

Regional Oral History Office
The Bancroft Library

University of California
Berkeley, California

Jack Citrin:
Free Speech Movement Oral History Project

Interviews conducted by
Lisa Rubens
in 2001

Copyright © 2013 by The Regents of the University of California

Since 1954 the Regional Oral History Office has been interviewing leading participants in or well-placed witnesses to major events in the development of Northern California, the West, and the nation. Oral History is a method of collecting historical information through tape-recorded interviews between a narrator with firsthand knowledge of historically significant events and a well-informed interviewer, with the goal of preserving substantive additions to the historical record. The tape recording is transcribed, lightly edited for continuity and clarity, and reviewed by the interviewee. The corrected manuscript is bound with photographs and illustrative materials and placed in The Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley, and in other research collections for scholarly use. Because it is primary material, oral history is not intended to present the final, verified, or complete narrative of events. It is a spoken account, offered by the interviewee in response to questioning, and as such it is reflective, partisan, deeply involved, and irreplaceable.

All uses of this manuscript are covered by a legal agreement between The Regents of the University of California and Jack Citrin dated March 10, 2003. The manuscript is thereby made available for research purposes. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publish, are reserved to The Bancroft Library of the University of California, Berkeley. Excerpts up to 1000 words from this interview may be quoted for publication without seeking permission as long as the use is non-commercial and properly cited.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to The Bancroft Library, Head of Public Services, Mail Code 6000, University of California, Berkeley, 94720-6000, and should follow instructions available online at <http://bancroft.berkeley.edu/ROHO/collections/cite.html>

It is recommended that this oral history be cited as follows:

Jack Citrin, "Free Speech Movement Oral History Project: Jack Citrin" conducted by Lisa Rubens in 2001, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 2013.

Table of Contents – Jack Citrin

Interview 1: February 8, 2001

Tape 1

1

Starting graduate school at Berkeley, fall 1964 -- recollections of the sit-in at Sproul Hall, arrests, and the meeting at the Greek Theater -- working at the Survey Research Center, surveying the arrested students -- esteem for the university, sociology department -- political divisions following the FSM within the sociology department -- on being an outsider, not American -- perspective on social movements, events, crowd behavior -- observations of Herb McCloskey's perspective on the Free Speech Movement -- gathering data and surveying FSMers -- the university administration's response to protest, ethnic studies 1990s

Tape 2

21

Working at Berkeley after receiving Ph.D., 1969 -- the Free Speech Movement and challenging authority -- position as athletic representative -- faculty members during the Free Speech Movement -- impact of the physical environment (Sproul Plaza), naivete of the students -- family background: Parents from Russia, living in China, being interned in Japan -- Jewish identity -- background as influence on political positions, importance of individual -- identity politics -- discussion of the Free Speech oral history project -- local connections from Asia

Interview with Jack Citrin

[Interview 1: February 8, 2001]

Tape 1

Rubens: I had a couple things really I was interested in. I wanted to talk about your cohort—how you came to Berkeley, and the extent to which you guys became a cohort. It doesn't have to be in this order, whatever memories come. I would love some memories, if you have them, vis-à-vis the Free Speech Movement that you think are important. If you're willing, I would love to make sure we get an accurate statement of your position on the brouhaha over the FTEs. Or you can cite something that you've written.

Let me just start: When did you come to Berkeley?

Citrin: I came to Berkeley in the fall of 1964 as a graduate student. That was the semester of FSM.

Rubens: Where did you come from? Why did you come here?

Citrin: I came from McGill University in Montreal, so I was not an American citizen. Now I am, but at that time I was not. I think that, to some degree, colored my views of everything that was going on. I came in the fall of 1964 and became part of a research group that Professor Herbert McClosky, who later became my Ph.D. advisor—but he hired me as a research assistant.

Rubens: That first semester?

Citrin: Near the beginning of that first semester. I met, then, a number of other people who were working for him as well. One of them, actually, was one of the people who was arrested in the Sproul Hall sit-in, a man by the name of Shannon Ferguson, who was not in graduate school, but who was working for Herb as a data analyst, as a programmer. He was one of the early sort of computer geeks, I guess.

Rubens: Had he been in graduate school at some point?

Citrin: I think he was trying to get into graduate school, Shannon that is. As this protest developed I was mainly an observer. I saw some of the rallies; I hung out at some of the rallies. I knew a number of people who were more active, and who we talked in a kind of a casual way about what was going on. Marty Roysner—I don't know if that name is familiar to you—but he was one of the steering committee, or coordinating committee, or whatever. He was one of the sort of leading groups. He was only a sophomore at the time, an undergraduate—I think a sophomore or junior. He was dating a woman whom

I knew from where I had gone to high school when our parents were good friends. I met him then, and then afterwards as well. I remember talking to him a little bit. But I was sort of peripheral, not really active.

Rubens: This is just what I'm trying to get at: undergraduate and graduate that basically are—.

Citrin: I think all of us at that time really—I don't know anyone who was not in some sense sympathetic, first of all to the claims being made, and then unhappy with the initial responses of the university.

I remember also—and you'll have to correct me on the timing of this—but I do remember that there was an attempt to reach some kind of a negotiated settlement. There was this big meeting at the Greek Theater in which the then chair of our department, Bob Scalapino, spoke. I was at that meeting, and I remember when Mario Savio walked out, and was dragged off, and so forth, and so on. I think there was a certain amount of ambivalence towards that. On the one hand there was, I think, a lot of people hoping that there would be some kind of resolution. On the other hand, there certainly was—I felt that the way that Mario was not allowed to speak in the context of the settlement on this particular issue in some sense underscored that there was a free speech issue involved.

Anyway, then things sort of progressed from there. The next thing that I can remember was the night of the sit-in itself.

Rubens: Theoretically—well, no, that's your memory, go on, go on.

Citrin: Do I have the dates in the reverse way?

Rubens: Yes, because the Greek Theater was after the arrest, because it was an attempt to smooth things over, and the students had come back from their arraignment, and then up there. Then, in the meantime, the Academic Senate was taking place.

Citrin: But the academic vote, I think, occurred after that meeting.

Rubens: Yes it did. The next day, I think. We're talking about observations; we don't have to do a narrative.

Citrin: I do remember that, but then let me go back a step because what I do remember is this—and I must have been a part of a series of just kinds of meetings and discussions that were occurring leading up to the sit-in. The night of the sit-in, at about 3:00 A.M., I got a phone call saying, "They are arresting these people. These people have been arrested. Can you come down?"

We're going to talk about what we can do because we know some people who were arrested." My friend Shannon was one of those. Then we talked with them that basically people are going to be released on their own recognizance, or what was going to happen—

Rubens: Do you remember who called you?

Citrin: Just another graduate student. I don't remember who it was. My wife and I got up, and we went down there and watched the sort of remnant of the police cleaning up after—

Rubens: I think they were still dragging people out by then.

Citrin: They were dragging some people out too. We saw some of that. They had these big buses right there at the Bancroft entrance, and they came out of that side entrance, and so forth. Anyway, that was all—

Then, we had a meeting—and I don't know if it was in connection with whom, or what, or whether it was sort of self generated—but we were working survey research.

Rubens: Survey?

Citrin: We were working at the Survey Research Center. McClosky's group was working at the Survey Research Center.

Rubens: Where was that?

Citrin: It was up at Piedmont, is where. 2220 Piedmont. It's now an empty lot. It's now where the driveway into the new Haas Business School comes down. That's where our research project was, and our group of people, and so we decided—because there was all this discussion about, Who were these students? They're not really good students. They're the riffraff. So we did a survey of the students who were arrested.

Rubens: With Legett?

Citrin: Bardach. You can see, it was published in this book by Lipset and Wolin, *The Berkeley Student Revolt*. You'll see that there's a little survey. I know it was Eugene Bardach and Jack Citrin, I think Paul Sniderman, and a couple of others of us. We very quickly put together this questionnaire, and I think while they were at some kind of a meeting with their lawyers, or something like that, we handed it out, filled it out, and we wrote it up. What we were able to show was that most of these people were excellent students on fellowship, blah, blah, blah. So it wasn't a kind of, you know, a proletariat, sort of dregs

of the student body, outside agitators. [interference of crowd] To the extent that I had any kind of activist involvement, other than going to meetings, and talking to people, and then trying to make sure that the people whom I knew who had been arrested would be okay. That was sort of my level of participation in that particular event.

The other thing was this: that Herb McClosky, my boss and mentor, was one of the people who worked out the Academic Senate resolution, and who spoke very eloquently at that meeting. Again, I was in the corridors of Wheeler. You know, there was a bunch of people in the corridors of Wheeler, and then they piped out the meeting to a whole group of people outside and listened to that. That sort of was a resolution that I think that I, for one, felt very kind of [pause] happy about, and sort of proud about, in the sense that my professor had been so instrumental in bringing that about.

I must say that on some other scores I didn't feel, never felt, the kind of passion or agreement—that I, to this day, think it was completely hyperbolic what Savio was saying, “You've got to—When the machine starts to grind you down, you've got to put yourself in the gears of the machine,” because my point of view was the machine wasn't grinding anyone down, that this was a great place to go to school. It was really, at that time, certainly in the social sciences, sort of the university was at it's absolute best.

I wasn't an undergraduate, so I didn't know what life was like as an undergraduate, but in looking back at it thirty-five years later, I have the sense that undergraduates were treated better then than they are now in terms of interaction with professors, and all of this stuff about having to fight for your courses, and TAs. I think it was just completely—

Rubens: The fighting for courses and TAs is more on-going now?

Citrin: Yes. I don't know what was meant by “the machine grinding it down,” but it certainly wasn't visible to me. Certainly, as a graduate student, none of that was relevant at all.

Rubens: That's what I wanted to ask you. I'm glad that you said your pride in McClosky. By the way, I've written him several times. I guess he's ill.

Citrin: He's ill, but I'll intervene with him on your behalf.

Rubens: Would you? Because Bob Price told me a story that he remembers vividly, but thinks definitely should be corroborated. Coming back from the Greek Theater, that event, McClosky, Wolin, and Kerr were together. They went up to the top of Barrows, and McClosky, Price said, pointed to the rally and said, “That's your public.”

- Citrin: You=ll have to ask him. I don't know about that story.
- Rubens: Let me throw out these things just very quickly regarding McClosky. Had you chosen Berkeley for a specific reason? Had you already decided you were interested in certain questions?
- Citrin: It was kind of ironic because I chose Berkeley because my advisor at McGill, who was an international relations scholar, and I was at that time in comparative politics and international relations—McGill had a pretty traditional kind of non-social sciencey department. He recommended that I apply to Berkeley and a couple of other places. Berkeley's attraction to me was partly location, and partly that I got a pretty attractive offer.
- Rubens: Fellowship?
- Citrin: I got a fellowship for one-year, and a promise of a TA-ship for the next year. I knew McClosky's name because we had used a textbook of his on Soviet politics as an undergraduate. I had no idea that he had long since departed from Soviet politics and was doing American politics and political psychology. But since I knew his name and they said, "Do you want any particular person as an advisor?" I said, "Well—." So I went to see him, and he suggested that I take his seminar, and after I did some work for him in his seminar he asked me to work for him, and that was the beginning of our relationship. That whole research setting was the most important part of my graduate education by far, much more than any course work or anything like that.
- Rubens: Say something about that.
- Citrin: Well, because we were part of a team of people; there was a group of people. McClosky was doing pioneering work.
- Rubens: Just a little sentence on that, because I don't know—
- Citrin: McClosky was one of the people who essentially started to directly examine the attitudes, backgrounds, and psychological characteristics of political leaders and political followers. He did this in a very systematic way. He's done some sort of pioneering work on American political ideology; some pioneering work on the differences between Democrats and Republicans.
- Rubens: This had already been published?
- Citrin: Some of it was published, some of it was in the process. We worked on those projects. He had a very good—and I've adopted this attitude. He gave his research assistants a lot of freedom, and he listened to what they had to say,

and he rewarded them for their work. I've tried to emulate that. That was one experience that I think sort of forged my future academic work. The other was that he had four or five research assistants and we were kind of like a little group, a little family. It was a very sort of—those years—it was a very, very intense kind of set of interactions. I know you know Ken Jowitt-

Rubens: Ken wasn't—

Citrin: No, Ken was not in that group, but they had their own group with him, and Sturdevont and Jervis, and those people. We had a large department at that time, a large graduate student body, and there were these sort of clusters of people.

Rubens: What was your cluster?

Citrin: My cluster was Eugene Bardach, who's now professor at the Graduate School of Public Policy here.

Rubens: I guess I misunderstood. He was a student at the time?

Citrin: He was a graduate student at the time. Paul Sniderman, who's now a professor at Stanford. David Elkins, who's now a professor at University of British Columbia. We had this Shannon Ferguson who was a kind of a, as I say, computer specialist who was arrested in FSM. He had a secretary, a woman who sort of was like the earth mother for all of us.

Rubens: Do you remember her name?

Citrin: Her name was Carol Wallin. She now lives in Los Angeles. You know, we were very, very close. We spent a lot of time together working. I mean, we worked long hours up there at night and stuff.

Rubens: Another year or two? How long did that go on?

Citrin: I worked for Herb from then until 1967.

Rubens: And some of those other people?

Citrin: And Paul roughly overlapped with me. Everyone had at least two, sometimes three, years of work.

Rubens: You were saying it was one of the best in social science and McClosky's star started to rise.

Citrin: No, he was already established as the A-star in his subfield within the discipline. But just Berkeley in general, I mean it's hard almost to describe. It

was really FSM and the war in Vietnam had some casualties—I mean it took some casualties—but if I think about the sociology department at that time, it was just a list of luminaries. It was a list of luminaries. I took several courses in sociology.

Rubens: What I'm trying to get at now is that if you remember any discussion—not necessarily vis-à-vis being an activist—but the issues. You thought the university was great. What were these students complaining about? Your professor is a compromiser?

Citrin: He was a centrist.

Rubens: Centrist, but he became converted to at least the fact that the administration was blundering, or—. You said he was eloquent during the—

Citrin: I think he pretty quickly—I don't know that he ever was opposed to kind of the free speech—. I think, you know, it was an ends-mean kinds of thing often that arose in all of these things. I think the Free Speech Movement was sort of the most consensual moment, okay?

Rubens: I get it, because after that—

Citrin: After that, new divisions began to arise. The issues changed, and—

Rubens: Except for the theorists. How severe were the divisions that you felt?

Citrin: I think the split between the theorists and the rest of the department emerged after FSM. And I think there were several different strands that ran into it: politics and the issues were one; but intellectual issues, just within the discipline, converged with those, or sort of overlapped, and reinforced some of those divisions.

During the FSM period, and even after that, I remember going to a meeting at Sheldon Wolin's home on Cedar Avenue—and I was not a student of his—but just with a group of students sort of saying, “What should we do? What's the next kind of step?” Sitting there smoking a cigar and talking to us.

Rubens: Particularly in association with FSM, or later?

Citrin: This was, I think, after FSM. I never was a student of Wolin's. I didn't really know him well. Certainly he was a figure who was charismatic for many of the theory students, and not just the theory students, because at that time we had a political theory requirement in our department and so many students had to—even if they weren't theory as their main field—had to take Wolin's

undergraduate courses or his graduate seminar. He had an impact that went beyond just his sort of graduate student cohort.

- Rubens: The specific question is if you were particularly aware of any real split that would have impacted the department's position, or student participation, or any of that, in that one semester particularly.
- Citrin: At that particular time, I mean there were no internal issues that I knew of in our department. We had our program—
- Rubens: You were working.
- Citrin: We were working.
- Rubens: You were married.
- Citrin: Married or not, I don't think that was relevant. I think graduate students were treated well, as far as I could tell—I mean, I was. We had a difficult, rigorous program, but you know—. You could rent a place for ninety dollars a month; there was not [a] housing crunch.
- Rubens: Were you intellectually alive with the program?
- Citrin: Yes.
- Rubens: That just really was engaging?
- Citrin: Yes. To me, my previous education, a lot of the stuff was completely new to me in terms of the types of the books that we were reading, the types of arguments that were going on, the methodologies that were being debated. This was really one of the happiest periods of my life. I would have to say that. Also, I would have to say that I was a little bit of a kind of an outlander because first of all I wasn't an American.
- Rubens: Did that inhibit you, that you thought you might not be able to—you shouldn't sit down?
- Citrin: No, no. Well, I think that you shouldn't sit in was a kind of a consideration, in fact, because there was a discussion of this, that sort of even among people who were sitting in, people who were foreign students, it was suggested that they leave. But I wasn't sitting in. No, what I'm saying is—and I think this has sort of colored my whole attitude towards a lot of the issues—if you're an immigrant to the United States, if you have a background where you've lived in a lot of different places, first of all, you don't feel the wages of sin, or the wages of history in the same way. So certainly when it comes to issues say of

slavery, for example. I think Americans carry a different kind of guilt about that that someone like me—I mean I can discuss it in an intellectual way, and tell you that it's wrong, and then discuss what's right and what's wrong in the race issues; but I don't have this kind of sense of, you know, this is a stain on my country because, you know, it's my country in a different kind of a way. That's one thing.

The second thing is, I think that there's a kind of a sense that if you lived in different places, and so forth, you know how spoiled Americans are; and you know how spoiled American students are; and you know spoiled everyone is with respect to freedom. There's kind of—as I said to you earlier—sort of a kind of a cynicism, or at least a kind of skepticism, when someone gets up and says, “They're grinding us down!” How are they grinding you down? I didn't really—I mean in what sense, you know, when like ninety-nine percent of the people on the face of the earth would be happy to be ground down there?

Rubens: There is the issue of Kerr's vision of the university. Let me lay out an argument though. I agree with you, completely. I was a freshperson here and I didn't get engaged by FSM. And I didn't get engaged in the details, or attention to it, other than as a contest of power between students and the administration. I was much more interested in Proposition 14 and labor issues. I also thought, These guys are so argumentative. If you're going to break the rule then take the consequences, don't be arguing over another person being expelled, et cetera.

In the course of this study, and paying attention to it, a thing that keeps coming back that seems unresolved—and as a political scientist I particularly want to ask you about this—there seem to have been a lot of students who didn't feel in anyway alienated. You took for granted that you had to be in at eleven if you were a woman; that you called your professors “Mr.” and there were regulations, and they weren't onerous. Maybe there had been a movement to integrate fraternities and sororities, but yes, it was a wonderful place.

But there was this rhetoric that captured enough people. Had there not been the critical numbers, it wouldn't have gone the way it did. I suppose the two are the car and the sit-in. The car because it was just so stupid. It was a sunny day and people said, “Sit down,” and they did. The sit-in because the university had, in a certain way, wound it up again by expelling more students. And then that rhetoric—people say when they heard him [Savio], they would almost go into the ends of the earth. Why?

Citrin: If you think of it just analytically, most social movements you mobilize a kind of a previously acquiescent mass, and people who don't really have a particular coherent ideological vision or commitment through leadership.

Events are critical. Events spark this kind of underlying feeling. Events and the behavior of authorities is absolutely critical. It's very easy to get young people to focus their hostility on authorities, for whatever reason, without there necessarily being an intellectualized, theoretical basis for it. Although for the leadership, for the vanguard, there may well be.

The second thing is that people learn to rationalize their behavior. They act in this way and in some sense they become socialized and they gain consciousness by taking on a legitimate explanation for conduct that otherwise might be harder to justify. I think that's just commonplace. I think you see that in examples. So how many students—you were here—know the meaning of the multiversity; who knows what that's all about? It's all garbage to people. It's even garbage, you know, in sort of a fundamental sense today. What does that mean? And yet, that becomes kind of something that symbolically can justify your behavior in saying, "What we are fighting for is sort of human values, individualized education," all of these other kinds of things, because those are the reasons that are given to you to sort of explain a behavior.

Then the other thing that happens is crowd behavior. Crowd behavior.

Rubens: Do you remember McClosky talking about that at all? I mean in the halls, or amongst when you were doing the research?

Citrin: No, no, no, no. His approach—he is an old fashioned liberal. He is an old fashioned Hubert Humphrey type of liberal.

Rubens: I didn't know Walter Mondale was still alive. I heard this voice on the air [radio] the other day.

Citrin: Oh yeah, he's still there. Herb came out; he came here from Minnesota. He was a liberal; he believed in free speech; he believed in kind of—he wrote an article called, "The Fallacy of Absolute Majority Rule."

Rubens: Is this right around the time? Afterwards?

Citrin: A little earlier. A little earlier.

He wrote an article called, "The Fallacy of Absolute Majority Rule," which basically was, in some ways, an echoing of James Madison's argument about the tyranny of the majority. He said that, you know you can't allow a majority to destroy the fundamental principles that allow for democracy. There's got to be some limits on majority rule. I think he felt very, very strongly that free speech was almost a *sine qua non*, and that the academy, of all places, should not be limiting freedom of speech, or freedom of inquiry. He was not involved in the Academic Senate, particularly. He was not involved in all of these

arguments of what education should be like. He came; he taught a seminar; he did his research, end of story. There was not a whole lot of discussion about these things, and I don't think there was a whole lot of discussion about these things even among the political theorists until after the fact.

Rubens: So the reason that he was eloquent in the Academic Senate—?

Citrin: He just made a very careful, coherent argument in favor of free speech.

Rubens: And in terms of your knowledge he didn't speak on Sproul steps, or on the car?

Citrin: No, no, no. Never, no. I don't know of any faculty member who was involved.

Rubens: In your department.

Citrin: I don't if even in—maybe some in some other—

Rubens: Yes, Lipset. There's some stories about Lipset.

Citrin: Did Lipset appear there to oppose this?

Rubens: During the car, just during the car incident.

Citrin: It's possible. It's possible

Rubens: Likening it to mad behavior.

I think the way you're going with all this critical mass, responsible authority—I wanted to just say in the liberal tradition which McClosky must have come out of, the one place where the issue of free speech was so dramatic clearly articulated was, if you can't hand out a leaflet that says there is this ballot issue, Prop. 14, there will be a speaker coming—. That that was, in the end, the relationship between inquiry and action.

Citrin: I think that for many people on the faculty at that time—and I know this because this is what I came to feel later on—and you asked me about this ethnic studies protest—some of the behaviors of the protesters were unpleasant, or one disapproved. But in that particular case it was pretty clear that on the substance, sort of on the merits of the case, where people came down—let's face it: the FSM kind of protests were mild, I mean, they were nothing. There was no property damage; there was no physical assault, okay. They wanted to arrest Weinberg so they surrounded the car—that was one thing—and the next thing was the sit-in. That upped the ante, but people were arrested for that. So I don't think that the kinds of things that happened

afterwards that led to people who had been pro-FSM turning away from the aftermath, the sort of the progeny, as it were. I call them the mutants.

Rubens: The mutants?

Citrin: The mutants.

Rubens: Who are you referring to?

Citrin: I'm referring to the mutants. I think, Filthy Speech Movement.

Rubens: The mutation of the—

Citrin: The mutation. Some of the anti-war protests, the attacks on the university—I think that's where people who were together on FSM began to really split.

Rubens: Unfortunately, my mandate is to do just the academic year, and I would like the connections. I have two more specifically vis-à-vis McClosky and you. One is actually an aside: Do you recall—I don't mean it on a gossipy level—a relationship between McClosky and Jack Scharr? He was the American theorist. Rogin was new and was rewriting his dissertation really into a book. I just don't know if there was ever some dialogue between those two.

Citrin: I think McClosky and Jack were friends. They had published an article together. When I say they were friends, I mean I think they had collaborated; they were cordial friends. I don't know if they were socially interacting at that time. Beyond that, at that particular time, whether they had any discussions or anything at that time—. I'll tell you, my perception—and other people may tell you differently—was that Jack Scharr was not particularly engaged in this process, in this thing. I think that Sheldon Wolin was more so, so Jack was—and I think, you know, Herb and Sheldon, they had good relations at the time, going into this.

Rubens: Tell me just a little more about the institute research—

Citrin: Survey Research Center.

Rubens: Do you know whose idea it was to get the FSM data?

Citrin: The FSM data idea was Bardach and me. As I remember, we just said, "Hey, here are these assertions going on the newspaper. We know some of these people. We can do survey research." We didn't know the exact results. We were sort of confident as to what we would find, and we said, "We will do this."

- Rubens: This was after the arrests?
- Citrin: After the arrests. Who knows who's going to be arrested until they're arrested?
- Rubens: Exactly.
- Citrin: So it was after the arrests, and I think there were 800 people arrested. I think we got 570 questionnaires.
- Rubens: Do you recall discussing it with McClosky?
- Citrin: I don't know that we discussed it. We told him we were going to do it. He sort of encouraged it, but we didn't run the questionnaire by him or anything. We were pretty self-confident.
- Rubens: You had also said earlier that McClosky fostered a kind of independence.
- Citrin: Yes. And we did it, and we wrote it up.
- Rubens: And we have it in the book to see?
- Citrin: I think it's in the book. I'm pretty sure it's in that book.
- Rubens: What about John Leggett? He also had some kind of short survey, and I wondered if you knew him?
- Citrin: I don't know him.
- Rubens: He was a professor who had already—
- Citrin: Sociology, right? Or something?
- Rubens: No, he was political science. Or am I wrong?
- Citrin: I don't think he was in political science.
- Rubens: You're right, I've got it completely wrong. I got it wrong, yes, right. It was Carey McWilliams, Jr. who told me about him. McWilliams had just left.
- Citrin: Lipset did this big survey of American college students at some point; he's published some stuff. And I think that our paper is published in the book edited by Lipset and Wolin called *The Berkeley Student Revolt*. I think it's somewhere in the back of the book.
- Rubens: I think you're right. I'll double-check that.

- Citrin: We just did that. And I think we did that, obviously, out of sympathy and commitment to the FSM and sort of to these people, and sort of as part of kind of the more public argument, because there was a public debate going on then, right? Reagan was about to emerge on the scene. But even with Pat Brown there was all this discussion about outside agitators, and Communists, and this, that, and the other kind of thing.
- Rubens: And then the old Communists were debating how the enemy is not the liberal.
- Citrin: There were some old Communists as part of this thing.
- Rubens: Of course Bettina was. She was very conservative relatively.
- Citrin: Bettina and I think Weinberg. At any rate, you know, none of that really was relevant. I think there was a kind of a sense, almost, of solidarity with your friends. I knew maybe ten people who were arrested, and I knew them all as good students and serious people. They were risking a lot to do this. There was not going to be the sense of, Well, we're going to let—so that was how we discussed it. We did it—it was like, in about three weeks, we did this study.
- Rubens: Do you have any image particularly of handing it out, or how the students responded?
- Citrin: The first thing I remember is that there were old lithograph machines—no xeroxing then, right? So we had these lithograph things, you know, cranked it out in this purple ink, you know, which you could hardly see with all the smudges. And then counting them up, and getting the punch cards, and doing the counter-sorter, which is how they count the Florida ballots.
- Rubens: You literally had those IBM cards?
- Citrin: Yes, we punched in; we had a code book. So, you know, name or gender would be one variable, and department, and this kind of stuff.
- Rubens: And handing them out?
- Citrin: No, we didn't do—once we collected the questionnaires we then put it on these IBM cards.
- Rubens: I understand, but just you have a vivid image at each end, I wondered if you had one in the middle of seeing—

- Citrin: Oh yeah, they had a big meeting, I think were talking to the lawyers, or something like that, and I think it was Gene who got up and said, “We’re going to do this survey and here it is,” and handed it out, and then—
- Rubens: Any particular response?
- Citrin: It was interesting because it was a kind of a combination of sort of a buzzing and humming, you know, people sort of know—everybody knew each other by this point in time. Kind of a sense, Yeah, okay, we’re going to fill this out. That’s, I think, why we got as many as we did.
- Rubens: And it was a lot. Geez, that was a lot.
- Citrin: Of the people who were at the meeting, I think virtually everybody filled it out.
- Rubens: Maybe we should move on.
- I’m wondering now as a political scientist, as someone who’s also, besides telling a story, helping me figure this out. I think your point about event and authority, that has really helped me in terms of looking at it. There are these critical events. I think there are leaders who do emerge at the time to articulate something that motivates people, whether they really felt they were being ground into dust, I don’t know. But authority—the university did behave stupidly in some cases, and also for students who read the next day in the newspapers something that is very different than what they knew. That was a kind of undermining of authority.
- Citrin: I think that these large institutions have a lot of difficulty in selecting leaders with a human face. When I talk to people who went to Cal in the forties and fifties, they talk about the then- president and chancellor Robert Sproul with affection and respect, and as if they knew him. The then-chancellor Strong struck me, even then, as being almost like a [pause] caricature. Where did they dig this guy out? It’s kind of a wooden person who exuded no human qualities, no empathy. Kerr, who is, I think, a very—in some ways a complicated person, a subtle person, and a warm person, and an intellectual person, nonetheless comes across as kind of, you know, a computer nerd. I think they didn’t understand what was going on, and I think that they failed to behave in a way that would have given them a chance to resolve this.
- I think what happens [is] in that confrontation you get into a dialectic with, if the leaders of the protest are smart, and they see what an advantage they have by their antagonism, making them behave in ways that make it harder to back down, or to compromise, or anything.

- Rubens: How lucky for Mario he could collapse on the stage, in front of—
- Citrin: Yes. I think that actually, if you think from beyond that point, and over time, I think, through the sixties and early seventies, faculties and university administrators learned how to cope with protest. They have a ritualized way of dealing with it, which in fact—you asked me earlier about ethnic studies. Berdhal kind of didn't successfully implement—
- Rubens: I have to tell you honestly, I don't know the story. In the shortest way, what do you mean Berdhal? There had evolved a kind of ritual on a more human, but also—?
- Citrin: I'll tell you my point of view, and I hope it's on the record for everyone to listen to. Ethnic studies and African American studies at Cal basically need to be conceived of as what, in the legislative world, we call a "pork barrel" and a "pay off." It is kind of a way of showing symbolically some kind of support and commitment to the aspirations of minority groups. These programs are academically in the minor leagues; they have a high dose of propaganda in their offerings, and they cater primarily to minority students who, in my view, would be much better suited, once they're at Berkeley, of taking topics that would enhance their life opportunities. That's just a particular point of view. But they exist.
- I've been on a number of ad hoc committees where I've been an outside department person reviewing the promotional records of people in these departments. And I can tell you unequivocally that if this was a history, economics, psychology, political science, English department there would be no way that these people would be promoted. Okay, so that is sort of the reality of the situation.
- However, despite that fact, in the 1990s during the period of a) declining enrollments in those departments, and b) faculty cuts in other departments; these departments were the only two departments in the social sciences to be spared cuts; to, in fact, be allowed to grow. I'm talking about African American Studies and ethnic studies.
- Rubens: Those are two distinct things? It's not that Afro comes under ethnic?
- Citrin: No, Afro is separate.
- Rubens: And you mean declining enrollments across the board, not just in Afro and Ethnic?
- Citrin: Both, in both of those departments.

- Rubens: Not necessarily in political science or—
- Citrin: No, because political science, and psychology, for example, which are two—okay, I wrote this up in an article that I will send you.
- Rubens: You said that.
- Citrin: But who knew this? The only way we knew this [was] by statistics that the administration, that the chancellor, circulated himself.
- Rubens: And who was chancellor at the time?
- Citrin: Berdahl.
- Rubens: He had just come in?
- Citrin: He had been here about a year, a year-and-a-half. What happened was—for whatever reasons—students in ethnic studies, aided and abetted by faculty in ethnic studies, generated this protest demanding more budget, demanding more faculty FTE's. They started out with a sit-in in Barrow's Hall, and then, after the sit-in, their leaders entered into negotiation with the vice chancellor who basically said, "Look, we're not going to—"
- Rubens: "We can't give."
- Citrin: No, "We won't give. You've grown. You have your appointments that will go through the regular process."
- Rubens: Why Barrow's Hall? Is that where—?
- Citrin: That's where the ethnic studies—that's where both of those departments are located.
- Rubens: Why are they sitting in their own offices?
- Citrin: They tried to close down the building.
- Rubens: I see, so that all the other departments—
- Citrin: Yes, right. Okay, so then what happened was the chancellor came in and he ended up sort of negotiating with them, and once again, basically saying, "No."
- Then at some point, six people started a "hunger" [quotes specified by Citrin] strike. Not all of them were Cal students; I guess a couple were from San Francisco State. So they were having this as Matty Price, Bob Price's son,

who's a cardiologist, said, "If they were drinking Jamba Juice and Ensure they were taking in more protein than 95 percent of the people on the face of the earth." Anyway, the bottom line is—

- Rubens: I don't know why you said Jamba Juice. Because it was down the street—?
- Citrin: Because it's right there on Bancroft; you can get it. At any rate, so the chancellor went through all of these sort of statements, "I'm not going to give in," blah, blah, blah. The budget committee of the academic senate opposed any change in the normal procedures for allocating FTE's. I then wrote an op-ed piece for the San Francisco Chronicle on Thursday, May the 6th, I think it was, saying the chancellor should not give in—that one, it's just a terrible precedent to set; and two, raising some issues about sort of what the quality of these programs are, and saying that what they really create are ethnic enclaves rather than an integrated intellectual community where people learn about different groups and interact. All right, so that was that. The very next day the chancellor essentially capitulated, in every respect, to these students.
- Rubens: Are you implying any connection, or saying there was—?
- Citrin: Between my article? No, there's no article. It's just I wrote my article saying this and then the very next day he capitulated.
- Rubens: Proof of the pudding, sort of.
- Citrin: Well, I was not alone in being enraged, but I was maybe more enraged than most and more willing to act on my outrage.
- Rubens: I was about to say, didn't it take courage to do that?
- Citrin: I suppose. Then, what happened after that was I talked to a group of people and said, you know, "This should be brought up before the Academic Senate."
- Rubens: Were you an administrator at the time?
- Citrin: No.
- Rubens: Professor of political science.
- Citrin: Well I did have a position. I had the position of faculty athletic representative, from which the chancellor dismissed me within a month of this.
- Rubens: On what grounds?
- Citrin: He has his grounds, but I think it's ironic when you talk about it in the context of the Free Speech Movement. [laughing]

- Rubens: Do you serve at the pleasure of the chancellor?
- Citrin: Yes, you do, so it was fine. Many of my friends say, “Oh, how could he do this?” blah, blah, blah. I say, “Hey, you know, I served at the pleasure of the chancellor. He didn’t want to have anything to do with me.”
- Rubens: But before you were dismissed you were already thinking of going to the Academic Senate?
- Citrin: We had started this discussion of going to the Academic Senate.
- Rubens: “We,” as others who were—?
- Citrin: John Searle, a couple of other people. More people, but then when it actually comes down to drafting a resolution and putting your name on it, you find out the level of cowardice that pervades academic life. I really think that academics, in terms of the courage scale, must rank among the lowest of any profession. I’ve really come to that point of view.
- Rubens: Do you mean academics in terms of courage or just putting themselves on the line?
- Citrin: Academics as a group, putting themselves on the line, are the least courageous set of people that I’ve ever encountered. One of the supreme ironies of it is that they have very little to risk since unlike most people in most jobs, academics have tenure.
- Rubens: I was going to ask about the risk, okay. Anyway, you draft the resolution.
- Citrin: We drafted a resolution and we held a meeting of the academic senate at which all the old faculty Left, from Reggie Zelnik on down, came and voted down the resolution. And also prevented a mailed ballot to the entire faculty, because if you had a mail ballot, I suspect the outcome might have been pretty different. But not too many people want to get up in front of the chancellor in a room where you can be seen, and put your—
- Rubens: I just want to ask you about the mailed ballot part. Wouldn’t that be a more neutral—? But also it was clearly a political tactic.
- Citrin: It’s political; it’s tactical. I think that’s that.
- Leading up to that vote, I wrote an article for *Heterodoxy* about the issue, and about the chancellor. I’ll send it to you. I’m very proud of it, but it was, shall we say, in the acerbic tradition of British polemics. The headline about the chancellor—the picture of the chancellor was underneath—it said,

“Chancellor Robert Berdahl, a Chamberlain, not a Churchill.” So you get the drift.

Rubens: Smart title.

Citrin: That was that. We had this motion, and the chancellor got up and spoke, and the establishment rallied behind him. There’s an establishment group among the faculty: people who kind of defer to authority no matter who the authority is, and then there’s an ideological group. On this particular case, and I think in most cases, the chancellor is sort of the leader of the Left, as it were, because he’s a big believer in affirmative action, and all of those kinds of things. I think he actually is probably sincere whereas many of the people who espouse these ideas are hypocrites, but there it is. That was this ethnic studies protest.

Rubens: What year was that?

Citrin: That was 1999.

Rubens: Just recently? I didn’t realize it. So it’s going on as the same time as 209.

Citrin: It’s three years after 209. 209 passed in 1996.

Rubens: And do you take a particularly political or public position on 209 to the same degree that you did about—?

Citrin: No, absolutely not. I didn’t say a word.

Rubens: So this was a very principled. And have situations changed at all regarding—?

Citrin: For me, or for—?

Rubens: No. Well, you’re not the athletic rep.

Citrin: I guarantee you; I will have been purged and never considered again for any administrative position on this campus. Not that I care, but that’s just the reality.

It’s interesting because we started with FSM and so we’re probably the litmus test of being in the administration was not to be soft on students. Today, the litmus test to be an administrator on this campus—certainly and probably in many, many other campuses throughout the world—is you have to be a kind of identity politics liberal. Not a liberal, but an identity politics liberal. You have to support ethnic studies; you have to support affirmative action; you have to say all of the things. Even if you don’t believe it, you have to say

those things; and if you don't then you have no chance being appointed anything.

Rubens: Is that what you meant by Berdahl steps outside the ritual behavior modes that had been set up after FSM in a way?

Citrin: What Berdahl did was he—what had happened afterwards is they had developed a way of kind of getting to a resolution through negotiation—or not backing down, but not being too harsh on the students. What he ended up doing was, you know, sort of talking tough and pounding his chest and then totally capitulating.

Rubens: Let me just ask a few more little leftovers here, especially speaking to FSM. You get your Ph.D. When did that come through?

Citrin: I got my Ph.D., I think, in '69.

Rubens: And when were you hired here at the university?

Citrin: Same year.

Rubens: And you've been here. This has been your—

Citrin: This has been my home.

Rubens: There was a cohort; it seems to me, I mean I particularly know of Jowitt and Price. You—I don't know if there are others. Hold one second while I go to tape—

Tape 2

Citrin: Well, I think at that time, and before us, Berkeley would hire its own students.

Rubens: History wouldn't, I don't think.

Citrin: Well, Reggie Zelnik was hired there, and he was someone who was involved—

Rubens: I thought he was at Stanford. Yes, he got his Ph.D. at Stanford.

Citrin: He got his Ph.D. at Stanford, but he was teaching here then, before he got his Ph.D.

Rubens: Yes, he couldn't go to the academic summit.

- Citrin: But I think in our department, it was not unique. Hal Jacobs had been a Berkeley Ph.D.; Hannah Pitkin is a Berkeley Ph.D. But at that particular time when we got hired, the department was expanding. It had hired thirteen people in three years.
- Rubens: Well, you were also in a different field, too.
- Citrin: Yes, in a different field. Well, hopefully. But we don't do that anymore, actually. I think in the sciences they still do it more because I think no one wants a superstar to leave and go and take the federal money to another institution. In the social sciences and humanities, maybe it's less. We have a sort of norm now that we will hire our own students, but only after they've been elsewhere for a few years and have established a sort of reputation outside of here. But I was very lucky; I was fortunate.
- Rubens: And your dissertation was—
- Citrin: My dissertation was on political alienation and political allegiance, which is sort of in, some sense fitting with the topic that we've been discussing.
- Rubens: We don't have to do it now, but I would really love to come back at another time [to talk] about how much people push when they question what my findings are about the Free Speech Movement. And mine's a cultural, social look at it through the oral histories, but I can't get this feeling that we were so alienated. Again, it was inchoate. I don't know how to speak to that, I think there were these building blocks of time and restrictions that all came down at the same time.
- Citrin: I think that if you are speaking about the Free Speech Movement, it's really wrong to speak about levels of alienation. I think that certainly, for a subgroup of the student body and the population as you move through the Vietnam era, and sort of the '67, '68, that particular period, a sense of hostility to the United States, a kind of hostility towards authority, a hostility towards the university grew among some people, among the most active elements. But I really think it's misleading to attribute that to a lot of the participants in the FSM. I don't know that our data, you know, our survey had questions of that nature, but knowing the people that I knew within that—
- Rubens: It was moral, right or wrong—
- Citrin: It was right or wrong, and it was, Hey, America's about free speech; We're not anti-American. We are realizing these values. Why are these guys telling us we can't campaign for racial equality? It was crazy; it was sort of insane.

- Rubens: I always thought that the irony was that within the movement, there was no particular addressing of how few blacks, Hispanics there were. It wasn't about teachers or administrators, it was just about this one issue; that's what it was.
- Citrin: I think that if that's what you are getting, that's your view, I really feel that.
- Rubens: Which is why I wasn't—
- Citrin: It's not to say that some people there—I know Mario or Bettina or whoever had broader kind of political views. But I'll tell you; Marty Roysner is someone—
- Rubens: I have to interview him.
- Citrin: You could ask him. I mean, neither then, nor subsequently, did I get that particular feeling from him.
- Rubens: Now the other who I think would almost just be a link between your position on the ethnic studies conflict—I can't think of his name. The current chair of the ethnic studies department, Ling-chi Wang—
- Citrin: Ling-chi Wang.
- Rubens: He came to two meetings. He was very articulate, but he said the university was shut down for nine weeks during the ethnic studies crisis, the original one. Nothing has ever been written about that; [nobody's] looked at that. You think about the authority and taking on a major institution.
- Citrin: Subsequently, after FSM, there were many more challenges to authority, both then and—
- Rubens: But that was the biggest—
- Citrin: In sort of an anti-war sort of a way.
- Rubens: —wouldn't you say? I mean, nine weeks?
- Citrin: Yes, I think I was here for that time, or part of that time. I don't really remember it all that well. I think it's wrong to say that the university was shut down for nine weeks because it was 1969, is that correct?
- Rubens: I'm not—
- Citrin: I think that's true. I think I was teaching then, and you know—
- Rubens: Maybe he means the strike; I may have been misrepresenting him.

Citrin: I mean, it was a much longer-term protest.

Rubens: Yes.

Citrin: I mean that's true.

Rubens: I mean, how many numbers were there? I don't know. It's not the point.

I want to just ask you, because you were athletic representative, when did you become that?

Citrin: 1990.

Rubens: Nine years. Craig Morton.

Citrin: Yes.

Rubens: Craig Morton was the football star already in 1964? He was on the Cal team.

Citrin: Yes. He was a quarterback.

Rubens: Do you think it's worth it all, is there anything worth asking the athletic department?

Citrin: I think that you could ask people who were involved in athletics then about how this event impacted on them, I would guess.

Rubens: Can you think of somebody who I might talk to?

Citrin: Hmm.

Rubens: Would Craig Morton—? Where does he live?

Citrin: He lives in Denver, but he comes around here.

Rubens: You know who I thought of asking? I don't know his name—I keep forgetting it—the agent.

Citrin: Lee Steinberg. He was here, he graduated in '70.

Rubens: So he wasn't here.

Citrin: So he wasn't here.

Rubens: Oh well, there we are. Someone has it wrong and you know that.

- Citrin: He graduated in '70, I remember.
- Rubens: My son's baseball coach's uncle was the baseball coach, and he thought he was there then. I called him up. This is what I like also, he says, "Oh yeah." I says, "Free Speech Movement." He says, "Oh yeah, I remember the airplanes and the gas," and you know immediately that that's not FSM. But people—
- Citrin: I think maybe people just sort of plunked it all together.
- Rubens: Absolutely, I think that's something.
- Citrin: I think the athletics department will tell you that the events here in the sixties and so forth set them back years because Berkeley became perceived as a place for radicals. It became perceived as sort of the more sort of conservative parents of these athletes at one level, We don't want to send our kids here. Then sort of the protests surrounding race lead to black student athletes being recruited away from here. I would say that the late sixties and early seventies were years from which it took the campus a lot to—
- Rubens: I don't think I'm going to get at anything particularly if I looked at '64 people, right?
- Citrin: I don't think so.
- Rubens: Well, that's sort of the last thing right now Jack. It's just listening to me and then I can show you the outline of categories. The main thing I've been doing is legal story, some professor-student relationship, trying to focus in on the political science department particularly.
- Citrin: Now Reggie, I think is writing a book.
- Rubens: Yes, he's editing an anthology. He's chucked my essay.
- Citrin: I saw the article by Bob Post.
- Rubens: I haven't seen it.
- Citrin: It's really pretty interesting.
- Rubens: Is it interesting? I have to read it. I will interview Buxbaum because he was here.
- Citrin: He was here.
- Rubens: And he was on the defense in some way, but I need to get a little more up to speed on free speech.

- Citrin: Well, are you interested in interviewing faculty?
- Rubens: Some faculty who were participants, but more—
- Citrin: Did you interview Howard Schachman by any chance?
- Rubens: I haven't. He's been interviewed for the loyalty oath crisis and we're hoping that the issue of money—
- Citrin: He was involved, and you know Herb will talk about his particular thing in the political science department.
- Rubens: I did do Wofsy—
- Citrin: Scalapino's around.
- Rubens: I've called Scalapino, I would like to do Scalapino, and I was a little intimidated thinking about how smart and or powerful these people are, including Jervis.
- Citrin: Scalapino would be a lot of fun because he's very diplomatic and he would give you—if he agreed—
- Rubens: To tell his story. Chalmers Johnson was his student, yes?
- Citrin: Yes, but Chalmers wasn't involved in any of this.
- Rubens: No. It's so interesting, in his recanting of the Vietnam War. The goal is to just get at the tertiary, the people who watched and sat down, but then went on their way. I have lots of names, I just wondered if there was anything, as a political scientist, but also as someone who observed, if you thought about other categories of inquiry. I'm trying to pursue the alienation, and the response to the rhetoric of Mario. What was it about him? You say the human face that Strong didn't have and Kerr didn't have that catch in Mario's voice that got people, it got people. The other thing about his speaking is that he seemed to go through a reasoning process out loud, and so he could bring—
- Citrin: He was very eloquent and—
- Rubens: He was a charismatic leader.
- Citrin: And you know, the other thing is, I think in a certain sense, you can think about how these events that the physical environment has something to do with it. You're sitting there, Sproul Hall; it's a small place, so if you have five or six hundred people there, it looks like it's a huge, huge crowd, right? So

sort of the center of things of most of the campus, like eight hundred people or a thousand people is five percent. But nonetheless, it seems big and cohesive.

I also have a kind of a funny feeling, I mean, I don't know if you talked to the participants, but my sense there was that there was a kind of a level of naivete, almost, and confidence. I think there was surprise when the police came in. I think there was kind of—on the one hand there was this protest, and all this rhetoric about how horrendous this institution was, but I think these were, for the most part, kids who had not experienced a lot of difficulty in their lives, who had nurturant environments, and who really did not expect it. I think in some sense, when those are the expectations, there is a point that it kind of fuels your anger—

Rubens: There was references to this as the Dr. Spock generation.

Citrin: Well, I don't know about that so much. I mean, this might be over-psychologizing, but let's face it, these are privileged people. Here they are in school at Berkeley, or in graduate school, and no one's—and I even think that in terms of expectations of how the administration would respond. I mean, in my own thinking about it, it wasn't the Sheriff Clark of Selma model that I thought, Oh gee, when you get into trouble in high school, they give you detention, right? I mean, maybe I'm being sort of naive, but I certainly think that as things took off, there was certainly the expectation that bad things could happen to you, and so there was a sort of gradual escalation on both sides.

Rubens: I forgot, until you said this, going to detention. There was something that people always talked about, which was their permanent record—that will follow you in your permanent record. Who knew that there were FBI and CIA records later on.

Speaking of records, do I need to ask you anything particularly about your family background that might have shaped you view of the world in any way? Were they activists, or particularly religious, or aware of—

Citrin: My parents were both born in Russia.

Rubens: Oh yes, but you said you moved around so much. Roughly this century or last?

Citrin: This century. They both fled from Russia after the revolution.

Rubens: 1917?

- Citrin: My father left in 1920, my mother in 1930. They moved to China because they were in Siberia, and that was the closest move for them.
- Rubens: Well obviously, were the families connected at all? Villages?
- Citrin: No. They both grew up in China, and they met at the University of Hong Kong. My father then became—he was an engineer. He became a naturalized British citizen and worked for the British Navy in Hong Kong. Then he moved to Shanghai when his father-in-law died to take over a small paper wholesaling business. Then we were in Shanghai during World War II.
- Rubens: You say we, when were you born?
- Citrin: I was born in 1941.
- Rubens: In Shanghai?
- Citrin: In Shanghai, and my family was interned by the Japanese in a camp from 1942 till 1945.
- Rubens: Including you?
- Citrin: Including me. That's where I grew up.
- Rubens: Have you ever written about this, or talked about this?
- Citrin: No. I mean, I've talked about it.
- Rubens: Interned. Was your family Jewish?
- Citrin: Yes. But that's not why we were interned.
- Rubens: No, I understand that.
- Citrin: We were interned because we were foreign nationals. We were nationals of a country that was at war with Japan, basically. The Japanese had occupied Shanghai in 1937 and then the international settlement where we lived after Pearl Harbor. About five months after Pearl Harbor we were interned.
- Rubens: What did you do to '45? That was four years. You were how old?
- Citrin: Well, when we went in, I was just one, then till when I was four and a half. So then you know, that's the background.
- Rubens: Well, wait, wait. So after the war—

- Citrin: After the war, we went back and we lived in Shanghai. My father went back to his business.
- Rubens: The paper factory was still there?
- Citrin: Well, it was not a factory; it was an import-export business. Then after the Communist revolution in Shanghai, in China. A year after that, we left. My family moved from Shanghai. Basically, almost all foreigners left China, leaving everything that they owned behind. Then we moved to Hong Kong, which was the closest place to go.
- Rubens: Did they have ties left there? They had been in Hong Kong?
- Citrin: Well, I mean, yes, they knew some people and my father tried to get a business going there. Then actually, through someone whom he had known in Shanghai, after the war he got a job in Tokyo. So we moved to Japan, and that's where I went to high school, in Japan.
- Rubens: An American high school?
- Citrin: American high school.
- Rubens: Not a British?
- Citrin: No.
- Rubens: They're not there; the Americans are there.
- Citrin: I switched from the British schools where I went to British schools in Shanghai and Hong Kong, and then I went to the American school there.
- Rubens: What was your father doing in Tokyo?
- Citrin: Business.
- Rubens: You say business, is it worth saying particularly what it was? The arena?
- Citrin: Textile and fashion business, importing European—
- Rubens: Did anyone in the family know Chinese and then Japanese?
- Citrin: They didn't know Chinese. My father learned Japanese pretty well. I learned Japanese. My younger brother was born in Japan and is bilingual.
- Rubens: What was your citizenship, British?

- Citrin: British.
- Rubens: Was his Japanese, or did he get to choose British or Japanese?
- Citrin: He was British. You can't become Japanese.
- Rubens: High school in America? Some day we must do more.
- Citrin: So my background was one of really non-belonging.
- Rubens: Well, I meant to ask you, when you said that you move around a lot—if you don't mind the interrupt—when did you get to Canada?
- Citrin: To university. When I finished high school, I went to university in Canada.
- Rubens: And why?
- Citrin: Because my mother had relatives there and it was cheap.
- Rubens: And your family stayed in Tokyo?
- Citrin: Yes.
- Rubens: Really?
- Citrin: My parents lived in Tokyo for forty-two years. 1954 till 1996. And my father retired. They moved here actually, and then my father died a couple of years ago. My mother still lives here.
- Rubens: Oh bless her heart! My god! And the brother? Just the two of you?
- Citrin: No there are three brothers. One of my brothers lives in Israel and works for an Israeli business, and my youngest brother who was born in Tokyo works for the IMF in Washington, D.C.
- Rubens: The International Monetary Fund?
- Citrin: Yes. He was a Berkeley undergraduate. He came here when I was a professor.
- Rubens: And he's the one that can speak Japanese?
- Citrin: Yes, he's perfectly bilingual.
- Rubens: In any way were you interested in going into Asian Studies? Because you had Chalmers Johnson, you had Scalapino—.

- Citrin: Well, it's because I think having been an ex-patriate, having lived in Asia all those periods—I love Asia, I love Japan.
- Rubens: You would go back?
- Citrin: I would go back, but I didn't want—you know, I wanted to have a place, a home, and I wanted my own family. If I had my own family to have deeper roots in a place than I had and so that was part of it. But it wasn't so self-conscious—I hooked up with McClosky and you know, to some extent, you go where you're lead.
- Rubens: That's unbelievable. I'm going to ask you just one more story and then let you go because it's a long time. Unbelievable story that your father took over a paper import-export business in Shanghai. I want to come back to that for a reason. I've just had the most extraordinary coincidence—I know through circles a guy named Bill Powell in San Francisco whose father was born in Shanghai and ran a newspaper.
- Citrin: Interesting.
- Rubens: I wondered if he was the son of a missionary. He was the son of a missionary, met his wife there, so did Bill. I can't think of the name of it, but Bill Powell is what it was, it was an English—
- Citrin: —language paper in Shanghai? I'm not sure.
- Rubens: Okay, I wondered if it spoke to you at all, did you know any name, did it ever come up?
- Citrin: My mother might know, I'll ask her.
- Rubens: I'll get the name of it; I'll email you the name of the magazine.
- Citrin: I will ask her.
- Rubens: They're not Jewish.
- Citrin: The school that I went to in Tokyo was founded by missionaries, initially was a school for missionaries. When I went there, 1955, '54, it was already sort of the international school for people who lived in Tokyo who wanted to educate their kids in English. There were some diplomats, some businessmen, some missionaries. Kind of a polyglot kind of a place. My senior class in high school had twenty-three students, fourteen nationalities.

- Rubens: And just to reiterate, the Jewish identity was not a critical one? That you have a brother that went to Israel?
- Citrin: No, the Jewish identity was a very critical one for my family. My family were not particularly religious Jews, but they certainly grew up involved in Jewish communities, and there were Jewish communities that were sort of the crucible of their social lives pretty much in Shanghai and in Tokyo, and even in Hong Kong, although less so in Hong Kong. No, and my parents were Zionists. After World War II, my father was the representative of Israel in Shanghai and responsible basically for arranging the exit of the Jews from Shanghai to other countries. So that's one of the reasons why we stayed in Shanghai for more than a year after the Communists took over, because my father was doing this work. He was always active in that way.
- Rubens: In all those years, '54 to '96 there was never a thought about moving to—
- Citrin: Moving? No.
- Rubens: To Israel?
- Citrin: No, not really. Because, you know, you have to make a living. You have to make a living. Plus, I think my parents—
- Rubens: Tokyo was a little safer! [laughter]
- Citrin: Well, not only that, my parents, this was their life—
- Rubens: And they had their kids.
- Citrin: Sort of. It's a little hard to explain, and I know a lot of people, when you grow up as a kind of ex-patriate in Asia in that way, there's a certain kind of way of living and lifestyle and people who you know. You know, it's not easy to pull up stakes and go elsewhere. Plus, my father loved Japan, and he had a pretty successful business. There was no reason for him to go anywhere, you know?
- Rubens: No one in the family took it over?
- Citrin: Well, my brother, the one whose in Israel worked in that business for a while, but then he and his family wanted to move to Israel. He has three kids; his wife is Israeli, so yes.
- Rubens: Well, that's a lot of stories there!
- Citrin: I have an interesting family.

Rubens: Really. Background, I mean. From another time. I mean what must it have been like to be a teenager in Japanese school with your family—the consequence of the internment. How many were there in that particular camp that they were in? Do you know?

Citrin: About a thousand.

Rubens: And it was literally in—

Citrin: Outside of Shanghai. Yes, we had a—you take half of this bar, like from here to the television set, across—three families would live in that space, separated by a sheet, curtains.

Rubens: Unbelievable. Do you have any pictures of that?

Citrin: We have a few.

Rubens: Well, I am very grateful for this. I just think some of the language also.

Citrin: It's a pleasure.

Rubens: And you will get it.

[tape interruption]

Citrin: My position on all of these political things that have come out, you know, that Berkeley has gone through and all of these issues of ethnic studies and so forth, is colored very significantly. You said about background—having been in the situations that I was, and also having had my father and my uncle and even myself experience the consequences of anti-Semitism or a Jewish quota, I totally oppose anything that doesn't judge people by individuals and that takes into account aspects of their background, whether it's religion or race or gender or anything like that. Sometimes I know I seem fanatical to some people about it, but I believe both in terms of psychologically—well psychologically it's one response—but I really believe that intellectually, that once you introduce those kinds of principles into the way that you treat people, that there's no end to it. There's no way you can logically draw the line. It sort of erodes what I've always felt was the core certainly of the university, the core of democracy, which is really [that] ideas are judged on their own merits, people are judged on their own merits, that kind. You're your own autonomous person. To some extent, I think FSM was consistent with that. And a lot of what's going on with those principles, with those kinds of principles of liberty and individualism, and a lot of what's going on in American politics and American academy since then really trampled on those principles.

- Rubens: Well, I agree with you, but I want to put all this back to you because I've never quite understood the definition of identity politics. I think that Todd Gitlin—I don't keep up with these arguments, but he is particularly arguing that identity politics undermined any sense of community. I think he calls it the "twilight of community."
- Citrin: I've seen that book; it's a good book.
- Rubens: What I'm wondering is how—well, maybe it's the passion—how come identity politics isn't embraced also in the context of interest group politics? The Madisonian associational splintering: there will always be new factions? I can't think that one out right now.
- Citrin: I think one of the reasons is that identity politics becomes a kind of an essentialist and refining role. You are a woman, this is inherent. You are a Latino; this is your essential identity.
- Rubens: It's also personal, isn't it? Madison was never talking about anything personal.
- Citrin: Madison talked about more than economic interests, but he didn't focus much on these kinds of things.
- Rubens: Personal and essential. Do you have a sense of when identity politics was really labeled "identity politics"? It's after—
- Citrin: The label is much later.
- Rubens: Probably eighties.
- Citrin: But I think the origins of identity politics are in black nationalism.
- Rubens: I think you're right. That's what I would have said. And then Latino, and the women's—
- Citrin: It's sort of imitative and partly because—. Some of it is genuine and some of it is purely instrumental and strategic.
- Rubens: Well then, the other thing I wanted to talk to you about is I want to pursue BICA. What sort of role that might have played here? Later on, the CoIntelPro program, people say that some of the—I haven't studied any of this—some of the most wild black nationalist or Black Panthers were agents.
- Citrin: Really? Yes.
- Rubens: Who knows? I don't know per se.

- Citrin: Well, I do think—I know nothing about this but I certainly wouldn't be surprised if the FBI and CIA had agents within these large movements, the anti-war movement, and so forth.
- Rubens: Sure, sure. We know that; it's in the records. So identity politics, that comes later when it emerged—as I agree with you, why the label comes. I guess someone is looking for it. I'm kind of interested in that, but I don't know who—. Maybe Gitlin even knows that, why the label comes.
- The other thing is—I actually talked to Reggie Zelnik about [this]—I remember so vividly that in those sixties people talked about what was politically correct. It didn't have the same commerce that it has today. It was an inside the movement talk, as opposed to a general—. That had to do with—
- Citrin: Well if you came out of a Marxist background, then the correct line was part and parcel of the discussion.
- Rubens: Right, exactly. That's right. You know, it's an older generation among students who are involved in all those splinter groups, the international socialists, and the YSA. I interviewed some of those because of the legacy of SLATE to FSM, but it's a new generation. It really seems to be a new generation of people who emerge, other than Bettina, who most everyone is saying was really rather conservative comparatively.
- Citrin: Because communists never liked this kind of stuff, they liked much more controlled—
- Rubens: Yes. Oh, and this is totally different—the person who has helped me a lot, but I don't talk to him as much as I'd like to, is Ray Colvig. Ray did a book with—
- Citrin: Seaborg.
- Rubens: Glenn Seaborg. And wasn't Glenn appointed to clean up the—? I can't remember now. There's a book about—
- Citrin: No. Glenn—you mean to clean up what?
- Rubens: One of the teams, basketball? The league?
- Citrin: Oh, Pac-10. He was involved in that for a while when they had some scandals.
- Rubens: I just thought that was so astute about when you said the impact of these social movements on the athletic department probably was to lower its standing, and who would come? The football stuff was never particularly

tainted, or any taint was way behind, is that right? Way back? When was that Pac-10 stuff?

Citrin: Cal was actually not involved. It was within the conference itself, within the Pac-10 conference. He was involved in sort of—

Rubens: Outside—

Citrin: Creating the so-called Pac-8 at that time. That was in, I think, '57, '58.

Rubens: Yes, I think it's the late 50s.

Citrin: And then he was a chancellor then.

Rubens: Seaborg?

Citrin: Yes. He was chancellor in '59, '60, and then when Kennedy was elected, he was appointed to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Rubens: Right!

Citrin: That's when Strong actually, I think, came in.

Rubens: You're absolutely right.

Citrin: Because Strong succeeded Seaborg.

Rubens: Came out of the philosophy department. Had already—

Citrin: Yes, that's right. I think he had been dean of letters and sciences.

Rubens: Yes, that's right.

Citrin: All these people, I mean, there are projects in a certain way.

Rubens: Colvig seems to be a really—

Citrin: Nice guy.

Rubens: Nice guy, what a roll. He had just the year before become the PR guy for—. [laughter] He won't go on tape yet. I think because he's writing stuff. I'll ask him.

- Citrin: You know who you might want to talk to? I'm not so sure—. I think he was here then—and if he was—Heyman.
- Rubens: He was here, and someone has interviewed him.
- Citrin: Okay.
- Rubens: I would like to go talk to him though, just to see if he knows—
- Citrin: Who's doing this project? Just you?
- Rubens: No. Well, the oral history—yes. Big bucks given to the university to honor Mario, then turned into the Free Speech Movement, so not Mario, because they didn't like it that way. So that was the big bucks.
- Citrin: A gift is paying for this.
- Rubens: Yes. Then smaller portion—collect the data, and get stuff online. I don't know yet if they've gotten permission for the Wolin-Lipset book. That would be a good book to put online. But it's listed.
- Citrin: Yes, it's easy enough to get.
- Rubens: Then a small budget to do oral histories, and I'm the only one doing any. But I have a good committee, and we searched what there is already out there, made links to it. And then part of it has been done.
- Citrin: I think when you talk to the participants—like if you talk to Marty or something—I think you need to challenge them on it. If they give you a highly elaborate kind of theoretical, ideological thing, I think you've really got to challenge them on that because I think these things develop in the process. I think that often, as a kind of an inchoate kind of beginning, and then you know, demands get articulated, then you need a structure, explanation to legitimate them. Then things sort of develop and grow.
- Rubens: That's a good identification of what the process is. I have to say I have not done the leaders yet. I wanted to get a little more grounded. So Roysner I have to do, and Weissman, because they seem to be the smarts behind the public face. A lot of people say that Weissman, in the GCC Graduate Coordinating Committee, was really one of the brightest—
- Citrin: I think that is probably true. Now Marty—
- Rubens: Now, did you know Marty?

- Citrin: I met him once. Now Marty, I don't know what his, I don't know much about him. I've met him a couple of times, recently a couple of times.
- Rubens: Nice guy.
- Citrin: Yes, he's a nice guy. I think he's doing some consulting in health or environmental—
- Rubens: Kaiser, yes.
- Citrin: Kaiser, yes. He was very young.
- Rubens: You said that. I didn't actually realize he was just a sophomore.
- Citrin: Just a sophomore.
- Rubens: But you knew—he wasn't necessarily a sophomore in political science?
- Citrin: No. He was not in political science.
- Rubens: You knew him because of the girl—
- Citrin: I met him because his girlfriend at that time was Janice Gercik, and Janice Gercik and her two sisters grew up down the road from us in Japan, so our families were friends.
- Rubens: I'm glad we got that roundabout. I wanted to ask you if you still encounter people here from that?
- Citrin: Oh yes, sure. A lot.
- Rubens: Sure. You know the other person that comes out of that community is Denny Abrams, the Fourth Street developer.
- Citrin: He comes from Shanghai?
- Rubens: Well I can't remember if it's Shanghai or Hong Kong.
- Citrin: Interesting. I didn't know that. But there are people, you know the famous constitutional lawyer Larry Tribe at Harvard?
- Rubens: Yes.
- Citrin: He's a year older than I am, and his mother and my mother went to high school together.

Rubens: I can't remember—1930, your mother comes? When you say high school, do you mean in Russia?

Citrin: No I mean in Shanghai.

Rubens: That's right, they met there. And the families come over in '20 and '30. I'll have to ask that, I'd like to know that about Abrams. I'm going to email you the outline of some of this, and I put down what you're sending me.

Citrin: What am I sending you? Remind me.

Rubens: I'll be glad to remind you in an email.

Citrin: I'm sending you the article about the chancellor, right?

Rubens: Definitely, and the op-ed piece, because you happen to have it. And the heterodoxy article.

Citrin: Heterodoxy article is a longer version of the op-ed piece. Okay, I'll send them both to you.

Rubens: Excellent.

Citrin: You have to give me feedback.

Rubens: Excellent. I will try.

[End of interview]