

TRANSCRIPT OF AUDIO FILE:

**INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT--JOAN DORIS GOLDHAMMER.DOC**

**14 OCTOBER 2007**

**INTERVIEWERS: NAOMI McCORMACK AND PETER SIMONSON**

**TRANSCRIPTION'S TEXT: UNCORRECTED FOR SPELLING**

---

*Thank you for working with Accentance for your transcription needs. The text below represents a professional transcriptionist's understanding of the words spoken. No guarantee of complete accuracy is expressed or implied, particularly regarding spellings of names and other unfamiliar or hard-to-hear words and phrases. "(ph)" or "(sp?)" indicate phonetics or best guesses. To verify important quotes, we recommend listening to the corresponding audio. Timestamps throughout the transcript facilitate locating the desired quote, using software such as Windows Media or QuickTime players.*

**BEGIN TRANSCRIPT:**

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: I am a New Yorker, born and bred in Manhattan. A member of a upwardly mobile Jewish family. I grew up on Washington Heights. Let's see, the first place I lived was 160<sup>th</sup> Street and Broadway in Manhattan. And then as things improved in the economic sense, the family moved to Midtown Manhattan, I guess you could say. We moved down to 83<sup>rd</sup> Street and West End Avenue, which was a big step up for the people at that time. And I went to public school – oh, no, I started out in a little, tiny private school on Riverside Drive. And that was fun because it was like a one room schoolhouse. Everybody was in the same room, all the grade levels were in the same room. And I used to tune in to what was going on with the upper classes.

And this was, I guess a very progressive school because French was one of the things that was taught. And we were greeted – each morning we had to greet our principal, "Bon joi, Madame" and curtsy a little. And I used to listen in on the people who were getting French lessons, so I picked up whatever I could. I loved studying languages; always did. So from there, I think in the fifth grade I went to public school. I hear a telephone.

INTERVIEWER: Let's stop until (inaudible at 0:02:01.1).

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Huh?

INTERVIEWER: Let's stop until – from that. Oh—

(Crosstalk)

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Okay.

INTERVIEWER: So when you were a child, did your family – what were your family expectations of you, and what were your own, did you have any goals? [0:02:16.9]

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Oh, yes, very high, I mean, we were expected to be good at school, get good grades, work hard. And actually, I say we – I had a brother five years younger, and he was brilliant, and he was a musician and so he got, you know, pushed to become the best that he could become. And it was assumed, you know, no question that we would go to college, never came up as a question. God, I had – my father's sister – sisters and – you know, my aunts and uncles – they were all in the New York education system. One was a principal of a school in Brooklyn, and they all taught and loved it. And I remember thinking, God, what a way to live. They had all their summers off and they all went to Europe in the summer. This was when nobody had money, so, you know, teaching was a great profession. And I suppose it pushed me in the direction of education and getting out to the world, getting out and seeing the world knowing all this.

My uncle would come back from Europe and bring me a little purse or a dress. And, you know, so it opened the world to us to have these people in the family. And is there anything else I should say along these lines?

INTERVIEWER: Well, did have any goals or, you know—

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: Aspirations yourself when you were a child?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Oh, yes, I wanted to learn everything there was to know in every book ever written. I was going to read my way through – and in those days you could really do that. You know, it was before the Internet, before all this proliferation. And that was my goal, I wanted to know everything there was to know. So I was motivated to be a student and a scholar I suppose. I didn't achieve any of that, sorry, edit that out.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, don't worry. How did growing up during the depression affect your studies?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Oh, it affected everything.

INTERVIEWER: You want to just start that with growing up in the depression affected – you know, include the word “the depression.”

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Growing up in the depression left its mark on everybody who lived through it. I know I hung on to everything I had so that you never knew when this dress or this pair of shoes was going to be, you know, something you would want. You didn't give things away; I didn't. I can feel my nose stuffing up, I'm sorry.

INTERVIEWER: You're still sounding fine.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Oh, yes, okay. Things were tight financially in our household. My mother's sister and brothers would periodically come and live with us, so that the scene in the bathroom in the morning always made me laugh when I thought back on it because my father would be in the shower, you know, behind a shower curtain. I don't know, somebody would be shaving at the sink, and another person would be brushing their teeth somewhere else. It was very crowded, and it was one of those old railroad flats – that there was a long hallway and rooms were off it. And every room was taken. And people would come because they had no place else to go and stay with us. [0:06:38.9]

And my father and mother never turned anybody away, so there were a lot of tight corners for them to handle. And I know my father was always putting – pawning things and, you know, trying to get them back – not trying – he would get them back. But it was tight, it was tough. And very different from the indulgent childhood that one sees around one now. I don't know, it was probably good for us. We appreciated what we had.

INTERVIEWER: What did your father do?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: My father was in advertising.

INTERVIEWER: Oh, okay.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: And that's how I got into – started working because when I was in college, on the vacation periods because of my father's connections, I would get little jobs at advertising agencies, coding and doing silly things like that. And to this day I remember the smell – my father would take me down to the agency that he was associated with – the Katz Agency and on a Sunday, the place would empty. And he would plunk me down in the – what do they call the room where they – the archives are, but they didn't call it archives – old newspapers. And I would have a feast. I would read all the old comics and I can still conger the smell of that room with its dead newspapers in it. It was really an unmistakable odor. Anyway, as far as career path, I went from in college, I was doing – during vacations I was doing interviewing and coding, and picking up a little bit of money that way even while I was in college. And then – I'll jump ahead now. When I graduated – that was in '43 of June – June of '43 – I didn't have any firm ideas of what I was going to do, but I wanted to get a job.

So I started going around to the advertising agencies, and I remember I – is the name Katz – Dan Katz or something like that familiar to you? I think that was his name. Anyway, I had an interview with – got an interview with him and he offered me a job. And I was very snooty, I didn't take it. It was with OWI or something like that. And so I

sort of continued my interviews, you know, trying to find people who knew people so that I could get an in and—

INTERVIEWER: What were you looking for? What did you want to be doing? What kind of job were you looking for?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Well, at that time I was looking for interviewing and research. I had no idea about sociology. I had never taken a course in sociology. The whole idea of sociology bored me. And I found it very dull, they were doing delinquency and – I don't know what they did – social work type studies at those days that didn't appeal to me at all. I was more interested in the overall international field. Anyway, long story short – I decided I would go up to Columbia and see Bob Lind (sp). Robert S. Lind (sp) was the man who wrote "Middle Town." He was the only name I knew in sociology. So I went up to Columbia one hot summer day into Fair Weather Hall – do you know Fair Weather Hall? It's the sociology department at Columbia. And I walked in and I was looking for Bob Lind (sp), and there was nobody in the building. And I was looking around and, you know, didn't know where to go.

And then there was a figure coming down from the upper story – upper floor, very good looking young man in a tweed jacket and, you know, leather patches on his sleeves, the typical professor. And he said – coming down the stairs he saw me there, he said, "Can I help you or anything." And I said – I looked at him and he looked like a graduate student and I said, "You, help me?" So I told him that I was looking for Lind (sp), and he said that Lind (sp) was on sabbatical or he was away for the summer. And he sort of offered his service to help me, and I looked at him very dubiously, he looked so young, good looking, pipe. So I said, "You," and then we started talking, and that was the day that Bob Murten (sp) hired me to work on the Kate Smith study – that was my first venture in research at Columbia. [0:12:42.0]

We talked for quite a while at the foot of the stairs there, and that's when he offered me the job right then and there for the next day. And I started the next day doing the interviews on the Kate Smith study, which were landmark interviews – I don't know whether you know that. Hey, historian back there – you know that.

INTERVIEWER: So what made that study a landmark study?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Well, the interviews were what we called or came to call depth interviews. They were probing for the underlying motivations in terms of what accounted for the behavior that they were reporting. And there were – we called it an interview guide where you had a general area that you wanted to explore, and then the interviewer sort of freelanced it. There weren't questions like yes, no, and maybe. It required reporting feelings and experiences. So that was something that hadn't been done before – at least as far as I know hadn't been because mostly, they were using survey type questions and answers with checkboxes. And these interviews ran – some of them I did ran three hours or longer. And then, you know, you have to go home and record the notes you took and transcribe it. And it was hard work for the interviewers. And the interesting

part for me in all this was that it took me into a world I didn't know at all. We got the names of the people who responded to Kate Smith's appeal to buy war bonds. And then we tracked them down and went and talked to them to find out what motivated them – how did they come – just come to her appeal?

And it got me into homes that I never would have gotten into. Places in the Bronx, in Brooklyn – I was in Brooklyn at one point tracking down a respondent. And I got lost, I didn't know where I was. So I knocked on the door and I said to the person who came to the door, "Where's the bus?" And the answer I got was, "The boss – he's upstairs asleep." It was a different language, it was a whole other world. And everything was covered in oil. You know what oilcloth is? Yeah – the tables were covered with oilcloth, chairs and sofas had oilcloth on them. That was not upper middle class New York, that was lower middle – middle, middle, lower middle, SES, socioeconomic status. And so I got into these homes and I met people and talked to them for hours. And they opened – they just talked and they adored Kate Smith, that's obvious. So it was easy to get wonderful material from them.

And the idea was you "probed," quote unquote. If somebody said something that sort of needed a little more explanation, you would follow it up with, "What do you mean and why did you say that" and so forth. And nobody had done interviews like this before. And Murten (sp) got the credit for all that when depth interviewing – and what else do they call it? Focused interviews came into the picture. And Paul Lazasfeld (sp) was the figure behind all this at Columbia. Did you come across that name?

INTERVIEWER: Oh, yes, we've heard it (inaudible at 0:16:55.4).

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: And I don't know whether anybody ever told you that he was called "Piffle," P-F-L – he signed everything P-F-L. So the staff called him "Piffle." Did you hear that? I don't know whether that should be spread around. So am I losing the track, where were we?

INTERVIEWER: Well, we're on the Kate Smith study, though, that was the beginning of your work at the Bureau – how long did you work at the Bureau for?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Oh, I left there in the 50's, I was sort of – we were all forced out because there wasn't any money. We weren't getting the grants that we had gotten earlier. And we just had to go and get jobs that would pay money. And that was when I sort of branched out into advertising research, which I spent a lot of time doing. But there too I was very fortunate because Herta (sp) Herzog (sp) was a figure at that time at McCann Erickson. And I was able to get carried along into that world. And that was an interesting one. My God, you would have thought that the world turned on McCann Erickson and what was it – Chesterfield Cigarettes. It was really horrible what we were doing, but it made money. [0:18:36.7]

INTERVIEWER: So what other kind of studies did you do when you were at the Bureau before you—

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: At the Bureau – some interesting things – one I remember during World War II this was. We did an analysis – a content analysis that was new too at that time. And I was very good at this sort of stuff – a content analysis of short stories in Collier’s and the popular magazines weekly – Saturday Evening Post and stuff. And we analyzed the characteristics of the heroes and the villains – the villains were always Italian, and the heroes were upright Anglo Saxon, you know? It was so, so what we wouldn’t allow now, but that’s what was there. And let’s see, what else – it sort of had an analytic slant because we were – some of us, you know, we’re sort of – wanting to make the world better. And so we were conscious of these stereotype – oh, I shouldn’t do that.

(Laughter)

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: We were conscious of the stereotype and what it did, you know, out in the greater world. So we were looking at things like that. And fortunately, there were people around in those days who wanted to sponsor – you know, were willing to pay for the research.

INTERVIEWER: What do you remember of the culture of the Bureau when you worked there?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Culture?

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: There was none, totally uncultured. It was very – men were at the top, women were nothing. And to prove this to you is the story I mentioned earlier. One day a bunch of us were in one of the offices, coding or making four-by-four tab at the tables. And Paul Lazasfeld (sp) bustled into the room and said – looked around and said, “Okay, we can come in here, there’s nobody here, nobody there.” Nobody here was four or five of us working, women, working doing coding, doing – making tables and taking percentages and things like that. “Nobody is here.” And that’s how we were, we were nobody. You won’t find my name, I don’t think, on anything that was produced at the Bureau at that time, but I was the best interviewer they had. You know, it’s just – you don’t count. It was a man’s world then.

INTERVIEWER: So did you not get any professional credit for the work you did there?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Not really, no. I don’t know, maybe, you know, somebody said to Bob that Joan was a bright student or something like that. But I don’t think you will find anything with my name on it. He’s nodding.

INTERVIEWER: How do you feel about that now?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Well, now it doesn’t matter. But I don’t know whether we were even – we weren’t marching in those days, you know, it was just, you were happy to have

a job, to make a dollar an hour, and that's what we were making in the early days. But that was how the world was, and you could scream at it, but it wasn't going to change it. So the Bureau was not a – and Columbia was horrible. As a graduate student we were – in fact, we went on strike even because the professors paid no attention – no mind to the graduate students. The idea of helping them or guiding them, never a kind word – it was rough. And as I say, we went on strike, not that it did any good, but—

INTERVIEWER: What was the strike for? What was the goal?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Huh?

INTERVIEWER: What was the goal of the strike?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Just to get them to pay some attention to us. (Inaudible at 0:23:45.5) really, you have no idea obviously, not the same anymore. I don't know, I suppose there are people who had wonderful experiences at Columbia, I just hated it, and most of my friends did too, and so did Thelma. You didn't hear any good stories, did you?

INTERVIEWER: Not yet.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: No – now the interesting thing is that in the – as time went on, Murten mellowed, he was very, very stiff in the original, early days. And he got very mellow, and when he would see us he would give us hugs and kisses, you know, this was when he was much older. And he valued knowing the people who had known him when he was younger. But, my God, it was not a good place to be if you were a woman. And it was not a good place to be if you were young, I guess, because you hadn't established yourself and nobody was going to pay any attention to you. And just see right through you, nobody is here. [0:25:10.8]

INTERVIEWER: I would have been infuriated.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Huh?

INTERVIEWER: That would have been very frustrating – I would have found it.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: So did the situation improve when you moved into the private world of advertising?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Yes, but it improved because Herta (sp) Herzog (sp) who was one of Paul Lazasfeld's (sp) earlier wives was at McCann Erickson. And they had a president who was very research oriented – Marion Harper was his name. He invested some of the company's money in developing a testing technique, so that the pre-testing of ads was validated. So that if you said, this ad is going to sell, you had proof that it was going to sell. And that made a big difference because we had a tool. And I'm sure Marion

Harper was a good salesman and sold a lot of studies for McCann Erickson on the basis of this validated technique. I remember there was stuff in the newspapers written about it and stuff. And then things looked up for those of us in the field as it were because people wanted us. And we had a way of getting in I suppose you could say.

The best time I had was at Public Opinion – PO – what was it called? It was Public Opinion Research. Elmo Wilson was the – Bud Wilson was the president of the company. And he set up a worldwide sort of public opinion research company with branches in Europe, Asia. He wanted it to cover the world. So I loved that because I would get questionnaires back in different languages, and I loved languages, and I liked playing with them. So I enjoyed that very much. And it would give you insights into the rest of the world, it wasn't just New York, Manhattan and the Bronx. Oh, I keep doing that.

INTERVIEWER: (Inaudible at 0:27:59.0). I don't know if we should—

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: It's tickling me.

INTERVIEWER: Oh, okay, yeah. Let's cut for a minute.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Roll.

(Laughter)

INTERVIEWER: All right, rolling.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Rolling – oh, the Eisenhower study – yes, that was very exciting because well, we had all this material. And I don't know, I think we had to fight in order to get permission to do it. It seems to me that Eisenhower's staff was being very protective – am I making this up or—

INTERVIEWER: No, no, actually, I just read that article you wrote this morning.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Oh.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, you're right, they were being very – in fact, you described to it – his aides is actually – military men who protected him from everybody.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Oh, yeah.

INTERVIEWER: But can you just rephrase that, and actually sort of tell us what the study was about? So (inaudible at 0:28:59.3).

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Yeah, well, this was in connection with, I forget which campaign – presidential campaign – '48 maybe. And there was a grassroots swelling of, "Let's run Eisenhower for president because he is clean, and he's..." everybody loves him and so forth. We're bound to win, I think was the idea. Oh, my, then we had to get



permission from Eisenhower's office's staff to get a look at the mail in order to do the analysis. Oh, here I go again. [0:29:51.6]

INTERVIEWER: So the study was – it was looking at—

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: What we wanted to do was analyze the things that people were saying in the mail, in their letters, and their petitions – they loved him, they wanted him to become the father of the country, just be there. And they poured their hearts and souls into some of these letters. And it was very moving to read them, and that, I think, is what captivated the analysts that we wanted to get closer to this material, and see what was behind it, and what the appeal of Eisenhower was based on and so forth. So that was the motivation of the research as I recall. And I think Murten had something to do with getting the approval of the Eisenhower people to do it. I'm not sure, but I think that's what happened. So we did get permission to do the study. And Lila (sp) Sussman (sp) – did you come across that name? She and I were working on that together. And the interesting part there is that over the years – as time went by and Lila (sp) and I had a falling out about what we wanted to do with the aftermath. And that's when we separated because she wanted to do a kind of traditional, I think, not sure – but I had this idea that there was something more behind the fact that that the Eisenhower office had cut us off and stopped the study, and taken the papers away from us.

I felt there was a story behind that, and that was the story that I was going after. And that's the one I wrote the article about. I still think it's a good story. So anyway, it was really a privilege, I think, to read these letters. They were right to not want other people to get their hands on them because people were so revealing of themselves in what drew them to Eisenhower, and made him their hero. I can't remember the term I came up with – well anyway, it's in the article – the one that – the Journal article.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, I have it, do you want to take a look at it?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: Let's cut for a sec.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: (Inaudible at 0:32:53.1).

INTERVIEWER: What was the comment on your experience actually being part of that study because you were one of the people who read the letters, right?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Yeah, I read all the letters.

INTERVIEWER: And then why you thought the study was suddenly pulled.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Well, that was always a matter of speculation.

INTERVIEWER: That's fine, speculation is fine. Are we rolling?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Well, everybody – no, not everybody. People at the Bureau just accepted that it was taken away from us, it was stopped dead unfinished. And nobody cared except me. And I sort of, you know, like the dog that won't let go of the rag or the biscuit or whatever. It kept bothering me that all this material was there, and it was stopped, and there was no explanation why, and why nobody even questioned why there was no explanation. It was part of the culture, I think, of the time that the higher echelons made all the decisions, pardon me. So but, you know, it's obvious from the timing of all this – ten years went by, twenty years went by, and nothing was done. And then I went back and started all over again trying to find out why it happened. And Lila fought me on that too, she didn't want to do that. She wanted to just do a sort of standard rehash of the – and I think maybe recast it in more current sociological terms. But I felt, you know, there was a real reason for this – political reason. And I think I came up with one. I'm not sure I can reconstruct it now, but—

INTERVIEWER: So can you tell us about your theory of the – the clash of the sub-cultural parallax?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Yeah, that's what—

INTERVIEWER: Can you use the phrase?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: A sub-cultural parallax – it was really a culture clash between the culture of what the administration – the political scene and the academic or the person who wants to find the truth. And that's what I was after. I don't know, maybe you think I didn't find it, but I think I did. [0:35:56.3]

INTERVIEWER: Seems like a good theory to me.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: How was the paper received when you wrote the – when you—

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Nobody ever said a word. And it wouldn't have gotten published if Murten hadn't been behind it. It's his journal that published it. And he backed me – it was just really very touching that he stood beside me and sort of hand on my elbow, you know, supporting it. And I was very grateful to him for that. And that all came about through the mellowness of older age, both his and mine.

INTERVIEWER: What was it like working for him in your younger years?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Oh, scary, I had never opened my mouth in a seminar or anything. I was just – he was so bright and he knew so much, and I didn't know anything. And I wasn't even a sociology major. So I just was very shy and stayed very low profile except when I got on to something that I really believed in, and then I stuck it out. When I was at Columbia I heard about this brilliant Herbert Goldhammer – everybody admired

him so, and I was absolutely tongue tied in front of him. I met him socially and I didn't want to say a word. I was sure I would pull a boo-boo or something terrible. So I wasn't used to, you know, swimming in those waters.

Working on the study – on the mail study I was quite at home because I knew how to analyze qualitative materials – that was my forte and so that was fun. And Lila and I had good rapport on doing the analysis – you know, the original analysis of the mail. It came easily to both of us. And I think there was some interesting stuff in there, I can't remember what it was, but the letters were very revealing of how people felt about Eisenhower, and their admiration and their trust. They really felt he would never lie, maybe because he was an American soldier. I don't know. It was a very different time. And people weren't afraid to put their faith in things, which I think is more a problem these days. Is there anything in the letter summary that you were particularly interested in?

INTERVIEWER: I was just interested in the whole – your whole idea of what had gone on, and why the subject – why the story had been – or the study had been pulled.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Well, you know, that was, you know, something I didn't really come to until forty years later, why it had been pulled. But nobody wanted to talk about it – that was the thing that I couldn't understand – why did nobody at the Bureau peep or raise a question. They just accepted it, rolled over and I still don't understand that. I mean, I understand it now in terms of my own hypothesis, but really strange behavior. It seems to me, you know, that in the academic there was always a protest – a voice of protest that people would question why decisions were made, but not in that case. And I think it's because Eisenhower was a general and, you know, he had a lot of clout. And they may have just been scared into silence.

INTERVIEWER: Um-hmm.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: I would be willing to listen to anybody who had a theory on that.

INTERVIEWER: Okay. All right, well, let's go back – that was good. (Inaudible at 0:40:39.0), right?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: What?

INTERVIEWER: I think we've done the Eisenhower (inaudible at 0:40:41.2).

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Okay, right. [0:40:42.5]

INTERVIEWER: Let's go back to the Kate Smith study because we – you were just talking with Pete in the kitchen about the types of interviews you did. And how so many of the interviews were with women.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Oh, yeah.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, so can you elaborate on that a little bit? What your experience—

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Well, as you pointed out earlier, the whole field was dominated by women when we were there. I don't know why – the professors were men. They didn't go out and do the interviews. I think they used women interviewers because most of the respondents – people who responded to Kate Smith were women. And maybe that sort of slanted the people they chose to do the interviewing as a result. Certainly rapport was not a problem in those days. People actually – I think people were much more open and willing to answer the doorbell and let whoever was there in, which you wouldn't find nowadays. There was more generosity and sharing. I really don't know. Certainly the rungs up the ladder in research were not more open to women than – it was a struggle too. But one of the things that helped was Herta Herzog at McCann Erickson because she was – well, Marion Harper who was the president of McCann Erickson was a very research oriented person. And he – I think I said this before – he sponsored this validation technique for validating the results of the research. I think that opened some doors for women, but it was still a struggle, nobody wanted us.

INTERVIEWER: Did you feel that the struggle was in getting the jobs or getting recognition or credit or doing – or advancing up the career ladder?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Well, advancing up the ladder certainly, yeah. I was – forgot all about this. I was hired by McCann this was to go to Europe to Germany to train some interviewers – cigarettes – it was a cigarette study in Germany. There was a big client – I've forgotten the name of the company that was involved. And I was supposed to go and train some interviewers there on motivation analysis – their motivation studies was before they had zeroed in on – what's the kind of study that Murten got credit for?

INTERVIEWER 2: Focused interviews?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Focused, yes – thank you. Before they zeroed in on that we called it motivation research. And I was hired to go to Germany and train a bunch of interviewers at a German advertising agency on motivation research. Okay, I sublet my apartment, I bought clothes that were appropriate for this job. And the night before I was to leave, I got a telephone call at home from a vice president of McCann Erickson, and he said, "Sorry, the job is off, it's been canceled – they're not going to do it. That's the way the cookie crumbles" said he to me. No we will reimburse you for the apartment – we will do this, nothing, that's the way the cookie crumbles. And they weren't going to do anything to, you know, compensate me for what they had done to my life. And then I didn't have a job either.

So there was a lower level man at McCann who liked me. And he managed to get the money to send me for a week of vacation in Bermuda as recovery from this blow that they had made. I just couldn't believe it – that, you know, somebody cared because

otherwise, it was just too bad, that's the way the cookie crumbles. Everybody around me knew that phrase.

INTERVIEWER: So when you said that the advertising world was just as problematic for you or just as challenging as—

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Oh, sure, yeah, it wasn't that the academic was harder, they had less money. But no, I don't think it was a difference between commercial and academic in that case. It was just the way the cookie crumbles. Well—

INTERVIEWER: Then you moved on to the Rand Corporation?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: What?

INTERVIEWER: Then you moved on to the Rand Corporation?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: And what did you do at Rand?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: I got in the side door. I don't think they ever would have hired me if I had applied for a job, but they got me as a package deal with Herb. And I started out helping him behind the scenes, you know, not being paid or anything – working on studies that he was doing, and doing the groundwork. But it was really interesting to me, and it also gave me access to the fact that I could go to Rand and sit in on seminars that they were having, staff meetings, and that was exciting for me because it opened up another world for me. [0:47:58.1]

INTERVIEWER: So what kind of studies did they do there or what kind of studies were you involved there? And could you say at the Rand Corporation?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: The Rand Corporation was mostly about the military and political studies. Herb was involved in a lot of classified work, and I never knew what he was working on. I mean, they couldn't tell me. I might do a interview on – you know, go and talk to so and so at the something foundation, and do an interview on something, but it would be peripheral stuff, it wouldn't be anything classified. And eventually, they let me do, you know, something by myself. So I became a sort of exoficiary (sp) staff member – if you want to call it that. And I can't say I made any huge contributions to Rand because they were all so bright and so smart. But the one thing I did that I really enjoyed, and felt what was a contribution was the oral history interviews I did with some of the early people from Rand who were still around and able to talk.

And I did – but more or less the sort of thing you're doing now with, I think, we got – before we were cut off by the administration – I think we may have gotten ten interviews, but these were with key people at the very beginning of Rand. And that was so exciting to listen to because the enthusiasm that permeated their work and their commitment to it

was just contagious. And you could hear it in the interviews. You should read those sometime, they're in the archive at Rand. I mean, they are accessible, it's just that nobody pays any attention to them. And I was talking recently to Andy Marshall – I don't know whether that name means anything to you, but he was – he's (inaudible at 0:50:19.2) if you are familiar with that phrase. And he's still at Rand and I think probably an advisory capacity these days. But just listening to him and his colleagues talk about Rand in the early days is inspirational.

And so some of us have said, "Why can't we reconstruct it, why can't we produce this again?" And that is something I would do – I would go to Rand tomorrow and work on that if we could do it – if somebody would fund it. Analyze what it was that made Rand so special and produced so much so quickly. And if you could identify those components and put them back in the – to work, it might – I don't know – times have changed and so probably it wouldn't work again. But it's inspirational to read those interviews, I think.

INTERVIEWER: So would you say when you look back at all the different kinds of positions you held – was that your favorite place to work or where did you do the most meaningful work? Why do you think that you really—

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Well, I would put that analysis as the – it's an unfinished business. I mean, I did the interviews, but we never got the chance to do any analysis. And that's sort of like unfinished business in my mind because we were all set to do an analysis, and the funds were cut off. And that was Rand administration that cut us off. Who was the president then? It was somebody who didn't really care about finding out what made it special, you know? That was too academic a thing. What they really were interested is stopping the war or starting a war – I don't know. There wasn't anybody in the administration at that point who cared enough to fight for continuation. There was somebody named Jim Digby (sp) who was one of the early Rand people. And let's see, he was on our team and one of the vice presidents – I forget his name, Gus Schubert (sp) and some of the – a few of the old timers understood what the potential was there, but they didn't have the clout to get us money to do any of the analysis, so it never happened. Well, boo-hoo. [0:53:14.3]

INTERVIEWER: Okay, well, that's – I want to ask you some general questions about, you know, how you feel about looking back on, you know, your sort of whole body of work now.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Yeah, it's a very scattered body – pieces all over the place.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, yeah, you know, you mentioned a number of challenges you had working as a woman, and essentially sort of – the Bureau was a culture that was dominated by men. And advertising was perhaps slightly better, but not much. And then at the Rand – because you were working with your husband, he was sort of, I guess, getting the credit for the work, and you were basically his assistant?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: So do you think, you know – do you think being married to an academic – another academic in your field helped you in your career or do you think it hindered you? Or was it sort of a bit of – when you look back at it?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Well, if not for Herb I wouldn't be here today. You wouldn't be interviewing me because I would have been buried as a non-entity probably. I don't know, it's a guess. Maybe I would have made enough noise to penetrate a little. I certainly profited from being exposed to a lot of very bright people, really outstanding. Nathan Litus (sp), Andy Marshall, the whole bunch of them. All major figures in the – this is now in the Rand culture – they weren't registered necessarily high on the advertising side. And I learned a lot just from listening. And at dinner parties, my God, the people who turned up at those – what's his name, Kissinger. And I can't even remember all the names. You've heard of Kissinger. Oh, that was funny, Herb wrote a book called "The Advisor" about the role of the political advisor in history, going all the way back to ancient China. And this was at the time when Kissinger was in the news a lot.

And I thought, oh, what perfect timing, you know, maybe we could get a ride on the adviser that Kissinger is – you know, the major figure he was turning out to be, and get some books sales out of it. I got absolutely nowhere, absolutely nowhere on that. Nobody wanted to push the book. I mean, how stupid can you be? It was an (inaudible at 0:56:30.5) publication. They are a major erudite house, and I all I wanted to do was get Simon and Schuster to put some of the books in their window, you know, that sort of thing. I got no help at all, it was so frustrating. It would have been a natural, nothing happened. So I was always fighting little skirmishes with the establishment. That's a great book – that book called, "The Advisor." It's full of gems of the ancient Chinese and the modern day advisors, and so forth and so on. Lots of nuggets in there. I was very proud of that book. I mean, I didn't write the text, but I got it out.

And the other thing that I was very proud of was the editing – I did a lot of editing of other people's manuscripts. Incidentally, that was one of my role models when I was growing up, was an aunt who was an editor at Prentiss Hall – you know, the company. And I always thought it was funny that I ended up doing so much editing. That isn't what I started to say. [0:58:14.4]

INTERVIEWER: Well, the projects or the things that you are most proud of.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Oh, yeah, Herb was sent as an advisor to the pan mon jong (sp) negotiations for truth in Korea. Do you know about that – in the 50's? And when he came back somebody stuck a recording device – I've forgotten what they were called in those days.

INTERVIEWER: The reel to reel tape recorders?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Was not a tape—

INTERVIEWER: (Inaudible at 0:58:52.7).

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Huh?

INTERVIEWER: (Inaudible at 0:58:53.9)? Like a audio tape recorder?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Yeah, an audio tape.

INTERVIEWER: Reel to reel.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Reel to reel – but it had a special name. Anyway, it’s all written down. And he talked into that machine about the experiences he had as an – a fly on the wall during the negotiations. He was an advisor, but he was also a listener. And he talked into this little ha, ha, ha, ha – I want to (inaudible at 0:59:34.6) machine, but it isn’t. I don’t know – he talked into this device and it did get transcribed, but nothing ever happened to it. And it was classified, I couldn’t even read it for years and get my hands on it. But I knew it existed. And eventually, you know, like twenty, twenty-five, thirty years later they cleared it for – you could get access to it.

So that’s when I took it and I decided to edit it for publication. And I got permission to do that. And that’s one of the things I was most gratified having got done because it made this period alive – the transcript is full of funny and odd and entertaining things. Herb’s observations of some of the personalities involved in the negotiations, the quirks of the advisors, and the advisors to the advisors, and so forth and so on. So it made a very, to me, entertaining piece. And that’s – I know it’s in the other room. So that’s available for reading. I recommend it.

INTERVIEWER: (Inaudible at 1:00:59.2)?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Huh?

INTERVIEWER: What it’s called?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: “The Korean Armistice Negotiations – A Personal Memoir,” I think, because that’s what it was. I mean, that was Herb’s personal memoir. And he was free to say anything he wanted to, so it was uncensored and entertaining too, I think. But these are the kinds of things that you cherish, you know, the unpublished manuscripts that really give you the flavor of what would go on in negotiations. That’s fun. Well, I said—

INTERVIEWER: Yeah, I was going to say (inaudible at 1:01:45.9).

(Audio Gap)

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Well, anyway, that’s my favorite document because it’s so alive and so fresh and so of the moment. That, you know, it’s not dusty old memoirs, it’s alive



and full of exasperation at some of the stupidity that was imposed on the people who were recording it. Anyway, I recommend it just for fun, you don't have to make a thing about it. It's not relevant to what you're doing at the moment, this. [1:02:54.3]

INTERVIEWER 2: No, but it sounds fascinating.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: It is in my opinion. And nobody has ever done anything with it really. Yeah, Ernest May (sp) – he tried to do something with it. Well, anyway, we tried to get it published by – as a more formal way, but it never happened.

INTERVIEWER 2: Well, let me ask you a couple of more questions just to follow up on things I was very interested in. So you said that you thought you were the best interviewer or one of the better interviewers at the Bureau?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: I was told that. Somebody said – quoted Murten as having said that about me. I did remember that.

INTERVIEWER: Can you rephrase that, so you actually give us the quote that somebody said?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Somebody told me that Murten or somebody had said that I was the best interviewer at the Bureau for this kind of probing, depth interviewing. That's what we called it, depth interviewing, that I was the best one. And that, you know, I think the reason for that is I did long interviews. I just got to know the people, you know, and they opened up to me and told me things. Maybe things I didn't even ask, but the rapport was there, and they were free to talk and they did. And I copied everything down, I wrote everything down, and then transcribed it. Oh, my God, hours and hours.

INTERVIEWER 2: So did you take shorthand?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: No, I did my own kind of shorthand, you know, abbreviation. I should look around, I might even have some of the original stuff in my files.

INTERVIEWER 2: So tell me what you think you did well to get good interviews. What was the secret?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Just not letting go of the topic, following it, you know.

INTERVIEWER 2: Can you start out by saying, I think a good interview was or I think my talent as an interviewer or something?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: I think one of the things that made my interviews good was the rapport that I was able to establish with the respondent. However I did it, that made them feel free – they could talk and tell me things that they felt – that they – feeling things, you know, not just verbalization. I think I got a lot out of people from that point of view. And then just staying alert and sensitive to where the conversation might – where you can

point. Not just say uh-huh and then what happened, and tell me more about that. And why do you think that's so. Oh, one of things – in the – I told you we had this validated technique for testing – pre-testing ads at McCann Erickson. And one of the things we would do – we show a couple of ads and then say, you know, “Would this ad make you want to do whatever it said you should do?” “What makes you say that?” “Anything else,” I mean, “Anything else that makes you say that?” “Why do you think that is?” Things – more and more questions, not leaving the subject in other words, but continuing to poke around behind and below and above it. [1:07:15.5]

INTERVIEWER 2: And—

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: But that was all part of the interviewing technique that we developed at the Bureau. And that was Murten I think. I don't know.

INTERVIEWER 2: You told us about a memory of going into Brooklyn when you were doing an interview. Are there other interviews that stand out or people that you can remember?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Well, the guy who said, “The boss is upstairs asleep.” Never forget him. I did get lost in the cornfields of Brooklyn, if you believe me or not. But they had cornfields – I was at the end of a bus line. And I don't know. I'm sure there were lots of other things that are in my head somewhere, but I'm not sure I can get my hands on them, though.

INTERVIEWER 2: No, that's fine. What did it feel like to be working on the Kate Smith study?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: It was exciting. It was like getting behind the scenes of a Hollywood movie. You were invited – at least I was, into homes that I never would have gotten into otherwise. Not that they were Hollywood homes or anything like that, but people I just never would have met, encountered. And I was going to public schools all my life, you know? And yet, it was a whole other world. It was interesting.

INTERVIEWER 2: And what do you think – what were the women at the Bureau contributing during those years? What do you think their roles were?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Well, they were the women who were having affairs. And I don't have any idea of what was going on with them, but I heard, you know, that there was a lot of stuff going on between some of the faculty and the women. But I never encountered it. I was too young and innocent. I was one of the younger people, believe it or not, at that time and very innocent. So I had heard about all the jumping in and out of bed. Murten and what's his name, Ted (inaudible at 1:10:05.3) and all the other – Cornhowser (sp) – people whose names, you know, were legion. But I didn't have any such experiences. I was out of the loop. Not that I wouldn't have liked to be in it, it's just that I was just not a candidate. And Thelma's experience must be very different because she was – wasn't she a wife at that point?

INTERVIEWER 2: I think about '47 she got married.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Oh, '47, so, but I mean, she was more part of the faculty than I ever was. I never was one of the faculty.

INTERVIEWER 2: And I guess maybe the last question is – as you look back on your experience at the Bureau, how do you think that advanced your career or didn't advance your career? What was the impact?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Well, it just flowed, one thing led to another. I mean, I moved from interviewer at the Bureau to IPOR, I think, was the next place I went, International Public Opinion Research, which then became INRA, International Research Associates. And that was a wonderful – that was fun. That was with Elma (sp) Ropa (sp) – not Elma Ropa, Bud Wilson. Bud Wilson's shop was really good. That's where Thelma and I shared an office for quite a long time. That was in the Empire State Building. And that was funny. We were on the 81<sup>st</sup> Floor, I think it was of the Empire State Building. And when the wind blew the building rocked, really did. [1:12:24.2]

And one day I was sitting at my desk, it was wintertime. Oh, we had leased some space on a lower floor because we overflowed our quarters. And we had looped some kind of wiring so that we could talk between the floors privately. You know, from one office to another. And I was sitting at my desk, and on the 81<sup>st</sup> Floor there was a setback, so that it was sort of a – not a balcony, but you could walk on the 81<sup>st</sup> Floor out of doors. And I was sitting there having lunch I think, and I looked up and there outside my window were two men, hats, scarves, gloves, mufflers, it was cold, wintertime. And they had gone for a walk on their lunch hour out on the 81<sup>st</sup> Floor of the Empire State Building. I thought that was just a kick. So there were these benefits – why did I tell you that story, I don't remember how I got there.

INTERVIEWER 2: Let's see, you were talking about what doors the Bureau opened for you.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Oh, yeah, so okay, I went from – the Bureau couldn't support us any longer. And so we were sort of cast out, and then that was when Herta took some of us in. And that was interesting because that was like when we got, like, the cigarette study I was supposed to do in Germany, and didn't happen. But anyway, so we got into the world of commercial research. And then what happened? Each step prepared me for the next one is all I can say. And then I met Herb, and I got absorbed into the Rand world where I am today.

INTERVIEWER 2: Well, thanks—

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: With still work undone. I'm serious – if anybody wants to support some more research. No, it would be all those people we never got to interview, the oral histories from – there's still a few of them alive. And it would be wonderful to

get them on tape. I don't know how many of them are still capable of putting sentences together.

INTERVIEWER: I have one more question. The question we have asked everybody that we talked to, but—

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: You have asked or you haven't?

INTERVIEWER: We haven't asked it, but how do you feel that World War II affected your – you know, you talked about growing up during the depression, and how tight things were. Well, when World War II came along, you were an undergraduate at that time or—

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Yeah, I was at – yeah, I guess I was at Michigan – yeah, I remember that's because – that's how I started studying Russian because Michigan had an immersion program for Russian. You know, they sent ASTP, do you know what ASTP means? Well anyway, it was a special immersion language program that the army sent soldiers to. And Michigan was one of the places they had it for Russian. And so it was open to students who wanted to, I guess, audit – I don't think we got credit for it. So I took that – I was wonderful, I still know some of the songs we learned. [1:16:15.4]

And as a matter of fact, one of the caretakers of the aides that was sent to me, you know, when I had to hire people to help me go to the bathroom and stuff when I broke my wrist. Do you know anything about that? I was wired for a broken wrist this past year. Now why did I start that?

INTERVIEWER: The Russian.

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Yeah, Russian – so one of the aides who was sent to me is Russian. And loveliest person I've met in years. She's been here about six years, and she's a nurse – I mean, she was trained as a nurse in Russia. We would drive – we do drive in the car singing Russian songs because I still remember some of the songs I learned as part of that Russian program at the University of Michigan. It was great. Well, totally irrelevant.

INTERVIEWER 2: So how World War II affected—

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Yeah, so I was at Michigan when it started, and it led me to study Russian. And I would also ride the Fifth Avenue bus and eavesdrop on all the Russian conversations I would hear among the passengers who were – oh, legion in New York during World War II. And I guess there was the OWI and sort of the beginnings of not security research, but research into the psyche of the enemy. So that was sort of an opening, a new area to explore.

INTERVIEWER 2: Did you do some of that?

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: I'm just trying to remember. I know I did some of it, but I can't remember what. But it was all very peripheral and not very useful I think. I remember feeling very frustrated that the way they were doing research was not right. It wasn't getting at the essentials and too superficial, and so forth and so on. But I can't think of a particular study that made me say that. Just general disaffection with the way things were going I guess.

INTERVIEWER 2: Do you have anything else now?

INTERVIEWER: You know, you said that you were a person who sort of got into a lot of scraps or your—

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: What?

INTERVIEWER: You said that you were a person who got into a kind of a lot of scraps. You were always the person who was asking questions, do you think of yourself that way now when you look back at your career, that you were sort of a bit of a rabble rouser or—

JOAN GOLDHAMMER: Not really, no, I think I was very docile, maybe not, I don't know. Ask somebody else. I couldn't answer that. Not a rabble rouser, but I was never satisfied with the way things were. I left Hunter College at the end of my first year because I couldn't stand it. It wasn't giving me what I wanted, which was really substantive material to dig my teeth into. And they were saying, "Go home and read pages eight to twelve." That was the assignment. This was awful. I had been in an experimental program at my high school. That was Julia Richmond High School in New York City. [1:20:39.1]

They called it the "country school" because it was a small segment of the school population, and we were treated like college students. We were given an assignment for the semester, go do it, write a paper, do whatever it was. And then when I got to Columbia – to Hunter College, they told me to go read pages two to sixteen for my assignment. And I just couldn't take it, so I left. I went into the dean's office and said, "I'm not coming back," and she said, "Oh, my dear, we're sorry to hear that. Where are you going? What are you planning to do?" "I have no idea, I just know I'm not coming back." So I quit, I mean, I left. And then I had to find a place to go, and I spent summer applying to various colleges around the country hoping for a scholarship, which I never got.

And I ended up at the University of Michigan because they gave me more credit for the work I had done thus far, and I wouldn't have to start all over again from scratch. And I got into an experimental program there. So I was always seeking. And the program I got into was an experimental program based on the British tutorial system. And that was – I thought it was great because I got credits for four points for just being in the program – I mean, taking what I was taking. And then I could do anything else I wanted, take courses like Scandinavian literature, you know, whatever appealed. But I didn't get any education. I never learned anything. And the man I had as my tutor – because each one

was assigned a tutor was an anthropologist who was sort of nutty. I mean, he didn't have any real training in any discipline, and he was no help to me at all in terms of guiding me. And he was my tutor. So I tutored my way out of Ann Arbor that way studying – he was an anthropologist (inaudible at 1:23:15.5) I remember his name.

And he had a diagram like this – food, sex and something. Those were the building blocks of society, and that was all I learned from him. Of course I adored him, I thought he was wonderful. But it didn't prepare me for anything. So then I was thrown out into the world, and started looking for a job, and that was how I – Dan Katz offered me something and I didn't want that. And then somebody else offered me – and I ended up with Murten at the foot of Fair Weather Hall. Thank God for him. So end of story.

INTERVIEWER 2: Well, that's a great spot to start or to stop. It started—

**END TRANSCRIPT**