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Sally Smith Hughes
Berkeley, CA, 2014
Today is March 15, 2012, and we are talking with Vice Provost Catherine Koshland. This set of interviews is kindly funded by Yvonne Koshland, and it's designed to capture the last eight years of Dan's activities. The last interview we did was in 1999, and Dan [Daniel E. Koshland, Jr.] was quite active after that, particularly at the higher campus levels that we need to capture. So that's what we're to do today. But I always want to find out where people come from, so could you give a quick summary of Catherine P. Koshland up to the present moment?

Up to the present moment. Well, very quickly. I had the great good fortune to be at Haverford College, which is where I finished my undergraduate degree, when I met Jim Koshland who is one of Dan's sons. We fell in love and got married and came to California where we both did our graduate work at Stanford. When I finished my PhD, there was a position open at Berkeley, so I applied and became a member of the faculty with the interesting situation of having both one's parents-in-law on the faculty. [laughter] Not the usual situation, one could imagine.

Was it a blessing or a bane or something in between?

It was actually a blessing, because they were both personally respectful of my independence and at the same time available as counselors and guides. In particular, my mother-in-law [Marian E. Koshland] was a really crucial role model, friend, and mentor. As a young faculty member with children and figuring out how to navigate this institution, she was an invaluable partner in that. Dan was more of a foil and comic and critic. [laughing] He was less useful when it came to the pragmatic realities of things. But it was fun having both of them here. And then even more wonderful was when my oldest daughter, Sarah Corinne, became an undergraduate here, and so here she was with her mother and one set of grandparents, all in the same institution.

That must not have been repeated very many times on this campus!

It was pretty amazing. I had the opportunity to be here and began my faculty position in the School of Public Health, became a member of the Energy & Resources Group partway through my career here, and then began to get involved in Academic Senate life, and then eventually in leadership, and became vice provost in 2004.
Hughes: Was it a deliberate move to move into administrative circles?

Koshland, C.: Yes. I think that I discovered through my senate work that I enjoyed the large picture, the challenges that the institution provided, the big questions that affect higher education. Those were of interest to me. And I followed, again, my mother-in-law's footsteps as a member of the Haverford College Board of Managers. She had been a manager for twelve years. That's the equivalent of a trustee. When she stepped off the board, I went on the board, and I'm currently the chair of the board. That experience of looking at higher education from that level was also of interest to me, and so being able to be in a senior administrative position here has been very meaningful and I enjoy it. [Campanile chimes the hour]

Hughes: Is there a lot of cross-fertilization between your activities at both institutions?

Koshland, C.: Yes, I'm an experimentalist. And I like to say my experimental model is Haverford for Berkeley. Berkeley is a complex problem, and if you strip it down to its bare essentials you get a liberal arts college, and then you can look at many of the issues. Obviously, research universities have lots of things going on that you don't have in small colleges, but there are many, many parallels. And the two institutions are, I'd say, from an ethical and values perspective, very aligned. It's irrelevant whether one's private and one's public because of their dedication to service and the mission that they see themselves as having. So that makes it very easy to move back and forth.

Hughes: That's interesting, because it's not an obvious parallel for most people.

Koshland, C.: It's not obvious, no.

Hughes: You retain an appointment in the School of Public Health?

Koshland, C.: I'm still an active faculty member. I teach occasionally. I'm teaching a freshman seminar this spring, and I still have graduate students and manage to get a small amount of research done.

Hughes: You mentioned Dan in your first years as being entertaining. [Catherine laughs] But not much beyond that; it was Bunny that was the real help to you. But what about later on when he was dealing with chancellors and thinking about the renovation of Stanley Hall, which was expanding beyond his previous research work? I know he always did—
Koshland, C.: He always did. Actually in that sense he was a terrific role model in himself, in that he made it possible to envision a life where you were still deeply engaged in your research and your science, but you could move from that more narrow and perhaps siloed set of issues to much broader issues. Certainly his work as editor of *Science* was a demonstration of his capacity to think broadly along many lines. Of course, his children and all of us would laugh that he was an expert on everything, and so whether it was investments or food or agriculture or whatever--

Hughes: He was not a man without opinions. [laughter]

Koshland, C.: That's absolutely true. And he was a true debater in the sense that he could take any argument and convince, certainly the unknowing, that he was all-knowledgeable about that particular subject. Those of us who would know something about the topic used to just get completely exasperated with him, because you'd be arguing with him and say, "You're wrong!" And he would just keep on going. [laughing]

Hughes: But some of that was deliberate, was it not?

Koshland, C.: Oh, absolutely!

Hughes: Just to stir things up.

Koshland, C.: Yes, he liked to tease, he liked to stir things up. And he didn't lose that. He kept that going right till the end. He'd had a vision in the early eighties, which he actually had when he was recruited to Berkeley in 1965, which was the idea of revitalizing and elevating the Department of Biochemistry at the time. I think he saw the need for a much broader vision for the biological sciences at Berkeley, which eventually led into the reorganization—

Hughes: The reorganization of biology at Berkeley.¹

Koshland, C.: --and the work he did on that. There are funny aspects. The very first plan that he put out, both Bunny and I looked at him and said, "This is unworkable. What are you smoking?" [laughter] And voted against it! The second one we approved.

¹ See the oral history: *The Reorganization of Biology at the University of California, Berkeley*, an oral history project of the Regional Oral History Office, conducted 1998 and 1999 and including interviews with Dan Koshland, Roderic B. Park, and Louise Taylor.
Hughes: Was he pretty much the author of the second one?

Koshland, C.: Oh yes. He understood academic politics, but he also understood how to get things done. So he tolerated a certain amount of process, because you can't do anything without giving people voice and having them have an opportunity to weigh in. At the same time he knew when to bring that process to a close in order to move forward, and he wasn't someone who felt he had to have unanimity to move forward. He did understand the point at which you have sufficient consensus that you can move forward with confidence that this is the right thing to do. At a certain point he also left certain programs or departments out of the conversation, because it was going to be too hard to persuade them to be a part of whatever it was that he was doing. He understood where to draw those lines and how to work that. He worked very collaboratively in the reorganization with Rod Park, with Mike Heyman. It wasn't Dan alone, but with the Chancellor's Advisory Council on Biology, which was his and Rod Park's creation. So he was a deft architect.

Hughes: He spoke about how he would have considered himself leading the show, but the success of the reorganization of biology at Berkeley was also in large part due to the two people that you mention.


Hughes: He also gave a lot of credit to Louise Taylor, more for organizing.

Koshland, C.: Yes, organizing.

Hughes: And getting it moving in the right direction.

Koshland, C.: Yes.

Koshland, C.: I was going to say when we move next to the late nineties, and I think the Gang of Three, which was Graham Fleming, Dan, and the late Rich Newton, look at the Health Sciences Initiative and the development of Stanley Hall and then eventually Li Ka Shing--again, he understood the value of partnership; he understood the value of collaboration in creating a different way of looking at the landscape.

Hughes: Was it in regard to the Health Sciences Initiative that he tended to have conversations with [Chancellor Robert] Berdahl?
I'm not sure. They called themselves the Gang of Three—was it Gang of Three or Gang of Four? I actually can't remember whether there's a fourth person there. I know for sure Graham Fleming.

I think Dan recognized that the reorganization had gotten to a certain point, but that there were new opportunities in terms of interdisciplinary work by looking at problems rather than disciplines for the basis of their work. So of course Stanley Hall was developed and designed in part to be the home for QB3. It houses faculty from physics, chemistry, molecular and cell biology [MCB], and bioengineering. They're arranged and organized by their interests rather than by their department lines. So if they're working in the same kinds of areas, whether they're from physics or chemistry or biology, their labs are co-located. And then we extended that even farther in the development of Li Ka Shing, where entire floors are simply devoted to problems, whether it's neuroscience or cancer biology. You have three or four faculty on the floor whose work is in those areas. And again, they may come from MCB, from public health, from psychology, or integrative biology. The bulk of faculty will be from MCB, but again, it's organized by problem area and inquiry area rather than by department lines or disciplines.

Well, I know multidisciplinarity is a big thing in science nowadays. But has Berkeley taken it a step further?

Well, I think by organizing by problem areas, where you bring both disciplinary expertise, and then there are folks who literally do work across disciplines, so you combine those capacities to address issues. Li Ka Shing [science building] has research on stem cells. There's a variety of things that are the organizing factors, and then the faculty bring their expertise in. Even the way in which the laboratories are arranged: they are big open spaces where you might have four or five investigators literally all in the same room. There are multiple benches, and one faculty member may have two or three benches with their students and postdocs working, and then another group in the next few benches. And so they share core facilities which are expensive, and then the capacity for intellectual cross-fertilization is there because they're all working in the same large space and can share ideas and collaborate on projects without having walls or buildings constrain what they're doing.

There's a precedent for that arrangement in the old Calvin Lab [on the Berkeley campus].

The old Calvin Lab, exactly. It does have that.
Hughes: We house a series of interviews on the Calvin Lab, and the narrators almost to a person talk highly of the fact that they were in one space and had to interact.

Koshland, C.: You have to interact, exactly. It's an idea that we're beginning to use more effectively. It doesn't work in every case. In Li Ka Shing we actually had to build more traditional separate laboratories for our infectious disease group, because you don't want to mix the tuberculosis organism with dengue virus, or whatever. So those are places where we did have to do more traditional kinds of things.

Hughes: In general is the building working very well?

Koshland, C.: Li Ka Shing is just being populated now, so we will see. I think Stanley Hall has worked pretty well. In some ways they wish they were even less constrained than they are, because they're still arranged as separate laboratories even though they're clustered. Our Sutardja Dai Hall, which is where the California Institute for Technology Research in the Interest of Society, CITRIS, is a much more collaborative environment and is working extremely well, and I think that bodes well for what we'll see in Li Ka Shing.

Hughes: Did Dan take any specific role in designing these respective institutions?

Koshland, C.: Not so much. I think he had a vision and I think he shared that. I think both Graham and Rich Newton share that vision. Rich was and I would say Graham today has very compatible minds with Dan's. Not identical by any means. Rich was one of these expansive thinkers. What we're doing out at Richmond Field Station is something that Rich envisioned a decade ago when we did the strategic plan. Now with our partnership with LBNL [Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory] that will come to fruition. I think both he and Dan are smiling down on us and saying this is exciting, this is a good thing. They all had a capacity to see the big landscape and then have a way to begin to address that landscape in a particular way, and ways that were appropriate and imaginative for Berkeley for higher education. I think there are things that they obviously couldn't have envisioned that we will do. And so in orchestrating the Health Science Initiative I think Dan was, and they all were, wise in their selection of someone like Bob Tjian to lead a lot of the development work.

Bob raised an enormous amount of resources to support the HSI, both the building and the program. Jenny [Cutting] can tell you a lot more about this. He was instrumental in convincing donors that this was a worthy investment for them, and that their gifts to the institution would pay themselves back in
terms of the quality of work that the faculty and graduate students would produce and the kind of experiences that our undergraduates would be able to have as a consequence. So Tij was really a critical partner in that.

The other person who was critical was Susan Marqusee, who is the now current director of QB3, which was actually the role that Graham had at the time that they were envisioning this. But Susan really orchestrated the design of Stanley and the process by which faculty were selected to go into Stanley Hall. She did a masterful job of really carrying out the vision in a very concrete, nuts-and-bolts way, and of course has her own capacities as well. She's a senior faculty member now in Molecular and Cell Biology, and she is the Berkeley director of QB3.

Hughes: If I get time with the chancellors, what avenue should I take that would be most fruitful in terms of clarifying Dan's relationship with them?

Koshland, C.: You know, I think Dan probably, especially with Bob Birgeneau but even with Bob Berdahl, was sort of an elder statesman, maybe more in a role like a Glenn Seaborg. I don't know how often he sent them off an e-mail or a letter or a note. I would periodically get things from Dan—[laughing]—usually things like, "I don't know if you want to listen to this old man talking, but here's my thoughts on x or y." Always with humor.

Hughes: Berdahl is a historian. I would think there would be a more immediate meeting of the minds with Birgeneau.

Koshland, C.: True, although I think there was a longer time for a relationship with Bob Berdahl, and at a point when the Health Science Initiative was getting off the ground. So perhaps more interaction there than the overlap with Birgeneau.

Hughes: I see, so the issues brought them together.

Koshland, C.: Yes. I think that for Bob Birgeneau Dan’s relationship would have been more in the capacity of an incredibly important member of the Cal community and conversations around that. But I honestly don't know how much direct work they had together. They only overlapped for what— Bob came in in fall of 2004. Three years.

Hughes: When did the Health Sciences Initiative begin to be talked about?
Koshland, C.: Oh, that's a good question. I am not sure. Probably Graham or Tij can tell you better than I can. Stanley opened the fall after Dan died, because the memorial symposium was held in the auditorium.

Hughes: It was fall of 2007.

Koshland, C.: Right. We would have gone in the ground in 2004, roughly, with that building, and we would have had to have raised the money and gotten the state approvals and things in 2002. I'm going to guess it was around 2000. It could have been even as early as, say, 1999. It could have even started sooner than that. But knowing the time frame and how these things work, it took a while to even get to that point.

Hughes: The next thing I wanted to talk about is the Marian E. Koshland Science Museum in Washington, D.C. I remember having progress reports from Dan about how it was going.

Koshland, C.: I actually was not as involved in that. For more information on that talking with Doug [Koshland] or with Gail [Koshland Wachter] would make more sense. Doug's now on our faculty.

Hughes: I know! Another Koshland! [laughter]


I think Gail may be on their advisory group at this point. I think Doug was more engaged early on, and I don't know what his engagement recently has been. I think Gail has been doing more of that now, with Yvonne.

I can't say much more about the museum. All I know is that periodically I get someone who says, "Oh, I've just been to the museum!" It's a gem of a museum, and when people discover it they really love it. But I haven't been there for a while, and I don't know what the latest is. I know, as in many institutions, it was having some challenges financially with the 2008 crash. Some of the things that they had expected would happen had not, so I know that they were rethinking some of the issues there.

Hughes: The Science Museum isn't right on the Mall.

Koshland, C.: No, it's not. It's in the same physical overall structure as where the National Academy of Sciences is.
Hughes: Does it seem to capture the public that goes to the Mall and from one museum to another?

Koshland, C.: The International Spy Museum is right down the street. It's extremely popular, and sometimes when the line's too long at the spy museum they discover the science museum. But in some ways it's a hidden gem, and when people stumble across it, they're really glad that they did. But it's not as well known as others are.

Hughes: And of course it's the newest too, isn't it?

Koshland, C.: One of the newest, yes.

Hughes: Dan and Bunny as a couple were highly unusual in both being appointed to the National Academy of Sciences.

Koshland, C.: Well, and Douglas was made a member most recently.

Hughes: That's right! But after Dan had died.

Koshland, C.: Yes, after Dan died.

Hughes: Is there any family that duplicates that record?

Koshland, C.: The Kornbergs, father [Arthur] and son [Roger]. I suspect there are some others.

One of the things I did want to say, and again Douglas may be a good person to speak to about this as well. Dan was engaged deeply in his science until, literally, the day he died. He had received a patent for a new process for creating methane using algae as a derivative fuel source. He was working on a second piece of that process when he died, had filed the first phase of a patent but hadn't been able to follow up on that. It was actually an interesting process. When I was going through his papers, I tried to see if there was interest among other colleagues at Berkeley in continuing the work. And I couldn't get any traction. It's a disappointment in some ways, because I think he was on the verge of doing some interesting things. But without the second patent I gather the first one's not all that valuable.

Hughes: Oh, really?
I think we have different leadership in our technology licensing department now. Maybe there would be more support for something like this. I worry that [it's] something that Berkeley is not itself going to be able to capitalize on. It's interesting to me how engaged Dan had become in issues of climate change and energy, and how committed he had become to this. He would work on things for about a decade. And then I think he would feel that he had achieved something or contributed something, and then he would get intrigued by something else and would move on to it. So you see that in his pattern of work. So that's an area that's interesting.

The other area that's interesting also to speak with Doug about is Dan's work on induced fit, which certainly got him nominated for the Nobel Prize, although he never received it. There's an interesting process by which that work has become more important, not less important. And probably more frustrating to some of us that he wasn't recognized for that work.

Was that somewhat because of the prestige of the French group under Jacques Monod? Dan was relatively young as I remember.

He was very young.

And he was not here. He was at--

He was at Brookhaven National Lab. He did the work at Chicago for his PhD, then went on to do his postdoc at Harvard, and then was at Brookhaven. And I think that's right. Douglas speaks very eloquently about this missing out on the Nobel. To give Dan credit, at some level he didn't care, or he got beyond caring at a certain point in his life. He was acknowledged for so many other things that he did that this wasn't important. The [induced fit] concept that he formulated, it was novel, it was critical, and it’s proving to be more important than one thought.

More important in a practical, applied sense?

I think both, in a basic theoretical way and in an applied sense. The notion that something could adapt to fit something, this induced fit, that you could actually create a coupling, is something that as we know more and more about the way in which molecules interact was more and more appropriate.

The French had a more static lock and key concept?
Hughes: Dan and I talked quite a bit about induced fit. I don't know if he said it in so many words, but I think he considered that concept, in terms of his basic science, his biggest contribution. But he never once mentioned the Nobel Prize.

Koshland, C.: No, he wouldn't, no, no, no. Those of us around him who knew about this and watched colleagues receive this honor, I think perhaps family cared more than he did about that recognition. And certainly he was recognized with the Welch Award [in Chemistry], the Lasker [for Special Achievement in Medical Science]—there were many ways in which he was acknowledged—the National Medal of Science. All of those were things that clearly put him in a top echelon of folks for their contributions.

Hughes: Well, is there more to say about those? Because the Welch Medal and the Seaborg Medal had not happened when Dan and I talked. The last interview was in 1999.

Koshland, C.: I forget exactly when the Welch was.

Hughes: The Welch was 2004.

Koshland, C.: Yes, Jimmy [Koshland] and I with Yvonne went to Texas for the award ceremony with Yvonne.

Hughes: Tell me about it.

Koshland, C.: It was lovely. And what was wonderful was watching Dan at—I don't know what he was at that point, eighty-four?—get up and give his talk with his combination of incisive wit and some depth to a very, very distinguished group. I know Tij [Robert Tjian] was there. I can't remember who else from Berkeley was at that event.

Hughes: Where was it held?

Koshland, C.: In Houston where—

Hughes: Joe Goldstein as chairman of the Welch Medal committee.
Koshland, C.: Yes.

Hughes: Was it just for lifetime achievement? Or was it for a specific contribution?

Koshland, C.: I believe it was lifetime achievement, but I'm not absolutely positive.

Hughes: And the Seaborg Medal? It was awarded in 2000 and presumably it’s a campus award?

Koshland, C.: I think so.

Hughes: I should look that up. [UCLA's Dept. of Chemistry and Biochemistry awards the Seaborg Medal to honor significant contributions to chemistry and biochemistry.]

Koshland, C.: Right.

Hughes: Where, if anywhere, does Levi Strauss enter in?

Koshland, C.: In that last decade?

Hughes: Or in his thought processes. I thought about that as a possibility when you said that he would reach a modicum of consensus and then move on, which could be a business strategy.

Koshland, C.: Well, I think he always thought of himself as having the capacity to think about business. You can ask my husband about that one. [laughter]

Hughes: Your husband might disagree?

Koshland, C.: He might disagree. [laughing] Dan loved, as I said, a good argument. He loved a good game. He liked a good puzzle and was sure that he could outsmart and outwit and outlive everybody. And we're still living with some of that.

Hughes: He said in the oral history that he planned to live to 100. It didn't work out.
Koshland, C.: It didn't work out that way. I think he really intended to, and I know there were lots of things that said he could have. He just had a stroke that was overwhelming and fatal.

Hughes: I would occasionally have lunch with Dan, somewhat because he wanted to know what was going on in the library.

Koshland, C.: [laughing] He loved the library. He absolutely loved the library.

Hughes: Yes, he did. But I was completely unaware that he was having little problems for some time. Not that I would expect him to say anything about it.

Koshland, C.: No, he didn't say very much about it at all. They actually had not really shared much of that with all the rest of us either.

Hughes: Did his passing come as a real shock?

Koshland, C.: Well, when your father or father-in-law's eighty-seven, yes and no. You know at any point something can happen.

Hughes: Right, but he was such a force of nature!

Koshland, C.: Oh yes! [laughter]

The time I think when we worried most about him and was the hardest was really through Bunny's illness; the stress associated with that was enormous. We were fearful that something would happen to him as we were with her. Once he got through the period of mourning and got back on his feet, then he really was much more together and much better. It tells you something about what stress can do to even the most capable of us, that it can have a really devastating effect, and we saw that. In some ways it was a relief to have him back in fighting spirits again after that, because you're worried about losing both of them at the same time.

Hughes: None of his children were around—well, that's not true.

Koshland, C.: No, we were here.

Hughes: You and Jimmy.
The year [1998] after Bunny died both Sarah and Maggie [Koshland] were still at Cal, and Hannah [McCaughey] was here on an exchange program from Australia. So he had a period of time where he had three beautiful granddaughters who were taking him out to dinner once a week and would appear at his door. And I think that made a huge difference. The other people who was just invaluable were Gerry [Gerald M.] and Lynn Ruben. Lynn was a saint. She and Gerry did a lot to keep him from being in a complete black hole that first year after Bunny died.

Well, the only other topic that I had on my mind is philanthropy.

Dan was both a part of what I would say is old school philanthropy but also probably moving into the kind of philanthropic strategies that many young entrepreneurs are using, which is much deeper engagement, not just I’m writing a check because I trust that you're going to do a good job with it, but real engagement in whatever the enterprise was that he cared about. Certainly the philanthropic legacy that he modeled, as did his father— So it starts at least with Dan Koshland, Sr. if not with Cora and Marcus Koshland before them, that of course you support the community, of course you support the things that you care about. And Dan set up mechanisms to do that. He certainly was generous with respect to a number of institutions, the Integrated Science Center at Haverford, which is another legacy of both Dan's and Bunny's, because in many ways it was both of their vision, and then Dan underwrote the development of the facility in honor of Bunny. It's named for Bunny. And then the museum and then of course his contributions at Berkeley. There were many, many—Ben-Gurion University. There were many places where he had an impact because of what he saw those institutions were capable of doing. But he also modeled the engagement, so when you look at the next generation, our generation, I think we've tried to emulate what he did, what they did, and certainly all three of our children are engaged in various levels in their own philanthropic efforts.

Meaning they don't just write a check, they sit on boards?

No, not at all. In fact, they're beginning to do things. Sarah, as the oldest, is the most engaged, but Maggie and Jake are doing things. We've all set up ways in which we can make these things happen and feel passionately that giving and making a difference is what we're about. At least for Jimmy and me and for Sarah, things involving education are the center of what we're doing, and that certainly builds on Dan and Bunny's and Yvonne's interests.
Hughes: Well, the Bioscience and Biotechnology Program at the Bancroft Library was launched by Dan. He was always in favor of oral history, and so his was the donation—

Koshland, C.: That made the difference?

Hughes: --that made a difference.

Koshland, C.: I think he would have been thrilled with the Bancroft’s collaboration with the Magnes [Collection of Jewish Life and Art]. Of course there are Koshland family papers associated with that. It's brought the collections together. So I think that's very exciting.

Hughes: What else should I be asking people about?

Koshland, C.: Let's see. What the science was that Dan was working on in the last decade, which I think Doug knows something about. Tij may know a little bit about it. Dan taught a freshman seminar almost every year in that last decade. I think it's terrific that he was engaged in doing it. His brother-in-law, Ted Geballe, who's the same class at Berkeley as Dan, is still teaching a freshman seminar at Stanford, and he's ninety-two! So that was another piece that I think was really wonderful that Dan didn't lose contact. He still had a few undergrads and postdocs working in the lab when he died. So, as I said, he was working to the very last minute.

Hughes: Catherine, how was it for you to come into this powerhouse family?

Koshland, C.: Oh, it was exhilarating! At times it could be intimidating. I met amazing people that very much align with my own sense of values and things that I cared about. I love the humor. It's still great to be a part of this family.

Hughes: Well, you're a very lucky person.

Koshland, C.: Oh yes, I know that!

Hughes: Well, I thank you very much.

Koshland, C.: Well, thank you!
[End of Interview]