

Oral History Center, The Bancroft Library, University of California Berkeley

Oral History Center
The Bancroft Library

University of California
Berkeley, California

Michael Tigar

Mike Tigar: From SLATE Leader to Civil Liberties Attorney

The SLATE Oral History Project

Interviews conducted by
Martin Meeker in 2018

Copyright © 2018 by Michael Tigar

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

This oral history recording and transcript have been placed in the public domain by its creator in a document signed June 30, 2018.

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

Michael Tigar, "Mike Tigar: From SLATE Leader to Civil Liberties Attorney," conducted by Martin Meeker in 2018, Oral History Center, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 2018.



Michael Tigar

Photograph courtesy University of Michigan Law School

Michael Tigar attended UC Berkeley as an undergraduate between 1958 and 1962; he returned to Berkeley to earn his degree in law in 1966. While an undergraduate, Tigar was active in the student political organization SLATE. He was elected for a term to the Associated Students of the University of California senate as a SLATE candidate. While a student at Berkeley, Tigar worked at KPFA radio station. In this interview, Tigar discusses the following topics: the context surrounding student activism and the role of SLATE in giving student activists a voice; KPFA and progressive radio; and the relationship between law and civil liberties advocacy. Note that Michael Tigar also was interviewed as part of the Free Speech Movement Oral History Project and his transcript for that project is also available from the Oral History Center.

Table of Contents — Michael Tigar

Interview 1: January 12, 2018

Hour One:

1

Born on January 18, 1941 — Father as the Executive Secretary of Machinists' Union at Lockheed in 1937 — Jacobus tenBroek — Attending UC Berkeley in 1958 — Volunteering at KPFA, the Pacifica station — Editor-in-Chief of the *Law Review* — SLATE's issue-oriented appeal — Free Speech Movement — SLATE as male-dominated — “Zero consciousness of what we now understand to be LGBT issues” — City Lights Bookstore — Clark Kerr's response to Dave Armor's election — “Falling out of love with the Navy” — Roommate Aryay Lenske (Kalaki) — Students for Civil Liberties — House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) — Beat Movement — Litigation as an instrument of political repression — Direct Action Movement — Against nuclear proliferation — Value of lawyering — National Student Association — Honorably discharged from the Navy as a conscientious objector — Televised presidential debates, Kennedy versus Nixon — Reading Paul Sweezy and the labor theory of value

Hour Two:

20

Right to privacy, McCarthyism, and real-life consequences: “It wasn't just that you were being required to disclose; it's that a step was now being taken to make sure you didn't work” — Reversing the Kerr Directives — Involvement in the Free Speech Movement throughout law school at Boalt Hall — Thoughts on current free speech issues affecting UC Berkeley — Bernie Sanders — *The Liberal Democrat* (TLD)

Interview 1: January 12, 2018

01-00:00:06

Meeker:

Today is the January 12, 2018. This is Martin Meeker, interviewing Michael Tigar for the SLATE Oral History Project. We are here, actually, in a jury deliberation room in the U.S. District Court in Oakland, California, and this is interview session number one. The way that we begin these interviews is the same with everyone. So just say your name, date and place of birth.

01-00:00:34

Tigar:

My name is Michael Tigar, and the date of birth is January 18, 1941—so I'm about to have a birthday—and we're at 14th and Clay Streets in Oakland, California.

01-00:00:45

Meeker:

Well, happy birthday.

01-00:00:46

Tigar:

Thank you.

01-00:00:47

Meeker:

And, again, thank you very much for joining us today, for participating in this group of interviews about the history of SLATE. We certainly want to delve into SLATE, but before we get there I'd like you to tell me a little bit about your family background and upbringing. I know that you have kind of a colorful family background history, including how the name Tigar becomes associated with your bloodline. So maybe you can just kind of situate the family that you were born into.

01-00:01:21

Tigar:

My mother and father were divorced when I was four or five, but my father had been born Charles Henry Locke, Jr., L-O-C-K-E. He changed his last name to Tigar, as had his elder sister, Inez, who became Zyska Tigar, a Vaudeville performer, and then his brother, Eugene Tigar, a barnstorm pilot. And exactly when my father changed his name I'm not sure, but it was before he had married my mother. He was working at Lockheed Aircraft, and then became the Executive Secretary of the Machinists' Union in 1937. That's two years after the Wagner Act. And Lockheed, that was the first industrial local of the Machinists' Union. Everybody sort of knew that a war was coming, and that airplanes would be needed, and he had that job throughout the war. He left it after the war. My mother, after my mother and father were divorced, became a secretary, and then became service supervisor for all of Southern California for Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Permanente. Had three hundred people reporting to her. Had everything wonderful about the job, except she got half as much money every month as a male would've had in that. And so we had lived, after my parents were divorced, with my grandmother, who was a violinist, and was also divorced from my grandfather, but she had taught her three daughters violin, viola, cello. And it was a modest circumstance. My two uncles had gotten an ROTC regular scholarship. I got one, too, where I would

do four years at Berkeley, I would get a regular naval officer commission, and there it was. So that's the background. And I could've gone to other schools, but I wanted to go to university at Berkeley. It was the state school. Somehow being able to get home for holidays was important. I'd never been out of California anywhere.

01-00:03:20

Meeker:

The name Tigar, was that invented by your aunt?

01-00:03:22

Tigar:

My aunt Zyska must have invented it. It turns out it means tiger in Croatian, but to change her name to Zyska—she was an exotic dancer, vaudeville performer. I only met her in her later years. Lately we've turned up some ads for her performances in the San Bernardino County newspaper, and the *Santa Ana Register*, "Famed Vaudevillian Zyska Tigar will be performing her" whatever. [laughter] And I just found a copyright notice that she is the author of a song that I haven't been able to find yet called "Aunt Lou From Good Old Kalamazoo," and I'm waiting to go to the Copyright Office and get that. But yeah, she's the one.

01-00:04:07

Meeker:

You had mentioned your father before you were born was involved in leadership of his union. Your mother was involved with the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan. I did another big project on Kaiser. I know that at this point in time the AMA was labeling them socialized medicine, so they were kind of more along the Labor Left side of the equation.

01-00:04:33

Tigar:

Absolutely.

01-00:04:34

Meeker:

Was this information, was this knowledge, was this communicated to you as a child?

01-00:04:42

Tigar:

Yes. These things were a part of my growing up. My grandmother took us every week to the Lake Street Baptist Church in Glendale. Glendale was a segregated community, as a practical matter. I mean, there was a sign on the public pool. But support for labor organizations was a part of Kaiser, because labor organizations were the first big members of Kaiser Foundation: the Retail Clerks' Union, Joe DeSilva's union, very powerful. And objection to racism; that is, that we didn't stand for that in our house. So those values I certainly had, because they were a part of growing up.

01-00:05:29

Meeker:

Did your mother or father communicate to you about who they were voting for? Were they interested in the political process on a scale?

01-00:05:38

Tigar:

My mother supported Democratic candidates, and then when her older sister, Aunt Pat, came out to California, yes. My father, no, not so much. He was very guarded about that. He had married again into a relatively conservative family. His new brothers-in-law used anti-Semitic and racist words in talking. They were doctors and dentists and so on, so they should know better. That was disturbing to me, but I never talked about that really with my dad. It somehow didn't feel right to do that.

01-00:06:19

Meeker:

So you had said that you could've attended a number of universities. Why, again, did you pick Berkeley?

01-00:06:25

Tigar:

Well, I wanted to go away from home, but I didn't want to go that far. I was a kid who had graduated from a public high school in Reseda, California, and I'd done well there, I guess, but it was with trepidation. I mean, I went at eight o'clock on a Monday morning, I sat down in Speech 1A, Jacobus tenBroek's class, and he walked in. He was blind. He'd place his cane in the chalk tray, and he starts, and he's calling on people, and I looked around and said, shit, I don't belong here. These people, they've read things that I haven't read. I felt like my dad must have felt. I mean, he only had eight grades of school. And so I can't imagine what the cultural shock would've been if I'd been at Harvard. So anyway, it was a choice. I was being cautious.

01-00:07:16

Meeker:

Did you take the tenBroek class as a first semester freshman?

01-00:07:20

Tigar:

Yes. He did a section of Speech 1A/1B designed for people who thought they wanted to be lawyers, and I certainly thought I wanted to be a lawyer that early in the game. And we read Mill's *On Liberty* and Milton's *Areopagitica*, and so on, and had a form of Socratic dialogue. We didn't recognize it as Socratic, although we did read some Socrates. But yeah, he taught the Speech 1A/1B. It was a magnificent experience.

01-00:07:50

Meeker:

What did you learn in that class?

01-00:07:53

Tigar:

Well, I certainly absorbed a certain ideology about political liberty, and political organization. And then as I read others of tenBroek's works that weren't assigned—the book on the Japanese internment—I got an education. I was talking about this with my son last night: what a coincidence to come here to Berkeley in 1958. You just have to think about what this was. At the co-op where I first stayed for a couple of weeks until my other dorm was open, a guy told me about KPFA, the Pacifica station, and he said, "You could volunteer there." So, well, okay, I guess. I mean, gee, I could be on the radio. So I went down, and they put me in a room, and I read Maeterlinck's

Massacre of the Innocents. Six weeks later I'm walking on campus and this guy said, "Hey, I heard you on the radio." So I went back down to KPFA and said, "Well, why didn't you tell me you were going to play my recording?" And Bill Butler, the Director of Literature and Drama, said, "I lost your phone number." So I volunteered at KPFA, running the control board, announcing. And at that time, here we are in 1958. I'm seventeen years old. John Leonard, Director of Literature and Drama, later to become Cultural Editor of the *Times*. Fred Haines, who later wrote the screenplay for *Ulysses*. Alan Rich, who later became music critic of the *New York Herald Tribune*. And Elsa Knight Thompson, who'd worked at the BBC during the Second World War. And so that was there. tenBroek was there. And here I was once a week in a Navy uniform marching around the field. Well, that didn't last the whole four years, but I had come to Berkeley, and that was the awakening. So when I discovered that there was this student organization that was interested in some of these issues, well, that was the next step.

01-00:09:46
Meeker:

Did you, going into Berkeley, already have a political consciousness, and that political consciousness was awaiting attachment to new outlets? Or was there an awakening that actually happened at Berkeley?

01-00:10:06
Tigar:

Awakening is a good word. I mean, I thought that the prospect of nuclear war was bad, that farmworkers surely should have the right to organize, that racism was bad. Now, this was before the sit-in movement had begun, which began on February 1, 1960, the direct action movement. But still, that all these things needed to be worked on. What I lacked was an appreciation of the place in history that these things—where these things had come from. And I lacked a context, what you might call an ideological context, in which to put these things to relate them one to another. And that ignited something. That's why later on I wrote a book about lawyers from the tenth century to the French Revolution. Why? Because I wanted to see how it came from. Where it came from.

01-00:11:06
Meeker:

In the tenBroek class, did he talk about disability at all?

01-00:11:10
Tigar:

Not in that class. It was clear. I mean, he would go to his office, and so on. The conversations about the law of disability didn't begin until I was in law school, and he was head of the California Social Welfare Board. He had these cases about search and seizure. And then when I was editor-in-chief of the *Law Review* we did this book called *Law of the Poor*, which was based on a *Law Review* issue in which appeared what became his iconic articles on the right to live in the world, which is a take on the Constitution and so on. I'm going to give a lecture about that in a couple of months. So this was a gradual process. Along the way somewhere I met Al Bendich, who became a friend, because he was involved with Pacifica Radio and KPFA. He, in turn, was a

good friend of tenBroek's. So, once again, I'm a teenager, and I got introduced into this world, into these people that were here. Lincoln Steffens' son, Pete Steffens, I took a class from him. He became a friend. So that's the process for me.

01-00:12:30

Meeker: It's really a storied intellectual and political network that's already established at Berkeley.

01-00:12:36

Tigar: Well, my son said last night, "Isn't it interesting how these coincidences occur?"

01-00:12:43

Meeker: Meaning?

01-00:12:44

Tigar: Well, I just came here, and then there were all these people, and I got to meet them.

01-00:12:52

Meeker: You had mentioned coming across this fledgling student organization, SLATE. So it's interesting: you arrive fall of '58. The founders of SLATE, people like Peter Franck and Mike Miller had both been—I think Hank DiSuvero, as well—had all three graduated that previous spring. They were gone.

01-00:13:20

Tigar: Yes. Aryay Lenske was here, and I remember him most vividly. Kate Coleman was here. Miller was still around. I think he was a graduate student. I don't think Miller ever left Berkeley, or San Francisco.

01-00:13:37

Meeker: He went to Columbia to study sociology, but then he would come back during the summer, like Peter, I think.

01-00:13:42

Tigar: He may have, yeah, okay. Yes. So anyway, Miller was around. A fellow named Brad Cleaveland was around. Herb Mills was around; I think he's passed now. Mike Myerson was here.

01-00:14:02

Meeker: How did you learn about SLATE?

01-00:14:07

Tigar: You know, I don't remember. That's the problem with interviewing people this many years after the event. I don't remember when the first SLATE meeting. I'm sure it had to do with an issue in which I was interested, in which they were working, and I went to it. Oh, my high school classmate Ken Cloke had come to Berkeley, and Ken was involved in that, and based on his

family history—his father had fought in the Spanish Civil War, on the correct side—and we'd been good friends, so that was an avenue, also.

01-00:14:42

Meeker: Was he a year ahead of you?

01-00:14:44

Tigar: No, he would've been a half a year behind, or the same year.

01-00:14:50

Meeker: So you basically arrived at Berkeley about the same time with him.

01-00:14:53

Tigar: About the same time, yeah.

01-00:14:54

Meeker: Okay. Do you recall what it was about SLATE that attracted you?

01-00:15:00

Tigar: It was accessible. You know, the SLATE people used to say, "Well, we're issue-oriented." And that's got a lot in it, because there was the Young People's Socialist League, and there was the Communist Party, yes, the Northern California, Archie Brown and all that, and there was the Democrats doing this, and there were all these people, right? Some of whom were commentators on KPFA, which is why I wrote for the *Liberal Democrat*. So these were folks who were tuned into issues from a sort of organizational, ideological perspective. What was so neat about this was that you didn't have to have the baggage.

01-00:15:50

Meeker: What was the baggage?

01-00:15:51

Tigar: Well, the baggage was whatever you came in with. I didn't have that. I just cared about the fact the farmworkers would be able to organize, or that the students should be able to speak out on issues that concerned them, or, I mean, the whole list of issues. And at that point in my life I didn't have, was exploring, was looking for some ideological construct with which to see all of this. So I guess that made it more welcoming.

01-00:16:22

Meeker: So the ideological purity that comes with the Trotskyists versus the Democratic Socialists or something like that, which result in factualism and debates, and that wasn't a characteristic of SLATE.

01-00:16:41

Tigar: It was emphatically not a characteristic of SLATE. The more I began to understand it, the more I understood that there were left efforts and organizational efforts that were being pulled apart by people insisting that you

had to come at the issues from a certain point of view. SLATE didn't have that.

01-00:17:08

Meeker:

Was there much talk of the history of SLATE, where it came from? Because at universities continuity of knowledge is often a problem, because people are there for four years and then they leave, so institutional memory doesn't necessarily exist as long. SLATE had really only been established in '57, so there's not a lot of history. But were people talking about that? Was there an attempt to establish some genealogy?

01-00:17:39

Tigar:

No. There were people who'd been involved for a longer period of time, and therefore they knew. What I was trying to do was understand where this set of issues and this kind of advocacy fit in terms of the university's role, and the role of young people in trying to change the world. [laughs] SLATE, there wasn't the structure that I thought we had to understand about that. I mean, we were either going to do it or not do it.

01-00:18:13

Meeker:

Well, tell me more about that, young people trying to change the world. What did that mean to you at the time? How would you have defined that fight?

01-00:18:24

Tigar:

Well, we could learn about it, but our perspective was that student government could, by passing resolutions, having forums, having discussion of these things on the campus, that here was a place where people could get together and talk about this stuff, and organize about this stuff, and as opportunities came along to demonstrate about it—although that comes in more strongly a little later, after 1960, when the Greensboro, North Carolina students give the example—that the arid, distant, alienating characteristics of a great state university that finally burst in the Free Speech Movement time with all that rhetoric was present. I don't think we put names to it, but if students were going to get engaged with the world, and what was unfolding in the world, they were going to have to do it through organizations that they developed and controlled and of which they were a part, because the professoriate wasn't particularly interested in doing that.

01-00:19:40

Meeker:

You know, it's interesting you say that, and I read your article on Clark Kerr, which I thought to be quite interesting, and wanted to ask you your thoughts on that, because you still describe the university of that era as arid, yet there were people like tenBroek, and there were certainly other interesting folks on campus. Did it really feel like the university wasn't living up to its potential in terms of educating and opening minds in those first couple of years?

01-00:20:19

Tigar:

Yes. Yes, when you say there were people like tenBroek, there was tenBroek, [laughs] okay? And there were flowers in the desert, or whatever metaphor

you want to use. But the university professoriate as a whole was not seeking to engage students in preparation to live meaningful lives at a time of enormous social change. Basically, the power establishments were telling the Supreme Court to go fuck itself. The American Bar Association was running articles in its official magazine that *Brown v. Board of Education* was a Communist plot. The compliance with *Brown*, just this elemental thing. I said to my son last night, *Brown v. Board* was decided, and the racists don't run up a white flag of surrender. Of course, what other color flag would they run up? But there certainly was no flag. And you saw that when the sit-in movement begins, it begins because students say, wait a minute, something needs to happen here. And the piece that you talked about Clark Kerr, he writes a book called *Industrialism and Industrial Man*, and he writes about the university having a function in society that's almost sci-fi, because he's not talking about any image of a free people engaged in tumultuous debate about the great issues of are we going to get blown up, and do people of color have the right to jobs and decent wages, and all the rest of that stuff. He's not there. So if something like that is to happen, if somebody's to talk about that, this is where it's going to be. So it was the one place on campus where you could do it. And then I had KPFA to go talk to people about it, too. So I was kind of lucky.

01-00:22:25

Meeker:

What about the larger community at Berkeley? If maybe the professoriate and the administration wasn't so encouraging of this kind of deep reflection, what about the broader community at Berkeley? Were they there yet?

01-00:22:43

Tigar:

Oh, yeah, to some extent. *The Liberal Democrat*, *TLD*, the magazine, which was, gee, Marshall Windmiller, and I can't remember the name of the other person who owned the store where it was put out, and you looked at the roster of commentators on KPFA as a representative of that, you look at the fact that this was a time when the Longshore Union, the ILWU, was going through these enormous debates about what was going to happen, mechanization on the waterfront, and preserving jobs, and Harry Bridges—still alive, still working. Well, Pete Steffens was teaching there; I didn't discover him for a while. So yes, the community of which the university was a part had a lot going on in it. You look back at California politics at that time, you can see it.

01-00:23:36

Meeker:

Tell me about your living arrangements at Berkeley. You said that you had lived for a couple weeks at a co-op.

01-00:23:46

Tigar:

Yeah, the co-op. I lived at the Ridge Road co-op because the Barrington Hall wasn't open. I moved into Barrington Hall before it became what Barrington Hall was later known for.

01-00:23:58

Meeker:

What was Barrington Hall later known for?

01-00:23:59

Tigar:

Sex, drugs, and alcohol. And I lived in that co-op for a year, I think, maybe less. And then I got an apartment off campus with a couple of friends. And then the next year, my sophomore year, I roomed with Ken Cloke and Charlie Fleckles. We had an apartment up in North Berkeley.

01-00:24:19

Meeker:

I know we actually interviewed Ken Cloke for the Free Speech Movement Oral History Project probably about ten years ago. This other gentleman's name?

01-00:24:30

Tigar:

Charles Fleckles, F-L-E-C-K-L-E-S. He became a doctor, a nonpolitical guy, just a nice guy, that's all. And we lived in that apartment, on the lower floor, on Cedar Street I think it was. And we were running for student government. And that was the landlady who ran the *Daily California* headline, "Ex Comm hopefuls want something or other," and she thought that means ex-Communist, so the landlady took to calling us Comrade Cloke and Comrade Tigar. [laughter] And when we would make too much noise in our apartment there would be a banging on the ceiling. It turned out she had an American flag in a stanchion next to her bed, and would take it out and would whack it on the floor. It was a charming lady.

01-00:25:21

Meeker:

What did the headline meaning actually?

01-00:25:24

Tigar:

Executive Committee was the student government body. That was what you'd ordinarily call, what, the assembly, or whatever, and we were hopefuls. We hoped that we would be elected to it.

01-00:25:38

Meeker:

So I just finished an interview with Peter Franck on Tuesday, and, you know, I was asking him to evaluate SLATE and what it accomplished. And it certainly had these specific policy goals: ending mandatory ROTC; ending discrimination based on race in housing for people who listed their apartments, for instance. And those were things that were achieved. But what he really talked about was more like a notion of awakening, like actually politicizing a generation of students. Does that ring true to you, first of all?

01-00:26:27

Tigar:

Well, politicizing a generation is a little generous, but certainly you look at the people that were involved in SLATE in these constructive ways. Now, some of them—David Horowitz went wherever he went. But you look at the contributions, you go down the list and look at what people wound up doing, and as a percentage, as a gross percentage of the number of folks who were involved, it is amazing to see how many kept on a path towards seeking and being involved in some kind of progressive change. So whether it awakened or deepened or whatever verb form you want to use about what happened, it

was an influential thing. And I think one reason is that it was issue-oriented. It's not my place to be reflective about this but adopting an ideology can be dangerous, because then you learn that there's hypocrisy going on, or you've been worshipping a false god, or you whatever. But if you just stay basic—gee, racism's not really a good idea; and people ought to have decent wages and working conditions, and let's work for that—then it seems to me somehow more logical that this would happen, whatever the reason it did. Maybe that's a little different take on it, but that's what I think.

01-00:28:13
Meeker:

Were there any issues that you thought were more central or pressing than other issues, in the context of SLATE?

01-00:28:22
Tigar:

No. No. I don't think so. I mean, you could look back and say that something turned out to be this or that, but sometime along the way I got hold of a view of society that said that these things all could be traced back to the same kinds of power relationship that were going on.

01-00:28:50
Meeker:

Could you tell me more about that?

01-00:28:52
Tigar:

Well, the drive to bust the Farmworkers' Union, you find a lot of racism in there, as well as economic dominance, as well as, hey, just another union busting, a particularly aggravated form, because they were excluded from federal labor laws. So, gosh, there it was. You looked at racism, and all of the ways in which racism penetrated, was in work and different institutional settings—not just housing, but in university hiring, and so forth and so on—and whose interest did that serve? There's one issue that we didn't get very much, and that was sexism. But the Black Liberation Movement didn't get it, either. Nobody got it. And what are now the LGBT issues, not a lot of consciousness about that. But anyway, I don't know where that goes, but—

01-00:30:01
Meeker:

Well, tell me about the extent to which women were involved in SLATE during your era.

01-00:30:09
Tigar:

Well, Kate Coleman, Susan Griffin—I'm sure other names would come to me as I went along. And Kate I know stayed involved in things. I've spoken to her several times over the years. But it was pretty clear that this was a male-dominated business that was going on, and a number of women who were involved have come forward since then to talk about the sense of discomfort that they felt, and so on. And anybody that's alive today in 2018 can look around and say, oh yeah, I see where that was.

01-00:30:59

Meeker:

You had mentioned LGBT. Were there any known gay/lesbian people on campus at that time, in the late '50s, early '60s?

01-00:31:06

Tigar:

Was anybody out? Well, Allen Ginsberg was out. As a matter of fact, I later represented him. I can't remember when it was that KPFA played "Howl" on the air and got in trouble with the FCC.

01-00:31:23

Meeker:

[laughter] I bet!

01-00:31:24

Tigar:

I certainly remember Herb Caen's column, and is that during when I was in law school or was in undergraduate school? Some cop interfering with Allen Ginsberg's doing something in San Francisco, and Ginsberg grabbing the officer and sticking his tongue down his throat, [laughter] is a great—I mean, it was in Herb Caen's column. But no, zero consciousness of what we now understand to be LGBT issues. And that's kind of interesting, because there was San Francisco, and there was City Lights, and there was a culture, but that wasn't our struggle. At least, I don't remember that being a part of what people were thinking about.

01-00:32:18

Meeker:

This is just an aside but in I think it was 1959 or '61 KPFA aired one of the first radio programs on homosexuality from a very objective perspective.

01-00:32:34

Tigar:

Oh, yes. Absolutely no question: the broadcast on KPFA had— The Mattachine Society was there. So yes, that was a part of what would be broadcast. But it wasn't part of the agenda of a whole lot of people in motion in the same sense that the assault on racism was.

01-00:33:01

Meeker:

You mentioned City Lights, and of course City Lights is very tied to the Beat Movement, and the '57 trial of "Howl" was a trial of City Lights for selling it. In addition to the political consciousness, do you get involved at all in the cultural scene around the Beats at that time?

01-00:33:29

Tigar:

Kenneth Rexroth was a regular broadcaster on KPFA, and I still remember his poem about Dylan Thomas, and his shouting it, and so on. Poetry and jazz stuff, KPFA broadcast a lot of that. I found it fascinating and wonderful. I could never get into it as literature. I got into Rexroth. Some of Rexroth's poetry I thought was powerful. To get to San Francisco, you paid seventy-five cents and took the bus to the terminal. I can remember meeting "Shiggy" [Shigeyoshi Murao], who ran City Lights Books, Japanese guy. And so we would go up there and hang out, wander around the bookstore. Ferlinghetti broadcast on KPFA. But the voice I heard was his "Tentative Dinner Given to Promote the Impeachment of President Eisenhower," about nuclear fallout,

the poem that begins “After it became obvious that the strange rain would never stop,” so forth and so on. So, again, it was that context. Plus, San Francisco was interesting.

01-00:34:59

Meeker:

At the end of your first year at Berkeley, in spring of '59, that's the first year that SLATE elects a student body president.

01-00:35:12

Tigar:

Yes, Dave Armor.

01-00:35:14

Meeker:

Dave Armor. Can you tell me about that election, and what the events leading up to it were like?

01-00:35:21

Tigar:

That was graduate student activism, because the graduate students had the vote then for student body office. And the perception was that the fraternity folks weren't going to vote for Dave Armor. For them, the student body presidency was sort of symbolically representative of a powerless sort of office. And Armor's campaign was based around substantive issues, the things people want to take a position on. So that was great. And Kerr responded to it in the way that he did, by stripping the graduate students of their vote. That just struck me as monumentally unfair, and in a personal way, because, gee, this was a discussion of the real things that were going on, and that wasn't happening in any classes I was taking. So I entered my second year carrying that.

01-00:36:34

Meeker:

Was Armor allowed to serve his term?

01-00:36:36

Tigar:

Oh, yeah. As I recall he was. But I entered my second year. I took my NROTC class. And the second year we were studying naval history; that's what we were going to study. And that was the beginning of my sort of falling out of love with the Navy. Our instructor, Lieutenant Commander Steed, was affable and so on, and I wrote a paper moderately critical of American nuclear policy. I got called to his house. He said, “I'm going to grade this paper and give it back to you, and this is not something you want in your file as ever having written,” and so on, which I thought was strange, but there you are.

01-00:37:25

Meeker:

In this '59 election, and when Clark Kerr removes the graduate students from eligibility to vote for ASUC, are you starting to see this at all in a legal framework, to—?

01-00:37:42

Tigar:

Oh, yeah.

01-00:37:43

Meeker: Yeah. Well, how did that happen?

01-00:37:45

Tigar: See, I don't remember when I met Al Bendich, okay, so somewhere along there I meet Al Bendich. But in the second semester of tenBroek's class we had read cases on equal protection. On the first semester we'd read cases about free expression. And tenBroek was a lawyer; he had a doctorate in law, as well as all the other degrees. So, sure, we were talking about that. And remember there's an organization called the Students For Civil Liberties, which Aryay Lenske was deeply involved in. And then in terms of time you remember the Committee on Un-American Activities comes in '60, and that's what David Horowitz's book was about. You've got the triple, right? And the execution of Caryl Chessman, and the Committee on Un-American Activities, and compulsory ROTC. So that becomes the year. And yes, we saw it in First Amendment terms, in lawyer terms, because as we looked around at the instruments of political repression there was this litigation that had been going on around those issues. The Supreme Court's first questioning of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in a case was a 1957 case called *Watkins v. United States*. So there's Earl Warren starting to push at this.

01-00:39:16

Meeker: Are you seeing these issues in terms of these broader Constitutional s, or are you thinking about it largely in terms of student rights and in loco parentis and those kinds of things?

01-00:39:29

Tigar: Oh, man, I wanted to be on the big train.

01-00:39:34

Meeker: Okay. [laughs]

01-00:39:35

Tigar: I wanted to be on the big train. See, I graduated in '62, and I took this job being European correspondent for Pacifica Radio. Went to London. And I did that because I had taken a class with Richard Drinnon, Professor Drinnon, who was a great ally, and I'd written a paper on atomic policy, concluding with dropping the bomb on Hiroshima was a crime and all that sort of thing. But did I want to get a PhD in history, and be like Richard Drinnon and William Appleman Williams, who I thought was great? Did I want to be a journalist, because as a journalist you get a machine and you call up and say "I'm a journalist" and people talk to you? I mean, all the people I got to talk to when I was working at Pacifica—Bertrand Russell and all these people. Or did I want to be a lawyer? I'm sorry not to answer your question directly—I wanted a ticket to the show.

01-00:40:33

Meeker: And the show was?

01-00:40:34

Tigar:

And the show was the great changes that we thought, here is a sit-in movement; here is a frontal assault on the Committee on Un-American Activities; maybe we're emerging from McCarthyism at last. Here is a worldwide movement against nuclear proliferation, and a pushback against the sort of Cold War confrontation between the nuclear superpowers. And so it's happening. Shelley said that "the great writers and artists of our own age are the companions and forerunners of some unimagined change in our social condition. The cloud of mind is discharging its collected lightning, and the equilibrium between opinions and institutions is restoring or about to be restored." Man, when I saw that I said, "Yeah, that's right. We're here." In this dialectical sense. I want a ticket to the show. I'm sorry to go on so long, but it was exciting.

01-00:41:38

Meeker:

No, that's great, and it's nice to see enthusiasm about this long history. Was there anything in particular that was happening around Constitutional law, Supreme Court cases, that told you that this was a viable route for change?

01-00:42:02

Tigar:

Well, they all were.

01-00:42:04

Meeker:

Okay, "they all" meaning—?

01-00:42:06

Tigar:

These three options that I faced. Under Drinnon's direction I wrote this paper called "Atomic Science and Social Responsibility." He asked me to read the transcript of the Oppenheimer Security Hearing, a thousand pages, and I did. That was lawyer stuff. But so there was that. Then, what journalists were doing, KPFA's brand of stuff writ large. And then there was what lawyers were doing. So I've almost forgotten the question, but the answer was, yeah, these were unparalleled opportunities.

01-00:42:43

Meeker:

I guess what I'm getting at is you go back to the 1920s, and the famous Holmes dissent. That was a dissent; he didn't win that case. Were there any particular cases or anything that said, yeah, let me go in law because I can be effective, because this is actually an arena in which change can happen?

01-00:43:15

Tigar:

Well, yes. I'm sorry to interrupt your question.

01-00:43:18

Meeker:

No, that's it.

01-00:43:23

Tigar:

It's hard to disembed what I thought then from what later on I sort of thought about, but the Holmes dissents, and the Palmer Raids, and so on, all these people that Woodrow Wilson had encouraged to believe that with the winning

of this war we were going to make some advances. Zechariah Chafee wrote of the tens of thousands of forward-looking young men and women whose hopes were dashed in the event. Yeah. Now, what that brought, the Warren Court had already begun to chart a path about what might happen. The California Supreme Court was in the hands of Roger Traynor, or was about to be. At the same time, I never thought—or maybe I shouldn't say “never”; at least I don't think I thought—that the judges were going to decree a great new world in which we'd all win all these things, that what was important about what was happening on campus was these were people in motion. These were people who wanted somebody to take their ideas into the courthouse and see how they fared, that this was a movement for change. And what had told us that was the students in Greensboro and the Direct Action Movement. What busted up the racist attempt to turn back *Brown*, and to turn back compliance with the Civil Rights Act, and so on? What led to the Civil Rights Act of '64, right? Hundreds of thoughts, millions of people, these voices. So that was what was going on. To be the lawyer meant you had a ticket to the show, but you only had a ticket if you were representing a movement that had reality. I wrote a play once in which a character says to Clarence Darrow, “Your lawyer's ego makes you think you stand at the center of all the events by which the world has moved. Your right to stand there when you stand there is only because some poor soul has been the victim of oppression.” So, sorry, that's just— I like that play. Actually, that play turned out well.

01-00:45:40

Meeker:

What was that?

01-00:45:41

Tigar:

Well, it was called *Haymarket: Whose Name the Few Still Say with Tears*, and it was based around the Haymarket trial. I imagined a conversation in 1921 between Lucy Parsons, widow of the lead defendant, and Clarence Darrow. She had become a leader of the anarchist movement, and she's saying, “The law, Clarence, is a mask the state puts on when it's about to commit some indignity on the oppressed,” and so on. So it's discussing the value of lawyering.

01-00:46:15

Meeker:

This is something you talk a bit about in your memoir.

01-00:46:17

Tigar:

Yeah, right. Oh, yeah.

01-00:46:20

Meeker:

You keep referring back to the lunch counter sit-ins. I believe that happened just shortly before the HUAC protest in May 1960.

01-00:46:31

Tigar:

It did. It's February 1, 1960. And shortly after it happened, Tom Hayden, who was editor of the *Michigan Daily* at that time, he came out, and students began

to picket Kress and so on in downtown Berkeley, in sympathy. Yes. And then HUAC came in May, and Caryl Chessman was executed.

01-00:46:48

Meeker: How did you learn about the sit-ins? Was that just a national news story?

01-00:46:52

Tigar: Oh, yeah. And then we were aware of it, but Hayden, as editor of the *Michigan Daily*, made it a big deal. I don't know where he got the money to do it. He came around and did a national tour. And Students for a Democratic Society was getting formed around that time, over the Port Huron Statement, all that kind of stuff.

01-00:47:11

Meeker: What'd you think of Hayden when you first met him?

01-00:47:15

Tigar: I thought he was an articulate, interesting, challenging person, and I then learned, gee, the *Michigan Daily*, that's a hell of a newspaper for students to be putting out. That was when I first met him.

01-00:47:33

Meeker: It seems like a pretty direct relationship between the lunch counter sit-ins to the protests at Woolworths and Kress, to May 12, 1960—

01-00:47:47

Tigar: Thirteenth and fourteenth, 1960. Yes. It was really surprising, in a way. Somehow, a burst of energy got set loose. There were people who could, "Okay, well, now we're going to go picket here," and Phil Burton comes and talks to everybody in the public square, and yeah, it was related.

01-00:48:14

Meeker: Do you recall if there were any serious conversations debating that tactic of protest and direct action?

01-00:48:23

Tigar: No. This [laughs] had a life of its own. Protesting, just picketing outside and having a meeting, okay, that was what you're going to do. The dialectic between the committees excluding people from the audience, and then the students demanding an audience, then you get a certain interaction, a crowd mentality that begins to go on, and those in power behave stupidly, and things escalate. The center cannot hold. [laughs]

01-00:49:03

Meeker: Hmm, interesting. Were those under discussion?

01-00:49:08

Tigar: Well, I wasn't there that day, and yes, I'm sure there were discussions—what should we do next—but there had not been at the beginning an organized plan that said "If they do this, we'll do this; if they do this, we'll do this." The

dynamic was more complicated than that. There was Mandel's confrontation. There was Archie Brown's confrontation with the Committee. And there was the absolute stupidity of the Committee's counsel, this guy, whatever his name was. And the people on the Committee side and their staff just unaware of what was going on in the world. And, well, the dialectic of change, much like what happened in the FSM time, a series of provocations back and forth, perhaps not understood by the people doing them at the time as provocations, or that they would result in what resulted.

01-00:50:16
Meeker:

During the summer of 1960—after this, right?—wasn't there a SLATE conference? I believe there were sort of summer gatherings of students.

01-00:50:28
Tigar:

There was a national student union conference that I attended in Minneapolis, because Mulford Sibley was teaching at Minnesota, and we got a resolution together against HUAC that we put through the NSA, National Student Association. That was the name of it. The memory's a little hazy, because by that time I had finished my second-year cruise as a midshipman, and had fallen out, seriously gotten in deep, deep shit with my commanding officer, which was to result very soon in them kicking me out, and telling me I had to report for duty as an ordinary seaman. So that was, for me, one of the most difficult and confused times of my life, because I was going through this whole thing of, jeez, I competed so hard to get this, and they were going to pay my way through school, and I was going to do this, but it all was somehow just inconsistent with what I'd come to understand and believe. And the worst was then I got summoned into the Commanding Officer's office, and he shows me an Office of Naval Intelligence report that speaks of a Communist front, Students for Civil Liberties, and attacks my roommate, Aryay Lenske as being a covert—all that kind of stuff. So I didn't know how I'd pay for college if I got kicked out. And my stepfather was about as far right as you could be. My mother's very sympathetic. He was not. And I didn't know how I was going to confront my mom with these decisions that I was having to make. So that was a difficult time for me to make decisions.

01-00:52:21
Meeker:

How did that resolve itself?

01-00:52:23
Tigar:

Well, they kicked me out. And I get this note that says, "We'll tell you where to report as a seaman." So I called somebody—Al Bendich must have given me the name, I guess—Francis Heisler, a lawyer in Carmel who helped conscientious objectors. And Heisler, he was Viennese. He was like a Dr. Freud. [imitates Austrian accent] "You don't sound like you really understand what this is you want." So we talked it through, and I filed a letter saying, "I am not going to serve because I am a conscientious objector." There was no form to fill out; I sent them a letter. Well, the regulations got changed late in 1960 and early '61, something like that, and that made some formal provision

to deal with a letter of this kind. And I got a letter back in January of '61 saying, "You are hereby honorably discharged from the United States Navy for the convenience of the government." Honorably discharged. So the consequences I had feared, which is if they'd called me I wasn't going to show up, did not happen. Suddenly, I'm a junior in college. I'm honorably discharged from that. I can put that behind me. And then all I needed was enough money [laughs] to get through the next year and a half of my education, which I did. Got a job at KPFA. They paid me. And then I got a job at Fybate Notes, which was run by the guy [Narrator's addendum: Tom Williams] that owned the *Liberal Democrat*, where I would take notes and type them up and sell them to students.

01-00:54:02

Meeker:

For lectures?

01-00:54:03

Tigar:

For lectures, yeah. I would take the course, but it was like letting other people steal my notes, except they had to pay me for it.

01-00:54:11

Meeker:

In the midst of all of this tumult happening in your personal life, and concern about paying for school, there's a national political election happening. Does this have any impact on you? Do you keep up with Nixon versus Kennedy?

01-00:54:32

Tigar:

Well, that was the first televised debate, and I watched them all. And I thought that Kennedy should be elected. We had all had experience with Richard Nixon, right? "You're not gonna have Dick Nixon to kick around anymore." [laughter] And Helen Gahagan Douglas, and Jerry Voorhis. Yeah, we had his number, right? But I wrote a paper about those, and I was taking a class in, I don't know, political science, I guess. But the name Alcibiades came to mind. The rhetorical web spun by both of these candidates just didn't reflect what was truly going on in America. Kennedy, as you recall, began the debate by saying, "Abraham Lincoln wondered if this country could be half slave and half free. Today, the world questions whether the world can survive half slave and half free." Well, what a ridiculous overstatement about nuclear confrontation. But Ted Sorensen had a lot to answer for, the guy that wrote his speeches. So, yes, it was nice he got elected, but, of course, his first judicial appointment was Harold Cox in Mississippi, because that was the Democratic Party, the guy who called African American litigants chimpanzees, and used the N word. So yeah, we quickly learned. The salvation of the Civil Rights Movement in the South in the Fifth Circuit, which at that time extended all the way from Florida all the way to Texas, was the Republican judges that Eisenhower had appointed, because the Republican Party in the South had been the party of Lincoln. Sorry, there you go. You just push the button, you get stuff.

Oh, and I took a course. Bertrand de Jouvenel lectured at UC Berkeley, and so I took his course, his political science course. de Jouvenel, a great French political theorist, a little bit too connected with CIA and all that sort of thing, yes, okay, but who really understood and lectured about power relationships. And that was a really significant course, that “often in our desire to see a particular decision made we forget our most cherished convictions as to who is competent to make it.”

01-00:57:25

Meeker:

Were you reading any of the new sociology, like Paul Goodman, or Marcuse, or anything like that coming out at the time?

01-00:57:34

Tigar:

Never read, to this day. I mean, I’ve introduced Marcuse when he spoke about his pupil, Angela Davis, but I have never read Marcuse, to an extent that I can remember. Paul Goodman, I sort of remember. But no, I didn’t. And I read Murray Kempton, which is sort of pop Paul Goodman. But no, I don’t remember that I did that.

01-00:58:00

Meeker:

Were there any contemporaries that you were reading at the time that were particularly influential to you?

01-00:58:06

Tigar:

The last two years were a step in my own— I’d had a TA named Oscar Pemantle, P-E-M-A-N-T-L-E, in poli sci, who introduced me to Paul Sweezy’s work, and then became a friend of Clinton Jencks, who had been the leader of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union, was getting his PhD in economics, and he set up a discussion group to read Sweezy’s work and so on, to read about labor theory of value, Marxist economics. And that was important for me in terms of context, and so on, because I was searching not only what should I do but what’s happening here, what contextually is going on. So that’s what I was reading.

01-00:58:51

Meeker:

Apropos of what you just mentioned, were you feeling seduced by any of the ideologies, any of the factions, as the years went on at Berkeley?

01-00:59:01

Tigar:

No. I liked the people. There were good CP, the Communist Party of Northern California, Mickey Lima and his daughter Margie. There were Young People’s Socialist League types. But whatever I could read about political movements, the kind of discipline to be a part of the organization stuff, I never got with that, because I thought I saw people behaving in the service of organizational unity or whatever, but in ways that were inconsistent with human values flourishing, etc., etc. I mean, that’s too grandiose a way to look at it. I looked at them, but never signed on. I liked the theoretical structure of Paul Sweezy. The clarity of that just seemed marvelous to me, and then, later

on, as I got more interested, in a historical sense, to folks that were looking at things in that way.

01-01:00:28

Meeker:

Well, if you sign on to one of the factions, you give up some significant measure of freedom of thought and action, liberty.

01-01:00:37

Tigar:

Yeah, mm-hmm.

01-01:00:39

Meeker:

Were those strong values to you?

01-01:00:45

Tigar:

I don't know. I don't know.

01-01:00:49

Meeker:

Well, I guess what I'm getting at is the balance, the difficult balance sometimes between liberty and equality.

01-01:00:58

Tigar:

It might just be ambition. I wanted to choose my fights. I wanted to make choices. This week I will be involved in Selective Service, the draft. This week, I would like to look at this, look at that. So you're asking a question that I probably should be able to answer, but I think I need more therapy.

01-01:01:26

Meeker:

[laughter] Let me ask you one other question about your writings, the article that you forwarded to me from *Liberal Democrat* in which you were talking, I think, in response to HUAC protest, and that film that came out afterwards, *Operation Abolition*. And it's an article that you'd probably really need to walk me through if I was to truly understand what you're getting at. But something that I saw in there, and I'd like you to comment on it: it seems to me that you're very concerned with privacy, and privacy of thought. So you seem to be objecting to that it's really no one else's business whether someone sees themselves as a communist or not, that that kind of somehow falls into the realm of privacy. Am I totally off base on that, or is there something to that?

01-01:02:32

Tigar:

No. The idea of privacy of belief as an independent value has some psychological thing. We all have things we'd like to hold private. But it wasn't simply that you were being required to confess your faith; if your faith was not an orthodox one, then things happened, if you said, "Well, yes, I am a member of the Communist Party." Now, semiotically, for the hearer, that didn't mean that you went to meetings once a week and passed out the *Daily Worker*. That meant you were an instrument of the Soviet Union, which was going to blow us all up and turn us all into robots, and so forth and so on. So, semiotically, you had confessed terribly. This is not dissimilar from what would happen in the Middle Ages if you'd said, "Jesus, I'm not really sure

that the Trinity works for me, you know? I mean, I get the virgin, but the Holy Ghost—” The thought was, Jesus, as it were, if that gets out then we’re all going to hell. We just can’t have that. But then, of course, it wasn’t just that that was happening. And this overstatement— I once reviewed a book by Abe Fortas in which he thought students were attacking the very structure of whatever. Well, fine. There’s a difference between sawing the roofbeam in half and pulling a nail out of the floor, right? Come on. And then there were personal consequences. The Supreme Court five to four had held that some lady who had vague Communist affiliations couldn’t be a dishwasher at the Pentagon, right? Well, she’s an African American woman. She’s been working there for years. What the hell’s she going to do now to feed her kids? So real consequences. It wasn’t just that you were being required to disclose; it’s that a step was now being taken to make sure you didn’t work. Hollywood Ten, okay? We all saw that. And the blacklist, generally. And, and, and. So the privacy was not simply—although it was also that—a statement about our own right to develop our personhood on our own, but also about the consequences to people.

01-01:05:16

Meeker:

And this is clearly something that you had to grapple with personally later on in terms of Justice Brennan.

01-01:05:23

Tigar:

Well, with Justice Brennan later on, but also with the Navy guy. What do you mean, a Communist Front tearing down—? I live with these people! Anyway, yes, Justice Brennan. Well, I got the job. I’ve told this story: he appointed me his clerk, and then right-wing outfits began to criticize the choice. And I didn’t find out until much later Chief Justice Warren told him to withdraw the nomination, the naming, because he thought that it would help Ronald Reagan get elected governor. Ronald Reagan was going to get elected governor regardless, and it was kind of stupid, but— I’ve told this story in a lot of different places. People can read it. It’s now been told, and Brennan has now told it to his biographers. And Brennan apologized later on. And he was right in the letter that he wrote to me in the sense that we became friends. In 1977, we exchanged letters, and then he said, “Well, come and have lunch,” and we started to talk, and we shared a lot of really interesting times, and a lot of really significant—Those were nice meetings. Those were nice meetings.

01-01:06:45

Meeker:

I guess the point is that these things are not abstract; they have real-life consequences.

01-01:06:54

Tigar:

Oh, yes, but that was. It wasn’t just that my politics were out there; it was, well, if that’s what you think then you don’t get this job.

01-01:07:08

Meeker:

I'd like to back up just a little bit and ask you about running for ASUC. Did you just run once?

01-01:07:15

Tigar:

Yeah, for president. I was on the Executive Committee, so I served that term, but then I ran for student body president, and lost. But not by a lot of votes.

01-01:07:23

Meeker:

So, I'm sorry, the Executive Committee—actually, in doing this project, I'm just learning about student government at Berkeley, and I'm still a little confused about it. I mean, I understand that there are elections every semester, so there's kind of staggered, yearlong terms.

01-01:07:43

Tigar:

I think for the Executive Committee. I think the student body president was once a year. My memory is, well, not perfect.

01-01:07:51

Meeker:

Yeah. Nobody's memory about this is perfect, which is one of the reasons that I'm having trouble understanding it myself.

01-01:07:57

Tigar:

Yes. But the *Daily Cal* did endorse me. The Vice Chancellor, Alex Sheriffs, fired them. Then they tried to publish their alternative newspaper for a while. Well, that kind of didn't go. I don't know if the then editor Dan Silver is still around, or can be found. But surely some of the people on the masthead of the *Daily Cal* that did the unprecedented thing of endorsing a candidate—which they weren't supposed to do because it was captive journalism or some damn thing, I don't know. But that was a hell of an election. And the winner, by, as I say, not very many votes—I got more votes than people thought I would, given that only undergraduates would vote, was Brian Van Camp, who is a judge today.

01-01:08:47

Meeker:

Right, I know him.

01-01:08:48

Tigar:

You know him?

01-01:08:48

Meeker:

Yeah.

01-01:08:49

Tigar:

Okay, well, then, I won't say anything.

01-01:08:50

Meeker:

[laughter] What about him?

01-01:08:52
Tigar: What would I say if I were going to say something? No, he's a judge. He wrote me a nice letter recently, so it's fine.

01-01:08:59
Meeker: Were you running against him?

01-01:09:01
Tigar: Yes.

01-01:09:02
Meeker: Oh, I didn't know that.

01-01:09:02
Tigar: He won!

01-01:09:03
Meeker: Ah, okay. Interesting. Fascinating.

01-01:09:07
Tigar: You know him?

01-01:09:08
Meeker: He's on the Friends of the Bancroft Library. Yeah, he's a big supporter of the Bancroft.

01-01:09:14
Tigar: Yeah, he invited me to do some speech on campus, and I didn't do it, this last fall, and I kind of regret that I didn't.

01-01:09:20
Meeker: Oh, for the class of '62.

01-01:09:21
Tigar: Yeah, right, sure. I should have, but I didn't.

[Side conversation deleted]

01-01:09:41
Meeker: So I do want to ask you about these times that you ran. So I guess you would've run twice, once, and—

01-01:09:49
Tigar: For the Executive Committee, and I served on that—

01-01:09:50
Meeker: Okay, so what is the Executive Committee?

01-01:09:52
Tigar: That's the legislative body of the student government.

01-01:09:56
Meeker: Okay, it's basically the student council.

01-01:09:58

Tigar:

Yeah, there's the word, the student council. It's the student council.

01-01:10:03

Meeker:

And what year was that? Do you recall when that was that you run?

01-01:10:07

Tigar:

When did I run? Was it '60? Must've been. Was it '60, or was it '61? I don't remember, okay? I just don't remember.

01-01:10:17

Meeker:

Okay. So you ran, and then you would have served in that position for a year, at the end of that, that's when you would've run for student body president.

01-01:10:24

Tigar:

Year, yes. I think that's right. Oh, I see, yes. But as I say, if you got out the *Daily Cal* and the editors and so on, and kind of counted forward and backward, then you could localize it, but I don't remember. As I say, there was just so much going on in my life and in my head and so on.

01-01:10:51

Meeker:

Do you recall if there was a particular platform that you were running on? What were the issues that you were running on?

01-01:10:55

Tigar:

Oh, yeah, we were going to address off-campus issues. That is, we were going to turn back the so-called Kerr Directives. The student government was going to have to be involved in the social issues of our time. We should do that. How else could we prepare? So forth and so on. That was the big one, that we were—I think that was the theme of the talks I was making when I was invited to speak at fraternities. "Look, we're getting ready to go out in a world that's in the process of change, and we need to start figuring out how we express ourselves and be involved in that process. It's time to be grownups here." I think that's what we were saying.

01-01:11:47

Meeker:

That's interesting. How did, for instance, the fraternities respond to that argument?

01-01:11:52

Tigar:

Well, you'll have to look, but I got a lot more votes than I thought I would. I think it was a close election. Of course, I lost the Electoral College, but that's— [laughter] Sorry.

01-01:12:06

Meeker:

That's happened a few times. Were these fellow students asking questions? Were they challenging you?

01-01:12:13

Tigar:

Oh, yeah. Now, there were some sort of “Lefty, you’re too left,” and this and that and the other thing, but the details have faded into memory, wherever they go.

01-01:12:26

Meeker:

Did these experiences have any impact on you in the sense of maybe encouraging you to consider running for public office in the future?

01-01:12:43

Tigar:

No. I remember thinking about public office, and I can remember really thinking about it when I was in high school, but by the time I was ready to get out of Berkeley I knew I knew how to talk, and I knew I pretty much knew how to write. And so lawyer/journalist/professor. And why? Because then you didn’t have to get elected by somebody to get a ticket to the show. I wanted to be able to have a place where I would work, and think, and write about stuff, and talk about stuff, where I didn’t have to temporize and assemble coalitions of this, that, and the other thing. Because then I wouldn’t be thinking clearly. I wouldn’t be making conclusions based on thinking about things. Now, that’s kind of arrogant to say that, but that’s what I wanted.

01-01:13:54

Meeker:

Did you feel like when you were running for ASUC president that you were given the opportunity to think clearly and to express your ideas?

01-01:14:02

Tigar:

Oh, yeah. Well, because we knew with the graduate students out we didn’t really have [laughs] much of a chance here. So we decided to carry—I mean, I can remember—and you’d have to ask others how they thought about it—as I would talk to fraternities at dinner, and this and that, this was a chance to talk about this opportunity that we had to be and grow in a certain way. So it was a challenge. Now, there have been successful candidacies for public office based on challenging the electorate, and Bernie Sanders is kind of an example of that. It was a model for some of the progressive politicians at the turn of the century, but the twentieth century. I wasn’t consciously thinking in those turns, but that was the way we phrased it, right? Look, you didn’t have to agree with every position that SLATE ever took. That’s not the question, because you’ve got a student councilor and an Executive Committee with various different points of view. What we’re looking for here is an honest count, and a commitment to have the kind of forum that we believe in, even if it’s got people in it we don’t agree with.

01-01:15:21

Meeker:

Do you recall what your opponents like Van Camp were arguing?

01-01:15:26

Tigar:

No. I don’t.

01-01:15:30

Meeker:

I mean, was there a strong component of students that's like, "Hey, let's just be undergrads and talk about football"?

01-01:15:36

Tigar:

Oh, yeah. I mean, oh, sure. But, again, I don't remember. We did what we did.

01-01:15:46

Meeker:

How long were you in France for? Or, no, I'm sorry; you went to England when you were the reporter.

01-01:15:58

Tigar:

Let's see. I graduated in '62. I was married then, by that time, and Pam was pregnant. Jon was born in London, October 8. We went first to the Helsinki Youth Festival in the summertime, and there I had been asked if I would be on the festival committee, and I said, "Yes, provided that the festival has a free speech area." At the earlier one in Vienna, there had been people expressing anti-Soviet views that weren't allowed to speak. Free speech area. And we had one. You could say any damn thing that you wanted. And the American delegation, then it would go, and it wouldn't be a delegation, as such; it would be a contingent. I got to meet Yevtushenko; he would come over and have dinner with us and all that. It was great. So then we go to London, and I start working for Pacifica, to produce programs, and I freelanced at the BBC. So we get to London in August, and we stayed till March. I interviewed Members of Parliament. I interviewed Bertrand Russell, Anthony Wedgewood Benn. Did a series of programs in Paris. That was after Algeria had become independent and there were the bombings and so on. So I was covering that stuff. Paul Bourdet was the head of the *Parti socialiste unifié*, and some other sort of New Left types.

01-01:17:21

Meeker:

Was there much interest in what was going on at Berkeley? Were people asking you? Had they heard of it?

01-01:17:25

Tigar:

Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah. There was a lot of interest in that by folks, as well as about the ferment, generally. I can't say it was always a topic of conversation. When I went back to France to work on the book, *Law and the Rise of Capitalism*, in '72? Well, anyway, '71, '72. Then Angela Davis was a big thing. That was more an international thing. But no, people were, "What's going on in the United States? What's the Civil Rights Movement doing?" Much more concern at that time with the Cuban Missile Crisis, and are these people going to blow us up.

01-01:18:19

Meeker:

Did the people you were engaging with in Europe think that the student movement was maybe the beginning of a bigger revolution in the United States? Was there that kind of talk happening?

01-01:18:32

Tigar:

Okay, now I've got to think. Nineteen sixty-two— No. I'm not aware of that consciousness, and that's weird because by '68 France had its thing. Columbia had gone—Now, that's serious shit. That's not picketing the Kress store. But no. In England, the agitation was around Campaign Against Nuclear Disarmament, CND. It was around should Britain enter the common market. Gaitskell made a magnificent speech in Brighton in '62; I covered that. And capital punishment. I was on a program with Sydney Silverman, MP, at Red Lion Square about capital punishment. And some labor rights, and a little bit about Ireland. But not the student thing.

01-01:19:56

Meeker:

During this year, are you plotting your return to the United States and law school?

01-01:20:01

Tigar:

I took the LSAT in London, and I applied to law schools. I'm not sure how many, but I surely applied to Berkeley, because it was my state school, and for a couple hundred dollars a year, we could make that. And I considered, okay, again, I decided at some point I would not apply to any PhD programs. That dropped out. And then the real question was, "Am I going to remain a journalist?" Then I went back and worked for KPFK then, a Los Angeles station. But law school won.

01-01:20:43

Meeker:

How did you select Boalt out of the options?

01-01:20:45

Tigar:

Oh. Well, it was a good law school. I had thought about Hastings, because they had the retired professors, and this, that, and the other thing. But then I talked to Vince Hallinan's oldest son, Pat, and he turned me off of it. He had been to Hastings. And he said, "Ah, look, the older professors, so forth and so on: first of all, they're tired; but second of all, racists." And he told me about his confronting them, and this and that. He said, "It's a nice idea, but that's not where things are going on, so don't do that." So, okay. But when I entered Boalt, I got a scholarship for \$500. That's going to pay my tuition for the whole year at Berkeley at that time. And that includes medical care at Cal Hospital. So I certainly wasn't going to choose Harvard. I didn't have the money to do that. I mean, we had help from Pam's parents, but I had to go to my state school.

01-01:22:03

Meeker:

I know from your memoir that you certainly observed the Free Speech Movement from afar, didn't really participate in it, because you were busy being a law student. Is that accurate, or—?

01-01:22:19

Tigar:

Well, it's not quite accurate, because I had dinner with a lot of people involved in leadership, including Bob Kaufman, all the time. I did speak from

the top of a police car. There's a video of me on top of a police car, making a speech.

01-01:22:33

Meeker: Do you recall what you said?

01-01:22:36

Tigar: No. And even if I did, I'm not sure I would share it. [laughter] But anyway. So I was in to that extent. And then after it happened, then we did that special edition of the *Law Review*, which was designed to talk about what is going on here. And then when the new regulations were made about speech, I was the lawyer for Bettina Aptheker, Susan Stein, and Herman Jacobs, in the disciplinary proceeding about free speech.

01-01:23:12

Meeker: In which that terrible punishment of not eating hamburger comes to—
[laughter]

01-01:23:15

Tigar: Right, yes, exactly. John Hetland, the hearing officer, most conservative member of the Boalt faculty, and so he didn't want to listen to constitutional arguments, or his "jurisdiction," but he thought the whole thing was ridiculous.

01-01:23:30

Meeker: I'd love for you to reflect on SLATE. Looking back on it, do you think it was successful?

01-01:23:44

Tigar: Well—

01-01:23:45

Meeker: I mean, think about what its stated mission or what its goals were, and evaluate it in relation to that.

01-01:23:50

Tigar: It's really funny.

01-01:23:52

Meeker: Is it possible to even do that?

01-01:23:54

Tigar: Yeah, but, you see, that's the funny word, "successful," right? I mean, I lost a case involving a defendant called *Lynne Stewart*, and we lost it big, but then the judge gives her a really light sentence, because I convinced him, even if I didn't convince the jury. Was that successful? I represented somebody and, gee, we got acquitted at the top two thirds of the exposure. Was that successful? I'd say yeah. So there's that. Okay, was it—? Yes, it was. It was successful, for all the reasons that you and I have been chewing over for this time. It was successful because it managed to steer clear of the ideological

rocks and shoals upon which so many other movements had gone aground. It was successful because it managed somehow to avoid getting hung up with the oversized egos of any particular persons, you know? Maybe that's looking back on this past in an inaccurate way, but I don't think that's true. I still have affection for every single person that I can remember running into in that outfit, and that's not some Buddhist generosity thing; it just is. We were in it together. Also—and I said this before—you look at the career paths that have been chosen by the people that were in it, and that were involved with it, and that were a part of it, and some of that is just that time. You told me you'd been talking to Marshall Krause. Marshall Krause is a wonderful person, and did wonderful things, and is still doing them. But that time gave us all—somehow there was the opportunity to be that and do that, and he was a part of the sort of larger movement here. So yes, it was successful.

01-01:26:11

Meeker:

Would you define SLATE as a New Left organization?

01-01:26:18

Tigar:

No.

01-01:26:19

Meeker:

No?

01-01:26:21

Tigar:

I mean, I know that term is used, and I used it already as we were talking, because I talked about Claude Bourdet, the *Parti socialiste unifié*. Because France has these political categories: there's the Socialist Party, and then there's the various transformations on the right, but they all give themselves names, you know? And so Bourdet attempted to cut through that, and that got, and merited, the name New Left. It had an organizational structure. It sought votes as such, and so forth and so on. SLATE, a lot about it was new and a lot about it was left, but New Left tends to get spoken these days with a capital N and a capital L. So I would resist it. [laughs]

01-01:27:07

Meeker:

Interesting. Well, some people say that SLATE was the ground zero of, I think, capital-N capital-L New Left.

01-01:27:19

Tigar:

Of what?

01-01:27:21

Meeker:

Was the beginning.

01-01:27:21

Tigar:

Oh, the beginning?

01-01:27:22

Meeker:

Yeah.

01-01:27:23

Tigar:

No, it wasn't. No, it wasn't. I mean, at that time there were farmworkers beginning to assert themselves, and taking enormous risks doing it, as we found out. Kids, children our age, sitting in lunch counters, getting the snot beat out of them by the cops, and so forth and so on. Man, it would just be hubris to make that kind of a claim, and dangerous. We were a bunch of kids. Although we thought we didn't have a lot of money, we were better off than most people, and we were white. So, fine, so we did a lot of good things. But we weren't the world.

01-01:28:30

Meeker:

Was there any of that consciousness at the time?

01-01:28:37

Tigar:

Well, you'd have to go person by person. I spent time knowing about, learning about the Longshore Union and those people. I knew that my father had been in labor organizations, and my mother worked for Kaiser Foundation, which was a union thing. My aunt had come out and worked for the Retail Clerks. We saw what was happening in the American South, and we saw the nascent movement that became Prop 14 and all the rest of it. So, I don't know. Of course, we probably took ourselves more seriously sometimes than, [laughs] in retrospect, we ought. But yeah, I think most people saw that. I don't know. You talk to them, so you can get a sense of what—That'd be one of the interesting things that I hope you'll talk to me about sometime in a reflective way is what were these people's take on themselves.

01-01:29:50

Meeker:

Well, it's definitely a question I'm asking, and I certainly hope that once these group of interviews are done that there's, I guess, a more nuanced understanding, answer to that question than there might be right now.

01-01:30:08

Tigar:

Well, this is the Heisenberg principle, right? You can't just be the observer. Inevitably, you injected yourself into it.

01-01:30:21

Meeker:

Well, I think just simply asking that question is a result of hearing other responses to it, and, in my mind, comparing the responses now.

01-01:30:34

Tigar:

Yeah, sure.

01-01:30:43

Meeker:

Thinking about SLATE, and I know your involvement in law and politics goes well beyond that, but in the context of SLATE did you at that point in time develop an understanding of the nature of social change?

01-01:31:05

Tigar:

No. See, I went to law school. We had this special issue on the free speech thing. We did the special issue on the law of the poor. I started law practice. I

then wrote this book on Selective Service law and became deeply involved in that, sat down at a typewriter and just wrote this thing, and I gave talks all over about the Vietnam War and so on, SDS, Weatherman movement, Columbia, Paris 1968. So about 1969, right, that's when I asked myself, is law worth it? Where did this come from? If social change is going to happen, is the Weatherman view of suddenly one morning we'll wake up and an apocalyptic thing will have happened overnight? And that was when I seriously thought about this. I thought, well, no, I think I have to understand the process of change in some historical context in order that I can understand where I am, where I've been. I've been doing all these things. [laughs] What's it about? And so I was lucky enough to get a grant to do it, so I could move to France. I mean, there I was at the end of '71, and I wondered, gee, could I get enough money to write this book? And I got a phone call from a lawyer saying, "Would you brief and argue a case in the Supreme Court?" And I said, "Why, sure. How much?" And he says, "How much do you want?" I named a number that would be enough to live in France for a year. And so he said, "Okay, fine," did that. And then I wrote the book. And as I wrote the book I realized that I couldn't just start with the fifteenth century. I wind up starting to talk meaningfully about the process of social change that leads to the bourgeoisie taking power in the 1000s, 1100s. And so that's when I began to feel able to see what I was doing, and to put some kind of a context on it. And that was a hell of a ride.

01-01:33:27

Meeker:

Well, it's kind of mind blowing, because what you're really talking about is what you first mentioned when we sat down, about the *longue durée*, about looking at a millennium, and you have to look at a period of time that long if you really want to understand the nature of social change.

01-01:33:45

Tigar:

Yeah. You're a historian, and as a historian I feel this connection as we're talking about this. I had a lot of questions about what I ought to be doing now, because as we study history we see a lot of folks that thought that this is what they ought to have been doing now, whereas if they'd sat down and thought about it for a long time they realize they probably ought to be doing something else. [laughter] And I wrote once that you can't make a bargain with history. I can't say, "Look, if I behave this way, history, will you a hundred years from now say, 'Ah, that was good?'" That's not a bargain we can make. All we can do is do the next right thing. And I've been terrible at that. There have been so many ways in which I just haven't: personally, professionally, legally, and so on. I understand that. But I thought it was worth the effort. And so that's when I sat down and started to use all these tools that I'd acquired. And those were good tools. What does it mean to have represented somebody? What does it mean to have gone into a community, and talked with people, and worked with them, and so forth—a-ha—so that I could read historical accounts of things? And that experience is valuable. But I don't know where that goes. It's a process.

01-01:35:09

Meeker:

Well, it's interesting, because what you're talking about is sort of an every moment counts approach, but every moment counts over a thousand years. I mean, there's a long and there's a microscopic view of change.

01-01:35:27

Tigar:

Yeah. As I say, sometimes it's hard to know what should I be doing now, you know?

01-01:35:39

Meeker:

Well, how would you then translate that, say, to a freshman at Berkeley today, who learned about SLATE in their class and said, "Hey, that's something that I think that we should be doing now"?

01-01:35:55

Tigar:

Well, I think that person should look around and say, "What are the impediments to the realization of social justice?" Or let me flip it back. That person should say, "What injustices are out here? And how can I be meaningfully a part of addressing them, even if that means that I've got to sit and not do anything for two years while I learn more?" That was why the book was called *Fighting Injustice*. I wanted it to be called *Sensing Injustice*, but the publisher insisted it be called *Fighting Injustice*, because a sense of injustice, "Were there no injustice, we would know what justice meant." That's Edmond Cahn. Gore Vidal wrote to me a nice note about the book; he read it and liked it. He said, "It's better to think about injustice, it's more manageable, than a soaring sense of justice for which we good guys fight." And then he added, "I thought that a somewhat overwrought sense of justice overwhelmed McVeigh," the Oklahoma City Bomber. And I knew Tim McVeigh. I mean, we represented the codefendant. And that's exactly right. And you look at history, you look at the wretched excesses of people that have adopted this or that ideology—the Papal legate at Béziers, "Kill them all; God will recognize his own," which he said of the Albigensians on the plane below—that's the danger. And so the first thing we say to the freshmen is, "Hey, just look for injustice. Look for injustice, and then reason from there. Right? You grew up in America. You can see it. Come on! Maybe your circumstances of your upbringing and what people have told you—You can see it. You really can." And that was issue-oriented, I guess, wasn't it? Yeah.

01-01:38:14

Meeker:

Is that the same as identifying the issue, the location of injustice?

01-01:38:20

Tigar:

Mm-hmm.

01-01:38:22

Meeker:

How does that then translate to tactics? What are the right methods for remedying those injustices?

01-01:38:31

Tigar:

Oh, so then the question is: how can I get a ticket to the show? Right? Somebody would say, "You know what? I think I'll be a teacher." Or, "I'll go to work for a labor organization." I mean, we're in a federal courthouse right now. There are two law clerks seated 150 feet from where we are, two young women. They have a wonderful opportunity to be clerks to a federal judge, and one of them is going to do juvenile justice issues, and the other's going to do refugee rights, as lawyers, because that's something that you can do if you've got a law degree, and you go out and find a place where you can do it. I work with students who do it. It's harder these days, given the tragic underfunding of federal defender services and legal services, and so forth and so on, but with a little study you can replicate that experience and begin to do something. And the other thing is that you're perpetually able to reinvent yourself. Actuarially, your eighteen-year-old is going to live for seventy years. And so suppose you go off down a path and say, "Gee, I think I'll do a different thing." I meet law students all the time that did something else, and they say, "No, I think I'll go to law school and do that instead."

01-01:40:10

Meeker:

Again, the *longue durée*, thinking about the whole course of one's life.

01-01:40:12

Tigar:

Yeah, right.

01-01:40:16

Meeker:

I haven't really been asking other folks about this, and I've been trying to figure out the right way to ask about it, but over the last year or so Berkeley has gotten into the news again around free speech issues, and quite a bit different than 1964. And these are folks on the right side of the spectrum who are saying things but are being shut down by some people who identify on the left. Have you paid attention to this? Are there any lessons to be drawn from the past to help us understand this moment?

01-01:41:08

Tigar:

I've paid scant attention to that, although I care about it deeply, and I could not even pronounce the name of the principal rightwing agitator. My sense, the Terminiello case this brings to mind, right, as long as the cops are able to control the crowd reaction, right, let the guy talk, and let the protestors protest, and there it'll happen. If it turns out that there's just a realistic fear of a genuine, uncontrollable shitstorm, then limits. But that's a generalization that I would decline to apply to any particular set of facts unless I really had all the evidence in front of me. And why? Because what we've seen over the years is suppression of speech with what turn out in retrospect to have been very unconvincing justifications of terrible consequences that would happen if we let somebody talk. I have confidence in this generation of students. And so that's the way I would approach it. And if you needed to have ten times as many cops that day, okay, fine. But that's with respect to an event of that kind. When we're talking about who we're going to hire to teach race theory

in our schools, then I think we're entitled to make decisions about what's bullshit and what's not. Doesn't have anything to do with free speech; it has to do with competence. Now, that line is not always easy to draw, so—

01-01:43:22

Meeker: Interesting.

01-01:43:22

Tigar: So there. Yeah, interesting. That's the word. By the way, the French seem to get along quite well with the category, you're a Holocaust denier, you get prosecuted.

01-01:43:43

Meeker: Right. Well, that's interesting. That's interesting, too, that we, over the course of the twentieth century, in large part because of the litigation of the ACLU and other organizations, have turned the First Amendment into a very robust and vibrant—

01-01:44:08

Tigar: That said, by the way, unless appointed by the Court I wouldn't be inclined to represent any of those folks. I'm entitled to spend my time elsewhere.

01-01:44:18

Meeker: Sure. We do have a limited time on this planet. [laughter]

01-01:44:22

Tigar: Yeah, right. If somebody, "Well, why would you represent Terry Nichols?" Well, yeah, I was appointed by the Court. But I thought the overuse of the conspiracy weapon—and I'll defend anybody in a capital case. Not anymore. I'm too old. But I just think that that challenge of getting twelve people, jurors, to say no to death, that's fine. Because by definition, whoever they're asking that question about has committed a terrible crime. That discussion as to death, no death, that's worth having.

01-01:45:04

Meeker: In all cases?

01-01:45:05

Tigar: In all cases, every one. And if you read the book, you'll read what I tried to talk to the jury about. Sorry.

01-01:45:17

Meeker: No, it's fine. I'm curious about the lessons that as a society we seem to have drawn from the 1960s about social change, and about how social change happens. And I think that it's taught largely through Hollywood films, documentaries, that is focused on civil disobedience, direct action. Are those the right lessons to draw from how social change happened in the 1960s?

01-01:45:58

Tigar:

Well, I think it's unfair to generalize about all of that literature about that time. What we see today is what we saw, to the extent that the prior thing is relevant: institutional frameworks for expressing interesting ideas try to tamp down, suppress, and divert ground-up movements that really want to make the issues seen. Bernie Sanders, Hillary Clinton. I mean, here's Mrs. Clinton, whose husband gave us the worst death penalty statute the federal government has ever seen; who entered into a treaty with Mexico with zero concern for the environment or to worker rights; who bombed the shit out of Yugoslavia; and so on. So, yeah. And that's why Sanders touches this deep sense that folks have about the need to do something. The abiding lesson of SLATE is, if there is one, that it's this movement. It's this issue-directed, gee, something's wrong about that, let's get moving. No, please don't put structures on us now; we're trying to get something done here. For me, that's what's refreshing about it.

01-01:47:34

Meeker:

How does that play out? How did you see that understanding play out, for instance, in the Sanders campaign?

01-01:47:45

Tigar:

Oh, because here's the regular Democratic Party, the Democratic National Committee, all the institutional forms. Shit, man—excuse me—it was a replay of '68, in a way. That's an oversimplification, but these are the people that gave you Hubert Humphrey instead of Gene McCarthy or, had he not been killed, Bobby Kennedy. It's, "Well, that protest, this movement, it's all right, but let's don't let it get out of hand," right? Indeed, the *Liberal Democrat*, TLD, in which these two articles appeared, that was a part of the California Democratic Party that was attempting to displace old-line California Democrats who'd held on to power for years and years and years, and who rejected all efforts to introduce new faces and progressive thoughts into the process.

01-01:48:45

Meeker:

And that effort to replace was largely successful.

01-01:48:47

Tigar:

It certainly was.

01-01:48:49

Meeker:

So then what would you say the lessons for the future are that you would draw from '68 and '16?

01-01:48:58

Tigar:

Well, the lessons are that some people need to get out of the road. For me, this is not new, and I'm not some great political philosopher about this, but it just seems to me that these movements are where we ought to be. In my own county, Pamlico County, North Carolina, I see grassroots organizing to get some of these Trumpites out. You saw some of it at work in Alabama. You're seeing in community after community efforts that—it's not as though Bernie

Sanders is a great savior, but just movements are seeing their power. I'm writing now some things about these community campaigns of labor organizations, helping the Service Employees Union to organize the laundry workers and the hotel workers, and Smithfield organized the culinary workers, by non-National Labor Relations Act campaigns, and the companies respond with these big lawsuits to try to stop them, because these community campaigns are enormously successful. I was retained by the SEIU when Sodexo sued them, because Sodexo's a subsidiary of a French corporation, to go to France and record infomercials on French television. [laughs] Boy, this company, headed by this iconic Monsieur Bellon, was trying to suppress labor rights in the United States, to take the community campaign back into his front porch. And I gave lectures at the University of Paris about it, and so on. It was great. So it's bubbling up, you know?

01-01:50:51

Meeker:

It's good. This is exactly the exploration and connections that I'm interested in. Well, why so much interest in France? Where did that come from for you?

01-01:51:04

Tigar:

Well, when I thought about writing the book that became *Law and the Rise of Capitalism*, I thought that the south of France would be a good place, because not ravaged by war and climate, the caches of solid documentary evidence— You can look at contracts written in the year 1010, right? It's got a trove. Plus, it's the Mediterranean. We have insufficient understanding of the role of what happened in the Mediterranean, including the contribution of Arabs, to what we now understand to be the rules by which we live. So that was a sense I had about that. It turned out to be right. I was directed a little bit in that direction by Eduard Goldstücker, who had been Minister of Culture in the Dubček government, is a Czech scholar; and then by Roger Aubenas, who's a fellow that taught in Montpellier. So, quickly, that worked. And I did speak a little French. I had written my law review comment, which included some research into medieval French stuff, because at that time Boalt had David Daube there, who was a great Romanist scholar, and he introduced me to the great trove of stuff that the Berkeley Law Library has, these French customary writings, going back to 1200s I think is the earliest one. So I just liked that. I thought that would be a good place to go, and to do this work.

01-01:52:34

Meeker:

Interesting. Let me actually ask a final question, and you'll certainly have the opportunity to offer any final comments if you'd like, but I daresay that most every undergrad who graduates from Berkeley in this day and age has at least heard of the Free Speech Movement, and will have a greater or lesser understanding of what it was. I think that there's considerably less knowledge of SLATE. What would you like undergrads to know about SLATE before graduating? Let me ask first: do you think it's important that they know about SLATE?

01-01:53:20

Tigar:

Yes. Oh, I think it's important. And, indeed, David Horowitz's book, before he went to the dark side, has some insights for us, that they should look at it, because here were students who, coming out of the McCarthy period, emerging, beginning to emerge, looked around and saw these injustices, and asked themselves, "What can I do about that? What can I do about that?" And so yes, that's the answer. I don't know if you know Christopher Fry's play, *The Lady's Not for Burning*, which an itinerant soldier, Thomas Mendip, comes to town—it's in the middle of a witch hunt; it's in the Medieval period—and creates a diversion by demanding to be hanged. And, of course, there's a big, noisy witch hunt going on out. And the mayor's wife says, "Why, whatever could it be?" And he says, "It could be, and it is, madam, a witch hunt." Whereby the good people of the town having washed up the dinner things, are about to scour their eternal souls in the blood of a grandmother, and the mayor's wife says, "Oh, so many things happened. We'd rather not." [laughter] And he says, "Be concerned, madam, to the extent of a tut, and I will thank God for civilization." Now, that was a wise comment on the McCarthy period at that time, and I think about it often, often because I know that play, and I did, at that time. I was concerned with it. Wake up! Wake up! Wake up.

01-01:55:18

Meeker:

Is there anything else you'd like to add?

01-01:55:20

Tigar:

No, I've had fun. Thank you.

01-01:55:23

Meeker:

Yeah, you, too. Thank you very much. This has been quite illuminating.

01-01:55:25

Tigar:

Well, you're welcome.

[End of Interview]