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JF: This is Tape 12 of the Morris K. Udall Oral History Project. Good afternoon, it's Tuesday, June 9, 1998, and we are in Room 122 at the University of Arizona College of Law in Tucson, Arizona. My name is Julie Ferdon, and I would like to welcome Professor Charles Ares to another in a series of oral history interviews that form the Morris K. Udall Oral History Project.

Okay, let's get started. I'd like to thank you for your participation, Professor Ares, and start by just getting a little biographical information about you, like when and where you were born.

CA: I was born in St. Mary's Hospital in Tucson, Arizona, September 11, 1926. My parents at that time lived at Marana. My father was a cotton farmer there.

JF: Tell us a little what it was like growing up on a cotton farm. Do you remember?

CA: My memories, of course, of that are a little dim, because it's quite a while ago. Most of my memories are of the Depression, because it hit very shortly after I was born. And my memories of farming at Marana--there are a few fragments of memories in the fields and that kind of thing--but mostly they were of the gloom of the Depression, and the economic disaster that it was for that whole community.

JF: How did it affect people in that community?

CA: Well, they had moved into the Marana area to open up what was called the Post Project. That whole area of land out there is very fertile land around the Santa Cruz River, where the Santa Cruz River spreads out and sort of disappears now. And a guy named Post had developed it as a farming area, and sold the land to farmers. He had recruited whole townships of people from Colorado, including my parents, and they bought one of the farms, purchased it--of course, on time. And one of the problems with it was that the water source for irrigation was at Cortero: the pump, the well, was at Cortero, and there was a concrete ditch that ran along the highway out to Marana. It may have gone further than that, I don't really remember that. But my father was astute enough to realize that if you owned the land, but didn't own the water source, that you were in a precarious position. And I guess the contract under which they bought the land--this is just hearsay, but I think it's true--the contract specified that they weren't to drill wells on their own land, so they really were dependent on the Cortero water. My father saw that as a danger and tried to organize the community to purchase the well and the waterworks, but he was unable to do it. And when the Depression came, the price of cotton started down, and the price of water either stayed the same or went up. And as a result--I think it's true, I'm not a historian of the event, but it's family lore that virtually everybody there who was still paying for their land on time lost the land. And many of them, the finance company that had purchased the mortgages, traded them land in California for their equity in the land in Marana. Some of them went to Visalia--fruit orchards and things of that sort. They offered my father nothing.

JF: Do you think maybe that's where your populist leanings got their start?
CA: No question. No question.
JF: You moved back to Tucson around 1935, if I'm correct.
CA: The chronology is not clear to me. Actually, we left Marana and moved to a farm at Flowing Wells, and then to a farm at Continental. And then my parents leased a farm that had an apple orchard on it down in Elfrida, Cochise County. And I went through the eighth grade down there.

JF: In Elfrida?
CA: In Elfrida. Then my parents, not wanting to send me to high school in Pearce--which is a little, I'm sure pretty bad, high school--sent me to California to enter the ninth grade, living with my sister in Santa Monica. And I finished, I guess, half a year there. By that time, they had moved back to Tucson, so I came back to Tucson and entered Mansfeld Junior High School in the ninth grade, I guess.

JF: And then you went to Tucson High School from there?
CA: Tucson High.

JF: And graduated in 1944?
CA: That's right.

JF: And then, as I understand it, you went from there directly to the Navy.
CA: Yes.

JF: Why the Navy?
CA: Well, I graduated, I was seventeen years old, I wouldn't have been eighteen until September. To show you the difference (chuckles) in the world--for at least some people--I wanted to go into the service. The war [World War II] was on. It was in the last stages, as we then knew--or maybe we didn't know--but it really was in the last stages. But I wanted to get into the service, and so I enlisted when I was seventeen, and the only branch that would take you.... The Marines might have, I guess maybe they did, but I was not physically big enough for the Marines.

JF: So you were in the Navy for two years?
CA: Well, I was in the Navy I guess about two years.

JF: And from the Navy you came back here and enrolled at the University of Arizona in about 1946 or so?
CA: That's right.
JF: Did you find that the post-war student body, being veterans, many of them—do you find a difference in today's student body, compared to the post-war student body, just in motivation, or anything?

CA: Well, I'm sure. There are obviously lots of differences, but most of them explained by time and changes—generational changes, I suppose. But that group of returning veterans were older, many were married, some had children by that time. They were, at the University of Arizona—and I'm sure most other state universities like this—very, very oriented towards occupations, toward getting an education in order to make up lost time in developing families and a job and that sort of thing. So they were, no doubt, more serious, more mature, I suppose, than many undergraduates today.

JF: When you were a student, you enrolled in 1946, and in 1946 and 1947, Mo Udall was a basketball star, and in 1947 and 1948 he was student body president. Were you aware of him then?

CA: I was aware of him, I didn't know him.

JF: Did you have any impressions of him as student body president?

CA: Not really that I can recall, except that he was obviously an able person, very outspoken, very sure of himself.

JF: Did you know Stewart [Udall] at this time, while you were in college?

CA: No.

JF: Not until later? You moved on to the law school in 1949, which was, as I understand it, only two years. You had only two years as an undergrad before moving to the law school.

CA: You didn't have to have more than that.

JF: And I think Morris did something like that, too. How did that work then?

CA: Well, the admissions requirements were that you had to have two years of undergraduate work, and at least a "C" average, and you could enter the law school. It was a very bad system, and it was one of the worst decisions I ever made, to go to law school after two years undergraduate school. I had very bad advice.

JF: Why do you think it was bad advice?

CA: Because I should have stayed in undergraduate school and gotten more education.

JF: A broader education?
CA: Sure.

JF: Was law school still three years, as it is now?

CA: Three years, right.

JF: How did law school differ then, [compared to] today?

CA: Oh, there's no comparison in the quality of the education that we offer now and that we got then. It was much smaller, though my entering class had 108 people in it. But with virtually no admissions standards, an awful lot of my classmates should never have been there. And after one semester and one year, they weren't. We graduated 35, I think, out of the 108.

JF: Was there an attempt to get rid of students? or was that just....

CA: I don't know that there was an attempt to get rid of them, but it was perfectly understood that those were the days when they systematically weeded out a third of the class, at least, in the first year.

JF: Did they have any clinical type of classes?

CA: No.

JF: It was strictly learning the law?

CA: Right. It was a very small faculty, very bare-bones curriculum, very private law oriented. It was assumed that all the graduates would go into small law offices, probably in Arizona.

JF: You didn't know Stewart or Morris Udall in law school, either?

CA: No. They were both gone by the time I got to law school.

JF: Oh, that's right. You received your law degree in 1952.

CA: Yes.

JF: And you immediately pretty much went to Washington, D.C., to become a clerk for Justice William Douglas.

CA: That's right.

JF: What was your greatest impression of Justice Douglas? Or lesser impressions, too--I'll take any! (chuckles)

CA: Well, it was his intellectual brilliance. I mean, this was the most powerful mind I had ever
run into, and probably the most powerful mind I've ever run into. He thought with the speed of light, he was very perceptive, he was very impatient, he didn't want to waste any time on anything except to get to the merits of something, get to the heart of it. Very demanding.

JF: Did you ever have occasion to compare him later in life to Mo Udall or to anybody else you've run into?

CA: Compare Douglas to them?

JF: Yes.

CA: Oh, he was unique. No, I don't think I ever compared him to Morris. (pause) No, not really. No, he was unique.

JF: You hadn't taken the bar before you left (CA: No.) and you returned here and took the bar exam after that. (CA: Right.) And you went pretty much directly into the county attorney's office.

CA: That's right.

JF: Why the county attorney's office?

CA: Well, one of my classmates, Harry Ackerman, was the deputy county attorney. Morris was the county attorney, and Harry was one of the deputies. And Harry and I had been quite close in law school: we studied together, and we had always had it in mind that we would probably practice law together after my clerkship. So when I came back, we did, we opened a small law firm, we rented office space from Morris and Stewart in the Valley National Building, they had a little cubbyhole office up there.

JF: This was at the same time you were in the county attorney's office?

CA: The county attorney, and all his deputies, could practice privately. So Harry and I decided that he would handle our civil law practice, and I would get some experience trying cases as a deputy county attorney.

JF: What were the primary issues that the county attorney's office dealt with then?

CA: Routine crimes. It was very different from the way it is now, I'm sure. Homicides were relatively rare, and I remember that we tried--I guess the first homicide case that I participated in, I assisted Morris in a first-degree murder case, a capital/death penalty case.

JF: Was there any organized crime, mafia sorts of things going on?

CA: There was organized crime. On occasion, they had had prostitution rings. They had had gambling in the state. There was some official corruption. Those kind of things happened with some regularity, I suppose.
JF: I'm assuming that the attorney general's office probably didn't have an office [in Tucson] then, so you were....

CA: I don't really think they did.

JF: Okay. So you were probably the show in town for that sort of thing.

CA: Sure.

JF: You told me just the other day that you thought Morris ran the best county attorney's office ever. Could you elaborate on that?

CA: Well, he hired good people. He had a very interesting staff. I was looking at a picture of the staff, I guess in the last year of his term, and that staff produced not only Morris, who then later became a congressman and a presidential candidate, but three federal district judges, the dean of a law school--in a very small staff.

JF: And a former ambassador.

CA: That's right. And a governor, ambassador--right, Raul Castro.

JF: Yes, and Superior Court judges.

CA: Yes.

JF: Raul Castro succeeded Mo when he left, and did go on to become an ambassador, I believe under [President Lyndon B.] Johnson?

CA: Yes.

JF: And Mary Anne Reimann then, Richey later, was in that office as well. There weren't many Hispanic or women lawyers at that time.

CA: Not very many.

JF: Why do you suppose they chose to work at the county attorney's office?

CA: Well, partly because of Morris. He attracted able people who wanted responsibility, and to be encouraged to develop themselves as lawyers, and Morris was a very good--one of the reasons I thought he was such a good county attorney was that he would hire good people, and then he gave them responsibility. And he would back them up, he'd support them. Morris himself had started into the practice of law at a very high level for somebody right out of law school, so he was accustomed to taking responsibility and doing things, doing things right, and he hired people who were similarly inclined.
JF: To do that as well.

CA: I think he encouraged Mary Anne, who had--I don't know if there was more than one
woman in her class, but probably not--maybe only one or two at the most. But she was an able
lawyer, and a good lawyer, and it was a good place to learn how to try cases.

JF: What were your impressions then about Mary Anne Richey?

CA: Oh, she was a little ahead of me in law school, and I didn't know her very well. I "knew"
hers, but we were not close friends or anything. But she was obviously a very--she was a good
lawyer, she was very serious, very conscientious, and she did her work, and did it in a
professional fashion.

JF: And how about Raul Castro?

CA: Raul was really a part-time deputy when I was in the office. He had a private practice and
he worked part-time, as I recall, as a deputy county attorney. I didn't have an awful lot to do
with Raul, though I knew him reasonably well. My wife had been a student of his when he
taught Spanish, so we knew each other--never tried a case with him.

JF: Where did he teach Spanish?

CA: I think here at the University.

JF: Who were the people in the office that you said became Federal District Court judges?

CA: Well, Mary Anne Richey. She went to the U.S. Attorney's office, and then ran for Superior
Court, and then was appointed to the federal bench by, I guess, President Ford. Fred Marquez--
Alfredo Marquez--became a federal district judge.

JF: Was Browning part of that office?

CA: Browning was not in the office. Browning clerked for our law firm, Udall and Udall, and
when they got out of law school, he and Don Estes officed across the street from us, and Morris
referred stuff to the Browning Estes Law Firm.

JF: Okay. Now, one more question, I think, about the county attorney's office. How has it
changed, or has it changed? to your knowledge.

CA: Oh, yes, it's vastly larger now. Crime is a very big ... burden on this community, and the
office has gotten very, very large. It has also become a place for professional prosecutors--that
is, people who stay in the prosecutor's office for virtually their whole career.

JF: When you worked there, it was more a stepping stone, someplace to go on the way up?

CA: It was really a way station. I have to say that. I don't suppose we were as technically
developed as lawyers have to be now under present circumstances. The law's gotten a lot more complex, the procedural system is more complicated. And in that respect, I'm sure they're better prepared than we were at that time. We were generalists, a collection of generalists. But I think there was also the sense that we were not apart from the rest of the practicing bar. And I think there is now a sense that prosecutors have set themselves apart, or the community has set them apart from the rest of the practicing profession.

JF: Well, when you were doing this, you also had your private law practice. At some point in time, while you were working simultaneously in the county attorney's office, and then with Ackerman and Ares, you moved over to Udall and Udall.

CA: That was after Morris left the county attorney's office, after the ill-fated judgeship campaign.

JF: Oh, it was. Okay.

CA: And then he moved his and Stewart's law firm down to a building that he had bought on Court Street. Initially, Harry and I rented space from them.

JF: Okay. And so when you were still in the county attorney's office, was when Stewart first ran for Congress in 1954?

CA: That's right.

JF: Mo said in an oral history that was done of him that he had considered running for Congress himself, and in fact really wanted to, but deferred to his older brother. Were you aware of that at all at the time?

CA: No. I didn't have any real relationship to them at that time. I went into the office in 1953, I guess in the fall of 1953, and I had worked with Stewart a little bit when I was in law school on political stuff, but I didn't know anything about Morris' ambitions to run for Congress at that time.

JF: Okay. So you weren't involved....

CA: No.

JF: Were you involved in Stewart's campaign at all then?

CA: No.

JF: The same year Mo ran for superior court judge--I suppose as sort of a booby prize or something. Were you involved in that campaign at all?

CA: Yes.
JF: How were you involved?

CA: Well, when Morris announced that he wasn't running for re-election to the county attorney's office, naturally people started looking around for a new horse to ride. And particularly Morris announced that he was running for judge. Judges don't have any political patronage or anything like that, they can't give anybody anything. Most of my colleagues found something else to do. I didn't. I worked with Morris on his campaign.

JF: Were his talents as a campaigner obvious at that time?

CA: Well, yes. He was a talented campaigner--tireless, worked hard, did all the right things. Some of it I think he hated. I remember one afternoon, hot, before the primary, four, five o'clock in the afternoon, stopping at a bar to go in to shake hands, and it was clear we had to do it. I remember the look on Morris' face as he took this deep breath, because he knew the minute you walk into a bar that time of the afternoon, you're going to catch an awful lot of guff from the barflies. But you have to do it and you have to smile and make jokes and all that. It wasn't pleasant.

JF: I gather that the results of the campaign weren't pleasant either.

CA: Disastrous. Disastrous. As I recall it now, it was the first year they used voting machines, and they did not have the sense to rotate the names alphabetically, and that, combined with the fact that Morris' father was running for re-election to the Supreme Court, and he was at the top of the ballot in the nonpartisan judicial section; Stewart was running for re-election to Congress, and he was on the federal office at the top of the ballot; and then people couldn't find Morris' name, because he's down at the bottom of the list.

JF: (tongue in cheek) They couldn't vote just a straight "Udall ticket?"

CA: They couldn't do it. And you couldn't vote a straight ticket if you were going to vote for Levi, because you didn't do it that way. In any event, the thing got all messed up, and people simply couldn't find Morris' name, and he began to get calls in the late afternoon, early evening by people complaining that they couldn't find him on the ballot. And I don't know, seven or eight o'clock, Morris called me and said, "We're dead." And we were. We lost to a very nondescript candidate who then lost in the general. And Mo's judgeship died aborning.

JF: Beaten by the big "political machine," huh?

CA: Yes.

JF: So he returned to private practice, to Udall and Udall. And you left the county attorney's office at the same time, pretty much. (CA: Right.) And you went to Udall and Udall from there as well?

CA: A little bit later. I practiced with Ackerman for a while, and then Morris invited me to join
the firm and I did.

JF: What led to that decision?

CA: Well, Morris needed somebody in the firm. Stewart was in Washington, couldn't practice law. Morris needed somebody, and we got along well, and so....

JF: So it was just the two of you initially?

CA: Well, no, Stewart was involved in it, but in a minor fashion, because he didn't participate very much. So initially it was Morris and me, yes.

JF: Did you ever practice with Stewart as well?

CA: Well, technically, I was his partner. And when he came back in the summertimes, he would practice law in the summer.

JF: So he'd go to Congress during the term, and then come back and practice law.

CA: On recess, he'd come back, yes.

JF: How was it to practice with Morris and Stewart? I mean, how did they differ in their styles or their approaches?

CA: Well, Stewart, by that time I think was not very much interested in practicing law. I mean, it didn't turn him on. Morris was just born to it. Morris was a great trial lawyer, and I learned a lot from him. The one thing he couldn't teach anybody else was his self-confidence. I guess you're born with that, I think it's a Udall trait. But immensely self-confident, and of course happily had the stuff to back it up with. So that it paid off. He was a wonderful trial lawyer. I tried a number of cases with him, and he was something to watch. He was instinctive. He had an ability to talk sense to juries, he had an ability to make things understandable to juries, and to make connections with them.

JF: So it was mostly trial work that he did?

CA: Yes.

JF: Was it civil primarily?

CA: Yes. Not entirely, but primarily. We tried a court martial at Fort Huachuca, a marijuana bust.

JF: Back in those days, huh? (laughs)

CA: Back in those days, that's right. Well, the Army cracked down, because they were
beginning to have some difficulty. So they swept up some of these kids from the 36th Army Band and it was really pretty sad. Almost all of them were college graduates. They were musicians and had been college musicians. And most of them were on the way to being music teachers and other things. And so a marijuana conviction at that time was a terrible blow, and so it was an important case.

JF: Did you get them off?

CA: I don't want to put it that way. (laughter) They were acquitted by a court martial.

JF: We won't quote you. (laughter)

CA: Yes, we did.

JF: At some point in time, you were joined by Paul Rees.

CA: Right. Paul had clerked for Levi, for Morris' father, and recommended him very strongly. So he came down and he joined the firm.

JF: Was he also pretty much a trial lawyer?

CA: Yes.

JF: In 1956, when you were in practice with Mo, he chaired the Arizona volunteers for Stevenson. Did you get involved in that at all?

CA: Not very much. I didn't get very much involved in politics with Morris, but on the Stevenson campaign, I do remember Mo being the state chairman. I think I remember only one time meeting Stevenson in Phoenix. When he was there on like some sort of a speaking engagement, I went up with Morris.

JF: In 1960, he published the *Arizona Law of Evidence* book. Do you have any idea or remember how he came about to be involved in that?

CA: (sigh) I don't know how he came to be involved in it. It probably was Morris' idea. He had incredible energy, and he never was satisfied to do just the mundane workaday stuff of whatever job he had. He always did something beyond that. And so he taught part-time at the law school.

JF: Is that labor law that he taught?

CA: He taught labor law, yes. In fact, when he was a student, he published an article on the law of evidence, I think in the *University of Denver Law Review*, if I'm not mistaken. And so he had those instincts--again, part of the family tradition, I think, to be somewhat scholarly.
JF: Were you involved in writing that at all?

CA: No, I wasn't.

JF: At some point, Judge Joseph Livermore came to co-author that book with Mo. (CA: Right.) Do you know how that came about?

CA: Yeah, I was responsible (chuckles) for that.

JF: Somehow I suspected that.

CA: I won't say I was responsible, but I knew that it had gotten to be a heavy load, and [Morris] needed somebody to work on it. And Joe had been my successor in the law school and was an evidence expert, and I thought it would be a great thing. And so I suggested to Morris that he talk to Joe, and suggested to Joe that he talk to Morris, and they got together and did it.

JF: And at some point, Morris quit working on *The Law of Evidence*, (CA: Right.) and pretty much turned it over entirely (CA: To Joe). Do you know when that happened?

CA: No, I don't remember. I don't remember that.

JF: Also in 1960, the same year he published the book, he chaired the Committee for Modern Courts, which was a bar attempt to reform the court system. Were you involved in that at all with him?

CA: To some extent, but I don't have much recollection now of what we did.

JF: Do you remember the goals of the reform?

CA: The goals were a unified court system: that is, an administratively linked system of courts. Before that time, they had been simply a collection of courts that were sort of linked only in a kind of a common law way. You took an appeal from the Superior Court to the Supreme Court. But there was no administrative control over the lower courts by the Supreme Court. The Modern Courts Amendment was designed to change that.

JF: I gather it passed.

CA: Oh, yes. The major thing was merit selection for the two major counties.

JF: That's right, up until then they had been (CA: All elected.) all elected. Is that the primary legacy, would you say, for the modern court system?

CA: Yes. Well, yes, it is the primary legacy, and the most important one, but the administrative structure is also important, because court systems now are so complex and have so many duties other than simply deciding cases, that it's important to have an administrative structure. There's
something now called the Administrative Office of the Courts which didn't exist in the early
days. Things would be a shambles without something like that.

JF: You hear nowadays about other attempts to reform the court system, and I'm wondering if
they're now looking toward simplifying?

CA: I don't know any real efforts to simplify the court system. I don't think that the Arizona
court system in particular is overly complex. It is a relatively clean administrative structure. It's
a relatively clean judicial structure.

JF: And was this the structure that was set in place by the modern courts movement?

CA: Yes. But it builds on what was there before. It was never a very complicated system. One
of the advantages that western states have is that they were able to build their court systems
pretty much on the basis of practical reality, and not having to fight through the crusts of ancient
court structures that made no sense. And so the result was that starting fairly small and clean,
they produced relatively simple, straight-forward court structures.

JF: One way that the courts are going now is that they're increasingly emphasizing dispute
resolution.

CA: Other than judicial trials.

JF: Exactly. Settlements in all kinds of dispute resolution. (CA: Right.) That was something
that Mo was very well-known for, was resolving disputes between parties in a way that was
amiable to all sides.

CA: Right.

JF: Were you privy to that at all? Do you know what made him particularly successful in that?

CA: Well, I know the personal characteristics that made him successful at doing that sort of
thing. They were that he would listen to people, that he was a quick study—he understood things
very quickly, and understood what people's real interests were. And he was able to deal with
people in such a way that they sensed that he respected them and their interests, and that he was
straightforward about things. And he could talk common sense to them about what the best
resolution would be that would be the best for everybody. And there was this sort of personal
"agreeableness" about him that made people trust him.

JF: Now, around this time you had an opportunity to teach law at New York University Law
School?

CA: Right.

JF: That was in 1960?
CA: In 1961 I went back there--I made the decision in 1960.

JF: How did Mo take the news of your leaving?

CA: I don't have much of a recollection. I had been teaching part-time at the law school at this university, and enjoyed it. And [Justice William] Douglas was always interested in having his former clerks go into teaching. He's the one who got the ball rolling by having deans from schools in the East contact me. I suppose it was clear, even before that happened, that teaching was something that I liked to do, and that was probably more my style than being a hired gun. So I don't think Morris was surprised when I said I was going to do that.

JF: What happened to the firm when you left?

CA: I always said that as a result of my deciding to go into teaching, that my partners had to find federal jobs, because Stewart then was secretary of the interior, and Morris was going to run for Congress. But the fact is, that's what happened.

JF: So your leaving broke up the firm?

CA: It really didn't, but it just happened to happen at the same time.

JF: In 1960, I think both Morris and Stewart were involved in the John F. Kennedy election campaign (CA: Right.) which led to some big events the next year in 1961 when on March 8, Stewart was appointed as secretary of the interior. And on May 2, Morris ran in a special election to succeed Stewart. They, of course, both went back East to the Washington area (CA: Right.) and you were in New York City. Did you keep in touch?

CA: Yes, to some extent. I had not much contact with Stewart. I do remember we had a good friend in New York who was an American Indian, a woman who had married, I guess a stockbroker or something, but somehow we had met her in Greenwich Village where we lived. She was very active in Native American affairs, nationally. And when Stewart came to the Metropolitan Museum for some event of some sort, we had a session with him there. But beyond that, I was in his office two or three times, I suppose, when we went down to Washington to visit, but we were there to visit Morris and Pat. So I had some contact with Stewart, and maintained some contact with Morris.

JF: The next year, Mo was appointed to the Interior Committee, which had him on the Interior Committee and Stewart as secretary of the interior. This is a very broad question, but what combined effect do you think that the two of them had on environmental law and policy in the course of their careers?

CA: Well, I'm not a good historian of that era, particularly, but I've always thought that Stewart, after Harold Ickes, was probably the best secretary of interior we've ever had. And it was Stewart's understanding of the environment and natural resources, that he had a powerful effect on the country, and on our policies in that respect. And Morris, in the same way also, but in a
different way, because as a congressman, you have a different kind of influence. But his work in the Congress, as he gained seniority and gained more power on that committee--I don't know any congressman who, certainly since that time, has had the kind of impact that Morris had.

JF: At what point.... When you knew them, they were both known as avid environmentalists and outdoorspeople. And yet until this time you don't really see that coming into their respective biographies or histories. At what point did it become evident to you, their interest in the environment?

CA: (sigh) Well, I think that's an interesting question I hadn't thought about. But I think it was sort of natural, given their backgrounds in St. John's and the country, country life. I don't know much about their contact with Native Americans, except, of course, their mother, Louise, was very active and wrote a book with Mrs. Sekaquaptewa called, *Me and Mine*. And it's evident that the Udall family was very close to Indian people, understood them. And I think, particularly with respect to Stewart, who was quite avowedly a "liberal Westerner," naturally interested in natural resources; and Morris, though not in quite the same ideological way, but equally as attuned to those interests--it couldn't be much of anything else.

JF: Sort of a similar question: They came from a very conservative Republican background, and both turned into rather liberal Democrats. At what point do you think, or what influenced them to go their own ways?

CA: Well, first.... I guess I wouldn't have characterized their background as conservative Republican. There's certainly a wing of the Udall family that's Republican and very conservative. I think it's also true probably that Levi and maybe Louise, their parents, were conservative. I thought Levi was a Democrat, however.

JF: You may be right, actually.

CA: But the Democrats that they came from, the Democrats of Arizona at that time, were by and large conservative Democrats. They were mostly "pinto Democrats" as we used to call them. Morris and Stewart were bright young guys who were moving out on their own, they were charting their own course, they were going their own way. And they came to the University, as adults, anyway, after the Second World War, and there were a strain of American veterans who were liberal, and who were the children of the New Deal, and they were continuing in that vein. Particularly Stewart was quite ideologically liberal. Morris was too, but in a much more pragmatic and quiet fashion.

JF: So to some extent, they were products of their time.

CA: They were products of their time.

JF: I'm going to stop to turn the tape over.