelings that you had?

Mr. Barnes: I did what I could in my job as a military pilot and accepted my job. Did what I could, as I say, while running the football team at Lowry Field, and in between football seasons flying B29s in the Gunnery School—there's a certain amount of danger in that.

In the Vietnam War, I was recalled with the reserve unit that I was with. I flew cargo missions in the C-124, a large, propeller-driven cargo ship. I flew cargo missions across to Vietnam and sometimes beyond—Cambodia, Japan, and Korea. I got what was called credit for combat support missions. So it was in combat areas, and of course, we could see the war going on at times. Some of our ships did get bullet holes in them, [these] we'd find when we'd get back. But I really wasn't involved in direct combat.

Ms. Bridgman: What sorts of things did you do to express your opinions to other people who might not have agreed?

Mr. Barnes: Well, anytime I had a chance I argued that we should win the war in Vietnam. I felt, along with most people at the first, that we were doing it the right way by just putting as much pressure as we thought was needed. Now, of course, we know that this was wrong. We should have gone in, in force, much like we did in the Gulf War. I would express my feelings in conversations with people, and of course, the people I talked with weren't unanimously in favor of what I was saying.

Ms. Bridgman: What effect do you think the anti-war protests had?

[End Tape 2, Side 2]

5 WORLD WAR II SERVICE

Ms. Bridgman: Today we'll continue our discussion of American foreign policy since World War II, then go back to your college years and your courtship and marriage to Sylvia.

Our conversation on the last tape led to your observation about U.S. foreign policy during the twentieth century. Several observations. I had ended the tape with a question about your estimate of the effect of the anti-war protests during the Vietnam War. Will you please now describe those opinions about that?

Mr. Barnes: The effect of the anti-war protests during the Vietnam War, I think, possibly, had a rather disastrous effect on our conduct of that war. First, it caused a slowdown or a lack of appreciation for winning the war and a lack of knowledge or reasons for winning the war. And possibly then resulted in the—because of the difficulty of winning the war—in the way that we were going about it. It possibly caused the withdrawal and giving up in the end.

Ms. Bridgman: What kind of domestic effects do you think that it had? The protests.

Mr. Barnes: My years in the state legislature haven't prepared me to be an expert in this field. I think that the domestic effects were, possibly, lack of appreciation for what was happening in the real world, that is, the appreciation of the aggressiveness of communist nations at the time. And the intentions of communist nations.

Ms. Bridgman: Your sons were twenty and seventeen in 1968, if I'm correct, when these protests were going on. How did they react to it?

Mr. Barnes: My older son joined the same reserve unit that I belonged to. As a result, we were both called to active duty to participate, and we did. My younger son attempted to join the Marines, but because he had allergies and hay fever, he was turned down. Neither of my sons agreed with the protesters at the time.

Ms. Bridgman: As you and I both remember, some Americans experienced lasting kind of riffs in their families, among family members or among friends, over foreign policy issues of the sixties. How many people did you know, or how much of that did you experience or observe?

Mr. Barnes: Myself, I didn't know too many people personally that were involved in protesting the war. I don't believe it was a majority of people. However, I was downtown at a time when the University of Washington students, about six-thousand of them, marched down the freeway and threw rocks at the courthouse. I was downtown when that happened and was able to witness it. It looked like a fun time for the kids that were involved. I'm not sure that they were too knowledgeable about what was really going on in the world.

Ms. Bridgman: Was that the march down the freeway immediately after the students were killed in Kent State? It would have been May 5, 1970.

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember the date.

Ms. Bridgman: An earlier one?

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember the date. There was only once that this happened.

Ms. Bridgman: Again, it was sort of a popular assumption in the press, as we both remember, that if these protests would lead to anything it would be a continuing dialogue about American foreign policy and our proper place in the world. Would you like to comment on that please?

Mr. Barnes: Well, possibly the protesting did result in dialogue that you mention there. I think there was a lot of debate, and possibly the attitude of the protesters brought some of it about. But it was a sad time, and we were losing lots of sons and daughters in Vietnam. So it was natural that there would be a lot of debate, whether there were protesters or not.

Ms. Bridgman: How would you appraise the endurance of that dialogue, or that concern with American foreign policy, now, in 1991, compared to say, 1970?

Mr. Barnes: The endurance of the debate? Well, of course in 1991 there aren't the reasons for the debate in what happened in the 1960s and 1970s. And the debate was long-enduring and lasted as long, and sometime after, we removed ourselves from Vietnam.

Yes, it endured as long as the war was going on and even a little longer.

Ms. Bridgman: You made a remark on the last tape about the Gulf War and America's military policy being more in line with your beliefs than was our policy in Korea and Vietnam.

Mr. Barnes: If we are dedicated to stopping aggression through violent means in the world, and through the United Nations, that's exactly what we did. Our own president was a leader in this, in putting together a coalition of nations which was very expertly done, and something that was difficult to do, very probably. And then under the auspices of the United Nations, which was the correct way to do it.

Our course was the way. It established a line and held it and then waited until we had the overwhelming build-up. Then using total effort [it] did within a matter of, I think it was four days, accomplish the goals that we had set. Where we may have made a mistake is in not removing—not occupying the entire nation of Iraq and removing the leadership that had caused the aggression, perhaps. But at the time, maybe, we figured that to announce as a goal, to do that, would make some of the Arab nations not so eager to help us.

Ms. Bridgman: May I ask then the extent to which you agreed with our policy during the Gulf War?

Mr. Barnes: I think, at the time, I agreed with it perfectly. It's only afterward, I began to wonder if we should have carried on and completed the job.

Ms. Bridgman: How would you compare the response of the American public to the Gulf War to that of the Vietnam War?

Mr. Barnes: The Vietnam War we figured to counter. First to counter the guerilla activity with a small number of troops, and mainly to aid the South Vietnam forces. As the enemy forces were built up slowly, then we found that we had to build up to match them. We tried to win the war with the minimum effort. That was—well, I agreed with it at the time, but now we can see it was the wrong way to go about it. The way that things were handled in the Gulf War was the proper way. If you have a goal, you go all-out to attain that goal with as few losses as you can. That requires an all-out attempt. All-out effort.

Ms. Bridgman: Did your friends and family and professional associates support our efforts in the Gulf War?

Mr. Barnes: I think nearly everyone that I've talked to has supported that effort.

Ms. Bridgman: Why do you think there is such a difference in our support for it, and the disapproval of our presence in Vietnam?

Mr. Barnes: Because there is a more clearly understood reason. It was naked aggression. It was highly visible. Therefore, the reason for doing this, and the method of doing it—through the United Nations—was so easily understood and wholly agreed to. In Vietnam, as I say, the piecemeal way of encountering the North Vietnamese, which was met with gradual growth of the North Vietnamese effort—it kept people hoping that with little effort we could end it. Of course, that was wrong; we were all wrong. And it was less easy to understand the type of aggression that took place. It was less easily understood. Although, if one does look at the history of North Vietnam, you can tell that it was an aggressor nation and one which would eventually cause the type of problems that they did cause.

Ms. Bridgman: How much of the opinion of the American public, during those two wars, would you attribute to the kind of information we got through television or newspapers?

Mr. Barnes: Probably American opinions were [a] result of the news we got over television. The news was probably objective and balanced, so I think the opinions were well-founded.

Ms. Bridgman: There are many references these days in history books and in the press to the sixties generation, the baby boom, and all that sort of thing. What effect do you think the sheer numbers of young people had to do with public opinion during Vietnam, and then their being older during the Gulf War?

Mr. Barnes: As I said, there's a lot of difference between the way the Vietnam aggression by the North Vietnamese came about and the Iraq invasion. A lot of difference. Vietnam started with just assassination of village chiefs and school teachers and guerilla type infiltration. It just was not as visible. The aggression was not as visible as it was in Iraq when Iraq invaded Kuwait.

This was one of the reasons, I suppose, probably the main reason that opinion never gelled among young people during the Vietnam situation and opinion gelled quickly in the Iraq invasion of Kuwait.

Ms. Bridgman: Then you would not infer anything more from this same generation merely now being

middle-aged and having been young during the Vietnam war?

Mr. Barnes: No, I think the way these two wars came about, the differences, is what caused the problem, is what makes the difference.

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you.

What events during the sixties do you now particularly remember? I'm thinking now before you were in the legislature and you were called up and working at Boeing. Even the term "the sixties" is hard to define, but when you think back on it, what comes to mind?

Mr. Barnes: Well, what comes to mind is the fact that the North Vietnamese infiltration, and later, invasion, of South Vietnam was really a part of what was going on in the rest of the world. At the time we'd had communist takeovers of several Eastern European countries, and we'd had communist influence, mostly directed from Russia or Red China. And this was all part of—apparently—a plan. This sounds, maybe, a little trite right now, but a part of the international communist attempts to spread communism throughout the world through their gradual takeover of various parts of the world. The communist influence in several of the developing countries was proof of that, to me: they would not use force unless they had to; if they had to use force to take a country, why then, they would. And they would do it in the most clever manner, which they did in Vietnam, that is, just using what they needed to infiltrate and to gain influence.

Ms. Bridgman: You used the word "trite" to describe your explanation. I'm interested in why you would say now that it's trite.

Mr. Barnes: Because that concept was treated so. It was made fun of. People of the liberal element, the leftists, whatever you might call them, really decried that opinion. But to me, it was so obvious. If you followed the history of what was happening in those days, it was so obvious that the communists did have the object and the goals of spreading communism throughout the world. Maybe it was a little bit too obvious so that people called [it] a trite sort of opinion, but I think it was based in fact.

Ms. Bridgman: It's December 31, as I said, 1991, and Gorbachev has just resigned and the Soviets are having a most distressing time. How would you, in light of what has happened since—how does the view of communist aggression during those post-World War II years seem to you?

Mr. Barnes: I lost track of your question, I think, about half-way through.

Ms. Bridgman: Perhaps it wasn't very well expressed. Would you say the difficulties the Soviets are having now—how is that connected, if it is, to their former international communist aggression, which you just described.

Mr. Barnes: In the first place, their economic system is the wrong one. It's one that doesn't work, the socialist system, to the extent they use it. It doesn't work. With their military, their tremendous expenditures on military, at the same time they had an economic system that just didn't work. It caused their economic collapse, and Gorbachev was smart enough to see this happening and smart enough to understand that their military aggression was really not necessary to help their people and neither was their government control of their economy.

Ms. Bridgman: You said you were in downtown Seattle the day the university students and their associates or—hangers-on—threw rocks at the courthouse. What other things do you remember about that time? Not necessarily political, but thinking back, what seems important and significant?

Mr. Barnes: To me, my son and I were both called to active duty at the time the electronic snooper-ship, I forget the name of it, was captured by the North Vietnamese. This was merely an excuse. We were really called up to help in the Vietnam situation. We started flying cargo missions across the Pacific and in Vietnam and across and over Vietnam so that when I was middle-aged I got some credit for combat support missions.

My son—since I was colonel and he was a buck sergeant at the time his first sergeant would call me up and tell me how he was doing and what I should tell him and so forth. So my son volunteered for overseas duty—to get away from me, mainly! They sent him to England to replace some of the C-130 crews that had been sent to Vietnam. He spent a good part of the time, about a year, in England, I think. I flew missions across the Pacific, and we flew into Japan, the Philippines, and Thailand, but mostly into Vietnam to deliver cargo.

I can remember seeing some of the war from there. We usually left at night or flew in at night and we could see the flares and the tracers and so forth. One time, while we were taking off and trying to climb out to get out of the country, we watched the bombing of one of the North Vietnamese held villages.

These things I remember, if you're asking for instances of things that I can remember.

It was exciting, it was interesting, and surprisingly it wasn't scary. It didn't seem so to me, although we did have some of our ships that had bullet holes in them when they got back home. As far as I know, none of the airplanes that I flew in ever were hit.

One time I remember, shortly after the Tet offensive, we had to wait to take off—this was in the daytime—until some helicopter gunships had completed some passes out over the runway where we had to take off. When they completed that and we took off, I looked down to see if I could see anything, all I could see was big bomb craters that the B-52s had left behind. But at any rate, I didn't have the miseries of being on the ground in that war, and we were able to fly in and fly out and sleep in clean sheets every night.

Ms. Bridgman: How much contact and conversation did you have with ground troops?

Mr. Barnes: Once during the battle of Kheson we landed at one of the northern airbases where C-123s were taking troops in and out, and bringing out wounded, really, from Kehson. I saw a squad, about the size of a squad, waiting for a ride in a C-123. And they looked pretty glum, and I asked the sergeant, "Where are they going?" He said they were going to Kheson. They didn't look like they were very eager to talk about it.

But one of the things I remember was the flight crew in the C-123, after flying their flight clearance, came out to get on the airplane, and they had a little dog with them. The flight crew just climbed on the airplane and the little dog backed off and ran and jumped up into the airplane, over the open tail ramp. So the little dog, I guess, was a volunteer, but he didn't realize what danger they'd be going into.

Ms. Bridgman: Would you say this glumness you describe was different than the attitude or morale of troops during Korea and World War II?

Mr. Barnes: I don't know. I imagine when you're going into combat, where people are getting killed, you're not going to be too happy about it. This was a real sad situation to be sent into. I imagine troops going into such a situation in any war are the same way. I think that the air force troops that I associated with were different, because many of them loved to fly, and the wars had given them a chance to fly. And there's something about flying that makes a person think that that's what he has to do. So the enthusiasm of the air force air crews was a bit different, probably, than the ground troops.

Fighter pilots, for instance, I think fought to get themselves on missions rather than to try to be left off of missions. The missions they were more likely to run into opposition were the missions that they wanted to be on because they were just that...

[End Tape 3, Side 1]

6 ANALYSIS OF FOREIGN POLICY

Ms. Bridgman: Dick, you were just remarking about the enthusiasm of pilots because they love to fly. And then began, off-tape, to tell me about an incident in grade school.

Mr. Barnes: Like I say, the air force pilots, military pilots, probably took a different attitude than the ground forces because of the fact they were all volunteers to fly. It required volunteers. And it required a heck of a lot of work and worry and efforts to become a pilot and to stay a pilot. And we discussed the fact that flying was so important to these people just because the flying part of it held a fascination for us.

My first memory of this kind of a fascination for flying was when I was in grade school. We were out at recess one day and a whole squadron of P-26s, that was the old open monoplane built by Boeing, flew over the school grounds. This was out in Iowa where we didn't see many airplanes. That just fascinated me, these little fighter planes like a bunch of hornets flying over.

At that point I decided I wanted to be a pilot. So the war gave me the opportunity. And myself, along with all the others going through cadet training and so forth—the worst thing that could happen to you was that you be washed out. Of course, a lot of them were.

But on into combat, it seems the air force pilots just felt like you had to fly. They wanted to fly and that's what they wanted to do.

Ms. Bridgman: I want to get back to your presence at probably the most memorable of the Seattle anti-war protests. In general, how would you characterize or assess the way the war protests were handled by the authorities?

Mr. Barnes: It seems to me like seven leaders of that protest were brought to court, but the only conviction that was obtained on them was a conviction for contempt of court, for being disruptive in the court. So I can't remember what the charges were now, but I know that one of them is now teaching at Evergreen State College.

It's hard to say whether it was handled correctly or not. I thought that it was pretty bad what they'd done. Of course I'd of liked to have seen them all thrown into jail, and I'd like to have seen punishment for each and every one of the six-thousand students that blocked a freeway and threw rocks at the courthouse and broke the windows in one restaurant. I remember seeing a big plate glass window that had been broken. I don't see how somebody sitting on the other side of the window couldn't help but have been cut by flying glass. The disregard for public convenience and public property and safety add to my disgust of these people who didn't seem to understand what was really going on in the world.

Ms. Bridgman: Do you think they were—we talked earlier about the kind of information we were getting from the media. How do you think they reached their opinions? Would you consider—I'm trying to think of a tactful word to use on tape here—which you don't share or think highly of?

Mr. Barnes: I think it was natural for young people to come to an opinion that they didn't like the war and didn't want to be involved in it. It was a miserable war. And people were being killed and hurt. And we had the draft at the time, and many of them were eligible for the draft—those that were in school, of course, were exempt from it. But I think it's that fact that made it easy to turn their minds against the war because it would have represented, to be involved, it would represent to them a miserable time in their lives.

To myself, I was glad that I had got myself in readiness so that I could do something because I felt that my generation had been guilty for allowing this situation to occur in the world. Without finding the right way to handle it, and by the right way to handle it I refer to the Gulf War.

So at least I was happy that I had kept myself ready to help out, although I, like many others, didn't like having my career interrupted and being called out to spend a year- and-a-half in the military, away from my job.

Ms. Bridgman: How do you think young people made the jump from not liking the war and the draft, and its being a miserable war, to civil disobedience and the actions that you characterize as thoroughly reprehensible?

Mr. Barnes: I think it was easy for young people to want to do—you know, they always want to do something exciting, or interesting. And they like to be a part of something that they feel is important. And you add this characteristic to the fact that the war was a miserable thing for them to contemplate. This probably worked to create such. Again, I'm going to sound trite, but I'm sure that we had the left-wingers and communists within this country agitating to create this type of thing. Usually at these events there were leaders who were from the various organizations that would have liked the spread of communism within our country.

Ms. Bridgman: Do you remember any of those leaders?

Mr. Barnes: Right now I don't. But there was a communist party within Seattle. They usually had a representative at these rallies.

Ms. Bridgman: What do you think about the concurrent Civil Rights movement during the sixties?

Mr. Barnes: Concurrent? I've always agreed with the Civil Rights movement, as a rule. Although I think that some of the people who were involved in civil rights movements were also involved in Vietnam protests. It's difficult to understand how that association came about—difficult for me to understand because, to me, the Vietnam War was to preserve civil rights in the world.

The North Vietnamese had been a very repressive society, in fact, they had executed about fifty-thousand of their own farmers who protested against their land reform in North Vietnam, and about a million people, which was about one out of every fifteen in North Vietnam, had walked to South Vietnam and defected. So the North Vietnamese had a very bad record of civil rights, and yet it seems as though some of the civil rights people from this country got involved in protests and seemed to be supporting the Vietnamese, and this, of course, was very difficult for me to understand.

Ms. Bridgman: How would you describe any lasting effects of all that we've been talking about—Vietnam and civil rights of the sixties—on American social and political life?

Mr. Barnes: This kind of a question comes out of the blue for me. Lasting effects? Possibly the reaction to the Gulf War was one of the effects. Reaction to conducting a war as we did versus what had happened in Vietnam. The memory of Vietnam is perhaps one of the reasons for our conducting the Gulf War in the way that we did. So that may be the lasting effect: that we will never get involved in that type or try to stave off aggression in that manner again but go all-out for it.

Ms. Bridgman: Was it just the reaction of the American public to our policy in the gulf, or reaction to the troops, the military itself, and the fellow citizens that was different? Can you tell us a little bit about that?

Mr. Barnes: I think so, the reaction of citizens that were called to active duty. Of course this was always a major disruption in your life and there were many that were called to active duty, all at the same time. And they knew what they were called for. And they knew what their objectives and goals were very clear. During the Vietnam War, I was called to active duty my group was called as a result of the capture of the ship which I can't remember the name of right now. Pueblo?

Ms. Bridgman: The Pueblo was earlier. I'm sorry, it's gone for me too.

Mr. Barnes: Syl, what was the name of that ship that was captured when we were called to active duty?

Voice in background: It was the Pueblo.

Mr. Barnes: She says it was the Pueblo.

This capture of this electronic eavesdropping ship, which had been in international waters, was given as the reason for calling us back, which I think was an excuse. So the goals were not as clear, although people in our group, the people who were called in our group, understood it. We knew what the reason was and what the goals were. But others probably didn't. People in our group were called up and were involved and put their efforts in, and I think we understood what the reasons were.

And these called up for the Gulf War, this was such an out-and-out example of invasion, and it's well understood as such. Although it disrupted their lives, they willingly went.

Ms. Bridgman: And how would you characterize the reaction of your neighbors, and my neighbors, as well as other Americans to that call up?

Mr. Barnes: To many of them it was a relief that we were finally doing something right, that we were going to discourage any further aggression of this type throughout the world. And it has had that effect.

Ms. Bridgman: And how do you think our fellow Americans reacted to the troops themselves, as compared to other wars, particularly Vietnam?

Mr. Barnes: How fellow Americans reacted to the troops? Well, obviously people appreciated the fact that some people had to sacrifice, had their lives disrupted or maybe they laid their lives on the line. I think people understood that, and people wanted, desperately wanted, to have as few casualties as possible. And war was carried out in that way.

Ms. Bridgman: I'm thinking about the Vietnam vets who still feel that, or express the opinion that, they were not appreciated and welcomed, and that that has affected their lives since. And I'm wondering if you see that sort of thing or not?

Mr. Barnes: I don't know whether you can call me a Vietnam vet or not. I got my Vietnam theater ribbon because I was there six times or more. I can't remember how many missions I did fly over there. I was a staff officer at the time, so I didn't fly as much as most.

But as a veteran I neither expected any special treatment or honorable treatment, nor did I encounter any other kind of treatment. I see a lot of pictures in the paper and stories about Vietnam veterans who cite the lack of appreciation. They run around in their camouflage fatigues and so forth, and I wonder if we haven't got maybe a set of professional veterans here who are trying to get attention that maybe many of us, or most of us, haven't expected or haven't worried about.

Ms. Bridgman: There's one last area of foreign policy I'd like to have you talk about. In one of the clippings you lent me, the writer of that piece referred to your being called up during the Cuban Missile Crisis. Is that correct?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, we were.

Ms. Bridgman: Will you describe your part in that? And your opinion as to the way that was handled?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, let's see. I think that was well-handled, also. There were obvious signs that we were prepared to invade Cuba, and the reason was to eliminate the establishment of nuclear weapons in Cuba that could short range weapons or mid-range weapons that could destroy the United States.

After the crises started, we were called out for practice missions and low level drops and night formations and so forth. At the time our squadron had C119 tactic transports, troop carrier transports. After a couple of nights of practice missions we were called to active duty. And the first thing they did was issue our sidearms to us. And they took off the conspicuous paint of our airplanes we had glowing orange painted on the noses and wingtips of our airplanes to make it more visible to avoid mid-air collisions, and they took this paint off the airplanes.

We started studying the situation as a squadron with squadron members giving lectures on various things such as the locations of missile spots and the possibilities of dropping troops in the geographic situation in Cuba. Also we had a Spanish teacher in our group, one of our pilots, and he started teaching us a little Spanish.

We had a leader then that was rather strict, and he kept us there on alert, and we were allowed to go home just for short times, overnight. We had to be out there early in the morning and stayed late in the evening. We were ready to go. But then, when the communists seemed to be backing down, we only were kept on active duty for a month before the thing was settled.

But during that month I led a flight of fifteen C119s, about five from my squadron and five each from two other squadrons, to go down and change the Military Police Guard at the University of Alabama where a company of MPs was kept to protect the African-American who had gained admittance to the school at that time. There was quite a national thing where the Army was called out to protect this person at the University of Alabama. It's kind of funny now because the Alabama football team has got a lot of blacks on it, and they wouldn't be as good as they are if they didn't have their blacks.

Ms. Bridgman: You said that the Cuban Missile Crisis was handled correctly. To whom do you give the credit for the correct handling?

Mr. Barnes: Well, at that time John Kennedy was president. I heard some things that weren't so good, that is, Robert Kennedy, his brother, was also an attorney general, was honing down and taking control of a lot of the minor details. I've talked to army officers, since retired, that told me this. That the administration was getting into the details of things, although I think the preparation and determination and so forth showed the proper attitude. In the Gulf War, of course, the entire operation was turned over to the military, and the administration didn't get into the minor details where to locate machine gun nests, and so forth. And I understood that did happen in the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Ms. Bridgman: But other than this involvement of JFK and RFK in the routine military matters, you think that the administration had the proper goals?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, other than that, it was done properly. The reaction was as it should have been, and it attained the desired goals.

Ms. Bridgman: Now if you will, we'll go back to your earliest military service in World War II, where we began this discussion of twentieth century American foreign policy.

You said, at an earlier point, that Pearl Harbor changed your mind about the appropriateness of U.S. involvement in that war. Will you please talk about that?

Mr. Barnes: Being a young person and so forth, I figured World War II wasn't our business, that we should stay out of it, as many people did, evidently. But Pearl Harbor, of course, changed everybody's mind. Just suddenly changed everybody. The Japanese couldn't have done a worse thing for themselves. The entire nation then devoted itself to winning that war, and it was different than anything we've seen since because the whole nation, all the people, were involved. Many people changed jobs and went to work in [the] defense industry and many people stopped driving their cars, and of course, gasoline was rationed. And people accepted the hardships, if you can call them that, that we accepted over here in the states. And the total effort was devoted toward winning that war.

This is something that's hard for people to understand who have come along since then. To know how it is for the whole nation to become involved in something, an effort of that type. Of course we all had friends and neighbors that got word of their sons being killed and so forth. And it was a pretty miserable time. But people were determined.

Ms. Bridgman: Where were you that Sunday morning when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor?

Mr. Barnes: I think I was out on a date with my girlfriend. And we didn't hear about it until evening. As a matter of fact, the attack didn't occur until it was late afternoon where I was morning in Hawaii, of course.

But it was kind of a stunning kind of thing. People were of course it got our attention, you might say. We had expected, I think, most people expected that we would be able to retaliate immediately. None of us understood the distances that were involved in the Pacific. And there was some consternation when we lost Wake and Midway shortly after. It was a blow to the people to learn that we were losing ground, at first.

Ms. Bridgman: How, then, did you get into the military?

Mr. Barnes: Well it wasn't hard in those days! The draft, of course, was taking everybody. I was at the University of Illinois. Before the attack I had taken the CPT, Civil Pilot Training Course, one summer at the Illinois State University. I was a student at the University of Illinois, but this summer I went to Illinois State University so that I could learn how to fly. So I had my pilot's license, so I shortly after the start of the war started trying to find out if I could get into cadet training and so forth. I first went to the navy in Chicago because my brother was a naval officer and I kind of wanted to follow him. But my eyesight was bad in one eye, so I didn't make it.

I went home and started stewing about what I could do about this, and I found how, by pressing on the side of my forehead, that I could bring my right eye into focus. So I went and took the exam for the Air Force at the time the Army Air Corp and used that little trick to get by. I used that trick from then on, every year when I had my annual physical. I would press on right there, and bring that eye in focus. And it took some doing, especially after they got these machines that you had to put your head up to.

Of course I didn't tell them that I had to do this. Since then I≤

[End Tape 3, Side 2)

7 MILITARY TRAINING

Ms. Bridgman: Dick, at the end of the last tape we had talked about how you got into the air force [back] then it was the army air corps by pressing your right temple to bring your eye into focus on that side, and also, by not mentioning your hay fever. The tape ran out just as you were explaining what you told your sons. So I hope you'll continue with this story about what you told your sons, and then we'll discuss your military service, your college, and as much of the rest of your early adult life as you can pleasantly get to today.

So what was it you told your sons about hay fever? Or was it about hay fever?

Mr. Barnes: Well, not necessarily hay fever. I just told them that in times of national emergency it was all right to shade the truth a bit in order to get into the military service, but not to stay out.

Ms. Bridgman: And did they follow this advice?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, in a way. During the Vietnam War my older son did get into the same reserve outfit that I was in. We were called up together. My younger son really would have had to go too far to get into the service. He tried to get into the Marines but was taking shots for allergies at the time and it was just too much of a burden. He wouldn't have been able to take shots if he'd gone into the service, so he was unable to get in.

Ms. Bridgman: Will you, for the record, tell what date you entered the military? Year?

Mr. Barnes: It was about 1942 when I signed up for aviation cadet training. I had to wait until there was room in the training for me, so I was called to active duty February 14, 1943. I graduated from aviation cadet training around December, 1943, I believe.

Ms. Bridgman: What was that cadet training like?

Mr. Barnes: First we went into a classification center down in San Antonio where it was determined whether we should be trained as pilots, navigators, or bombardiers. I was qualified for pilot training. So we went to the pre-flight school in San Antonio at the Aviation Cadet Center, and then off to after certain academic training, military discipline training, and physical training I was sent with my group to Uvalde, Texas, where we were to receive our primary training in flight training.

It was at the Aviation Cadet Center that I met my long-time friend, Hank Bakken, who later became my best man when I was married. Our friendship continues to this day since we live close to each other in Seattle.

After our primary flight training at Uvalde, we were sent to San Angelo, Texas, where we received what is called the basic flight training in the old BT-13 Vanguard. It was here that I was married, during my training period.

Ms. Bridgman: Before we talk about your meeting Sylvia and courtship and marriage, I'd like to know your reaction to your training.

Mr. Barnes: In those days my own motivation was to fly, as with most of the students in cadet training. Our supreme desire was to fly airplanes, and the war gave us that opportunity, you might say. This was, mainly, the thing on our minds to be successful in our flight training so we wouldn't be washed out and we could go and continue and then fly in the air force.

We did lose about sixty percent of our class to washouts in the primary training, and a few more in basic. It was a rugged program to get through. It was high intensity training [which] totally lasted about nine months. After [the training] we were sent to various assignments for transition into combat aircraft.

Ms. Bridgman: You mentioned part of the training was military discipline and military custom, I suppose. How did you find that to be?

Mr. Barnes: For those of us who really, at heart, were civilians, the military training was exacting and was kind of tough. But the desire to fly made us willing to withstand any kind of treatment or training, so we would put up with it, and go along with it, and so the training was successful. Many of us then became militarized.

Ms. Bridgman: But the becoming militarized was an effect, if I understand you correctly, of your initial love of flying and wanting to serve your country.

Mr. Barnes: Yes, the motivation was the desire to fly.

Ms. Bridgman: How about getting along with those of different rank, both of higher rank and of lower rank?

Mr. Barnes: Cadets were all one rank, of course, and our enemy was what we called the tactical officers, those that were responsible for our military training. They were considered as the enemy. And we had to do everything that they said, of course, and they meted out the punishment, usually in the form of having to walk tours of guard duty for one hour for each of our demerits that we might get. I had a series of those, mostly for being late to formation. But I was forgiven some on the day I was married, so I would have time to get married.

One incident that happened on that day: The other cadets in my barracks, as I was getting ready to go to the wedding, several of the cadets had a place in the wedding as ushers or best man. They grabbed me and threw me in the shower and poured iodine all over my body to cause me embarrassment on my wedding night. I stayed in the shower and tried to scrub off that iodine or was it mercurochrome whatever it is that won't come off!

Ms. Bridgman: So were you embarrassed, if I may ask?

Mr. Barnes: Well, it was dark.

Ms. Bridgman: It sounds as though you had many good friends.

Mr. Barnes: Yes, the bonding in cadet training was rather close as we all were going through a highly intensive training period. We all had the same motivation and highly intense desire to fly, and we all had the strict disciplinarian treatment. So the bonding and the friendships that were made there were close and of the type that you would remember. When you take the fact that occasionally you lost a friend to accident, and then, after graduation, we went off into our tactical units and, of course, we lost many of our friends to enemy action.

We've tried to keep track of where some of those people are, although we've lost contact with most of them. We'll hear, from time to time, of somebody who was killed during the war or who is living now, and we'll try to make note of that in our class book that we had printed.

Ms. Bridgman: Do you have reunions?

Mr. Barnes: Our class hasn't had a reunion because these classes were a very transitory nature, even though you did form solid friendships. Mostly the reunions are of the tactical units that the people were in after they graduated.

Ms. Bridgman: You mentioned, earlier, becoming militarized, which is, I think, an interesting phrase. Can you describe when and how that happened?

Mr. Barnes: It was necessary because once you are in combat you must do some things that are very dangerous. That requires a very basic mode of training and attitude which is developed by this military discipline that you went through during training. It's a temporary situation; once the war's over it was easily shed. But in the meantime, the training to stay in formation regardless of what happened, the training to perceive some necessary action and take it regardless of danger: it is the type of thing that this military training is aimed to engender in the pilots that were trained.

Ms. Bridgman: How would you describe permanent changes of attitude toward the military which resulted from your having served?

Mr. Barnes: Probably the realization that this training was necessary. Sometimes that realization didn't come until after a person was out and into the tactical units. But the realization that this was necessary and there was a purpose behind it was probably a change, or a change in attitude, that continued then, even beyond, after we had gotten out into civilian life. Then you could realize what the purpose of this training was.

Ms. Bridgman: Will you please characterize your attitude about America's military establishment now?

Mr. Barnes: Now we have an all volunteer force and they seem to be highly trained and of a relatively high level of intelligence. If we speak particularly of those that are trained as pilots like I was, it's required that they have a college education. They go through a very highly technical period, and I understand that a lot of money is spent on the training of each individual pilot. They are very highly technically competent, as well as having a militaristic attitude; which is maybe suppressed somewhat nowadays because I think the service depends on the highly intelligent type of person in that position one who can figure out for himself the necessity for the need to react and the need to sacrifice. Probably the level of training and level of the person is much higher than it was during World War II.

Ms. Bridgman: When you joined, what did you think about our chances, or our future, in fighting World War II? The duration. That sort of thing.

Mr. Barnes: There was an attitude throughout the country that hasn't been seen since then. People that have been born or became aware of life after World War II have never experienced the complete dedication that the entire country had toward winning World War II. There was never any doubt that we would win the war. There was, of course, a lot of realization that many lives would have to be sacrificed, and the entire country was, as I say, dedicated to the war effort. It was a phenomenon that we have never experienced since then.

Ms. Bridgman: Then did this dedication lead to optimism? Or pessimism?

Mr. Barnes: I think the country was optimistic. We knew we would win the war eventually. Those that had sons or daughters involved, I'm sure, were very concerned. Of course many were killed, so there was a lot of sorrow, but as far as the optimism was concerned, there was never any doubt that we would keep fighting until we won the war.

Ms. Bridgman: And on what basis do you think Americans had come to the conclusion or conviction that they would be absolutely victorious in the end?

Mr. Barnes: I think there was never any doubt. There were some shocks at the beginning when we lost Wake Island and some of the other Pacific islands. There was some consternation that we had lost ground, and that was a surprise to many of us. But determination that then ensued just didn't leave room for any doubts that the war would be won. The entire country was dedicated to that purpose.

Ms. Bridgman: Did this dedication include a kind of appraisal of, not only national character, but economic resources and that sort of thing? Or was it just more of a good feeling. The kind of flag-waving, parade sort of feeling?

Mr. Barnes: There was economic sacrifices as well as human. For instance, production of civilian goods was kept to a minimum. There were no automobiles manufactured. All the automobile manufacturing facilities went into making tanks and airplanes and other things that were needed for the war effort. And people cut back their standard of living and lived only for the war effort, it seemed. Movies were still made, and most of the movies were of a patriotic nature. Some of them were pretty corny, but they were popular, and that's what happened.

Economic sacrifices, of course, the urge to buy war bonds and government bonds; many people put any excess money they had into that, which lead to when the war ended many people had savings in the form of bonds, and that lead to a quick reconstruction of the economy once the war was over.

Ms. Bridgman: When you bought bonds did you think about that? How much did you think about that what you called reconstruction of the economy?

Mr. Barnes: I didn't think about much of anything except trying to learn how to fly and enjoy life while I had it. So that, really, the deeper truth of how the economy was going to react after the war probably escaped me completely.

Ms. Bridgman: I do remember that earlier you said, when we were discussing the New Deal and your reaction to it, that during the war discussions with your friends had affirmed, or increased, certain convictions you had. Can you elaborate on that please?

Mr. Barnes: I think when the war began it was just about the time I was becoming a little bit politically aware. The war changed things. We understood that you couldn't have a normal economic reaction to things as the country went into a complete mobilization of its resources. We realized there had to be price controls and there had to be production controls. There had to be a mobilization of our economy for the war effort. My normal feeling about politics had to be put on hold for that purpose. Although I realized, I think, at the time, but particularly when the war ended, the idea of getting back into a free economy and allowing people to make their own decisions as far as their choice of goods that they would buy and the way they handled their money would be left up to the people on their own. This was my economic philosophy at the time.

Ms. Bridgman: And with whom did you discuss these things?

Mr. Barnes: I was in close contact during the war, and at the end of the war for some time, with other friends, like myself, that were trained as pilots. I don't remember that we had any in-depth discussion, really, although I found that many of them had the same attitudes as I did.

Well, most of our conversations were about flying, I'll have to admit.

Ms. Bridgman: How many did you meet, pilots or other people, who held different political/economic views?

Mr. Barnes: Not very many. Most of those that were like myself were really reservists, weren't regulars, had similar views. They believed in the free economy. They believed in people making their own decisions in their lives. Their attitude, actually, was rather casual toward government.

Ms. Bridgman: Then how much discussion was there of the rigors of the depression and that sort of thing? What the country had just gone through.

Mr. Barnes: The depression had been wiped out by the war, really. So the depression was not forgotten, it was remembered by the people of my age. How should I say this? It would remain as a sort of thing to fear, that something of a similar nature might happen. Therefore, there was agreement on many things, such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to guarantee bank deposits, government actions of that type, the anti-trust laws designed to prohibit large monopolies and conspiracy in restraint of trade. The things that would promote free enterprise investment were things that were appreciated, I believe, by the people in my station.

Ms. Bridgman: I now would really like to get back to your college years, which we've skipped over here. You attended, first of all, Burlington Junior College. How did you decide to attend college?

Mr. Barnes: Junior college was the cheapest, and it was right there in my home town. I hadn't really fully made up my mind what to study in college; therefore, the best thing was to take the basic courses and get the freshman courses out of the way at the cheapest rate possible.

My mother had moved into Illinois and had become a housemother. [She] was keeping girls in a rooming and boarding house down at Illinois State University. I stayed in Burlington, Iowa and roomed with neighbors and took my freshman year of education there. At the end of that period I decided I wanted to study geology and had made up my mind enough so that I transferred to the University of Illinois. I studied there for two years until leaving to go to the air force.

Ms. Bridgman: And why did you chose geology?

Mr. Barnes: It seemed a subject of interest to me studying the nature of the earth. I don't know how you explain what it is that interests you, but that is what interested me.

Ms. Bridgman: In an earlier interview you referred to your entire generation's recognition of the necessity of studying hard and working hard as an effect of the depression. How would you relate that [to] your choice of geology?

Mr. Barnes: I don't know that I would relate the depression to my choice of geology. I don't know that I really realized, at the time, that you had to study and work hard because I really didn't study as hard as I could have at the University of Illinois. As a matter of fact, I didn't do too well academically there for the two years I was there. I was restless, particularly after the war began. It seems like most students were restless and not really satisfied with remaining in school, and therefore, it was a release for me when we started to sign up [with] the air force the air corps, at the time.

[End of Tape 4, Side 1]

8 COLLEGE EDUCATION

Ms. Bridgman: We were talking about your studying geology at the University of Illinois. What plans for a career in geology did you have at that time?

Mr. Barnes: Well I wasn't very forward looking, but I assumed that there would be jobs in geology, particularly with oil companies and perhaps in overseas positions.

Ms. Bridgman: What alternative plans did you have?

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember that I had any alternative plans. I wasn't really very thoughtful in those days.

Ms. Bridgman: How about the part you thought luck, or time and chance, would have in your getting a job and living your life as you wanted as opposed to planning things carefully?

Mr. Barnes: At that time that I was in junior college, or at the University of Illinois, I can't remember that I was very thoughtful in planning my future or in assuming what kind of things might happen to me afterwards. I think I just figured that if I got my degree and studied in geology that I would be able to work for one of the oil companies.

Ms. Bridgman: Sports have always been important to you, but in a clipping you lent me it was reported that you joined a band in college instead of playing football. Will you describe the band and the role that music played in your college years?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, that was one of the things that was causing me conflicts. I was interested both in sports and in music. At the time, I wasn't really very big, and going to a Big Ten school, I didn't consider myself much of a prospect. So I played in the band.

The band was the big activity at the University of Illinois. It was, presumably, one of the best in the nation. However, in the spring I did a walk-on. As a walk-on, I went out for spring football practice the two years that I was there and did have some success I received some attention from coaches and some encouragement. Possibly, if the war hadn't started and I'd have stayed for my senior year, possibly I would have tried to be on the football team rather than be in the band. But that decision was taken out of my hands when the war started.

Ms. Bridgman: And how did you enjoy the band?

Mr. Barnes: That was a lot of fun. And actually, it took the place of military ROTC. We were required to take, I believe it was two years of ROTC at the University of Illinois. I did take one semester, I believe, then band took the place of ROTC because it was a military-type band. We had to learn the marching and so forth, so we were given an ROTC credit for being in the band.

Ms. Bridgman: I understand. I hadn't known that.

During one of our first conversations, you mentioned a particular course in economics that you considered very influential. Was that at the University of Illinois?

Mr. Barnes: Yes it was. I took a course in basic economics. They taught the basics of economics from a capitalistic point of view. We learned the rules of economics, such as the rule of supply and demand, the rules of diminishing returns, and so forth. We got a basic groundwork in economics. I've always been influenced by that. And I remembered that quite a lot during my period in the state legislature, the many, many times that we had bills that seemed to be in violation of these basic laws that I would argue against because of my early training in this basic economic course. I'm not sure that these basics are taught in our schools these days because there seems to be so many people that don't really understand it.

Ms. Bridgman: And your support for FDIC and anti-trust and that sort of thing you didn't see as in conflict with the principles that...

Mr. Barnes: No. The anti-trust laws are designed to promote competition and to prevent the forming of monopolies and conspiracy in the constraint of trade. The FDIC is a protection for investors, really.

Ms. Bridgman: How much different do you think the United States would have been had the New Deal measures not been taken? In light of all we've discussed.

Mr. Barnes: Actually the FDIC had been proposed before the New Deal. And I think that although the anti-trust laws were passed during Roosevelt's administration, I think they were based on the need for competition that people realized.

There were many things in the New Deal such as the National Recovery Act, the NRA, which was de-

termined to be unconstitutional. And then there were efforts by President Roosevelt to pack the Supreme Court so he could get the decisions he wanted from the Supreme Court, so he could institute some of his New Deal policies. Some of which, as the NRA, were really unconstitutional.

Ms. Bridgman: I want, I guess, to repeat my question as to, in your opinion, how much difference did all this make?

Mr. Barnes: It's hard for me to judge that. Particularly since some of the onerous policies such as the National Recovery Act, or NRA it was known, was not implemented because it was considered by the Supreme Court to be unconstitutional. Some of the things that were instituted undoubtedly helped guide us through the recession and through the war, some we have come to accept as essential actions of government, since then.

Ms. Bridgman: Will you give me some examples, please.

Mr. Barnes: I was afraid you'd ask that.

The only example that comes to my mind right now is the FDIC and the anti-trust Laws. Examples of things that weren't implemented, the National Recovery Act.

Ms. Bridgman: What other influential courses do you recall? At the University of Illinois.

Mr. Barnes: At the University of Illinois. Of course I had my basic science courses: chemistry, physics. I took a course in Spanish took a year of Spanish. And then my science courses in the geological field.

One course that I remember was a course in philosophy that I struggled through. Perhaps what was influential for me in that was an example of analyzing advertisements. For instance, advertising writing, in which you pick apart the slanted reasoning and slanted wording that would be included. This can be carried on into newspaper editorials, and that enabled me, I think, to pick out slanted reasoning and slanted wording where I can strip an editorial or an advertisement of the wording that causes you to have a certain slant toward the subject that they're discussing. I think that course might have had some influence on me also.

Ms. Bridgman: All-in-all then, how would you evaluate the kind of education you got before you entered the service?

Mr. Barnes: Because of my own values, it wasn't too important because I was restless and not really highly motivated and didn't get very good grades. [I] just managed to keep from getting flunked out of school, and maybe just barely.

So other than the courses in economics, the course in philosophy that I described, then the usefulness of some of my other courses that I was able to transfer to the Colorado School of Mines after the war it helped me get through the School of Mines because it lightened my load a bit, but I can't say that my education in Illinois had real great influence on me.

Ms. Bridgman: Influence aside, how would you rate its quality?

Mr. Barnes: It was there, and if I'd have been so motivated I could have gotten much more out of it than I did. I think that Illinois is a good school. It wasn't the highly technical school that the Colorado School of Mines was. There were courses I took at Illinois, for instance, my first year of math at Illinois had the same course names as some of the courses as the Colorado School of Mines, but at the school of mines, the course was much more highly technical and much more demanding.

The education at Illinois was much more general, and it was a vastly easier school to make fair enough grades to get through.

Ms. Bridgman: What jobs did you have in college?

Mr. Barnes: I can remember picking up little extra jobs, for instance, helping tear down a carnival after they'd finished their run in Champaign. I played a little bit of music. I got a little bit out of that, but all-in-all I didn't really have a steady job in college, not at Illinois. Once I got to Mines it was different. When I was at the Colorado School of Mines I was in the National Guard and that was my outside job there.

Ms. Bridgman: How about friends in college who were they and what did you do together?

Mr. Barnes: My first friend we lived in a dormitory together, and he was even worse than I was about studying. We used to wrestle a lot in our room instead of studying. And we made friends with those who lived around us in the dormitory. At the time it was much more fun sitting around and shooting the bull with my friends than it was studying. So friends weren't much of a help. We made friends and I remember them, but I'd have done a lot better if I'd have spent my time studying.

Ms. Bridgman: Among these friends, what sort of role did you play?

Mr. Barnes: Well, I don't know. Let's see what sort of role I played?

Ms. Bridgman: How often did you suggest things that you might do together or how much did they rely on you, or you rely on them?

Mr. Barnes: Since it has been about a half a century, I can't really remember that much about it. But many things, like during the winter time, my roommate and I decided to provide our own food, fix our own lunches and so forth. I don't know whether I suggested that or he did. Many of these things we decided on our own.

We would keep our milk and cold cuts and so forth on the window sill outside of our room because it was cold. It was like being in a refrigerator. Of course, since the window ledge had a little slant to it, quite often during the night the bottles of milk would slip off and fall down about three stories into the alley below and break.

Ms. Bridgman: Am I correct that you did meet Sylvia while you were at the University of Illinois?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, she was going to the Illinois State Normal University where my mother owned a house, where she kept girls room and board for girls that were going to school. And while I was. . .

[Tape on, Tape off]

Ms. Bridgman: Sylvia's just reminded you of another way you earned money. Will you tell us about that?

Mr. Barnes: One day one of the boys who had a little more money than most of us I don't know how we got around to this but he offered five dollars for anybody that would run around the block in his undershorts. So my roommate and I took him up on it. We ran around the block in our undershorts. In the process of this we had to go past a couple of sorority house. We heard a yell as we went by each one of them, but we ran around the block in our undershorts and earned five dollars each.

Ms. Bridgman: Was the five dollars worth more or the fun of doing it?

Mr. Barnes: When I think of it now, I think "no."

Ms. Bridgman: We were talking about Sylvia and you mentioned your mother's boarding house.

Mr. Barnes: Yes. I had a room in the basement, so when I'd go home I'd either stay with Mother or with my grandparents who lived across town.

But when I was there, one of my fraternity friends my second year I joined a fraternity at Illinois one of my fraternity friends and I were going to go out recruiting high school seniors that were graduating and going to the University of Illinois the next year to join our fraternity. We made plans to do this and thought, "Oh we might have to take a couple of girls with us." So I'd had a girlfriend at the time and invited her to go along. We were sitting in the library discussing this and Sylvia was working behind the desk of the library. We decided, "Why don't we ask her to go along?" So we did. My girlfriend went up and explained the situation to her and asked her if she'd like to go for a ride in the country to visit these potential recruits for our fraternity. We did that, and that's where I met Sylvia.

Ms. Bridgman: And you preferred Sylvia, obviously, to the other girlfriend?

Mr. Barnes: Well, when the other girlfriend married someone else, I broke it off with her.

Ms. Bridgman: I see!

Mr. Barnes: [I] started going with Sylvia and others. But it wasn't long before I decided that Sylvia was the one.

Ms. Bridgman: Can you remember, or can you describe what you remember about the sort of best thing about your relationship when you discovered that Sylvia was the one?

Mr. Barnes: She was very sympathetic and very sincere. She was extremely attractive. So all of these things added together. It was hard to deny. These things sort of happen and [you] can't fully understand them.

Ms. Bridgman: Both of you, later, were very interested and active in politics. At that stage in your relationship, how much did you discuss political ideas or politics? How much a part of the relationship was it?

Mr. Barnes: Probably none. I can't remember discussing politics at all.

Ms. Bridgman: What do you recall about the sorts of things that you had to work out between you in order to get along well?

Mr. Barnes: It's hard for me to remember that we had to work out anything. I went away to the air force, and when I went away we were engaged by then. I remember Sylvia came down to see me off, and she cried a little bit.

Then, during my training, we had decided to get married. She wanted to get married as soon as possible although I felt that we should wait until the war was over. She felt we shouldn't [wait until the war was over] so she came down to visit, and of course, we weren't able to see very much of each other for a

while because I was in training and could only get out at certain times. But we decided to get married while we were down there, and we did, and then she stayed with me throughout the training. We'd find a room or some place nearby where we could see each other occasionally.

Ms. Bridgman: And how did she persuade you to her point of view about getting married sooner, rather than later?

Mr. Barnes: I don't think it was very hard.

[Voice in background, too low to discern words]

Mr. Barnes: That doesn't belong in these archives!

Ms. Bridgman: Will you describe your wedding, please? Other than the iodine.

Mr. Barnes: Other than the iodine. It was on a Saturday night, and of course we had physical training formations early in the morning and other things. I was supposed to have two or three hours of walking tours for demerits I'd gotten. I went into one of the tactical officers, and I approached the right one, one that was more compassionate than most of them, and told him that I was going to get married and wondered if I could walk my tours at some other time. He forgave me two or three hours of walking and allowed me to have the time off that Saturday afternoon when we were through with our training formations.

We were married in the base chapel, and the base chaplain married us. One of the other cadets sang in our wedding. A friend, Hank Bakken, who lives nearby now, was my best man. And the young girl of the couple that Sylvia rented a room from while she was staying down there was the bridesmaid. It was a rather simple wedding, but real nice.

Afterwards we went into town and had the bridal suite in the only big hotel in San Angelo. [It was] called the San Angeles, I think. During the night we received many telephone calls, presumably from friends, but nobody answered these when we received the calls.

We did have a dinner downtown at the hotel which a couple of the ushers and the best man attended. After, we went up to our room; then we started getting telephone calls.

Ms. Bridgman: Was this entertaining the bridal couple with telephone calls was that a custom of the time or invented by your friends?

Mr. Barnes: I think it was just a brilliant suggestion of one of the friends.

Ms. Bridgman: What did Sylvia look like? What did she wear at the wedding?

Mr. Barnes: She wore a white dress. I have a picture if you want to see. She wore a white dress and a white hat, I believe. And carried a white Bible.

Ms. Bridgman: And were your families there?

Mr. Barnes: My mother came down. She was there, but she was the only one of our families that was there.

Ms. Bridgman: You said that during your training Sylvia lived in rooms. What was married life like during all the vicissitudes of wartime?

Mr. Barnes: During my cadet training I would have to live on the base, and maybe I'd get to come into town on Saturday or Sunday and we'd get together. And sometimes Sylvia would come out on the base and we'd go to the PX and get a piece of watermelon or something, have some refreshments. And that was what it was like. We would only be able to be together on the weekends if I got off on the weekends. It was pretty stringent, really, we didn't get to see much of each other.

After I graduated from cadet training, I was allowed to live off the base. We'd live in hotel rooms and maybe I'd get in, in the evening and have to leave real early in the morning. So we would be together, maybe, in the evenings. Of course, during the day Sylvia would have to worry that I would be in an accident of some sort because we were flying every day.

Ms. Bridgman: I think that brings us around to something we haven't discussed: your actual combat service. Can you begin to talk about that please?

Mr. Barnes: Actually I lucked out during World War II, I didn't get any combat service. After getting sick from having wisdom teeth pulled at B-26 Marauder Transition School, I was sent to fly navigation cadets at a navigation school. That was very fortunate because in ten months I got over one thousand hours of twin-engine time, which is a goal of many of the pilots to get a lot of time, twin-engine time, because this advanced their career and would make possible a career in the airlines if they so chose, after the war.

So when I was flying for ten months there, flying navigation cadets≤

[End of Tape 4, Side 2]

9 BOEING EMPLOYMENT

Ms. Bridgman: Today we'll talk about the years in your life from World War II until your entry into the state legislature: 1959 through 1973.

I hope to cover, briefly, the many activities that you engaged [in] during those years: sports, music, your career at Boeing, and your attitudes about such an active life. Finally, I hope we can discuss the political participation in those years and your entry into the legislature.

To begin, how do you explain all that you did in those years? So much, much more than most of us ever do.

Mr. Barnes: I guess the only way to explain it is to say that I was interested in doing the things that I did. I wanted to play football; I wanted to play music; and of course, I had to get involved in a career. And ultimately [I] got involved in politics through various issues that came about while I was working at Boeing.

Ms. Bridgman: Now to recap this, and sort of go back to the beginning: right after World War II you decided to continue your schooling, and in 1949 and 1950 you served in Korea, so this was interrupted. Why did you decide to continue your education, and specifically, why did you chose the Colorado School of Mines?

Mr. Barnes: I had always been intending to complete my education, which I hadn't gotten to complete at the University of Illinois before World War II started. When it came time then to chose a school and leave the service and go back to school, it seemed like I got hold of some material which showed the schools where the graduates were having the easiest time getting jobs. The Colorado School of Mines was one of those that was able to place all of its graduates, even before graduation, and where I'd been to school before at the University of Illinois they were, at the time, having trouble placing their graduates.

That, plus the fact that I was bothered with hay fever back in the Midwest and I wanted to get out West. That contributed also to my decision. So I chose the School of Mines and was accepted, and within about three days I arranged the timing of my discharge so that within about three days I was registered and starting school out in Colorado.

Ms. Bridgman: What were your impressions of the school when you got there?

Mr. Barnes: It was a small school but had a very good reputation. My strongest impressions came about the first day of class when taking a course that I had already had at the University of Illinois. I learned that this really was a much higher level course than I had before. I was really quite frightened in that it appeared that I was in with a higher class of students than I'd been with before and there would be real competition.

So I started studying the first day after school. I then started the habit of studying until one or two o' clock in the morning, I think it was. I was really quite frightened that I wouldn't make it at the school. But having credit for some of the courses I took at the University of Illinois, I was able to take a lighter load and that saved me. I had more time to study for the more difficult courses.

Ms. Bridgman: And you did begin right away to play football there? Even with this rigorous academic demand, and even though you were somewhat older than the others? What kind of experience was that?

Mr. Barnes: I, of course, had always loved to play football, so it was natural for me to approach the coach and tell him that I wanted to play. So when spring football came along, why, I joined the team. And really, I think it made it easier for me to study to get a couple of hours on intense activity and get that out of my system, then go home to study. I think it really kind of helped me in a way.

Ms. Bridgman: And you still continued to study until one or two o'clock in the morning?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, that had to become a habit for all the time I was at school. It was a tough school.

Geophysical engineering was a tough course. I formed friendships with some of my classmates who were good studiers and rather bright. Some of them helped me.

Ms. Bridgman: During these years you became a father again, twice second son and a daughter. Now we've got very demanding academic work, football, and a growing family. What was it like to combine all of those demanding activities?

Mr. Barnes: Well, at the time I also flew with the National Guard, during my last two years of school. I flew jet fighters with the National Guard and had some responsibilities there. And I still stayed involved in music, playing my trombone in the school band. Actually, I formed a seventeen-piece swing band at school and lead that, which became another activity that was quite interesting. Actually, I couldn't spend a lot of time, naturally, at that. And the National Guard flying was generally weekends.

So I managed to get everything fit in, but there was a lot of time involved. Of course I had my family, too. It was an intense period of my life.

Ms. Bridgman: In those years, how many other people among your acquaintances did you know who managed to combine all those things or a similar diversity of things?

Mr. Barnes: The type of students at the Colorado School of Mines were people that were interested in life, you might say. For instance, the football team, I think, had a higher grade average than the average student at Mines. There were a few two or three that were involved in National Guard and Reserves at the same time. So the type of student there although the academic program was demanding and was devoid of the humanities, really, consisting almost entirely of highly technical courses even so, the typical student there seemed to be interested in life. So that type of student was typical, although I don't know of any that were involved in so many things as I was.

Ms. Bridgman: How did you think about this, being involved in so many things?

Mr. Barnes: It made life interesting. For instance, I just couldn't picture life without football, or without flying, or without music. So it just seemed to come natural.

Ms. Bridgman: How much did you reflect on it being so natural, being so very active?

Mr. Barnes: I don't know that I reflected on much of anything. I was quite engrossed in my studies, and that was the hardest thing, keeping up academically, although I managed to do so.

I managed to have a lighter than the average load because of my previous schooling. I was able to get a lot of my courses accredited at Mines so that I had, perhaps, a lighter load than the ordinary student. But I needed it. So I was able to keep up my studies and was able to stay on the dean's list, the honor roll that is, throughout my entire career there at Mines and was able to get a scholarship for my last year. I think it was the Sun Oil Company. They awarded [it] for the student with high grades that was also involved in school activities.

Ms. Bridgman: What kind of career plans were you making as you approached the end of your schooling?

Mr. Barnes: This is where I was really deficient. I wasn't thinking too far ahead. I, of course, had rather a variety of paths open to me. Most of them, though, were involved in exploratory type of jobs. Starting out with oil companies, as a rule, on the seismic teams. But by this time my kids were getting old enough that they would soon be going to school, and one of them had already started to school, so I wanted a job where I could settle down.

Then I was given a job offer by Boeing, which seemed quite important to me because Boeing was making the B-52 at the time which I felt was going to keep us out of war for the next ten years. The Seattle area, which I had visited, was very attractive to me, and the fact that I would be settled down in one place was attractive to me. So I accepted the job with the Boeing Company.

Ms. Bridgman: How many things did you apply to before you got the Boeing offer? Was that an offer solicited by you or

Mr. Barnes: I had written exploratory letters to a number of oil companies and mining companies and was given solid offers. I think I had about twenty-seven solid offers at the time from an aerial survey company, two of them. I was offered one job as a combination pilot and geophysicist with a small exploration company which would have been interesting. But the personnel problems which they had I think that company was made up of eight partners or something, and I was little bit concerned about it.

When I got an offer from Boeing, it was as a technical writer writing the flight handbook for the B-52, which called upon my experience as a pilot a B-29 pilot operating under Strategic Air Command rules. I was able to fit right into that, and I thought it was an important effort. Then, really, the idea of settling down in Seattle was very attractive to me.

Ms. Bridgman: You mentioned earlier that you believed that the production of the B-52 would help prevent war for ten years. How did you arrive at that conclusion, and with whom did you discuss it?

Mr. Barnes: When you're in college you carry on a lot of discussions with other students that are interested in world affairs and the professors and so forth. At the time the idea of mutual assured destruction, or deterrence by being so prepared that any enemy would be afraid to start something was the philosophy behind our defense. And the B-52 was one of the aspects of our defense that was quite important in maintaining a threat to anybody who would make plans or have plans of any aggression against the United States. So it was important, and I felt it was, and this had some influence on me in making a decision.

Ms. Bridgman: You've mentioned that you wanted to move to Seattle and that sort of thing. Would you say that that very interesting philosophical, geopolitical, opinion was the most important reason for your moving out here? Or how important?

Mr. Barnes: I think that had influence. I don't know what was most important, but the idea of living in the Seattle area was attractive. The idea of being involved in an important defense activity was important. Boeing offered good pay, also. So it all just sort of fell into place.

I think maybe the most important thing was the fact that I would be settled down and living in one place rather than being in an exploration mode where I'd be moving around.

Ms. Bridgman: You began as a technical writer, you said. How did your work change over the next let's say from the time you began working for Boeing until you entered the legislature?

Mr. Barnes: I worked for three years on the flight handbooks for the B-52, then went to another job where Boeing was proposing what turned out to be the F-111. TFX we called it at the time a tactical fighter bomber.

I had experience in flying fighters, and as a matter of fact, had been involved in the National Guard flying fighters. So they tapped me to write the operational concepts for a new tactical fighter in the environment in which they would expect it to have to operate in a future war. So I spent, I think, two or three years involved in that effort, in determining and analyzing the operational concepts of a tactical fighter for the future.

Ms. Bridgman: How does one analyze that?

Mr. Barnes: You have to kind of look ahead and foresee the type of a battlefield environment that would exist. You have to become acquainted with the various weapons that ground forces would have and that would be available to air forces.

Then you try to picture what kind of activities such a weapon as a tactical fighter would be involved in: where it would be based, how it would be handled, and what type of characteristics it would need in range and speed and electronics and so forth. Then you try to measure through analytical programs, war gaming on paper, in other words just how effective a weapon would be with certain characteristics.

It's a complex thing, and it's a type of a job that nobody knows if you're wrong until after you retire.

Ms. Bridgman: That kind of writing and analysis, I didn't know that. I was surprised to hear that that was what you did. I thought geophysical engineers did more strictly technological things. I guess my question is how congenial did you find the adjustment to that kind of very high-level writing being your main job?

Mr. Barnes: Mainly I think the capability you'd have to have was logic. Able to first get knowledge from the design type of engineers that you spoke of. Get knowledge from them on what capabilities would be available in the future. To speak to military planners to see what they had planned and what they would expect could occur and what kind of conflicts might exist during the time period where you are planning for the weapon.

So you'd have to be able to contact various types of people to learn these various things. Then you sit down and try to think it through and come up with a way that you can test, on paper, what advantages the various characteristics of a weapon might give you.

There's a lot of assumptions that have to be made, and a lot of surmising that has to be done. And a lot of guesswork. So who knows whether you're right or not? But it takes a lot of teamwork with other people and a lot of thinking things through and creating methods of simulating battlefield environments. It's a complex field.

Ms. Bridgman: You mentioned teamwork. Will you describe how decisions were made in this team, and how the team fit into the section within Boeing where you worked and with the enterprise at large.

Mr. Barnes: How decisions were made. Quite often, if a paper method of testing characteristics could be arrived at, then testing on paper the ability of a

weapon or weapon system to survive and be effective could be measured through war gaming methods. By changing the characteristics of an airplane and gaming it through various scenarios, then maybe you can arrive at a decision as to which characteristics were the most valuable.

If that seems kind of vague, that's exactly how it is.

Ms. Bridgman: How many alternative characteristics might you consider in this highly rational, logical process?

Mr. Barnes: Each of the characteristics, I guess, can be traded off for the others. For instance, in a tactical airplane the operating range might be one thing. It would be traded off for the weapons carrying capabilities or your loitering capabilities the ability of the airplane to be able to loiter in the vicinity of action and then called on when needed and to be ready, involved say, at the instant that it's needed. That range and loitering capability might be traded off for an ability for vertical lift-off, for instance, where you could park an airplane near the scene of battle, where it would be available immediately rather than having it circle in the air.

All of these characteristics involved trade-off. For instance, an airplane that would be available on the ground nearby would have to [have] a very short or vertical take-off capabilities, and, for this reason, might not be able to carry very much armament. And [it] might not be able to have very much range because of lack of weight in fuel.

So these decisions would have to be made through guesswork and war gaming.

Ms. Bridgman: I lost track, but you listed at least half a dozen attributes, characteristics, of this particular aircraft that would be balanced or traded off.

Now this team, how many were on the team, and what kind of discussions did you have with them about these things?

Mr. Barnes: The number of people on a team which would be working on a certain weapon system would vary, depending on the stage of the progress that you were making and the effort that was being put into it. For instance, with the TFX, which became the F-111 built by another company by the way. It started off with just three of us, a design engineer, and myself as the operational concepts person, and a third person who was more or less administrative. That grew as the proposal became more certain. It grew into a larger group until finally, during the competition to see who would really get the contract to build the airplane, there must have been two hundred people involved in the proposal effort. The area that I was in, the operational research, or operational analysis, had maybe eight or ten people working on it.

Ms. Bridgman: Did the two hundred meet together and discuss things? How often?

Mr. Barnes: No, not the two hundred, but quite often the operational research people, of which I was one, would meet on an individual basis with people from the design engineering to≤

[End Tape 5, Side 1]

Ms. Bridgman: I'd like, here, to say I made a mistake introducing side one. We are attempting to cover the years from 1949, when Representative Barnes entered the Colorado School of Mines, up until the beginning of his legislative career. We probably won't make it.

You were describing to us the consultation that takes place in Boeing as a project becomes larger and approaches fruition. And I think we lost, on the last side of the tape you said your teammates would discuss with the larger group, which had two hundred people, once you arrived at decisions about which characteristics were desirable. Is that correct?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, that was the idea, to determine what characteristics would make the airplane most effective. And then the design engineers could emphasize those characteristics in the design of the airplane. Of course, all this taking place on paper was it was anybody's guess whether we were right or not.

Ms. Bridgman: How many times were there then, instances, when it was obvious it wasn't right? And what was done about that?

Mr. Barnes: I'm trying to think where we might have changed our minds about certain design characteristics, but actually, this is an evolving process that you go through as you go along, and you change your minds and you try various characteristics through guesswork or war gaming if you had a method of war gaming. So the characteristics would evolve slowly [by] trying different characteristics in different situations.

In this way the decisions were evolutionary rather than revolutionary. Then the final decision, of course, would be made by people in the Department of Defense.

In the case of the TFX which was a typical competition to get the contract to produce an airplane our effort would be presented to the Department of Defense [to] the committee that was assigned the task of making the choice. Other companies then would make their presentations also, and that committee then would have to come up with the choice between the two models [and decide] which company would build the airplane. There would be differences in that one company might come up with a different set of characteristics than another company would. And there were differences in design characteristics and the hardware way in which the characteristics that were desired were arrived at. The Department of Defense then would have to decide which was the most possible which airplane would possibly turn about to be as it was planned.

Ms. Bridgman: How many times in this two or three year process of analysis did you have to chose or invent you used the word create an entirely new concept or alternative?

Mr. Barnes: It's hard to cast back right now and remember. Outstanding efforts were in this TFX fighter that became the F-111. Another was the large outsize transport that became the C-5, a big transport now used by the air force. Both of those competitions, by the way, were won by other companies.

Another effort that I was involved in was the advancement of the Minuteman Missile. That got rather complex and very mathematical in figuring out the characteristics of a missile. It's surprising how many different characteristics there are to a weapon that's just launched and flies ballistically. But there is the protection of that weapon in its launching area, protection from attack so it would be available when the time came. That protection [achieved] through its hardening, by having it in a hole in the ground and by having anti-missile weapons around to protect it.

Then there's the characteristic of accuracy because it's worth more if it can be more accurate. And the characteristics of throw-weight, that is, [how] big a weapon will it throw over to the enemy, and will it have several warheads that can break apart and fly on their own to a target. And how accurate would they be and how about its ability to penetrate through defensive weapons. And then its ability to do destruction when it hits a target or hits near a target.

So all these various characteristics. I devised a method of calculating those mathematically to see what [was] the optimum combination of those characteristics. In other words, you trade off throw-weight for accuracy. Or hardening for numbers of weapons if the weapon is more vulnerable, then you have to have more of them to make sure that you have enough left.

And all this was to scare an enemy into not attacking us. That was the vaguest part of it: how many weapons were required, and what kind of characteristics were required, not to destroy an enemy, but to keep him from attacking us. That was the whole philosophy behind it. Of course it was guesswork as to what an enemy might consider prohibitive, or [what] characteristics would prevent him from attacking us. Once an attack occurred, the whole thing was down the drain. The whole thing had failed then.

Ms. Bridgman: To what degree would you say that what you've just so eloquently described was the underlying assumption at Boeing about American defense, and then, the continuation of American life?

Mr. Barnes: The underlying assumption was how much destruction could a potential enemy tolerate and still want to initiate a war. This was arrived at, not by Boeing, but pretty much by the Department of Defense at another level. Boeing then would take those assumptions and try to work out, for instance, how much manufacturing production, or what population kill, would be attained through missiles with various characteristics.

Of course, consideration had to be taken of the enemy's ability to harden their weapons and the number of weapons that they had. And it all had to take into consideration the fact that it was always considered that the enemy would fire first. It was never a philosophy that the United States would initiate such a war.

Ms. Bridgman: To what degree was the Defense Department's view of all of this, in your opinion, accepted and held by, not only your colleagues at Boeing, but your neighbors and other Puget Sound citizens during these years?

Mr. Barnes: Neighbors and Puget Sound citizens, it's hard to say. The opinions were made up of many millions of individual opinions. I'd say that most people had the impression that adversaries could destroy each other several times over because of the number of weapons that they had. However, this really wasn't the right way to look at it. The right way to look at it was that if they hit first, how much destruction could they expect out of our retaliation, and would that be enough to deter them from initiating the attack in the first place.

Another thing that had to go into this was what strategy or tactics would be used. Would all weapons be fired first? Would they be fired at weapons, or would they be fired at cities? And then, what would be held in reserve? So the tactics that might be used by a potential enemy and by us were rather speculative.

Ms. Bridgman: How often were you called upon, or did get into, conversations with I say neighbors and Puget Sound citizens to try and explain the distinction you've just made between annihilating one another several times over or just deterrence?

Mr. Barnes: At the time I was working in an area [where] things were classified pretty highly. I wasn't really allowed to talk with neighbors and citizens about characteristics that were being planned, and about the methods that were being used to determine what characteristics weapons should have and about strategies and tactics and so forth. So while we had these discussions formally, among ourselves and with design engineers, we weren't able to talk much about these things with neighbors and friends.

Ms. Bridgman: I'm trying to get at what was later to become a sort of foreign policy debate and your description of the Boeing and the Defense Department's view is one that I have not heard explained as clearly before. Do you think there was a way that our neighbors and citizens we're talking about could have informed themselves better? What way could they have informed themselves better and had a

Mr. Barnes: There were writings by various people in some institutions that did analysis of the conflict and what might happen outside of the government. And there were books that were written. But these didn't interest the general public. The newspapers really didn't follow in-depth the possible tactics or strategy, or the mathematical procedures that had to go through had to be gone through with in order to determine what it takes to deter an attack.

It is a complex field and really there wasn't all that much information that was put out to the public. The public probably wasn't interested in going to any depth on these things; although, the public was concerned, if you remember, with bomb shelters, and quite concerned with the possibility of an attack.

Ms. Bridgman: Looking back, do you see a communication gap? An information gap? And how would you I'm really calling for hindsight but how much of the ensuing foreign policy, the unpleasant debate that we later went through as a nation, might have been ameliorated had there been. . . Or is there a better way that we can all be informed? Talk?

Mr. Barnes: The main requirement for better information getting to the public is that the public has to take an interest and has to be willing to spend time to

look at something in some depth and has to use logic. You'd be surprised how many people have not learned the use of logic in their thinking.

Of course the assumptions that are made there's a lot of difficulties in arriving at any consensus of what assumptions can be used in determining these things. A lot of the assumptions are based on politics and economic theory for instance. It seemed to me, at the time, that those people who felt that an economic system where government has control and there is less economic freedom were the type of people that felt one way about these things, and the people who were adamant that our economic system was the best and personal freedoms and so forth were quite important took another view. These two different views focused in on the results, and the whole thing was emotional rather than logical.

Ms. Bridgman: You observed earlier that part of the strategy of the Defense Department was to scare the enemy. How much fear, then, do you think was part of this emotion that you just described, among those Americans who favored more government economic control?

Mr. Barnes: I imagine fear had a lot to do with it, on both sides of that question. Fear had a lot to do with it, and it wasn't very comfortable, really, working with figures that were talking about population kill. As a matter of fact, I had a neighbor who worked for Boeing who quit and moved and took another job working for someone else because it bothered him to be working with figures like that. We were talking about results that would end up in, say, sixty percent of the population dying and that sort of thing. That really wasn't very comfortable.

You had to just assume that you were working to prevent this. That was our whole philosophy: that having a potential enemy that might not be too rational, just what would it take and the potential enemy that maybe didn't have a lot of concern for the lives of its people just what would it take to deter an attack?

Ms. Bridgman: And what was the assumption about the enemy not having a lot of concern about the lives of its citizens based on?

Mr. Barnes: Experience in the past. Revolutions. World War II. The fact that assassination was an accepted political tool, and the person who was in charge was the one that was best at assassination. These led to the figures that the federal government would come up with that would determine what is necessary to deter an attack by a government which was ruled by these principles where, perhaps, the people in power were mainly concerned about themselves and not their population.

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you. You've illuminated a lot of things for me, and others, I'm sure.

On your questionnaire, you listed as one of the achievements you were proud of, presenting a paper on calculating the advantages of tactical air weapons at a national seminar. Will you explain about that please?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, there were war gaming techniques that were rather accepted, and of course, based on assumptions that you could put into this thing. If you wanted to manipulate the answers, you could make your assumptions such that the answers would come out the way you wanted. But nevertheless, these war gaming techniques were accepted, and my paper was involved in adding to the destruction ratio, in essence, the effects of tactical air to the other weapons that would be involved, the ground weapons and so forth. My presentation to this symposium involved how to integrate the effect of tactical air into these war games. I had series of slides that showed how that could affect the results and so forth.

Ms. Bridgman: And where did you give that? And in what year?

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember what year, but the symposium was held in Seattle. It was a national symposium that was held about every six months in various places. I attended it in Norfolk and other places throughout the country. The one in which I made my presentation was held in Seattle.

Ms. Bridgman: Can you give me an approximate date? You began working for Boeing in 1955. The sixties? Early seventies?

Mr. Barnes: This must have been late fifties or early sixties.

You know, I do have a bunch of publications which I wrote during this period that I could show you if you want to take the time for me to go dig them out.

Ms. Bridgman: Let's do that next time.

Now, while you were pursuing this career crucial to our national safety, you continued to participate in sports, playing semi-pro football. Can you tell us a little about that please?

Mr. Barnes: Yes. When I first came out here, the first year, I played with the old Seattle Ramblers. But I had to work overtime quite a bit so I missed some of their games, which didn't set to well with the

coaches, of course. The second year I started out playing with them I thought I would be clear to make all the games, but again, we started working overtime and since they played on Saturdays, I had to miss some of their games. So I was cut from the team.

But the old Seattle Cavaliers, which at the time were a lower team, were playing on Sundays, so I switched over and started playing with the Cavaliers. I remember our first game that I played with them was over in Walla Walla at the state prison. I played nearly the whole game over there!

Ms. Bridgman: I've not ever played, even touch football, but what kind of attitudes about winning and losing did the Ramblers and the Cavaliers have?

Mr. Barnes: It was just an avocation not a vocation, of course. But to enjoy football, you've got to be intentionally involved on game day and on practice days. That was your only thought winning a game and making a showing as an individual and so forth. So during the game all thoughts were on the game, and if you lost a game you were utterly disappointed, and if you won the game, why you were elated. Probably just as much as if you were a professional team. But that's the way to enjoy the sport. And of course you can go home and forget about it, and you have your job and family and so forth so that you put it on hold until the next game.

Generally we'd practice two or three times a week so you would have that effort you'd have to put forth, too.

Ms. Bridgman: Now in a sports enterprise like this, how were decisions made about positions and I'm really a novice here how much participation would a team member, as you were, have in that sort of strategy and tactics?

Mr. Barnes: Team members the team would be controlled by the coaches and the owner, and they would come up with the strategy and whatnot. Of course they're all amateurs, so sometimes it would be rather poor attempts but everybody being all excited about it and involved it was all terribly important to us.

As I say, during a game your whole intention was on the game. And one of the problems was that if a person didn't get to play enough, like he felt he should, there were quite often heavy disappointments and anger and so forth that would occur.

[End of Tape 5, Side 2]

11 FAMILY AND LEISURE

Ms. Bridgman: This is being recorded on Representative Barnes tape recorder because the Washington State equipment has failed us.

Mr. Barnes: Had to get that in there, didn't you!

Ms. Bridgman: This is April 23, 1992.

Last time we ended taping with your reminiscences about the Seattle Ramblers and Cavaliers. I think we'll start there and then discuss your life and American life in general, during the fifties and sixties, and then the beginning of your political career.

At the very end of the last tape we were discussing your participation in Seattle football. You spoke of disappointment and anger if one didn't play. How were these negative aspects of participating in sports resolved?

Mr. Barnes: Perhaps they weren't resolved. Some of the players would be very frustrated if they didn't get to play enough. This is typical of semi-pro football where you have a lot of people who maybe were good athletes in high school, but didn't have the emotional stability and intelligence and so forth to go on to college where they could mature under a well-coached team in a disciplined environment.

In semi-pro football the coaches are amateur just like the players, and quite often the discipline is not very present, although sometimes on the Cavaliers we did find a way to discipline a player by suspending them for a game or two. And with these type of players, the worst thing you could do would be to suspend them so that they couldn't play. That brought about some discipline.

As far as my concern, I would just feel disturbed, or sad, or disappointed if I didn't get to play as much as I wanted. And that was usually the case; people that like to play football never get to play enough. Although, we did play games. Sometimes we played three games within a span of five days. Then we would get enough. Once we played a double header.

Ms. Bridgman: A double header football game!

Mr. Barnes: Yes, down in the Memorial Stadium in the Center, we had two teams coming in one day. Everybody got to play enough that day.

Ms. Bridgman: One of my favorite professors at the University of Washington is fond of illustrating history by making analogies to tennis which is his sport and comparing sport, in general, to life. What kind of things carried over from your participation in sports to the rest of your life, whether it be your family or career or politics?

Mr. Barnes: I think one of the things I learned in playing football was that during the game and during practices you have to concentrate on that particular activity. You have to forget everything else, and then you have put everything you've got into it. And I think that at times I sat back and reflected and thought, well, maybe this is what you have to do in your business life and your career. So I think in a way football helped me learn that lesson. Perhaps not enough because I wasn't really all that successful in my career.

Ms. Bridgman: In a newspaper article, which I was planning to refer to later on, you made some remark or told the reporter that perhaps you would have been more successful had you not been involved in so many other things, but that you would advise people with many interests to try and do everything, halfway. I found this a very intriguing statement.

My first question is why do you not consider your career a success? In what ways?

Mr. Barnes: I really never went up the ladder in administration, although I did hold a job that was a very good, responsible job, and interesting one, for thirty-one years at Boeing. I did enjoy the work, and it was rewarding. I wasn't one of those that got a lot of pay raises. I really wasn't one of the high-paid engineers. Of course I started late, not getting out of college until I was thirty-four.

Then while I was working at Boeing, I was very interested and very active in a flying organization in the air force reserves, and of course, I was very interested and involved in playing semi-pro football. Then, later on, I got into the state legislature and was necessarily absent from my job quite a bit during that time. Also, during this time I was interested in playing music, although I couldn't go all-out on that because the time just wasn't available. But I did manage to play in the local community symphony orchestra and in some Dixieland activities locally.

Ms. Bridgman: I suppose that the reason your quoted remark struck me so was that the ideal of the renaissance man is a person who does many things with pleasure or, going back farther, the Greeks advocated moderation in all things. And it seemed to me that that's the way you chose your activities and chose to live your life. So that it meant a better kind of ideal, if you will. Will you comment on that?

Mr. Barnes: I really chose that kind of a lifestyle, I guess. I chose to sacrifice brilliant success in a career to take part in other activities. I can remember a conversation I had when I was a scoutmaster that's another thing that took up some time. When I was a scoutmaster my two boys were in the troop. I can remember a conversation with one of the other fathers in which I was asking him to be more active in helping with the hikes or camping trips and so forth. And I remember him stating that his career kept him he was also an engineer at Boeing his career kept him too tied down to be very active in helping the troop. We discussed that at the time, and I told him that I had purposely chosen to sacrifice success, or the type of success that he was attaining, in order to have the other activities, including being a scoutmaster.

Ms. Bridgman: We've talked earlier about these interests going way back. Do you recall when you thought it through and made it a decision or a choice?

Mr. Barnes: No, I can't recall other than the conversation that I told you about. I can't recall making an original choice saying that I would do this. It's just that my desire to play football and play music was so strong that I just felt I didn't want to give them up. And this, probably, is what made my life what it was.

I just couldn't see living without flying, without playing football, without playing music. This led to things such as my two sons they learned instruments and we formed a Dixieland band with their little friends. Our Scout troop was the only Scout troop that had a Dixieland band in the country, probably. And the boys enjoyed that. In fact, one of them went on to study music and later got his degree in music. Some of the other neighbor boys that played with us also stayed in music as a profession later. So the boys enjoyed it, and it kept me active with my sons and their friends, and it was fun.

Ms. Bridgman: How then would you characterize the influence on your family of this diversity of activities? Of a life filled with many things?

Mr. Barnes: I think my children, who went along with me quite often on football trips, and of course, participated in music with me, and of course, the two boys were in the Scout troop. I think that they enjoyed growing up with me. My wife was sometimes impatient, but I think that's a characteristic of wives; no matter how much you're home, it's never enough. But I think it probably made me a more interesting person for my family to live with.

Ms. Bridgman: Your sons are grown now. What kind of lives do they live in terms of varied activities?

Mr. Barnes: One of my sons, as I say, still plays music. He's a very good musician and composer, and arranger, really. He's not in the profession. He went on to get a masters in business administration and works in that type of work now. My other son, who did have academic problems and so forth, wasn't as musically talented, but he played the piano with us, and he did enjoy it, and in later life he has, as many adults do, sort of dropped out of music. He still has a piano and organ in his house, but I don't think he uses them very often.

Ms. Bridgman: You've talked about the Scout troop Dixieland group and your own you also belonged to the Highline Symphony by the time you went to the legislature. When and how did you get involved in that?

Mr. Barnes: Not too long after we came out to Washington, the symphony orchestra started in the Highline area. It's now the Federal Way Symphony. And I think, after it had been started about a year, I heard about it and approached the leader who was a music teacher at Highline High School and joined the orchestra. It grew and got to be a pretty good orchestra. Of course, along with it, I improved my playing in order to keep up with it. So I enjoyed that, and I enjoy playing good classical music. But I had to drop out when I got into the legislature because I couldn't be up here for rehearsals.

Ms. Bridgman: But during the years you were in the symphony, you also were in the Dixieland group or groups?

Mr. Barnes: On occasion I would play with amateur Dixieland groups and occasionally with a professional group I'd be the substitute. At the same time my kids were young and I played Dixieland with them.

Ms. Bridgman: Those were, of course, years of important family responsibilities. How did you see the role or the place of your family within the context of this very busy life?

Mr. Barnes: The role of the family? Well, of course, the job of the kids was getting their education. And my wife and I did pay a lot of attention to their school work, and we helped them a lot. And my wife was always very busy keeping the home for us and helping raise the kids. So she was heavily involved in that. And she was quite busy also in keeping a home.

By the way, one of the things that probably made things interesting for my kids: When they were over at camp on Hood Canal, at Boy Scout camp, I couldn't be with them because I had reserve training I had to be going through. My air crew and I fixed up a large package of gum drops and fastened a little cargo shoot [to it] and flew over the Boy Scout camp where the boys were and dropped this package of gum drops, and they got them. But it was funny when we flew over the camp because the boys all came pouring out of the mess hall where they were having some kind of an activity and it disrupted that.

Ms. Bridgman: Accurate placement!

How did your ideas change about family and child-rearing as your kids got older?

Mr. Barnes: I've always enjoyed children and always thought they were quite important to us. I was always very interested in their development. I guess as the changes came as they grew up, perhaps my interests in participating in sports and music, the emphasis sort of changed to their participation and encouraging them to do the various things. And I think that my wife and I did it in a way that our children appreciated and enjoyed because we didn't push them real hard, we just sort of helped them or encouraged them.

Ms. Bridgman: What family experiences meant the very most to you?

Mr. Barnes: It's hard to pinpoint any one particular thing. Playing music with the boys was important to us, we did a lot of that. For instance, when they were in high school, for five weeks we played three nights a week in a supper club down in Tacoma the boys turned professional! So it's hard to say what activity you'd focus on.

When the boys got into sports, of course, it interested me, and I went along with them and would watch. In fact I was vice president of the Burien Bear Cats the "Little League" type football association for a while when my sons were involved in youth football.

Ms. Bridgman: How were family decisions made?

Mr. Barnes: My wife and I would argue about these things and come to some kind of a decision. I can't recall now any particular method we used, but we were always very compatible. Maybe we had different ideas about how things should be done, but we would talk them out. I can't remember getting the children in on important family decisions. That was the realm of Sylvia and I.

Ms. Bridgman: Was there any particular decision that was painful or caused difficulties?

Mr. Barnes: I suppose we had our normal arguments like all couples do. But I can't think of any particular prolonged, painful disagreement or anything.

Ms. Bridgman: And then the obverse, I suppose, what did you make a decision about in this way that turned out the best, or that you feel happiest about now in remembering?

Mr. Barnes: I suppose my participation in the state legislature, a decision to do that. That turned out to be a good experience a very intense experience for both Sylvia and me because, although she objected to my decision to some extent and didn't want me to stay in but one or two terms, I won out in that decision, and I stayed in.

She did help me very much: she ran my campaigns each time, and she did a lot of the contacting of constituents while I was in office. Did an awful lot of telephoning work, helping constituents out that needed to talk with me about one or two things when I was very busy. And she went along, participated, and went to Olympia with me every time and would work in my office.

However, when it came time to quit, that was her decision. She just put her foot down and said she didn't want to run any more campaigns. Of course, since then she's been running campaigns for other people.

Mrs. Barnes: There we go. Every time I turn my back he talks about me.

Ms. Bridgman: How about the very initial decision that you should run?

Mr. Barnes: She wasn't too enthusiastic about that. I was kind of doubtful about it too because I didn't really realize how much time it would take. But it did interest me because there were things that I thought well, I thought that somebody ought to go down and straighten that bunch out down there in Olympia. That's what I thought! And this was my intent, to go down and straighten them out. Of course, when I got down there I found out there's two sides to every

question, so it was a little more difficult than I had assumed.

I talked with my boss, and he wasn't too enthused but he okayed it. Official policy of the company was that it shouldn't hurt your career, although it just couldn't help but hurt because you're gone and they can't depend on you so much for long-term responsibilities.

When I first went in, it was Sylvia's intent and she argued that I shouldn't stay in but one term after the half-term that I received in appointment in the middle of a term. But I got highly interested, and she probably was interested too. So we ran seven campaigns and I had seven-and-a-half terms.

Ms. Bridgman: What particular thing were you going to straighten out, that you later I think you used the word "compromised."

Mr. Barnes: I felt that the main body of our legislators, most of them, didn't really understand how our economic system worked. And that some of the decisions made and some of the laws passed in our legislature were those that would hurt the economy of our country. I had studied a bit of economics in college, and I had some definite ideas.

It was, particularly, a milk price-fixing bill that got me interested originally. And I was able to defeat that bill during my freshman year. Also, I was interested in better funding for education, and I was able to change the constitution in my freshman year to allow easier passage of school levies.

There were certain specific issues, such as those that got me interested and sort of drove me to want to go down to Olympia and fight for the ideas I felt were right. And I had some success in my initial couple of terms at that.

Ms. Bridgman: You had, prior to going to the legislature, managed campaigns, participated as a precinct committee officer, and were vice-chairman, I believe, several times of the King County Republican Central Committee.

Mr. Barnes: No, it was Sylvia that's been vice-chairman.

Ms. Bridgman: Sylvia's been vice-chairman?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, of the Central Committee she is now.

Ms. Bridgman: She is. Well then, will you review for us on tape what you did politically before you went to the legislature?

Mr. Barnes: I didn't run any campaigns. I did participate at the grass roots level on a couple of legislative campaigns. And I did participate in a referendum effort in an earlier time when the milk price-fixing bill had passed the legislature and had been signed by the governor. I participated in a group that got this bill on the ballot as a referendum and it was voted down by the people of the state. That came up again after I got into the legislature and I was able to defeat it there.

But Sylvia and I did participate in a couple of legislative campaigns, and I was a precinct officer, and I think an area chairman.

[End Tape 6, Side 1]

12 VIEWS OF POSTWAR POLITICS

Ms. Bridgman: Dianne Bridgman interviewing Representative Dick Barnes for the Washington Oral History Program.

We were just talking about your interests in politics before you actually went to the legislature. What year did you first participate in local politics?

Mr. Barnes: I think what got me interested was the referendum on the milk price-fixing bill. I think that was around 1962. That, probably, is what got me started and involved with local grass roots efforts.

Ms. Bridgman: How did you find out about that?

Mr. Barnes: It was reported on in the newspapers. Just recently, since I have been out of the legislature, it has been passed and signed into law by the governor, and I didn't know about it until after it was done because there was no coverage at all. But this time it had an emergency clause in it so we couldn't get up a referendum on it.

Ms. Bridgman: So you read about it in the newspaper. Then what happened next to get you established?

Mr. Barnes: It's hard to remember, but there was a group of people, I think they were the milk handlers or what they called juggers people that have their own cows and bottle their own milk and sell it themselves rather than retail it. There was something in the law well, they were included. So they organized to oppose the law, and this is why it got some publicity. I think by reading who they were and having sympathy with their efforts, I contacted them. But I can't remember who it was now.

Ms. Bridgman: Besides consulting Sylvia, you mentioned having consulted your boss when you finally decided to run for the legislature. But who did you consult at this earlier stage about getting involved in yet another very demanding activity?

Mr. Barnes: You mean, such as working with this referendum? I don't remember consulting with anybody about that! Sylvia and I discussed it, I imagine, and I convinced her that it was a bad law and that we should do something about it. She then helped with this effort.

Ms. Bridgman: How much had you been aware of local politics before this milk-pricing issue?

Mr. Barnes: Probably not a whole lot, I think. I'd been pretty busy with other things and really wasn't too involved until that time.

Ms. Bridgman: And state politics?

Mr. Barnes: I'd always been interested in following the news reports about state politics, but having been involved now, as I have been, I realize that you really can't understand what's going on behind the scenes by just following the news media. Actually, you have to be more highly involved before you can really understand what's going on.

Ms. Bridgman: This was the milk-pricing issue was 1962, and the time prior to your involvement would have been in the 1950s, the Eisenhower years. Before that, what we now call the McCarthy era, that is, the investigation into un-American activities. What was your opinion of that?

Mr. Barnes: I was in college, actually, but at engineering school, not a liberal arts school. The students were heavily involved in their studies, as I was, but we were aware of what was going on. McCarthy was a joke to us. I don't suppose it was a joke to people who were being investigated.

But although the students that I associated with, and myself, sympathized with the problems that were pointed out because of the influence of Communism with some of our people, I think it was generally thought that McCarthy was playing politics and was really being outlandish in his approach to it. We listened to radio reports of some of the committee activities, and that's why I say that his demanding a point of order so often as he did, and so forth, that it was really a joke. We didn't really take him seriously, I don't believe. And I don't think that he had a chance to become seriously considered by most of the people in the country.

Ms. Bridgman: You were then at the Colorado School of Mines. Did you then, or later, hear about the Canwell Committee hearings here in Washington, which were a corollary to this federal investigation?

Mr. Barnes: I didn't hear about them at the time, and I've just vaguely heard about it since coming out here. So I really didn't form an opinion on them.

Ms. Bridgman: How about your views of the Eisenhower presidency and the Eisenhower years in general?

Mr. Barnes: I felt that Eisenhower was the first president that we'd had in a long time that really understood what the bounds of the president's authority was, and understood the reason for, and the separation of, the three branches of the government. Of course, political opponents tried to make this appear that he was an uninvolved president. If you compared him to Roosevelt, who had tried to load up the Supreme Court to try to take it over and really tried to be a more powerful influence that I felt didn't follow the intention of the founding fathers to have the three separate branches of government. My impression of Eisenhower was that he did understand the reason and the necessity for the three branches of government being independent. They're not exactly independent, but have limited influence on each other.

Ms. Bridgman: What was your reaction to Cold War issues? Sputnik, establishment of the National Science Foundation, the interstate highway system? Those things that we now associate with that time in American life?

Mr. Barnes: One of the subjects that you asked about was the Sputnik. I figure that you're talking about the technological race between the Soviet Union and the United States. Those of us who had been through World War II and had been alive during the time that fascism had caused such great consternation and suffering in the world could see the same type of a government had developed in the Soviet Union. And [we] were very concerned that the leaders of the Soviet Union would want to extend their power, perhaps over the whole world. So we were alarmed there and felt that we should deter any ambitions.

Of course, as time went on, the determination which our country had to deter or stop any encroachment on the free world that might take place, that determination lessened as people began to forget about Nazism. But some of us didn't, and I suppose those of us that didn't forget that, and were very concerned about the Soviet danger, are those that are called conservatives.

But this was a very real concern that arose out of the problems that had caused World War II. We didn't want future generations to have to go through another episode like that, and the only way that I, and others like me, could see was to maintain technology and defense and an economy that just couldn't be challenged without danger to the potential enemies. This is why the Sputnik incident alarmed everybody. Because it indicated the Russian technology was much father ahead, more advanced, than we had thought it was.

Ms. Bridgman: How about the prosperity of the 1950s, the whole post-war prosperity? How did that seem to a person who had matured during the depression?

Mr. Barnes: It was a great comfort to realize that your job was in no danger, that you had job security. Anybody who was dissatisfied with their job at Boeing, where I worked, could quit and get a job with any other aerospace company. Sometimes another aerospace company would offer increases in salaries to buy you away. This was a problem at the time. Of course, for the employees, this was great because it was your world it was an employee's market, sort of. And that sense of job security was very comforting.

After the Boeing recession there was always some nervousness and tension because you knew that you could lose your job. There was a difference in your feeling of security. In the fifties when you did feel secure, that was a happy time.

Ms. Bridgman: It's certainly remembered that way by a lot of people.

Now, the initial milk price-fixing issue that got you involved in politics in 1962, then your involvement in local politics until you went to the legislature in 1973, spanned what we now call the sixties. We've discussed, I think, quite thoroughly your views on foreign policy and some of the domestic problems we experienced. But to just quickly reflect, what do you particularly remember about those years as you were becoming, at the same time, more politically involved yourself?

Mr. Barnes: Probably my greatest concern during those years was the fact that as a nation we seemed to be forgetting our determination to not allow another world war to happen. With the situation developing between us and the Soviet Union, or the situation that was developing in the Soviet Union, this was probably my greatest concern: that we, and the younger generation coming up who hadn't known World War II and who had only just heard of the Nazi policies and activities that lead up to the war—this was my greatest concern, that we were forgetting, and we were losing our determination as a nation to prevent that from happening again.

At the same time I felt that if we could deter through being strong if we could deter any attack or aggression throughout the world long enough to where the Soviet Union would have to educate its people in order to keep up with the rest of the world technologically, then communications would have to open up with the rest of the world and sooner or later what would happen actually did happen [the collapse of the Soviet Union], only I didn't expect it to happen in such a short period of time as it did. But it did happen, and we'll have a safer world now because of it. This is what I really was hoping for.

In the meantime I was afraid that our nation was becoming less determined to prevent the type of thing that happened earlier.

Ms. Bridgman: How was this associated with your growing participation in local politics?

Mr. Barnes: Possibly my understanding of the differences between the economic systems in the United States and the Soviet Union. As I saw things happening in this state that would modify our economic system to where, in certain aspects, it might be more like what the system was in Russia, or in the Soviet Union. For instance, the government control in prices and production of milk made me concerned that our legislature and our government didn't understand the benefits of our economic system, how it works and how it is tied in with these various actions they were taking. It was probably the economics that concerned me most and got me really involved.

Ms. Bridgman: How about the events that had become sort of folk myth or national memory: the Kennedy assassination, or the killing of the students at Kent State, or Woodstock, or the day the University of Washington students marched down Interstate 5. What are your recollections of things like that?

Mr. Barnes: I happened to be downtown when the occasion happened where the students marched down Interstate 5 and threw rocks at the courthouse and so forth. I was downtown for some reason at that time. I remember I was quite disgusted with the activities of the students. I saw some of them throw rocks at windows in restaurants.

For instance, one restaurant where people were sitting and eating inside of the window. And the window was broken and there was danger of glass flying and hurting these people. It was quite disgusting that college students, people of an age that should have some judgment, that should have known better and should have had some respect for property and should have had some idea of what they were really doing and what they were complaining about it impressed me that they didn't understand the real world at all.

Ms. Bridgman: Your children were teenagers then?

Mr. Barnes: I think yes. I believe during the sixties they went through college. No? When was it?

[Unidentified voice in background]

Mr. Barnes: Okay, they were a little bit later then. Roy was—

Ms. Bridgman: I ask because I wanted to know how these events affected your children and their friends.

Mr. Barnes: One of my sons was very much in tune with my thoughts. And he has done some writing, actually, that reflects that. He's a very good writer. In fact he won the Editorial of the Month, or something, award from one of the major newspapers, having written a response to an editorial that the paper had printed. Also he won the Letter to the Editor award for a month because he can write well and he knows how to research some facts. He knows how to assemble facts and put them together and then how to use them in an argument. He reflects my feeling toward the importance of the national defense and so forth.

While I had not preached to him on this subject and had not tried to influence him, really, he was influenced by the fact that his older brother was in the service and I was in the service. We were called back in for the Vietnam War. My older son was in the same unit that I was in. And I can remember what organization was it, Syl, that came that Dick argued with? Jehovah's Witnesses?

Of course one of the things they said he went to the door and was speaking with them they said something about the immorality of the Vietnam War, and this was a time when I was over there. I think he started lecturing them, and they backed off and went down the street. He followed them for about two blocks down the street. They didn't come back for about three years after that!

Ms. Bridgman: So you have family legends about this time.

I think now, in a roundabout way, we've covered up to the time that you did enter the legislature. You talked about you and Sylvia discussing the first time you ran. How about your filling out that unexpired term of Paul Barden? Was there a lot of discussion about that?

Mr. Barnes: No. We did talk about it maybe Sylvia can add something here. I think I can remember her saying "it's all right, but don't stay in past one full term." Evidently, I talked her into going along with six more terms after that first full one. And while she, maybe, was reluctant for me to be in the legislature, she did fully participate in helping me with the job. It was her efforts that made it easy for me to get re-elected six times.

She got to be a better known character in the area than I was because she did a lot of the telephone contact for constituent problems. What we'd do: I'd get a letter of a phone call, and I would do a little research I always did answer individually, except when on a certain issue there would be a whole flood of letters and I'd have to give the same answer to all of them.

Anyway, I would do a little research, put my opinion down as to what should be done or how I should vote or whatever, and I would write a little note on a slip of paper. Then she would call the person. We did this with her telephoning rather than sending letters in most cases. So she had personal telephone contact with an awful lot of our constituents and a lot of them appreciated this very much. They appreciated the fact that they got a specific answer to the question they had. And it would be an honest one.

Actually, there was no economic benefit to me being in the legislature. It wasn't as though I had to keep a job or anything, so I could answer in the way I felt was truthful. I didn't have to be political. I think people sense this and appreciate it.

Ms. Bridgman: You described yourself as "pretty establishment" during your first campaign for the legislature. One paper described you as a big-business representative. How do these descriptions seem to you now?

Mr. Barnes: I've always felt that business is the thing that provides jobs for people and that we should encourage the growth of business and the establishment of new business and so forth. And we should make business operation government should be helpful in that. And I still feel that way. Perhaps this is where it came from. I don't know. Or perhaps it came from the fact that I was an employee of a large business I was a Boeing employee. And perhaps the newspapers just figured, then, that I must be representing big-business.

Ms. Bridgman: Also, in that first campaign you said you believed in representative government and citizen participation. Will you elaborate a little on that?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, I think democracy is not possible unless people involve themselves, educate themselves on the issues and on the candidates and what's going on. Then, using judgment, cast their votes and influence their legislators. I don't believe we can have a real democracy if you just listen to what might be a special interest group, such as a labor union or your employer, and believe what they tell you because we know that will be in their interest rather than in the interest of the entire state or nation.

Therefore, the public, to have a real democracy, must educate themselves, and that's possible through reading the media and so forth. But you've got to read between the lines all the time.

So to maintain a democracy takes effort and time on the part of the public. And enough of the public does this so we do have a fairly successful democracy. We have a successful democracy to the extent that some of the public does participate in this way. We don't have a perfect democracy because some of the public doesn't...

[End Tape 6, Side 2]

13 VIEWS ON RACE RELATIONS

Ms. Bridgman: Today we planned to begin talking in detail about your legislative service, your career there. I've decided to change plans in light of the events of the last few days, beginning April 29, 1992.

At the end of the last tape we were talking about your entry into state politics, your completing the term of legislator Paul Barden. We had discussed your belief in representative government, and particularly, citizen participation.

You had earlier called yourself a moderate, and last time, for the first time, called yourself a conservative, which I found interesting. You based that on your what you called traditional view of government non-intervention in economic matters.

Instead of going on with your legislative career, I'd like, today, to talk about the disturbances in Los Angeles and Seattle, in light of your philosophy and experience, because we have all been concerned about them.

For the record, the troubles were triggered when four policemen in Los Angeles were acquitted of beating a black motorist whose name is Rodney King. So, if we can digress then and speculate about this event what was your initial reaction to the news from LA?

Mr. Barnes: I guess I was surprised, like everybody else, that the verdict came out like it did. What you and I and the rest of us saw on television would indicate something very different. But of course, we didn't sit through what was it three months of testimony, which the jury did. But it's still very hard to understand because there were segments of that tape that we saw that definitely looked like force was used that wasn't necessary and was just a matter of emotional response, probably. I'm glad I wasn't on that jury.

Ms. Bridgman: How did you feel about the reaction in the streets in Los Angeles?

Mr. Barnes: I suppose, like everybody else, I felt kind of revolted. By that, and the fact that people were killed. That was the real tragedy. In the last couple of years, when I went through a period where the doctors told me that I was not going to live very long, I came to realize how precious life is. To see people just wantonly killed just seems like a real tragedy.

Ms. Bridgman: How did you find out about all of this? What were your sources of information?

Mr. Barnes: Probably nothing other than the television and news reports that everybody has read.

Ms. Bridgman: How many newspapers did you read?

Mr. Barnes: We take three newspapers both dailies and the local biweekly. And we take a couple of magazine like U.S. News and World Report. Plus we do watch television news, which doesn't really go into much depth but still gives you the surface information.

Ms. Bridgman: With whom did you discuss all this?

Mr. Barnes: Well, usually with my wife, Sylvia. Although I have had opportunity to discuss it with other people. For instance, a group of retired pilots that I have lunch with every Monday noon. I was able to listen to the comments from some of them. But all of us are handicapped by the fact that we just get the news and what's presented to us on the news is what we get. None of us, of course, that I've discussed this with, were able to follow the trial very closely.

Ms. Bridgman: What kinds of opinions did they have about it?

Mr. Barnes: Some of them were kind of off-the-hip. Most of them, I think, felt the same way I did: surprise at the verdict, revulsion at the reaction to the verdict. There were some that realized, as I do, that well, we weren't really in on the trial and all the testimony that took place, so maybe we hadn't gotten all the information.

Ms. Bridgman: Will you please talk about what this kind of disturbance might indicate about the structure of our society, keeping in mind your experience growing up in the depression, your service in the war in wars, your career at Boeing, and your service as a legislator.

Mr. Barnes: That's a kind of broad question, isn't it? What's my impression of the structure of our society, is that it?

Ms. Bridgman: It is a broad question. I asked it because in the Seattle PI a Seattle businessman was quoted as saying that these disturbances were very different than those in 1964 and 1965, both the civil rights disturbances and those in the Watts riots, because "we now have a class, a strata, of violent people." And so I would like you to respond to his statement.

Mr. Barnes: It's my impression that in 1964 the Watts riots is that what you're referring to?

Ms. Bridgman: Watts was 1965.

Mr. Barnes: It was very similar. There were about thirty-four people killed then. There were windows smashed and looting happened. I think it was very similar. So I really don't see from my point of view I don't see the difference.

I think in both cases it indicated that our society has some people in it that are sort of opportunistic as far as the taking advantage of a chance to steal things, break things, because that's their nature. And here was an opportunity to do so without getting caught. This is my impression. There's more that than there was of anger and frustration at the verdict of the trial.

Ms. Bridgman: Then you would disagree with this Seattle businessman whose opinion it is that there has been a shift in class structure, if you will.

Mr. Barnes: I think so because if you use the Watts riots in comparison to come up with that idea I think I would disagree because I think the same thing happened then.

I remember back when I was a kid there were race riots, for instance in St. Louis. They were quite similar in fact maybe they were worse because there was more involved in whites fighting against blacks and killing just based on that. In this latest riot situation there were whites participating with blacks. And maybe that's the change that you notice even since the Watts riots. Mostly blacks were involved in that. In this latest one there were whites involved, and blacks, on both sides.

Ms. Bridgman: How about your response to the events in Seattle?

Mr. Barnes: I understand that police arrested a number of people and said that most of them they had seen before, in other demonstrations that were similar. So there is a core of people that like to do this. I think that they have particularly chosen wrong methods. If they were expressing frustration at the trial verdict, they were certainly choosing the wrong method. And I would attribute it to an opportunity to be lawless and get away with it. This is an internal thought of mine that is not based on any type of fact.

Ms. Bridgman: That's exactly what we want.

How did your opinions develop as the days went by?

Mr. Barnes: I'm not sure that there was much developing. From the start I think I had the same opinions as I do now.

Ms. Bridgman: How would you connect up this kind of behavior in terms of your philosophy about the economic order of our society?

Mr. Barnes: You know, I don't think I really connected the two things. I assume, as the commentators have said, that people who don't have a stake in their community are the ones that might destroy their community. So I presume that many of the people who participated in the riots and destroyed property and stole property were those who didn't know what it was what it meant to work, to build property and to start a business and to run a business and so forth.

Most of the people, according to television shots we saw, were probably too young to have really got to the point where they are involved. So maybe it's a problem with how our children are raised and what kind of attitude they're given as regards private property and so forth. Apparently most of the perpetrators of the rioting were young, although some of the old people joined in, in picking up television sets and so forth.

Ms. Bridgman: Having been a legislator, what kinds of things do you think leaders ought to do in this sort of situation not only to handle the immediate problems but as long-term remedies?

Mr. Barnes: Of course the immediate and short-term reaction was taken that was to get the force out into the streets that's needed to restore order. That's the first thing that leadership is responsible for.

Looking at the long-term and what President Bush referred to as the underlying causes which I think were the words he used in his speech. There it's very difficult to see what leadership of the country can do because the underlying causes probably lie with families more than they do with government.

So if you presume that leadership has a role, what can leadership do to strengthen the family structure in the country? I saw in the headlines this morning that one of President Bush's aides has tended to blame our welfare system and the welfare system I suppose citing the problems it's caused because sometimes the disruption of the family brings welfare benefits that

don't exist when the family stays together. So I suppose some thinking has to be done along that line.

Ms. Bridgman: I'd like to interject an interviewer's comment here that one of the blue ribbon members of a group of businessmen that Seattle Mayor Norm Rice convened to discuss remedies to this said exactly what you've just said.

What ought ordinary citizens those of us sitting around the table today what ought we to do to help out? To prevent? To meet the mission that our founding fathers set for us in governing ourselves?

Mr. Barnes: I suppose the first thing ordinary citizens should do is to think these things through rather thoroughly. To not react emotionally, as some of the people I've talked to who had just an emotional reaction. Some of which may indicate an increase in racial feelings because of the situation, and mainly there was a lot of black participation and initiation. This could be a reaction along racial lines which we've got to be careful of.

And I think we've got to all examine ourselves and make sure that we don't contribute to the racial feelings that might still exist. We're going along thinking that a lot of progress has been made, and I think it has, as far as eliminating racial prejudice. But maybe it hasn't all been eliminated, and maybe it still is the cause of blacks not being as well off, generally, as whites are. So we should all examine ourselves and see that we don't contribute to that situation.

Ms. Bridgman: These emotional responses to which you just referred, were they your ex-pilot friend's?

Mr. Barnes: There were some, yes.

Ms. Bridgman: As you talked, how much dialogue was there and what sort of conclusions were reached?

Mr. Barnes: Well, when you get in political arguments there's usually no conclusion reached. Nobody influences anybody else. But I think that just the fact of the discussion forces people to stop and think a little bit, if you have some rational discussion and some calm discussion. Sometimes you just have arguments where everybody just entrenches their own feelings and builds a case to strengthen what they already feel. But I think maybe there was some laying back and thinking done as a result of the discussion.

These people are pretty-well educated and have had responsible jobs. Retired airline pilots, mostly. I'm not one of them, I was a military pilot, so I'm kind of an outsider there.

But I think, as a result of a discussion, if the discussion is of the right kind, people will stop and think a little bit.

Ms. Bridgman: Norm Rice in Seattle plans to try to get business to get together and establish what he called what one of the businessmen called, actually a sort of CCC to try and help these young people. What is your opinion about a solution like that?

Mr. Barnes: I grew up in the depression and nobody thought we had to have jobs in order to behave ourselves. We were expected to behave ourselves. Of course, we maybe had strong family ties, had both parents in the home well my father died when I was nine, so I was a little different that way. But we didn't feel like we had to have any special programs devised to keep us out of trouble. We were expected to stay out of trouble anyhow. And we found things to do.

Ms. Bridgman: I'll close this off by asking you things in common now. Would you predict lasting effects, that is, do you think this is comparable to the Watts riots and Detroit riots and the kind of unrest we experienced in the 1960s, or is this something else?

Mr. Barnes: There's probably a difference in that these riots the most recent ones were more widespread. I think the Watts riots were more concentrated in a certain neighborhood. Not knowing Los Angeles too well, I couldn't say, but that's my impression. It's my impression that there's going to be a lot of people out of jobs for a long time. And that's going to really hurt, particularly at this time. So there's going to be a long economic recovery time for this situation.

What kind of an effect the riots would have on the thoughts or attitude of young people who participated, or the type who would be inclined to participate, it's hard to say. I'm hoping there would be some kind of a reaction against this kind of activity that would cause people to try to instill in their children a different attitude toward people's property and lives. But who knows whether this will happen or not.

Ms. Bridgman: I think I didn't phrase my question as carefully as I might.

Mr. Barnes: I probably didn't know the answer to your question, so I changed it. Go ahead, try again!

Ms. Bridgman: [Laughter] During the sixties, the summers became a time when we almost expected disorder in the inner cities. It was part of a much larger national phenomenon, a criticism of many things. How would you compare the events of just these past few days? Do you see them as a harbinger of that sort of thing or as something different?

Mr. Barnes: I don't know, you wonder about the reaction of Mayor Rice, for instance, to start a program for young people. You hate to look at it and say "Well we riot" if they riot then things will be done for them. I hate to see that attitude started. But who knows, maybe some kind of program is necessary. But I think rather than job programs or activities programs, these things or the attitude that young people take some of them it is more, maybe, a result of the fact that we have been so affluent.

Young people grow up feeling that the house and two cars and stereos, and all that they come automatic, and that everybody will have them. And maybe you don't have to work or sacrifice to get things. Maybe there's a lack of realization of what really has to go into to producing these things that make our living so good. And I think that in a lot of cases, yes, the young people just don't realize that there is blood, sweat, and toil that went into building communities. So there's more of an inclination to destroy things.

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you. There's an implicit comparison in your answers. How much are you thinking back to your own youth and the way things were then?

Mr. Barnes: Maybe quite a bit, because there seems to be a difference. Although I'd say the young people that I've met seem pretty good. Evidently there are young people out there that I haven't met that are able and willing to participate in this type of activity. Maybe my experience is kind of narrow, the young people I've met recently have been through my grandchildren, maybe, and they seem like very nice, law-abiding, intelligent, and articulate and so forth. So maybe my experience is a little narrow to be making judgment.

But even in the kids I've known, I see that lack of appreciation, really, for all the things they have. And the lack of understanding that they're going to have to work hard in order to continue to have these things for their children.

Ms. Bridgman: To what extent do you think we all have this narrow view that you talked about, and what ought we to do about that.

Mr. Barnes: I don't know. I'm a lot older than you people, so do I have the same viewpoint? I may be a generation ahead of you, but judging from my kids and how they raised their kids, I'd say there isn't a lot of difference. Except that fact that both parents work in the case of both my sons. And this maybe this makes a difference. Maybe it doesn't. I can't answer your question on all this, I don't know.

Ms. Bridgman: You can't recommend how each of us here could go out tomorrow and acquire a less narrow viewpoint?

Mr. Barnes: That has to come within your own mind. You have to realize that you could be wrong. This is something I found out when I went to the legislature. [Mutual laughter]. I went down thinking I knew exactly the answers to all the questions and I was going to set those people straight. When I got down there I found out there were two sides to every story. Sometimes the other side had some validity; therefore, you've got to think things through pretty carefully.

[End of Tape 7, Side 1]

14 LEGISLATIVE CONCERNS

Ms. Bridgman: Representative Barnes, you had just said that when you began your career as a legislator you thought you knew exactly what the answers were, but when you got down there you discovered there were two sides to issues and that sometimes the other side had validity. What's an example of that, that you remember from very early on? You went in 1973 the first time.

Mr. Barnes: It's probably harder for me to remember what issues the other side had some validity on. But I do remember getting somewhat emotional over at least the first two or three years getting somewhat emotional over some of the issues where I thought I was right, and it was very important that my ideas prevail. It did come to my mind, though, that this feeling that you were right is really the motivating force between people that makes people want to be re-elected. It isn't the perks or the money you make in the legislature, at the time I think it was three thousand dollars a year when I first went down there. It's really the feeling that your political philosophy is the right one, and it should prevail, that it's important for the state and the nation that it does prevail.

All the time I'm talking, I'm trying to think of an issue! Possibly the first issue that I got real heavily involved in was the proposal to set up a commission in the state to fix minimum prices for milk, which passed, by the way, since I left. I was able to defeat that, but it passed after I left the legislature. And the dairy industry was having trouble. Their prices of cattle feed had gone up and they were having trouble as they always do, really; it's a struggle in any kind of business, and theirs is not different. But they wanted to eliminate that struggle and make it easier for themselves, so they thought that if the state government set a minimum price for milk, that would solve their problems. They wouldn't have to compete on a basis of price. The federal government already sets a minimum price, but that wasn't high enough for them.

At any rate, I thought this was wrong, according to how our economic system works. So I took the opposing stand and was able to eventually defeat that. I'm trying to think now, did the other side have any validity? Not really!

The milk producing people, the dairy people, are very fine people. All their kids went to Washington State University and became cheerleaders, that sort of thing. They're really a good group of people, and I got to know them pretty well during the process of fighting over this issue. In fact, they invited me to their Dairy Princess luncheon, downtown, and we became good friends. And I suggested to them that probably their problems would be alleviated somewhat if they ran a good advertising program, and they did. And that's when this white "moo-stache" advertising started coming out. But they had to wait until after I got out of the legislature before they could pass their bill. And they eventually did, and in effect, now they're trying to set up the standards and the prices and so forth.

But their problem is over-production. They produce about two-and-a-half times as much milk in this state as they can sell, and the remainder, the surplus, has to go into other products: butter, powdered milk, and so forth. A lot of it is picked up by the federal government under the price support program.

I didn't answer your question. What issues had two sides to them.

Ms. Bridgman: You were involved in WPPSS and

Mr. Barnes: Oh yes, rather heavily.

Ms. Bridgman: and other energy and utilities things. Higher education. Does anything come to mind out of those?

Mr. Barnes: The education issue. And the funding of education.

My priority for funding was my highest priority was education. I felt that was dictated to us in our constitution which says our primary paramount is the word they use our paramount obligation is to fund education.

The other side of the issue was you couldn't take too much money away from social programs. So it was establishing priorities: education versus social programs. Of course the social programs are to help people out who can't help themselves or who are in dire straits. So there's an issue that you've got to consider the other side. And the problem has not been resolved yet, and probably never will be because there is never enough money to satisfy everything.

Ms. Bridgman: I'd like to go back to the very first days of your being a legislator. What were your first impressions of the campus, of the opening day ceremony, that sort of thing?

Mr. Barnes: I was appointed. I didn't have to run a campaign, so I kind of walked in without the tough procedure of a campaign, not having had to go through that. I was kind of impressed with myself, maybe, the fact that I had been able to get there. But almost immediately, I began to see that this was not going to be as easy as I thought it would be because of the fact that there were other sides to the question. It impressed me, I thought, "Well now my vote counts a lot more that it used to. Now my vote counts here, and I've got to be careful that I vote the right way."

So I became quite concerned, and it seemed to me that the issues were coming up too fast for me to really make good, rational decisions on them. There are so many issues that each person can only get heavily involved in a very few. In fact, a person does make progress only if, maybe, they just concentrate on one issue. That means you have to know who you might have similar philosophies with so that you can follow somebody else's vote. So all this I came to realize in the first week, maybe.

Perhaps before I fully came to realize that I got myself in trouble. I was maybe the one lone "no vote" up there, pretty often. As a matter of fact, throughout my career, I had more lone "no votes" on issues than anybody else, I believe. And it was a lot because I didn't feel that I understood the issue, hadn't had enough time to really look at it in some depth.

Ms. Bridgman: How well, in the first week or first weeks, did this process, which you've described as being somewhat different than you envisioned, seem to work?

Mr. Barnes: I became surprised that as I started looking and listening to people speaking on the other side of an issue, I became surprised that quite often we'd come up with a reasonable compromise on things. I lost on a lot of issues, and this would really concern me for a while, and I'd be disturbed by the fact that things weren't going the way that I thought they should. But on reflection, and after a session was over, I thought "Maybe we did come up with a reasonable compromise that gave some ground to everybody's ideas."

Ms. Bridgman: Can you give us examples of some of those early reasonable compromises?

Mr. Barnes: This requires some thinking because that's been twenty years. It's been a long thing.

Ms. Bridgman: Spaces on the tape are a sign of good thinking.

Mr. Barnes: I can think of one where probably all of you at this table would disagree with me. So there must be something reasonable on the other side.

There's been a series almost every year the legislature does mandate some kind of coverage in health insurance that wasn't mandatory before. Maybe it was available people will have health insurance and then they'll come down with something that isn't covered, and maybe they hadn't realized that it wasn't covered. So they go to the legislature and somebody proposes a bill that says this item will be covered by any health insurance sold in the state. And that happens almost, I think, just about every year.

The first one, unfortunately, was the coverage of newborn babies. It was my feeling that people should be allowed to buy the coverage they want and shouldn't have mandated coverage that maybe they don't want. Like, for instance, a Catholic priest, say, wouldn't want to cover newborn babies, and wouldn't want the expense of having that coverage. But on the other hand, insurance is something that is supposed to spread the expense over an entire population. A lot people, when they get insurance, don't realize that certain coverage doesn't exist.

So there's an issue that perhaps and on some items I was able to change, amend, the bill so that instead of mandating coverage of a certain type item, it mandated offering of coverage and would bring it to the people and say, "Do you want this included?" So on two or three of the items I was able to get that type of an amendment on the bill, but not on all of them.

Ms. Bridgman: I'd like to ask your impressions now of some of the people you encountered when you were first down there. Let's start with Governor Evans.

Mr. Barnes: Governor Evans, I thought, was a very intelligent person, very reasonable. And he, of course, was more knowledgeable of political process than I was.

For instance, I remember a bill that I got involved with in developing different levels of expertise for various electrical contracting licenses. I remember that I wanted to have a meeting with the governor and two or three of the electrical contractors that seemed to be leaders in the field. And when I arranged for this meeting with the governor and the electrical contractors found out about it, all of a sudden there were about twenty of them that wanted to

be in this meeting. They thought it was a big deal to be in a meeting with the governor. So I was embarrassed, here I thought I made arrangements for two or three people to meet with the governor, and I was sort of nervous about the fact that all of a sudden there were about twenty people crowded into the room. I spoke to Governor Evans afterward, and he just sort of laughed and he said, "That happens all the time. Don't pay any attention to it."

Ms. Bridgman: How about Speaker Lenny Sawyer?

Mr. Barnes: Len was somebody that was appreciated by both Democrats and Republicans. His integrity was unblemished, I think, and he was a very friendly person. He was very political, so you had to watch him on that! But when you got together with him and made arrangements that things would go a certain way, that there would be certain issues that would be brought to the floor and certain people would be allowed to speak and this and that and the other, he always followed through. And he was appreciated.

Of course, about my second or third year down there he was deposed by his own party. Perhaps because he was too easy for the Republicans to get along with. I don't know.

Ms. Bridgman: Can you tell us a little bit about that deposition? It's something that people like to reminisce about.

Mr. Barnes: Yes. Of course the Democrats pretty well kept the undercurrents within their own caucus. There was a period there for about two weeks that we'd go out on the floor and the Democrats would go into caucus and we'd sit and wait while they sat in their caucus behind closed doors and fought over the issue. And it was kind of traumatic for them to have to depose their speaker. And I suppose it took a lot of argument on their part. I think about two weeks went by where we really didn't get anything done. We just sort of sat and waited.

That would happen regularly. We'd have a session, we'd go into session, have the role call, and the Democrats would ask for time for a caucus, and they'd go in their room and close the doors. The Republicans would sit out, and I remember once we got up a quartet and sang some while we were waiting. Anything to pass the time!

Ms. Bridgman: What did you sing?

Mr. Barnes: Just any popular song. We had a very good singer from Hawaii. What was his name? He was only there for one term. But he was kind of the leader of that group, and he had been a professional singer at one time.

Ms. Bridgman: Was this barbershop quartet kind of singing?

Mr. Barnes: Sort of. But it didn't stick to that style. It wasn't as good as most barbershop quartets.

Ms. Bridgman: How much information did the Democrats give you, deliberately or otherwise, about what was going on?

Mr. Barnes: On that issue? None. That was completely in their own bailiwick. And I'm not the kind that goes around trying to pry information out of people, although I was curious about what was going on. And we did have people trying to get information, but it probably was the fact that Len Sawyer wasn't as hard on the Republicans as he could be. And there was always the political concern that, "Our party might not be in control next year, and we've got to do everything we can to keep our party in control." That sort of thing. And that might have been the underlying cause.

Ms. Bridgman: How about Chief Clerk Dean Foster?

Mr. Barnes: Dean is a very competent person, and he's always been appreciated as such. He ran things very well, he handled all the paperwork, and the payrolls, this, that, and the other. He was very easy to get along with. There were no problems with Dean.

Ms. Bridgman: And the two chairpersons of the two caucuses?

Mr. Barnes: There were times when floor leaders, for instance, would be bitterly partisan. I think that doesn't pay off. It brings a reaction instead of cooperation. While I was down there, we elected Clyde Ballard as a leader, this was one of the things that we thought: not be bitterly partisan, and not be overly critical just for partisans sake, but to try to influence through a cooperative type of work. There were times when the exchanges would be very politically bitter, and that really didn't pay off.

Ms. Bridgman: Again, can you remember a particular instance?

Mr. Barnes: Oh yes, but I'd have to name names, of friends of mine that were involved. And it would be critical of their style. And in many cases the style has changed, of certain individuals.

Ms. Bridgman: Can you do so without identifying them?

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember the particular issues now, but I can remember bitter exchanges between the floor leaders. Most of this is done in the hopes of catching a reporter's attention and getting the criticisms printed in the papers. In view of the upcoming elections and this concern about the next election goes on, of course it is only two years in between elections. This goes on all the time.

Ms. Bridgman: How about Lieutenant Governor Cherberg, who has just now passed away? How did he seem then?

Mr. Barnes: He was very well liked. Of course he was very courteous and gentlemanly. Politically, not really controversial. I can remember him, though, promising me that a certain bill wouldn't be passed through the Senate Rules Committee, which he chaired, and then the next day that bill came out of the Rules Committee. So I was somewhat disappointed in that situation. But he was very friendly and courteous. He was tremendous at remembering names, and when he introduced people, he would include everybody in his address of the audience, you know. Until the last few years it got to where he was forgetting names and forgetting people and so forth. So I think he deserved retirement, perhaps a little earlier than he took it.

Ms. Bridgman: There is now, I find, a lot of nostalgic reminiscing about the Evans years. Alan Thompson called it "the closest thing to Camelot that we had." How does that characterization compare with your impression of the Evans era?

Mr. Barnes: Of course I was kind of new. Evans was there when I first went down, and that was the time when I was very emotional about certain issues. In a way, I defeated the milk marketing act that I told you about. I fought that through the house and through the senate and had three meetings with Governor Evans, which included, sometimes, the dairy people. And he vetoed the bill. So I've always appreciated him.

I don't know if I would call it a Camelot because at the time I was concerned about issues and hadn't really learned how to roll with the punches yet. We were in the minority, and we were losing a lot of issues.

Ms. Bridgman: For the record, that year the senate Democrats were in the majority, thirty-one to eighteen, and in the house, fifty-seven to forty-one. But more to the point, how long did it take you to "roll with the punches?"

Mr. Barnes: Probably about five years, five or six years. Well, the two years that I was chairman of the Energy and Utilities Committee, this was right in the middle of the WPPSS problems, so I really had the hot seat. And during those two years when we really re-wrote the rules regarding operation of municipalities, like WPPSS, that was very intense, very concerning, and maybe a little bit emotional. There we had trouble with our own Republicans in the senate. Specifically, with the Republican chairman of the Utilities Committee in the senate.

So this was a tough session for me. And very intense. Probably, it wasn't until after that year, and I can't remember what year that was. It wasn't until after that, that I began taking things a little easier. Then I figured when I took things too easy, it was time for me to quit.

Ms. Bridgman: Since this is an important issue, and will continue to be for all of us, I'd like to talk a little bit about how this committee functioned, that is, Energy and Utilities. Particularly during that crisis. And how the decisions were actually made. How much were alternatives discussed?

Mr. Barnes: There was a lot of intense discussion that went on. Day after day and meeting after meeting. I think a lot of the opposition that we got from Democrats in the senate, where there was a one vote difference I think this was the year that Peter von Reichbauer switched parties, and the Democrats were, of course, quite bitter about that because all the chairmanships then went to Republicans.

One of the first things the Republicans did was to try to reduce the staff they had in their committees, and this meant that a lot of people would lose their jobs. And they took this to court, to the Civil Service Commission, and were restored to their jobs. A lot of them had been hired by Democrats and had the Democratic political philosophy, and this made for some influence in committees, like in the Energy Committee in the senate. This is where we had our problems, because these people were kept on in their jobs. Maybe some of their jobs were shifted to different areas and so forth, but this made things a little harder.

We had intense and bitter battles to change the method of procurement of parts and contracts and so forth, for building WPPSS plants, and anything else that might come along in the future of that nature. For instance, our contracting laws were oriented toward how you would pave a parking lot rather than how you would build a very highly technical nuclear plant. There was a feeling of some partisanship in the senate. I think that what we were doing was right and

good, and overdue, but because Republicans were doing it, and it might turn out good, there was political opposition to it. Each party doesn't want the other party to do something good.

So this, I think, was a source of much of our opposition. I can remember getting a lot of the lobbyists and people concerned, labor leaders and so forth, because labor was one of the problems with the WPPSS plants.

[End Tape 7, Side 2]

15 ENERGY AND UTILITIES ISSUES

Ms. Bridgman: Today we're going to talk about the events involving the Washington Public Power Supply System, otherwise known as WPPSS. I'd like you to explain not only your role as chairman of the House Energy and Utilities Committee during that time, but your special knowledge of the actions of lobbyists, of journalists, of the governor when he was involved, and of the state and federal judiciary and the US Congress, all of whom were eventually involved in this momentous part of our state's history.

Last time we met, you mentioned your term as chairman of the Energy and Utilities Committee. Before we discuss WPPSS, how did you come to have that position?

Mr. Barnes: We had taken the majority that year, 1981, just about the time of the WPPSS crisis, as we referred to it, when WPPSS really ran out of money. They'd had problems in constructing the five nuclear plants that they had decided, some years before, to construct. They had labor troubles, they had a great deal of inflation in the cost of construction, and in the meantime, people of the state had discovered conservation as a means of cutting down the use of electricity. So several things appeared, like the increased cost of construction and the fact that perhaps all five plants would not be required until a number of years later than had been estimated.

So many people of the state objected to the increase in rates of electricity which were going to be required to pay for the construction of the plants. A good deal of municipal bonds had been sold to finance the construction, and the cost of paying off these bonds was going to increase as more had to be sold to finance the construction.

There was a oh, you might say a holdover from the sixties, this being the early eighties, of people who objected to nuclear plants in the first place, and these people seized the opportunity, I believe, to try to sway more of the public opinion to oppose the construction of nuclear plants. And many influenced a lot of the public utility districts to just renege on their bonds, on their costs. And many of the utilities' election of commissioners came up during this time. Many of the people who ran for commissioner were the active opponents of the nuclear power plants and the opponents of paying for them. So we had a lot of commissioners that took over and other commissioners following the very vocal opponents of paying for the plants.

All this led to many utilities just deciding not to pay their bills. They had borrowed the money by selling bonds, but now they just decided not to pay the bonds off. So this was one of the greatest defaults of municipal bonds that occurred during this time.

In the meantime, I was appointed chairman of the Energy and Utilities Committee of the house. You asked what the reason was. It was that they wanted a technically educated person who was not a controversial character in that area. The former Republican minority leader on the committee had made himself quite controversial in his arguments the year before, so they gave him another assignment in order to avoid having a controversial character as a chairman of the committee. I had wanted, and expected to get, the chairmanship of the Education Committee. The leadership were very adamant in asking me to take over this one. And I'm glad that I did, finally, because it turned out this was the hot seat of this term a two year term in the legislature. It was the most exciting position to hold, probably.

The committee was given all proposed bills that had to do with energy and utilities, and this included then, the WPPSS problem. We were also given the responsibility of coming up with some kind of a solution to the problem. Well, it was too late for a solution, the horse had already escaped from the barn, so it was too late to lock the barn door.

We did come up with some legislation that would prevent the same type of situation from occurring, probably, because one of the bills would have changed the methods of procurement and contract signing. Previously, our state laws which governed municipalities in procuring facilities and signing contracts for construction such as this were really built around the problems you'd get in paving a parking lot or something like that. And here we were having a very high-tech effort in building nuclear plants; and as I like to say, the largest municipal effort since the building of the pyramids. So it really needed revision of the methods which were used to decide on the contractors and to write contracts. We did write a bill, then, that updated this and made it more applicable to a large, highly technical effort.

Another bill that we did write is that we restructured the board of directors of the municipality of WPPSS. Previously it had been thought to have nothing but local people, local commissioners, on this board of directors. As a result of this we had a muffler shop operator from Aberdeen as the chairman of the board that was in the largest effort since the construction of the pyramids.

We had no nationally known decision-makers on that board. We restructured the board then, such that it would include people from the outside. It would include a majority of people from local utility districts on the board, but would also include some, as I said, nationally known decision-makers. So the board was eventually restructured in this way. But of course, it was too late for that particular problem that we were in at the time. It may prevent similar problems in the future.

In the meantime, the default of these bonds really caused a tragedy for some people who had invested: some retired people, elderly couples who had invested their life savings in WPPSS bonds. They lost their money. They lost their life savings. So it was a real tragedy, and I've always felt bitter about those utilities that did refuse to pay their debts that they had contracted for simply because enough activists that were opposed to nuclear plants were able to influence them people who naturally didn't want to pay higher electrical rates anyhow. It was a real tragedy, a tough time for the state as far as bond ratings were concerned. Perhaps some of our bills that we did pass through will prevent something like this in the future.

Ms. Bridgman: For the record, the bill that reorganized the executive board of WPPSS was, in 1982, was it not, the last bill passed in the session. Am I correct?

Mr. Barnes: I believe both of those bills I mentioned passed in 1982. They were hard to pass because it became a partisan issue. For some reason, the Democrats opposed both of these bills and fought against them and attempted changes. In the senate, for instance, when we passed these bills over to the senate and we got Democratic cooperation in the house to pass them when they went to the senate, then there were attempts at changing them. I believe the Republican chairman of the Senate Energy Committee was under the influence of the staff which had been hired by Democrats. Toward the beginning of that session one Democrat had switched parties. This switched the majority from Democrats to Republicans. There was a struggle going on in the senate.

Ms. Bridgman: And that was Peter von Reichbauer, was it not?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, Senator Peter von Reichbauer switched parties. Which put the Republicans in charge then. And really, the first thing the Republicans did was to eliminate a number of the jobs. They always felt that the senate had hired too much staff, so they eliminated a lot of staff jobs and laid off a lot of staff members. The staff members then went to court saying that they couldn't be eliminated, that they were protected under the state laws. Those that were eliminated weren't really protected by State Civil Service, so I don't know what criteria they used. But they won their case, and this was handled very quickly so that they weren't laid off. Many of the committees were still under the influence, to the effect that staff can influence committees, by the staff hired by the Democrats.

Ms. Bridgman: And this was in the 1981 session and preceded, or was not associated with the WPPSS issue in particular, until it became an issue.

Mr. Barnes: Yes, that's right. Peter von Reichbauer switched parties. This had nothing to do with this issue. This did, of course, upset the Democrats in both houses to a great extent and made them rather combative. And that carried on into this rather essential public interest of doing something about the WPPSS problem.

Ms. Bridgman: I'd like to go back a little and pick up some interesting things you mentioned. First of all, who was the former chairman of your committee, the Energy and Utilities Committee? Who was felt to be less neutral?

Mr. Barnes: I believe the former chairman was Representative Dick Nelson. He was then the minority leader when I took over as the chairman. And Dick and I became quite good friends during these sessions, although we had very different ideas. We were politically quite divergent, of course. And Dick although we included him in the sessions that we'd had with various lobbyists and other interests while constructing the two important bills that I'd mentioned Dick, I think, then opposed those bills. I can't remember for sure. But he was in on the sessions in which we wrote those bills and had given his input.

He became the chairman of the committee then, the following term, when Republicans lost the majority in 1983 and end of 1982.

Ms. Bridgman: You referred to labor troubles as well as inflation as part of the underlying causes. What sort of labor troubles were they?

Mr. Barnes: There were strikes among the workers, the technicians that were constructing the plants. I can't remember the names of the unions that were involved. This was an important part of the problems that were created in the construction of these plants. It caused slowdowns and stoppages. There was a lot of highly expensive facilities that were put on hold, and the money was just frozen for a while, and interest had to be paid on it, of course. In the meantime, inflation was fairly bad at that time and costs went up.

I can't remember the issues that were being contended during those strikes, but I suppose that it was wages. Financial.

Ms. Bridgman: Then what part did the labor community if I might call it that, labor lobbyists, representatives of labor play in the all the various negotiations and attempts to keep this going?

Mr. Barnes: As I remember, we had labor representatives. We had put together, I had put together, a committee or group I don't know if you'd call it a committee. I just gathered a group of lobbyists, which included labor and utility business and other businesses in the state. And I think we included a person or two that were active as oppositionists of nuclear plants. We got together in the vault down in the auditor's office, in the Capitol Building in a place called the vault. We got together there one Sunday morning and sat there for about four hours until we whipped out the general idea of these two bills. Mainly we were interested in the procurement bill.

I think the most prominent player in this from the legislature was Emilio Cantu, who was at that time a freshman representative. He's now a senator. He had experience in the Boeing Company in dealing with high-tech contracts, and he was invaluable in helping to put the revised procedures for contracts by municipalities into state law.

Ms. Bridgman: This meeting, then, included your committee and this group of lobbyists or representatives of special interests?

Mr. Barnes: A few members of my committee.

Ms. Bridgman: Which members?

Mr. Barnes: I can remember Emilio and myself and Dick Nelson, the minority leader. And I believe Bobby Williams, who was not on the committee but who later ran for governor. He had been particularly interested in this as an issue, and I believe he was included I can't remember for sure, but I believe we included him in this meeting. I can't remember the names of the lobbyists, but there were lobbyists from the construction industry and lobbyists from the labor unions that were involved, plus other business people and a couple of citizen activists, I believe. There were about, I'd say, fifteen people that we gathered together in this vault and ironed out the changes in the procurement laws.

Ms. Bridgman: Were there representatives of the bond holders as well?

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember, but we tried to include everybody. I'm not sure. We had some bankers, I believe, which might have been, or people that were interested in the financial industry, and I believe they could be considered as having represented bond holders.

Ms. Bridgman: This may seem off the subject, but do you remember if it was warm in the vault?

Mr. Barnes: No, I think it was rather comfortable. Is it warm there now?

Ms. Bridgman: My office is in the vault, and it's very warm.

Mr. Barnes: It was January or February during the session, so it was during winter, and I don't know that anybody mentioned the fact that it would be warm.

Ms. Bridgman: To continue then, about this meeting in the auditor's vault where you developed or negotiated among various people the details of the procurement bill, were there staffers involved in that?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, we had staff. I think a very brilliant staffer we had, Fred Adair, who was the chief of staff for the Energy and Utilities Committee, was there. But they were there mainly to record other people's results, what other people's discussions were.

Ms. Bridgman: And what part had he or the staff this is of the house committee, I assume had in developing that bill?

[Tape on, Tape off]

Ms. Bridgman: We were talking about the role of the staff in the development of this bill.

Mr. Barnes: Staff was invaluable in keeping us informed in the technical facts and the politics. That's their main function, to organize the events such as this meeting, to contact the people that we needed to speak with and to line up the meetings and the inter-

views and so forth. To be the technical experts on the basic facts of what we're talking about. There were a lot of technical aspects to this WPPSS problem. As I said, the construction of nuclear plants is a highly technical operation, and the contracts and the construction that has to go on is something that makes it different than paving a parking lot.

Ms. Bridgman: How would you characterize the discussion and give-and-take compromises, if there were any, and disagreements, if there were any, during that meeting?

Mr. Barnes: Let's see, this was only ten years ago, but still it's just difficult to remember.

The discussions were friendly and cooperative. Everybody the participants had a common goal. In other words, we were working toward the same thing, except perhaps Dick Nelson [laughs]. And I can't remember that Dick really had much to say. We wanted him in on the discussions, and on the formulation of this bill because to have his input or his knowledge of how the bill was put together, of course, would be beneficial in getting the bill through the house. We didn't have too much trouble getting it through the house, but I don't believe that Dick had too much to say. Again, I can't remember.

Mostly the people involved in contracting, the construction people and the labor people, were quite valuable in their comments. And all comments, I believe, added to the progress of the meeting. We did, then, overcome a rather difficult problem, and we got a rather good consensus.

[Tape on, Tape off]

We were talking about reaching a consensus in that meeting, and I believe that the comments made from all sides tended to indicate an agreement that we should change the methods of procurement mainly to get away from the emphasis on picking the contractor's bid with the lowest price to make sure that we were picking a contractor who had a reasonable price and who was most capable of doing a job. So the emphasis was switched from price to capability. I think we all agreed on that, and the bill, then, was constructed to reflect that.

Ms. Bridgman: Did that emerge during this discussion? How was it

Mr. Barnes: Yes, I'd say the agreement emerged. And my understanding of the problems were much clarified by this discussion. I had not been, myself, involved in contracting, as Emilio had, for the Boeing Company. Of course the Boeing Company, when they're contracting or getting subcontractors for highly technical things such as missiles and airplanes and avionics and so forth, they have got to consider, first, the capability of the subcontractor to do the job. And to do a job which has, for instance, a lot of emphasis on safety. So Emilio did have the conception in mind of this emphasis, and it was rather new to me.

Ms. Bridgman: I'd like to go back for just a minute and have you review who was on your committee. Who were the other members besides Emilio? You...

Mr. Barnes: I have always had trouble with names. Right now, as you bring this up, I can visualize the faces that were on that committee. In fact, one of the construction lobbyists could have been I'll put a question mark after this, but it could have been Dick DuCharme. I'm just not sure.

But one of the lobbyists was the one that suggested this meeting. It had not occurred to me to do this. I was trying to get all the information in committee hearings which was just kind of unwieldy because we had to have the whole committee. You couldn't have other people sitting around the table who could just pitch out their suggestions as we went along. A committee meeting has to be held a little more formally. But it was one of the lobbyists that did suggest this, and it turned out that this worked right. People of various interests were sitting around and were able to speak up and give their suggestions and ideas and express their concern as we went along.

People didn't interrupt each other, but they didn't hesitate to put in their two-cents worth, and I think this really cleared things up and enabled us to form the bills and then the staff helped put them together after we got≤

[End of Tape 8, Side 1]

Ms. Bridgman: We've been discussing an important meeting you had which led to the final version of, or the good version of, the procurement bill which then passed the house and the senate.

Mr. Barnes: As I explained, it probably should be noted that these bills went to the senate, and the chairman of the senate committee, Sue Gould, did put the bills on the title only bills of which she was the sponsor. The bills were passed by the senate and came back for confirmation well, not for confirmation, they came back for passage by the house as senate bills with her as the author. Actually, the bills had been authored, really, in my committee, mainly by Emilio Cantu with great participation by Bobby Williams and some by myself. So this is the story on those two bills. They are senate bills as they passed.

Ms. Bridgman: The press stories that I read emphasized Sue Gould's hesitation or opposition. Correct me if the media has made a mistake, or if I have, but was there not a bill also passed requiring a study of whether two of the plants should be completed before this procurement bill went through?

Mr. Barnes: You know, I just can't remember that. Again, Fred Adair might have memory of that, or Emilio Cantu might have memory of that. Of course, it would be a matter of record if it did pass, so research in the records of bills that passed that year would indicate what it was.

By the way, another player in this, Al Williams, Senator Al Williams, was the minority leader in the senate committee. He had been the chairman in the senate committee up until the time that Peter von Reichbauer switched parties.

Ms. Bridgman: And how would you describe his role in all of this?

Mr. Barnes: Similar to Dick Nelson, although he was a little more combative, I believe. He did show opposition to the bills. It's difficult to explain his rationale for the opposition, but I believe that the Democrats, particularly in the senate, were very upset about losing the majority when Senator von Reichbauer switched parties and were very hostile toward anything that the Republicans were doing that might cast or reflect merit on the part of the Republicans. It became a very partisan problem. I can remember reminding Senator Williams that what we were trying to do was to save public utilities when, actually, Republicans are known for their support of privately owned, investor owned, utilities.

I can remember making that statement to Al Williams, and I guess finally we got their cooperation. At least the bill did pass. I don't remember how many Democrats voted for it. There was a one vote Republican majority in the senate. There were Republicans that probably opposed the bill because many of the activists who opposed nuclear power felt that this was a bill to help straighten out the problems of constructing nuclear plants. It wasn't very well understood just what the bill was to do. Many of them just felt it was to benefit nuclear power, so they just blindly opposed it. We had many people opposed to the bill like that in our committee hearings that would get up and expound at length on that.

Some of the followers in the house and senate who didn't wish to antagonize these people would take opposition to the bill because of that, just for political reasons. It was a problem that did have a lot of political aspects to it, and I'd say that mainly the politicians or the legislators who were afraid of the opposition they'd create for themselves at election time if they opposed these people, they'd go against the bill. That was part of the problem.

Ms. Bridgman: What were the reasons for those who opposed it on other grounds?

Mr. Barnes: Being a politician myself, I can't understand the rationale of people who opposed it, other than those who opposed it for the two reasons that I've mentioned. Just because they felt it might help organize the construction of nuclear plants in the future or that it might what was the other or support of it might engender the antagonism of the anti-nuclear activists who, I've got to say, didn't really understand the problem and who were blindly striking out at anything they thought might be associated with building nuclear plants.

Ms. Bridgman: I'd like to ask now, since the Bonneville Power Administration was the head of all of this, and the parent so—

Mr. Barnes: The BPA was not really a party, not a head of the WPPSS board of directors. The BPA is a federal organization that had some dealings with utilities in that they sold electricity to them.

Ms. Bridgman: Perhaps my question is premature. It's a philosophical one, that is, I'm asking about your philosophy. Since BPA is part of the Federal Department of Energy, I wondered how that connection, however tenuous it was, how you reacted to it, considering your own previous articulation about opposition to a lot of federal intervention in the economy.

Mr. Barnes: Maybe you can clarify that question a bit.

Ms. Bridgman: I did go on, didn't I?

Were you uncomfortable at all because of the federal connections with this project?

Mr. Barnes: No. The federal connections didn't really affect us or make us uncomfortable in any way. Where we got into the federal connections was a little later on. We had dealings with the feds on the cleanup of the Hanford area that had been caused by contamination due to weapons production and the storage of spent nuclear fuel.

These issues were with the federal government. And those came a little later and were not really associated with the WPPSS problem, except to the extent that the storage of spent nuclear fuel was one of the issues that was cited by people who opposed the construction of nuclear plants. That was one of their main concerns.

Ms. Bridgman: So how did you feel, then, about BPA being the agent, as it were, agency, which sold electricity to Idaho and Oregon and would sell it from these WPPSS plants. And their being, then, part of the Department of Energy?

Mr. Barnes: There would be, once WPPSS plants were constructed, there would be an exchange of power between the BPA network and the utilities' networks. The price of that power would be mixed: rather cheap power from BPA dams, and a little more expensive power from the WPPSS-owned plants. And this had been worked out. Once plants were producing electricity, it all would be involved in supplying sufficient electricity to the area. The cost of the electricity, of course, would be mitigated by the fact that hydro-generated electricity was rather cheap in the Northwest. The nuclear plant generating electricity would be more expensive. But the mixture, the melded price, would still be quite reasonable if you compare it to the price of electricity in the rest of the nation.

So everybody appreciated that fact that the BPA dams were here. Maybe the fish don't, but at the time we weren't worried that much about fish, although the concern was starting. We were aware of the fact, at least those of us that were highly involved were aware of the fact that our electricity was very reasonable in this area because of the hydro-electric power generated in the Northwest, mostly by the BPA.

Ms. Bridgman: Going back to the study which was passed concurrently with the bill we've been talking about, as reported in the Seattle Times, their story emphasized the role of lobbyists, that is WPPSS lobbyists, in the house. Rather than asking you that, I would just like you to characterize the role of journalism and media in this whole series of events.

Mr. Barnes: First let me comment on WPPSS lobbyists.

Actually, WPPSS didn't have well, the director of WPPSS, we did use him to get a lot of information from him, had him testify and interview with us and talk with us. And the main lobbyists involved were utility lobbyists of the various utilities, public and private. And, possibly, the large private utilities provided the most expert lobbyists I guess they can pay the most for them and they had some very sharp people. Of course, they are one side of the problem. You've got to listen to both sides if you're going to make a vote that's going to count. But they did have expert lobbyists, mostly from the large private utilities.

The public utilities also had lobbyists. They had people that contacted us. And then labor groups also. And then, of course, the citizen activists we heard from them quite a lot.

Ms. Bridgman: Will you mention some of the large private utilities?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, there's two particularly: Pacific Power and Light and what's the other one? Syl?

Ms. Bridgman: Are you thinking of the Spokane

Mr. Barnes: That's Spokane

Ms. Bridgman: Washington Water Power?

Mr. Barnes: Syl, what are the two large private utilities.

Mrs. Barnes: It's Washington Natural Gas. Is that the one you're talking about? Puget Power?

Mr. Barnes: Puget Power and Light.

Mrs. Barnes: Skagit Power and Light. Now who does what?

Mr. Barnes: Who represented who was Mike Tracy?

Mrs. Barnes: He's with Puget Power.

Mr. Barnes: Who's over in Spokane.

Mrs. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Barnes: Northwest Power or something.

Ms. Bridgman: Washington Water

Mr. Barnes: Washington Water Power?

Mrs. Barnes: I don't know. Let me look.

Mr. Barnes: Washington Water Power, I think that's the one.

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you. And how about the PUDs? Which PUDs?

Mr. Barnes: Let's see. I'm trying to remember the names of the PUDs. I remember one up in Skagit Snohomish? No, Skagit. What's the county north of us there?

Ms. Bridgman: North of King?

Mr. Barnes: Yes. Is that Snohomish?

Ms. Bridgman: Yes.

Mr. Barnes: Yes. Matt Dillon was one of the activists up there and he ran for commissioner, the position of commissioner, and was elected. And to this day he opposes their paying the debts that they contracted, paying back the bonds they sold. So he was one of the foremost activists in opposing payment of the bonds. One that, of course, advocated defaulting.

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you. Can we go back now to the role of the newspapers, TVs

Mr. Barnes: Newspapers covered this rather extensively. I've got to emphasize that this was a rather large issue in the state of Washington that everybody was interested in. Many people made disparaging comments, of course, of the organization, Washington Public Power Supply System. They used that word, WPPSS, to create the butt of many jokes and disparaging remarks. It was a large issue. And of course it was one of the largest defaults, probably the largest default, of any municipality's bonds in the history of the United States. And it caused a lot of people to lose important savings.

So the newspapers covered it rather extensively, and some of them covered it quite well. Others, it was a difficult issue to explain and newspapers sometimes have difficulties with complex issues which may have two sides to the story. Sometimes young reporters have trouble keeping this straight, but I'd say some of the most experienced reporters did cover this extensively and rather well.

Ms. Bridgman: Do you remember any particular paper, reporter, with whom you agreed or thought did their job?

Mr. Barnes: It's hard for me to remember which ones I agreed with. Some of them reporting weren't taking one side or the other; some were doing what they were supposed to do.

I'd say that two of the people Dick Larson was one that possibly wrote articles on this and Shelby Scates can you remember any names, Syl?

Mrs. Barnes: Mike Layton, probably. Probably did more than either Shelby or Dick.

Mr. Barnes: Lyle Price from the Valley News.

Mrs. Barnes: And then we had John White.

Mr. Barnes: John White from over in Spokane.

Mrs. Barnes: Yes, he was with

Mr. Barnes: International News Service, INS.

Mrs. Barnes: UPI, United Press International, I think John was. He lived in Olympia. Those are the ones that I remember. Of course Adele.

Mr. Barnes: Adele Ferguson.

It was covered extensively, and from many sides. And people were extremely aware of the problem. Whether or not they were knowledgeable of the problem, they were aware of it. Having to depend on the various news stories for their information, people probably took different views of the situation. And there were people I'd say that people that objected to nuclear power seemed to be the same people that objected to nuclear weapons. Probably the commonality of the nuclear energy being used in both caused this phenomenon where people who objected to nuclear weapons which maybe in a way was all of us but people objected to us defending ourselves by having a deterrence seemed to be the same people that objected to us producing power by nuclear means.

So I would say there was a connection between what you might describe as liberals versus conservatives on the sides that were taken on this. That's a dangerous thing to say because your definition of liberal and conservative is very flexible in some cases so it's difficult to say. But I'd say that in general the people who in my politician's viewpoint wanted us to surrender in the Cold War were those who objected to us producing power by nuclear means. And proba-

bly would have objected to us building more dams, too. I don't know. But it seemed to be the same people associated with this. And those people are, I think, called "liberal," but I'm not sure that's a correct description of their politics.

Ms. Bridgman: I appreciate your caution here. And this is completely off the WPPSS subject: Would you say, now, that those divisions among American citizens which seemed at the time to be so pervasive, still exist and are still as important?

Mr. Barnes: Probably not as important now that the Soviet Union has surrendered in the Cold War. There are still remnants of this division left. It seems to me like I've read recently in the paper some sides that have been taken in the El Salvador problem, the Nicaragua well that's been solved. In the opinions you hear about our actions in the Gulf War, our actions in Panama, Grenada, and El Salvador. There seems to be the same kind of division. But that division is perhaps weakening, somewhat.

Ms. Bridgman: Getting back to WPPSS, there were, at the time, some decisions made on predictions of energy use. You mentioned earlier that Washingtonians had discovered conservation. There were also dire predictions made about the effects on our state economy should we default. How did you feel about those predictions at the time?

Mr. Barnes: I think my main feeling was that it was dishonorable to not repay a loan that you have accepted. And I feel that the bonds that were sold were loans that were backed by the ability to collect rates on electricity sold to the constituents of a utility. I've always felt that, that was rather immoral: to default on that bond.

What's the other part of your question?

Ms. Bridgman: The predictions about in two separate studies, twenty-thousand jobs would be lost and that sort of thing.

Mr. Barnes: It was predicted that the state's bond rating would be affected, which it was for a while. It's coming back, but it's not all the way back yet. It did increase the interest rate that the state had to pay on bonds that they sold after that event. So there was some effect, and nobody knows how to measure it.

One thing, however, where the liberals were right and I was wrong was that there was an awful lot of electricity that could be saved by conservation. It turned out that people who claimed that were right, and there has been a lot of electricity saved in this way. Although we have increased our demand for electricity year by year as we've gone along since the occasion, we have also created enough conservation, or saved energy by conservation, to really not require those five nuclear plants. We have used one of them, and are continuing to build another. In the future, we may have to reactivate the construction efforts of these plants and continue, if the plants are not obsolete by then.

But it has turned out that we didn't need five nuclear plants at that time. People who opposed nuclear plants turned out to be right in this way, although they were wrong in many other aspects of their activities.

Ms. Bridgman: What would you predict would happen if we chose to take these plants out of mothballs, so to speak? See a replay?

Mr. Barnes: Recently comments by the Northwest Power Planning organization what was the complete name of that? Recent comments by that committee that construction should be continued on one or more of the remaining plants has brought forth the opposition to nuclear plants that existed back in the 1980s. So I suppose there would be a certain amount of opposition remaining, and we still haven't, to everybody's satisfaction, resolved the problem of storage of spent fuel. As long as we haven't solved that problem, we will probably have this controversy.

Ms. Bridgman: The next year, in 1982, there was an Initiative 394 which would have required the people's vote on financing any major energy projects. Can you comment on that please?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, I just vaguely remember that occurred. I don't remember whether it made it to the ballot and how it turned out. Do you remember how it turned out?

This would take out of the hands of those utilities, which would issue the bonds, take out of their hands the decision of whether they should or not, and put into the hands of the people of the state in general. This maybe has some logic to it, since the default of bonds by a group of utilities, such as what happened≤

[End of Tape 8, Side 2]

17 THE SPELLMAN TERM

Ms. Bridgman: Today I hope we can finish the recollections about the WPPSS crisis, 1981 through 1983, and get some brief reflections on Governor John Spellman's administration, and then go back to discuss another issue you considered very important in your career, the basic education measures passed in 1977.

At the very end of tape eight, you were explaining your reaction to Initiative 394, which was approved by the voters in autumn of 1982. This initiative required voters approval for financing any major energy project. There were about 532,000 votes for and 384,419 votes against it. Will you please continue describing what you remember about this.

Mr. Barnes: This is something that catches me by surprise now. Have I forgotten what we have said about that?

Ms. Bridgman: It was after the part of the public involvement in the WPPSS troubles. I believe your last words were something to the effect that you did not consider it inappropriate that the voters, the people, should give the final approval for that kind of major project that requires so much money.

Mr. Barnes: Yes, I suppose there's reason to feel that the voters could have some say in that because of the effect that such large projects have on a state. Either when they succeed or when they fail, like the WPPSS plans did sort of fail. So that leaves the politicians to lay the blame on the people if a project fails like that again. I suppose there is good reason to have such a thing. There's been no occasion to use that since then.

It was kind of an emotional issue, and it was like a lot of issues that are done in that manner, through the referendum procedure. A lot of people are casting their vote who hadn't had the opportunity to really brief themselves or to become thoroughly acquainted with the issue, the pros and cons of it. So I don't know how it will turn out if it's ever used, but there is reason to feel like it's a good thing to have.

Ms. Bridgman: How do you think it will work to publicize the issue? Suppose something like this were necessary quite soon to reach the public on a major project.

Mr. Barnes: Yes, I presume through the media. This may be an issue that doesn't have a strong group of citizens organized to promote or defeat a proposal, like so many issues do have, organizations of citizens that cause controversy and therefore more media attention. This may be something that does cause a lot of controversy and has a lot of attention, or it may be something that state officials are trying to explain to people and the people aren't interested in. So who knows how this is going to turn out.

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you. To finish up our discussion: The state supreme court, as you remember, ruled that default was allowable because utilities and municipalities who had purchased the bonds, in fact, did not have the right to enter into that kind of contract. And that was upheld by the United States Supreme Court. Do you, can you, explain your reaction to that?

Mr. Barnes: I had my emotional feelings about this also. I felt that it was wrong for the utilities who had committed themselves by borrowing your money, which was represented by the bonds they sold, that many of the utilities were just going to walk away from their debts. I felt that that was wrong. But the courts felt that there was some question about the agreements and the contracts that were signed, so they allowed that. It did hurt the state's credit rating. And rightly so because who would want to invest money in a state in which such a large default had occurred. So it hurt the state's credit rating, temporarily. I think we slowly came out of that. I felt it was wrong, but evidently the courts allowed it, so I must have been wrong.

Ms. Bridgman: I suppose the last chapter was an attempt of the U.S. Senate Interior Appropriations Subcommittee to adopt an amendment and rescue WPPSS, so to speak. The press described those representatives and senators from the northwest as publicly supporting it, but being privately lukewarm; and in fact, as you remember, nothing ever came of it. How did you feel about that effort of the feds to bail us out?

Mr. Barnes: I didn't feel that it was necessary for the federal government to feel that they had an obli-

gation to bail us out. It was our fault. We couldn't blame them. So I didn't really have any feeling that they should. It would have been nice if they did, for our state, but I don't think that the federal government had any obligation in that case.

Ms. Bridgman: Let's leave that sad chapter in our state's history behind. I'd like to hear your opinions and reflections on Spellman and his administration. While he was governor, 1981 to 1985, during all of this, how did he compare with Dan Evans?

Mr. Barnes: Evans had had more experience in state government when he became governor in state government. He had been a state legislator. John Spellman had been a county executive, and before that, a county commissioner. And Spellman really only had one term and hadn't I feel hadn't felt that he had gained the strength of leadership that Dan Evans had done. Of course, Dan had three terms and then had experience in the state legislature beforehand. I think that made a difference.

John Spellman was probably too concerned with keeping the two parties together, and maybe didn't have the same feeling that there is a difference between the two parties, and that he should take strong leadership in guiding it toward the Republican philosophy. This, maybe, had been reflected rather early in the fact that the federal government passed the laws which formed the Northwest Power Planning Administration. Each state, each of three states, Oregon, Idaho and Washington was to designate two people to serve on that commission or committee. I forget which they called it. And there would be rotating chairmanship of that. Dan Evans offered himself for that as an appointee. He didn't want to take it as a full-time job he was president of the Evergreen State College. And there were arguments, on a partisan basis, mainly, as to whether that should be a full-time job or not.

There also was argument as to whether that should be partisan or non-partisan. I was in the middle of that argument, too, because I was chairman of the Energy and Utilities Committee, and we were, the Republicans were, the majority. I'm trying to think now.

There were two issues: whether it should be a full-time job, and whether it should be partisan or non-partisan. I felt that it should be non-partisan. Maybe I was naive in thinking that would satisfy the problems that people would have with having members of the other party representing them in such a it was to be a very powerful committee, planning for future energy in the Northwest. And not only energy, but planning for it in such a way as to preserve fish runs and so forth.

Anyhow, Spellman, I think, wanted to satisfy the Democrats on the issue of being partisan, where you'd have one person from one party and another person from the other party. I felt by having it non-partisan would keep the partisanship out of the question. I thought it should be non-partisan. Maybe that's a little naive.

But at any rate, I forced through the house a bill that would make it non-partisan. And because I wanted Dan Evans to take the job, and he wouldn't take it unless it was part-time not full-time I forced that through also. We got those two issues through the house, and then the senate accepted them. So what John Spellman did was, he appointed Dan Evans as one of the members of the commission, and I can't remember the name of the other person. The other person had been associated with the Democratic party and was not a politician, but his family and so forth had been associated with the Democratic party. He was very good, had a good background, and was a businessman in Seattle. It was a good appointment, both appointments were very good, and as we had expected, Dan Evans became the chairman of the commission, the first chairman.

At any rate, John did sign or appoint one person who was a known Republican and another person who was, in a way, connected with the Democratic party. So I felt that he did that to avoid antagonism from the Democrats, in the senate, particularly. So it turned out okay, the way I had wanted it to. Both appointees were very good. And the Northwest Power Planning Commission was then put into effect and is operating now.

Ms. Bridgman: How did he go about working with you and the other legislators to make his preferences known, particularly on this issue, since you've just been talking about it? And how did that compare with, say, Dan Evans?

Mr. Barnes: In the house, the Republican caucus, we were concerned that he might have been too conciliatory in trying to keep peace between the two parties. A couple of times I had to go down and see him and ask him to come up and talk to our caucus to get their comments directly and explain his thoughts and so forth. So he did that once or twice. He came up to our caucus, and we did talk with him about these things.

Ms. Bridgman: Now how often had Evans spoken to the caucus? Or did he have an entirely different way of relating to you all?

Mr. Barnes: No, I don't think he had an entirely different way of relating to us. I know that he had, on occasion, been up to speak to the caucus, but remember, I was only there during one of his terms. He had three terms. I had conferences with Dan Evans outside of the caucus. Particularly on that milk marketing act. In fact, I convinced him to finally veto that. I can't remember what subject he covered when he came to the caucus. It may have been just kind of a formal, more or less introductory or social or whatever meeting. But in John Spellman's case, we did have specific concerns that we wanted to take with him about.

Ms. Bridgman: How would you characterize Spellman's staff and the way they operated to get things done as compared to Evans?

Mr. Barnes: It's hard for me to remember the specific things. I remember one of Spellman's staff members was Steve Excell. He kept contact with the caucus. He was sort of a conduit for communications between us and the governor. And the specific methods of operating I just can't recall too much on that now.

Ms. Bridgman: Apparently they weren't dramatic or unconventional or they would have been memorable.

Mr. Barnes: No.

Ms. Bridgman: Now Ralph Munro, my boss, had just been elected secretary of state then. Can you remember your impressions of him then, when he had just been elected?

Mr. Barnes: He had been part of Dan Evans' staff. I didn't know him too well. I remember that he was around and he was rather quiet. It was a long time ago, so it's hard for me to remember any specific issues or talks that we had with him, with the caucus. We became acquainted socially. There is an attempt to do that, you know, through our receptions and so forth. And I was aware that before Ralph was elected, the previous secretary of state had thought the office was superfluous and had wanted to do away with it, his own office. I can't remember now who was that? Lud Kramer?

Ms. Bridgman: No, it was following Lud.

Mr. Barnes: Is Sylvia still here? She would remember.

Mrs. Barnes: Bruce Chapman.

Mr. Barnes: Bruce Chapman. Yes, that's right. Bruce. There was certain things that Bruce had in mind. He did not want to have primaries. He didn't want to require people to have to declare that they were Democrats or Republicans. He was concerned that if people would just have to come out and declare, that most of them would declare themselves Democrats. And they would then become Democrats and support Democratic candidates. He felt that as long as we had no requirement to register that people wouldn't get locked into one party or the other. This he felt would anyhow, it's politics: You do whatever you can to help support your own party.

Ralph immediately took an interest in the job. It was the correct place for him. He was the right man for the right position because he has an interest in things the history of the state, for instance and wants to have a position where he can study this and preserve some of the history of the state. And Ralph's interests Ralph was very interested, I know, in a state primary. He has always pushed that, and he finally got it. And he was the motivating force, probably the primary motivating force, behind that; although the people evidently agreed with him: they voted to change the constitution for it.

Ms. Bridgman: How about Sid Snyder who was secretary of the senate during most of your time down there? How would you describe Sid?

Mr. Barnes: Oh, he was very friendly and very capable. He conducted the business in a capable manner. We were all friendly with him. He was a good his position, it's similar to the clerk of the house, but I forget what the title is now. Yes, we liked Sid.

Ms. Bridgman: And Vito Chiechi?

Mr. Barnes: Chiechi! Vito Chiechi.

Ms. Bridgman: Had replaced Dean Foster as chief clerk.

Mr. Barnes: Yes.

Ms. Bridgman: And what was he like?

Mr. Barnes: Vito had worked for Len Sawyer, a Democrat, earlier, and when he was working for the Democrats he was regarded as one you could rely on. When he gave his word on something he kept it. And he did a very capable job. Later when we became the majority party, Bill Polk was our Speaker and he appointed Vito as the house clerk. And Vito was very good at it.

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you. Are there other important personages associated with the Spellman years, that I have forgotten or don't know about, that you remember?

Mr. Barnes: Oh, I can't think of anything. There are incidents about his term. For instance, one of the important things, I think, was when they had a strike of the engineers on the ferry system. We passed a law which would have placed the ferry workers under the state civil service rather than as employees of the ferry system, which wasn't a civil service position. It would have placed them on the civil service and would have outlawed their strikes, I believe.

This, of course, labor then opposed, very strongly, and kicked up quite a fuss about it. They did this to a point where Spellman then I think he pocket-vetoed that bill and, instead, appointed a commission which included some labor and so forth, and some ferry users, to study the situation for a year. Then we were to come back. It was his intention we were to come back and consider the law again the next year. Well nothing ever became of that. I think John Spellman's term ended, and so the bill, which was opposed by labor, and therefore labor being supported by the Democrats it never passed.

By the way, side notes on John Spellman: he loved to sing.

Ms. Bridgman: I didn't know that. I hadn't heard that anywhere.

Mr. Barnes: Yes, he's pretty good. And one of his good friends, a tenor, an Irish tenor I forget his name but he had this fellow when he made his inaugural speech to the legislature when he was first elected. In our first session. He gave his speech, and then he invited this tenor up with him, and the two of them sang a couple of duets.

John liked Dixieland music, which was my favorite. And I had before I went to the legislature I had a seven piece Dixieland band. He invited me to put together my band, which had kind of broken up when I went to the legislature, for a reception in the Governor's Mansion. We did that. In fact, I've got a picture somewhere. And we played some Dixieland music in the Governor's Mansion for a reception, and the governor sang a couple of numbers with us. He knew the words to an awful lot of the Dixieland tunes, and he wasn't particular about what key you played them in. So he'd strain his voice to match it. And so I have a picture I can show you later.

Ms. Bridgman: Do you remember what songs he sang at his inauguration?

Mr. Barnes: I think one of them was "Tomorrow." He sang that as solo. I can't remember what the other one was, but he sang "Tomorrow." Then, just a year or two ago I was invited by the Puget Sound Traditional Jazz Society to play at their concerts every now and then they invited me to play for a jam set between sets of a featured band. I called John and asked him if he'd like to come along and sing with us, and he did. And this was quite a flurry. People were really impressed. We got the governor, the ex-governor at that time, down to sing some jazz numbers with us, and he did, and he had great fun. People enjoyed having him and got a big kick out of it. And it wasn't too bad, in fact, I've got a tape of that I can play for you if you want.

Ms. Bridgman: Do you remember what songs he sang then?

Mr. Barnes: Oh, things like "Bill Bailey" and "After You're Gone." What else? I don't know. It was just the standard jazz type numbers. He knew the words to all of them. He didn't have to have any notes or anything like that; he just got up and sang and he was very easy to get along with. He isn't temperamental artist type.

Ms. Bridgman: Well, I had no idea that Spellman was a musician.

[End of Tape 9, Side 1]

18 EDUCATION LEGISLATION

Ms. Bridgman: Let's get started on something really important to all of us: the basic education measures which were passed in 1977 during Governor Ray's term. That was a very long winter and spring for all of you, with regular and special sessions from January 10 through June 22. You served on the House Education Committee. The chairman then was Representative Art Clemente. Am I pronouncing it correctly?

I'd like to start with your description of that committee, its personnel, how you worked together, and the characteristic way you decided things or worked through problems.

Mr. Barnes: It operated much like all committees. It had a majority of Democrats, of course. I was the ranking Republican on the committee. Art Clemente was the chairman. Dennis Heck was the vice-chairman. I believe that was his position. The three of us, Art Clemente, Dennis Heck, and myself were on the conference committee that really wrote the Basic Education Act.

To start with, this issue had been let's see, I had been in the legislature maybe three or four years at the time. Before, I'd had an experience at Boeing where I'd been given the responsibility of describing and defining an avionics laboratory for the company. I didn't know anything about avionics laboratories so I had to go around and find out just what an avionics laboratory does and what should it consist of and what kind of equipment you need.

So I'd had to learn to define the performance which was required and then find out how you get that performance. I carried this experience into the legislature with me, and when I saw the way we were funding education was sort of "How much money is there?" We would argue over how much we need and how much we can afford. And I saw it would depend on politics and how much money was available. So I thought, well gee, we should define what basic education is and what we expect it to do in such a way that we can then say, "Well, what do we have to get for it, and how much is it going to cost us?" And come up from that angle rather than the way we were doing it.

I wrote to, I think all states, the legislatures of all states. I wrote to whoever had a related position to our superintendent of public instruction to ask how they determine funding for their school system. And I got replies from a number of them. I did this with the help of one of the administrators of the Highline District whom I had a lot of confidence in. We framed the questions that we wanted to ask and so forth. We got answers from quite a number of the states, and found that no state really had a good method of determining how much money they needed for education. In most states it was like we were, it was kind of a function of how much money was available and who had the most political clout.

So I figured we'd have to do like I did on that avionics laboratory. We'd have to define what we mean by basic education and then, from that definition, come up with what we had to have to fund it.

Ms. Bridgman: Excuse me. Did you write to these states before the 1977 session there? This had been an issue

Mr. Barnes: Yes, it was after the first session that I had gone through. Actually, it was just a half a session. I was just there long enough to become acquainted with how we were handling the situation. So it was very early, probably in the first year that I was in the legislature that I did this. And probably in the second year that I did present an amendment to the budget I believe it was the budget bill which would have required the superintendent of public instruction to define basic education in such a way that we could determine the funding requirements.

I presented this amendment on the floor, and maybe I got fourteen votes for it, or something like that, out of ninety-eight. So it didn't go over very well. But shortly after, I think it was about a year later, we had what's been referred to as massive levy failures in the state. The city of Seattle failed their levies and Highline District, big districts, failed their levies and were left with maybe half or sixty percent of their budget. The state was providing the rest, but up to thirty or forty percent of the school districts' budgets were levies.

So the school districts, several of the districts, and the teachers union, the WEA, sued the state on the basis that the constitution of the state said that our primary what's the word the primary duty of the state was to provide education equally throughout the state

for all children: adequate basic education. So the school districts and the WEA that brought the suit won the suit. Judge Doran in his decision said that we had to define education, basic education, and fund that basic education according to the constitution of the state.

Ms. Bridgman: And that was in January, 1977?

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember the dates of that, but it was a year or two, or three, after I'd presented the amendment which would have required this. But the judge said that the legislature has to define basic education instead of the SPI.

So then we did. That was our big, big task in 1977, I guess it was. And we had, of course, several bills presented to the legislature. I can't remember the exact mechanics of what all happened, but it did end up with a bill passed by the senate and a bill passed by the house. Then we had to have a conference committee, a free conference committee to rewrite the whole thing because we couldn't get agreement on it.

Ms. Bridgman: Before we get into the conference committee, I'd like to trace a little of the different attempts to define and solve this problem. First of all, you sponsored a resolution on January 26 saying that basic education should be the first priority. Do you remember that?

Mr. Barnes: What year was that?

Ms. Bridgman: 1977.

Mr. Barnes: No, I can't. I sponsored a

Ms. Bridgman: Yes, house resolution and the press was very pleased.

Mr. Barnes: I did something the press was pleased with?

Ms. Bridgman: Many things, as a matter of fact. Now maybe you can help me with this. But there were two main packages of legislation presented in this long solution. One of which you were a prominent sponsor it was the Citizens for Fair School Funding package.

Mr. Barnes: Yes, that rings a bell.

Ms. Bridgman: Then there was another one, sponsored by Representatives Denny Heck, Frank Warnke, and Jim Bolt. That one emphasized curriculum more than the CFSF, yours, which emphasized funding according to ratio. How did you and Representatives Lee and Valle join to sponsor the CFSF one?

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember the details. I know that I was aware that our law defining basic education had to be such that you could interpret that as money. In other words, so many teachers per thousand students, rather than, "We've got to teach science, we've got to teach math. How much does that cost? We don't know." How many teachers you need that you can interpret as how much money you need.

So my bill emphasized the method of defining, which would help you turn the crank and determine how much money you'd need. I can't remember too much about the other approach to it, but the other approach would not have allowed, I felt, you to easily interpret it or convert that to money.

Ms. Bridgman: Do you remember what the committee deliberations were like as you, that is, the House Education Committee, worked to develop a composite bill?

Mr. Barnes: No, I can't remember too well. I can remember some of the conference discussion, the conference committee discussions.

Ms. Bridgman: We'll get on to that. Am I then to assume that there was not any particular controversy?

Mr. Barnes: Oh, yes, there was lots of controversy.

Ms. Bridgman: Within the committee of this first go-around? Or did that

Mr. Barnes: Well, I really can't remember the committee discussions. But I know that the approaches that people had differed. For instance, everybody had their opinions on just what basic education was and what all should be included in the definition and what approach the definition should take. Should it dwell on subject matter, number of hours that a subject matter had to be taught, and that sort of thing, or should it draw on the amount of staff you'd have to have and the facilities and so forth.

So there was a lot of controversy and argument from these different approaches. The basic education law that came out did include consideration of both. And maybe you've done a lot of research, maybe you've read that. It does have some indication of how many hours or years of certain subjects should be taught by certain grade levels. Those have changed through the years. But I was rather adamant that we should not dictate to the local districts what they should teach or how it should be taught. But I was insistent that we were to come with a method whereby we'd say what's fair in the line of money to the different districts.

Ms. Bridgman: What role did lobbyists play in all of this? You've mentioned the WEA. Can you describe

Mr. Barnes: The WEA was, of course, heavily involved. They're always every year they find something to be heavily involved in. They've got to justify their salaries. And I did get curious about that once and got a list of salaries. I don't know how I did because they're trying to keep it secret, but I got a list of salaries and found the president of the WEA made almost as much as the governor of the state did. One of our legislators, in fact, took that list and sent it out to all of the teachers in his district. From then on the WEA was out to get him. His name he's from Spokane and he was a prime target of the WEA from then on until he retired.

But yes, the WEA was heavily involved and I think their main purpose was to preserve two things, probably. One of them, of course, to benefit teachers any way they could through job security and salaries. The other purpose was to maintain as much as they could of issues and subjects that could be bargained for because the importance of the WEA to their members, and therefore attractiveness to their members, had to be their ability to bargain for things that are important to teachers. And that was their I've got to say it that's been their main program throughout all the time I was in the legislature. And I was one of the targets of the WEA too, by the way.

Ms. Bridgman: Oh, I didn't realize that. Now were there other groups or particularly interested citizens who were active lobbyists?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, this group, this group is called Citizens for Fair School Funding. That was a statewide organization that had gotten together to do something about education funding. And they came up with proposals that were thoughtful and had some substance to them. However, they didn't hear all the arguments, one side or the other. So their proposal, their main proposal I think, was kind of naive in certain ways and had left things out. I can't remember now exactly what their proposal was, but they did contribute to our thoughts in this way. And they had some influence.

I remember after the issue was settled and the bill was passed and into effect, members of that organization tried to keep it active by transferring its interests to other issues as time went on. But no other issues had had that strong interest, so they finally disappeared.

Ms. Bridgman: Were there, or who were, adversaries? Supporters of the old levy system?

Mr. Barnes: We really didn't have any adversaries to the idea that we had to do something. Everybody realized we had to satisfy the court decision. Everybody realized, by this time, that we had to define basic education and fund it. Nobody suggested changing the constitution so we wouldn't have to do these things. That came later, by the way.

So I'm trying to think while I talk here. We really didn't have any for and against; we had different approaches and that's where the arguments came.

Ms. Bridgman: Shall we now get to the deliberations of the conference committee? Augie Mardesich, Sue Gould, Jim McDermott, Denny Heck, Clemente, and you. What were they like?

Mr. Barnes: Pretty intense. I remember we had to spend a lot of time waiting for Augie Mardesich because he had other things. He was one of the leaders of the Democratic caucus in the senate. I can remember Jim McDermott when we thought, well, let's go ahead without him. Let's make some of these decisions and write it up. And I remember Jim McDermott saying, "No we've got to wait for Augie." Holding us back. So Jim didn't want to go ahead without him.

I disagreed. I felt that we should go ahead. We had things to do and we were all being kept, sometimes, waiting for Augie to come, with nothing to do. And we missed a lot of votes on the floor because the meetings in this conference committee were long and argumentative. We knew Sue was a senate Republican Sue Gould. So many of these meetings had to be held at the same time there were floor votes being taken, and so this was the only year I missed a lot of floor votes.

The gist of our arguments were such that I think others wanted one set of people wanted to name the subject matter and how many hours should be taught and this sort of thing, as a definition of basic education. I wanted to name the time that had to be spent in the classroom, the number of days and number of teachers we should have and the number of students in the class and that sort of thing. This would translate to money. And so, as a matter of fact, we got both things in the bill. If you've done the research, maybe you have seen that.

So we finally settled on that and got it passed. And that was good. I think we had probably the best education funding system of any of the states by that time. This was what I thought we should have had for several years.

Ms. Bridgman: Among the six of you, do you remember outstanding arguments? Which members held out? What were the dynamics like?

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember this. I do remember that we were, we were all cooperative, and we all had the same goal, and we all worked toward the same goal, and our arguments, I think, were very constructive. So it was probably the best example of legislative action that I had seen in the fifteen years. Except, maybe, our action during the WPPSS thing. But this was, I think, very constructive legislative action. And I hadn't seen anything like that very often. Lots of times we were divided by partisan philosophies and things, and lots of times our discussions are rancorous.

I think our discussions and arguments were constructive, and we all seemed to be working toward the same goal. And we kept our, you know, we were very friendly. I was somewhat perturbed because we had to wait so much for Augie Mardesich. I thought he should have somebody else be on that committee if he had to be other places doing other things, because this was our primary duty. But he felt that it was of importance that when he was the caucus leader in the senate, he wanted to be on that committee himself.

Ms. Bridgman: The vote then on House Bill 900 was thirty-eight to two in the senate. And favoring eighty-five to five in the house. So apparently you did a stellar job.

Mr. Barnes: Maybe by this time everybody was so glad to get something.

Ms. Bridgman: June 21.

Mr. Barnes: Was it June 21?

Ms. Bridgman: Well, I think the last day of this session was the twenty-second.

Mr. Barnes: Is that right?

Ms. Bridgman: Now in 1984, to go ahead a little bit, House Bill 166 partially undid that formula. Do you recall that and

Mr. Barnes: I remember that number, but I can't remember what it did.

Ms. Bridgman: Let me go on then. I understand that Senator Al Bauer now is in support of much greater use of achievement tests. That is that he is among those who believe that what we might call input, which you all established in the basic education legislation, is not sufficient. So we need to check on output or progress for achievement. He would like to do the Metropolitan Achievement Tests for the eighth and tenth grades. What is your feeling about that?

Mr. Barnes: I agreed with him. I thought that people should know how our schools stacked up. Of course there are a lot of things other than the quality of school that determine the grade level that comes out of that. And so I think the WEA, in this case, was quite opposed to this. They were afraid of eventually teachers being paid on the basis of how much the students merit pay and so forth. So they're deathly against. So, if I remember right, and I've got to qualify that by saying that the WEA was against this: I felt that it was right, and I since have come across parents who appreciate it.

One parent that I worked with down at Boeing, in fact, tracked his school versus other schools in the district. And we did also pass the bill that required districts to allow people to take their kids to another school if there was space available in that other school. This fellow that I knew, he tracked he was an engineer he charted the test averages and so forth, and I believe he moved his kids to another school. He was very happy about knowing which school the kids were doing best in. Others, most parents, have just sort of generally looked at these test scores to compare their schools against other states, or other districts, and so forth. I think there wasn't very many actions like this gentleman I told you about where kids were moved from one school to another. There wasn't very much of that as a result of the test. People like the tests. They like to see how their schools stack up, and they judge them by that. Although, as I say, the legislatures are aware that≤

[End Tape 9, Side 2]

19 THE RAY TERM

Ms. Bridgman: This will be the last hour in our interview series. We'll be discussing things not talked about before, things that you've indicated were important, accomplishments or memorable events during your career. And we'll end with a kind of summing up.

After the last tape ran out, you were elaborating on your comments about the Basic Education Act and were talking about some of the opposition to that act. Those opposing were, and are, worried that teachers will teach only for test results. You continued to make comments about that after the tape was over. Can you recall what you were saying?

Mr. Barnes: Part of the opposition to having to test certain grade levels to tell which schools are doing well by their students was that teachers might teach to the tests that were being scheduled. It's been my contention that if the teachers taught to the tests, if the tests are written well, that if the teachers teach to the tests then they are teaching the students the things that they need to learn anyhow.

For instance, in mathematics, the type of problems that are put in the tests are problems that are typical of the things that students must know to get that subject matter. Therefore, if they teach a student to complete that type of problem, then they are teaching the things that the student is supposed to know anyhow.

Ms. Bridgman: How would you counter the argument that the tests aren't that good?

Mr. Barnes: I don't know how I would counter that argument. But I know that it is I've taken a lot of tests in my life I know that it is possible to write tests with different problems, varying the problems from test to test so that you don't have to have a specific problem, a specific set of numbers each time the test is given. It's possible to write a good test where a student must know how to do a certain type of problem in order to complete the test. A test shouldn't be impossible to write, certainly.

Ms. Bridgman: Let's continue by talking about Governor Dixie Lee Ray whose term was 1977 through 1981. How would you evaluate her and her actions in office?

Mr. Barnes: Governor Ray was a rather unique character, as all of our governors are, really. And she had in her mind certain things that were right and wrong, and quite often she didn't have a lot of patience in talking with the reporters quite often, and explaining things that should be explained. So this gave her a disadvantage in getting along with the reporters. Quite often they lost patience with her. And she didn't have the patience to explain things carefully sometimes. And so she had trouble with the news media because of that.

Ms. Bridgman: How important was it that she had not been an active politician for years and years, and therefore, not well known either within her own Democratic Party or to Republicans in the house and senate?

Mr. Barnes: It was important, I think, in getting elected, that she hadn't been heavily involved in political activities before her election. That was the year they referred to this present year as the "year of the woman" that was also considered the year of the woman. She was the first woman we'd had running for governor in this state. And therefore we had a lot of women, particularly those activist women in the organization, the Women's Political Caucus and the National Organization of Women and so forth, that were excited, particularly excited about having a woman running for governor. And many of them voted for Dixie and supported Dixie because she was a woman, with no knowledge of what her political philosophy was. And we heard comments from women later who then had said that they had voted for a woman because she was a woman, but they wouldn't do that again.

She turned out to be somewhat conservative. And many of the activist womens organizations were somewhat liberal. And therefore, some of them were disappointed in her political philosophy once she was elected.

Ms. Bridgman: How effective was she, in your opinion, in getting along with the legislature? Both the Republicans and the Democrats.

Mr. Barnes: She got along with Republicans fairly well. I remember one of our caucus leaders having been down to visit her one time and reported back to the caucus that, "Gee it was nice having a Republican in the Governor's office for a change." Of course

Dixie was a Democrat, and we had had a Democrat before, so he was sort of facetiously referring to the fact that here was a governor that had somewhat the political philosophy that met some of the aspects of the Republican's philosophy.

Ms. Bridgman: What kind of problems, if any, or what kinds of situations, resulted from that? Did you remember specific legislation that was affected?

Mr. Barnes: None comes to my mind right now. I wish I had this question to think over a little bit beforehand. I can't recall anything right now that arose because of this situation, this difference in philosophy that Governor Ray had. As we talk I'll try to think of something.

Ms. Bridgman: What comes to mind about any remarks that Democrats made?

Mr. Barnes: I don't remember the Democrats particularly being anxious to remind people that their governor didn't have a philosophy that exactly matched theirs. So I think they rather soft-peddled that. And perhaps it was, more or less, that comments of this nature were, more or less, a facetious type. And she really didn't adopt the Republican philosophy, but she did because she had been elected with the help of labor unions and so forth she did keep the ideas in mind that were the goals of labor, particularly the state employee's labor unions.

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you. How much did the retention of elected officials all but one were the same; the one who changed was the insurance commissioner. How much effect did that have on her term?

Mr. Barnes: Let's see if I can understand this question. The change in insurance commissioner?

Ms. Bridgman: That the lieutenant governor, secretary of state, treasurer, auditor, and on and on were all the same people who'd held the office before.

Mr. Barnes: The same people.

Ms. Bridgman: Yes. Slade Gorton, Cherberg, Bruce Chapman. I didn't state that very clearly. The insurance commissioner was the only one which changed. I'm just wondering how much effect having a group of the same elected officials and the same kind of majority and minority in both the house and the senate. You get a continuity of personnel there, but Dixie, herself, had to fit into this situation.

Mr. Barnes: First her, what would be known on the national level as her cabinet, were independently elected. They were not tied with the governor at all. So of course, their philosophies and their methods of doing things would continue on as before. And the governor had little influence on them.

There was, I'm trying to think. There was conflict between her and the Parks Commission. She wanted very much to replace the parks commissioner. What was his name now, Odegard. There was an attempt by her to replace him. First she tried to get the state law changed that would have made him subject to her appointment. But that became a partisan issue then, as it was because it was at that time. It was a Democratic governor who wanted to get rid of a Republican parks commissioner. I think the situation was that he had been appointed by a former governor and then would keep that appointment for a certain time. And the new governor didn't have the power to terminate his term. And that became a hassle in the legislature at the time when she took over.

I'm trying to remember when the senate changed hands so that the Republicans became the majority in the senate, when one of the senators defected from his party. Peter von Reichbauer changed parties and that turned the situation around.

Ms. Bridgman: In 1977, when she was elected, there were still thirty Democrats and nineteen Republicans in the senate as there had been. And in the house, Republicans gained one house seat.

Mr. Barnes: Let me ask Sylvia if she remembers.

[Tape on, Tape off]

Ms. Bridgman: How about Governor Ray's own personal staff. How did they get along with those of you who were more experienced at all levels?

Mr. Barnes: I didn't have any personal very little personal contact with her, except social or friendly social contact. I remember a couple of times when I did have social contact with her. I didn't have any conflict of interest with her in political things, I don't believe, at the time. As much as I did have with John Spellman. I figured my influence with her would be nil, maybe. So I didn't have an occasion to try and influence her in that way. So I really couldn't answer your question I guess, myself.

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you. How about the new Speaker of the house that year, John Bagnariol. You've not talked about him.

Mr. Barnes: Yes. John Bagnariol was very popular with the Republicans because he could be we felt that once he'd given his word on some item, like the presenting of a bill to the Rules Committee and so forth, in passing a bill in through the Rules Committee and

having a floor vote on certain things when we agreed with him on something of that type we felt that that was a very solid agreement and that we could trust him to carry through the word that he had given. And besides that, he was a friendly person and very popular and easy to get along with.

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you. I'd like to continue now, talking about other things you've indicated were highlights of your career.

You explained on-tape and off-tape that one of your initial political concerns had to do with milk producers subsidies. And that not until you retired was an act passed. You had succeeded in getting vetoes up to that time. I'd like to record your recollection chronologically please, if we can do that.

Mr. Barnes: Chronologically. Okay.

Ms. Bridgman: Can you describe by, or begin by describing the legislation introduced?

Mr. Barnes: Yes. Sometime before I got into the legislature the Milk Marketing Act was passed through the legislature and signed by Governor Rosellini. About this time I read about the bill in the newspaper and became somewhat alarmed because, in my mind, the bill was contrary to our basic philosophy of how our economy works. It was a government setting price and production quotas and so forth of a product. So Sylvia and I joined with several other types of people, I think mainly it was the people who produced and bottled and sold their own milk like ones that deliver milk to your door who had been included in this bill, and they wanted out. And we got with them. Our purpose, of course, was that this was just a bad situation for market economy.

We got the bill put on a referendum. We got a referendum on the bill on the next ballot, and it was defeated by a greater margin than eighty percent. So it was really defeated. And I felt that if our legislature didn't reflect the people's desires any better than to pass a bill that would be defeated by a referendum greater than eighty percent, I felt somebody should go down and straighten them out.

So that was my purpose when I got the opportunity to go to the legislature. I had in mind the fact that our legislators didn't really understand our economic system and would pass law that would destroy that system if it carried through to other laws, and so forth.

So when I went down to the legislature, my first year down there, this same law appeared again. It was now about ten years after the first law had been defeated by a referendum. The same law came into effect. This time it didn't include the juggers, as they were called, people who produced and sold their own milk. So they didn't they thought it was great because it would leave them without certain competition that they had. If the state established a commission that could increase the price of milk, except for theirs, then they could undercut the other milk producers, and so they weren't interested in defeating this bill now. So I was alone.

Fortunately we had Governor Dan Evans at the time who was an engineer. I was able to draw up charts that showed him the progress of the milk industry, how they had increased their production every year, in spite of the fact that the biggest argument for this the bill, that was now coming up again, was the claim that the milk industry was failing. They used the argument that enough dairies would fail that it would leave people without enough to feed the children with.

Actually, the milk being produced, according to my research, was about two and a half times the amount that could be sold and so it had to be sold through the federal government as surplus milk products. And I was able to chart out this fact, the growth of the products, milk and so forth, and prices and the number of people it took to produce milk and how that had changed over the years, and actually, how the amount of milk that each cow could produce had changed over the years. This destroyed the arguments for the bill on that basis and made it easy for Governor Evans to see. And he vetoed the bill this time.

I fought the bill through the entire legislature and did slow it down quite a bit and probably did lose some votes for it. It was evident to me that the people who were supporting the bill, and who voted for it, really didn't understand how our economic system worked and really didn't understand the effect of this action on the milk industry. That has carried through until I left the legislature, when it was then presented to the legislature again, and passed with an emergency clause, an emergency clause saying that this is necessary for the immediate health and welfare of the people of the state. So they passed the bill in such a way then, with the emergency clause in it, that it could not be subject to referendum. It took effect immediately upon the governor's signing. This time the governor, Booth Gardner, signed the bill and it went into effect immediately.

Since then I've had some dedication to following the bill to see what happened. Nothing much has happened. There were negotiations going on with Oregon State, which is a part of the milk marketing district. Oregon State had this bill for some time, but it couldn't really take effect because the states can't control

the price of a product that is transported from one state to another. Interstate commerce is under the control of the federal government. This is the problem that I don't understand how they're going to get around. So that the bill might not work, it might not do anything. But it will cost some money because now there has to be a committee that has to get together and decide what the price of the milk should be, and so forth.

At any rate, if they're able to increase the price of milk as the farmers seem to want, it would cost the milk consumers of the state about two million dollars a year or was it twelve, twelve million. I had figured it out one time, and I don't remember now what I figured. But it will be expensive for the people who buy milk. And of course, that's the people who have children, and for the benefit, or supposed benefit, of dairy farmers. It won't help them because the increase in the price of milk will, of course, impose a problem to those who buy milk and the market will be reduced a little bit, just because of the laws of economic nature.

Ms. Bridgman: And you said that you were alone in your opposition.

Mr. Barnes: That's not really true. I had help from a Democrat, Helen Sommers, who has a degree in economics by the way. She understood the problem. And I had help in the senate from Lois North who did speak against the bill in the senate.

Ms. Bridgman: Where did you get all of this information that you amassed for the charts?

Mr. Barnes: Most of it was readily available in the pamphlets. The material, information, is put out by the federal government's milk marketing people. And there was actually information available to the legislators who would take twenty seconds to look at this material. They could then have told that the argument for the bill was rather nefarious.

Ms. Bridgman: How about the opposition then, those who supported it? That included all dairymen?

Mr. Barnes: All except the juggers, people that I mentioned. There are very few of them left anymore who produce their own milk, bottle it, and deliver it. Sell it themselves, perhaps. They are still quite satisfied≤

[End of Tape 10, Side 1]

20 MEMORABLE ACHIEVEMENTS

Ms. Bridgman: You were talking about the vicissitudes of milk marketing in the state of Washington, and explaining who was, and is, behind this measure: the dairymen, but not the juggers. Why then did they have so many allies in the legislature?

Mr. Barnes: I always use this bill as an example to explain to people that our legislators do not understand how our economic system works. No one was able to arouse concern of what would happen to the milk industry, when this bill was passed and became effective; if it was effective, as the farmers wanted. The farmers I'm talking about are the, for instance, the Darigold farmers who have a cooperative that can set their own prices, if they want. In fact, one time they did, and when this didn't work, they backed off and un-set their own prices and asked the state to do it for them. Why they thought that the state would have any different effect economically, I don't know.

To me, this bill shows that the legislators don't understand economics, and that is a reflection of the citizens who don't understand economics who think that they can solve a problem by passing a law such as this. Fortunately, I think in my time Governor Dan Evans was able to understand it.

And you asked about why this had such widespread support. It was because the dairy people, who also didn't know what this would do to them, were very insistent and had been for a number of years. Now this how long has it been since this bill was first introduced and Sylvia and I got involved in helping to get it on the ballot? That was thirty years ago, maybe. And ever since then, as long as there is nobody in the legislature to fight this thing, they've been introducing it, and it finally passed.

What got me started on this?

Ms. Bridgman: I'm wondering were the farmers who produce milk for Darigold, for instance, did they have particularly effective lobbyists? How much of this is strategy and tactics and that kind of thing?

Mr. Barnes: They did have lobbyists. When the lobbyists talked to me, they didn't appear effective because they had no effect on me. But what they did was they got the Democratic house members involved, and the house members appointed a freshman legislator to herd this bill through the legislature. And this was to be her bill that would make her very well in the eyes of the farmers, who have an organization that is quite effective in their lobbying. They're present all of the time, and they're there and will let you know that they have a voting block.

Ms. Bridgman: Who was that legislator?

Mr. Barnes: A girl, Syl! Who's the girl that

[Tape on, Tape off]

Yes, the freshman Democratic legislator, Mary Kay Becker, was given this bill to push it through, and she did what she could. She was very articulate, and she also didn't understand how our economic system worked. So she did try to get that through and got it through the legislature, and of course, I got the governor to veto the bill.

Ms. Bridgman: How close were the votes in the house and senate?

Mr. Barnes: They weren't very close. The farmer areas, the farm districts are generally Republican districts, so they had some powerful Republicans on the side of that bill. For instance, Max Benitz, in the senate, who was a Republican and a very good legislator, came to me and said that he couldn't vote against that bill himself because many of his supporters were farmers and were very persistent that the bill be passed. So he on the sly gave me information on what their tactics would be to pass the bill and how it was doing. And he would, nearly every day, get in touch with me and give me the latest poop on the bill.

In the house, for instance, our caucus leader was Duane Berentson, who also supported the bill because his district had a very strong dairy farmers organization in it. There were strong Republicans that had to vote for the bill. Some of them told me personally that they had to; they didn't believe in the bill, but they felt they had to support it.

Ms. Bridgman: What kind of efforts did you make to get citizens who weren't dairy farmers your constituents involved, to see and understand your viewpoints.

Mr. Barnes: I got a couple of agricultural economists in the state, one of them from the Washington State University and one of them on loan to me from Boeing, for this purpose: to work out the cost of this, what it would cost the consumers of milk once it went into effect. And so I got that worked out and we publicized to the extent we could. We got articles in the paper that would explain how much this bill would cost.

But it wasn't a really colorful issue. I really didn't get any letters on it or anything of that sort. And really people didn't take an interest in it. And that's been reflected in this latest passage of the bill which passed not too long ago. Nobody seems to know about it. I asked my milkman about it. "What bill?" He didn't know about it. It really didn't receive any publicity. I didn't find out about it going through of the legislature until after it was gone, and I happened to be reviewing some of the bills that had passed, you know, that were printed and in the newspaper. It just lists the bills, and I came across this thing and got a copy of it. Sure enough, it was the same thing that had passed once before, been rejected by referendum of the people, passed again, been vetoed by the governor, and then passed again. When I was gone, no one was there to watch for it.

Ms. Bridgman: It's a good story of the whole process.

Mr. Barnes: Yes, that one bill probably won't have a lot of effect on the state. It won't work. It won't have much to do. But it does illustrate that our legislators and our people and our milk farmers, who are very good at producing milk, how these people don't understand how our economic system works: the market system.

Ms. Bridgman: How much did you talk to the dairy farmers?

Mr. Barnes: Quite a lot. I got to knowing them pretty well. And they're great people. They have a lot invested in their land and their farms and so forth. They have great children that go to WSU and become cheerleaders and so forth. Great people. And I was able to convince them that they'd take care of some of their problems by an advertising campaign. And that's when they started this campaign that featured the white "moo-stache." You may remember when that came out. They did increase their sales and so forth and alleviated some of their problems with that advertising campaign. And they invited me down to their Dairy Princess Luncheon and things like that. So I got to know them, and they're a great bunch of people. But they don't know anything about economics.

Ms. Bridgman: I want to get back to that at the end of this interview. Thank you. It is a classic story.

You wrote on the preliminary questionnaire that one of the most memorable occasions in your career was the midnight jam session on the house floor. When was this?

Mr. Barnes: I can't remember what year it was. I know that when two or three people got up to make farewell speeches to me in my last week in the legislature, one of them mentioned that jam session. It wasn't really a jam session; it was just Barney McClure, who is an excellent piano player, one of the best in the Northwest. Barney McClure and I, we rolled out the piano, and I got out my trombone. We were stuck on something and just had to wait had nothing to do but sit and wait for something to happen. We played. Of course the news media, the television people, being very anxious for something that they could put on the air, thought this was great and grabbed it. So we played a few tunes, and they got the people to get around the piano and sing a few a tunes. We just relaxed and had a good time until whatever it was came out and we could take another vote.

Ms. Bridgman: Your fellow members of the house liked it, then.

Mr. Barnes: Yes, they got a kick out of it. They needed something to relieve the boredom at the time, really.

Barney and I did organize a good jam session with a very good sax player, and clarinet, a husband of one of the legislators. Sylvia says it was 1984. We got a seven piece outfit put together, and we entertained at the Tyee Motel. The lobbyists got the hall for us and set up things where we could have drinks and so forth. So we had a good session out there, and that's what the flyer that you have was for.

Ms. Bridgman: And did a lot of the legislators and state government people come to that?

Mr. Barnes: There were a few, yes. I don't remember how many, never counted how many came. But yes, it was a pretty good crowd that came out and sat around and had drinks and peanuts, and stomped their feet and cheered and so forth. So everybody relaxed and had a good time.

Ms. Bridgman: Another memorable occasion you indicated were the speeches given at your retirement.

What kind of occasion was it where these speeches were given?

Mr. Barnes: This was one of the final sessions of the legislature before I quit. I've got tapes of that, by the way, in case you want to copy it or review it or something.

Several of my friends and opponents in the legislature had prepared little speeches, and they got up, and it was mainly to say good-bye to me. And it was most of them, were quite amusing.

Ms. Bridgman: What kinds of things did they say?

Mr. Barnes: I remember Dick Nelson, who had been the chairman of the Energy and Utilities Committee when the Democrats became in the majority, he said some of the questions that I asked in committee hearings were kind of crazy. He said, "Crazy like a fox." Because he had lost two or three of his pet bills that he wanted to get because I had managed to put undesirable in his mind amendments on these bills when they were in the committee. And it had to do with the takeover, or the attempted takeover, by the utility, of the dam site on one of the rivers in southwestern Washington when the fifty-year lease was up. I had an amendment that would require people to be notified if their utility was being taken over by a public utility. Things of that matter.

Utility lobbyists would hold their breath every time I'd present one of these, and they'd laugh because it would pass. I was able to make it sound so logical. I think it was about three of these amendments I passed on three of his, of Dick Nelson's, pet bills. And after I got these amendments on them, then he'd drop the bills. He didn't want those amendments passed.

Ms. Bridgman: Was that dam site on the Columbia? Or a tributary?

Mr. Barnes: No, it was I can't remember which river it was on.

Ms. Bridgman: What about the other of Dick Nelson's pet bills?

Mr. Barnes: His bills usually had to do with, well, he was opposed to nuclear power and quite often his bills would have to do with the things that would make it more difficult, if not impossible, to provide or to build nuclear power plants. He fancied himself an environmentalist and many of his bills had an element in them that would, in his mind, prevent damage to the environment and so forth. Quite often at the expense of electrical power for the state. And it so happened at the time that we didn't need as much electrical power as we were generating because we discovered conservation about that time and were able to cut back on and save a lot of power for the time being until we'd exhausted that effort.

Ms. Bridgman: What kind of amendments did you add to those to nuclear power?

Mr. Barnes: It's very hard for me to remember now. The storage of nuclear power waste was quite a large concern to the people of the state because that hadn't been figured out. It still hasn't been, I guess. We hadn't yet figured what to do with nuclear waste, the high level waste, that is. And the federal government, we thought, was not doing as much as it could to determine this. And then were was also the element of people who didn't want the waste in Washington State. To heck with the other states, let whatever happened happen to other states like Nevada, but don't let them store it in Washington State.

There was a range of opinions on this. They ranged from, "To heck with other states, just save Washington State," to the more sensible efforts to determine scientifically just what could be done and what it would take, and so forth. It's a difficult subject. It still is.

Ms. Bridgman: What else do you remember as being particularly outstanding about the speeches made at your retirement?

Mr. Barnes: I don't know if anything was outstanding. I'll copy that tape if you want.

Ms. Bridgman: The newspapers recorded your reflections at the time of your retirement. One article I read praised your unblemished record, "endured with grace" it said. That you had endured with grace high praise, I think. And then the same article went on to list three comments that you made about being a legislator. One which we've discussed thoroughly here today, that most legislators don't understand how the economy works. Second, that the state law inhibits individual freedoms. And third, that technical issues are clouded by emotional arguments. And your example there was nuclear waste.

Could you elaborate on that second one. How state law inhibits individual freedoms? What examples did you have in mind?

Mr. Barnes: There are many times when somebody who has a problem with their state government or county government or whatever feels that a law passed would solve his problem, without any consideration as to what this might be doing to other people who maybe don't have the same problem. An exam-

ple, I'm trying to think of while I'm talking, is insurance coverage, for instance.

Every year that I was there, almost every year, there would come a bill suggested by somebody on health insurance. Somebody would have something go wrong with themselves that they would find was not covered by their health insurance. So the solution the law or the legislation would have would be to pass the law that all health insurance policies must cover that particular item. The first item that came to my attention was during my first week in the legislature. It was treatment of newborn babies. In other words, sometimes a newborn baby it was discovered that some policies didn't cover their care for a certain amount of time after their birth. So we had a bill presented to us that would require that all newborn babies would be taken care of and be included.

Well, that sounds pretty good. You don't want to have a health policy that doesn't cover newborn babies. But, what if you do? What if you're a Catholic Father or something, and you don't want to pay the extra premiums that it would cost. You then would be ruled out of having your choice of coverage. But that was a hard argument to make. I made this argument on the house floor against this bill, against the advice of my leaders in the caucus. They said, "Don't do that." They wanted to protect for the following election. I went and made the offer anyhow. And I can remember the dirty looks I got from my own caucus. "Why do you visit this upon us?" you know.

The only "no" vote on this bill as the red lights and green lights came on mine was the only red light until one legislator, who was very strong willed and who felt like I did, didn't want to see me up as the lone vote. He changed his vote to "no" also, so that there was one other red light besides mine up there.

Ms. Bridgman: Who was that?

Mr. Barnes: From Spokane. Syl! Who was the

[Tape on, Tape off]

That was Jim Kuehnle who switched his vote to "no" so that I wouldn't be the only "no" vote. That was a futile effort on his part, though, because I was the only "no" vote on enough bills that I had the record for that, I think.

Anyhow, a week later comes another bill of the same type. And this was to require the treatment of alcoholism be included with any medical health. And I got fourteen votes to go with me on that. So that was a little easier. And sure enough, in the upcoming campaign my opponent made the claim that I was against sick babies. Sure enough, that was brought up in the campaign that I had voted against sick babies, with no further explanation of the occasion than that, I think.

Anyhow, every year since, there has been a bill. Once it was mastectomies. What else was there? A number of things: alcoholism, mastectomies, but it's gotten so now there is enough restrictions that you can't tailor a medical health bill like you want. Say I want a coverage of this, that, and the other. I've got to take what is required by law. I felt that this was an infringement on the freedom to determine your own requirements. And maybe I'm wrong, I don't know. But anyhow, I was defeated on that.

On a couple of these bills I was able to get a compromise amended to where it read that the coverage under question had to be offered and had to be given as an offering, but didn't have to be included. But the rest of them were included. And so now we've got kind of a hodge-podge of things like that.

That's my example of what can be done by a well-intentioned legislator to take away some of your individual freedom.

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you.

Another article appeared when you retired, one you wrote yourself prior to your last session. One of your remarks was that you would particularly enjoy the relationships with other legislators during this last session, some of whom were adversaries, though friends. We haven't talked about who were particular friends, both adversaries and allies. So could you enumerate them?

Mr. Barnes: Through my close association with Dick Nelson we became friends. During most of my legislative career I≤

[End of Tape 10, Side 2]

21 POLITICAL CHANGE

Ms. Bridgman: We are continuing with Dick Barnes' recollections and reminiscences about his retirement and kind of a summing up of his career. We were just talking about your particular friends, both adversaries and allies. And you talked about Dick Nelson, and then said there were allies. That was off-tape.

Mr. Barnes: Yes. I guess some of my favorite allies were, for instance, some of the legislators that were there when I first came into the legislature in the middle of the term, by the way. Ken Eikenberry was one of the those that I had high regard for. Jim Kuehnle, whom I have mentioned before, was one of the conservatives that was very clever and humorous. It was fun to listen to him talk, particularly when it came to his criticism of the Evergreen State College. He would come up with limericks that were very entertaining, none of which I could remember, if they were repeatable.

Ms. Bridgman: What exactly were his objections to Evergreen?

Mr. Barnes: He felt that it was a university or a college that didn't concentrate on the actual learning of technical facts. Well, what he objected to was the political environment on that campus. I remember that he complained that the biggest posters on the bulletin boards were the notices of the gay society meetings. So I had occasion to be on the campus, and I picked one of these posters up and posted it on his office door. I don't think he removed it either.

Bill Polk was one of my favorites. Terrific sense of humor, particularly when he was in the chair as the house leader. When we were in the majority he was the house Speaker. I was particularly friendly with I can't remember names now, so I'd better not go any farther. I can't remember names very well. Of course, I was friends with Lorraine Hine who was the Democratic legislator from our district.

Ms. Bridgman: You also wrote that in this article, your retirement article, that the legislative process had undergone "subtle changes" which were adjustments to the open meetings law. In your words again, "There was little partying and no more smoke-filled rooms." Can you give some examples of the subtle changes which occurred as a result of the open meetings law?

Mr. Barnes: I came to the legislature after the open meetings law was passed. There was still a lot of controversy going on about whether it was good or bad. Many of the newspapers still wanted us to have open caucus meetings, which we didn't, and still don't have, but the committee meetings were all open.

The subtle changes were in the smoke-filled room concept. When I first went down there, there was so much partying done, particularly, say, if anybody had a birthday in their office after hours everybody would kind of gravitate at their office. And there would be champagne and snacks of some kind or other. And everybody would sit around and talk and drink champagne and so forth for an hour or two. And that went around; maybe there'd be two or three of those a week. There was occasions that legislators would go out at lunch and have three or four drinks and come back and be a little stupefied because of that.

But that changed and those were the subtle changes that I was referring to. Within three or four years that sort of stopped. There was no more partying for birthdays, and no more going out at lunch to drink at noon. And people were more serious. Maybe not anymore capable, but more serious about their jobs. So that change did take place. And it was noticeable to me.

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you. You continued this article with a list of things which, in your opinion, wouldn't change. First, sharp differences along party lines due to ideological differences between parties, and then, number two and three in that list, legislation offered and sponsored with re-election in mind and maneuvering to make one party look good or bad. You've talked a little bit about this here today. Are there other examples that come to mind?

Mr. Barnes: I'm trying to think of examples. Occasionally, I read in the newspaper now, in following the federal Congress, in seeing certain things that are being proposed and done, some of them I think maybe I agree with or don't agree with, either one. But I can see that obviously, to me, they are being presented for the purpose of political advantage. I don't particularly want to give an example now because the only example that comes to mind is one of

a bill that I believe should be passed and one of my own party members is using it. But I think he's doing it, at this point, when it's not going to pass. I think he's doing it at this point for a political advantage, so he can go out and he can say, "I proposed such and such."

Ms. Bridgman: This is in the Congress?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, but the Democrats wouldn't pass. The same thing goes on in the state legislature. Only right now I can't think of any. I haven't been following them as closely.

Ms. Bridgman: This brings us to a subject we touched on today but have not thoroughly discussed. I suppose I might ask it by saying: What are your opinions about what representative government is and ought to be? To what extent should a legislator represent his or her constituents? How much should he or she think out questions and vote and act according to his or her opinion?

Mr. Barnes: Yes, this has always been a question to me: How much should I depend on the public opinion to make up my mind on how I would vote on a certain issue? There are some issues that are strictly emotional. I think the abortion issue is one. And the gun control issue is one, perhaps. Should I depend on my own opinions of what should be done in this case, or should I depend on the opinion majority opinion of my constituents. That's kind of hard to decide because quite often you can't tell what the majority of your people think.

Like in the abortion issue, for instance, I do have my own definite opinions, but what are my constituents' opinions and how do I measure that? It becomes very difficult. Those are the types of decisions you might tend to make more on the issue of what your constituents think. But with other issues that are a little more technical, where you're in a position to learn something about the effect of this issue and your constituents will only think of the issues, maybe for a few minutes when they read about it in the paper. They don't have the opportunity to know the secondary effects and so forth. Those are the type of issues that you would be more inclined to use your own judgment on because you are in a position, a legislator is in a position, to know the secondary effects and so forth. So this was my thought on that subject.

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you. That's a good summary and rule of thumb.

Another closely associated question: to what extent do you believe a legislator should consider his or her constituents, or his or her region, as opposed to statewide interests? How did you resolve that one?

Mr. Barnes: Oh, yes. Again, here is a case where you might think it would do you more good electorally to favor your constituents in your district, instead of the concern for the whole state. And quite often this is solved by trading votes. Say, "I have to vote such and such."

I mentioned Senator Benitz, who was one of my favorites, telling me that he couldn't vote for that milk marketing bill, but he could help me in any way I could to defeat it. So there is this element. I never felt too bound by the requirement to vote for things that might be of disadvantage to the state as a whole but an advantage to a few people in my district. I never felt bound by that, too much, because, for one thing, if people didn't like the way I voted, they could vote me out. And it would have been more to my advantage financially to not be a member of the legislature. So I thought I would do what I felt was right, let people know what I feel was right and hear what I could about it, and then let the chips fall where they may.

I'm trying to think of an example while I'm talking here. I really can't think of an example. The issue of the secondary treatment for sewage that is dumped in the sound is something that I felt was of special advantage to people who lived along the sound in my district, but it was also an advantage to the entire state.

And the airport issue, the noise issue around the airport. I had two bills on the books now that had to do with allowing the noise abatement program to be established. There was a buy-out program, buy-out assist and noise insulation for homes, and that sort of thing. But I didn't think that they were of particular disadvantage to the rest of the state, except they cost money. But the people in this district were paying the price, or suffering the results, of something that was an advantage for the rest of the state: to have an airport, in other words. So I felt that it was right for these things and didn't feel it was particularly a disadvantage for the rest of the state.

So I have trouble finding an example where I could vote for something for advantage for my district that was a distinct disadvantage to the rest of the state.

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you. You've explained your viewpoint thoroughly.

Finally, in this article you wrote that constituent citizens should express their opinions and monitor the legislature and use, in your words, "unbiased knowledge and judgment." You referred earlier to the difficulty in knowing what your constituents felt about any particular issues. So I would like to ask you: How should I tell my friends and neighbors and family to most effectively monitor and use their unbiased knowledge and express things to their legislator?

Mr. Barnes: First, it's best, and more impressive and more effective, if you demonstrate a knowledge of the issue when you talk to a legislator about it. If you talk to a legislator about an issue of which you are completely ignorant or mostly ignorant, you don't have much effect because he knows there are certain things that you are not aware of. He may, if he has time and the ability, explain to you what you don't understand about it and see what you have to say then. And sometimes this is done. Citizens who take the time to call their legislator and talk to him, or to go down to Olympia, or to go to his home and visit him on a certain issue. This exchange can happen then. A legislator can express what he knows about the issue and listen to what the citizen knows about the issue. But this is one person. How many people are there? Fifty thousand people in a district?

Ms. Bridgman: Yes.

Mr. Barnes: I remember an example of my trying to know what people thought about certain issues. One of them was the lottery. I've always opposed the lottery, myself, just because of emotions, I guess. I think it's embarrassing for the state to have to get their money for education, or what else, through being in the gambling business. And I expressed this anytime I had a chance. But I remember when the lottery issue came up, I sent a letter out to all my people in the district and asked, you know, a questionnaire on it; what do you feel about this, that, and the other. Went through a number of issues. And one of them was the lottery issue. "Do you think we should have a lottery or not?" And I got the answer that, yes, we should have a lottery. About seventy percent.

Well, the first time the lottery passed, it was passed with the referendum on it so it got the opinion of the people that voted, not just the people who answered my letters. And it came back. The lottery was voted down the first time, very heavily, in my district. So it turned out that while my questionnaire was answered that many people wanted the lottery, the actual voting turned out that many people didn't want the lottery. So what do I do now? I sent out a questionnaire and I don't know whether to believe if it's valid or not because people who are interested in a certain issue will answer that letter and make their mark. But people who are not particularly interested in that issue, they throw it away and don't answer it until they have to go vote.

So that was an example of how you can not really determine what the people want. I voted against it, but the lottery bill was passed later, without a referendum, and so it is in effect now.

Ms. Bridgman: By the time you entered the legislature in 1973 protest marches had become customary. How effective are they? I mean, speaking as a legislator. Were you influenced by that kind of demonstration?

Mr. Barnes: I've got to speak for myself. I don't know how to speak for other legislators who maybe are more interested in getting the votes of a certain type of people. I suspect it's different with other legislators, but to me the demonstration type of thing has a rather negative effect on me. I happened to be downtown when a bunch of the Washington students marched. You probably remember when this happened. They marched down the freeway and down into downtown and threw rocks at the courthouse. And I happened to be downtown. I think that was before I got in the legislature.

Ms. Bridgman: Yes.

Mr. Barnes: Yes, I happened to be downtown, and I saw several windows broken and I saw the students there in their outlandish costumes and childish actions. And it had a very negative effect on me. This is the wrong way to do things. And, of course, I had the opposite opinion of the Vietnam War. I think it was most of them, too. So maybe that had something to do with it. Some affect on my feelings.

Since then, why, when I see pictures in the newspaper or on TV or something of people doing this kind of demonstrating, it turns me off. I think that that's really not the way to do things, just using chanting or something is, you know, not being reasoning. So how do I describe that? But I see other legislators marching with people and holding a sign and so forth for something that is, what I think is, rather childish, and I see pictures of other legislators getting themselves involved in something like this. So I think with other legislators, they will jump on a bandwagon to get a few votes. Maybe they believe in, some of them do, believe in the things that are being protested, too. But they certainly are not using reasoning power to get their point across.

Ms. Bridgman: Whereas coming to your office or writing you a letter with informed knowledge would be using reasoning powers?

Mr. Barnes: Yes. I think your influence, the influence of a legislator or a constituent speaking to legislator in both cases, is directly proportional to the amount of knowledge you have about the issue.

Ms. Bridgman: Thanks.

I'd like to close by a sort of retrospective in reflection. Speculative as well. How do you think life differs, or differed, for most state residents when you began your term and now?

Mr. Barnes: How did life differ?

Ms. Bridgman: Yes.

Mr. Barnes: I keep seeing in the paper how we don't have as good a standard of living as people did twenty years ago. And I don't know whether to believe that or not because I see people with two cars. You've got to have two cars now. And the cars are so much better than they used to be. And people now have VCRs and televisions and what not that they didn't used to have. I don't think it's true that we don't have a better standard of living now. And many of the things we buy are cheaper than what we used to get.

For instance, a few years ago I bought a little hand-held calculator that could nest fifteen parentheses and could do all kinds of things. You could program it and poke it and it was really capable. I paid twenty dollars for this. It's exactly what I paid for a slide rule when I was going through college. And a slide rule you had to juggle the decimal point around and half of the time get it wrong. And your readings were approximate, not exact like they are in the little hand calculator. The things we get now are comparable in price to things we had then, but they are so much better.

And that goes for travel, for instance. I hear so many comments that regulation has ruined the airlines and so forth. But you look at the number of people that are able to fly, can afford to fly. It is vast compared to what it used to be. You used to go into a bus station and see a bus station and see a crowd of people and so forth and they'd get onto a bus. Now you go into an airport, which is a lot larger than a bus station, and the crowd of people is a lot larger.

I think our life is so much better in health care. It's so much better than it used to be, even though it costs more. Maybe a pill you'd have to take, if you get pneumonia, for instance, get an infection in your lung, you'd have to take a pill. Eegad! A pill's fifty-cents apiece, and I have to take three a day for a week or something like that. Well, when I was young, when you got pneumonia you went to the hospital and you paid you only paid twenty-five or fifty dollars a day, but after three weeks you died. So I think our life is so much better now.

Ms. Bridgman: What part in these changes of these things that got better did state government play in your time?

Mr. Barnes: They stayed out of the way part of the time. If I just try to think just what happened to improve what the state government did to help improve our lives usually things that had to be done because of greater population. Like, for instance, the improvement and treatment of sewage. We could get by with it thirty years ago when I first came to Washington State. You could get by with a lot less than you do now. Now you've got to treat the sewage to a greater degree. And education, for instance. Education probably is as good as it ever was, but it's got to be better now.

Ms. Bridgman: What kind of changes that the state government made were the least beneficial? You've named some of that were beneficial.

Mr. Barnes: Those things that I opposed.

Ms. Bridgman: Fair answer.

Finally, the legislature is going to change by about thirty percent this year. I'd like you to imagine that you are sought out by one of the newly elected legislators≤

[End Tape 11, Side 1]

22 PREDICTIONS AND ADVICE

Ms. Bridgman: I've just asked you to imagine that your advice has been sought by one of those who will be elected this fall to the legislature. What changes would you tell this man or woman are needed now?

Mr. Barnes: If you're asking for a specific issue or a specific change, it's real hard to come up with a specific. I could give you my opinion on the need for mass transportation, for instance. Something has got to be done to relieve the traffic congestion that's going to occur, or is occurring now. It's going to get worse as time goes on. So I presume that my advice would be to look carefully for some alternate way to run things. For instance, light rail. Even that requires solutions to problems like, how do people get from their far-flung communities to a point where they pick up light rail? And when they get downtown or get to where they work, how do they get from there to their far-flung areas of work? There's problems here to be thought about, and this would be one of my suggestions. You think very carefully through the details and the specifics of how a mass transit plan would work. This is an example.

Then when you get one of the issues that comes up now, education, and everybody, particularly at this time, is saying the federal government, you, Bill Clinton, or George Bush, have got to do something about education saying: What are you going to do? What's your plan? Well, I think our Constitution, our federal Constitution, says certain things the federal government is supposed to do, like the common defense and controlling interstate commerce. All other things are left to the state. What is the role of federal government in education? Nobody has set that down to define what it is. Should the federal government pour more money into the states for education? What about the concept of local control? It's so strong in this state, for instance. What do we think about that?

We've got to have somebody work on, insist on, the fact that the federal government has got to make it clear what their role in education is. As of now, it's just somehow the federal government will put more money into education somewhere. So my advice would be: clarify that, among other things.

My advice would also be to inspect every bill that comes up to see what affect that has on people's private lives that government really doesn't need to get involved in. And running of an educational district is one of these things that I would be concerned with or advise the legislators they'd be concerned with.

I can remember, for instance, when we had to cut some of the funding for education. When it came to the Highline District, for instance, my district should I cut funds for this hearing impaired education for something else, you know. And I don't know. We've got basic education defined, and we've got to put the funds in there; but these other things we fund, who should decide on that? My impression was that the people in the district should be the ones that make the decisions on that because they know what they want most and what they need most. But contrary to what I thought, we got very adamant complaints about that because people didn't want to get themselves in trouble with their constituents. They say, "If I have to make the decision on the local level, everybody's going to come after me and complain about what I decided. They want something else. And what do you think I'm going to do."

At any rate, I would advise a new legislator to keep things on the local level as much as possible. Because the local people know what they need and want most. This is one of the precepts of republicanism and the Republican Party that is different than the Democratic Party. Democrats say, "Well, I think we know what's best for you. We'll pass a law that makes you accept that." And there are people who are in the position to make a decision on the local level that want just that because they don't want to have to take those decisions on themselves and get themselves in problems with their neighbors.

Ms. Bridgman: One final question. What would you tell this new legislator, how would you respond, if he or she said, "Did I do the right thing by running and getting elected? Is it worth it?"

Mr. Barnes: I'd have a mixed response. I'd say, "No, it isn't worth it, but you did the right thing." When it's all over with and you've spent part of your life and you've sacrificed other things, I think you feel that it's worth it, because if you've had some influence on how things turned out, and you are very adamant how you think things should turn out, then you feel satisfied that, "Okay, I did what I could to influence things my way."

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you very much. This will end our interview series. And I want to go on record for thanking you for being so candid.

Mr. Barnes: There is one little thing I wanted to include.

Ms. Bridgman: Good.

Mr. Barnes: Which is kind of an aside. It goes back to an issue we were talking about before. We talked about the education act.

Ms. Bridgman: Yes, the basic education.

Mr. Barnes: The Basic Education Act that came about, and the reason for limiting the amount of money to be raised by the levies.

It came about as a result of a lawsuit which was filed by several of the districts and the teachers union. Now that fifteen years has gone by, it looks as though levies are having an easier time passing now. So the teachers union, in some cases, some of the officials of the teachers union are saying that we should now relax that restriction on the levies, and we should lift the levy lid. I think this is the words they use now. Which is liable to get us in trouble again with the courts. So it shows how people have a short memory. Even those people that are heavily involved, and should know exactly each step that was taken and why.

Ms. Bridgman: Thank you. One of the purposes of what we've done together is to make sure there is a good record of these things so that we won't forget.

Thank you again.

[End of Tape 11, Side 2]

APPENDIX:

CHRONOLOGY: THE UNITED STATES 1900-1994

THE PROGRESSIVE ERA AND WORLD WAR I, 1900-1918

Population: 1900 76 million
1918 103 million
Presidents: 1900 William McKinley
1901 September 14. Theodore Roosevelt
1909 William Howard Taft
1913 Woodrow Wilson

Washington State:
Population: 1900 518 thousand
1910 1.1 million
Governors: 1900 John R. Rogers
1901 Henry McBride
1905 Albert Mead
1909 Samuel Cosgrove
1909 Marion E. Hay
1913 Ernest Lister
Legislature: Republican majorities.

Politics: Progressive Legislation
1901 Initiative and referendum adopted by Oregon. Other states followed.
1901 September 6. President McKinley shot by an assassin.
1902-12 Social legislation adopted by states. Examples: workman's compensation, Maryland, 1902; 10 hour industrial workday for women, Oregon, 1903; public assistance for dependent children, Illinois, 1911; minimum wage, Massachusetts, 1912.

Washington State Politics:
Farmers and Worker Unite
1909 Women's suffrage.
1911 Workmen's compensation.
1912 Initiative, referendum and recall ratified.

Economics: Continued Industrialization
1901 US Steel, Ford Motors established.
1903 Wright brothers flight.
1908 General Motors established.
1918 First airmail routes.

Washington State Economics:
A Natural Resources Economy
1900 Weyerhauser buys 900 thousand acres of NPR land.
1909 Seattle hosts Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition.
1911-18 Economy grows after 1907 recession.
1916 First Boeing plane built.
1916-19 Labor unrest.

World Affairs: World War I, 1914-1918
1917 US enters war. Greater recognition of US as global power.
1917 Russian revolution.
1918-19 Influenza epidemic, 20 million died.

Everyday Life: Accessible Entertainment
1903 World Series established.
1906 San Francisco earthquake.
1913 Charlie Chaplin's first movies. Nickelodeons in every neighborhood.
1916 Jazz. Developed from ragtime.
1917 Bobbed hair. Millions of American women cut their hair in imitation of Irene Castle, famous dancer.

THE ROARING TWENTIES: 1919-1929

Population: 1920 118 million

Presidents: 1921 Warren G. Harding
1923 Calvin Coolidge
1929 Herbert Hoover

Washington State:
Population: 1920 1.3 million
Governors: 1919 Louis F. Hart
1925 Roland H. Hartley
Legislature: Republican majorities

Politics: Assorted Experiments
1919 Soldiers' Bonus Act.
1919 Prohibition.
1920 Women's suffrage.
1924 Harding administration scandals: Teapot Dome.

Washington State Politics: Reform and Reaction
1921 Consolidation of state government into ten departments.
1921 Gas tax: one cent per gallon.
1925 Tax Commission created to standardize real estate accessment.
1926 Grange proposes PUDs.

Economics: Uncertain Prosperity
1919-21 Postwar depression. Agricultural depression continues throughout decade.
1922 Stock market boom begins.
1929 US: 34% of world's industrial production.
1929 October 28. US stock exchange collapses.

Washington State Economics: Problems and Promise
1921 State agricultural prices drop by 50%.
1920-29 Lumber companies cut best timber, then let land revert to counties.
1920-29 Markets open up as highways are built.
1926-29 Property values fall.

World Affairs: Retreat from a Troubled Europe
1920 US refusal to join the League of Nations.
1921-29 Germany: Inflation, economic collapse, increase of Hitler's influence.
1922 Fascist government established in Italy.

Everyday Life: Boisterous and Troubled Times
1921 First regular radio programs.
1923 The KKK gains political power: 200 thousand attend a tri-state conference in Indiana.
1925 Flappers wear cloche hats, short skirts and dance the Charleston.
1927 The first talkie: "The Jazz Singer"
1927 Charles Lindbergh flies the Spirit of St. Louis across the Atlantic.

THE GREAT DEPRESSION AND WORLD WAR II: 1930-1945

Population: 1930 122 million
1940 132 million. Smallest % increase since 1790.
1945 140 million
Presidents: 1933 Franklin D. Roosevelt. Served three terms. Elected 1944. Died April 12, 1945.
1945 April 12. Harry S. Truman

Washington State:
Population: 1930 1.5 million
Governors: 1933 Clarence D. Martin
1941 Arthur B. Langlie
Legislature: 1929-31 Republican majorities.
1933-45 Democratic majorities.

Politics: Government Functions Redirected
1932-35 New Deal legislation: Agricultural Adjustment Act, Public Works Administration, National Industrial Recovery Act, Social Security.
1933 Prohibition repealed.
1940 Selective Service Act.
1941 Lend-Lease Act.
1943 Emergency Price Control Act. Allowed government price-fixing, rent control.

Washington State Politics: Democrats and the Federal Government
1930 PUDs authorized.
1933 First Democratic legislature.
1935 Blanket primary adopted.
1938 Department of Unemployment created.
1943 Hanford Atomic Energy plant constructed.

Economics: Decline and Recovery
1931 US unemployment 15-25%.
1939 Economic boom from European orders for arms and war equipment.
1941-45 Women and blacks replace men in war industry jobs.

Washington State Economics: Relief and Revival
1934 Seattle strike: maritime and timber workers.
1934 600 thousand receive federal relief funds.
1939 Eight thousand working on Bonneville Dam.
1941-45 State receives $8-10 billion from federal war contracts.
1943-44 Agricultural recovery. Crops worth 500 thousand annually.

World Affairs: World War II
1934 Hitler designated Fuhrer by German plebiscite.
1939 France and England declare war after Germany invades Poland.
1941 December 7. US declares war after Japanese attack Pearl Harbor.
1945 War ends: VE Day, May 8. VJ Day, Aug. 14, after US drops atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.
1945 Discovery that five to six million Jews had been killed in concentration camps.

Everyday Life: Doing Without, Together
1930 115 million movie tickets sold every week
1930 Contract bridge
1931 "The Star Spangled Banner" adopted as national anthem
1940 Penicillin and sulfa, first antibacterial drugs, marketed.

POSTWAR PROSPERITY AND THE COLD WAR: 1946-1963

Population: 1950 150 million
1960 180 million
Presidents: 1949 Harry S. Truman
1953 Dwight D. Eisenhower
1961 John F. Kennedy
1963 Nov. 22. Lyndon B. Johnson

Washington State:
Population: 1950 2.3 million
1960 2.8 million
Governors: 1945 Mon C. Wallgren
1949 Arthur B. Langlie
1957 Albert Rosellini
Legislature: Democratic majorities, four elections.
Republican majority, one election.
Split, two elections.

Politics: Search for Stability
1947 GI Bill: one million veterans enroll in colleges.
1950-54 Senator Joseph McCarthy's investigation of Communist infiltration in government.
1954 Brown vs. the Board of Education: racially segregated schools illegal.
1956 Federal Aid Highway Act: provision for construction of interstate highways.
1963 November 22. President John F. Kennedy assassinated.

Washington State Politics: Growth and Change
1948 Canwell Committee investigates Communists.
1957 The Omnibus Civil Rights Act.
1958 $52 million bond issue for school construction.

Economics: A Consumer Society
1953 US workforce: 30% employed in commerce and industry.
1954 US: 6% of world's population; 60% automobiles, 58% telephones, 45% radios.
1960 Television: 85 million in US homes, 1.5 million in 1950.

Washington State Economics: Prosperity and the Suburbs
1952 Irrigation opens 80 thousand acres.
1954 Boeing's 707 line begins.
1960 Census shows rapid growth of suburbs, slow growth of cities.
1962 Seattle World's Fair.

World Affairs: Geopolitical Rivalry
1949 Communist People's Republic proclaimed in China under Mao Tse Tung.
1950-53 Korean War.
1952-53 Hydrogen bomb. US: 1952. USSR: 1953.
1957-58 Satellites. Sputnik I and II: USSR, 1957. Explorer I: US, 1958.
1962 Cuban Missile Crisis.

Everyday Life: Security and Disquiet
1954 Montgomery bus boycott begun by Rosa Parks.
1956 "Blue Suede Shoes," Elvis Presley. Beginning of dominance of rock music.
1956 Polio vaccine.
1961 Oral contraceptives marketed.
1963 Birmingham, Alabama, march led by Martin Luther King. President Kennedy calls out three thousand troops for marchers' protection.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND VIETNAM: 1964-1975

Population: 1966 196 million
1970 205 million
Presidents: 1964 Lyndon B. Johnson
1969 Richard M. Nixon
1974 August 9. Gerald R. Ford

Washington State:
Population: 1970 3.4 million
Governors: 1965 Daniel J. Evans
Legislature: Democratic majorities, four elections.
Split, two elections.

Politics: Challenge and Scandal

1964 Civil Rights Act. Guaranteed right to vote; equality of education; access to goods, services, facilities and accommodations.

1965 Great Society legislation: Medicare and Medicaid, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Older Americans Act.

1968 Assassinations. Martin Luther King, April 4. Robert F. Kennedy, June 6.

1973 Roe vs. Wade: abortion during the first six months of pregnancy may not be prohibited.

1972-74 Watergate. Five arrested inside of DC Democratic headquarters, 1972. House Judiciary recommends impeachment, 1974. Nixon resigns August 9, 1974.

Washington State Politics:
Clean Environment, Clean Government

1965 Evans "Blueprint for Progress:" economic growth, expansion of higher education, equitable taxation, government efficiency.

1967 22 community colleges and TESC established.

1970 Ecology Department established.

1971 Shoreline Management Act.

1972 Public Disclosure Commission established.

Economics: Foreign Competition

1966-69 Space Race. Moon soft landings, US and USSR, 1966. Apollo 11 moon landing and moon walk, US, 1969.

1971 Balance of payments crisis. Nixon orders 90-day wage/price freeze.

1973-75 OPEC oil energy crisis. OPEC embargo results in 100 thousand unemployed in US, 1973. OPEC raises prices 10%, 1975.

1975 US unemployment 9.2%. Highest since 1941. Washington State Economics: Recession

1970-73 Boeing bust. Reduction from 115 thousand to 29 thousand. 39 thousand leave state.

1974 Spokane "EXPO '74," first environmental fair.

1975 Value of production $2 million, 1970 $900 thousand.

World Affairs: The Vietnam War

1964 Escalation of US involvement.

1968 Worldwide protest.

1969 US troop withdrawal begins.

1973 Ineffective January and June cease-fire agreements signed.

1975 Communists overrun South Vietnam.

Everyday Life: Protest and Response

1963 August 28. March on Washington DC. Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech.

1964 Mississippi Summer. Northern college students help blacks register to vote.

1969 Woodstock. Bethel, NY. 300 thousand attend rock festival.

1970 May 4, Kent State University. Four student war protesters killed by Ohio National Guard. Resulting disturbances close 448 universities and colleges.

BABY BOOMERS AND THE NEW CONSERVATIVES: 1976-1993

Population: 1977 216 million
1980 226 million
Presidents: 1977 Jimmy Carter
1981 Ronald Reagan
1989 George Bush
1993 Bill Clinton

Washington State:
Population: 1980 4 million
1990 5 million
Governors: 1977 Dixy Lee Ray
1981 John Spellman
1985 Booth Gardner
1993 Mike Lowry
Legislature: Democratic majorities, five elections. Split, six elections.

Politics: A Conservative Agenda
1982 Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act. Corporate taxes raised. Social programs cut.
1985 Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act.
1986 "Irangate." Reagan admits secret arms deal with Iran.

Washington State Politics: Defining Responsibility
1977 Basic Education Act.
1981 Annual legislative sessions.
1983 Bipartisan redistricting commission established.
1985 Comparable worth.

Economics: Recession and Inflation
1978 US dollar at record low against the Japanese yen and the German mark.
1984 70 US banks fail. Largest number since 1937.
1985 US world's largest debtor nation: deficit 130 billion dollars.
1987 October 19: Black Monday. World stock market prices crash. Dow-jones index falls by 23%.

Washington State Economics: Urban Patterns
1981-83 Timber prices fall. State unemployment 13%.
1979-87 Employment along I-5 corridor grows 22%.
1986 $7 billion military establishment equals 11% of state employment.

World Affairs: A New Order
1978 US and People's Republic of China establish full diplomatic relations.
1987 US and USSR finalize INF treaty. Destruction of missiles in Europe.
1988-91 Eastern European states gain independence. Poland: government reconciles with non-communist groups, 1988. Czechoslovakia: first free postwar elections, 1991. USSR recognizes independence of Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia, 1991.
1991 Gulf War: US and allies liberate Kuwait from Iraq.
1991 December 26: USSR disintegrates, replaced by a commonwealth of republics.

Everyday Life: Diversity and Fragmentation
1976 Discovery that gas from spray cans, air conditioners, refrigerators and computers depletes ozone layer.
1981 IBM markets PC
1981 Scientists identify AIDS. 125,000 US fatalities from AIDS by 1991.
1982 ERA not ratified.
1988 Crack cocaine common in US cities.