I: Dr. Steinmetz taught at San Diego State University for over 20 years, and I'm going to ask him some questions dealing with his firing from San Diego State back in 1954. Now, the first question I wanted to ask you, Dr. Steinmetz, is "When did you first become involved in politics?" Did you take it up when you were in college, or was it something that you'd always been involved in?

HS: Well, I suppose so, because I was always socially conscious with a background and experience in the Far East. I don't know, first, well, probably in World War I, actually before the war I belonged to what we call that little college in Oregon that my very religious mother had sent me to. We had a Leavenworth Club, which was for conscientious objectors who expected, therefore, to land in Leavenworth and so we wanted to have our club rules set up before we got there. But, of course, I weakened, and ended up in Officer's Training School with the University of Washington, and actually felt it manifested, perhaps, a little aptitude for the military, which is odd. But I didn't do badly, but as soon as the war was over, a few months later, and we were discharged, I joined the Private Soldiers and Sailors Legion of the IWW. And we policed Seattle during the hundred-day strike, and there wasn't a crime in Seattle, I guess. We had a good record. But that indicates more to me in memory than actual clear line of continuation that I did have, you see, a political outlook, if that's the first that you want.

I: Right, that's what I was interested in. Did you know Bill Hayward, and some of the...

HS: No, of course not, but I remember the arrival of the SS Shilka(?) from Vladivostok. Some of the Northwest timberworkers and waterfront workers had written a letter to inquire what the Russian Revolution was all about, and Lenin had encouraged, and the Vladivostok Soviet had financed a ship to come over with a crew of propagandists, I suppose, but two of them spoke English. And I remember that very well...those were thrilling days in Seattle and probably initiated my interest in Soviet Union of course. That was in the winter of 1917, in fact, the ship was tied up in port in Seattle - that's another long story - but it left about December 2nd to return to Vladivostok.
I: Now, when did you become involved in politics in San Diego? I know I think you ran for Mayor, didn't you, and I believe for Congress?

HS: Oh yes, and for State Superintendent of Public Instruction later. Well, in San Diego during the depression, early depression years, we started a league... let's see, the Society for the Study of Technocracy or something like that. And I was president of that, and I remember I made 35 talks one month to service clubs and women's clubs and unemployeds' groups all over the city and out into the County a bit, and then the Progressive Fusion League was formed later to try to emulate New York. They picked me to try to become the little La Guardia of San Diego, and I wasn't dry behind the ears but I let myself get lured into it and so I was campaigning for Mayor of San Diego in the fall of '35.

I: What about... did you run for Congress, later, was that in the 40's?

HS: Yes, that's a big gap, 1948. The way I put it, I ran from Congress on Henry Wallace's coattails.

I: In these particular early interests in politics in San Diego, did you have any fellow individuals who were involved with you, for example, did you know Marston?

I think Marston was involved in politics.

HS: Oh, dear old George Marston. Yes, in fact under the table he actually financed one of my escapades, I suppose. But that was in support of the Charter League. I was a, and still am I suppose, a "united-fronter", that is, I believe in coalitions and I believe in "you center in the left" and most of the political gamut getting together for reforms that will prevent violence and alleviate our plight, which gets deeper, I'm afraid, and more deeper all the time. But in those days, I wouldn't involve, no, I wasn't involve George Marston very much, because it was a mixed group of professionals, we would call them, I suppose, intellectual radicals, who precipitated me consciously and unconsciously into the political activity from the mayorship campaign on. There were nine candidates for mayor, and three of us came out at the top — I was number three. The number two man was Ray Sower, who owned the San Diego Herald, and he had stolen our platform, lock, stock and barrel. But he was allied with the liquor interests and had a newspaper, you
see, so he came out second, and then of course, the city elected the undertaker, Mr. Benbough, and I think he wasn't a bad mayor at all, but I had made my pitch, and tried to pursue, in my own way, an educational program for the public; our platform was refunding of bonded indebtedness, municipal ownership of utilities, and about a score of other goodies, too many planks, really, to make a good platform. But it was highly educational.

I: Okay, you were also involved in some things, weren't you, for example, I've read some newspaper clippings where you were protesting treatment of blacks in southeast San Diego, I think.

HS: Oh, yes, the Progressive Fusion League was backed by the minorities pretty thoroughly, and those were the days when the Jewish citizens were a minority, and the blacks were as bad off as they usually are. So yes, we had a black candidate for the City Council, and we were sincerely for measures that would militude against poverty.

I: There was an explosion, as I recall, in Pittsburg, this is in Pittsburg California, dealing with... apparently some workers were loading some ammunition and there was an explosion there. If I recall, the newspaper made some comments that you and some other people were talking about the blacks; they were trying to make them go back to work and they were apparently very much afraid of another explosion. Do you recall that at all?

HS: Oh, very faintly, it was a very subsidiary event from this distance.

I: Okay, When did you start teaching at San Diego State?

HS: I came for the summer session in 1930, and on condition that we liked it and they liked us, but indeed I was very fond of President Hardy, and I think he reciprocated. We got along very well during his incumbency. My wife came down that fall and we've been here, more or less, ever since.

I: Did you enjoy teaching at San Diego State? As far as an institution, did you think it was...

HS: Oh yes, I saw it develop from a normal school type of program into a full-fledged university program, and enjoyed it very much. I've always been loyal to the university,
I think.

I: What size was the university at that time? Was it, do you recall, was it a thousand, several thousand?

HS: Well, let me see, I don't know, about... the fall of '30 it must have been around 1,100, I'm not sure.

I: Yes, it was pretty small then. Of course now it's evolved into a university of 32,000, 34,000 or so, it really is quite immense. You were teaching psychology, weren't you, at State?

HS: Yes, and then I initiated the instruction in Philosophy.

I: Who were some of the professors who were teaching with you at the time, do you recall any of them, that were your fellow colleagues?

HS: Yes, well, in the very early days, Elizabeth Hammock and her sister...I should have a list of the... and Gwen Bacon and Christine Springsten, she started... she's about my wife's best friend, and she started in, I think, the summer or fall, too, of 1930. Yes, there are a number of others who really should be named. But they don't come to me so fast as names like that used to.

I: Okay, when were you first attacked in the sense that there was an attempt to kick you out of the university? Do you recall when that first began, or how it first began?

HS: Well, I think I can give you two instances of about my earliest memories. One was when I sponsored the local appearance of Holland Roberts from San Francisco, who headed the California Labor School, where I think I was the first speaker and the last speaker before it dissolved. And Holland Roberts was speaking on peace, and I thought how incongruous, and yet revealing the attack on me was when his subject was peace, and it was a time when peace was the left wing aspiration. Later, of course, I climbed on the bandwagon for World War II, I think it was absolutely necessary, and I was for support of Spain before that. And Spain meant a lot to me.

The other illustration would be I think, I was director of extension studies and I set up classes around folks who needed help and were skilled and I set up a ceramics class where the instructor one time said "You've been so good to me, I'd like to do
something for you", and I said "What are you talking about?" "Well," he said, "I've gone to your meetings and reported your talks to General VanDemend," and he was a gentleman out on Point Loma whose eyes were very close together, and he kept track of all of us so-called Reds. "Well", I said, "If you've been snitching and snooping like that, maybe you can get some pages from his book; how does he keep his records?" He said, "Fortunately, it's a looseleaf book and I have access to it". So I said, "Fine, get the pages out of my friend Dave Wask and my friend Leslie Claypool," and maybe I named Daisy Lee Worchester,"and my pages. I'd like to read them". So he said, "That's easy, he won't miss them, and I'll have them in the book before Monday." So he got them out, and in those days I was doing a lot of radio broadcasting. I initiated both the faculty program and the student program on the air, and then I'd been in politics a lot, so I was on the radio a lot. And a short time after this, I forgot under which auspices, I was on the radio, and I quoted from the pages about me on the radio, saying that this was the kind of malarky that was being peddled around. And I understand that it did not contribute to the General's longevity.

I: Was he a military general then?

HS: No he was retired. But he still kept - he's been in intelligence - and he still kept it up from habit, I guess. But I had been when I was a kid too in the Far East.

I: Okay. Who were some of the individuals and groups outside of the general who were pressuring for your firing? Do you recall, was the American Legion involved in that at all?

HS: Oh, the American Legion was involved up to the hilt. And I'd been a member of the American Legion after World War I up in Seattle. That was really something. Yes, the American Legion, and, oh, the Union-Tribune took my picture when I went down to Tijuana on May Day to - and the Mexican women picked up my four year old son, and put Union buttons up and down his Mackinaw, and put him in the parade. I had to walk along the edge to keep track of my son, and a reported caught me against the crowd, so it looked like I was marching with the marchers. And I understand that some banks - the Chamber of Commerce got it - and some bank downtown had it in the window for a couple of years.
Now, this is the way an American professor spends his time... in Tijuana.

I: Doesn't sound very suspicious...

HS: No, it sounds ridiculous in these days. But it was not in those days. It was that far paranoia had gone. Maybe a little on both sides, but I don't think I exaggerate when I give these illustrations of what was occurring.

I: Was Harry Foster involved in...

HS: Oh, Harry Foster was a self-appointed enemy of mine, I never did quite understand why, but he pursued me for a long time. I have somewhere some records of that but I can't remember. I tend to push those people out of my mind.

I: I understand. How about Max Oslo? I think he was on the...

HS: Oh, Max Oslo was a butchers' union representative, and I guess it was Miriam appointed him to the State Board of Education. And yes, he was one of those who voted to fire me. Oh yes, Max ended up in jail, I think.

I: Why did they attack you? I mean, was it - do you think that you were...

HS: People took their politics just so terribly seriously. I don't know whether I still do or not. I do from the standpoint of what I think menaces us, but I don't day to day, and I try to live a normal life without being too wrapped up in it.

I: It, I guess it's because looking back at it from a perspective of modern era, that particularly younger people kind of see this, I try to teach this in my class, and they have a very difficult time understanding why anybody would be blacklisted or lose their job because of their political views. This is kind of a loaded question, it's probably unfair, but I just wanted to ask it, but were you a good teacher?

HS: You should ask my students. But a great number of them signed a petition for me. Yes, I think so. In the ratings, I did not come out tops, but I generally came out in the top fourth or fifth.

I: Did your politics...I know I get involved in outside things when I'm trying to teach and sometimes I feel that I don't do a very good job, or I'm not doing the job that I should...did your politics ever seem to get in the way, or cause any problems in regards to your teaching?
I: I don't think so, unless it was in the class in Ethics, which I had the pleasure of teaching and I consider the most supreme subject. And there I would be occasionally challenged to relate theory and practice in a comment that I couldn't entirely avoid, but generally I leaned over backwards to avoid that sort of thing. And I don't think that there have been fair... there have been occasional rumors against me on the campus but they were usually squelched by those opposed who thought that I leaned over backwards to avoid that sort of complication.

I: I talked to John Adams and other people on the campus and they seemed to think that you'd done a good job teaching, that there was no particular problem. They both mentioned that you were involved in politics, but they didn't think it interfered, I was just curious of your own assessment.

HS: John Adams and who else?

I: Harry Ruja.

HS: Oh yes, I voted to hire Harry Ruja, remember? We've had our differences since, but I think we're friends.

I: Why were you specifically fired? What was the real reason behind the firing? I mean I've read a lot of newspaper clippings, and I've seen all kinds of things that...

HS: Well, the real reason was that there was a competition between Frank Luckel, my assemblyman and Fred Kraft, my senator, to get me. I don't know to whom they were pledged, but I think Kraft was a druggist at the beach who did as much out of his back door as his front door, and he was put in by the Medical Association to prevent socialized medicine. And Luckel was an assemblyman who, 30 years before or so, had been retired from the Navy for psychological reasons I think. But they were adamantly against me, and Kraft got through the anti-Steinmetz bill of 1951 which the Governor Warren vetoed as an obvious bill of attainder. That has another story - you really ought to ask about that, and then Luckel got through the Luckel Bill, which is an extension of the Dilworth Act against school district employees, requiring that we appear before our employing agency and answer any questions which they could dream up that they could relate to Communism, and if we didn't, we'd be insubordinate. And this applied to every State
employee from State Bank Examiner to an irrigation ditch tender who got part of his pay from the State. And I just don't like to get pushed around.

I: It seems almost ludicrous that a bill like that, in other words it appears to me from what I've read that the Luck Act was passed specifically to get you or people like you. Is that true?

HS: Yes. But the appalling thing is that not one State employee in a thousand realizes that he's still working under it. That is, it is still on the books of California. And this incenses me; I don't know how to bring it to their attention, because so long it involved only me, I at least could understand that nobody anymore gives a damn. But that the employees continue to work under it is unbelievable. But at that time, we had quite a division of the ... I had been President of the American Association of University Professors, and I wanted to appear in Berkeley before that branch, and they gave me two dates and then reneged both times, so I never was able to get it. That's why I ran for State Superintendent of Public Instruction, because one of my backers said, "Here's $300. Go down and file. I won't give another nickel to your case, but the best defense is offense." So that was congenial with me so I got a quarter of a million votes without spending any more money than the filing fee.

I: Another question. You've mentioned before that there's another story there involved with Earl Warren was Governor and he vetoed the particular bill that you mentioned; what was that particular bill about that he vetoed?

HS: Well, this is extremely important. The anti-Steinmetz Act of 1951 was the Kraft bill against College and University Teachers for their memberships, subscriptions, contributions, and associations. It was so wildly a bill of attainder that the Governor vetoed it for that reason. I was teaching at the University of Cincinnati, and the Associated Press calls up and said that my hometown paper wanted a comment on the Governor's vetoing this, and I said, "Look, I've been a newspaper man myself, and I learned that if you live and let live you learn more." So he said, "Well, go on". And I said, "You wouldn't want to hurt Gordon Renner, would you?" "Oh no, no," he said. "Of course not". I said, "I thought he was your pinup. He's head of your House Un-
American Activities Committee in the State of Ohio, and he's my first cousin. And I'm living right behind his lovely home, in the middle of two and a half acres of lawn right here in Cincinnati right now. So I don't want any of this to get out into the Cincinnati papers." And the Associated Press man said, "Well, you tell, you give me a comment on the Governor's veto, and I won't let it out." So with that, I commented that, to the effect that what the Governor had done was what any civilized person would expect of another civilized person but in these times public officials appeared so seldom civilized that I was very grateful. And of course I was never used.

I: Then the Kraft was apparently passed just to get you, or people like you...?

HS: Yes the Kraft act was, well the Governor vetoed it — said it was such an obvious bill of attainder, everybody knows who it's aimed at. And that's why he vetoed it. But then, you see, ...51, 52, in 1952 he was the candidate for the nomination of the Republican Party for President of the United States. And he, Eisenhower offered him the first vacancy on the United States Supreme Court, if he would withdraw his "favorite son" candidacy in his favor. Which Warren was glad to do because he always thought of himself as a lawyer and wanted to be a Supreme Court judge, and didn't particularly like executive office, although I think he was a pretty good governor. So he said, he withdrew, and then, as history would have it, Chief Justice Vincent died, Ike redeemed his promise and appointed Warren, but he would then have to get the approval of the Senate and there sat McCarthy, and his friend Brownell was Attorney General, and there was a lot of other support, and the American Legion of California saw its opportunity, and they laid four unbelievable bills on Warren's desk for signature. One of them was this Luckel Act, an extension of Dillworth, another one was a special loyalty requirement of veterans to get State home loans, another one made preachers, rabbis, and priests responsible for the loyalty of their congregations, and the fourth one was, I think, the old Kraft Act all over again. That's right. And Warren, I'm told by newspapermen in Sacramento, walked up and down, changed colors, said, "Well you boys know if I don't sign these, I'll still be here, and if I do sign them, you know where I'll be, and somebody's bound to contest them." And therefore, he closed his eyes, signed them, and went to Washington.
And it took me two years to pursue his dirty work. But I've researched this enough to be satisfied that at every critical point in his personal career, Warren has gone with the establishment. I'm glad he got to the United States Supreme Court, I'm glad for his decisions in 1954, but I think it is necessary to appreciate that, to a considerable extent, we have reached a deplorable state of where the heels rise to the heads.

I: Of course, I think it's fairly well known that Warren was, when he was Attorney General of California, that he was involved in the removal of the Japanese, and of course he did not, my own personal feelings are that he did not acquit himself very well there, either.

HS: No, the King Ramsey Connor Court. I read up on his record as attorney of Alameda County, California, and as Attorney General of the State, and as Governor, and I said what I did because I think this was characteristic of him. He was an establishment man, but he did have his principles. And I have very ambivalent feelings about him.

I: Why did the Supreme Court refuse to hear your case? Was it because of him or was it because of the times...

HS: Well, as I understand it, you have to get four votes for review, and then you have to get five votes to win. And regardless of what Warren had said when the appeal... in California I didn't have to go to the Superior Court in suit to get my job back, because in State involved courts you go directly to a fourth appellate court that sits in Sacramento. And there was John Pete, a former friend, I mean Paul Pete, and we'd been Paul and Harry to each other under the governorship of Olsen, Cuthbert Olsen. And so I thought Paul Pete would certainly vote right, but he and his fellow justices, three of them, ruled the easy way. All they had to do was satisfy the Supreme Court Role in the case of Constitutional Claim, and so they found, after 3 months was 114 pages of facts, which were that I'd been insubordinate, which I had to be to contest the law. So I lost there, and then it went to the State Supreme Court, and we lost there, but we won ringing assent by Supreme Court Justice Jesse Carter. And on that, the American Civil Liberties Union, which was handling my case said, "We cannot lose in the United States Supreme Court".
Well, what they overlooked was what Warren did when they got there, finally, he simply abstained. So as I understand it, Frankfurter looked out the window, and the others didn't vote, and the only votes I got were Black and Douglas. So with only the votes of Black and Douglas, of course, I was two short and my famous anglo-saxon day in court was terminated and due process was aborted, and I think the case was still moot because it has never been fully adjudicated.

SIDE II

I: Were you blacklisted after your firing? Were you able to get jobs other places or...?
HS: Very thoroughly,... everyone was scared of McCarthy. And I don't know how many applications I got out, but never got the smell of a job. Until, I was in private practice both years in Hollywood a bit, but I never made any more than I usually made on the side as a psychologist, but officing with M.D.'s as a rule - I preferred to practice scupulously. But I didn't get anything until, in Europe in 1960, the AAUP wrote the climate had so changed in this country that they'd set up a retired professors registry, and if I'd wanted to register, they thought they could find something for me. So my very domestic wife, who'd become an international bum, said, "What's all this mail you're getting?" And we realized if we came back I'd have to go to work again. So, we were seeing Europe on $400 a month and saving $100 to get back on, you could do it in those days, I had students all over the place, and I got some free rent, I admit. But then I got 5 offers through the AAUP, and chose to pinch-hit for a year in Michigan. And then I went to the Atlanta University System - Morehouse College particularly, Martin Luther King's school, and was there for four years. And we were very close to the Kings - three generations of them. And in the whole kneel-in, die-in, cry-in period, we were the only whites in the area for several blocks near the University and College.

I: After you were fired... if I recall reading the one article that you had in there, apparently you did a little tour, you went on to Europe, just traveling.
HS: In 1958, our son came home for Christmas with one-way tickets to Europe, so, he
said, "You've never been there, you've talked a lot about it, and you've got nothing better to do". So we married our daughter off in the Spring of 1959, shoot, we'd already sent her over there to reconnoiter for us, so to speak. She attended the University of Vienna for a semester in the Fall of 1958. So we went over 5 minutes before April in '59, save summer rates, and got lost in Europe for 17 months, in 17 countries.

I: You may have already answered this question, let me rephrase it again; Were you ever able to find equal employment, the type you had before, or did you have to just take part time things...?

HS: Well, yes and no. In positions, yes, but not in income. That is of course the black colleges were not paying so well as California, by far, but Canada came pretty close to it, and there I was Visiting Professor of Psychology at the University of Alberta, and also Director of Psychology at the Royal Alexandra Hospital, and, the last year, Counselor at the University. But those salaries were 12, 14,000, plus maybe a few dollars on the side, but California was better.

I: Did you ever notice, was the political climate in Canada anything like it was here? Was it much more relaxed, or were they uptight about Communism too...?

HS: No, the political climate in Canada was more mature and tolerant. For example, at the University I helped organize a seminar for the faculty on permanence and change in Eastern Europe. And we varied in our views from left to right, but we were all, we all tried to be scholars. And we educated each other, and we would not debate, we would present the thesis and when we ran out of facts, we'd stop. But we would be questioned about our facts and not our views. And we also formed an academic, a Society for Academic Intercultural Exchanges, which worked to some extent. And the climate was quite good. We liked Canada so well we almost, we wanted to retire there. There's another story about that that's not complete, I'd rather not get into it right now.

I: Why do you think the political climate in the United States was so severe? Was it the Cold War, was it a multiplicity of things, or was it any one particular thing you could put your finger on?
HS: Well, it was the Cold War. I don't believe in sharp demarcations in the history of a large country. I think from 1917 the competition between capitalism and communism or socialism has not yet become a fully civilized competition. But I'm hoping it may become, I hope we'll never get over competition in ideas. But to call ideas subversive and attach people for ideas is barbarous.

I: I've read quite a bit about the blacklisting period in American History, particularly in Hollywood, in that region. But it still seems to be kind of amazing, I've heard different writers claim mass hysteria to see how people could get so hysterical and upset about the fear of practicing another politicals, for example, I've heard people say that anyone who talks of politics outside of the Democratic and Republican Party is subversive, which is kind of humorous. But what do you attribute to this...

HS: Well, yes. People pursue their own advantages in their ideological formulations; the ideological composition of the individual is a very interesting subject. You're right, my attorney before the House Un-American Activities Committee in the Spring of 1953, was Bob Kenny, who'd been Attorney General of California, and a very dear friend, and he had defended the Hollywood ten, and learned that the Bill of Rights had been suspended. So when the ACLU pivoted my case on test of the first amendment, he said, "Harry, you're a dead duck". And he bowed out because he'd already got burned on that one. Really, you ought to ask me about that case, the ACLU I had belonged to for 20 years before, and I had a notion that I was entitled to some consideration, but when the ACLU dictated the strategy of my defense and I went to them for consultation the very first thing the attorney said was to rub his hands and say, "How much money do you have?" And I'm sorry to say this, because I regard him fairly well. But it was a futile thing. I wish that he had put my case on not only the first amendment, but what is it the property rights, too, because just before court a young aircraft attorney, registered Republican, a former student, called up, and said, "I'd like to file an amicus curiae brief in your behalf." And I said, "For heaven's sake, why? How so?" He said, "We do a little business with the State, and if, in the middle of an ongoing contract without proof that the other party has reneged in any way, a new condition cannot be stipulated. And they're
trying to hand you on that." So, with great glee, I told the ACLU attorney about that one, getting an amicus curiae brief from the attorney of an aircraft company, and he said, "Nothing doing". So my property rights, my tenure, were not emphasized, but by implication at least, according to Jesse Carter, in his dissent, they were more than implicated. And that was violated and the tenure law was broken by my suspension, I think that's the term in the law which became the permanent, became permanent after it carried on. Well...

I: Well, basically, as a teacher then, you were operating under a contract?
HS: Of course.
I: Right, then as long as you fulfilled your end of the bargain, the contract... that's what you're saying then, basically.
HS: Exactly.
I: That's a very important point.
HS: Exactly. A very important point. That's quite a bit the basis of my claim against the State, now. And I think that the State owes me, they owe itself to redeem its honor in the matter of compensating me for the six years of total unemployment, and the eight years of employment with less than the California scale. And a miserable retirement monthly check of $495.95 a month now, even with the cost of living increments.
I: Where was, if I recall reading in the papers, there was a bill which was before the State Legislature just prior to the vote on Proposition 13, is that correct, and that Proposition 13 was passed and then they axed that bill? I think that was correct, I'm not sure.
HS: Oh, you must be referring to Assembly Bill 3026, which some friendly assemblymen got in to compensate all those McCarthy victims, principally the Levering folks, but I contend that the Luckel Act, which - the only question I was asked of the Luckel Act was really the Levering question - and Levering permits the individualization, Luckel permits the individualization of the Levering, and this proposition that the friendly assemblymen sponsored would have given us, me in my case a tithe, or $25,000, all of us equally, regardless of the fact that our separate claims ran from 40,000 to
$500,000. $25,000 each, and this was finally compromised between the two houses and I believe it was attached to a $7,000,000 bill for compensating already affluent doctors who claimed to have given services to welfare patients that had not been authorized services, and after we had been expunged, the legislature passed the $7,000,000 for the doctors, and we didn't get a cent. Some people seemed to think that we had something from the State, we haven't had a nickel.

I: Okay. How did the years from 1954 to the present really affect your life; obviously, you lost your job, and I'm sure it was...

HS: Well, you know, it affected my life in various ways, in some ways, my wife took a nice humorous attitude, that it was the best thing that ever happened to me because we got to go all over Europe - been there 6 times now, oh, 7 times, and around the world, and broadened our understanding of a lot of humanities and social studies. But it devastated me professionally, of course. I think that I was engaged in some very promising research, and I think I said this in the San Diego Tribune, that actually the punitive measures that I suffered from were a little bit tardy because I had, and unnecessary, I was already inclining toward the pursuit of my doctoral interests.

I: Okay, looking back at your career and the problems you had at State, what would you have done differently if you could go back and change some particular point in your life that might have made a difference?

HS: Well, I don't know, you know. Life has its inexorable aspects, and you go on living from day to day without, at least I don't consume myself in regrets. I wish that I had dropped the ACLU and taken Bob Kenny and let him stipulate my tenure, and tried it out on that basis, and I think I might then have remained employed. But I would not have reneged on the principle of the thing at any point, because I think I was right.

I: Who were the attorneys for ACLU that were defending you in that particular instance?

HS: Well, Al Wirin, mainly. I kind of thought Pat Brown, who was Attorney General, tried to lose the case but he couldn't do it in those days, McCarthy requirements were so rigid, well, I mean the law was so rigid, he had to go with the law on the books of
the State. But I've never held any animosity for participants in those legal things.

I: (A.L. Wren?) of course, had some experiences back in the 1930's down in the Imperial Valley I'd read about.

HS: Oh, yes, I knew of those very well. And quite a number of people were wrapped up, in fact, I was told to stay out of the Imperial Valley or I would never get a ... so I didn't get over there, become a hero in those days, in the background I was helping quite a bit. In fact, I don't mind admitting, that, well, there are aspects of that I prefer to keep for my autobiography.

I: The thing that interests me is it seems that the Imperial Valley hasn't grown any, hasn't matured politically, since that period because of Metzger now, he seems to have gained a great deal of votes in the 43rd Congressional District, which is kind of interesting.

HS: Well, yes. There's a lot of that hoi polloi stupidity prevalent, and some baronial landed interests feudal in their aspect, but on the other hand, the only other Lucky victim that I know of is my dear friend Carl Callendar, who is a tree surgeon, and he was caught subverting the trees and the bushes, so he was fired by the Board of Supervisors, or their, whoever was in the Park Commission at that time. And his case was subordinated to mine, and when I didn't get anywhere, his case was not pursued further. But he certainly is entitled, as I am, to recompense for grave injury and injustice. And he lives in the Imperial Valley and I think the people over there have been pretty tolerant. He seems to have friends in several directions, that's rather surprising and gratifying. So I don't think they're all uncivilized over there.

I: I'm sure they're not, I didn't really mean that.

HS: I know, I wanted to get that in there.

I: Right. I think you maybe answered this question already, but let's, maybe, just pursue it one more time. Would you have testified any differently in any of your hearings that you had? I look at these the HUAC is kind of an abomination. I can understand why you'd take a stand against them because they seem to be almost pernicious as far as I'm concerned.
HS: Oh, I was before the House Un-American Activities Committee in the Spring of '53 and then here in San Diego in the Summer of '55. But that had nothing legal to do with my elimination from State employment. I mean to say I got by with defying them and I would defy them again even more forcefully than I did if I had it to do over again. And I see no reason to water down my principles.

I: When you were before the HUAC how was it conducted? I mean, was it - I've heard some testimony, I've read some testimony - but was it kind of a badgering, hard nosed attitude towards questioning?

HS: Yes, there was a bulldog tenacity with the main point that they were pursuing without regard to your response. And I was before Veldi and Walters, see Congressman Jackson was in there too. I can't remember the other Congressmen's names, but it was yes, it was pretty trying, because it was tricky, and in those days if you conceded anything in your own behalf, you'd be subjecting yourself to interrogation regarding others, and that was the principle reason that I defied them because if I had submitted obviously I knew a lot of Communists, and I could be asked about them. And I wasn't about to submit to that.

I: Veldi had a reputation for being kind of a tough individual, I've forgotten now but I've read some testimony where he.

HS: Yes, a former FBI agent...

I: I read some testimony where he had been interrogating a black individual, I can't remember who it was but I think he was with the Railway Union or something, and he cursed him out and everything else right there in the testimony, it was kind of interesting, I mean, apparently he was very abusive.

HS: Yes, you had no political, you had no legal recourse, to what they called you I guess. But I don't remember Veldi, if indeed he actually sat. It may have been Walters sat in his place as chairman, when I was before them. I don't remember.

I: Okay, do you have any concluding statements you might want to make about the firing or anything about it, or do you think you've pretty well summed it up?
HS: Well, I've pretty well summed it up except that I don't see how anybody can consider the facts of the case without agreeing that I have a strong claim for recompense for the injury done me by the State. And it's the State I still love and I would like to see its honor redeemed.

I: Do you think that you might be able to win over a decision of some sort?

HS: Well, the issue now, I suppose, I'm represented by the California Congress of Faculty Associations, and I hope the California State Employees Association. And I should think any of the other faculty associations would be in favor of my case. Or claim. But what's your question?

I: I was thinking that, do you think that you're going to have a...

HS: Oh, yes, I started to say that the issue is whether we should go before the Legislature with a special bill or whether we should go to court again. The court is menacing because of the long, drawn out procedures that are required. The State is questionable on account of the political composition of the voters. And I think that in the last vote that I mentioned a little while ago, it came out 42 in our favor, 26 against, and, what was it, a dozen abstentions, 13 abstentions? So you see, the change of a very few votes would have given us at least a pittance, $25,000. But the main thing, I think, is the impedement of the Luckel Act. If the State employees and the Legislature would rescind the Luckel Act, then I think Carl Callendar and I would have a clear case and it would be settled, perhaps, even out of court.

I: Okay, thanks very much.

I: Dr. Steinmetz, perhaps one last question. What is your attitude toward San Diego State University today?

HS: Well, I think it's in the record. I am loyal to the university from the beginning. I was vice-president of the University of California program for the retired called Institute for Continued Learning, until I had a little heart trouble, and then San Diego State started this, and I became chairman of the board there for a couple of years until I had another little heart problem. But I have helped develop that program, and that's my institution, that's the institution I'm loyal to. I would like to feel the faculty
was a little bit more up-to-date and the times with regard to issues of justice and their own academic interests. I am a little disappointed in the almost indifference of AAUP throughout, and I'm entertained by the fact that it seems to be slipping nationally, but I'm proud of San Diego State and its development and I hope that I can assist in any little way in the years ahead as I think I'm doing perhaps a little bit now, in the development of its relations of theory to practice.