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When President Robert Gordon Sproul proposed that the Regents of the University of California establish a Regional Oral History Office, he was eager to have the office document both the University's history and its impact on the state. The Regents established the office in 1954, "to tape record the memoirs of persons who have contributed significantly to the history of California and the West," thus embracing President Sproul's vision and expanding its scope.

Administratively, the new program at Berkeley was placed within the library, but the budget line was direct to the Office of the President. An Academic Senate committee served as executive. In the four decades that have followed, the program has grown in scope and personnel, and the office has taken its place as a division of The Bancroft Library, the University's manuscript and rare books library. The essential purpose of the Regional Oral History Office, however, remains the same: to document the movers and shakers of California and the West, and to give special attention to those who have strong and continuing links to the University of California.

The Regional Oral History Office at Berkeley is the oldest oral history program within the University system, and the University History Series is the Regional Oral History Office's longest established and most diverse series of memoirs. This series documents the institutional history of the University, through memoirs with leading professors and administrators. At the same time, by tracing the contributions of graduates, faculty members, officers, and staff to a broad array of economic, social, and political institutions, it provides a record of the impact of the University on the wider community of state and nation.

The oral history approach captures the flavor of incidents, events, and personalities and provides details that formal records cannot reach. For faculty, staff, and alumni, these memoirs serve as reminders of the work of predecessors and foster a sense of responsibility toward those who will join the University in years to come. Thus, they bind together University participants from many eras and specialties, reminding them of interests in common. For those who are interviewed, the memoirs present a chance to express perceptions about the University, its role and lasting influences, and to offer their own legacy of memories to the University itself.
The University History Series over the years has enjoyed financial support from a variety of sources. These include alumni groups and individuals, campus departments, administrative units, and special groups as well as grants and private gifts. For instance, the Women's Faculty Club supported a series on the club and its members in order to preserve insights into the role of women on campus. The Alumni Association supported a number of interviews, including those with Ida Sproul, wife of the President, and athletic coaches Clint Evans and Brutus Hamilton.

Their own academic units, often supplemented with contributions from colleagues, have contributed for memoirs with Dean Ewald T. Grether, Business Administration; Professor Garff Wilson, Public Ceremonies; Deans Morrough P. O'Brien and John Whinnery, Engineering; and Dean Milton Stern, UC Extension. The Office of the Berkeley Chancellor has supported oral history memoirs with Chancellors Edward W. Strong, Albert H. Bowker, and Ira Michael Heyman.

To illustrate the University/community connection, many memoirs of important University figures have in turn inspired, enriched, or grown out of broader series documenting a variety of significant California issues. For example, the Water Resources Center-sponsored interviews of Professors Percy H. McGaughey, Sidney T. Harding, and Wilfred Langelier have led to an ongoing series of oral histories on California water issues. The California Wine Industry Series originated with an interview of University enologist William V. Cruess and now has grown to a fifty-nine-interview series of California's premier winemakers. California Democratic Committeeewoman Elinor Heller was interviewed in a series on California Women Political Leaders, with support from the National Endowment for the Humanities; her oral history was expanded to include an extensive discussion of her years as a Regent of the University through interviews funded by her family's gift to The Bancroft Library.

To further the documentation of the University's impact on state and nation, Berkeley's Class of 1931, as their class gift on the occasion of their fiftieth anniversary, endowed an oral history series titled "The University of California, Source of Community Leaders." The series reflects President Sproul's vision by recording the contributions of the University's alumni, faculty members and administrators. The first oral history focused on President Sproul himself. Interviews with thirty-four key individuals dealt with his career from student years in the early 1900s through his term as the University's eleventh President, from 1930-1958.
Gifts such as these allow the Regional Oral History Office to continue to document the life of the University and its link with its community. Through these oral history interviews, the University keeps its own history alive, along with the flavor of irreplaceable personal memories, experiences, and perceptions. A full list of completed memoirs and those in process in the series is included at the back of this volume.

Lisa Rubens, Series Director
University History Series
Regional Oral History Office
The Bancroft Library
University of California Berkeley
INTERVIEW HISTORY

Howard Schachman, UC Berkeley Professor of the Graduate School in the Division of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, was interviewed as part of a series of oral histories revisiting the attempt in 1949 by the University of California’s Board of Regents to impose a loyalty oath on its faculty members. As a young assistant professor newly arrived in Berkeley, Schachman joined the opposition to the oath, building relationships with like-minded colleagues that were maintained throughout many subsequent battles for academic freedom and free speech.

The oath required faculty members and staff not only to declare loyalty to the state constitution (required of all state employees) but also to deny membership or belief in organizations (including Communist organizations) that advocated overthrow of the United States government. Many faculty, students, and employees resisted the oath, and thirty-one professors and many other employees (the non-signers) were dismissed in the summer of 1950. The oath was subsequently declared unconstitutional in 1951, and many of the dismissed faculty returned to Berkeley. Schachman himself ultimately signed the oath, urged to do so by more senior faculty whose economic status was more secure.

As discussed in the oral history, Howard Schachman has continued to take an active role in matters of academic freedom and free speech on campus for more than fifty years. One session of the oral history discusses his role in the 1964 Free Speech Movement, where he was the only scientist on the steering committee of the Committee of 200, a faculty group which supported student protestors. Throughout the interviews, his many battles to promote and safeguard free scientific inquiry are discussed. In 2000, the American Association for the Advancement of Science awarded the Scientific Freedom and Responsibility Award to Howard Schachman for his exemplary contributions to preserving freedom in scientific research.

Schachman’s oral history was tape-recorded in March 2000 and August 2001 in his office in Stanley Hall. He undertook a careful review of the transcript of the interview sessions, clarifying unclear sections, checking his records and correcting or elaborating where memory had been faulty, making his language more precise and more formal at times. This oral history is one of a series undertaken for the fiftieth anniversary of the oath with seven individuals who had participated as young faculty, students, or faculty family members. Other narrators in the series include Professor Emeriti Howard Bern, Charles Muscatine, and Leon Litwack (who was a Berkeley student during controversy, interview in process); Ralph Giesey, a graduate student of non-signing history professor Ernst Kantorowicz; and Deborah Whitney and Mary Kent, daughters of the faculty leader of the non-signers, Professor
Edward Tolman (Kent was also married to a non-signer, Jack Kent, professor of city and regional planning).

In 1999, the Center for Studies in Higher Education held a retrospective symposium to reflect on the significance of the oath and academic freedom. Proceedings from that symposium are available at:


Researchers interested in the university’s loyalty oath will also want to consult numerous earlier oral histories with faculty, administrators, and regents.

On August 1, 2007, we supplemented this audiotaped oral history with a single videotaped session, in which Schachman discussed more briefly the themes in the 2000-2001 interviews and concluded with some thoughts on current issues relating to the freedom of scientific inquiry. The videotape of this session will be available in the Bancroft Library.

The Regional Oral History Office was established in 1954 to augment through tape-recorded memoirs the Bancroft Library’s materials on the history of California and the West. The office is under the direction of Richard Cándida Smith and the administrative direction of Charles B. Faulhaber, The James D. Hart Director of the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley. The catalogues of the Regional Oral History Office and most of the collection of oral histories can be accessed at http://bancroft.berkeley.edu/ROHO. Tapes of most interviews are available for listening in the Bancroft Library.
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INTERVIEW WITH HOWARD SCHACHMAN

[Interview 1: March 14, 2000]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

Lage: Today we’re recording an interview focusing on the loyalty oath. We want to look at your personal background, both as it pertains to how you got involved in issues such as the loyalty oath and also how your interest in science developed.

Schachman: And you’re going to lead me into all this? By asking the appropriate questions?

Lage: Yes. The first question is an easy one. Tell me where you were born and when.

Schachman: I was born in Philadelphia, December 5, 1918. My father was a dentist and also was a pharmacist. Our home was a three-story house in an area of Philadelphia where to walk around today you need a bulletproof vest.

Lage: What was it like then?

Schachman: It was an upper-middle-class neighborhood. I’d say 50 percent, perhaps 75 percent of the people on the block were Jewish. It was a neighborhood where many of the adults were in professional activities of some sort or another. It was a very nice neighborhood in those days. It deteriorated years later.

Lage: Things change.

Schachman: I think it may be actually being rebuilt. Interestingly enough our home was about six blocks away from the area where the mayor bombed the city [about ten years ago]. Do you remember when that crazy group settled in there? They wouldn’t vacate, and the mayor ordered the dropping of some firebombs, which started a massive fire killing a lot of people. That was only, oh, six blocks away from where I was born. It was pretty shocking. I remember years ago when I was on sabbatical in the late fifties, I asked my wife if she’d like to see where I grew up, and she said, “Sure.” We were driving from Bethesda, Maryland, up to New York and stopping in Philadelphia for a big affair. We drove by the street where I grew up, and as soon as I saw the neighborhood, I
locked the car and hoped we didn’t have a flat tire. I could tell immediately that it wasn’t a neighborhood that I should be driving around in—it had changed dramatically.

Lage: But at the time, it was upper middle class, professional?

Schachman: Oh, yes. Right.

Lage: Primarily Jewish, or at least the majority?

Schachman: Yes. I would say so. Although the Jewish background was important, we were not an ultra-religious family. I was trained as a young Jewish boy and went to Hebrew school several afternoons a week after public school. My mother was the dominant person in my life in that regard. She was very active nationally in Jewish affairs.

Lage: In what way?

Schachman: She was an official in various organizations, like Hadassah, and I met a lot of very famous people, nationally, in the Jewish community, who were influencing presidents of the United States and affecting policy with regard to the development of the future of Israel.

Lage: So we’re talking about in the thirties?

Schachman: It would be the twenties. When I was a kid about ten or twelve years old, I thought I was going to become a rabbi. I was so impressed with this type of activity, and I met a lot of the famous people.

Lage: Tell me some of the people you met.

Schachman: Well, one of them was Rabbi Stephen Wise, who was probably the most influential rabbi in America in that period of time and for many years afterwards. And then there’s a man by the name of Abba Hillel Silver, who came from Cleveland and was probably president of the Zionist Organization of America. These were the people who were advocating a future homeland for the Jewish people, and I was very impressed with them.

Lage: Was that your mother’s influence?
Schachman: My mother’s influence, I think, more than anything else. At my Bar Mitzvah, when I was thirteen, I delivered a talk on Justice Cardoza, who was at that time the second Jewish justice appointed to the Supreme Court, Brandeis being the first one. I was very impressed as a thirteen-year-old kid with Cardoza’s life and growth, and I remember vividly giving that speech. Then somebody said you must mail a copy of it to him. I mailed a copy of it to him.

Lage: Did he reply?

Schachman: I think he did, but I don’t recall any detail about that. So, I was just a high school kid and was not specializing in science. Science didn’t have any particular attraction to me. I don’t think I ever took a high school chemistry course, as a matter of fact.

Lage: You didn’t!

Schachman: I don’t think I did.

Lage: You must have been on a college trajectory.

Schachman: Right. I was. I was going to go to college and study liberal arts.

Lage: Thinking about becoming a rabbi?

Schachman: That’s right, and then a family friend, not a particularly close friend, a young man who lived in the neighborhood, a very nice guy, whom I admired, began giving advice to me and my parents that this was all well and good, but on the other hand, this was during the Depression. “What are you going to do if you have to make a living?” That made a deep impression. Some of this is in my article in the Annual Review of Biochemistry. On the basis of that we scrounged around and decided I would study chemical engineering, without any real preparation for it at all. I seemed to be willing to do almost anything at that time, and so I went to the University of Pennsylvania for a year.

Lage: I’m going to make you back up for a minute here.

Schachman: Go ahead. I enrolled in chemical engineering at the University of Pennsylvania—that was 1935.

Lage: Just like that. Without—

Schachman: Right. I graduated high school at sixteen-and-a-half, something like that.

Lage: Now tell me about other siblings.

Schachman: I had an older brother who was about four years older than I. He was interested in commercial art, so he ultimately went into the advertising arena and became a commercial artist and pursued that his whole life. He had two children. Long after I left Philadelphia and moved out here. Whenever I went back east, I would visit with them. But I haven’t been in touch with him for many, many years.

Lage: And no sisters.

Schachman: No sisters. No. Just one brother.

Lage: Was there any thought that you would follow in your father’s footsteps? Dentistry didn’t—

Schachman: No. No.

Lage: Or being a pharmacist?

Schachman: No. Did not appeal to me at all. That’s true. There was never any interest in that at all.

Lage: Now, what about politics? I guess having a Zionist bent is a political statement, but other than that?

Schachman: Oh yes. My mother was a very progressive and liberal person. I think my father was probably supportive of that orientation too, although the area was dominated by Republican, smoke-filled-room politicians. I recall that my father had pretty good relationships with some of those guys. Remember Hugh Scott, a major Congressman from Pennsylvania? He was in that neighborhood when I grew up.
Lage: So that was the representative from your district?

Schachman: Right, so I probably have a long-standing objection to the conservative politics. That dates back probably since I’m ten to thirteen years old.

Lage: Was this something that was discussed in the family?

Schachman: Somewhat, I think part of it is in the culture of the Jewish people—new ideas, new challenges. Change was important to us, so being staid and conservative just did not make much sense. You know, the rabbis that you would listen to would always give high-sounding praise to new ideas and progressive issues, and I grew up in a time when lynching was going on, and I was aware of that at that time.

Lage: This kind of thing caught your eye. You seem like you were maybe more aware of the world than we think of a lot of teenagers being.

Schachman: Probably was a little bit.

Lage: Did you get drawn into the idea of Zionism?

Schachman: Only in a very superficial way. I think that without any deep, profound understanding of it, I was extremely sympathetic to it and for years thereafter. One time when I was graduating college, I toyed with the idea of going to Israel to do research, but I can talk about that later. It didn’t materialize.

Lage: Was Zionism something that divided the Jewish community?

Schachman: Well, yes and no. The Russian Jewish or the Eastern European Jewish community was extremely sympathetic to building some sort of a homeland and identity for the Jews. The German Jews—my brother married a woman who was from a very prominent, rich German-Jewish family—were, of course, assimilationists, so they were totally contemptuous of the Eastern Jews. There was a major clash between the German Jewish community and the Eastern European Jews. One of the issues was should there be a homeland for the Jews. One wanted identity and the other one wanted no identity, there was that fundamental division, and I was well aware of that.

Lage: Was your family Eastern European?
Schachman: Yes.

Lage: And how long had they been in this country?

Schachman: Well, my mother was probably brought here as an infant, and my father was born in Eastern Europe—Russia, Poland, Kiev—that general area.

Lage: Had he been educated here?

Schachman: Yes, and he went to college here and got his dentistry degree here. He was brought over as a young man, a young kid, I’m sure, and my mother was essentially an infant or maybe even born over here. I never can get straight information on that.

Lage: Did the Depression affect your family much?

Schachman: Oh, yes indeed. Yes. It was a very serious problem, and things were bad for my father. He was very depressed about the whole thing. In my going to college, I got a lot of help from my mother’s brother, who was a very rich merchant in South Africa, in Johannesburg, South Africa. He went over there as a young man—

Lage: From here?

Schachman: From Philadelphia, he went over as a salesman for the National Cash Register Company and sold the first cash registers in all of South Africa. He stayed there, and then got into agriculture and mining and became extremely wealthy. He helped finance my education in college. He had no children, and he was very good to his nieces and nephews of various sisters and his brother—he had one other brother. I was one of the beneficiaries of that.

Lage: Is there more to say about your family and about how they influenced you?

Schachman: No. My father died early when I was about thirteen or something like that.

Lage: Oh, he did—before you finished high school?

Schachman: Yes. Before I went to college, maybe I was fifteen or fourteen at the time. So I was very close to my mother for a long period of time. I must have been around sixteen. My brother was married and though he lived in Philadelphia,
he had moved away from the house. We kept roaming around from one
apartment to another. We sold the house in which I was raised. I don’t know
when. Then my mother lived in apartments. After one year at Penn, I wanted
to go to a classier school, so I transferred to MIT, with the help again of the
finances from my uncle—

Lage:  Did your uncle help your mother out financially?

Schachman:  No. My mother was largely self-supporting. She worked in a variety of areas.

Lage:  What kind of newspapers were read in your family?

Schachman:  Probably the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, which, at the time, it’s my guess,
was an afternoon newspaper. I was not aware of the New York Times at that
stage.

Lage:  Did you have a particular boyhood interest?

Schachman:  Yes. I was interested in sports; I loved baseball, touch football, roller-skate
hockey, all sorts of things that kids played in the streets. There was a big park
about a block away from my home where we grew up and tennis courts there,
and so I was a very active kid with my peers at that particular time.

Lage:  You weren’t off alone with a chemistry set—

Schachman:  Not at all.

Lage:  I think it’s so interesting that with this interest in liberal arts you could just
enroll in college as a chemical engineer.

Schachman:  That’s right. It was a strange thing, because I’m almost sure I never had high
school chemistry.

Lage:  So how did your college years go?

Schachman:  I transferred to MIT in 1936, after one year at the University of Pennsylvania,
and, of course, I was not particularly interested in losing a year, so I studied
for what are called the advanced placement exams. One summer I took a
bunch of exams without taking courses. In that way I accomplished the
missing courses that I would have had at MIT by studying by myself in the
summer time. Essentially in my second year at MIT, I became a junior rather than a sophomore.

Already by that time, I began to protest on political grounds. MIT was a land grant institution, and they required ROTC for graduation. I don’t remember what I did, but I do know that I was extremely unhappy with ROTC and made my views abundantly clear. I did acquiesce and didn’t go out on the picket lines. And I didn’t do some of the things that were done here many years later. Do you know about the protests here in Berkeley and in many other universities?

Lage: Oh, yes. Protesting ROTC. I think there was even some of that here in the thirties.

Schachman: In the thirties? So I was probably doing the same thing at MIT.

Lage: Now what was your sense about this approaching war?

Schachman: Well, I was a real hawk. I really felt that Roosevelt was going much too slowly. Behind the scenes, I was certainly aware of what was going on to the Jews in Europe.

Lage: You were.

Schachman: Oh, yes indeed. I doubted those people who claimed they weren’t aware of the Holocaust—it wasn’t called the Holocaust then. The extent, I certainly wasn’t aware of, but I knew things were terrible over there.

Lage: Was that information from your mother’s networks?

Schachman: Well, yes, but also from the newspapers. I used to read liberal journals like the Nation or the New Republic at that particular time. They were very good journals once. I don’t read them anymore. Then in my second year at MIT, I had a roommate who was a Polish émigré whose family owned nearly all the oil wells in Poland. A very entrepreneurial family whom I got to know well later in life. He was a delightful guy, very sophisticated. He spoke many languages, a real male chauvinist with the women, but very knowledgeable about what was going on. He left Poland early.

Lage: And he was Jewish.
Schachman: He was Jewish. He changed his name ultimately to Morgan from Morganstern and has a son who lives here in Albany. Dave obviously knew a lot about what was going on in Europe. Many of his family were killed, and he knew already that they were killed. Other brothers—it was a pretty big family—escaped and ultimately wound up going through Siberia and coming to the United States. From him I knew an enormous amount about what was going on in Europe and the politics of Nazism and the Russians. Of course, some of those people were much more unhappy with the Soviets coming into Poland—the Russians and Germans met in the middle of Poland. So politics was an important part of my life even as an undergraduate at MIT. There’s no question about it.

Lage: How did being a hawk square with protesting ROTC?

Schachman: Well, I just felt the ROTC presence more on the campus was not appropriate. I became very active here in protesting against it years later. I have no quarrels with the military. I have no quarrels with secret research. I just don’t like them on campuses, and that’s part of what motivates me. I think there is a place for all of that kind of activity. But you shouldn’t need to take Reserve Officer Training just because it’s a land grant institution, and, of course, we don’t have it as a requirement anymore. I was protesting it years before other people protested.

So, my analogy would be, if I want to go to Hebrew school, it’s an outside activity after my public school, and if you want to be interested in becoming an officer in the army, then you should do that after school. It shouldn’t be foisted on everybody who goes to that school. That’s what I used to argue about here. Take it off campus, and don’t make it a requirement. You don’t need it for graduation. You don’t have these guys supplied by the army teaching this course. Most people who teach in the university go through the budget committee, the appointment committee, and they’re nominated by departments. The textbooks are written by themselves; they’re not written by some external source. So, to me way back in the thirties, the whole concept of ROTC was foreign to what I called “the nature of the university.”

Lage: It’s interesting that you came to this so early.

Schachman: Yes. Well, I’m sure part of it was the tremendous enthusiasm I saw around my mother and the people that she was meeting with. I would listen to some of
these talks and was inspired by them. My political views probably started to get focused very early in my life, and I’m still there, obviously

Lage: But the topics were very different, the topics that you must have heard in your mother’s circles.

Schachman: Yes. They were primarily trying to get a homeland for the Jewish people, but civil liberties would be involved. These same groups would be extremely unhappy about lynching and the poll tax. I mean, my roommate was from Poland and he said, “What means poll tax?” His English was not yet very smooth. So I said, “That’s for these Poles who come over from Poland.” It was a conversation very early in my undergraduate life, and I just couldn’t abide the idea that you were barring people from voting through a means test, basically.

Lage: Did you get involved in organized political groups?

Schachman: Yes. I’m sure I did. Not in any big way, but there were discussion groups. Yes, there were.

Lage: Were there anti-war groups on the campus that you were aware of?

Schachman: Not that war. I don’t think. Not really. This was very early, so I graduated in ’39, before we got into the war.

Lage: By the time you had left MIT, what field were you in?

Schachman: I was a chemical engineer when I left MIT. I got my bachelor of science degree in chemical engineering with the rationale that this was probably a good way to make a living. The marketplace should have been wonderful. Here I came from presumably the best place in the world for chemical engineering—the MIT department was at that time top-notch. For an engineering and science school, it was a very good school, but for chemical engineering, it was almost preeminent. And then I found out that I couldn’t get a job easily. The reason I couldn’t get a job easily was because the companies who were hiring chemical engineers with reckless abandon didn’t want Jews if they could avoid it.

Lage: Oh, and was that very obvious? Tell me.
Schachman: You can read about that in many places. One would be in Arthur Kornberg’s oral history and articles. He had trouble getting into the University of Rochester Medical School. It’s ironic because Rochester just named a medical building after Kornberg, with a big dedication. The dean of the Medical School at Rochester, when Arthur wanted to go to medical school, was the prominent MD who set up the quota system for keeping the Jews down to a minimum in medical schools. So Kornberg was one of the few who got into the University of Rochester Medical School, because he couldn’t get into other places. He writes about that extensively somewhere.

In my case, it was a question of getting jobs, and it was very transparent. There was just no question about it. I described one episode where I got a questionnaire from a—and I would always write novel letters, you know, “I saw a bottle floating” and all kinds of concocted stories on why I was interested in your product and things such as “with your product, you could bend light around a corner.” I would write frequently to presidents of commercial companies, the president of a major company or a big shot at Dupont. I even had entrée through friends of the family to people of high rank at Dupont. It never got anywhere. They were always questioning. One letter not only wanted to know my background and that of my parents but also where my grandparents were born.

Lage: That’s unbelievable.

Schachman: I think I saved some of that correspondence. I hope I still have it under the house somewhere, I must have written to about a hundred different companies, and I got really crummy jobs as a chemical engineer that did not use any of my training. I worked in one company that was a major producer of alcohol. They were unusual in that they made alcohol for commercial purposes and alcohol for drinking purposes. This is very rare because you have to clean the tanks and scrub everything in order to change overnight from one form to the other. They were very nice. I worked there for quite a while, but it was clear I wasn’t doing chemical engineering. They were not using any of my training, and I was miserable, I kept looking and looking then I got a job in a paint factory and again, it was not something like Pittsburgh Paint, where you do real chemistry and real chemical engineering, so I was not content in any of those jobs.

Lage: It wasn’t the Depression. You say that they were hiring chemical engineers?
Schachman: No. No. My classmates were all getting jobs with no trouble at all. I graduated MIT in 1939, so this was the early forties.

Lage: Let me just ask you, had you experienced any of that in your college years? Or your growing up years?

Schachman: No. Not really. There were Jewish fraternities at MIT, and I was not a member. I lived in the dormitories, and I had the feeling, and I think it was probably valid, that fraternity boys were richer kids, so I certainly wasn’t in that category. I was dependent upon an uncle for tuition. Tuition was something like six hundred dollars a year, and in fact, I borrowed money from MIT, which didn’t get paid off for a long time. MIT was quite good about postponing the payment of your loans. Because I went to graduate school ultimately thereafter and it took years before—I was already married—I paid off the loan from MIT.

Lage: Were your friends primarily Jewish? Or a mix?

Schachman: My roommates both were. It was a mix I would say. The fraction of Jewish kids at MIT was not any higher than you’d expect in any other major university.

Lage: But nobody advised you in the course of your studies that you might have difficulties.

Schachman: None at all. I had no conception of that at all. I did not realize what would be happening in the companies. As a young kid, in a nice way, I would confront somebody, “Oh, you’re not really going to hire me because of my religion.” That was met with the response, “Oh, no, no, no, some of my best friends are...” It was the classic story that you would hear. They would tell me about a big shot here, a big shot there. There was no question that Dupont, when they wanted somebody who was outstanding and well-known for a high-level position, would hire him or her—there were no hers in those days— without any thought whatsoever of their religion.

It’s just that for the average pedestrian job, they would just prefer not to employ a Jew. The line I used to get was that they didn’t stay very long. They always were so ambitious they wanted to get ahead, and they would move somewhere else. So that’s essentially what I did for these two companies. I
I didn’t stay very long because I was pretty miserable, so I confirmed this allegation.

Lage: How did you eventually find a good opportunity?

Schachman: I would keep looking, and I heard of a lecture at the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia, which is a distinguished institution with a planetarium nearby, by a guy whom I didn’t know. It was all on the physical chemistry of tobacco mosaic virus. This building where we are talking now is, as you’ll hear later, the house that tobacco mosaic virus built. It is now known as Stanley Hall.

[Wendell] Stanley won the Nobel Prize for his work on tobacco mosaic virus. So this lecture was by one of his young colleagues, sort of a senior person in his lab at the Rockefeller Institute. He gave a terrific lecture, and I liked what I heard, and I liked him. I didn’t meet him, but when I got home that night, I coined a letter telling him how thrilled I was to hear the lecture, and added that, “I’m a chemical engineer and I studied with a guy by the name of Hauser,” who was a prominent colloid chemist at MIT, and “the work you describe I find extremely exciting. How do you get a job in a field like that?”

He was nice enough not to throw the letter away. He answered it by saying, “You need a PhD”—to do research in an academic institution—”and so you have to go back to school and get a PhD. Your bachelor’s degree isn’t good enough, but if you’re interested, we have a job as a technician, and we’re recruiting right now.” I certainly was interested, and in no time flat I responded, “I’m interested.”

I arranged for an interview at their laboratory. The Rockefeller Institute was an independently financed institution. It was a very famous place, and a lot of Nobel laureates came out of the Rockefeller Institute. Its main laboratories were in New York City. It’s called the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research; it also had branch laboratories, because several of the very distinguished guys didn’t like New York City. Also, they wanted to work on animals and plants and they needed a lot of ground, and so they had laboratories a few miles from Princeton, New Jersey. It was really five miles outside of the town of Princeton, right on the highway. It had about 800 acres, and two Nobel laureates came out of that particular laboratory at Princeton, one of them being Stanley, who then moved here.
So I went by train up to Princeton—it’s halfway between Philadelphia and New York—and had my interview. And in the interview, I had a wonderful time. I met Stanley. Stanley was a big name. I didn’t know much about him, but he was very gracious and he seemed old at that time, although—[laughter]

Lage: He couldn’t have been that old!

Schachman: As we both got older, he got closer in age to me! Stanley was very generous. [Max] Lauffer spent most of the time with me, and they told me what they had in mind, and they were very interested in me. While waiting in the library for something, I heard somebody—it was a man by the name of Kunitz who was a great enzymologist and a remarkable man. This story about Kunitz is relevant actually to my own career. Kunitz panhandled a very distinguished scientist by the name of Jacques Loeb, whose sons were also very prominent. One was distinguished medical scientist and the other a professor of physics.

Lage: His brother had a certain reputation, I seem to remember.

Schachman: Is that right? Well, I never met Jacques Loeb, but he was really a classy, world-class scientist. On the street, Mr. Kunitz as a young kid, apparently, tried to beg from him or pick his pocket. I don’t know what he tried to do. Loeb stopped and gave him a lecture, and asked him what he was doing. He was doing nothing other then what he was doing on the street, and Loeb says, “Why don’t you come and work for me. I’ll give you a job washing glassware or something in my laboratory at the Rockefeller Institute in New York City.” Kunitz began to be a dishwasher in Loeb’s laboratory, then he became a technician, and then he was encouraged to go out and get a degree. He went to night school for ten years to get a PhD after starting as a technician. I sort of replicated that career years later, that’s why it’s important.

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

Schachman: I didn’t know the name Kunitz at that particular time, but Kunitz was really a classic Eastern European Jew. Though the accent was identified as a Jewish accent, it’s really an Eastern European accent and it became the caricature of a Jew.

Lage: Now, was he one of the people who interviewed you?
Schachman: No, he didn’t, but he was in another department of the Rockefeller Institute at Princeton, New Jersey. By that time, he already had his PhD and he was a very successful scientist. He worked with a man by the name of Northrop who shared the Nobel Prize with Stanley; Kunitz never really got all the credit that he deserves from Northrop. Very interesting in and of itself. You should get Kunitz’s biography.

But in any case, I was sitting in the library looking through some journals and listening, and I heard some guy—a very distinguished scientist imitating derisively this Eastern European accent, and I thought, “Oh, my God, am I going to see this all over again.” Then a little later I went back to meet with Lauffer before I left, and he asked me my religion, I said, “Not you, too.”

Lage: You said that?

Schachman: I did indeed. He was very relaxed about it. He said, “Yes. We just want to know what the prospects are of your future employment. It won’t influence us a bit.” But he just felt he ought to know it. So I told him I was Jewish. Then the conversation ended, but I did certainly ask him, “Not you too.” In a nice way, with a smile, I’m sure, and I got the job. My mother and I lived in an apartment in Philadelphia, and every morning I would get up and take the subways and train to Princeton. Then finally we got a car, and I was able to drive to Princeton.

Lage: And how long would that be?

Schachman: It was about a forty-mile drive. So it was relatively easy in those days. Gas rationing came along a little bit later—it was a very exciting time for me. I was learning a lot, and I was a technician for a wonderful guy who has been very generous to me. Stanley was a very benevolent boss of a laboratory. My contacts were largely with Lauffer, although they were occasionally with Stanley too.

Lage: Tell me about Lauffer.

Schachman: He was a very good scientist and an extremely kind person. Several years later he became a professor at the University of Pittsburgh.

Lage: Was there some exciting science going on there?
Oh, yes. That was a very exciting period, and I was a bright young kid with my own ideas. I was doing a lot of service work as a technician. I used to do a lot of calculations, which were very tedious, and the plate reading of the ultracentrifuge patterns was very difficult. So I built a gadget, based upon my knowledge from MIT, to make life much easier. Lauffer was tremendously impressed.

This was all de novo, my activity. It had nothing to do with what he asked me to do or what he wanted me to do, but I did it because this would make my work easier. I’d be able to turn out more work for them, and they all appreciated it. When this thing was built—it’s called an alignment chart for calculating sedimentation coefficients—they said, “Gee, that ought to be published.”

Well, by that time I knew the Rockefeller Institute very well and Lauffer and I would discuss their undemocratic policies. Even though he was my boss, Lauffer was extremely open. We could joke with each other. For example, in this totally undemocratic, non-democratic, anti-democratic institution the faculty—they were called staff—wore long lab coats and the technicians wore short lab coats. I would joke with them and say, “Look, Dr. Lauffer, I’m on the floor cleaning that machine up, and so forth and so on, my knees are getting into the oil, and so I need the long lab coat.” The rejoinders were wonderful. He would say, “Well, but you make so little money, your clothes are not worth anything. It doesn’t make any difference if you’re on the floor.” [laughter] They had a clubhouse for the senior staff—the faculty, so-called—where they had a subsidized lunch. He would walk about a quarter of a mile across this 800-acre area and he’d come back telling what a great lunch he had—and of course, there’s no lunchroom for the technicians. You brought your lunch, and you ate in your lab or whatever. It was fantastic. I said, “Gee Dr. Lauffer, before I leave here I’m going to eat in that lunch room.” His response was, “My dog is more welcome in that lunch room than you are.”

Now this was all good-natured?

All good-natured. He was really very generous; when gas rationing came, I literally moved into the laboratory.

Oh my goodness, you couldn’t make that drive with gas rationing.
Schachman: I couldn’t make the drive back and forth. Well, along the line they kept telling me about the PhD, and I said, “Gee, I want to get a PhD.” I knew about the Kunitz experience, and Kunitz had a technician, a woman by the name of Margaret McDonald. He helped her the same way he had been helped. She was the second person, in my knowledge, in the history of the Rockefeller Institute to do that kind of work, to go through the ranks from technician, get the PhD while serving. I was going to be the third one.

The logical place to go was to Rutgers. It’s about fifteen miles closer to New York, but there was nobody in Rutgers of any major significance in biochemistry. By that time, I knew the literature; I knew names and I knew which schools were famous—and there was nobody at Rutgers that I could get excited about. Princeton had practically no biochemistry. I said, “I would like to go get my degree at the Harvard Medical School.” They said, “You can’t very well go to class every day and come back here from Harvard Medical School.” They had a very extensive summer program at Harvard and through Stanley and Lauffer, the two of them, they persuaded the head of this department, who was a real tyrannical guy in the Department of Physical Chemistry to accept me as a part-time graduate student. It was the only university in America that had a Department of Physical Chemistry in its medical school. Very unusual. The chair of the department was very interested in protein chemistry and did very important work on the blood plasma problem during World War II. Stanley’s intervention convinced them to let me become a part-time student at Harvard. And I had a girlfriend [Ethel Lazurus] in Boston. Of course, that was an additional motivation.

Lage: Another reason!

Schachman: That’s right. So I wanted to go to Harvard. I went to Harvard one summer, took a very famous physiology course, came back to Princeton and worked. My bosses were very generous.

Lage: So you just took the summer off from work—

Schachman: And Stanley, as I recall, had to go through machinations because the Rockefeller Institute was a very aristocratic, austere outfit. For example, technicians had to punch a time clock. I said to Lauffer, “Gee, it’s crazy for me to punch a time clock. I’m not leaving.”
Lage: You live there!

Schachman: Right. And to punch a time clock. You know I’d do experiments at night and—you have to go through tunnels. They didn’t give you keys to the other buildings, so I’d have to go through a tunnel, which was hot and underground with animals, bugs, all kinds of things, and cockroaches galore. I didn’t punch a time clock. The guy who was in charge of the technical staff would complain to my bosses, and they would say, “Well, he’s still working here. He hasn’t left.” They were responding to a lot of my objections to the system in a very supportive way. They put up with some nonsense defending me. They were very, very generous to me.

Lage: It doesn’t really sound like nonsense when you describe it.

Schachman: Yes. Stanley had none of these instincts himself, but he was extremely generous toward individual people and certainly toward me. We’ll come to that issue in the discussion of the loyalty oath. In his book President [David P.] Gardner says Stanley was opposed to the loyalty oath. Stanley was not opposed. He signed the loyalty oath within minutes, but he called me and asked me to come and talk to him in his office on the fifth floor. “I assume you’re opposed to it.” And I said, “Yes,” and he wanted to know why.

But my reasons were not part of his makeup. We just had different orientations on such issues, but he was supportive of me in doing what I wanted to do, even though he had to put up with some crap as a result.

So, this guy in charge of the technical staff was a pain in the neck to Stanley and Lauffer, and they covered for me. When I went to Harvard Summer School, Stanley collected my paychecks and mailed them to me privately, they, in principle, didn’t know I was away three months. They probably knew it, but it was sort of a cover to avoid asking for three months off; officially I wasn’t away.

The first summer went very well. My romance with my girlfriend who turned into my wife prospered very well, then I came back, we started corresponding again, and I lived literally in the lab. I went up a second summer, in the middle of the second summer—six weeks corresponded to one semester and six weeks for the second so it would be a year course. The physiology was a whole year course, so it was twelve weeks.
Lage: You were taking one course for six weeks.

Schachman: That’s right. So it was the first semester and then the second semester of organic chemistry. After the first semester, I got a phone call, or a message somehow from Stanley and Lauffer, that I had to come back. They obtained a war contract to develop a vaccine against the influenza virus and a few other viruses, and they needed me to run the centrifuge, which was my prime occupation. I then inquired of the professor, who was a very famous Harvard organic chemist, “What can I do about the second semester?” His answer to me was, “Come back next summer.” Well, that wasn’t a very appealing answer to me, because I didn’t know what the next summer was going to be. It was clear we were getting closer and closer to war, or we were already in the war. I can’t remember.

I then went to the young post-doc who was sort of the teaching assistant. He was more than the teaching assistant. He turned out later to be one of the greatest organic chemists in American history, Robert Burns Woodward. He was a nice guy who was going to teach the second semester. I had a friend who now is a professor in the chemistry department here and he told me that Woodard had terrible reputation as a young guy. He received his own PhD, without any professor supervising him, in two years. He was considered to be brilliant but impossible. To me, for some strange reason, he was just a total angel. He said, “Look, go back to Rockefeller, and I’ll send you the outlines of my lecture notes. You ought to go ahead before you leave here and get some lecture notes from somebody who took the course a previous year. It’s the same course during the winter as it is during the summer, and then come back here and take the final exam with the regular class and then we’ll—”

Lage: That’s wonderful.

Schachman: And he said, “If you can do your lab work at Rockefeller, you’re at a chemistry place there, then you can get everything you need.” I went back and Stanley was extremely gracious. I did experiments on my own that satisfied the Harvard organic chemistry requirement, and I got these shortened annotated notes, and I had detailed notes from some student who took it before.

Stanley gave me a week off to go up there before the exam, and I moved in with this friend who’s now a professor emeritus here. I just worked night and
day for five days, or something like that, studying. Woodward would see me at frequent
intervals to straighten out things I didn’t understand. I showed him all the results of the laboratohy
work. I took the final exam. I even called him at home and talked to his wife—I never met her,
just talked to her. She was very generous toward me. I suppose that I was some sort of a novel
duck that he wanted to support. He told me I got the highest grade in the class. Anyway,
he said I did excellent work or something like that. And so, great! I got my organic
chemistry. Except that the major professor was extremely unhappy.

Lage: He knew about it

Schachman: Oh, yes, he was adamant. He went to the head of Harvard Summer School,
who was a famous scientist. Harvard was a well-attended school during the summers. And we fought, lots of letters back and forth. Lauffer even got letters. “Turn this guy Schachman off. He’s getting to be a damned nuisance.” Woodward wrote and protested for me. And I never got credit for it.

Lage: Oh my goodness!

Schachman: I didn’t learn that much organic chem. I mean, I cramned it in, I learned it,
but I wish I had literally taken the course. But that was the way my life was going at that time. I was very frustrated, and the idea of going back there and taking it again did not appeal to me at all. Also, the war was building up with more and more war work. I then said, “Gee, maybe I ought to switch to Princeton.” Well, Princeton didn’t like part-time students. Only five miles away. It’s even closer than Rutgers. And again, the chair of the—he became a dean later, was a very stuffy guy and very famous—Hugh Taylor was the professor of chemistry and chair of the department. He had an English background. Stanley called up and so they took me as a part-time graduate student. They didn’t have very many graduate students anyway, and a lot of them were in uniform by that time.

Lage: Now what time period are we talking about here? We’ve got to get our dates.

Schachman: Well, it was probably 1944. So I started taking courses there. There was a
very distinguished physical chemist named Henry Eyring who became my advisor. Later he became a big shot at the University of Utah. He was a Mormon, very famous. Eyring was a lovely man and great physical chemist. By that time, Lauffer left Rockefeller to go to the University of Pittsburgh,
and Stanley was even more dependent upon me, because I sort of ran the physical chemistry in that laboratory. But in the meantime, I was becoming itchy. The war wasn’t going well enough to suit me, and I was convinced that we couldn’t beat Hitler without my participation. I wanted to enlist in the services.

I kept taking physical exams in all sorts—New York, Philadelphia. I even went to Trenton, New Jersey, because one eye was not good enough. I wanted to see if I could get a commission to go in the navy and do some medical research in the navy. Finally, I got word. During that period, I was getting draft deferments all the time because of the war work that we were doing.

Lage: So you were working on war-related projects.

Schachman: Right. That’s certainly true and it was a very pleasant environment, and I was pursuing my PhD, but somehow or other I wasn’t satisfied. In the meantime, I guess my wife had already gone in the Marine Corps.

Lage: Your future wife.

Schachman: My future wife. Yes. We weren’t married yet. She was in North Carolina and then ultimately transferred to the El Toro Marine Base in southern California, and I finally got a call to go in the navy, and I went in the navy. That was probably ‘44 to ‘45, I don’t remember when. I was stationed at the Naval Medical Research Center in Bethesda, Maryland, which just happens to be across the highway from the National Institutes of Health. There was a big tall skyscraper building. It’s the building from which Secretary Forrestal jumped out the window when he was dreaming the Nazis were coming. He was a real militarist.

Lage: I don’t remember that.

Schachman: See, you’re so young, you can’t remember all these wonderful things. Anyway, so that’s where I wound up. But I skipped a couple of things about the nature of Rockefeller, which are very important. When I built this gadget, Stanley says it ought to be published, and Lauffer said it ought to be published. Great. They went looking into policy and of course, technicians don’t publish from Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research. It’s called the Institute. The Institute.
Everybody is supposed to know what the Institute is. So they got the bright idea, which seemed to pass muster with some of the bureaucrats, that it would be okay for Lauffer to coauthor a paper with me. So that was done. I had no experience, although my bachelor’s thesis was published as an undergraduate from MIT, which is relatively unusual. Lauffer wrote this thing up, which I, in a way, couldn’t have written up. I was just a youngster. We submitted it to the hierarchy, and it was turned down. Oh, there was a big battle. They won’t let us publish that way.

Lage: Based on the fact that you were a technician?

Schachman: I was a technician and not a member of the staff, and you couldn’t contaminate those guys. They finally came up with a proposal that it not be coauthored, but that I write it alone, as long as it had an asterisk next to my name to indicate with a footnote, “Technical Assistant in the Laboratory of Animal and Plant Pathology.” Then they okayed it. By that time, it was unfair to Lauffer. He had already invested a lot of time in writing it, but he was extremely gracious, and there was an appropriate acknowledgment about his help in writing the paper, so that paper came out. And it was amazing.

Lage: Where was it published?

Schachman: *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, a very famous major journal in the United States. It’s the preeminent journal of biochemistry in the world.

Lage: And were they the ones who were fussy about how the authorship would be?

Schachman: No. It was Rockefeller Institute. There were people—the cognoscenti knew that that footnote meant something, because they didn’t want me to be misidentified—. If it had just said Department of Animal and Plant Pathology, people might have thought I was a member of the staff, and these guys did not want that to happen. Later, there was another piece of activity that I started, and Lauffer got turned on by it completely. He changed his interest and moved into that one and then when it came to write this up he said, “Gee, you know we can’t go through this again.” I said, “Don’t worry about it. You can thank me.” So, some very interesting work.

Lage: What was that about?
Schachman: That was all tobacco mosaic virus; the degradation of tobacco mosaic virus, the mechanism of action of urea—. Well, that gets you more into the science, so we’ll never get to the—. There was an area where I made a major contribution to some of Stanley’s work, and he wrote it up and got a big prize for that, but the prize was predestined already. It was a very complicated political scene, as it was explained to me. In any case, I had a wonderful time there, and the Princeton thing worked out quite well. I was going back and forth, and then I went in the navy.

Lage: And this meant interrupting your PhD.

Schachman: It meant interrupting my PhD, and I was single, and then my wife—my girlfriend and I decided to get married. She arranged a leave to come to Bethesda, Maryland, incognito, while people were having bachelor parties for me. We planned that we would marry in California, as far as the navy was informed, but we were already together. We had gotten married in Philadelphia at a friend’s home. Then when I got my leave, the two of us went back to California—and she had to go back on duty, but we spent a lot of time together even though her leave had expired, so we staggered our two leaves and then I came back to Bethesda alone and she was still in El Toro, California. Then six or eight months later, she got out of the service, and we were looking for a place to live in Bethesda, Maryland. At that time, it was very hard to find a place to live. Arthur Kornberg wanted to go learn biochemistry. He was across the street at NIH in a uniform—the Public Health Service Corps. A friend of mine introduced me to him, and I sublet his apartment that he and his wife lived in, so we’ve been friends since 1945.

Lage: That’s interesting!

Schachman: At his eightieth birthday, party there were a lot of speeches, and I’m a wise guy as you can probably tell, so I said, “Well, I want to point out my unique relationship to Arthur. I slept in Arthur’s bed.” [laughs] “He wasn’t there, to be sure”—and then I described how I rented his apartment, so everybody got a big kick out of this. We lived in his apartment, Ethel and I. It was really wonderful. It was a lovely little apartment in a very convenient location, and Ethel went back to school, to Catholic U. to study political science.

Lage: Now tell me a little more about your wife—how you met her and what her background is.
Schachman: Well, she was a Simmons student in Boston when I was at MIT, and I met her through my roommate originally, this Polish guy, who picked up women at the drop of a hat. Ethel and I became fast friends. All three of us were very close. He really brought us together, so to speak, then all the time that we were separated, we corresponded with each other. I think pretty much on a daily basis.

She became very interested in political science. When I was in the navy in Bethesda, she enrolled in Catholic University, which was nearby. She had some trouble with some of the professors, but did like some of the others. Some were pretty doctrinaire, and she was too liberal for them, but it was a very interesting experience. Then I got out of the navy; I went back to Rockefeller, to Princeton.

Ethel, for a while, went to the University of Pennsylvania to pursue her degree. Then finally we settled in Princeton when I got an apartment. She got a wonderful job as a secretary for the Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists, which meant that every day of the week she would pick up the mail there and go to Einstein’s home. He was the titular head of the emergency committee, honorary chairman, but he was much more than honorary; he was quite active. She would go to his house every day and bring him messages.

The public relations people were all in New York, and they would sort of frame an answer for Einstein to these inquiries or statements to the press. Frequently he would not like them. As he said, “Well, they’re making me sound like God,” and he would dictate a new message. He thought in German, obviously. He would speak in German to the housekeeper assistant that he had for many years, Helen Dukas, and then they would translate it back into English. Ethel would go back and reformulate that, and that would be it.

By that time, I had met a bunch of wonderful graduate students at Princeton who were in physics, and my political activity really blossomed.

Lage: Let’s talk about that a little bit.

Schachman: We began to have what we called “discussion groups” on various and sundry subjects. What was science like in the Soviet Union? We knew of a guy, a famous MD who had come back from a visit to the Soviet Union. We invited him to come and talk. It was my chore to go see Dr. [J. Robert]
Oppenheimer—as he was director of the Institute for Advanced Study there—and ask him if we could use his lecture hall. I was shocked when I arrived at his office, because I had to go by a couple of fierce looking guards in uniform with fixed bayonets. I found it abhorrent—the Institute for Advanced Study—the director—anyway, I got in and it made a very lasting impression, as you will see. Oppenheimer was extremely gracious. He said, “Sure, you can have the hall,” so forth and so on. Not only that, he attended a lot of the meetings subsequently.

But I went back and complained to my friends, “What kind of crap is this? These guys outside—” They said, “Well, you know he’s got all those secrets from the bomb project.” I said, “I don’t mind him having the secrets, but you know there are hills outside of Princeton, fifteen miles away. You can have forty guards instead of two, and they’d be much safer, and then you won’t have this threat to the openness that you need in an institute for advanced study or a university.”

It has just prevailed throughout my whole life. When I first got here [UC Berkeley], I heard stories about the hill people [from the Radiation Lab, now Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory] and the Faculty Club. You couldn’t talk at the Faculty Club. You couldn’t go to the men’s room, because you might say something to a guy from up on the hill. At that time they were doing secret work on the hill—I found that anathema. Universities ought to be open. In any case, we held these meetings. There was one meeting, for example—

Lage: Now, what was this group?

Schachman: A bunch of kids, just graduate students. It didn’t have a name. It was, I would say, the beginning or the precursor of the Federation of Atomic Scientists, the Princeton branch, which then became the Federation of American Scientists, which is FAS, which is now a very prominent outfit that’s been going—

Lage: It was focusing on atomic war?

Schachman: They publish the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, right, it originally was. A lot of them were very disappointed in their mentor whom they loved, Oppenheimer, because he thought he could make deals with the United States government. The big issue was who is going to control atomic energy. That was the big issue. Oppenheimer had sided with the War Department, and I remember
vividly—the vote was ten to one out of the Armed Services Committee with Senator [Brien] McMahon, the minority of one—in support of the May-Johnson [Atomic Energy] Bill that would control atomic energy in the United States.

The kids of that generation, they were the students and post-docs of J.R. Oppenheimer. They organized a tremendous political campaign. The vote of the Senate was in the opposite direction of a ten to one vote and it became the—what was it called? McMahon something bill, [McMahon Bill, December 20, 1945] and it resulted in civilian control of atomic energy rather than the military. It was a dramatic change. It was my first experience in politics at the grass roots level, where the grass roots came from young physicists and scientists in general. They loved Oppenheimer, but they fought him tooth and nail on this issue. These guys used to sit—

Lage: Was this setting up the Atomic Energy Commission?

Schachman: Right. Right.

Lage: That’s interesting given Oppenheimer’s treatment—

Schachman: No, in that particular case, he was on the wrong side, because he felt he couldn’t get it through. When you know too much about what’s going on in Washington, you tend to warp your own personal desires and the crusade to fight for those desires, and he knew too much. Everybody in political circles told him it can’t be done, so therefore, get the best you can with what can be done. Those guys said, “But we don’t believe it can’t be done.” That’s essentially the kind of argument you bump into all the time. You have it until this day. It’s always a conflict, and you have to be very careful when you think you know so much that you’re willing to accept a compromise that you wouldn’t have accepted if you were still as cantankerous as you had been when you were a youngster.

There was one evening, for example, my wife and I used to drive Einstein around to press conferences, and we had an old Studebaker, which we hated to give up later in life, because he used to ride in it. If it was hard to get in the back, he said, “No, we can all sit in the front.” You know there is this picture of Einstein, this absent-minded professor, who doesn’t know where the door to the car is. But the truth of the matter is, that’s all nonsense. What he was
absent-minded about were those things that he didn’t care about. He didn’t want to wear socks, because they would fall down all the time. He didn’t like his hair being cut; he didn’t want to depend upon barbers. Once we were late picking him up, and he was a little chagrined because he felt that they would construe him as being a prima donna who was holding up this whole press conference, when it was this jerk who’s a graduate student at the university that was late, not Einstein. So, he was wonderful.

Lage: Did you feel like you got to know him well as a person?

Schachman: Not really well, but we were in love with him, I mean, that was about the size of it. When Ethel applied for a job here at the Starr King School for the Ministry, she wrote to his assistant Helen Dukas for a recommendation. Einstein wrote back a nasty little note, “Why didn’t you ask me?” He wrote the recommendation, which we don’t even have, pretty tragic, yes it is. But he sent a beautiful autographed picture to her.

Several years ago, there was a big volume published of Einstein’s relativity theory. Some rich entrepreneurs thought they would make a lot of money on collecting the handwritten version of the relativity theory, and they published it. They put it together in the form of a book. They couldn’t sell it for what they expected so they got a tax deduction by giving it to Israel—somewhere in Israel—and they collected statements from all sorts of wonderful people. Somebody mentioned that Ethel Schachman worked for Einstein, so they asked her to write a little piece. She wrote a little piece with her husband’s help, which is in this volume and so, yes, it was a very exciting period for us.

At this one meeting, for example, where I presided, the subject was the future funding of science in the United States—it was the forerunner of the National Science Foundation. There was no such thing. NIH was not giving out grants. The National Science Foundation didn’t exist. Everybody got war contracts at universities during the war. What were you going to do after that? The war contracts were either for biomedical research or physics or chemistry, so this was a major debate again.

So I was asked to plan this whole meeting, and I was chairing it. I was sitting in the center of this place. In the audience were Einstein, Niels Bohr, Dirac, J. Robert Oppenheimer, and then us graduate students, you know, and some post-docs. I don’t know how many people were there, but it was a good
crowd. I was a nervous wreck. I was a young kid, and it was fantastic. Oppenheimer knew so much. He had been in the political scene with these people. He was meeting with presidents of the United States and senators and secretaries of state, etc. He knew his way around. He was just full of wonderful ideas, but he was also nauseating because he was so damned brilliant that you kept getting annoyed—and as soon as he would finish something—

Lage: Tell me more about that aspect of Oppenheimer.

Schachman: Well, nobody else could contribute. He overwhelmed you.

Lage: Was it his attitude?

Schachman: Well, to some extent. I’m told here in seminars, when he was a professor on the Berkeley campus, he would get up and displace the seminar speaker with a much more erudite, beautiful presentation than the seminar speaker. You couldn’t help but dislike him! You follow? Even though you admired his fantastic ability. So jealousy would show up—not in my case, there was no such thing—but he would say, “Well, Bohr, what do you think about this.” Bohr was from Denmark, he was thinking in Danish, and he had that leonine head, a gigantic head, and you could see the wheels going around translating from Danish to German and English. By the time Bohr was about to mumble something, Oppenheimer had another gem, so you almost never heard from anybody else. He was overwhelming, but in a very constructive way. So they were striking meetings.

[Begin Tape 2, Side A]

Schachman: Robert Gordon Sproul had met Wendell Stanley somewhere on some occasion and was determined that he was the guy he wanted to bring to the University of California. They began negotiating and Stanley was then offered the chairmanship of biochemistry. Biochemistry at that time in Berkeley was a division of the medical school. Even though it was located here, it really belonged to San Francisco. It did not belong to the College of Letters and Science. Stanley would come to Berkeley and chair that department and build it to a bigger one and also become director of the Virus Lab. So that’s what he
did. He accepted that offer and challenge. Lauffer was trying to woo me to go to the University of Pittsburgh at that particular time, and I was just the subject of their deliberations. I didn’t know enough. I had no idea how to get a job.

Lage: Had you finished your PhD?

Schachman: Not quite yet, but I was getting close. Then Lauffer came in to me one day on a visit—he was already at Pittsburgh, and he would come down, because they still collaborated—and he said, “Well, forget about going to Pittsburgh, because Stanley has plans for you to go to California.” That was the first time I heard that I was going to go to California.

Lage: Yes, he had plans for you! [laughs]

Schachman: Right. So sure enough, Stanley offered to take me to California, and we were obviously thrilled about the whole idea and—

Lage: Had you been to northern California?

Schachman: Yes, I had. Ethel and I while still in uniform flew to southern California and then we drove to northern California. I did some work for the navy on that trip to try and have an ultracentrifuge built but I really didn’t know the area at all. After learning of Stanley’s plans, we were just getting ready to pull up stakes. We hated to leave, because Princeton was very exciting, and we thought we were going out there with cowboys and Indians where it would be very, very dull in California.

Lage: Had you talked about this? And that was your perception?

Schachman: Oh, yes. Yes. My wife was thrilled with her job. I was thrilled with all the interplay. You know, I had a bunch of wonderfully exciting friends who were mainly physicists interested in world affairs to the same extent that I was. The idea of leaving Princeton was anathema to us, as a matter of fact. Stanley pulled up stakes first and he moved, and then Arthur Knight, who became a professor here also left Princeton. He was more senior than I, and had been with Stanley for quite a few years at Rockefeller. Hence, we were the three people that essentially moved here.

Lage: But you didn’t have to come.
Schachman: No, I didn’t have to come, but I didn’t even know how to look for a job. In those days, you didn’t need post-doc experience, which you do need now. So getting a job was just wonderful. Here I was a newly anointed PhD arriving in Berkeley to join the biochemistry department. I had never had a biochemistry course in my life, because Princeton didn’t really have biochemistry and I did not stay at Harvard long enough to take the biochemistry course, which I would have done at Harvard.

Lage: Was your PhD in chemistry?

Schachman: Physical chemistry. I had a bachelor’s in chemical engineering and a PhD in physical chemistry. Now I worked on biochemical things. I worked on tobacco mosaic virus for my PhD thesis, and so that was perfectly okay and nobody really cared about the degree. But it was ironic because I would get here, have to teach, and in a course I had never taken myself, so to speak.

Lage: You’re lucky you were a fast learner.

Schachman: It was interesting. I learned some biochemistry when I knew that I was going to move to Berkeley, Princeton had a very unusual PhD oral exam after you completed your dissertation. It was more or less a formality, because nobody ever flunked it. You had to prepare propositions in different branches, and I decided I’d do a lot of reading in biochemistry, which I didn’t know. Most of my propositions were on very biochemical ideas, which attracted a lot of interest among the faculty at Princeton, because they were not biochemists. They saw how I was using chemistry to answer questions in biochemistry.

Schachman: So it worked out fairly well, and we got out here although we had many problems on the way, because my wife was also pregnant with our first child. Unfortunately, she was having enormous problems at Princeton. I finally got in touch with a family friend in Philadelphia who directed us to a very good doctor, and he said, “Something is crazy. Your wife is pregnant but something is wrong.” Previously, the doctor from Princeton said, “The fetus is non-viable and she can abort somewhere. Just get in the car, and you can drive to California, and she’ll abort somewhere in Iowa.” She was in agony. The pain was enormous. It turned out she had a fibroid tumor the size of a nice-sized watermelon.
Lage: Oh, my God.

Schachman: She was only pregnant a month or two months at the most, but from her size it appeared she was ready to give birth. It was an incredible experience with a terrible mistake by one of the best people in Princeton, New Jersey, an intellectual center. In a Philadelphia hospital, they went crazy trying to figure out what was going on, but they did. The doctor said, “Well, we’re going to have to remove this. The chances are she’ll lose the fetus, but you’ll be all right.” There was a miracle. Ethel did not abort at all, and they removed the tumor. We then inquired, “Well, can she drive to California?” The response was, “Look, you can fall down four flights of stairs. If you didn’t lose that baby now, you’ll never lose it just driving to California. Except you just had a major operation, take it easy. Just don’t drive too long.” So we drove off to California where contacts had been made with obstetricians at Alta Bates. So we already knew who was going to deliver the baby, because it had to be done by Caesarean.

Lage: Did Stanley help you do this?

Schachman: No. It was all done by these friends in Philadelphia. Stanley didn’t know anything about it until we arrived. He had already left for California. We were the last to leave Princeton. When we arrived, she was about six months pregnant. Then a few months after we got here, she had a Caesarean, and our first child was born. He happens to be here today because he’s the principal oboist in the Philharmonia Baroque. He’s a world-class oboist.

Lage: What’s his name?

Schachman: Marc. He arrived by plane last night and then went out to Andronico’s and bought food and came back and cooked a dinner for the two of us. Now he’s cooked a turkey for tonight for us. His wife is also a world class musician. They live in New York, but he plays here a great deal. He was here a week or so ago for the Mark Morris. He played in the pit for the Mark Morris Dance Group. This week he’s going to have a solo piece.

Lage: Now have you been interested in music all along?

Schachman: No. When people ask me about that, I say that Marc is my first experiment in recombinant DNA. [laughter]
Lage: Is your wife interested in music?

Schachman: No. We both enjoy music but we don’t play any instrument. When Marc was growing up he was convinced that I was going to turn him into a biochemist, and he resented it. I said, “No, I’m not. You want to be a musician, you can be a musician.” But I added that you could make out very well as a mediocre biochemist and not as a mediocre musician. His response was simple. “I won’t be mediocre.” He wanted to audition at Juilliard and the New School for Music and all kinds of places, and I said, “Good. I’ll arrange a lecture tour so I can earn my keep across the country and pay plane fare, and you can go with me.”

We went and he auditioned, and everywhere he auditioned he was accepted. Then it turned out, he also applied to Stanford. He was a good student from El Cerrito High—and we’re backtracking on my personal life, but it’s interesting—so Arthur Kornberg knew him as a little boy, and he wrote a very glowing recommendation for him, but what surprised Kornberg no end was that Stanford went after my son as if he was going to be an all-American quarterback. They really made a great effort to recruit him and the kid of sixteen was overwhelmed at the excitement of them coming after him.

So he went to Stanford, and after two years he said, “Hell, there’s no music here.” He was wrong. There’s no performance music there, that was true. He’s since come to admire the musicologist for whom he had little respect in those days when he was a kid. Thus, he switched to Juilliard. He stayed there and has been in New York every since. In the meantime, he has become a great admirer of Mr. [George] Houle whom he knew at Stanford. Marc’s been a performer all of his life even though I convinced him to get a doctorate.

Lage: In musicology?

Schachman: Yes. At Juilliard.

Lage: Oh, that’s wonderful. There have been a lot of success stories.

Schachman: We see a lot of him because he plays here very often here. He’s one of their few imports as the principal oboist. Marc has been really influential in the Philharmonia Baroque where he has many friends.

Lage: Wonderful. Does he have an orchestra he plays with back there in New York?
Schachman: Back in New York he and his wife started a group called the Aulos Ensemble, which is one of the original baroque ensembles in the United States. They’ve been very successful. They’ve done a lot of recording. As I like to say, his CDs are much more interesting than my reprints. He plays in the Handel and Haydn Society in Boston. He and his wife are both in the Smithsonian Chamber Orchestra.

Life as a musician is a chaotic one. They travel all over the world. They’re very busy; they have two kids. It’s very difficult, but somehow they’re young, and they’re still doing it. It’s amazing. He was here for a little over a week for the Mark Morris performances. He flew home and immediately went to Washington with his wife to play at the Smithsonian. Then he came home with her, and he left the next morning to go to North Carolina. Then he went home on Saturday. It was her birthday. He was home Sunday with her, and he flew here yesterday.

Now he’s thinking about a three-day interval in between the concerts this weekend and the next weekend. He knows I’ve got a lot of mileage on TWA that I’m not using—so he’s thinking of hopping a plane and going home for three days, even though it will be a lot of flying. I said, “Sure. Do it if you want to.” So it’s a very difficult and complicated life. I mean, I do a lot. I have done a lot of travelling. I haven’t lately because my wife is ill, but in my case I grew up where the spouses weren’t very active as well. Marc’s life and Linda’s are much more chaotic because they play together a lot as well as separately.

Lage: Well, that’s nice at least. What about other children, as long as you’re doing your children.

Schachman: My other son is a lawyer in Chicago, and he also has two children, a boy and a girl. We don’t see him nearly as much. He’s an advisor to me on legal problems, so when I was fighting the university on mandatory retirement, David was a very valuable source of information. We’ll probably come to that later.

Lage: Yes. Now let’s see, we got you to Berkeley. It’s 3:00. Maybe we shouldn’t get into the loyalty oath until next time. How does that fit? Should we say a little bit more about what you found when you got here? When did you actually come?
Schachman: I came in the fall of ‘48. September of ‘48 is when I arrived.

Lage: And did you find it filled with cowboys?

Schachman: A very vivid recollection, which I actually put in writing, was of driving down Route 40, I think on San Pablo Avenue, and seeing nothing but bars. It confirmed our worst fear, you know, where you’re expecting people to come out shooting any minute, but obviously it turned very interesting, very, very quickly.

The political activity in Berkeley started very soon after I got here. The 1948 election, for example, was something that interested me a great deal, and I was not a dreamer. You know Henry Wallace was running for president independently of Harry Truman and, of course, the third party split would have wiped out Truman’s chances of being elected. There was no question in my mind. I was a fairly practical, liberal guy. I voted for Harry Truman, but during that period before the election, Henry Wallace came on a tour here, and I remember being invited to meet him. I don’t know how I got tapped so quickly, but I was invited to go to the Faculty Club, “Would you like to meet Henry Wallace?” At that luncheon, Mrs. Paul Robeson was present. Did Paul Robeson die already? I can’t remember.

Lage: I don’t think that early. [1976]

Schachman: In any case, the professor who arranged the lunch, but didn’t join us for lunch, was Peter Odegard. He was a well-known political scientist. He came from Reed College at just about the same time that we came here. In the course of introductions, he leaned over to say hello to Henry Wallace.

I guess he knew Mrs. Robeson and they started to talk. She asked him, “Are there any black professors on the campus?” I think his answer was, “No, but we’re trying to recruit one.” She said, “Well, I hope he’s good.” “Well, we think he’s good, but you might not think so.” She says, “Really? Who is it?” It was Ralph Bunche. She said, “I think he’d be terrific.” But Odegard probably had this vision that this radical left wing guy Paul Robeson might not appreciate how good Ralph Bunche was.

It struck me even then, as an eavesdropper at the lunch table listening to them talking. He was standing and she was sitting down. Henry Wallace had been
very active in the Department of Agriculture. Before he became a political figure, he was the secretary of agriculture and a very dynamic guy. He was very interested in farming, and he played a major role in the creation of the five regional laboratories of the Department of Agriculture, which were very good research centers. The one in Albany, California, is called the Western Regional Laboratory. There is one in Peoria, Illinois, one in Philadelphia, and there was one in New Orleans. They were regional laboratories, run by the Department of Agriculture, did very basic science, but their goal was, of course, to try and utilize crops and material that you get from plants.

Lage: But they weren’t university extension.

Schachman: No. They had nothing to do with the university. They were all separate. But Wallace was scientifically oriented and felt that it was important to do this. He began talking to me across the table and found out I was working on tobacco mosaic virus. He wanted to know if he could visit the labs, so he joined me—we were then in the forestry building before this building was built. My graduate student just went overboard completely when Henry Wallace walked in. He expressed deep interest when I showed him the ultracentrifuge and told him about what we were doing. Stanley was also impressed at the idea of Wallace visiting the lab. So politics was already happening within months of my getting here. The rumors and the rumblings of the loyalty oath issue occurred probably a year and a half after my arrival.

Lage: Yes. They would have. Was there residue from all the activity on the hill? Was that a concern?

Schachman: No. I mean, I knew there was a rad lab, and I knew there was a lot of secret work going on there, and I knew there were entangling alliances here at physics and chemistry, but it didn’t play much of a role in my life at all.

Lage: Did you have the sense that there was going to be a lot of support for science and for your lab?

Schachman: Oh, yes. Stanley was a Nobel laureate, and we were already designing this building, which is now fifty years old. Unfortunately, soon they are going to tear it down. As I say to them, the only way they can get rid of me is to destroy the building, and I will go down with the sinking ship. They tried to get rid of me ten years ago without success.
Lage: So you fought that mandatory retirement and won.

Schachman: I took them to court and then they settled with me out of court as we won the court decision on appeal. The settlement led to professor emeritus temporarily. Then professor of the graduate school was the new appointment for those who are really active. Yes, I fought over mandatory retirement at the age of seventy and received a lot of publicity out of it. It was a very interesting experience. One of the most interesting was—so my son helped me a lot—when he warned me, for example, that—we’re skipping quite a few years—I hadn’t filled out any papers for retirement. I was teaching in two departments. I had been chairman of molecular biology for a long time. I had been teaching in biochemistry and was no longer chairman of this department, but the people here, as you might have guessed, loved me, and the same thing was true down in biochemistry. I was on extremely good terms with most of my colleagues.

Lage: And you still were compos mentis.

Schachman: Right, and I had a lot of grant money from Washington. I was really rich in terms—and the overhead the university was getting out of this was very significant, and I loved it. I had no intentions of quitting.

Lage: How old were you?

Schachman: Seventy. My friend Gunther Stent never supported me, opposed me tooth and nail, typical Germanic thing. He says, “Howard, you knew the retirement age was seventy.” I said, “Gunther, but when I came here it was sixty-two, it then became sixty-five, it then became sixty-seven, it then became seventy, and I’m telling you it shouldn’t be seventy.”

So I decided I wouldn’t accept it. The department wrote very strong letters with the two department chairs supporting me. I was very active, my course was extremely popular, and there was nobody else to teach it. My son warned me that they’ll filibuster and, “you better have some money in the bank because if you don’t file papers for retirement”—which I didn’t want to do because that would indicate I was ready to compromise—”they cut off your pay and you’ll really be up the creek.”

So I was prepared for that and sure enough, I wasn’t getting paid all of a sudden. In the meantime, I went through all the machinery, wrote lots of
letters and received very perfunctory answers or none at all. The department chairs were getting very frustrated with inadequate responses from the administration.

Lage: And you were writing to whom?

Schachman: To administrators here.

Lage: Here on campus.

Schachman: Right. So then David, my son said, “Gee. Since you’re a good friend of Mike Heyman’s from all the battles in Berkeley over free speech and so on, why don’t you go see him? He’s the chancellor, and you have to exhaust your administrative remedies.” That was the goal. So I said, “A good idea, I’ll call Mike.” I called Mike Heyman and talked to his administrative assistant, who asked, “What do you want to see him about?” I said, “He’ll know. We’re old friends.” She said, “Okay. I’ll call you back tomorrow.” I called her again and received the response “He won’t see you”. I was also given the advice to consult a specific administrator who had been conspicuously uncommunicative in earlier dealings. Hence, I said, “Thank you very much,” and I did exactly what we had planned to do. I went to San Francisco to a lawyer that David had found, who had fought some other battles, and he then started writing letters.

Lage: Age discrimination battles?

Schachman: Age discrimination. It turned out the employment bureau or whatever, labor department in Sacramento, was very excited about taking my case. They led us to believe that they would be ecstatic, because I had hundreds of thousands of dollars in grant money, and was a big shot in all sorts of agencies in Washington, DC. I wasn’t a left wing communist. I was a respectable citizen in the community, so their deliberations went on for quite a while, with them saying we’ll take the case. It would have been an age discrimination case against the university, with one agency of government fighting another agency.

Then they must have been subjected to enormous pressure because quite late in the game they withdrew and said, “Sorry. We won’t take your case.” We
never did know what was going on, but in the meantime, my lawyer began to fight on his own. Once he started writing letters, we began getting answers.

It turned out, sure enough, they said that we, as you probably know, were challenging them on state law. State law says that you can have mandatory retirement—you people in California, provided you have facilities and procedures for year-by-year reappointments and reemployment on a yearly and individual basis.

We were not fighting the federal law. The federal law said professors can be forced to retire. Although there was a policy against discrimination based on age, federal law said you can’t discriminate against anybody except firemen, policemen, and university professors. This exemption was to continue until about 1983, and here I was in 1980. So it was three years away and we were not fighting that one. We thought the state had a wonderful policy. That all I wanted was to sit down and set up a committee the way you normally do and evaluate me. You have three criteria here, teaching, research, and public service. Okay. I’m willing to take a chance.

Lage: And you don’t mind being evaluated each year.

Schachman: That’s right. Even that was a compromise, but I was willing to take that chance. I think it’s the ideal solution because otherwise you wind up with people who don’t want to leave and have no retirement policy at all.

Lage: You mean they don’t currently have a policy?

Schachman: Now there is no retirement at all in the University of California, because the exemption in the federal policy has expired. If a guy wants to stay here and is willing to stand the gaff from his colleagues and be placed in a closet, you can remain on the faculty. If you’re an English professor and you don’t need laboratory space and so forth; you could stay here forever. It’s too bad, and there ought to be a way of solving that problem. You’d draw your salary, unless they fire you for incompetence, which they’re very unlikely to do, because they’re afraid to do that. So I would prefer to have some machinery.

Anyway, it turned out, sure enough, that the Berkeley campus did not have written procedures. They had no procedures. They had just bluffed in a few previous occasions before my case. So then they reappointed me for a year. I
received my back pay for the few months that they didn’t pay me at all and then I was reemployed. I took it for granted the next year that they would back off and it would be easy. It turned out not to be the case at all. They were even more adamant the next year. By that time they put this nonsense in writing, and I was terminated.

Then the lawyer really went to work and filed a court case, and we lost in the lower court. Then we appealed to a higher court. I was receiving calls from people who were willing to contribute money toward my legal costs, although I didn’t accept any, and didn’t need any, as it turned out. Then the appellate court ruled, I think unanimously against the university, that it was violating state law. There were two other guys in the court case. One I’ve never met from some other campus and one from the math or statistics department, whom I hardly knew.

By that time I was appointed by Harold Varmus to be the special advisor to the Director of the National Institutes of Health and had partial control of a $10 billion dollar budget. (I hope you realize when I am exaggerating or joking.) As a consequence, the university was a little bit more solicitous of my well being. Their lawyer began to approach my lawyer about making a deal, and my son and the lawyers recommended I accept it.

In a way, my wife and I now we know better. We shouldn’t have accepted it, but anyway, we did. Basically the deal was that I—I’m not supposed to talk about it, and I won’t talk about any of the financial aspects—could continue my research with government grants. I’ll give you an illustration.

During the early part of the struggle, while it was still horrendous, I received a phone call from NIH that they would like to convert my five-year grant, it from what is called a RO1 award to a R37 award. The latter is a merit award for extending research in time. (MERIT is an acronym, which means the grant would be automatically extended five additional years.) They asked, “Do you mind?” “Would I mind? The university is trying to fire me, and you are now telling me you’re going to give me $300,000 dollars a year for five more years?” I figured, “Gee. I’m going to tell them I’ll take it.” While filling out all the papers, I kept thinking that the grants office here is more interested in the fact that 45 or 49 percent of that 300,000 is going to go into the university pocket, and maybe they won’t know that another part of the university is trying to kick me off the campus.
Sure enough, they signed the papers, and I’m still in the business of getting money from Washington. I’m awaiting a phone call any day now as to whether I’m going to get four more years of funding.

Lage: But was it as a result of your suit?

Schachman: No. But the federal exemption ran out. They didn’t ask for another exemption. There was a committee of the National Academy of Sciences which studied the impact. One of the workers called me on the phone, “Howard, you’re going to be very interested in this result. We claim that it’s not going to destroy universities to end mandatory retirement.” It hasn’t destroyed them, because most people do quit. You get tired and—.

Lage: And then they have things like the VERIPs, [Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Program] which cleared out a lot of people.

Schachman: Oh, that did, and that cleared out good people. That’s the sad part. Oh, there are some young kids around here that are marvelous, who shouldn’t have quit. I don’t know why they quit. I love what I’m doing and I don’t know how they could do it.

Lage: Well, I think we should end for today.

[End Session 1, Tape 2, Side A]
Schachman: Still another committee has been created by the National Academy of Sciences to study environments that foster research integrity. This is the umpteenth such committee and they are now meeting. My good friend, Bruce Alberts, who was almost my student, is president of the National Academy of Sciences, and he told me at the recent regional meeting here, “Howard, we’ve got a wonderful committee. Have you heard about it?” I said, “No, I haven’t heard about it.” I didn’t know anything about it. So I said, “That’s good.” I didn’t know what they were studying. Then all of a sudden I get this email asking whether I would be willing to go before this committee to talk about my experiences—traveling around the world and country, primarily—and factors which foster research integrity. I immediately called one of my friends who is on the committee. He said, “By all means, you’ve got to come, because I don’t like the tenor of the committee and the direction we’re following. You are one of the few scientists that can stand up to most of these people.” I said, “Okay.” Then I called a second member of the committee. Same thing. “Howard, you’ve got to come.” So I’d been thinking about it and I told them I’ll come.

But in the meantime I called up the executive secretary of the committee and asked, “Who’s sponsoring this?” The Office of Research Integrity, was the response. This office (ORI) is one in a long succession of government offices that grew up when the fraud issue was front page news. The office used to be part of the National Institutes of Health. They’re now independent of NIH, but they report as part of the Department of Health and Human Services, so the assistant secretary of the HHS, who has not yet been appointed, will be the boss of the man who directs ORI. Formally the office is no longer part of NIH.

The main reason they were kicked out of where they were, was because of their notorious failures in their investigations of allegations of fraud. They were involved in the so-called Baltimore case. They were involved in the Gallo case; they were involved in the Fisher case. In every one of those cases, they ruled that the accused was guilty. However, when they went to appeal it turned out that they were not. In each of those cases, that office, I can say this categorically, involved the whistle blower as part of the
investigative machinery. Instead of saying, “Hey, you made a charge and that’s wonderful. Now we will independently investigate this, and we will provide due process to the people who are accused.” They didn’t do that. They were out to convict.

I actually testified in one of those three cases on behalf of the defense because some woman lawyer who knew me very well called me on the telephone. She said, “Howard, will you be willing to testify?” I said, “You know, I am not fond of the principal investigator (the head of the laboratory), and I don’t know anything about the science.” I know he’s distinguished, and he’s made marvelous contributions. He’s widely despised. I’m not unique.

Lage: Which investigator?

Schachman: It was [Robert] Gallo, in this particular case. This case dealt with stealing the so-called virus from a French investigator. Many of my friends tell me, “Howard, they deserved each other.” In any case, she said to me, “Gallo’s not on trial. It’s a young post-doc by the name of [Mikula] Popovic”—whose name didn’t mean anything to me. “He’s on trial, and I want you to talk about not the science, but how a laboratory works. How do you handle a foreign post-doc who doesn’t speak English. Who writes the paper? Who corrects the paper? Who submits the paper? How do you go over the data? All kinds of things of that sort.” So I said, “Gee, that’s interesting. I’ll be in Washington at the time you indicated.”

I went with my wife to meet with this very distinguished lawyer, Barbara Mishskin, to talk about the case. At dinner she presented me with thirty questions. I said, “Barbara, this is not appropriate. That is not appropriate. This is a terrific question, and you could build on that one.” Anyway, we went over what I was to be asked by the defense attorney on the stand. She built up the story, sent my CV to the court and ORI and I went to the “trial.” The charges against Mr. Popovic included three counts of fraud and misconduct because of falsification.

Lage: He was foreign?

Schachman: He was a foreign post-doc in Gallo’s lab and was the senior author of the contested paper. This was a surrogate trial in that ORI went after Popovic rather than Gallo. They were going to try the young guy first, then beat up the
big guy later. I’d never met Mr. Popovic, except at that trial where I was testifying. It was a fascinating experience. Three of the charges were on falsification of a table of data in the paper. In the table you have numbers in column one, in column two, in column three. In a couple of places the table had the letters ND instead of numbers. Now ND usually means “not determined,” which is synonymous with “not determinable.” It means that the noise level of your instrument was such that the number you obtained was not meaningful. I usually put a little squiggle indicating that we couldn’t get any reliable number, so there is no number. Some people write ND, and some journals call that “not done.” So in the journal where the paper was published, it was Science, ND stood for “not done.” According to ORI, he fabricated, he falsified, because he had done the experiment. I went to the appeal trial armed with instructions to authors of another prominent journal, and it said, “When you use ND, you don’t need to define it. We all know what it means.”

Lage: But it doesn’t mean the same in every case?

Schachman: That’s right. It means not determinable sometimes or not done in other instances. But it certainly means, “I don’t have a number.” It’s sort of a vague phrase. Nevertheless, that’s the way it is. And the three judges, the appellate judges, they just went crazy when I read the instructions for authors of that journal.

Lage: In another journal.

Schachman: Right, and they threw out the conviction of misconduct. This was a preposterous conviction, debarring for ten years a young guy. Well, then it turns out, of course, to be a wonderful story. He had written the original draft of the paper, and he referred to the French work. In the margin of the paper, his boss wrote, “You’re crazy,” and he crossed out the reference to the other group. He had a copy of his draft. His wife was brilliant. She kept the copy. And they went back to Europe, because he lost his job. The defense lawyer had obtained a copy of the original manuscript. As a result, Popvic won his case hands down. The first time he had an appellate opportunity with a real trial, with real charges, with a defense attorney and a prosecuting attorney, and he won.
In the Baltimore case, it was [Thereza] Imanishi-Kari who was being debarred. She called me up, although I didn’t know her either. But she called me up because she knew I was in the racket and could give her advice. I said, “If you’re lucky, you’ll be indicted.” Can you imagine telling somebody that if they’re lucky they’ll be indicted?

Lage: Because you’ll get a fair hearing.

Schachman: That’s right. She says, “What are you talking about?” She started to scream. She thought I was supposed to be a friend, rather than the enemy. [laughs] I told her, “That’s the only way you’re going to get all the material they confiscated from you. You’ll be able to go over your stuff.” Her notebooks were gone. She didn’t have any of her records. Everything was taken away from her. It turned out that she got a trial not through a court room because the attorney general in the state of Maryland chose not to indict her, because he didn’t think he had a case. But she’d already been convicted by ORI (or its predecessor agency), debarred for ten years and fired. She lost her grant.

Lage: Was that reversed?

Schachman: Then she went to the appellate panel, and the review court. I was asked to testify in that case also. By that time I was working for NIH, and I couldn’t do it, so I didn’t.

Lage: These were written up in the New Yorker. I remember reading them.

Schachman: The Baltimore case was written up extensively. Now it’s a big, thick book, [The Baltimore Case: A Trial of Politics, Science, and Character]. The author, Daniel Kevles, is a very distinguished historian in science. He was at Cal Tech, he’s now moved to Yale University. His book on the Baltimore case is a marvelous story.

Lage: I’m going to stop a minute. [tape shuts off, resumes] I want you to back up just a minute and say what you just said to me.

Schachman: I’m giving a talk of about twenty minutes in April on what fosters scientific integrity. My principal message is that integrity starts at the top. I plan to use a variety of illustrations. One of them is about the [UC] vice president in outreach programs who enrolled a couple of football players months after the course had terminated. He may be suspended for one semester, but he makes
$207,000 a year on the outreach program. That’s integrity in the University of California.

There’s a classic story from UCSD. One of the first fraud cases that attracted my interest dealt with a man, named Slutsky, a professor. He was publishing, as I like to say, a paper every ten days. That’s not quite accurate. He published thirty-nine papers in 1985. Thirty-nine papers. That’s enough to attract anybody’s attention. The chancellor, who is now the president of the University of California, thought he walked on water, so they set up a committee to promote this guy. A friend of mine happened to be on the committee. He obviously was as amazed as I am at that publication rate. He began to look at some of the papers which listed many co-authors. He called one of the co-authors on the phone, as I remember the story, and that individual said, “I don’t know anything about the paper,” even though he was listed as a co-author. So that led into a full-fledged investigation, and it turns out, of course, that many of them were fraudulent.

Lage: Completely nonexistent?

Schachman: Right. He made them up, or just published the same thing in different forms. It became a cause celebre in the fraud story in American universities. This case was not like Imanishi-Kari apparently making some mistakes, or being careless in the laboratory and not keeping decent notebooks. Which is true, she didn’t. That type of work would drive me crazy, but she’s not in my laboratory, and she wasn’t in Baltimore’s either. She was an independent investigator, a collaborator.

So anyway, they investigated Professor Slutsky and found he was guilty. And then what do you think they did? His lawyer and the university counsel got together, and they made a deal, and the case ended. As I like to say, he’s gone somewhere in the United States, practicing medicine, and he’s probably treating my grandchildren. I want disclosure. But the university wasn’t interested in disclosure because that might open litigation, and they don’t want bad news to go out, so they kept the whole thing quiet. That is the characteristic pattern of how institutions treated real fraud. They just covered it up. If the case was unequivocal, the individual would leave.

But on the other hand, there was no publication that he was guilty of fraud, and no adjudication in the real sense of the word. This guy quit early in the
racket, so he was never subjected to a trial. Then they opened all these new offices. Office of Scientific Integrity, and Office of Scientific Integrity Review, then the Commission on Research Integrity, and now the Office of Research Integrity.

Lage: Here in the university?

Schachman: No, no, this is NIH. They were all in Washington or Bethesda. That’s the one that’s sponsoring this new meeting, and I’m going to point out that they keep saying, “We want to set up rules and guidelines that will prevent misconduct.” I am always telling them, “You can’t prevent it. The only way you’ll prevent it is to stop doing science. There are always going to be some people who are guilty of no ethical standards whatsoever.” Prosecute them with due process, adjudicate the case, reach a decision, impose proper sanctions, and then disclose. There is recidivism.

I have a fabulous quote, which I can’t put my finger on, but I’ve asked my secretary to print it out on a transparency for me. It is by a law professor from Cornell or Columbia where I heard it at one of the meetings I went to ten or twelve years ago on the subject. He says, “Criminal law teaches us a lot.” He points out that, “Wherever there’s a lot of money, there’s going to be a lot of crime. There’s no question that we could wipe out all criminal activity, but the cost to our society would be unbelievable.” That doesn’t mean, he goes on, that we should countenance the fakes and frauds in science, but to try and get rid of them will destroy science. It’s a beautiful quote. I’m going to use it before this committee. I think they’re wasting their time and the taxpayers’ money. This outfit, the ORI, is made up of a bunch of fraud detectives trying to make a living. I feel very strongly about this issue as you can probably judge from my remarks.

Lage: So what’s the solution?

Schachman: The solution is to beat hell out of the guys who are proved to be guilty, but as you know, capital punishment does not eliminate murder. I don’t believe in capital punishment I think you can have courses in integrity, but to have an attitude that you can eliminate fraud or unethical behavior is just preposterous nonsense. Look at the Catholic Church. You’ll fill the world full of promises that won’t be fulfilled.
Lage: And you seem to accept that scientists are just as liable to be unethical.

Schachman: Absolutely. They are just like other people in our society. We have a whole series of adjectives which describe my colleagues in science: ambitious, self-serving, opportunistic, selfish, competitive, contentious, aggressive, and arrogant. But that doesn’t mean they are crooks. I have just received an award for my activity in this field.

Lage: I know. I have a little clipping about that.

Schachman: So, I prepared about a page and a quarter of comments. They told me to speak for three minutes. It turned out that the first person to get an award was on another subject, a very distinguished physicist, Leon Lederman, a Nobel laureate. Letterman apparently had been president of the AAAS [American Association for the Advancement of Science]. He gets up there and starts telling jokes. He’s gotten older and so forth and so on, his wife no longer buys green bananas, and he made a couple of sexual innuendoes. Some of it, I thought, wasn’t very tasteful, but in any case, he essentially talked about growing old.

The next three or four awards were people [speaking] as if they were at the Academy Awards. They thanked their brothers, their uncles and aunts and all their teachers. My wife is sitting next to me, and she says, “What are you going to do?” I said, “I have all these gorgeous remarks down here.” She says, “Well, you’ve got to use some of them.” So I got up there and I indicated, “My thanks really go to a series of unnamed congressmen and a series of fraud detectives in Washington who’ve kept me exercised over the past two decades.” [laughter]

That set the audience off. Then I described this horrible case. Also this will be along diversion from my remarks at the award ceremony. The original language was “fraud.” The lawyers in Washington don’t like that word because you’ve got to satisfy five criteria. The most important one is, you have to prove intent, and proving intent is impossible. You also have to prove that causes harm. Well, if you publish a fraudulent paper in science, you can’t prove necessarily that harm is resulting from it. It’s just that you’re harming the culture of science, and you’re harming the individual who did it.
They wanted to get rid of the word fraud, so they called it “scientific misconduct.” I happened to be president of the American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology at that time. I said, “Scientific misconduct, that’s horrible! I don’t know what that means. What are the criteria for what I call the equivalent of fraud? Well, fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism.” So I kept fighting for those three words, which I call FFP, because it stands for frequent flyer program. I was flying back and forth across the United States giving speeches on the subject for years.

So, sure enough, I am invited to a meeting by the director of NIH—this was a long time ago, about twelve years ago. In the room are the chief deputy counsels of this government agency, that government agency, maybe ten chief counsels of universities, the director of NIH, who was a distinguished scientist, and me. And I’m fighting over each word. They want “misrepresentation,” “deception.” I said, “Look, to a lawyer what I do by leaving out some data is called deception. To me, that’s selective use of relevant data. I made a prudent choice. Watson and Crick ignored this. Pauling ignored that. And you would say they were deceiving the outside world.” I said, “You can’t use words like that. “Misrepresentation” is a horrible word. If you fabricate something, you make it up. If you falsify, you change the results. That’s disgraceful. If you steal—.” So, we fought like hell.

A couple of guys came up and said, “Gee, you’re a persuasive attorney.” So, great. I go home and a few days later the director of NIH calls me up. He was ecstatic with my performance. He said, “Howard, they added the phrase, ‘Those practices which seriously deviate from those commonly accepted in the field.’” That’s the medical malpractice line which, if you deviate from those practices that are commonly accepted, that’s how they get you on something very vague. I said to him, “Anything that’s creative and brilliant seriously deviates from the crap that’s being published daily in all the journals of the world.”

Lage: They didn’t use those three, fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism.

Schachman: They kept those in and added the seriously deviate clause. So then I fought a twelve-year struggle to get rid of it. One of the cases was adjudicated by the inspector general (IG) of the National Science Foundation. The IG happened to be a woman at that time. It’s called the OIG [Office of the Inspector General]. I’ve tangled with her a lot. She’s a bright person, but she’s gone
now. She convicted a young man of scientific misconduct using the seriously deviate clause. He worked on a contract with a big Midwestern Big Ten university, and taught a course in Central America somewhere. I don’t remember exactly where it was, and he was charged, according to depositions made by sixteen students, of almost rape—certainly sexual harassment and sexual abuse. They were horrible depositions. I read every one of the affidavits. She called that scientific misconduct because he did that as part of his job as an instructor. I indicated that this case and her decision demonstrated the preposterousness of using that seriously deviate clause. [laughter]

Lage: He did seriously deviate, hopefully.

Schachman: He sure did. So I pointed out in my talk here in San Francisco that I come from Berkeley. I’m not even sure that deviates. The audience got a big kick out of that, too. Anyway, after twelve years of my battling, they have gotten rid of that seriously deviate clause. It’s now FFP.

Lage: You’ve had quite an impact. You’re like a bulldog.

Schachman: I fought for twelve years over a few words. Anyway, I’m a bulldog.

Lage: Just noting for the record: today’s March 19, 2001. This is the second interview with Howard Schachman. We are talking about the loyalty oath. I wanted to have you talk the way you just have about your current interest. Now I’m going to make you go back fifty-one years.

Schachman: Right.

Lage: You were a new arrival.

Schachman: That’s right. It was very shortly after we got here. You asked me how I knew about it [the loyalty oath]. It turned out I got a phone call from someone who knew, apparently, which side of the political spectrum I fit on. I don’t remember who it was. He said, “Have you heard this story about a loyalty oath?” I said I knew nothing. He said, “Well, there’s going to be a discussion.” I went to this meeting and distinguished faculty like [Edward C.] Tolman were there. There were all sorts of big names, and some younger faculty. They began talking about this loyalty oath. I was horrified. Nothing was in print. There was no academic—
Lage: So this was very early on, before it had been made public?

Schachman: Very early on. That’s right.

Lage: Do you recall how they knew about it already?

Schachman: I don’t know. They knew that [Robert Gordon] Sproul had recommended it. There was this vice president [James] Corley who was involved. He was our representative in Sacramento. This was before McCarthy, but Mr. [Jack B.] Tenney was the state senator. You know about him?

Lage: Yes. The Tenney Committee [Un-American Activities Committee of the California State Legislature].

Schachman: Right. He was agitating about getting those communists at the University of California. The University of California in those days was synonymous with Berkeley, because the other campuses were much less prominent.

Lage: Although UCLA might argue a bit about that.

Schachman: But at that time, even UCLA probably couldn’t make a strong case, because it was still a relatively young, new campus. But they had very good people, there’s no question about that. The professors at this meeting might have heard about it through the legislature. Corley convinced Sproul, I gather, that there was danger of Sacramento doing something to the university, and therefore, we ought to do something. Though former President [David P.] Gardner disputes this, I think it was a preemptive first strike on the part of Sproul to propose a loyalty oath and forestall any reaction coming from Sacramento. You’ve seen Gardner’s book. [The California Oath Controversy, UC Press, 1967]

Lage: Yes, but I didn’t know he disputed that. I thought that was accepted that it was a first strike.

Schachman: I think he doesn’t interpret it that way. Have you seen my remarks at that symposium? You have that. [October 1999 UC loyalty oath symposium: http://sunsite3.berkeley.edu/uchistory/archives_exhibits/loyaltyoath/]

Lage: Yes. Let me just get a little background. You came to Berkeley in the fall of ‘48.

Lage: And this must have been in the spring of ‘49.

Schachman: Yes, it was very early. Well, as a matter of fact, I think Henry Wallace visited during the election period, either before the election or just after the election, because he ran for president at that time.

Lage: And you remembered meeting him.

Schachman: Right.

Lage: How did you put down roots here when you came? You knew Stanley, of course. Then how did you meet other people?

Schachman: Well, he hired about four or five young faculty members. The department was built up very slowly, but we were all crowded in one big office in the forestry building. The present building, Stanley Hall, did not exist. We were all planning the construction of this building, and we shared an office together. Stanley’s secretary was in this gigantic office, and Stanley had an office off the side of that, so anybody that came in to see Stanley would ask the secretary, but we would all see that person. We just had desks and some filing cabinets. There was a lot of close contact. I had a lab just down the hall from this big office, and this one terrific graduate student, and was enjoying my life enormously.

Lage: Did you go to Academic Senate meetings? Did you know the faculty from the liberal arts end of things?

Schachman: No. I don’t think the senate was a very active affair. All these loyalty oath meetings were just a volunteer group of people who got together. And I can’t remember whether the Committee of 200 was the loyalty oath or was that the Free Speech movement?

Lage: Free speech. That will come another time.

Schachman: Right. But there were two hundred, roughly, in both groups. That’s why I get confused.
Lage: I’m thinking about the private side of your life, too. Did your wife go to work or was she basically home?

Schachman: After Marc was born, several months following our arrival in Berkeley, she was preoccupied at home

Lage: So she was just a young mother.

Schachman: A young mother. My first graduate student died, unfortunately, several years ago. I talked to his wife the other day. You’ll love this story. My wife and I were down south just recently for a trip. I arrived at home, and found voice mail. It was from Mrs. Harrington, the wife of my first graduate student, with whom I was a very close friend. It’s not like any relationship you ever have.

Lage: With a graduate student?

Schachman: Yes, he and I, his wife and my wife were very good friends. The message on my answering machine was, “Howard, did you notice that Arthur Peacocke won the Templeton Award?” Do you know about the Templeton Award? It is an award given for somebody interested in tying together science and religion. My first post-doc, who was in my laboratory when Bill Harrington was my graduate student, was this man, Arthur Peacocke. He came from England, and has just won this award amounting to 700,000 pounds—that’s over a million bucks. He had become a minister. Arthur Peacocke.

Lage: So Mrs. Harrington—

Schachman: Called up to tell me about it. Of course, being down south, we missed reading the New York Times. Fortunately, we didn’t cancel our subscription, so when I found the voice mail I went back to all the old newspapers that were lying on the floor. Sure enough, the article was in it and I was able to obtain all the details. The awards ceremony will be at Buckingham Palace, on the ninth of May. It’s a big deal. A million dollars.

Lage: Now did you say he was also your graduate student?

Schachman: He was a post-doc. Arthur Peacocke. So I had a very prominent post-doc, right?

Lage: And did issues like science and religion come up in your—
No. I would never have guessed it. I mean, he worked on DNA with me, and we published a nice paper together. Bill and Inga Harrington went, years later, as a post-doc to England. That’s why they were friendly with him. He arranged to get them some housing at one of the colleges at Cambridge, and he’s now at Oxford. (That was the aside interrupting the flow of our discussion.)

My wife, shortly after the birth of Marc, wanted to work. She worked as the administrator for the dean of the Unitarian School for Ministry. Very fine guy. My wife, I told you, had to send a letter of recommendation in from Einstein. Unfortunately, she gave the letter to him. We don’t even have a copy of it because we didn’t know any better.

Oh, that’s right. You don’t have a copy. She was a working mother?

She worked and Bill Harrington’s wife ran sort of a nursery to help him go through graduate school. So I dropped my son Marc off every day at Inga Harrington’s house, picked up Bill, the two of us went to work. As I say, we were almost like brothers rather than professor and student. So my wife worked half time.

Was that unusual at the time?

Oh, I think so, yes. I don’t think any of our colleagues’ wives worked at that time. It was rare.

But that gave you a different circle of friends, also.

And she had enjoyed what she had done for the Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists, so being clammed up would have been terrible. It worked out very well. Then, during the free speech battle she went back to graduate school.

Oh, she did?

Here.

Was it related to free speech?
Schachman: It was political science. Because we were having meetings with all these colleagues I considered the cream of the faculty. The group included [Jacobus “Chick”] tenBroek, all sorts of wonderful guys. John [Searle] was part of that group. Frequently the meetings would be at my house. Ethel got to know Carl Schorske, who then went to Princeton University, and Sheldon Wolin of the political science department. It was a fantastic group of people.

Lage: Okay, we’re going to talk about that another time.

Schachman: I was the only scientist in that crowd.

Lage: We really do want to get into that one, but first tell me how you recall the events of the loyalty oath. What stands out? I just want to hear your impression.

Schachman: There was a series of meetings every Friday night at the Faculty Club.

Lage: Before dinner?

Schachman: I like to say for our therapy. No, it was after dinner, and we would talk about strategy and tactics. I was intemperate enough as a young kid one day to walk in and say, “What’s going to be the compromise tonight?” And the guy who jumped on me was a person who liked me very much, Milton Chernin. He was then or became later the dean of the School of Social Welfare. He was a very nice guy, and he liked me a lot. We became good friends years later, but I remember him not liking my comment [suggesting] that these older guys, even in this wonderful collection, were a bunch of compromisers. The thing I remember the most was, I guess, [Ernst H.] Kantorowicz getting up and saying, “Here’s a card. If you put your name on the card—if there are 200 people, 200 cards collected, any of those people on that list will resign when the first man is fired.” I was perfectly willing to do that, and from there on down plans for united action were being watered down and watered down.

Lage: So the initial decision was to really put your job on the line.

Schachman: That’s right. All of us, as a unit, as a block. With unity, we would prevail, according to the Kantorowicz proposal.

Lage: How many?
Schachman: Over 200, I’m sure, at that time, in a faculty of 1200. It was a significant minority. Early in that game, Stanley called me up to his office one day and said to me, “What are you thinking about the loyalty oath?” I told him, and he said, “I assume you’re not signing it.” I said, “That’s right.” He asked me why, and I told him my principal objection was swearing to anything as a faculty member. He knew me very well. I had been his technician; I volunteered to go in the navy because I felt they couldn’t win the war without me when I was working for him at Rockefeller. I went in the navy, and of course, I signed a loyalty oath as an officer in the navy, so I’m perfectly prepared to sign loyalty oaths in the proper setting.

Lage: But not as a faculty member.

Schachman: As a faculty member, that was not appropriate at all. And on top of that, it was a political oath that dealt with a group of people designated as members of the Communist Party. First, I didn’t know who were members of the Communist Party, but I couldn’t believe that you hired people on the basis of their membership. I couldn’t believe you could fire them on the basis of whatever the prohibitions were. And to me, it was also ironic. I kept pointing this out, very early, that the regents had instituted a noncommunist hiring policy way back around 1940. This is already ’49. But we were at war with Nazis, not with communists.

Lage: They didn’t have an anti-fascist hiring policy.

Schachman: That’s right, and they still don’t. But they still have an anti-communist hiring policy.

Lage: Still now, they have—?

Schachman: The policy still exists. At that symposium, when I brought this issue up as the probability of using lie detector tests, former President Gardner says, “I’m going to have to talk to [UC President] Dick Atkinson about this,” I had commented, “You guys are asking for trouble.” And now with the affair at Los Alamos over Wen Ho Lee, perhaps employees at the University of California will have to be subjected to lie detector tests. I made a joke about they were going to do DNA analysis, to look for the gene for spying. There have been so many periods in the last fifty years, as I said at that occasion, during which a vigorous, dynamic, thoughtful, prudent chancellor or president
could have come forward to the Board of Regents and said, “Hey, look, this policy is no longer appropriate. Why don’t we get rid of it?”

Lage: In the current period?

Schachman: Yes, because we are no longer hysterical over communists. In principle, we’re not hysterical. Mr. Bush may be, but I don’t know.

[Begin Tape 3, side B]

Lage: Thinking back to this group of 200 people, did they come with different reasons for opposing the loyalty oath?

Schachman: It’s hard for me to recall exactly. I think some of them objected—there was dignity involved. That didn’t bother me, that we were being singled out. I think the overwhelming bulk of them just felt that the policy was wrong, and this was a device for implementing the policy. Previously there was no opportunity to evaluate or criticize or discuss this odious policy before it was implemented. So now we had an excellent opportunity when the loyalty oath was introduced as a device for implementing a non-communist hiring policy. In this way they could get somebody on grounds of perjury. That would be the implication. But I can’t swear that everybody felt that way. I’m sure Chick tenBroek opposed it on grounds of principle, that he didn’t think communists ought to be barred any more than blind people ought to be barred. He was blind.

Lage: Yes, I remember that. Was that a fault line, that some of the faculty really believed there shouldn’t be communists hired or retained on the staff?

Schachman: Oh, a lot to them thought that. The majority of those who went along willingly really felt that communists were dangerous people who didn’t believe in truth. Even Wendell Stanley tried to concoct some language that by virtue of swearing fealty to the Communist Party doctrine, you no longer could have the freedom to pursue truth as truth existed. They thought that that was a restriction. You could have made the same case about the Catholic Church, as far as I’m concerned, but I wouldn’t make that case, because I think a lot of Catholics don’t feel bound. So, that’s it. There’s no question that there were people on the campus, like Joel Hildebrand, who would give impassioned speeches about how you can’t trust them, and they shouldn’t be
members of the faculty. That’s essentially where I think we got in trouble, because we never were forthright in coming out and saying, “Hey, damn it, the policy is crazy, and there are some communists.”

I knew some in England. J. D. Bernal. One of the greatest crystallographers in history. He was a well-known Marxist. Whether he was a member of the English Communist Party or not, I don’t know. But he wasn’t an American, so I couldn’t tell you that he joined the American Communist Party, which really contained a bunch of nuts. But many of them were well-meaning people who joined as young kids.

Lage: And it wouldn’t mean that they couldn’t be good scientists.

Schachman: That’s exactly right.

Lage: Good historians.

Schachman: Right. And of course, the three major cases—the other day I went to get David Hollinger’s article out of this book on unfettered expression. It’s a fantastic collection. It’s a lecture series at the University of Michigan in honor of three people who were fired by the University of Michigan because they refused to testify before Congress. One is H. Chandler Davis. The others are Clem Markert and Mark Nickerson. Nickerson is a very distinguished scientist, and Markert is probably even more distinguished, I’m not sure. But I knew Markert very well; he fought on the loyalist side in the Spanish-American War. He died a few years ago, but I used to see him at annual meetings of the National Academy of Sciences. He was very involved in trying to recruit me after the Free Speech battle to go to Yale. He was chairman of biology at Yale, and wanted me very much to join as chair of biochemistry at Yale. When I visited with him and started talking about the politics at home, he said, “Howard, here I am.” He says, “You’ll find Kingman Brewster will be very receptive to your political views.” He knew that I had been extremely active. At the time I was wearing a collar for a

---

wrenched neck and people asked, “Why are you wearing a collar?” I said, “The regents tried to hang me, and the students cut me down, and this is covering up the rope burns!” So that was when I was being interviewed by William Sloan Coffin, who was very outspoken at Yale.

Lage: And that was the FSM [Free Speech Movement]?

Schachman: That was FSM. Many years later. So, Markert had a distinguished career, despite being fired by Michigan. You notice that the Michigan Academic Senate set up a lecture series honoring these three men, and David Hollinger is the most recent lecturer, so he’s in this book [Unfettered Expression] The first article is a preface written by Halberstam.

Lage: Oh, David Halberstam?

Schachman: Do you know about him? Are you a baseball fan?

Lage: Well, he’s written about basketball, also. He’s written about—

Schachman: In this marvelous preface, he writes about free speech. I just Xeroxed it so I can give it to my wife to read. She’ll enjoy reading David Halberstam. He’s the author of The Best and the Brightest.

Lage: Yes, he wrote The Best and the Brightest. He also wrote something on the civil rights movement.

Schachman: Oh, he’s terrific. The rest of the chapters are by very distinguished people considering the question, what is academic freedom? Walter Metzger, who was a pioneer fifty years ago, wrote an academic freedom chapter, and then Hollinger wrote a chapter on money in the post-McCarthy era, and the corruption at universities. He gave a lecture here on that subject.

Lage: He lectured in connection to the loyalty oath, too.

Schachman: That’s right. Yes, he’s good. He’s stimulating. That was just a very informal talk, but I can’t remember when Tolman became the leader in the group protesting the loyalty oath.

Lage: Of your group.
Schachman: Yes, the group. We met almost every week.

Lage: Were you connected with the other universities where similar things were happening?

Schachman: Not at that time. Various well-meaning people like Wendell Stanley took it upon themselves to contact all sorts of university presidents and distinguished scientists from other universities. They were essentially defending the non-signers, basically, and not endorsing the policy. The various compromises that were concocted and put together involved faculty members like Wendell Stanley who tried to craft language which would not be unequivocally clear.

John Francis Neylan saw through all of that, so we were always responding, at these meetings of our two hundred to what the leaders of the Academic Senate were doing, who didn’t necessarily share our views. Some of the people in our group were much more respectable than I and certainly much more dignified.

Lage: You were just a young instructor.

Schachman: Right. They wanted to be on close terms with these leaders, Malcolm Davisson and people like that, who were fighting on the side of the angels but really weren’t angels themselves.

Lage: They were willing to make some of these compromises.

Schachman: That’s right.

Lage: And was it an age-related—

Schachman: No, because Kantorowicz was a significant senior citizen. Monroe Deutsch, you asked about. He was, you know, a very distinguished scholar.

Lage: Was he involved with your meetings?

Schachman: A couple of times, but not in any forceful way.

Lage: Because here he was, provost of the whole university, or he had been.
Schachman: That’s right.

Lage: Was he a well-respected member of the university?

Schachman: Yes, he was. Probably he was the last of—. This is something which you made me think about when I received your outline. I came here an idealistic young kid, and I thought the dean of the graduate school would be a man of enormous stature. No women, obviously, in those days. This individual would be some giant intellectually who would be very profound, and you could look up to. I found they were a bunch of—ever since I’ve been here, I mean, these are second-class bureaucrats. They didn’t make it, basically, to scholarly—

Lage: The people who took the administrative roles?

Schachman: Right.

Lage: Who was dean of the graduate school?

Schachman: I don’t know who was dean of the graduate school at that time. Somewhat later Sandy Elberg [Sanford Elberg became dean of the graduate school] He was a very kind person but he seldom took a principled position in a major controversy. That just wasn’t his nature.

Lage: That’s, again, on the FSM?

Schachman: But Sandy probably voted for all the resolutions that we put up in support of the students. I have no doubt where he stood politically, but he was not the one to be out there forcefully as an advocate.

Lage: Well, maybe that’s the nature of anyone who takes an administrative position.

Schachman: Well, the only way they get an administrative position is if they have been that way. That is probably right.

Lage: Chicken and egg.

Schachman: Although I was offered the deanship one time, in biology.

Lage: The dean of?
Schachman: Biological studies. I was smart enough not to take it.

Lage: And how long did you think about it?

Schachman: A little while, because I had some very personal problems at the time about the department affiliations, but once I laid down terms, I made it impossible for them to continue.

Lage: When was this?

Schachman: This was after FSM. I was very heavily involved in politics, and my wife wanted me out of it completely. That’s when I went to visit Yale. I was getting offers to leave, and she wanted me to go. One of my good friends who was a professor of biochemistry, David Hackett, was killed in an unsolved murder. It was a very hysterical time. Her attitude was, “Let’s get out of Berkeley. It’s been a wonderful place, but it’s just too nerve wracking.” And I think by that time our kids, one of them, was already gone to the east coast. So anyway, we began toying with other jobs. Then I became the chair of a department, and that removed me from politics. I became director of the Virus Lab, and chairman of molecular biology. And I ran a zoo. Do you have a copy of what I call my obituary?

Lage: No!

Schachman: The Annual Review of Biochemistry every year honors somebody by asking them to write a prefatory chapter, an autobiographical account. So a summer ago, I decided, I was just learning how to use a computer, I’d write this by myself. So I did. It’s what I call my obituary. It’s in the Annual Review. It’s a mixture of my science and my politics.

Lage: [Reading from article] “Still Looking for the Ivory Tower” [2000, 69:1-29]. For someone who’s been in the ivory tower for so long, you have mixed feelings about it.

Schachman: Right. The battle went on for quite a few years. You asked me some interesting questions, in the written interview outline, which I clearly can answer. My first introduction to the loyalty oath controversy was very informal, and I don’t remember many of the details. I just went to an informal meeting and started to meet people that I would never have met. I
used to bring my lunch, or the department would go to the Faculty Club for department meetings.

Lage: So in a way, it really brought people together.

Schachman: Oh, yes. People from the English department, political science, history and sociology—people I just didn’t know. I became very friendly with [Jacobus “Chick”] tenBroek. Joe Tussman was involved in the early days of the loyalty oath. Tolman was a sweet old man. He was probably forty years older than I was. I met Milton Chernin, who was probably twenty years older than I at that time. So there were a bunch of wonderful people that I met.

The relationship with tenBroek continued for years. We drifted away, and then one day he called me up five years later about an academic freedom problem, and said, “Howard, I’ve got a guy who’s complaining bitterly. He’s being discriminated against. He’s supposed to be a sensational biochemist. And he’s blind. And they’re discriminating against him.” He said, “Do you know of him?” I said, “No, I never heard of him.” He said, “Then he can’t be any good.” So I said, “Chick, that’s not necessarily true.” [laughter] He said, “To my way of thinking, it’s true. If you have never heard of him, he can’t be any good.” Chick was a tough guy.

Lage: Was he older than you?

Schachman: Yes. Not much, though. Maybe five years, something like that. In fact, we received a phone call from his widow not too long ago. She’s obviously pretty feeble. Ethel said she had trouble understanding her. She’s in Sacramento somewhere.

Lage: We’ve been trying to convince her to send his papers to the Bancroft Library.

Schachman: And you can’t get them yet?

Lage: Well, there’s some question about whether they should go to the National Federation of the Blind, but then there’s so much UC history that it’s a shame, especially if they’re papers about all the different political things that went on.

Schachman: Oh, yes, that is terrific.
Lage: Did he ever talk to you about his work with the blind?

Schachman: Oh, yes. I met many of his colleagues at his home. We’d go there and he would be chopping wood and he had this unbelievable house up on Shasta Road, which wound around like crazy. In fact, I remember driving him home from the free speech battle, going up Euclid, he says, “Turn now.” I said, “Hey, Chick, do you drive?” [laughter] It was incredible, the instincts. And my Katz speech, I’ll never forget. I worked with him on the case, and then I decided that I would give the motion. I read the speech, and he didn’t interrupt me. It was about twelve pages long and he didn’t interrupt me once. Then when I was finished, he said, “On page two, get rid of that wisecrack. This is no time for humor. On page three, you are not pronouncing ‘inquiry’ correctly.”

Lage: Amazing mind.

Schachman: It’s just amazing.

Lage: When you think of all the work he produced, most of it having to be retained in his mind.

Schachman: My wife took his course. She was a nervous wreck because she would write these case studies. You had to write an analysis of a case. He would grade as many as you submitted. If you didn’t like your grade, you could rewrite it. His wife would read them to him, and he would then grade it. But she worked her tail off. She learned how to write concisely and is very critical of me, because I waste time with “quite” and “almost.”

Lage: And wisecracks.

Schachman: Right. [laughter]

Lage: Did his wife do most of the reading for him?

Schachman: Yes.

Lage: Rather than somebody he might hire.

Schachman: Both. His wife was a very smart woman and very devoted. It was a remarkable—
Lage: Did he ever talk about blind issues as civil rights issues?

Schachman: Absolutely. He once called me about something and said “the law of the blind.” I said, “Chick, you mean the law for the blind?” He says, “Hell no. I mean the law of the blind.” I learned to be much more sophisticated about little things like “of” and “for” because of listening to him. When I give my speeches on “scientific misconduct”—that was the phrase in Washington—I said, “There’s nothing scientific about the misconduct.” They don’t even use the English language properly. Misconduct in science. Or misconduct in research. But they called it “scientific misconduct.” I’m sure that kind of innuendo or detail, I would pick up from my experience with tenBroek.

Lage: The precision . . .

Schachman: Yes. Precision of language is very important.

Lage: I think he hasn’t been recognized enough as a forerunner of a lot of the disability rights legislative attempts, and the whole thinking about disability. Those two words, “of” and “for,” are key.

Schachman: He was fantastic. As I say, I met many of the people [associated with blind], and I know he thought very poorly of some of the leaders that were involved. He thought they were the crybaby types who just wanted things given to them, and he wanted them to be independent.

Lage: Tell me more about what you mean by that. Are we talking about the loyalty oath?

Schachman: No, I’m talking about the blind now. He just wanted to make sure that they weren’t discriminated against, but on the other hand, he didn’t want things given to them. He wanted them to have the opportunities to become independent themselves. I had a secretary for many years in this building. She was marvelous. She used a wheelchair, since she was a polio victim. She tended to resent people helping her. However, when it came to getting up that ramp outside this building—because she worked for me when I was chair of the department on the second floor—she was deeply grateful that there was someone posted at the bottom who would push her up the ramp. Otherwise she would wear herself out wheeling the chair, so she appreciated the help. She was terribly frightened about using the elevator. On the other hand, she
disliked people coming up to her and asking, “Can I help you?” or things of that sort. She wanted to be as self-sufficient as she could possibly be. She was an extremely resourceful woman.

Lage: What era was this? What decade?

Schachman: Oh, she worked for me for twenty years, probably, but she was my department secretary from ‘69 until about ‘74. She was very active in music, and she decided to quit. She became very good at the computer, very late in life. When I mean late in life, she was probably fifty or sixty, maybe; she got married relatively recently. She still lives in the El Cerrito area. But I remember learning a lot about the disabled as a result of her sensitivity to it, and wanting help that was absolutely necessary, but not wanting you fawning over them.

Lage: Not the pity.

Schachman: That’s right.

Lage: Interesting. That’s a little diversion, and now I’d like to get more about tenBroek. He was terribly important on this campus and in those circles.

Schachman: I wish I had known about the papers. I would have mentioned it to Hazel. But I’m sure they’re torn about where to place tenBroek’s papers.

Lage: I think so. It’s a question about what is the proper thing. Where do they really belong? You might think you could separate out the ones that would do with the faculty from the blind, but sometimes that’s hard to do. They overlap.

Schachman: That’s right. I’ve seen some notes from her—we didn’t hear from her this past Christmas, and that was a surprise. But in the one before that, the handwriting looked like a feeble person was writing it. My wife’s handwriting, despite all the trouble she’s had, is just as beautiful as it ever was. So I have the feeling that Hazel tenBroek, who’s not much older than we are, is having problems. And then Ethel told me she didn’t sound too coherent on the phone.

I spent considerable time visiting Hazel and Chick when he was very sick. He had colon cancer. I was extremely nervous about the doctor who was treating him. So I called one of my friends on the phone, and I said, “Hey, I
have this friend who’s a fantastic scholar, a constitutional expert, blind, and he’s dying of cancer. I want to make sure he’s getting some decent care.” He said, “There is someone at our university who is one of the leading chemotherapy experts in the world.” Well, it turns out that this doctor was the brother of one of the leading scholars on academic freedom. So I was able to get tenBroek to have medical advice coming from New York City by telephone to his doctor, who didn’t seem resentful at all that we were calling him. It was in the early days of my experience with the medical field, but I was able to intervene in his medical care.

I remember vividly going to visit him in the house and then in the hospital. He said, “Where are the old guys? Nobody’s coming to visit.” I said, “Chick, they all feel uncomfortable. They don’t know how to deal with a person who’s extremely ill.” I remember witnessing as he made it clear to the doctors that he wanted to be kept alive as long as he could work intellectually. Boy, he was tough. “I don’t want to be kept alive as a vegetable. If I can’t use my head, dictate papers, and things of that sort, forget it.” He wound up getting pneumonia, I think. I was in the room, practically, as he was dying.

Lage: And did you feel that people didn’t come around?

Schachman: They didn’t! I mean, all of his old cronies, I was probably the only one who was visiting him. I don’t know how you deal with tragedy, and I’m not sure I have ever dealt with it as effectively as I did in that particular case. I was just at ease with this guy and his wife, and my wife was, too.

Lage: And you got involved in the care aspect, which gave you a personal—

Schachman: Yes, it probably helped. But I think of some other cases. I’ve lost a lot of friends. At my age, a lot of our friends are dying, and there are times when I feel ashamed of myself that I wasn’t much more active with a surviving spouse. So I just don’t know how you can cope with it. There are other times when I’m very involved. So there’s something about the individual case that allows you to break the barrier of worry.

My lab assistant has a mother who is 101. My lab assistant has been with me for thirty-some years. She’s phenomenal. As I like to say, she’s better than five post-docs put together, congenial and productive and creative. So I tell
her to go home. Her mother is dying, she has relatives coming to help. I’ve
also been trying to help her, but it’s clear that she can’t face this problem.
Her older sisters have flown in from Taiwan and from Canada, and they’re
much more capable of dealing with the fact that their mother is going to die.
This young woman, who’s divorced from her husband, has lived with the
mother all alone for all these thirty years now, and she can’t face it, and I
can’t bridge that gap. I’ve had my wife call her on the telephone because she
loves her, too, but it’s tough. So for some people, maybe the barrier comes
from the surviving spouse. This is not a spouse, in this case, it’s a child. Not
a child, but—

Lage: With a mother, age 100. Goodness.

Schachman: 101, yes. Incredible. So my relationship with tenBroek was probably closer
than with any of the other people.

Lage: It sounds like a network of friends developed that you maintained over the
years.

Schachman: Right. Howard Bern, for example, was one of those. He’s much more close to
Chuck Muscatine than I am, but certainly we’re always pleased to see the
Muscatines.

Lage: So, friendships along ideological grounds, in a way.

Schachman: That’s true.

Lage: To go on with some of my questions, was there much media coverage of the
loyalty oath controversy? Was this something you saw?

Schachman: Oh, yes.

Lage: And was it fair?

Schachman: I think so, as I recall. It probably was not unreasonable. It probably was
hysterical about communists, but McCarthy had not really come into full
bloom. We just had this jerk, Senator Tenney, up in Sacramento, and he was
not popular.

Lage: Not even among the media.
Schachman: That’s right. He was a joke. He played a piano in a house of prostitution.

Lage: I didn’t know this about him.

Schachman: So he was considered a comic figure in many respects. He didn’t have anywhere near the clout that was developed with the House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities. Or the McCarthy investigations of later times, Parnell Thomas, and people like that. So the federal committees became much more powerful. At the time of our loyalty oath struggle, there had been three professors fired at the University of Washington—or maybe that was a little later, I can’t remember—but these were well-known Marxists who announced they were Marxists. I’m not sure if they were members of the Party, but they were clear-cut Marxists, and the chairman of the board of trustees—I don’t know if you knew this—was the most one of the most crooked labor leaders in the United States, Dave Beck.

Lage: Oh, Dave Beck.

Schachman: He became chairman of the Board of Regents. I think that is an elected office in the state of Washington. Of course he went after these professors hook, line, and sinker to get them fired, and succeeded in having them fired. He, much later, wound up in jail for stealing money from the union. [laughs] It’s a very interesting story in and of itself. But Beck was the chairman of the board of trustees. These comments are all based on memory, and people tell me you shouldn’t write history on memory.

Lage: Well, we can edit a little bit.

Schachman: That oral histories have a bad reputation. You’ve read that article recently in the New York Times?

Lage: Yes, but it wasn’t talking about the bad reputation.

Schachman: But about how erroneous it can be. Self-serving.

Lage: The way we remember these things is important, because it often affects how you behave. If there’s a community memory about the loyalty oath, that carries over in the ethos of the institution. That’s the way I would apply it to this—
Schachman: Well, that’s a good point, and that’s appropriate, because a lot of us, with only one major exception, were allied together again during the Free Speech Movement. It was more or less the same crowd. Some of the leaders of the Free Speech Movement had not been here during the loyalty oath. During the struggle of the FSM, some of the faculty members wanted respect from students, and they didn’t receive it. If that’s what you were looking for, you were in the wrong business. There were some great younger faculty involved. Reggie Zelnik was one.

Lage: Some of the younger crowd. Now what about someone like Ken Stampp? Was he active in—

Schachman: Stampp? I don’t recall his role in the loyalty oath circle, but I worked closely with him in the FSM. When did Ken come here?

Lage: He came in ‘46. Maybe he wasn’t active in your group, although he talks about collecting money for the non-signers who were fired.

Schachman: A lot of faculty did that. It was remarkable. If I had thought that was going to happen, I probably would have not signed. I was scared.

Lage: Tell about that, then.

Schachman: Well, I went looking for jobs. I called various friends before I made a final decision. Already, I had or was about to receive one of the earliest grants from the National Science Foundation. I was told that if I refused to sign, my name would be mud, and that I wouldn’t get a nickel from any government agency. Funding of science was not done by government yet; it was just beginning around 1950, ‘51, ‘52.

Lage: Could you see that that was the wave of the future?

Schachman: Yes. One of my navy bosses was a big shot in one of the funding agencies. I called him up and he told me—he was totally sympathetic to my position—and he told me I’d be wiped out. There would be no question.

Lage: He really felt that would be the end, even though other campuses weren’t instituting loyalty oaths?
Schachman: Yes, but at that time, government funding was being terminated for political reasons and this was the rise of McCarthy—this is the period, don’t forget, when passports were being taken away. Linus Pauling couldn’t get a passport to go to Europe. I had a very good friend, who just died recently, who couldn’t get a passport to go anywhere. There was a real crusade to get these individuals. Anyone who wouldn’t sign the loyalty oath would have been on some list, and would have been summoned to testify before Congress. Many were fired from the University of Michigan and other universities because they refused to testify. To some extent, they were unemployable in certain places.

And it took a courageous [institution]—either a Yale University or a Washington University in St. Louis—to employ these individuals. Martin Kamen worked here during the bomb project and was identified as giving secrets to a Russian spy. He was fired summarily by E.O. Lawrence. He wound up working with a couple of biochemists here on campus and became a biochemist. He had been a physical chemist at that time. He was hired at Washington University in St. Louis by Arthur Holly Compton, who was the chancellor at that time.

So that was a very courageous move, when an institution would hire a professor who was a suspect in the political scene. Martin Kamen was identified as Scientist X, but fortunately he wasn’t Scientist X. He was identified, not only in the halls of Congress, but then the Washington Times Herald and the Chicago Tribune printed his name as Scientist X. He was able to sue them and pay a lawyer that had been working for nothing—
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Schachman: So when I looked for a job, it was not too surprising that there would be difficulty. I called a very good friend who was influential at the University of Pittsburgh, and he said, “Howard, you won’t get a job.” These were all liberal people, and I guess they saw the writing on the wall. So then we went through a period of torture.

Lage: You and your wife? Or you and the whole group?

Schachman: My wife and I. It was personal torture. I had no idea that there would be that much support for the non-signers. Don’t forget, the situation had changed.
We were no longer 200. We had been wheedled down, and then after that, there were changes in the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

Lage: I want you to tell me about that.

Schachman: The Academic Senate had a Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and I think Chick tenBroek was on it. They were supposed to adjudicate individual cases, in which privileges or tenure were abridged. Presumably there would be individual hearings in which each of the non-signers would have a hearing, but this committee had on it polar opposites. It had tenBroek on the one hand, and it had some others, whose names I don’t remember, who were strongly opposed to the non-signers. It seemed clear that the committee wouldn’t be able to adjudicate these cases. Therefore, according to the powers in the Senate, “we needed a distinguished group on the committee.” That’s where Clark Kerr came into the picture. I don’t think he was made chairman of the committee.

Lage: I think he was.

Schachman: But he was made a member of this special committee, and they were supposed to have interviews with the non-signers.

Lage: And did tenBroek stay on it?

Schachman: No. Oh, no. No. It became a very neutral committee. I guess, without exception, all signers of the loyalty oath. I’m sure you’ll find that in Gardner’s book. But I’d bet any amount of money there were no non-signers on that committee. There were decent people, and Clark Kerr certainly was one of them; he was a liberal person, Clark Kerr, though I fought with him on one major issue, he was much better than virtually all of the people in the top administration of the university.

Lage: Did you feel he performed well in this setting?

Schachman: Well, not in my view. I think the committee members asked the same questions that the regents were asking. Are you a communist?” When Wendell Stanley called me in and said, “I assume you’re going to have a hearing,” I said, “No.” He asked, “Why not?” My response was, “I don’t trust them. They’re well meaning, but if I’m not going to tell the regents that I’m not a communist, why should I tell them that I’m not a communist?” I wasn’t
a communist. It never entered my mind to be a communist. I just felt that the distinguished faculty members would be principled individuals like E.C. Tolman, and there would be some other younger types, who would be pretty nasty and would get a bad rap. And indeed, that’s what they got.

John Kelley of the math department was one of a group of seven or eight for whom the committee could make no recommendation, because they weren’t very cooperative. Whereas Muscatine told them, “I fought in the Pacific during World War II,” and so forth and so on. “And it’s just that I don’t like the damn oath, but it doesn’t affect me personally.” And they, thirty-some, or whatever the numbers were, were judged to be distinguished, principled people, who should be employed. When Sproul received the recommendation about the seven or eight sort of recalcitrant, obstructionist types, he escalated by saying (and I am exaggerating), “These are disreputable characters. Fire them.” And then, as I remember the episode, [Regent] John Francis Neylan said, “They’re the only ones with principle, fire the whole damn bunch of them, including the cooperative ones.”

Lage: So that backfired. [laughs]

Schachman: That was the scenario. Oh, absolutely. That’s why I didn’t have a hearing, because I anticipated every bit of that. Neylan was brilliant, and he had no counterpart on the Board of Regents who could contend with him. Earl Warren was sweet and well meaning, in my opinion, but he wasn’t in the class with John Francis Neylan in that kind of political struggle.

Lage: I haven’t heard someone say he was brilliant before. Did you recognize that at the time?

Schachman: Oh, I think so, and everybody knew that he was the power. He was William Randolph Hearst’s personal attorney, and he was responsible for much of Hearst’s career. I think there’s no question that he was extremely smart and tactically very efficient. There was Ed Pauley on the board and the motions of the Board of Regents frequently were very complex. There would be a vote to cut off debate. Sometimes that meant you were for the signers, and other times you weren’t. Ed Pauley would have to look around, not knowing whether to vote for or against something. John Francis Neylan had, essentially, to give instructions to some of these old fogies. They didn’t know what they were doing.
Lage: Did you go to meetings, so you could see all this going on?

Schachman: I went to quite a few, yes.

Lage: How fascinating.

Schachman: They were fascinating and educational. Warren was the governor of the state. As a consequence he was in a complicated position. He could not dare to appear to be sympathetic to communists. So he was caught in this political never-never land.

Lage: And the Korean War—

Schachman: Well, that hadn’t started yet, but I guess it was starting to happen, that’s right. And then, of course, John Francis Neylan was exploiting north versus south. That’s the part that Gardner speaks about a great deal. He says it was a myth that the struggle over the loyalty oath was about principle. At our recent meeting, I took real serious objection to that view. Oh, yes. Because for us, that was it. It was about principle. If you look at the preface of Gardner’s book, except for Jack Kent and several others, there are very few people who met with non-signers, among the people he thanks.

Lage: He did interview a number of people. But maybe not—

Schachman: In my view most of the people he interviewed were not among the “hardcore” non-signers. Milt Chernin met with us. He was one of the good guys. Malcolm Davisson was on the committee with Wendell Stanley. They were sympathetic but not “non-signers.” Well, Frank Newman certainly was in with the good guys, and Jack Kent was another who met regularly with us. Frank Kidner certainly wasn’t part of our group, and Neil Jacoby wasn’t part of our group. Joel Hildebrand was scalding in his denunciations of communists. [John] Hicks was hysterical. Robert Gordon was certainly good, as was Stephen Pepper.

Lage: Where was Robert Gordon from?

Schachman: Robert Gordon was from economics. Same area as Clark Kerr. And Pepper was a philosopher. [Raymond] Sontag was raving about the communists.

Lage: Tell me about him.
Schachman: During this period of time, the view had gone out in academic circles throughout the country that the Berkeley faculty was opposed to the loyalty oath. In actual fact, the truth was about 1000 faculty had signed and only 200 were non-signers. If memory serves me correctly, Sontag got together with E.O. Lawrence and one other person—I can’t remember who it was—and they wrote a private letter to John Francis Neylan, indicating that they supported him completely.

Lage: Was he the astronomer? Was he the other one?

Schachman: I don’t know who it was. Can’t remember. It’s probably in the book. Of course, John Francis Neylan released this to the press and Sontag was embarrassed because he didn’t want to be opposed to all these good guys down here who were on the side of the angels but didn’t like the policy either. But he was embarrassed.

Lage: Now, finish what you said about Wendell Stanley.

Schachman: Well, he was very sympathetic to me. Stanley was a person who, with individual people, was extremely generous and kind. I don’t think he was an issue-oriented person and therefore was not as upset about language as I was. To me agreeing to an oath with words I do not believe in was awful. The word “believe” didn’t mean as much to Stanley as it did to me. Just recently there was an AAAS [American Association for the Advancement of Science] meeting in February. There was a symposium on to pledge or not to pledge. A bunch of the young kids throughout the world have come to the AAAS, a very distinguished body, and said, “We’re very worried about the contamination of the earth, the water, and the air, and we don’t like the proliferation of weapons. We want people to pledge that they will not do things that will be harmful to the world.”

We had a meeting of a committee that I’m on. I indicated, “I’m allergic to oaths. I started my career with this kind of thing.” The “pledge” had a note down at the bottom, “I freely subscribe to this.” I said, “You people are out of your minds!” If this is going to be a requirement of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, then it’s not freely subscribing.

Lage: Oh, you mean they wanted this to become a requirement?
Schachman: That’s right. They had a symposium, which I opposed completely. It was almost like the meeting I told you about here. They had a bunch of people there that were saying that we’ve got to do something, and we shouldn’t have people working on dangerous things. I said, “Let’s go into DNA. I’m working on DNA, and I’m working on combining different types of molecules together, and somebody will come along some day and use that to try and clone human beings.” I was not interested in cloning, I said, “But I don’t want you to write an oath that will preclude the pursuit of knowledge. I’m interested in creating knowledge to the small extent that I possibly can. One must differentiate between the creation of knowledge, a responsibility of scientists, and the later use of that knowledge, which is a responsibility of all citizens. It is in the use of knowledge that I will join other citizens, and perhaps even better informed because I was a scientist in that field, I might oppose the use of the knowledge. But “One should not write a loyalty oath that will preclude creative research.”

I had an enormous problem persuading my colleagues to give up the idea of a “pledge” and stop talking about it. Many of the people who worked on the bomb were content working on the bomb because they were worried about Adolph Hitler. Today they wish it didn’t exist and many opposed its use against the Japanese. Should Einstein and others not have worked on the physics that ultimately resulted in the bomb?

Lage: It’s very complicated.

Schachman: I made a major point about the creation of knowledge versus the use of knowledge. What you do about the use of knowledge should not interfere with your attempts to create knowledge.

Lage: And the point about pledges. Did we talk enough about the players in the oath controversy?

Schachman: By and large, we did. I don’t think Gardner consulted enough people, and certainly not the “right” people. He had a couple of good guys in there. But many were on the “wrong” side. He didn’t get good advice, in my view. Or he selected the company that he wanted to talk to—I remember being infuriated by the book when I first read it. I didn’t know Gardner at all. He’s a very charming guy, and I enjoyed arguing with him at this meeting, and even afterwards, when we had wine—
Lage: Did he listen to your views?

Schachman: Yes. When I brought up the existence even today of the ban against communism, and pointed out that, “You’re now going to have to have lie detector tests,” he said, afterwards, “We’ll have to do something about that.” I asked him, “Look how many opportunities there have been to get rid of the oath.” “Yes, that’s true,” was his response. But what did he as president and even as a former president of the university do? He’s not a kind of person that’s going to make waves. Why should he do that?

Lage: Okay. Where are we here? You talked about Stanley’s position

Schachman: Yes, I told you that there were months when I wasn’t getting paid, and he gave me money.

Lage: He did. From his own—

Schachman: His own pocket. He couldn’t believe that I didn’t get paid. He said, “Well, maybe it’s alphabetical.” I asked, “Well, did you receive a pay check?” and then he offered me money. Then there was an outcry about that, and the money was forthcoming, but the regents were like U.S. Steel fighting the auto workers or something like that.

Lage: That’s right. They probably looked at it like that.

Schachman: That’s exactly the way they behaved. There was a corporate body up on top and we were employees. It was a typical battle of management versus workers, and it went on for quite a while.

Lage: You mentioned how you talked to your wife and eventually signed. You also told another time about Tolman’s—

Schachman: Well, when I finally made up my decision to sign, I think you had to get it notarized. It wasn’t an oath any more; it was a contract. I can’t even remember all the details. I was walking down from this building through the campus, and I bumped into Tolman. He knew me, and he said, “How are you doing?” I said, “I’m terrible.” I told him my problem, and he then volunteered that his kids are grown, his house is paid for, there will be lots of battles in the future, and there are enough of us continuing the battle and you shouldn’t feel bad; just go ahead and do your thing. That’s essentially what I
did, and it worked out. But as you probably know, somewhere along the line by that time, there was a state oath. I don’t know whether we talked about this or not. The state oath, of course, was written differently from the other. One specifically said, “I’m not a member of the Communist Party,” and the other one says, “I’m not a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow.”

Lage: Are we talking about the Levering oath?

Schachman: That’s right. It was called the Levering oath.

Lage: So that came in after the regents lost their battle.

Schachman: No. It came in about that time. That battle was still in court, I think, when the Levering oath was imposed. And the regents—John Francis Neylan was the leader in opposing this oath. He said, “This is essentially a violation of the autonomy of the regents to run this university. You, Mr. Levering in Sacramento, can’t tell us what requirements we’re going to impose,” so the regents didn’t make this oath a requirement. So I said to myself, “Just because I finished signing one oath doesn’t mean I’m going to run around every Sunday morning and sign another oath.” I won’t sign this oath!

Lage: Oh, I hadn’t realized that.

Schachman: That went on for quite a while. I kept quiet about it, and I didn’t blow my horn about it or make any noise. At one of those meetings that were still going on, because money was being raised, the issue was moving from one possible court to another, lawyers were being hired, and Milton Chernin said “I hear there’s only two faculty members who didn’t sign the Levering oath. Why won’t they speak up?” I said, “Well, I don’t know who the other person was.” [laughter] I was surprised that everybody who opposed the first oath wouldn’t also oppose the second oath. But most of them them I guess, said “The hell with it.”

Lage: Do you think they just were worn down, or do you think that they objected to the university being singled out, and once the university wasn’t singled out, they were willing to do it?

Schachman: But the university was still being singled out in the Levering oath.
Lage: Every state employee had to sign the Levering oath.

Schachman: I see.

Lage: The Levering oath is much broader.

Schachman: Yes. But it doesn’t say Communist Party.

Lage: “I do not advocate—”

Schachman: Right. “Nor do I belong to a party that—”

Lage: “Nor am I the member of any party or organization that now advocates overthrowing the government.”

Schachman: See, people felt that was a preferable oath, and I claimed that language was ambiguous as hell. Maybe the Red Cross is included under that party. So, anyway, I didn’t like it. At that time, since the regents were equivocal about it, Neylan was their prime mover in this equivocation, I consulted the executive director of the Northern California branch of the American Civil Liberties Union, whose name, I think, was Elliott Spitzer. He came over to the house. He was just absolutely enthralled with the idea that I would be the test case on the Levering oath, because here I was quite a respectable citizen. I think by that time I’d had a grant from the Office of Naval Research. I’d been to the navy, and certainly I hadn’t been in any of these parties. I was too young to join most of the parties.

Joining student political action groups by college students was New York-centered or Pittsburgh-centered or Philadelphia-centered or Chicago. I had a lot of friends who were older than I who were members of the American Student Union, which was construed as a cover of the Communist Party. These students all came from Depression-ridden parents, and they were very concerned about the economic situation in the United States and social and political problems. So the ones who lost their passports—I had a variety of friends who lost their passports in addition to Martin Kamen—and they were all people who had joined one or another of these organizations and then wound up on some list that McCarthy or Congressman Dies didn’t approve of. I wasn’t on any of these, because I was younger. It was just as simple as all that.
Lage: You were younger. If you were older, would you have joined them?

Schachman: I probably would have if my peers at that time were in college and worried about the same problems I did. Anyway, the ACLU was really interested. We had quite a few meetings and then we decided that I would be unemployed, and my career was at stake. I had a child at that time, and a house with a big mortgage. So we withdrew and he got somebody else, I can’t remember who it was. But he’d considered me a wonderful case because it looked like I was a little bit more distinguished.

Lage: Was that a hard decision? Was that something that you brooded about?

Schachman: Oh, it was tough. I didn’t like it at all. I felt it was terrible. But I’ve learned how to make compromises in my life and so I made it. That was essentially the end of the oath struggle as far as I was concerned. Then I went back to my business, which was doing science and teaching my course. The answers to your questions on this outline are fairly clear. The philosophical issue, why was the oath so abhorrent, I talked about that. Nature of the university and of academic freedom, you know my views on that. Can communists teach? Absolutely. [laughs]

Lage: They did fire one T.A., David Fox.

Schachman: That’s right. I didn’t know him.

Lage: I think he was in physics. The faculty voted four to one to oppose employment of communists, so the feeling of the faculty was pretty overwhelming.

Schachman: Oh, absolutely. During that period, physics was the branch of science containing the most liberal faculty. Not only did [Wolfgang] Panovsky leave, but Robert Serber left and some other younger faculty members left. When I talk about the sociology of science (and I want to assure you that I couldn’t make a living as a sociologist), I cite the period between the loyalty oath and the Free Speech Movement as the era of the physicists. Physicists were the most active people in opposing the loyalty oath. However, by the time the next controversy arose, they were part of the establishment. Chemists were long gone from liberal circles. I mean, the most serious worries I had in being outspoken during the oath struggle were distinguished professors of
chemistry here. I had a friend who would loved to have not signed the loyalty oath, or to be able to protest as long as I did, but he didn’t dare.

Lage: This is a chemist?

Schachman: Yes, a chemist. He knew that he would be *persona non grata* among the big shots in the chemistry department, whereas I was never worried that I would be in a comparable position with Wendell Stanley.

Lage: Because chemistry had Joel Hildebrand?

Schachman: And Wendell Latimer. Latimer was a terror on this issue. He felt sure that communists could not pursue “truth,” and Hildebrand gave speeches about truth, and quoted Thomas Jefferson as unalterably opposed to those who could not pursue truth. I don’t know why they had that feeling of almost hysterical opposition to communists. Many of them were concerned with economic and social issues that had nothing to do with how they did biology, physics, or chemistry.

Lage: Now, what did you say about the physicists? I understand the chemists.

Schachman: So the physicists were the driving force among the liberal cause.

Lage: Even though we had E.O. Lawrence.

Schachman: Oh, yes, the theoreticians, Wolfgang Panovsky, and in another context, J. Robert Oppenheimer, were all liberal and perhaps left-leaning people. So Serber resigned. I don’t think he was fired. He left on his own initiative. There was another terrific physicist who quit at that time. Or was fired. I can’t remember which.

Lage: Let’s see. [looks through Gardner’s book] Panovsky seems to have resigned before he was fired.

Schachman: Is that right? Well, Gian Carlo Wick was one of those who got fired. Harold Lewis was the one I was thinking of. He was a young guy. He was twenty-seven. So Kantorowicz would have been my hero at the time. I never really got to know him well. He had a very heavy accent.

Lage: Did he come to your meetings? And Wick and Lewis?
Schachman: Oh, absolutely. I think all these people did. Loewenberg was an old man already, at that point. Edelstein was another very profound scholar. He was forty-eight at that time. You know, I would be twenty-seven or twenty-eight or something like that. Maybe I was thirty. Hugh Coffey was in psychology. He was one of the old timers.

Lage: Now this woman, Emily Huntington, is listed as a non-signer, and she did an oral history with us years ago, and she said that at the last minute she signed.

Schachman: That’s interesting. I didn’t remember. I remember her at meetings.

Lage: And what about the artist Margaret Peterson? Did you know her?

Schachman: I didn’t know her very well, but Howard Bern did. My wife remembered her, but I didn’t. That’s interesting. So here are the non-signers who were dismissed [appendix to Gardner book].

Lage: Some you probably don’t remember.

Schachman: No, that’s certainly right. Emily Huntington is listed here, Kantorowicz is listed, Harold Lewis I remember, Loewenberg I remember, Lewy I remember. Tony Morse was fired.

Lage: Mowat was at UCLA. Was there much traffic back and forth with UCLA?

Schachman: Very little. David Saxon was from UCLA, and became president of the university much later. Remarkable guy. So Serber left, and I guess Panovsky’s not on this list. They left before, and they had tremendous reputations. They were very highly respected. The Panovsky family was a very distinguished one. There was an enormous amount of support and almost a boycott of the university by the physics community, “Don’t go to Berkeley, because it’s a terrible university.”

Lage: I think it’s interesting that there was this tremendous boycott and almost a censure of the university by the AAUP [American Association of University Professors], but at the same time, you were told you wouldn’t get a job elsewhere.

Schachman: It may have been too early, and maybe my information was wrong. But at the time, of course, I had no reputation.
That’s true. You’re dealing here with Panovsky and some of the ones that already had made distinguished reputations.

Right.

When did you become a professor? You came as an instructor.

Came as an instructor. That’s another episode, part of my history with some amusing overtones. I came as an instructor, which doesn’t exist anymore. (By and large, faculty positions in universities, especially in science, start with the assistant professorship. Most scientists have experience as post-doctoral associates following their PhD degree, so the position as instructor is virtually extinct.)

As you know, I specialize in creating amusing slides for my talks. On my gag chart on academic metabolism I have a little asterisk. It refers to a footnote designated “a hypothetical unstable intermediate.” That’s what biochemists speculate about when composing metabolic charts. It’s one of my famous slides. Some of these cartoons appear in “my obituary.” They are among the few that I finally published.

I spent two years as an instructor, and then in my fourth year as an assistant professor, Stanley recommended me for promotion to tenure. On that basis I would have been skipping two years in the normal course of events. One day he came to me and congratulated me for being promoted. As you can imagine, I was thrilled to learn about being promoted, because I wanted tenure very much. On July 1, when the new contract arrives, I discover I was not promoted. I went to see Stanley, and he couldn’t believe it. He became infuriated. The word got out very quickly, “Schachman didn’t get promoted,” and the confidentiality which is highly treasured in promotion matters broke down.

There was a very conservative member of the chemistry department whose views on politics couldn’t be further from mine. But he was a very decent guy. He came to me, because he was on the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee is the one that reviews all departmental recommendations. According to him, the members were unanimous and enthusiastic that I be promoted. Now, there are very few cases that are overruled, but there are some, and those are the ones that count. Then Stanley became involved in
this very deeply. He was very close to Robert Gordon Sproul. There was no chancellor in those days.

Lage: Right. Sproul was president.

Schachman: And it turned out that my promotion was turned down in the president’s office. I couldn’t help but draw the logical conclusion that it was turned down because I was a politically unsavory character. I said in my obituary that I wonder if it had anything to do with my views on the loyalty oath. No proof ever came out. The answer given to Stanley was it was too rapid an acceleration. I was skipping a whole step, because they had three steps in the system, and I was skipping step three. Of course, I had gone through the normal two years of each of the preceding steps, so it wasn’t that fast after all.

In any case, I was very nervous about this. I consulted Stanley about my two appointments. One was as an assistant professor in biochemistry, and the other was as an assistant virologist in the Virus Laboratory. That was an eleven-month appointment. So the salary—your academic title came from the department, but the money all came from the Virus Lab. It was state money.

I was not funded through the department of biochemistry, but funded through the Virus Lab with state money from Sacramento. It is a very unsavory relationship. I don’t like it, but it existed for many years. In any case, I went to Stanley and I said, “Dr. Stanley, I really”—and I did call him Dr. Stanley. He always called me Howard, but I felt that he was a much more formal person, so I didn’t call him by his first name. I said, “Why don’t you ask for a promotion in the Virus Lab for me? I need the money.” There’s a big increase when you go from step three, assistant professor, to step one, associate professor. “Can you get me the appointment as associate research virologist, and I’ll forget the other appointment?” He said, “But then you’re giving up the tenure.” I said, “Well, I need the money.”

I didn’t believe what was going on. I’m an untrusting sort of guy. It wasn’t that I didn’t believe him, because he was very upset. He said, “Okay, I’ll go fight for that.” In the meantime, months are going by. Contracts come out in July and you are already on your next year’s salary. I expected to be a faculty member with tenure at that time. Finally Stanley came back to me in about November and indicated that I would receive the promotion on about January
1. Basically, I would have lost six months of the salary increase. The money was no longer an issue for me. Tenure was much more important. So, I did get promoted.

Lage: It would be nice to know what went on in these conversations and who he spoke to.

He was dealing with Sproul completely, and there is no question that there were many faculty involved. I happened to know the chairman of the review committee. He was the kind of person who blew up, and he made it unequivocally clear that this was a fantastic case for promotion. Then this individual from the Budget Committee came to me, completely unsolicited; I didn’t even go looking. Confidentiality is preserved here fairly well on those things. In this instance, it broke down completely. There would have been a statistic that would be cited on the floor of the senate, “Why did this guy not get it? Very few times is the Budget Committee overruled, but when they are overruled, there’s usually a reason.

Lage: And the faculty cares about that.

Schachman: That’s right.

Lage: Who was head of L&S [College of Letters and Science] at that time?

Schachman: Probably Davis.

Lage: It might have still been Davis, or would it have been Lincoln Constance by then?

Schachman: I don’t think it was Lincoln Constance. He was a friend and supporter of mine. I think he came later.

Lage: Do you remember the year that this happened? Could we date it?

Schachman: Well, it would have been six years from 1948. That would make it 1954, probably. I did get tenure and felt very happy about that.

Lage: Let’s see if there’s more to clean up here. Roger Stanier. That’s somebody Howard Bern talked about.
Schachman: That’s right. He was, I think, the chairman of the review committee. He was infuriated and very outspoken. He was a good friend. He was active in the loyalty oath controversy. An opponent, yes, indeed. We had collaborated on some exciting science and published together.

Lage: Tell me more about the relationship of the department to the lab and why you objected to it.

Schachman: Well, when Stanley came here, he was hired to do two things; to become director of a brand new virus lab, the only one in existence, and also to chair a department, but I and many of my colleagues, most of whom are retired now, were professors in the department of biochemistry—

[Begin Tape 4, Side B]

Schachman: We were richer with outside money. We had the privilege of not doing as much teaching, because primarily we had research positions. But none of us would have been here had we not had academic titles. For many years it was okay because Stanley was the chairman of the department and the director of the Virus Laboratory. But years later, when the chairman of the department was another person and Stanley was still director of the Virus Laboratory, then the potential for friction came in, because the chair wanted you to do some teaching or committee service and discovered he had no control over your budget.

In fact, the chair of the department, Edmund Snell, he called one of the faculty in the Virus Laboratory who’s now dead, Arthur Knight. I remember vividly, Snell said, “I want you to do some teaching,” and Knight said, “I don’t think I can do it because my lab is going like a house on fire, and I want to concentrate on my research.” By that time, the chairman of the department realized that he had no power over a full professor in his own department.

Then, years later, we formed a new department. There was a lot of historical friction among biochemistry, plant biochemistry, and the Virus Lab, which was very sad. [Horace] Barker just died a short time ago, and the relationship between him and Stanley is a very sad history.
Sally Hughes was looking into the Barker history, so she knows all that correspondence. There were some very nasty battles between Barker and Stanley. I was the Henry Kissinger of that era, trying to make peace between these two individuals, because I was very fond of both of them. I was sort of Stanley’s son, but I was much more sympathetic on these issues to Barker, so it was very complicated.

In any case, Robley Williams then became the chairman of molecular biology. By that time we were separate from the biochemistry department although I was in both. Robley and Wendell Stanley sort of walked on eggs with each other. They were very close good friends, and they avoided friction, but I could see it, as an observer. When Robley Williams wanted out, and his time was up, the dean of Letters and Science at that time, Walter Knight, asked me to become chairman of the department. I said, “No, I’m not going to be chairman of the department. Whomever you choose to become director of the Virus Lab, you should make that person chairman of the department.” I said, “You’ve got a lot of candidates who want very much to be directors of the Virus Laboratory,” because Stanley also tendered his resignation.

So this went on for many months. Stanley kept telling the dean that Schachman was not going to become chairman of the department because as I told him, “I’m not going to do the same thing with your successor that you had to do with Robley Williams.” I knew three guys who wanted to be director of the Virus Lab. It required no work, it had power, and money. The chair of the department had to get faculty to teach, and these were the people who couldn’t teach or wouldn’t teach, or you wouldn’t want to teach.

Finally, after months of haggling, Walter Knight came to me and offered me both jobs, and ever since then, the person who’s the chair in the department was also the director of the Virus Lab. Stanley asked me to write a report for him on the future of the Virus Lab when he was thinking of quitting. I said it should be disbanded. It served a major purpose. It was a catalyst in bringing Robley Williams here, Howard Schachman here, Art Knight here, Fraenkel-Conrat, a bunch of people, and it helped staff the biochemistry department, but its contribution is over. Its money ought to be transferred completely into the department budget rather than kept as a separate budget and then create friction. ORUs, as they’re called, organized research units, are a source of
potential friction everywhere, because they give some people a red carpet, and other people wish they had the red carpet.

Lage: Are they often created in order to attract important people?

Schachman: Yes, for special missions. Ever so many professors in this department wanted to be director of the Virus Lab, and I was never interested. It had a three thousand dollar a year stipend. Something ridiculous. Chairs used to get nothing. I used to watch Robley and Wendell. I was very close to both of them. They were senior to me, but I knew them very well, and it was clear that they were not doing some things they would have liked to have done because they were worried about the other guy. And I knew the horrible battle with Barker, which was most unfortunate. And when Snell became chairman, he couldn’t get a professor in his department to teach a course because his primary appointment and entire salary was in the Virus Lab.

Lage: Now, from 1969 to 1976, when you became chair of both, or director of one and chair of the other, what did you do with these guys that you said didn’t want to teach and no one would want them to teach?

Schachman: I had a hell of a tough time with them. I invented a great course, based on one taught by Edward Teller. He knew about Linus Pauling, who had a reputation for being a great teacher. Teller started a course here called Physics 10.

Lage: I remember. I took it from him.

Schachman: It was a magnificent course which included discussions about size. He had pictures of forests, then trees, then branches, then leaves, and so forth. By factors of ten he went to cells and then to inclusion bodies and finally you saw tobacco mosaic virus. He was brilliant.

Lage: Now, wait, is that Teller?

Schachman: That was Teller.

Lage: That was Physics 10?

Schachman: You don’t remember?
Lage: I don’t remember that. I remember him talking about relativity. He may have done different things.

Schachman: I’m sure he did, but he was a very inspiring teacher, wasn’t he?

Lage: Yes.

Schachman: He taught Physics 10 for education purposes, not to recruit people. As I like to say, it was not a seduction course. I said to my colleagues in a department meeting, “Look, we’ve got a field that is much more exciting, molecular biology. We can start with a disease, show a picture of a baby, and the baby’s got some horrible disease. What’s the disease? It’s the malfunctioning of some metabolic process. What’s that due to? That’s due to something called an enzyme. And where do enzymes come from? They are built by DNA.” You just imagine what you can do. Then you come back and say, “We design drugs.” You can go full circle around this thing. I said, “Ronald Reagan and Shirley Temple will be the students in this course. We are not trying to attract them into molecular biology. They may be the president or the governor of the state or something.” “Oh, great,” was the response. So whom do I get to teach it? I don’t know if you know much about some of the people in this department.

Lage: I don’t.

Schachman: This particular one had been a great scientist, but he was an impossible colleague. He wouldn’t teach; nowhere could I find a satisfactory teaching assignment for him, so with great trepidation, I gave him this assignment.

Lage: Did you give him an outline of what you wanted him to do?

Schachman: I described it as, “We go through disease and work our way all the way around it. There’s no chemistry, no prerequisites. You’re not trying to seduce them into the field. You’re just trying to give them a feeling of what we do and what impact it’s going to have on our society. Health, well-being of people.” But he just taught what he knew! So, for example, I saw some of the comments on the student evaluations. MB [molecular biology] 10, it was called. “What good does it do to know the structure of insulin when I don’t know what insulin does?” He never bothered with the physiological role of insulin and the concept of metabolism. That would have required effort as a
teacher. He gave them the code and the amino acids. These students never had a course in chemistry in their lives. It didn’t mean a thing to them. It was crazy to give them that material.

Then he did a horrible, obscene thing in the final exam, which was called to my attention when some student went to her father and her father went to her assemblyman and the assemblyman wrote to Clark Kerr, and Clark Kerr sent the messages on to me.

Lage: That’s the circle that got started.

Schachman: It came back to me, so I went looking for the final exam, because I couldn’t believe it. The final exam for MB 10 was not in the files. In order to verify the validity of the complaint, I had to write him a note. By that time, our relationship was not that good. He wrote back and furnishes the exam, and comments, “Tell him that she deserves an A for scholarship and an F for humor.” Do you want me to tell you what the test was?

Lage: Sure.

Schachman: It was obscene and stupid. He gave them the code on a piece of paper, that, “ATC spells this,” so it’s all spelled out. There’s a little box. It’s very easy to do. Then he writes out a series of letters representing the nucleotides in DNA, like the human genome, and they will spell out a series of amino acids—phenylalanine, alanine, threonine, etcetera, etcetera. The code is spelling out these things. The first letter in each of the amino acids will make a sentence. So I gave you the first word, “pat.” The next letter was “h” for “has,” and then “a” for “alanine” again, and “s” for “serme.” So “Pat has,” and he wound up with a remark that a young female student found insulting and offensive.

So one student in the class went through this whole thing as a dumb exercise. It’s like a jigsaw puzzle; it doesn’t take any real imagination. She spelled it out, and she was infuriated and told her father about it. So then I was infuriated. When it came to promoting him—this was my role as a department chair—I decided that he didn’t deserve a merit increase.

I went looking through the rules and regulations. It was about my fourth year as chair of the department, and I was not dumb. I knew enough to read the rules. It said you don’t give merit increases, which you get ordinarily every
three years whether you need it or not, unless there’s some merit to it. And you don’t get it on past achievement. Now I had raved about his science for many, many years. He was a potential Nobel prize winner at one stage in his life. He was that good. He did some revolutionary science, but he was a very difficult person to deal with.

Lage: And not much of a teacher.

Schachman: Oh, God, no. Horrible. I told the dean that I wasn’t going to write a recommendation for a merit increase. The dean at that time was a good friend of mine, Fred Carpenter. As dean of Biological Sciences, Fred was the nervous type, unlike me. He said, “You have to write a letter why you’re not giving it to him.” I said, “It doesn’t say anything about writing a letter why you’re not giving it to him.” I showed him the rules. He says, “No, if you won’t write it, I’ll get somebody else to write it.” I said, “Well then, they’ll write a letter recommending promotion without any knowledge of his terrible performance.” He said, “Well, that’s tough.”

So I went home. My younger son at that time was already thinking of becoming a lawyer and advised me not to write what I was thinking. I must have spent a week, knowing full well that every word in that letter was going to be scrutinized with a high power microscope and eventually I’ll have to come out and defend everything I do. I put the story that I just told you in the letter, and a host of other things were in there. I indicated the science he was then doing was pedestrian, his best years were behind him, that his teaching was disgraceful, his service was a huge minus, and therefore he didn’t deserve a merit increase.

Apparently it shook up the Budget Committee. They don’t get letters like that. Chairs of departments generally avoid writing such negative recommendations. I had to do the same thing in another case.

Lage: Did you put in this final exam incident as one of the reasons why Fraenkel-Conrat didn’t deserve a merit raise?

Schachman: I’m almost sure I did. Carpenter thought it was funny.

Lage: Oh, he did?
Schachman: Yes, he thought it was funny. He was a good friend of mine. We grew up together here in Berkeley. He also has died. He and I differed a great deal. I had this gorgeous young undergraduate come into my lab way back in 1950, '51. [laughs] She was the runner-up in the homecoming contest. And she wanted to go to graduate school. She was in love with a student on the third floor of this building who was pursuing his degree with another professor, and she wanted to go to graduate school and to be near him. She had been working in my lab, and we were publishing two papers on her work as an undergraduate.

Lage: So she was bright?

Schachman: Oh, yes. And Carpenter, who was the graduate advisor at the time, said to her, “You’re too good looking. Why don’t you go home and have babies?”

Lage: What happened?

Schachman: She left.

Lage: She actually did.

Schachman: She went and obtained a PhD at George Washington or Georgetown, I don’t remember which. She was married to Vic, and when they left I wrote letters of recommendation. She obtained a job in Bethesda with good friends of mine at NIH. She did marvelously well, and then she went to night school at NIH, and she’s done very beautiful science.

But that was Fred Carpenter, so he obviously wasn’t offended by the exam question. I called in one of my good young friends on the faculty and said, “Look, you can’t possibly get this sentence by starting with DNA. You have to have made up the sentence that you want from the amino acids, then work your way back and write the three-letter code for the nucleotides.” His response was, “Yes, there’s no way in the world.” So Conrat had this dumb idea to begin with.

Lage: He might even have had a Pat in the class. That would have been even worse.

Schachman: That’s true. He might have. I never thought of that. That’s true. So anyway, I shook up the Budget Committee.
Lage: And what did the Budget Committee do?

Schachman: They turned him down. He didn’t get merit increase. I had nothing but furor from two of them for quite a while following the second case.

Lage: The department chairs don’t do that very often with established people.

Schachman: No, you almost never do it. It’s too much work. And why the hell look for trouble? To me, this was a fundamental principle. There are faculty who are deserving, and you write strong letters in support. Why should I write gobbledygook about those who don’t deserve a merit increase?

This office in which we are sitting used to be a publication office. The secretaries there would come to me and complain bitterly. There were three or four secretaries in this combined room who would type manuscripts. One would say, “Professor So-and-so just gave me a manuscript and he didn’t have the correct references. So I told him to please go look it up.” So he comes back, and he gives them a page number and a volume number from the *Journal of Biological Chemistry*. The secretary went in the library and looked it up. It’s in the middle of an article on some other subject. He wasn’t going to spend the time, the fifteen minutes, to go really look up the proper reference. He just made up numbers. Didn’t give a damn. He didn’t care! It was his behavior pattern. What are you going to do, change a guy like that?

Lage: Well, no. Probably not. You don’t have to promote him.

Schachman: Is this going to be in my oral history?

Lage: Well, you can seal it. I think it might be something you want to seal. You can decide. We have to think a lot about things that are really controversial.

Schachman: Interesting. I’ve always said that to be a department chair is one of the toughest jobs in a university, because you’re really beholden to your faculty as well as to the administration. After my service as chair ended, Rod Park wanted me to come to be a dean. I wouldn’t touch it.

Lage: It would compete with your work, too. Don’t you think?

Schachman: Yes! I love my work and have been in the very fortunate position, as you can probably gather, of being able to select social, political, moral issues that
interest me. I can fight those battles on my own and I’m not obligated to fight
issues that others originate which are usually over personnel. To me the issue
problems are much more fascinating than people problems. When you’re
chair of a department, your problems are mainly about people.

Lage: Should we talk about the legacy of the oath? I want to have one more
meeting where we talk about FSM, which may have something to do with
that.

Schachman: Okay.

Lage: Did it leave lasting animosity between members of the department?

Schachman: I don’t think so. Certainly not in my relationships. I had many friends who
loved what I was doing but weren’t feeling secure enough to do the same
thing in their department. Their views were very similar to my own, and our
relationships have been very good. There were other people who had
opposite views. I never felt any problem at all. The only implication of any
potential problem was that promotion, which was very strange. We’ll never
get the true answer to it. I can speculate, and I did speculate in my obituary
article.

Lage: But it didn’t affect your getting government grants?

Schachman: No. Not at all.

Lage: Though it may have if you hadn’t signed.

Schachman: That’s right. I think history has indicated that probably I would have
survived. After all, Chuck Muscatine went to Wesleyan and came back, and
several of the others—

Lage: But he wasn’t getting government grants, either.

Schachman: No, that’s true.

Lage: But who knows? I think we’ll leave the rest for next time, as a lead up to
FSM. There were things that happened between the loyalty oath and FSM
with communist speakers on campus and other incidents.
Schachman: Yes, and I was deeply involved in a controversy over ROTC. Also there was an incredible academic freedom problem which tenBroek called to my attention. He would call me at periodic intervals. I wound up at one stage of my career on the Privilege and Tenure Committee.

Lage: That very committee.

Schachman: That’s right. Years later. An individual came to the Committee asking us to intervene in his case. He was, as I remember, a lecturer. It was a magnificent case. I have a thick folder on it which really ought to be in some archive.

Lage: It’s not the [Eli] Katz case?

Schachman: No. It wasn’t Katz. I am not certain that I remember his name but I think it was Floyd Matson. I think but I’m not sure that he was in the speech department. Battles were going on with students, the nature of exams, and courses, over what was proper and what was not proper with regard to final exams. This individual apparently assigned a term paper that involved discussions with him, approval of the topic, and so forth in the undergraduate course.

The student who took the course was a Nazi, a confirmed self-proclaimed Nazi. Frequently he wore a uniform on campus. He wrote a horrible term paper about Nazis and Jews and women and sex and a host of other things. The instructor, as I say, was a lecturer, so he wasn’t a member of the Academic Senate, per se. That ultimately became a technical issue. The student protested to the dean because he was given an F. Then the dean of the College of Letters and Science, who was at that time Bill Fretter, changed the grade. Fretter argued that the instructor had violated the rule requiring a final exam. The instructor didn’t give a final exam; he gave a term paper, but there had to be meetings and discussions in addition to the formal paper.

Lage: They do it all the time now.

Schachman: That’s right. Based on the grade change, the instructor appealed to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. Members of the Committee debated the issue a great deal and they decided not to accept the case because the instructor was not a member of the Academic Senate, or some other jurisdictional issue.
The instructor had already been chastised by Dean Fretter’s ruling and the grade change. Therefore, he felt that his privileges had been violated. The majority didn’t deal with the issue, so I wrote a minority report. It was about ten times the length of the committee’s decision not to take the case. The chairman of the committee at that time was John Reynolds, in the physics department. John was, by and large, a wonderful guy, but on this issue we were far apart and he was not happy with me at all.

The issue in this case was fairly straightforward. The Academic Senate had passed a regulation that undergraduate courses should have a final exam. In some respects, this instructor/lecturer had violated this rule, although he argued that this requirement for discussions, meetings, and papers constituted a final exam. There was nothing in the Academic Senate policy about a remedy if there had been a violation. Hence the dean’s action to change a grade from an F constituted an inappropriate violation of the instructor’s “privilege” to grade his students for their performance. I personally considered it a political decision by the dean and was pleased to see it reversed. The P & T Committee wanted no part of the potential debate on the merits of the dean’s actions and therefore wanted to bury the case by the subterfuge of no jurisdiction for lecturers. [The narrator added the previous paragraph during his review of his transcript, and made substantial changes to the interview transcript on this topic after referring to his records.—ed.]

Anyway, the very short majority statement and my extensive minority report were printed in the Blue Book of the Senate call for the meeting. A friend of mine read all this and said to me, “I don’t know what is wrong with that committee of yours, but it seems to me that the minority has a much better case than the majority.” Both sections were unsigned. So I said, “Why don’t you go to the Academic Senate meeting and make that point?”

He went to the Senate meeting where a furor broke out. The report was debated upside down and inside out. The committee was completely overturned and the Academic Senate concluded that there was a major grievance which should be rectified. Fretter was infuriated with me, because by that time, I was identified as the author of the minority report. I have a copy of the term paper. It was a disgrace. Also, I’ve met several people in the English department who said they were intimidated by this Nazi student. I mean physically intimidated by him. He had maneuvered his way around the
campus and scared hell out of several professors who gave him better grades than he would have otherwise gotten.

Lage: So this lecturer was willing to stand up to him.

Schachman: That’s right. Then I stood up for the lecturer. TenBroek was ecstatic with joy, because he had brought the case to my attention and persuaded that lecturer to go to P&T. He wasn’t planning to appeal to P&T on the grounds that it wasn’t clear that they had province over lecturers. That was another of my fascinating cases. And then Katz came along—

Lage: Do you remember when that was? Was that before the Katz case?

Schachman: Yes. I can find that for you.

Lage: And the ROTC was an ongoing thing

Schachman: That was Creighton—I don’t know if you know about Creighton—and that was a case handled by TenBroek. But I was very intrigued by it—Creighton marched in uniform, protesting ROTC. He received an F in the course from ROTC, and TenBroek turned to the same rule that guided the Matson case. You may do something that violates the rules, but that doesn’t allow instructors or administrators to change the grade of a course. So academic performance is the basis for a grade in the course. We fought the Creighton case on the floor of the Academic Senate. The Creighton case was TenBroek’s. I had nothing to do with it, but I backed him up.

Then I wound up on the Senate Policy Committee where once again, I was a renegade. I brought up ROTC as compulsory education and introduced a resolution that it be terminated and gave a big speech on the floor. I didn’t give very many, but I gave a few.

I had done my homework. Boy, that was really interesting. I found out that Eric Severeid, a student at the University of Minnesota, fought with General Douglas MacArthur and beat the pants off Douglas MacArthur. It’s a fascinating history. It’s like everything else, when you start reading it, and if you have any intellectual curiosity at all, you become intrigued. I get up on the floor of the Academic Senate and give this speech. There were all sorts of people who wanted to defend the status quo, who just felt absolutely powerless because they had done no homework, and I had done it all. One of
them was, gee, I don’t remember his name, a big shot in the political science arena at Berkeley. He was just livid.

Lage:  Wildavsky?

Schachman:  No, no. Wildavsky became a good friend of mine because he was very close to tenBroek when tenBroek was dying. Up until that time, Aaron Wildavsky and I were on separate sides. But we became very close over that, and Aaron and I have actually negotiated several things on politics because he was very good at that. And even Nelson Polsby, I have a fairly good relationship with him. No, I can’t remember the name of this guy. I’ll think of it.

But in any case, it passed the Academic Senate. I used to talk about how I went to Hebrew School in the afternoons. I don’t mind people getting military training, and I don’t mind ROTC being off campus, and kids who finish their courses during the daytime can go take a course off campus, but I did mind the military and Washington D.C. dictating the instructors, because we had no control over their appointments—dictating the textbooks, dictating the lectures, dictating the exams.

And my friend and departmental colleague Fred Carpenter again was on the course committee. He opposed me in that struggle, although he was vulnerable and he knew it, because we pride ourselves over the vote of the Academic Senate and in the Educational Policy Committee and the Course Committee in having control over everything, and the Budget Committee has control over appointments. But we didn’t have control over the appointments of professors in ROTC.

Lage:  I’m surprised you didn’t get very broad support on that.

Schachman:  It passed overwhelmingly, and then a few months later the regents said “screw you” to the faculty, and the faculty, instead of saying “okay,” they rescind the resolution that I had—that’s what breaks my heart, my wife’s heart. I said, “I didn’t mind the regents overruling me. I knew they would overrule me. But I wanted us to speak from our vantage point. My hat is that of a professor and not that of a regent, and I doubt if I’ll ever wear the other hat, but if I did, I’d probably be a bastard just like them.” Is that on tape, too? [laughter]
Yes! You know you’re enjoying this.

But that was a fascinating case. It turned out that my speech was broadcast on KPFA, and unbeknownst to me, my son was listening to it. He was a young kid at the time, the younger son. I got home, there was this huge banner outside the house: “Welcome home. Congratulations.” Because we never expected it to pass. But I had done a historical study and went through it. Land grant institutions, I read the rules, and, as I say, I grew up with it. I switched from the University of Pennsylvania to MIT. When I got to MIT, I wanted to be a sophomore. I didn’t quite make it. I was a freshman, but I was going to make up some courses. But in ROTC I was a freshman. I had to take two years of ROTC, and I resented every bit of it.

And you protested it, didn’t you? I seem to remember—

Yes, but I didn’t do much about it, other than just shoot my mouth off.

Well, you certainly have a long history of that. [laughter]

That’s right. Shooting my mouth off.

I think we should end here.
Interview 3: August 7, 2001

[Begin Tape 5, Side A]

Lage:  This is the third interview with Howard Schachman. He’s going to elaborate on the Matson case that came in front of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, which we talked about last time. Now you have some written materials that can help fill in some of the details.

Schachman:  I have some information that will refresh a faulty memory. What happened was some professor—I think he was a lecturer, although the book describes him as Professor Y—The Committee on Privilege and Tenure reported to the Berkeley Division. It’s [reads from document] “for the information of the division, actions and opinions of the committee in two cases are reported here.”

Case one is Professor Y. “The findings of the committee are set forth in a letter to Professor Y from the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, Berkeley Division.” And then it goes on, “Dear Professor Y—”

Lage:  “Y” is to keep him anonymous?

Schachman:  Right. Everything is kept anonymous, that’s right. And this case—”Our concern has been chiefly whether proper procedures were followed. We find that the only grounds upon which a grade may be changed without the consent of the instructor are those specified, Berkeley Regulation A.1279.” It goes on. It’s an extremely short opinion. “We have established to our satisfaction that the dean made an investigation and that the Committee on Courses was satisfied with this investigation and accepted the recommendation of the dean [Dean William Fretter]. In view of these facts, it is our view that the Senate legislation, which is our guideline in this case, was complied with, and there has been no violation of academic privilege. The vote in this action was four ayes and one nay.”

Then the record of the Academic Senate goes on. There was a dissent in this case, which is pages long.

Lage:  This was your dissent.

Schachman:  This was my dissent.
Lage: Along with Herma Kay?

Schachman: No, no, by myself. It was four to one on this. She wasn’t on the committee at all. This was an entirely different situation.

I described why I was dissenting from this, and the case was all “Course X,” “Professor Y,” so nobody was identified. The irony of this particular case—I remember it full well—a good friend of mine saw me walking across the campus one day, and he started yelling at me, “What the hell kind of jerk are you? I thought you were going to fight for fundamental freedoms. I saw this case in Privilege and Tenure, and it sounds like the dissenter was absolutely right. What’s wrong with you guys on the committee?”

So I said, “Why didn’t you go to the Academic Senate meeting and probe into the merits of this particular case?” I don’t know whether he probed into it or somebody else probed into it. In any case, it came up on the floor of the Academic Senate. Of course, the dissenting opinion prevailed, because it was quite clear this was an egregious violation of the privilege of this professor.

In fact, Dean Fretter, in my opinion at that time and it was subsequently the opinion of the Academic Senate, did make an egregious error, and it was a messy case, especially since many of the people thought that the student might have been a communist, when the truth of the matter is the student involved in this case was a Nazi. He used to walk around in Nazi uniform. He intimidated a significant number of professors, many of whom—not many of whom—several of whom came to me afterwards and told me how happy they were that somebody had been able to stand up to this particular guy. I never met the guy, but I stood up for the professor who did stand up for him.

It was a lovely story.

Lage: Are the dissenting opinions not signed? Is that why your friend approached you like that?

Schachman: No names were attached. There was no identity at all what the nature of the struggle was. It was all disguised.

Lage: And there was no discussion of this--
Schachman: On the floor of the Academic Senate it became clear. I can’t remember the details from the floor of the Senate. That may be in here, and I may find out, and I may have prepared a speech. I’m not 100 percent sure.

Lage: And what was the date of that?

Schachman: The date is April 26, 1966, and it’s in the proceedings of the Academic Senate, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate. It was a fascinating story

I think the second case, in which again I think there’s a dissent—let me just see if the language is clear, because that was Professor Y, and they said there were two cases. [looks through documents] All right, the other one was Petitioner K. And [reads from the document] “The matters raised in this letter from the petitioner were carefully considered at five meetings of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. All members of the committee were present at each of the discussions. The committee is divided with regard to the ultimate disposition of the complaint, and we hereby furnish statements of the majority and minority positions.”

Here, the majority denied this guy his rights before the Committee on Privilege and Tenure because he wasn’t a faculty member, and they didn’t think he had a position. There’s a majority opinion, and the minority opinion says, “Two members of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure believe that it would be dangerous from the standpoint of protection of academic privilege to exclude from the jurisdiction of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure questions of injustices in hiring procedures.”

Again, I was in the minority. This particular case was particularly annoying to me because somewhere in the course of the deliberations a professor of the Law School who was a member of the committee showed up with a document that had my name on it. It was in essence a sort of a defense fund for this particular individual. I think he was a TA or something of the sort, and he was asking for coverage under the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. This was clearly a debatable issue, where honest people could differ as to whether the P&T really covered people who were not members of the Academic Senate. My feeling is it should cover it.

In any case, I was embarrassed like crazy because I had never known anything about the so-called “defense fund.” I didn’t know this guy from a
hole in the ground. And then somewhere in my file last night, while scrounging around, I amused myself and my wife by showing her a handwritten letter, from the guy who grieved this case, saying he apologized profusely for getting me in this embarrassing position. He misidentified Strohman as Schachman, so the ad, when published presumably in the Daily Cal, had Schachman’s name down there under support, when in fact Schachman didn’t know the guy from a hole in the ground and had never been approached.

As I said in my beautiful letter to members of the P & T Committee, I had no chance either to accept his invitation to put my name on, or to reject, the invitation. I didn’t even know about the activity. So anyway, that was the other case. It was a wonderful story.

But the Matson case, dealing with an instructor’s responsibility in grading courses, was much more clear-cut. It arose at the beginning of the free speech battle, and the place was a shambles. There was a regulation in the Academic Senate manual that undergraduate courses must have final exams. Matson was a lecturer, as I recall, in the speech department, and he felt that entree and relationships between students and instructors ought to change in this period. The faculty was becoming aware of student grievances, and therefore what he was going to do was make the final exam—he still called it a final exam—in the form of a term paper that would require interviews with the professor and discussion of the topic and things of that sort, and it would be what he called the final exam. It wouldn’t, however, have been in a room where it would be printed on a manual from nine to twelve, and you collect the papers at twelve o’clock.

So he conducted this. The student obviously didn’t show up for any of the interviews, and he wrote this unbelievable paper full of, oh, sexual activities with regard to Jewish girls. I probably have it in my file somewhere. It’s a terrible thing, and the professor obviously was infuriated. He thought it lacked all the criteria for discourse that you needed, and he gave the student what he thought was an appropriate grade, namely an F. Then Fretter came along, the dean at that particular time, and said, “You violated the rule.”

Lage: The rule for final exam?
Schachman: For final exam. But then he went and changed the grade, and that became part of my dissent. Changing the grade had nothing to do with the presumed violation of the rule requiring a final exam. He might have violated the rule, in which case you punish him for violating the rule, but you don’t go ahead and change the grade of a professor unless the grade was given for reasons extraneous to the purposes of the instruction and proficiency of the student in the course material. There was no reason to believe that the grade was changed for those reasons.

For example, a grade change occurred on the famous Creighton case. Creighton was a young man who marched in ROTC [Reserve Officer Training Corps]—I mean, in a protest against ROTC, in uniform, and the ROTC people came along and changed his performance to an F, and he flunked. TenBroek, my great friend, the professor of speech, gave a marvelous talk of them violating the law because, in that particular case, they graded him for reasons other than his performance in ROTC; they graded him for his political activity and using his uniform while he was marching to protest about ROTC.

So that was a classic differentiation between changing rules or violating one rule and applying it to another case. I remember Bill Fretter being very unhappy with me for fighting my way through this particular case, but I thought it was worthwhile.

Lage: Did Bill Fretter talk to you individually about that?

Schachman: He might have for a while, but he was obviously hurt to have a dean essentially be overruled on the floor of the Academic Senate, and that’s essentially what happened.

Lage: Do you think he read the paper?

Schachman: No, I don’t think so. I think he was—I think they all were horrified at this guy’s performance. I don’t think there was any question about that. But on the other hand, it’s an intimidating atmosphere, and they felt that—he probably looked for an excuse to justify changing this, and I don’t know why he would have picked—I don’t think he had any grievance against this particular guy, Matson. I’m pretty sure Matson was an instructor, so he wasn’t on the Academic Senate.
Lage: And now, of course, this kind of final exam is more than typical.

Schachman: Absolutely. We do it all the time. That’s exactly right. We now talk about having a dialogue with your students. In my graduate course, for years I gave my final exams as orals, where I would meet with the students. I used to meet in the conference room across the hall with five students, and I would bring some of my senior post-docs or graduate students in with me. We’d have five of them taking the exam at the same time. I would roam back and forth, asking questions: “Well, he says that. What do you think?”

It was a great teaching experience, and that exam, as far as I was concerned—and I have students to this day talking about it—was a great learning experience, rather than a testing experience.

Lage: Was it an evaluating tool for you?

Schachman: Oh, sure. Oh, sure.

So anyway, that was one of the famous cases.

Lage: Oh, that’s very good. I’m glad we elaborated on these cases and on the ROTC case as well.

Now between—I’ve called it “between the wars,” between the loyalty oath and FSM, there were—

Schachman: Right. Well, this was one that came up in between, and then somewhere along the line, I was on the Policy Committee. I’d love to find a copy of what Herma Kay and I wrote, because we laid out a bunch of wonderful problems—

Lage: Do you remember what the issues were?

Schachman: Oh, all sorts. I can’t remember. It was governance, it was teaching. I was very proud of that particular document.

But the ROTC thing was quite independent of Herma Kay. I was on the Policy Committee, and the Policy Committee bought my suggestion that we ought to go after ROTC. At that time the [ROTC] faculty was chosen in Washington, okay? So we didn’t go through the normal machinery where you
have a budget or departmental relations committee. It’s really called the Budget Committee, but it’s an appointments and promotions committee. It’s misnamed in Berkeley for fifty years or so and functions extremely well.

Departments come in and make recommendations, then the Budget Committee sets up an appointment committee composed of some members of the department and some members from outside the department, and they look the candidate over. Well, the military suggested and told you who was going to be here. Then it turns out at that particular time that the military also provided the course material, so it wasn’t that an individual professor could do what most individual professors do: select what they want to talk about and do it, and the department has to say, “Hey, that’s a great idea” or “We think that’s terrible, and we think you’re shirking your duty by not covering this.” It was all controlled by Washington. I was given carte blanche to go ahead and raise the issue that ROTC should be moved off campus, so to speak.

The way I think it was resolved—it should not be a required course that is sanctioned by the Course Committee of the university. The Course Committee of the university controls all courses. It’s one of the few areas where the Regents of the University of California have delegated responsibility to the faculty, and they have terrific responsibility there. Only when a controversy arises like this, then the regents decide, “We’ll take back some of that authority that we gave away, because we didn’t really mean to give it away to that extent.”

In any case, we had control. I read an unbelievable amount of stuff. For example, have you ever heard of Eric Severeid? Did I mention Eric Severeid to you?

Lage: I think you did, actually, but go ahead.

Schachman: Well, Eric Severeid was at that time the Dan Rather or the Tom Brokaw of--he was a Walter Cronkite, a better class, okay? He was the Walter Cronkite of radio and television, if there was television in those days. He had been an undergraduate at the University of Minnesota and led a protest movement as an undergraduate against ROTC and tangled with General Douglas MacArthur. I remember it very well.
I read an incredible amount of material—it was a major curiosity problem. I thought it was fantastically fascinating. So I read all this stuff on land-grant institutions, because that’s the way ROTC was instituted. See, I went to the University of Pennsylvania. It’s not a land-grant institution. I took no ROTC. I then moved to MIT as an undergraduate, essentially becoming a second-year student, because I had spent a year already at Penn, and, of course, I had to take ROTC, but I had to take freshman ROTC, and then as a junior, when all of the other MIT students were finished with ROTC, I had to take sophomore ROTC, or otherwise I couldn’t have graduated.

I remember marching in uniform and being very frustrated by the stupidity of the whole thing. It was certainly much worse by the time these guys were starting to take their dictation from Washington, and they would move professors in and out, and we had absolutely no control. “Major This Guy” or “Lieutenant That Guy.”

I learned all about the land-grant act, the Morrill [Land Grant] Act [of 1862], which required this, and I learned things I’ve forgotten. But for me it was fun. I wrote a big speech which was given at the Academic Senate meeting. I gave this speech. I remember full well some of the more establishment members from the political science department, who should have known this subject and history extremely well, feebly getting up to protest, but I had all the facts. Of course, I was prepared and they weren’t prepared, and instead of letting it lie, they tried like the devil to protest against it. It was an extremely feeble opposition, and the faculty passed overwhelmingly the resolution.

That’s what my son David heard on the radio. It became wonderful. Of course, I was ecstatic. All I said was—it was analogous to what I did when I was in high school. When I went to high school, I wanted to study Hebrew. I was going to learn a lot about Hebrew by going to Hebrew school after public school was over.

Lage: And you didn’t get credit in public school.

Schachman: That’s right. Now, I had no objection to ROTC renting space on the campus, but students don’t get credit for it, and they go take it after hours, and it’s not a requirement of them; those who want it can do it. Because I firmly believe that the kids—you know, that was the big argument: if you get the civilian population involved in the military, you’ll have a more democratic military. I
agree with that principle completely, but it was a question of manipulating the 
university and the university being willing to be manipulated, that shook me 
up.

So anyway, it passed overwhelmingly. Of course, the regents blew their 
means over this, and a month or two later the Academic Senate, in its infinite 
wisdom, revoked its actions. I expected fully that that would be exactly what 
would happen. We didn’t have the power to do that kind of stuff, was the 
rationale.

So it was a wonderful effort—

Lage: So even though you were winning—

Schachman: I lost.

Lage: You had a sense that it would be overturned?

Schachman: Oh, I was pretty confident that it wouldn’t take, and it was an act of 
frustration, so to speak, but for me it was fun. I must have a book at least this 
big on the documents I acquired on the ROTC case. I really enjoyed that 
one enormously, because I learned an enormous amount. You read about Eric 
Severeid fighting General Douglas MacArthur. You know, a college kid and 
this powerhouse of a general. There were loads of wonderful articles. Like 
everything else in this world, there’s a fascinating literature if you want to go 
find it. Ordinarily, when does a biochemist ever knock himself out, or even 
most historians knock themselves out for that? So that was my story about 
ROTC and about Matson.

Lage: That helps fill in some of the details from our last interview. Between the 
loyalty oath and FSM were the Kerr directives.

Schachman: Right. That was the immediate precursor of the battles.

Lage: But the faculty seemed to get involved before FSM.

Schachman: Oh, yes. And no, FSM was just essentially getting started at that time.

Lage: There were the HUAC [House Un-American Activities Committee] 
demonstrations off-campus.
Schachman: Right.

Lage: Was that anything that you were involved with?

Schachman: Not really, no. There was the protest where the students from San Francisco State were washed down the steps of a building over in San Francisco with the hoses. There were Cal students there, too, but there was this wonderful young woman, black woman, who led some of that. Then there were these famous shop-ins. Do you remember the shop-ins?

Lage: Yes.

Schachman: The kids went down to the Cadillac agency on San Pablo Avenue, or maybe the one on Shattuck Avenue, and then the one where they loaded up their shopping carts. You know about that one?

Lage: I don’t remember that one.

Schachman: They loaded up their shopping carts at Lucky’s, or whatever the supermarket was, mostly with frozen goods, hundreds of dollars’ worth of frozen stuff. They would go to the cash register, and when they were halfway through totalling up the thing, the kids said, “Oh, I changed my mind,” and they would walk out. So here was this shopping cart. My friends in the East were actually horrified. “Howard, do you condone that kind of activity?” I said, “Look, it’s a shock to me. I really don’t believe in destruction of private property, but this is the next step after a sit-in. It’s called a shop-in.” Though I don’t like it, on the other hand, they got attention. They weren’t getting attention prior to that.”

Lage: These were over hiring rights issues?

Schachman: Oh, yes, absolutely, absolutely over the hiring of blacks. No question about it, and they were fantastically effective, but my sensibilities were really shaken at that time because that wasn’t my style.

Lage: Your style was different?

Schachman: Right. I wasn’t a sit-in person, either, and I didn’t go march. One of my friends, in derision, pointed out that I was a talker, not a walker, and in a way that’s true. I mean, my activities were more at the intellectual level.
Lage: You’re such a good talker.

Schachman: I don’t know if that was true, but in any case, that was the way I reacted. But those things were going on. The Creighton case was a case where I was on the periphery because tenBroek handled that one, and then all of a sudden, out of nowhere, came the [Eli] Katz case. I guess we haven’t really discussed this in detail.

Lage: I want to go back to one thing that happened before Katz. You were chair of the Berkeley AAUP [American Association of University Professors].

Schachman: Oh, I was. I was the local president, or whatever it was called, of the American Association of University Professors, but in a big campus like this, AAUP played practically an insignificant role, although you will see it did play a role in the Katz case. But I didn’t do anything--

Lage: It wasn’t a major forum.

Schachman: No, it wasn’t a major forum. The Academic Senate here was the predominant forum. AAUP, unfortunately, didn’t play a role. It plays a role in much smaller institutions, where they have no tradition of faculty self-governance. I claim much of our self-governance is sandbox governance, but on the other hand, it is still infinitely more powerful, if you want to use that phrase, in Berkeley than it is at most other institutions, or the University of California as a whole. I mean, compared to, let’s say, Beaver College or Kenyon College.

There, the AAUPs are the only chapters that provide some protection for academic freedom, and they can go to the national organization and protest. Then committee A of the national organization comes in, sets up a committee to investigate this allegation of academic freedom, and then the sanction comes from the national organization, whereas Berkeley sanctions came through the Academic Senate—AAUP didn’t get involved in firing of the professors and the loyalty oath. They played an insignificant role.

Lage: What about the Committee on Academic Freedom? Were you involved with that at all?

Schachman: I don’t know whether I was ever on the Committee on Academic Freedom, but that’s where the Katz case came up. I can tell you all about that. I refreshed some of my memory on that one.
Lage: Okay, good. One more thing. Reggie Zelnik [Department of History] is writing about Free Speech.

Schachman: Okay.

Lage: You probably don’t remember this, but he has in his draft article that in ’63, which is the year before FSM, Chancellor Edward Strong made a speech to the AAUP annual meeting, and he warned that faculty would declare a cold war against the administration. Does that ring a bell to you?

Schachman: No. I don’t remember that.

Lage: It seems like he was almost anticipating FSM.

Schachman: He probably was, because that would probably be the beginning of the Katz case. The Katz case was already lingering along with another appointment, which was related to it. I was heavily involved in both.

Lage: Okay, the Katz case.

Schachman: Well, what happened in the Katz case: The origins of that are very simple. A friend of mine, who is a very distinguished professor at UC San Diego, had a young post-doc in his lab, and this guy knew a man by the name of Katz. Katz was an assistant professor, or temporary, or whatever the title was at that juncture, in the German department.

Lage: Acting?

Schachman: Maybe acting. Until he got his PhD or whatever, and then he would be made a member of the Academic Senate. This friend of mine called me up and said the guy’s being fired presumably because of his communist activities, although I understand he signed a loyalty oath, the Levering Oath, by that time. The other oath had been gone. “Can you help him?” My answer was very clear. I said, “Sure, I can help him. I know all the things that you can do that are wrong because I’ve done them all on previous occasions, so there can’t be any more actions that you can do wrong. Therefore whatever’s left over will be right.”

He laughed, and he said, “I’ll tell him to call you up.” Within a fraction of a second or something, I don’t know how fast it was, this guy came to see me,
so I talked to him. His name was Eli Katz, and he was in the German department, and it was none of my business whether he was, or had been, or was about to be, or was tired of being, a member of the Communist party. My problem was learning a little bit about the firing of the guy.

I immediately got a hold of my friend, tenBroek, okay? He and I decided to meet, and we invited a third party to this meeting, and the third party was Frank Newman, who later became the dean of the law school and still later became a justice in the Supreme Court of the State of California.

We then went through this whole scenario. All of us had been compromised in the past by negotiating with the university, because of what happens when you go to see Strong or other university administrators. I recall being in a room with Strong on one occasion, for example, when he was talking to me, and he opens up his desk drawer—. First of all, he wouldn’t see me alone, so he had Alex Sherriffs in the room with him. I don’t know if you knew much about Alex Sherriffs and the role he played—

Lage: I’ve heard a fair amount about Alex Sherriffs.

Schachman: Okay. He used to be a liberal psychology professor, or something like that, when we first got to know him, but then he became the number one assistant to Ronald Reagan and moved to Sacramento. Sherriffs was sitting there, just because obviously Ed Strong wanted a witness. He starts up and says, “Howard, I’ll show you these files.” I said, “Ed, I don’t want to see any files. I don’t believe a word that’s in any of those files.”

Lage: This is all about Katz.

Schachman: I don’t know whether this was about Katz or something else, but I remember that kind of episode. When we go into the Katz case, we all agree we’re not going to talk to the university administrators. Everything we get, we will get on our own, rather than having it given to us in a confidential framework. We’re professors, and we like the administrators and we love the university, so therefore in discussions with administrators we are compromised. We therefore can’t divulge any information anymore, because it was given to us under the strictures of confidentiality by some administrator, even though we might have liked some of their activities.
So that was it. It was verboten. There was no question about it. I was getting
document after document with regard to Katz, and we contacted Ernie Besig.
Have you ever heard of Ernie Besig?

Lage: Yes.

Schachman: He was the executive director of the ACLU [American Civil Liberties Union]
of Northern California, which was one of the best American Civil Liberties
Union chapters in the United States, the one that fought the war over the
Japanese relocation. They were a hundred years ahead of every other branch
of ACLU in the United States. This guy Besig was phenomenal.

We clued him in from the very beginning so he could institute a suit against
the university, and we would be the filter that would provide him with all the
documentation. Besig knew Newman, and he knew tenBroek, and ultimately
he got to know me, not very well.

Anyway, our activities were moving along fairly well, although it was clear
he was going to be wiped out, and John Kelley, of the math department, was
the president of the local chapter of AAUP. John Kelley was a very sweet
guy, was a non-signer of the loyalty oath who got fired. He died rather
recently.

Lage: I remember that.

Schachman: His death occurred shortly after a symposium at the time of the fiftieth
anniversary of the loyalty oath struggle. Kelley did not have our prior
experience with being wiped out by the university with all sorts of
confidential information, so he decided—you know, it’s a normal thing. You
want to do a good job, and Clark Kerr’s a reasonable guy; go see Clark Kerr
and talk to him. He called Clark Kerr on the phone, and Clark Kerr then
describes to him the conditions under which Katz can stay. All of this is on
the telephone.

Kelley then sits down, and he writes a letter, “Dear Clark, This is what I
understand,” and he types out all the various conditions, in what later became
what I frequently have called a blackmail letter: “If Katz will do this, then
we’ll leave you alone at the university.” Clark Kerr, in his infinite wisdom,
then did what he ordinarily does. He doesn’t type a new letter, he writes all
around the periphery. Are you familiar with his technique, that little scribble that you can hardly read? It takes one of the experts to read it, and then he has his secretary type on plain white paper what that scribble says.

Those papers are supposed to be collected, like the Lincoln papers. He did that when I was moving to UCSF. I would write a formal note: “Dear Clark, I must see you about this,” and he’d scribble on the note, which I couldn’t read at all. All I wanted from him was an appointment, and I wanted a guarantee that if I had trouble with the chancellor over at UCSF, I could get to see him. By that time, I learned his trick. I would then mail back his paper to him, with my scribble on it! [laughter] As if to say, “I’m not interested in your papers for posterity.” Anyway, Clark did this, and Kelley received this typewritten sheet, which of course we all got, now without any compromises whatsoever. Katz got it. I might have gotten it from Katz, rather than from John Kelley. In any case, it was--

Lage: It was the deal that could be struck?

Schachman: Right, right. I’ll find you my speech. So Katz was fired. He was at Western Reserve, and we went through a whole shenanigans with this thing, and it was about October of 1964—I can’t remember the exact period—and the Academic Freedom Committee repeatedly—we were always going to them—said, “Settle the Katz case.” The irony of it is the chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom is a guy by the name of Joe [Joseph] Garbarino, who happens to live across the street from me, right now. He didn’t in those days. Joe Garbarino was in the School of Business Administration. He couldn’t care less about any of this kind of activity, and he was the one with whom we planted all the time, place, and manner resolutions when the battle over FSM became critical.

[Begin Tape 5, Side B]

Lage: You were talking about Garbarino.

Schachman: Garbarino diligently went ahead and at every Academic Senate meeting, or every other one, he would report back what progress there was or if there was no progress we kept talking about what you had to do about Katz’s academic freedom.
Finally there was a meeting at which there was on the order of 400 people—I
don’t know how many. It was probably October.

Lage: It seem like it got brought up in October and then again in November, right in
the midst of all this FSM stuff.

Schachman: Right, precisely, because that’s how I got so heavily involved. At that meeting
the Committee on Academic Freedom reiterated its proposals, and Schachman
got up to give an amendment to the academic freedom resolution. We knew
what the call for the meeting was, and my amendment dealt with five major
points, the fifth one of which was “we hereby condemn the local and
statewide administration of the university for its disregard of and contempt for
the Academic Senate and its duly constituted committee system. Its actions
constituted violation of academic freedom” and so forth and so on. You know,
you could hear a pin drop. I read this blackmail letter on the floor.

Behind me at the meeting was tenBroek with a big cardboard carton to hold
his Braille speech so he could show support by seconding my amendment. It
was just overwhelming. I remember full well the first speaker to get up was
my department chair, and he feebly tried to find out where this letter came
from. I’m not sure I handled this extremely well, but in any case, it was a very
feeble gesture. He was trying to provide some sort of support for the
administration because this was, as far as I knew, the first and only time that
the Academic Senate was going on record condemning—that was the word—
the local and statewide administration. I made it quite clear that it meant
Strong and Kerr.

Lage: Was this chair Robley Williams?

Schachman: Yes. Robley was a decent guy, but on the other hand, he was also an
establishment guy. We were good friends. I always used to argue that “I wish
Robley wouldn’t get into administration because I’d rather not fight with him.
I like him. I’d rather argue with him about viruses and structure and
electronmicroscopy, which is his field.” I’ve always argued that if the
university—and I told this to Clark Kerr years ago—would only hire a bunch
of Standard Oil executives to run the campus, ninety-nine times out of a
hundred we’d be very happy. The hundredth time, they’ll violate one of the
fundamental principles of a university, academic freedom or something of
that sort, and we’ll beat hell out of them.
But in the meantime, they’ll run it a helluva lot better than the professors whom you recruit because they’re over the hill, and they become your administrative lackeys, and they’re not good administrators; they’re not decisive, and I don’t want to fight them. I’d rather fight the guy from Standard Oil, if necessary.

Anyway, Clark Kerr, he knew full well what he was doing. Clark Kerr’s major mistake in life was to hire weak people so he could control all the campuses by not having strong chancellors around, and that’s how Strong got this job. Clark rued that day, I’m sure, that he got more trouble by having a weak chancellor in Berkeley than he would have ever gotten if he had a strong, independent-minded chancellor.

In any case, I’ve seen department chairs all over the United States in biochemistry do exactly the same thing: hire very weak colleagues around, because they don’t want to feel threatened, whereas Arthur Kornberg, when he was looking for people, he said he wanted the best people in the United States. He knew who the best person in the United States was, himself, so he wasn’t threatened by anybody else. I used to use this as an example all the time.

Anyway, the amendment basically, with the five points in it, passed with only one change. Robert Aaron Gordon got up, who was a very decent liberal professor, played a major role in subsequent battles, but he also was very close to the administration, and said, “Would you mind adding ‘in the handling of the Katz case’?” In other words, we condemn them for—I looked at tenBroek, and it was clear to me—he was blind, but it was clear to me these were acceptable words. I wasn’t condemning them for what they did about football; I was condemning them for what they did with regard to the handling of the Katz case. Those few words were the only words that got changed in my resolution. It passed by an overwhelming vote.

Lage: Did that surprise you?

Schachman: Yes. Oh, yes. My wife and I discussed it at great length. I fully expected—I might have been an associate professor; I’m not sure what I was. Maybe I was a professor. I had tenure, that I’m sure of. But we thought that I wouldn’t sleep well unless I finally brought this to fruition. Katz was my baby, so to speak. I nurtured it from the day the issue came up, and—
Lage: You were the moving party.

Schachman: That’s right. I was informed about it. It wouldn’t have arisen on the campus had my friend in biochemistry at UC San Diego not called me.

Lage: Do you think it would have just been quietly dealt with?

Schachman: Well, [Madison S.] Beeler I don’t think was getting anywhere. Beeler was chairman of the German department [1964-'65]. I’ve never really discussed this problem with Beeler. I hardly know him. Beeler was wonderful in this whole thing. I mean, he was extremely supportive of Katz. Katz, you know, taught Yiddish in the German department.

Lage: Oh, I see. How did it end up being resolved?

Schachman: So when [Martin] Meyerson came in [as acting chancellor, spring 1965] he, with real diligence and fortitude, rehired Katz. Hence Katz returned to the campus from Western Reserve.

Lage: I wonder if that got Meyerson in trouble with the regents.

Schachman: No, at that time they didn’t care anymore. The composition of the regents had changed, and as tenBroek and I used to joke with one another, we won the battle too soon because Katz didn’t do enough scholarly work to get tenure at Berkeley. If he stayed at Western Reserve and became an associate professor there, when he came back, he would have come back here as associate professor.

Lage: So he didn’t make tenure?

Schachman: No.

Lage: Do you think there was anything political in that?

Schachman: No, I don’t think so. I don’t know, though. I would never know. I mean, I usually stay way from those kinds of judgments. My guess is Katz was not a great scholar. I’ve seen him once or twice since, maybe more than twice. In any case, the ACLU was ecstatic with joy, and they published the whole resolution that I had written, and I got a lovely note from Ernie Besig.
Lage: So they didn’t have to bring a suit.

Schachman: No. Well, ultimately I think they probably did, and maybe that helped galvanize Meyerson. Years went by before he came back. He was long gone.

Lage: It couldn’t have been too long if it was Meyerson because he was only here for a fairly short time.

Schachman: Yes, but Katz was gone before the free speech battle. Katz had already been fired at the time that I presented the speech. He was already at Western Reserve.

Lage: Now, do you think that all the turmoil about free speech contributed to that vote?

Schachman: Oh, there’s no question about it. The people in that room were faculty members who were already exercised over the Free Speech Movement, and all of a sudden, an unknown guy by the name of Schachman became a major hero because he introduced a resolution the likes of which had not been introduced before. And then next thing you know, I was invited to an evening affair, which was all connected with the student movement, and it was at the home of the math professor who got in trouble, brilliant professor—Steve [Stephen] Smale—it was at his home. I was then treated more or less as a hero. When the faculty began to meet over organizing our activities, I presided at every meeting, so the right-wing or the former liberals like Seymour Martin Lipset [Department of Sociology] and all those guys—who were the other ones?

Lage: Glazer?

Schachman: That’s right, Nathan Glazer [Department of Sociology]. They called this group the Schachtmanites, meaning the Schachtman with a “t” in it, Max Shachtman from the old anti-Trotskyite movement. Unbelievable, that they analogized it as if I was the spiritual leader of this movement. I got into this role only because I had been so heavily involved in the Katz case.

Lage: Now, tell me who were they referring to with this Shachtman?

Schachman: They labeled our group, the Two Hundred, or whatever we were called--
Lage: Yes, Committee of Two Hundred.

Schachman: Right. They were called the Schachtmanites or something like that.

Lage: But you say they were referring to?

Schachman: To Max Shachtman, who was a great Trotskyite leader, or maybe he fought Trotsky. I don’t even know. But he was very active in the Bolshevik movement in the twenties or thirties or forties. It’s a form of history--

Lage: Was that their way of casting a red flag?

Schachman: Yes, we were a bunch of left-wingers. That’s right. As I told you, then one of my friends in that group said, “You’re a talker, not a walker” because I wouldn’t march down to the barracks in Oakland when they were all marching.

So anyway, that’s the only way I got involved.

We wound up with a Steering Committee that had on it people like Chuck [Charles] Muscatine, department of English, Ken Stampp, department of history], Charlie [Charles] Seller [history], Bill Kornhauser [sociology], and of course, tenBroek, and Herb[ert] McClosky from the political science department, and Bob [Robert H.] Cole from the law school. It was the cream of the faculty, as far as I was concerned. The group included great professors from the departments with me as the only scientist.

Many of the meetings occurred in my home, of that small fifteen or twelve. [Carl] Schorske [history department], Sheldon Wolin [political science]—all of them.

Lage: And Zelnik, probably.

Schachman: Reggie Zelnik [department of history] was the youngest guy around. And John Searle [philosophy] was very active.

Lage: Henry Nash Smith [department of English]?

Schachman: Henry Nash Smith.
Lage: I’m looking to see who else Reggie remembers.³ Lowenthal?

Schachman: Leo Lowenthal [speech and sociology departments].

Lage: Who was Leo Lowenthal?

Schachman: Lowenthal was a wonderful, distinguished German scholar, who was probably--did he mention that guy from sociology? Oh, God.


Schachman: Phil Selznick, right. Lowenthal was the senior member of that department, sociology, and a wonderful, distinguished guy. See, this battle ultimately became the new left versus the old left, and there were people on campus that thought these students showed absolutely no respect and this was an incipient Nazi movement. “They’re going to desecrate the synagogues.” There were some Jewish refugees from Europe who were horrified at the students in the Free Speech Movement, because they were so disrespectful. They were breaking windows or whatever, invading buildings, and sitting in, and shopping in.

As I say, it bothered my sensibilities, but on the other hand, I didn’t attribute political motivation to that, and these guys are analogizing exactly to the incipient Nazi movement in Germany. But Leo Lowenthal was a different one. He was also a German refugee, and he felt differently about it.
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Lage: Who were the ones who analogized it to Nazis?

Schachman: Well, there’s Dan[iel] Arnon [Department of Cell Physiology] on the campus here, who felt that these were horrible people. My friend, Hardin Jones [cell physiology], who was certainly not a scholar, was another one. There were a significant number. And then the political science people—the guys like Seymour Martin Lipset, Martin Trow [sociology], and Paul Seabury [political science].

Lage: They objected to the students’ style and the behavior more than the aim?

Schachman: Right, right, right. They certainly showed no respect.

Lage: You agree with that?

Schachman: Of course. You know, there’s the phrase, “We don’t trust anybody over thirty.” Reggie was identified with them, and John Searle was, and I was involved in some of their all-night meetings, but I was probably the only one over forty at those meetings with Mario Savio and the leaders of FSM.

Lage: Well, tell me about your role in those meetings.

Schachman: I was usually quiet because these were people much better informed than I was, and I also learned very, very quickly that their tactics usually were the correct ones, even though they bothered me. I couldn’t participate in what they did, but ultimately things got really very bad.

I’ll give you an illustration of one episode that was fascinating. Lenny Bruce performed on campus, okay? This is a lovely story. My wife wanted to go see Lenny Bruce. My wife was from New England, and I thought she’d be horrified and would want to walk out, because, you know, if you’re talking about offending sensibilities, Lenny Bruce was a past master at this, but Ethel was intrigued.

Everything, without a question, had redeeming social value. I mean, there was a scene of an Uncle Tom. There were men at a urinal and, you know, things of that sort. There was a pseudo-fornication scene on a bench, and so forth and so on. There was a big crowd. Performed in Wheeler Auditorium.
I get home, and the next day or two later, I read in the Daily Cal a comment by [Earl] Budd Cheit, who was working by that time for Roger Heyns, about how they won’t be back here again. So in a nice quiet way, I wrote Budd or Roger, whatever, both of them, a note and said, “Hey, you guys, I was there, and though it’s not my style of activity, I can assure you that this is classic, of socially redeeming value, and there was nothing here that could be categorized as being something you could stop without violating principles of free speech.”

So that was the end of it. It was a nice, constructive letter. I didn’t publish it. I didn’t release it to the newspapers. About three or four months go by, or maybe even less time. I got a phone call from Budd Cheit, “Can we come down to see you? We want to talk about that performance.”

I said, “Who’s ‘we’?” He names a bunch of guys. “Gee, it would be easier for me to walk down to your place than for you all to come up to my little office.” (I had a bigger office then, at that time.) Anyway, I went down there, and the first thing they do—the police chief is there. They give me the police report and ask me to read it. I read it. It’s accurate. They described all the scenes that I had seen. It was a pretty good description. “What do you think?” I said, “Precise. It’s accurate. It’s exactly what I said. It’s got socially redeeming value. Every one of these things had to do with minorities—blacks in particular, Uncle Toms, a typical scene about Uncle Tom, and you should allow them.” They thanked me very much, and I disappeared.

Lage: You didn’t discuss it?

Schachman: I think there was general acceptance of the view that my position was overwhelmingly correct, that they couldn’t very well argue that this should not be allowed on the campus. It’s tough as hell for you to defend that with the Board of Regents, but that’s the way life is. You’ve got that job: you’ve got the headaches with it.

Some weeks later, the whole bunch of our guys—Schorske, Wolin, tenBroek—they’re all at my house and the phone rings, and it’s either Roger Heyns or Budd Cheit, who was doing most of the heavy lifting for him. “Howard, they’ve invited Lenny Bruce back again.” So I take the phone away, and I go into the other room. “They’re hysterical. The administration is scared to death. How do we get rid of Lenny Bruce?”
One of the guys there says, “We’ll take care of it. Tell them we’ll make sure Lenny Bruce doesn’t come,” so they felt very relieved. We get back and we discuss it, and it turns out—of course, we had very good connections with Lenny Bruce’s lawyer, and Lenny Bruce’s lawyer was sensible. Lenny Bruce was sensible, too. Even though he’s irascible as hell, he was sensible.

We tried to make it clear to him that this would be devastating and that this was not the time to show your weight with regard to this kind of activity, so Lenny Bruce didn’t come.

Lage: What was your thinking on that? I mean, somehow I would expect you all to say, “Well, bring him on.”

Schachman: No, because we weren’t looking for confrontations. We were trying to solve very, very difficult problems. You know, the language at that time was “time, place, and manner,” and that was the way the resolutions were all phrased to the students; have freedom of speech, and the only thing that the university can control is time, place, and manner. So, for example, you can’t have a rally outside a classroom at nine o’clock in the morning, and that’s why the lunch hour on Sproul Hall steps became the grounds under which all of this was going on.

The manner dealt with speech rather than lighting firecrackers and things of that sort, or throwing hand grenades. That language was from the constitution. It was written by guys like Bob Cole and Bob O’Neil. Did you ever hear of O’Neil, Bob [Robert M.] O’Neil? He became the president, I think, of the University of Oregon and then the University of Virginia. A wonderful guy.

Lage: Was he in the law school?

Schachman: Yes, so even though in principle you’re right, most of us would say if Lenny Bruce is coming, Lenny Bruce is coming, but we thought that there was a better time, and why don’t we--

Lage: Did you think the regents would get in on it?

Schachman: Oh, I think they would have fired the next chancellor who did it.

Lage: So things were that bad.
Schachman: Oh, yes. Strong was given a leave of absence because he broke down, and then somebody else was made acting chancellor, and then after that came Martin Meyerson.

Lage: Meyerson was acting chancellor. He never really was anything but acting.

Schachman: Didn’t he ever become chancellor, himself?

Lage: I don’t think so.

Schachman: Of course, by that time Kerr was gone, and I guess Hitch was the president of the university, and then after Meyerson, Roger Heyns got appointed, and Roger Heyns was very, very good.

Lage: You thought Roger Heyns handled those years okay?

Schachman: Yes.

Lage: What did you think of Budd Cheit overall?

Schachman: Oh, I still see Budd at concerts. Some of my friends were annoyed at him, but I thought Budd was a very smart guy. He was level headed. Though he was much more pro-campus administration than I was, I thought he had respect for the guys on the other side, and most of us did for him, too. I certainly did and have had very friendly relationships with him for a long time.

Lage: Let’s go back now to the FSM period and see if we can get any more detail here. We have the little group which Reggie calls the Sellers circle.

Schachman: Because we met in Charlie’s office frequently, down in Dwinelle.

Lage: How did the group come about? Did it come out of the Katz case?

Schachman: No, it came out of the free speech thing, but some of us were just normally brought into it. I don’t think, for example, Frank Newman showed up to those things, but tenBroek certainly did. Ken Stampp was very active. Bill Kornhauser was there, and we recruited other people. John Searle was there all the time. Reggie was one of the few young people.

Lage: And you were the only scientist.
Schachman: I think I was probably the only scientist, right.

Lage: Why is that?

Schachman: I don’t know the answer to that, although there are a lot of faculty in the sciences who were very sympathetic. My friends knew what I was doing, and there was no question that they were supportive of my position, but I guess it’s just a question of personality.

I’m still doing it. I’m involved in a horrible situation right now on the campus. It drives me crazy that sometimes I can’t get out of these things.

Lage: Just give me a hint what it is because—

Schachman: It’s my personality, I’m sure.

Lage: No, but I mean the issue now. Maybe we can talk about that later. What are you involved in right now?

Schachman: I’m involved in a misconduct case on campus, which Beth [Burnside, Vice Chancellor for Research] asked me to help her with.

Lage: I see.

Schachman: Ordinarily, I would never have received a phone call from Burnside, but she knows about my activities and my experiences in the past. Therefore she asked me, and now it keeps blossoming. That’s why the computer breakdown this morning is causing me a lot of grief because I received two emails from the person involved early this morning.

Lage: It’s not necessarily something—

Schachman: Not something we talk about, right. But ordinarily—I’ll give you an illustration of political activity. This outfit called the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology—I used to be the president of it. It’s now got roughly 100,000 people. It’s a federation of roughly thirty societies. When I was involved, there were only seven. I’d been the president of the Biochem Society then. I became the president of this.
Today they had a conference call—and I’m not active in that anymore—but they asked me would I participate in this conference call, and the conference call is over an amendment to the Treasury and Postal Bill, appropriations bill of the last Congress, and some congressperson amended this thing to require that all government agencies must assure the quality, the integrity, the objectivity, and the accuracy of everything that comes out.

So they called me up, “Howard, will you participate in this?” because objectivity is not something you get. For example, I have hundreds of friends at the National Institutes of Health who publish papers, and they’re peer reviewed for the journals for which they publish. Some of them are inaccurate. Objective, they ain’t. Scientists are not objective; scientists are subjective, they’re passionate, they’re biased.

It’s the clash—I keep saying over and over again till I’m tired of hearing myself say it—of different views that makes science a collective activity. We obtain objectivity because subjective people fight with one another, and then somehow or other some step toward truth emerges. Truth is always being changed.

So here’s a government agency that’s decreeing this and providing a vehicle where anybody in the outside world can challenge it. Now, why is this resolution in there? Why did this congressperson from Missouri or wherever she came from do this? She did this because people don’t like the EPA [Environmental Protection Administration] standards. They’re in the coal industry or the automobile industry, and they think government agencies which say, “This level is bad”—they want to harass them so that the agency will not perpetrate that kind of stuff.

This is what I call non-peer review of really what was peer-reviewed science. It may be wrong, but it was peer reviewed. It was the best you could do, but it may not be accurate. It certainly won’t be objective, and when you publish a paper on aspartate transcarbamylase, my favorite enzyme, you may be subjective as hell because you’re pushing an interpretation that you like. It may turn out to be right, and it may turn out to be wrong, and only time will tell. And other guys will challenge it.

So they asked me to participate in an hour-and-a-half phone call this morning, and that’s what I did.
Lage: Do most of your scientist friends agree that scientists aren’t objective?

Schachman: I think so. Those who think carefully about this will agree that we are biased, that we push points of view, and that we espouse a position. We interpret data in a direction that we think is appropriate, and we’re damned careful because if you go too far you’re going to have egg on your face and then your reputation is smeared for life. So your bias is under a certain self-control element in your own body and your own brain, but that you are biased, I think, is beyond a shadow of a doubt.

That was my battle over the scientific integrity issue, when these guys tried to get objective as an absolute requirement. “A scientist must be fair.” Scientists are not fair; they’re human beings.

Lage: That’s interesting, how your political outlook interacts.

Schachman: Yes, absolutely.

Lage: The passion that you have for both things comes out.

Schachman: Right.

Lage: Back to FSM.

Schachman: Right. So what about FSM now? What else do we have to say?

Lage: The famous December 2nd sit-in on Sproul Hall, were you there?

Schachman: Yes. Oh, of course. Well, I sort of engineered—you know, as the chairman of this committee—we had planned strategy for the Academic Senate meeting, and we knew who the good speakers were: we knew which ones ought to talk.

Lage: Are we talking about that December 8th meeting?

Schachman: Well, it’s before the 8th, wasn’t it? It was before the sit-in.

Lage: We have the sit-in, and then the official committee—there was an unofficial meeting, which came to be called the Committee of Two Hundred.

Schachman: Two Hundred, right.
Lage: That was December 6th.

Schachman: It was the 6th? I don’t recall all the dates and meetings.

Lage: And then the Greek Theater incident was the 7th. The Greek Theater, you remember?

Schachman: Yes.

Lage: And the Academic Senate met on the 8th, when they passed the resolution.

Schachman: Okay. We had carefully planned. The chairman of the Academic Freedom Committee was Joe Garbarino, and Joe Garbarino doesn’t feel these issues. He has no passion for this kind of issue. Nice guy, but on the other hand, this wasn’t his kettle of fish. He didn’t care about it.

As I recall, Ken Stampp and Chick tenBroek were on the committee, constituting a minority of the members on the Committee on Academic Freedom. We were meeting on our own, the Committee of Two Hundred, with the Steering Committee of the guys you know. We prepared a resolution that we wanted passed by the Academic Senate. We were fairly intelligent guys—we knew that a rump activity on the part of our group would antagonize an awful lot of people, that our best bet was to sell it to somebody who had official status. That official status was the Committee on Academic Freedom.

I personally was asked to go to the Committee on Academic Freedom and deposit this resolution and try and convince them that they ought to sponsor this resolution, and if they didn’t, obviously we would. But on the other hand, we felt it would be much more likely to be successful if they were to sponsor this.

They met. They had two guys on there that were part of our group, so we knew about them. I think Everett Dempster, a sweet guy from genetics was on that committee. I’m not 100 percent sure of my memory anymore. He’s dead. And apparently they agreed to go ahead and do it.

It was clear that free speech must be maintained and the only thing that could be governed was time, place, and manner. The resolution would come from the Committee on Academic Freedom. But we also knew that members of the
Committee on Academic Freedom weren’t the best spokesmen in the world for a resolution of major magnitude, so we sort of strategized who would get up when.

Lage: On that December 8th meeting?

Schachman: That’s right. I sat in that room, sort of looking around and pointing, and it isn’t that I was quarterback and did all that, but we knew who would be able to answer what opposing argument most effectively, who would be most influential. You know, a person like Henry Nash Smith commanded an enormous amount of respect; Carl Schorske, a huge amount of respect.

One of the more profound people in our whole group was Sheldon Wolin, but Sheldon Wolin—he wrote this famous book on political theory, one of the great books of this type in American education—but Sheldon was not a passionate, dynamic speaker, whereas Schorske would be much more flamboyant.

So we more or less decided in advance. If you heard tenBroek give his speech from Braille, it’s awe inspiring. He was just overwhelming. That was essentially part of the activity, and we walked out of that meeting, I think tenBroek was on my arm, walking out of that meeting. You know, the students were out there, roaring, because it was broadcast outside, and it was a very thrilling—.

Lage: Reggie Zelnik had to be outside, too, because he wasn’t a formal member of the Academic Senate.

Schachman: Is that right? I don’t remember that. That’s interesting. He was wonderful. He is wonderful still.

I used to drive tenBroek home. I remember once going out of Dwinelle with him, and he says, “Turn here.” You know, he was totally blind, and when I drove him home, he says, “You make a right turn now.” I said, “Chick, do you drive home usually from campus?” [laughter] He said, “Sure.” He was extremely self-sufficient and obviously could mark time with a car as well as a foot. It’s amazing. I’ve just never gotten over the opportunity to know him. I met a lot of the people in the blind [community] through him.

Lage: You did?
Schachman: But he was most impressive.

Lage: Do you think there are recordings of those Academic Senate meetings?

Schachman: Oh, I’m sure.

Lage: I think in fact they might even be on the Internet.

Schachman: I’m sure they’re recorded.

Lage: Through that Free Speech Movement project. I’d love to hear tenBroek speak.

Schachman: Well, you should. He’s really great.

But the arrest thing—when you talked about the arrest—I’ve lost track of time. I remember the Greek Theater thing. But on one episode—we’ll have to fit this into a pattern—when the students were being yanked out of Sproul Hall steps, we were running around like crazy. I remember vividly, for example, having resolutions typed, circulating, and tenBroek says, “You can’t run around like that. You’ve got to get somebody to help you.” I had a very tall graduate student at that time, a very wonderful guy, and so he was willing to help me. He actually sat in, so he was arrested with the group. I think there were five people from this building arrested. Three of them—is that right? Three from my own lab, okay.

Lage: Grad students.

Schachman: Right. So I was obviously very sympathetic to these people. This kid says he’ll do anything for me, and when we were typing things and running back, this guy would go down frequently to tenBroek’s office with something for tenBroek to see, and then somebody would read it to tenBroek. One day tenBroek called me on the phone, and he says, “Who’s this Viking you have working for you?” That was how impressed I was with his hearing capacity because this student had gigantic feet. He wore a big shoe, and he was 6’-1” or something, and that was his reaction: I’ve got a Viking working for me. [laughter]

Schachman: But when the students were being arrested, we were in consultation, one with another, and who’s going to do what. I was asked to go down to the
courtroom. Who told me to go to the courtroom? I haven’t any idea, but we were delegating responsibility to one another. There was no real boss.

[Begin Tape 6, Side A]

Schachman: I go down to the courtroom, okay? There’s this old gentleman, Mr. [Judge] Crittendon, and there’s another guy in the room and me. The other guy in the room turned out to be a man by the name of Ed[win] Meese.

Lage: Oh, yes, I remember Ed Meese.

Schachman: Okay? So Ed Meese--

Lage: He was with the district attorney’s office then.

Schachman: That’s right. That’s exactly right. He worked for Lowell Jensen at that time. Later he became Lowell Jensen’s boss in the Reagan White House. Ed Meese was ranting and raving, you know, “They’re taking over the university and then they’re going to take over the city of Berkeley and then the state of California and the nation.” It was unbelievable.

I’m sitting there very patiently, and I said, “Your Honor, I would be glad to argue with the district attorney about the merits of this case, but I don’t think you have time to argue the merits of the case. I can tell you the dynamics. There are 800 of them being arrested. If you keep them in jail, tomorrow you’re going to have to arrest 1600. If you keep them in jail, the next day you’re going to have to arrest 3200 because the students think that what these 800 have done is correct, and they want to support them. So the dynamics of the situation, independent of the merit, are such that you’ve got to release them.”

Meese was infuriated. He wanted me to fight and say that these were loyal people and they weren’t all a bunch of Communists and so forth and so on, and Crittendon looked around. He said, “I’m going to release them on their own recognizance. Why don’t you go out to” wherever it is—Livermore—goddamn, I can’t think of the place. That’s horrible! [the Santa Rita Correctional Facility]

I walk outside, terrifically impressed, and outside the courtroom were a bunch of parents. Among the parents were some lawyers who were going to support
the students and defend them, and one of them was, as I remember—his name was Hoffman; I’m not sure. He was the brother of the wife of George Wald. George Wald was a Nobel laureate at Harvard University, and Ruth Hubbard is George Wald’s wife’s name. She publishes science under her own name. George Wald died. Ruth Hubbard—I think her brother’s name was Hoffman; I’m not sure.

Anyway, they offered me a ride out to Santa Rita. I said okay, and I picked up the phone somewhere, and I called my wife and said, “I’m going out to the prison farm. I’ll be home late.” So I went out there—a sheer, fascinating experience. Pure unadulterated chaos. There were a lot of parents already there. “Have you got any children there?” Well, I was too young to have children there at that time. “No, no, I’m just one of the faculty members supportive of the students.” They began giving me money for the free speech funds. I was collecting checks from people because they thought they were going to have a massive court case with $75,000 that we’d need. They needed bail money and whatever. I think the old man [Vincent] Hallinan was there. You know about the family—

Lage:  Yes.

Schachman:  And the son is now in trouble himself, being subpoenaed over this marijuana case. But they were a bunch of roughneck kids. Hallinan was, of course, I think he was Harry Bridge’s attorney, the old man. A real good left-wing lawyer. Smart guy. And he comes up to me. “Oh, my God, I wish I had known you [were coming]. I keep money in the safe for just this purpose. I would have brought it for you.”

Then the first thing you know is somebody went over the hill, so we said, “Oh, my God, some kids have broken out of the Livermore jail.” It turned out these were really professionals who were arrested who broke out. It wasn’t our students. The students were happy to be there. They were having a wonderful time, and most of the prisoners apparently were appreciating it. And, of course, there were a lot of romances going on there: Suzanne Goldberg and Mario Savio. All kinds of stuff was going on.

It turned out there was a wonderful judge in the city of Berkeley, whose son had been arrested. I don’t remember his name, but I’m sure it’s in the books. The police were dying to find this kid, who was a diabetic. He had no insulin,
and they wanted to give him insulin. I was there for many, many hours. Essentially, I was there all night long. The judge was the one who drove me back to Berkeley and took me home, and I got in the house around six o’clock, sort of sheepish. My kids—my two boys were getting up and they’re getting ready to go to school, and Ethel looked at me, but she knew where I’d been.

The next thing you know, I said, “I’ve got to get to the university. I’m going to go in and take a shower,” because I had been up all night. Ethel comes yelling to me, “Hey, you’re wanted on the phone. It’s Hardin Jones.” Hardin Jones was an old friend of mine from the navy days. I’ve known him for a long time. His first comment was, “Howard, you’ve got to stop the strike.” So I take the phone away from my ear, and I say, “Ethel, I just got the greatest compliment in my life. Hardin wants me to stop the strike.” Even to think I could stop the strike--what greater compliment could anybody get?

So I get back on the phone and say, “Hardin, I’ll do whatever I can.” These guys were crazy. They were so frightened. Paul Seabury—all those people in that group, who were real basically decent people, but they were so frightened about this takeover of the world by Mario Savio et al, that they did dumb things like that: “I should stop the strike.”

Lage: They weren’t just worried about disorder on campus?

Schachman: Oh, they thought it would go way beyond the campus. They really thought it was a national movement and this was the beginning of it.

Lage: In some ways it seems--

Schachman: Well, it did that, only because the war came along. No, it switched. But at that time, it was strictly over free speech at Berkeley, and then the protests became protests for protest’s sake. That’s when I got fed up because I used to say they wanted to argue whether the door should open to the left or to the right, and that didn’t concern me. That was not an issue of any consequence as far as I was concerned.

Most of these kids got into this thing because of the Civil Rights movement. I mean, Mario Savio had been in the South. That’s why he was so smart, because if you weren’t smart, you’d be killed. So they used good tactics
because they knew they had to protect themselves against real physical harm. When they came here—

Lage: Do you think they came here looking to stir things up?

Schachman: I don’t think so. I don’t know why they came, but I think there were people—some of them were not involved in the South at all, and some of them just became affiliated. Have you heard of Michael Lerner?

Lage: Oh, yes.

Schachman: Okay. I’ll give you an illustration of another evening.

Lage: These are very valuable recollections.

Schachman: Oh, they are? Okay. I was at one of these evening sessions with Savio and a bunch of the other guys—I don’t remember all the other names—and he was there.

Lage: Lerner.

Schachman: Lerner. And Lerner was always dressed in a very natty sport coat. He looked different from all the others and a cut above in terms of wealth. By that time, the issue had come up over the four-letter words.

Lage: Oh, yes.

Schachman: And Mario Savio was determined not to let that issue of the four-letter words become identified with the free speech battle. In other words, we’re not going to defend guys with signs “FUCK,” whereas Lerner really wanted that to be part of the thing. And this battle went on for hours. I’m sitting there, watching and listening to this stupidity from this guy, Lerner. I got to dislike him very, very much during this battle because I realized that, as I said, it became protest for protest’s sake, not because there were any fundamental issues. Later it became the war, and that was a fundamental issue, but when the four-letter word issue came up, the situation deteriorated tremendously, and I was no longer involved.

Lage: So that’s when you turned off.
Schachman:  Right. I tried to get turned off. In ‘69—the only way I would ever really get out—my wife wanted me to leave, I was getting offers to leave, and the only way I got out of it was I became chair of the department here, and that consumed so much of my time that I was able to avoid going to some of those meetings.

Lage:  But there was a long way from that filthy speech movement, which happened in the spring of ‘65, just right on the heels of FSM.

Schachman:  That’s right.

Lage:  And then the war.

Schachman:  Right, the war came along.

Lage:  Shall we say for the next six years?

Schachman:  That’s right. It went on and on and on. Oh, yes. I’ll give you an illustration of a fascinating experience. So Clark Kerr was fired. I don’t remember when, but you can look up--

Lage:  In ‘67.

Schachman:  So Clark Kerr is fired. I was at that regent’s meeting, outside, in the audience because they’re open to the public. You couldn’t get in the room. Or maybe I was in the room, but I was certainly outside when Clark Kerr walked out. He shook hands with me and thanked me for being there. He knew me. He also knew I had introduced the resolution—you follow?—before that. But I have always said that Clark Kerr was a great university president, and on most issues he was on the side of the angels, but his survival skills and desires were so overwhelming that when it became necessary to compromise, he compromised, whereas I wouldn’t have because I didn’t have the job, nor did I want it. If you wear that hat, you accept the troubles you bring with it.

Lage:  Right.

Schachman:  Anyway, Clark Kerr was fired, so then immediately faculty members said, “We have to do something!” There was almost hysteria. I was invited to come to a meeting probably in the law school. I’m almost sure it was at the law school. We’re going to do something to protest the Clark Kerr firing. There
were a bunch of very much more establishment people than the ones I was used to being with at this particular meeting, and they were talking about a rally at the Greek Theater and a bunch of speakers and so forth and so on. Immediately, “What are we going to do about the protest by the students?” And how big the banners could be?

I never heard such--there’s a lovely phrase in Yiddish, *mishigas*, nonsense, in my life. I mean, they’re worried about all the wrong things. Instead of figuring out how to get a good meeting going, they’re worried about how they can rein in the protesters. My attitude was, have a good meeting, and there won’t be any protesters. I’m sitting there, annoyed, and I had made it clear I was going to be there only as a participant; I’m not going to be on any committee. I said finally, “You guys, why don’t you invite some wonderful speakers, and then you won’t have these students protesting. They’ll be ecstatic with joy.” “Okay, Schachman, whom should we invite?” I said, “First of all, you should invite Earl Warren,” chief justice of the Supreme Court and former governor of the state of California, very close friend of Bob Sproul’s and so forth; he loves the university.

“Oh, you’re crazy.” So who was in the room? E.T. [Ewald] Grether and [Ira] Michael Heyman. Now, Mike was one of our underlings during this battle.

**Lage:** Earlier.

**Schachman:** Of earlier parts.

**Lage:** What do you mean by one of your underlings?

**Schachman:** Well, he wasn’t the top brass—you know, the fifteen of us, Henry Nash Smith and all those guys, but Mike was on our side of the fence on most issues. As I found out later, he became one of my nemeses, but I’ll tell you about that later. Over mandatory retirement. Mike disappointed me no end.

Anyway, so he immediately said, “Aw, Howard, you’re living in a fantasy world,” because of the Warren Commission and the Kennedy assassination, “he ain’t gonna touch this thing.” I said, “You guys, I think he loves this university so much.” I said, “But you know him. Why don’t you go in there and call him up?” Grether and Heyman went into another room at the law
school, and they called him up. I couldn’t have called Warren on the telephone. I think Mike had been his clerk.

He was certainly a Supreme Court justice clerk, whether it was Warren’s or not, I don’t really know, and of course, Warren accepted right there, while we were still in the other room. They came back after the telephone call, and announced that he had accepted. “Okay, Schachman, you’ll be a committee to go pick another one. Have you got any more ideas?” I said, “Yes. [Senator William] Fulbright.” “Oh, you’re gonna turn this into an antiwar movement.” I said, “Fulbright was fired as the president of the University of Arkansas, at a regent’s meeting directly analogous to the regent’s meeting which Reagan attended, his first regent’s meeting as governor of the state of California and the head of the Board of Regents.”

So I said, “This guy—after whom the Fulbright fellowships are named—understands free speech. He’s got a daughter here.” “Okay, Schachman, we’ll leave you alone.” They left me. I was a committee of one, so to speak. It was very informal. I had the most incredible line of connections—I don’t know how I found the connections here, there, and yonder about his daughter and access to William Fulbright.

At the end Fulbright told me he was dying to come in, there’s nothing he’d rather do, but he’ll be destroyed. He has an election coming up. He’s already on their list to get rid of him because of his anti-Johnson war activities and things of that sort, and therefore he, with great reluctance, said no.

But it was very protracted, a very protracted discussion.

Lage: The negotiations—

Schachman: Yes. It took a long time, and I would develop this contact with him, and then put some pressure on him from that guy. This is all new activity for me. I had never dealt with this level of activity. In the meantime, I’m thinking of other people. One of my major sources was free speech, and the great expert on free speech was Richard Hofstadter from Columbia University. He wrote the classic book on this [Academic Freedom in the Age of the College]. That was a relatively easy one for me, and I knew that would be a very scholarly address. I don’t know how I got to Hofstadter, but I got to him very quickly.
Lage: He’s a friend of Ken Stampp’s.

Schachman: He probably is, but I think tenBroek knew him, too. A lot of people knew him. He had written the basic stuff in that field. So we got Hofstadter lined up very, very quickly. Of course, I didn’t do all this myself. I would consult my friends, but I wasn’t consulting the people who met in the law school, who were the Grethers and all the powerhouses on the Academic Senate that ordinarily would not talk to me under most circumstances. I don’t think they disliked me, because you can’t dislike me; I’m such a nice guy. [laughter] But I was too militant and mischievous for them. Then the next question is, “Where do I go from here?” I tried a bunch, and I mean a bunch of university presidents—whether it’s [Derek] Bok—you name them. I had unbelievable entree to the president at MIT, whose name also escapes me right now, but it was a distinguished scientist.

Lage: Jerome Wiesner?

Schachman: Yes, Jerome Wiesner. Here again, nothing they would rather do but to come to the aid of a president who got fired like Clark Kerr, whom they all admired, and I did, too. But they wouldn’t touch it.

Lage: Oh, that’s very interesting!

Schachman: Protect your hide. So finally, you know where I went? I went to 6’-8’’—the economist from Harvard.

Lage: Galbraith?

Schachman: John Kenneth Galbraith! John Kenneth Galbraith never knew what hit him. I had so many connections. I talked to his secretary, finding out where he was, what appointments he had the day before, the day after, et cetera. I practically bought him the airplane tickets, and he was being pressured from innumerable sources, by me, because I had connections here, there, and yonder, and, of course, Kerr knew him very well, but I wasn’t involved with Kerr at all. Galbraith dropped what he was going to do. This opportunity was too important. Galbraith, of course, was a militant guy. His personality would be—

Lage: And loyal to Cal also.
Schachman: Right, of course. He got his degree here, and I think he had a child here, too, at that time. I’m not sure. Anyway, Galbraith used to call me and “how low below the belt can I go?” I mean, he wanted--

Lage: As he was planning his talk?

Schachman: Yes. He was consulting me all the time about the details. I, of course, would consult with tenBroek. One day tenBroek says to me--this is a fascinating story in and of itself--he says, “You know, wise guy, you’re going to have to write a speech for the chief justice.” The chief justice doesn’t just come and give a speech. Somebody has to tell him what the speech is about. I said, “What the hell are you talking about?” He says, “You’re going to have to do something about it.” Well, there was, lying around in my office, a wonderful article by Larry Levine and someone in the history department. I don’t know how I had come across it. It was really a profound statement of the history of universities and freedom in American universities. It was very profound, very different from what I knew Hofstadter would talk about. It was marked up. It was a mess.

I gave it to my secretary, and I asked her to retype it so it was a nice clean copy, and I sent that to Chief Justice Earl Warren. Then we had the affair at the Greek Theatre. I remember there was a rumor somebody was going to assassinate the chief justice, and the police got very upset about that.

Lage: This is the Greek Theatre?

Schachman: Greek Theatre, right. It was analogous to the one where Mario Savio came across the stage and all hell broke loose, but this was at the Greek Theatre sometime later, and it was very ceremonial. We were all in robes, and one of the few times I’ve marched into the Greek Theatre with a robe on. I remember those historians hearing that speech by Earl Warren, and wondering where they hell he got it! [laughter]

Lage: You did get the information from somewhere!

Schachman: No, I was guilty of plagiarism, I’m sure. But I didn’t do it. I just gave him a copy of the speech.

[Only a few months ago I was at a “reunion” of some of the friends from FSM days that I haven’t seen for years. Larry Levine was there with his wife along
with others from the history department. At one point I said, “Larry, I want to apologize to you because I have been having guilty feelings for many years.” He wondered why and I told him the story of my sending his manuscript to the chief Justice. He had no idea how Warren had attained it. But he was happy to be the victim of plagiarism by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. The story was retold by him last week following the wonderful gathering honoring Reggie Zelnik.—added by Howard Schachman, 9/02/04.]

Lage: And Warren did well?

Schachman: It was a sensational affair. Galbraith is a pretty arrogant sort of character, and he says, “I hope you’re putting me on last.” I said, “Of course I’m putting you on last.” He didn’t want to upstage the chief justice. So we had the chief justice, then we had Hofstadter—so the whole affair, with all these frightened guys—I mean, there were no student protests whatsoever, because it was a very scholarly affair, with tributes coming from all over the world in honor of Clark Kerr.

And, of course, there was considerable entertainment for Kenneth Galbraith and Earl Warren, and I don’t remember seeing either of them [laughs] at that occasion. The whole affair with three speakers was arranged through my cantankerous activities. It went very, very well.

Lage: That particular event has escaped my attention.

Schachman: Yes. That was the protest over the firing of Clark Kerr.

Lage: Your discussion with the “establishment” professors led to this.

Schachman: I’ll never forget how annoyed I was, sitting there, because I had been dealing with these students for a long time, and I knew who the reasonable ones were. Another kind of illustration: When the issue—remember when Wheeler Auditorium burned down and things of that sort—Roger Heyns was the chancellor, and my relationships with him were very good. My relationships with Budd were very good. They knew exactly when I disagreed with them and where I stood, and I was very much a part of the gang that was protesting nearly everything that was going on in Berkeley, although their administration was much more reasonable and less frightened. One of the principal
motivations at the outset was fear. Seabury had all the locks changed in the political science department. They had no conception that all the secretaries were taking the material that they had and giving it to the students. They were just dumb.

Lage: You mean this was happening, you’re saying.

Schachman: Was happening, right. The secretaries were totally sympathetic to what the students were doing, and they were working for professors who were totally paranoid about what the students were doing. They began to wonder, “How did they get this and how did they got that?” They got it because it’s a big institution. It’s like a secret in Washington. There are no secrets in Washington. It’s just out of the question. There is no confidentiality. These guys—someone changed the locks in the political science department, and they can’t get in. Well, they didn’t need to get in. The documents that you asked to have typed were being transmitted immediately to the students.

I knew nothing about most of what was going on here, but I remember being annoyed. I didn’t know Seabury very well, but I was annoyed at what I considered this fear. There were very different political science professors that I knew, people like Herb McClosky, and who else? Well, tenBroek had a partial appointment.

Lage: But Herb McClosky was involved?

Schachman: He was part of our group, yes.

Lage: Your relationship with your graduate students who were involved or other graduate students, how did they treat you? Did they think of you as a mentor?

Schachman: You mean the ones who were arrested, or what?

Lage: Just in general. The ones who were involved in Free Speech Movement activities.

Schachman: They loved me, I’m sure. I was very close to the students. I used to work in the lab with my own hands in those days, and interestingly enough, some of the great work that came out of my lab was done in the middle of the night, when I would come back from a political activity. I worked with a young faculty member by the name of John Gerhart, who became a distinguished
scientist on the Berkeley campus. He took early retirement. He’s about twenty-five years younger than I am. It breaks my heart. He’s so creative. He’s so good. He’s still doing some things, but he was a great teacher and a wonderful human being. He’s a member of this department.

Lage: Now, you came back to your lab after—

Schachman: We came back, and John and I would do experiments together. It was a phase—and I worked on this enzyme where it was obvious what we ought to do. We were milking a major opening of the problem, and therefore it didn’t take much imagination. You didn’t have to lie awake and think, what shall I do now? It was obvious what you should do. Why don’t we just go do it? You had to do it. That was all there was to it. And everything you did essentially turned to gold because it was such a new concept. It was coming out of this very small problem. Have you read the *Scientific American*?

Lage: Your article?

Schachman: No. No, the man across the hall. It’s right over here somewhere. [finds a recent *Scientific American* article] This office I gave up, which I occupied for almost forty years, is now occupied by Peter Duesberg.

Lage: Oh, you’re kidding! When you were forced to contract your space?

Schachman: Because Barker Hall was being rebuilt and refurbished to make it earthquake-proof. So I was asked, would I give up some space? My lab was not all that small, so I said, “Sure, I’ll be glad to give up some space.” So who moved into that space? This guy, Duesberg. Right across the hall.

Lage: You don’t respect his science, I’m gathering.

Schachman: Neither his science nor him. He’s the one who said AIDS is not caused by HIV. He convinced President [Thabo] Mbeki to ignore this problem in South Africa, and, of course, thousands of people have died. Now he’s got a cure for cancer. The last couple of sentences tell you exactly what he’s like.

Lage: [reads to herself] Hmm.

Schachman: I’ve always argued that people who go along with the established doctrine are not going to be very creative scientists. Also those people who oppose all
doctrines are not going to get anywhere. There are of course others who have a healthy skepticism toward some and not toward other points of view. But this guy wants to break down all the paradigms that we now talk about. So he fought against the world about HIV, and now all of a sudden he’s discovered they were all wrong on cancer. I keep saying if you’re lucky in research, you add a couple of stones to this huge body called knowledge, and the big problem is to make sure you don’t wind up taking stones away. He doesn’t seem to understand this. It’s got to be all or nothing. Crush everything else that is known.

Lage: He seems a little conspiracy theory—

Schachman: Oh, yes. The world is against him; he can’t get any grants, and now (according to stories I have heard) he’s being funded by a guy whose daughter or wife is dying of leukemia, and he received $100,000 from him. Of course, it’s all because of us not giving him government money, and he thinks that—he says it in here, if you have a $100 billion budget, at least five percent of the funds for science should be set aside for work on fringe theories. Meaning his own.

Lage: Yes.

Schachman: What I was trying to say is our problem is a relatively small problem in biology. It’s gotten us some awards, and we’re very happy with it. It made an impact in this very narrow area. During all this nonsensical period, I was able to do some important experiments, and a series of papers we published in 1968 represented a major contribution into this branch of enzymology. And 1968 was, as you can tell, a relatively busy period of time because that meant you were doing it in 1967, ‘66 and ‘68, and writing the papers.

Lage: How did you go to all these meetings and get so involved and do your research?

Schachman: I neglected my wife, and I neglected my kids, but they still love me.

Lage: Here’s a question for you, going back to FSM: The December 8th resolutions. That was a great victory.

Schachman: Right.
Lage: Then they elected the Emergency Executive Committee to lobby on those resolutions and try to get the regents to accept them, and only one of your group was elected, one of the Committee of Two Hundred, and that was Carl Schorske. Do you recall the politics there?

Schachman: I don’t recall.

Lage: So most of those people on that Emergency Executive Committee were the more conservative and moderate--

Schachman: I’m not surprised. I mean, it’s the same as in the loyalty oath battle. You know, people had the impression that the Berkeley faculty opposed the loyalty oath, when the truth of the matter is two hundred people opposed the loyalty oath when it started. And the same thing here. We galvanized--I mean, there’s no question about the persuasive power of a Schorske and his speech or Leo Lowenthal with his accent or a Chick tenBroek, and they would be overwhelming in the floor of the Academic Senate.

But when you go out with a mail ballot and, as we like to say, you bring in the engineers to vote who don’t go to the Academic Senate meeting, and you bring in the Ag school [College of Agriculture] people who were there before the move to Davis, you wind up with us being a very small minority.

It’s the College of L&S, Letters and Science, which is really where the strength lies. The math department, the physics department—chemistry faculty are relatively conservative. Speaking of professional schools, the School of Business Administration—that’s where Joe Garbarino came from—or the College of Engineering, have very conservative people. They weren’t passionately excited about free speech.

Lage: They did care about order on campus.

Schachman: Much more about that. Oh, hell, yes. They would much rather have no protest rallies, in my opinion. They’re not evil people, but on the other hand, this was not a compelling, exciting issue for them, battling over free speech. It’s like the war. Look how it [the antiwar movement] started, as a protest movement. I’ve always maintained that the college kids of America got us out of Vietnam, but look how long it took, and look what the sacrifices were before they were able to convince the unions, and only when people started to come
back, unfortunately, in body bags, that people switched. So they were way ahead of their time. Too far ahead. That’s one of the problems.

Lage: You say you didn’t particularly like the marches and all that, but did you stay involved at all?

Schachman: Oh, yes. I was involved with trying to get people here. Because of the connections I developed over the Clark Kerr thing, I had entree to John Kenneth Galbraith and other people, and I think we approached—what’s his name?—Fulbright again when the war issue became a hotter issue and the center of gravity of our free speech battle switched to the war effort.

So yes, I was involved, but not as actively as I had been before, and that became a bigger issue.

Lage: Were you involved in that Vietnam commencement?

Schachman: No.

Lage: A lot of faculty got involved in protesting it.

Schachman: I don’t remember.

Lage: That was ‘68. What about issues revolving around the Third World students? You know, there was a big movement to establish a Third World college.

Schachman: Right. I had nothing to do with it. I felt the faculty was asleep during much of that, but I think exhaustion set in.

Lage: Then there are issues that I would think the faculty would get very involved in, about regents getting into hiring or firing?

Schachman: Oh, right. You asked me about my experience with Strong. At the time they were trying to get rid of Katz, this same friend of mine in San Diego was pushing that his post-doc, Leon Wofsy, be hired at Berkeley.

[Begin Tape 6, Side B]

Schachman: Leon Wofsy is almost my age. Not quite. A half dozen years younger. Leon Wofsy was a teacher in Connecticut, I think in high school. He apparently
was a fantastic high school teacher, and he had a long background of activity in socialist organizations that may have had connections with the Communist Party. His family had been very active. I don’t know all the details, but Leon is very proud of the family and very affirmative about this kind of activity.

He got involved in hearings that ultimately became the House Un-American Activities Committee except it was Connecticut, just as we became involved with this guy [Jack] Tenney, the predecessor to Martin Dies and those people. This is a California committee. That’s how our loyalty oath got started.

Leon got involved very, very early. The ACLU of the state of Connecticut was a very good one. It had Tom Emerson, a professor of law at Yale on it, and they were defending Leon Wofsy. Repeatedly he was given assurances by the big shots in the teaching activity that he would not be fired, but ultimately they had to come and tell him he’s about to be fired. They couldn’t protect him any longer because his activities in the past had been so intimately involved, I guess, that he was beyond redemption. I’m making these words up.

A couple of the people involved in the ACLU were professors of chemistry at Yale University, one of whom was a wonderful man by the name of Julian Sturtevant and the other of whom was S. J. Singer. They said to him, “You’ve got a very short half-life in front of you in this activity. Why don’t you go back to school and get yourself a PhD?” He enlisted at Yale, worked as a graduate student, a much older graduate student, working with Jon Singer and did a beautiful piece of science, which I knew inside out. It was gorgeous. It was right in my field. The Wofsy-Singer paper was a very important paper.

Then, when Singer moved to San Diego as one of the charter members of the faculty helping to build the San Diego campus, he took Leon with him as a post-doc. Leon spent a year or two—or whatever it was, I don’t remember—as a post-doc, and then he began looking for jobs. Everywhere he looked, his political background came up.

In the meantime, one of the places he considered was here at Berkeley. The head of the department that was going to hire him was Sanford Elberg, who became the dean of the graduate school. Very sweet guy. Sandy Elberg knew me very well, liked me very much, and he wondered, would I write a letter about Wofsy. I knew the work. I didn’t know him at all. I had never met him,
but I knew the work, and that’s how you write letters, on the basis of publications.

I said, “Sure, I’ll be happy to,” but I said, “You know, Sandy, I’d be a logical guy to be on the Appointment Committee. This is going to be a controversial case. You may be better off if the Budget Committee appoints me to the Appointment Committee; then I’ll know all the machinations that are going on.” Sandy Elberg wasn’t dumb, and he says, “That’s a good idea.”

I wound up on the Appointment Committee, appointed by the Budget Committee, to look over the qualifications of this particular guy, and I didn’t write a letter of recommendation. As I remember, the chairman of the Appointment Committee was a very conservative professor whom I knew very well, but he was a terrific scientist. Sure enough, we read the application and the papers, and we could evaluate them, and we were ecstatic about appointing this guy to the bacteriology department, which was not a very good department in those days.

Of course, as soon as that issue came up, his political background surfaced right to the top of Ed Strong’s head, and that’s almost certainly why I was in there at the meeting when he wanted to show me the FBI files, and that’s when Alex Sherriffs was present—I’m almost sure that’s the connection.

Well, it turns out on top of all that, to make life complicated enough, Katz is a distant cousin of Leon Wofsy. [laughter] So here I am, fighting like hell to find out why they’re not implementing the recommendation of this Appointment Committee, and at the same time, fighting to prevent them from firing this guy, whom they ultimately did fire. I’m probably the only guy around who knows that there is a close relationship between them.

I think Eli Katz was a distant relative of Leon’s wife. I don’t know. In any case, I didn’t meet Leon during this whole battle. In the meantime, I had lots of information from my friend, Jon Singer, and I knew what was going on. I knew the filibuster was overwhelming and that we’re going to postpone and postpone and postpone this appointment until maybe he’ll reach retirement age. In the meantime, he was going to go to Pittsburgh, and then Pittsburgh asked him to fill out papers, and that was the end of Leon Wofsy’s candidacy at Pittsburgh. Things were really, really tough.
I’m almost 100 percent certain that Katz signed the Levering oath, and I used to argue to the administration, “You bastards, if you want to accuse him of perjury, accuse him, and then you’ll win your battle because he was guilty of perjury and we don’t want guys on the faculty who are guilty of perjury. If he’s a member of the Communist Party and he signed this oath, then you can get him.”

Lage: You have to prove it.

Schachman: But they didn’t want to do that because they might lose, and so they filibustered. Ultimately what happened was Esmond Snell [Department of Biochemistry] was chairman of the committee, and he kept pressing. As I remember, it was Esmond Snell. [A review of some old papers indicates that I was chairman of the committee and that Snell was a member.—HS] He kept pressing, “Why don’t you process this appointment?” Finally Leon Wofsy got appointed to the faculty of Berkeley and has been a very active participant in really every political activity you can think of. We had dinner with him a few weeks ago, so I still see him socially, and we’re very good friends.

So that was the interim interplay. It was a fascinating interplay. Before this became public, I would want to check it with Leon.

Lage: Yes. Would his past follow him via the FBI, or the scuttlebutt in the academic community?

Schachman: Oh, absolutely. Both.

Lage: Because if he signs the oath, that’s all he has to do. He doesn’t have to—

Schachman: That’s right, an ex-communist. But, you know, they really don’t want ex-Communists either.

Lage: But you never have to say what you are. You just have to sign the oath.

Schachman: Right. Well, he signed the oath, but they obviously think he lied, but they’re afraid to say he committed perjury. It’s a political decision. Then there are hysterical people like Mrs. Hearst on the committee.

Lage: Catherine Hearst.
Schachman: Yes. Yes, I haven’t come to her yet. That’s right.

Lage: No. Do you have something to say about Catherine Hearst?

Schachman: Yes. Roger Heyns is here, okay? And there’s crisis after crisis. I think on one occasion Roger Heyns was invited to serve on the board of the National Science Foundation. I knew him well enough to probably drop him a note. I can’t remember if it was in writing, or whether I saw him, and I said, “I wish you hadn’t done that.” So he said, “Why?” I said, “Roger, you’ll be at a National Science Foundation board meeting when there’s a fire in Berkeley.” I said, “It’s lovely that you are participating, but the truth of the matter is this is classic among university presidents. They’re on boards of directors. Usually they get big fees. You don’t get one from the National Science Foundation, but they’re on the board of directors of U.S. Steel, of General Motors, and so forth and so on, at directors meetings where they bring in huge amounts of money for themselves, and the truth is you’re neglecting the store back home.”

In a nice way, I make it clear that though this is good for the country that you’re going to provide your expertise to them, the truth of the matter is Berkeley needs you here full time. We don’t need a president who’s taking a month off in some isolated part of Texas. I mean, the poor bastard; he’s going to get a phone call every once in a while with a problem. I feel sorry for him.

But anyway, Eldridge Cleaver comes up. Eldridge Cleaver is teaching a course. Roger Heyns, in a nice way, approves an Academic Senate activity to call this course X—or I forget what the heck they called it.

Lage: It was a student-initiated course, a special program.

Schachman: Right. It got a special number, with an X on it or something. One of my absolutely superlative graduate students, who’s now a world beater, one of the leading scientists in biology in the world, is now a Harvard professor, unfortunately. He left UCSF. His wife is going to these classes. He’s my graduate student during all this period when John Gerhart and I are working together. He’s a fantastic student. And Phyllis Kirschner starts telling me about this class. Eldridge Cleaver is more academic than the academics. There’s just no question about it. Very different from being on television, where all he does is utter four-letter words.
I knew a lot about what was going on in this course from the wife, the superlative wife of the superlative graduate student. Somehow or other, I was asked to come to the regents meeting at which they were going to fire Roger Heyns—I mean, basically that was what they were after—over the Eldridge Cleaver thing. Presiding at this regents meeting is that great distinguished governor, and by his side as I remember, was Alex Sherriffs and that whole crowd.

So I flew to San Diego. I’m sure the university paid for it. I don’t now how I got my ticket, but I go to San Diego. I had some very good friends in biology, and it turns out that Billy [William K.] Coblentz—have you heard of Billy Coblentz?

Lage: He’s one of our interviewees, too. We’re just finishing an interview with him, but we don’t call him Billy.

Schachman: William, huh? [laughter] He was one of the good-guy regents. I’ve forgotten how I saw him very early, but I had known him from way back, when I was being wooed to go to San Francisco.

Lage: UCSF.

Schachman: UCSF. So that wouldn’t have been too way back. I can’t remember.

Lage: Why did he get involved in that?

Schachman: I used to know him socially, and during the loyalty oath battle and I guess the beginning of the free speech battle, Coblentz was one of the good guys. There was another distinguished regent who was a wonderful, liberal guy. They were a minority of about two on the board.

I was invited to some affairs, and Coblentz was at a table. He said, “Howie, what do you think about the faculty at UCSF?” I looked around. Didn’t I tell you this story?

Lage: No.

Schachman: So I said, “Gee, you know, Billy, if you walk down Market Street and you pointed to that guy over there and said, ‘You should be head of gynecology’ and you pointed to that guy over here, ‘You should be head of surgery,’ ‘You
should be head of ophthalmology,’ you’d have done a heck of a lot better than what you’ve got right now.”

The people at the table loved it. He agreed that the chancellor at UCSF was a classic example of not wanting any threats, so the weaker and the less competent the people that you hire, the better off I will be—this was John B. De C. M. Saunders. He was an impossible chancellor. He caused more trouble for Clark Kerr, and he kept that university from being first rate.

I said, “You know, it’s pretty hard to have such a lousy medical school at such an attractive place. It takes real talent.” And that’s what I meant. “Just walking around, at random, you’ll do better than you did.” They were terrible, and they were trying to recruit me about that time, so I knew a little bit about it. I guess he knew about it.

Anyway, so I knew Billy Coblentz. Somehow early in this day—I’m going to be testifying the next day. You know, two minutes or something. Coblentz says, “Why don’t you stay with me? There’s room. We each have a big suite at this motel.” I was going to stay with some of my biology friends; for example, Singer was there and a whole bunch of other friends. And they said, “Hey, you ought to stay with Billy.” “Gee, I don’t want to stay with Billy.” I didn’t know him that well.

They talked me into it. I went to the motel, and I stayed with Billy Coblentz and saw him late at night and went to bed, some fancy motel, and early in the morning Coblentz disappears to go running. I don’t get up and run. So somebody knocks on the door, and I open the door. It’s a regent. But he doesn’t know me from a hole in the ground. “Oh, I was looking for Coblentz’s suite.” I said, “This is Coblentz’s suite. He’s probably out running.” I’ve forgotten who that regent was.

So then Billy comes back in, he takes a shower, he gets dressed, and “Let’s go have breakfast.” Well, I walk into the breakfast room. There’s nobody there but the Board of Regents and me. Immediately I listen to the conversation, and Catherine Hearst in a screaming tirade about Steve Smale, because he had been picked up in the Soviet Union, lambasting the United States on the steps of the University of Moscow.

Lage: This is our math professor.
Schachman: That’s the math professor, right. He was censured more or less by the professor of chemistry who became the acting chancellor during one of the crisis periods, a very distinguished chemist, a very conservative man. But very fair. Bob--[Robert E. Connick] The other people indicated there were no grounds for firing Smale, and she had her day of hysteria, and that was it. So we got in the car, this wonderful regent, Coblentz and me, and the three of us were in this car together. We then start driving toward the campus, and when we get near there, the kids are out there—they picked up very quickly who was in what car. All of them cheering and cheering and cheering. So I said, “You guys don’t be too flattered because these are all biology people, and they’re cheering for me.” [laughter]

I went to this meeting, and I was dismissed within thirty seconds of my start. They weren’t interested. I tried to use the phrase that Eldridge Cleaver was bilingual and on national news and in front of a microphone he was full of four-letter words and cursing the white people, and in front of the classroom he was more academic than the academics, but they couldn’t care less. They just weren’t interested.

I remember taking a walk across the campus with Roger Heyns, telling him how pathetic the situation is. And this is relevant to another subject. Berkeley just had a memoriam about three months ago for a man by the name of H. A. [Horace] Barker. Barker Hall is named after Barker. Barker was a fantastic scientist—it’s relevant because in the course of my conversation with Heyns, I said, “Gee, Roger, this is a tragic way for a head of an institution to spend his time. You’re busy putting out fires all the time, and you don’t even know what the hell is going on on your own campus.”

He said, “Yes, I agree with you.” I said, “For example, if I told you that you not only do not know who the best biochemist on the Berkeley campus is, you don’t know anybody who will tell you who the best biochemist is.” That is a pretty devastating, okay? Because he knew Melvin Calvin and he knew Wendell Stanley and all the Nobel laureate types.

So he looks at me. “Howard, that’s pretty devastating. Who is the best biochemist on the Berkeley campus?” I said, “H. A. Barker.” He never heard of him. The truth of the matter is that those whom Heyns knew would never tell him that Barker was a far better biochemist than they, because they didn’t believe it. But I can assure you it was true! It was the nature of the beast. I
mean, he wasn’t flashy. He was quiet and shy, and the other guys—I mean, Stanley was a good advertiser of his original work. Though I’m very fond of Stanley and have wonderful memories, and he treated me wonderfully, the truth of the matter is Barker was a more profound scientist.

Lage: So he’s a good guy to have a building named after.

Schachman: Yes. Oh, absolutely. He was a phenomenal guy, but most people didn’t know it.

Lage: We did an oral history with him, but it was a little too late.

Schachman: I know. It fell apart.

Lage: He was not well enough.

Schachman: That’s right, and that was too bad. He was a mentor to a huge number of people. Kornberg didn’t show up at this thing on the campus, but Kornberg spent some time with him. I remember Sally [Hughes, Regional Oral History Office interviewer] told me that by the time she tried to deal with him, he wasn’t with it.

Lage: Yes. That’s always too bad. Well, these are all—Connick. Was it Bob Connick?

Schachman: Yes, Bob Connick was a very conservative but decent guy, and he was the acting chancellor and spanked Smale and suspended, I think, his ability to use his NSF grant.

Lage: Because of something he said in Russia?

Schachman: He said it on the steps of Moscow University, criticized the country, and then the question came up: “Was he justified in using his travel money from his grant?—you know, stupid to the extreme.

Lage: It would be so much easier for the university if they had just said, “We don’t want to deal with that,” and left it alone.

Schachman: In a phone conversation this morning, I learned more about government regulators and their stupidity. Mr. [Tommy] Thompson [Health and Human
Services Secretary], who has to advise Mr. [President George W.] Bush on stem cells, received a letter from one of the scientists who knew him from Madison, because Thompson was the governor of Wisconsin, and he was very close to some of the professors at the University of Wisconsin.

One of these scientists is a good friend of mine, and he wrote in just the other day because Thompson said that the people in NIH cannot go—a bunch of them could not go to the International Congress of Immunology, which just occurred, I think, in Stockholm a couple of weeks ago. Moreover, if you went, you couldn’t stay an extra day to be on vacation. You know, it is sheer insanity to do that.

Lage: Because of the government money?

Schachman: Because of government money and the criticism of these scientists, and they’re all pushing to have stem cells—you know, the immunologists. It’s just an incredible attitude. You go through these phases, up and down, all the time.

Lage: Have you seen a big change since the Bush administration came in?

Schachman: Oh, sure. We’re all sweating like crazy. I can’t wait to turn on CNN and see what happened today because there’s this jerk [Dr. Panayiotis Zavos of Cypress] who advertised in this morning’s paper that he’s going to clone human beings, and the National Academy of Science had an all-day meeting on this issue. You’re not going to stop some lunatics. I mean, you’ve got one across the hall.

I don’t know why they don’t realize this! I’m just writing a piece based on a speech I gave in May. I’m trying like mad to finish it. It’s called “The Impact of Regulations on the Conduct of Research.” I deal with nine areas, starting with human subjects, where most of us are willing to take all kinds of regulations, and working our way down to the most egregious one, which is what I call “the rats, the mice, and the birds.” I’m treating nine subjects on regulatory burden, and I point out that some regulatory burden is worth it because the consequences of the regulations are beneficial to society, but a lot of regulations are not worth it. I quoted today from the former head of the FDA [Food and Drug Administration], who wrote a piece which said, “Dogs bark, cows moo, and regulators regulate.” [laughter]
Okay? And he was a regulator. They want to do that. So that guy across the hall is opposed to all regulations, and you don’t abide by that principle any more than you abide by the principle that cows moo, therefore we need to regulate. So you impose more and more regulations on those people who don’t need it. And they are a burden, and they’re costly, and they interfere with research.

Lage: And they don’t work.

Schachman: And they don’t work.

Lage: I think we’ve run our course.

Schachman: God, look what time it is! You should look for people who are much less talkative.

Lage: Well, I think you offered valuable insights on an important time. Thank you very much.

[End of Interview]
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