An Oral History of

STANLEY CHODOROW and JOSEPH R. GUSFIELD

On August 5, 1998

CHODOROW: —with me. Because I came that same that year.

GUSFIELD: By the time I actually came to take up residence Bill [William] McGill had been chancellor.

CHODOROW: Let me just explain that very briefly. What we're doing is trying to recapture as much as you can from your memory your experience of coming here. But more importantly, your intellectual needs. And the way you read your—the way your discipline was going at the time is how you wanted to build a great department here in the face of what you understood to be the general trends and character and difficulties within your discipline. And the how your earlier recruitments—how you gathered people here—how that affected both your successes and failures that kept you from the original visions that you had. That is the type of discussion we'd like to have. And then you will follow it up with anything you want to say about the department and it's relation to other departments, for example. Political science, anthropology, economics, whatever—however those things worked out. So why don't you start.

GUSFIELD: Let me go back to where I was before I got recruited. I've been at the University of Illinois for about twelve years. And Champaign-Urbana was not exactly the best—pleasant place to live. It's flat and there's not much in there that's cultural. The department was one which in general had a reputation for good people who then left, for one reason or another. And that was happening. I felt that I was in a rut. And I had actually—let's see, in '62,'63—gone to India on a Fulbright. That had a big effect on me. I'd forgotten now how I actually came to UCSD [University of California, San Diego] the first time. I had been playing footsie in many ways with California, which was very attractive as a place to live. And I had been recruited at Riverside [University of California, Riverside] which I had turned down because it was a small town again. And they were in process of trying to move from a good undergraduate college to a graduate center, which I felt was a mistake anyway because it was a very good undergraduate college—but even though it was part of the University of California system. But I turned that down. Then I was recruited again at [University of California,] Santa Barbara. And that was kind of appealing, I must admit. The then dean of liberal arts at the University of Illinois, an old friend of mine from Political Science named Jack Peltason had just accepted position as vice-chancellor at

[University of California,] Irvine. And I remember him saying to me—we'll had a response to this offer in twenty four hours—that's something that can't do it at the University of California. He was right about that. But at any rate, I felt that even they offered and I had a good position, I wasn't that much attracted by living in Santa Barbara. Again, it was a small place. But San Diego came up—that did attract me. But again, I was a little bit hesitant. It was a new place and I didn't know quite what I was getting myself into. And I came out, looked at it, and ultimately, I turned it down, although very ambivalently.

CHODOROW: Do you remember what year?

GUSFIELD: 1966 or early '67. And in '67 we went to Japan for six months on an exchange professorship. And while I was in Japan, they called me again and asked me was I interested. And at that time, I was interested. Some extent, there was some altercations inside our department, you know how things always happen. And they weren't that serious, though. And I was still ambivalent about moving to UCSD, but I was much more inclined to move, attracted by two things. Attracted by Southern California and the climate, and the thought of being in a bigger city than Santa Barbara or Champaign-Urbana or Riverside. And the other thing of course was just simply the notion of having a new department that wanted to take shape. I thought I could shape it. I think I did. But at any rate, it was more appealing. My wife and myself and my daughter— My son and my other daughter only came to visit at the time— We came out on our way back from Japan. On our way back from Japan, I stopped at Hawaii both because I used to stop there and I had now been referred to the summit meeting. We were both trying to decide what should we do. And we sort of clicked. That, too, was a good beginning. So, by the time I came to look at UCSD again, I was much more inclined to accept the offer, which I did. That would have been January of '69. January of '68, not '69. And started to work towards building a department. The question was, what kind of department? Sociology at that time was undergoing— here I'm a little bit affected by a recent manuscript I read from the University of Chicago Press, which deals with the history of the *American Journal of Sociology* on general aspects of American history of sociology.

CHODOROW: Do you remember the author?

GUSFIELD: Yeah! Anthony Abbott, he's at the University of Chicago. I forgotten what he calls the thing, but it's a manuscript. It took a long time for it to get published. At any rate, what he was recounting there was things that I had been talking about. Also, I had occasion to reflect on

the whole field. About three years ago, a sociologist—not Northwestern—in Georgia, named Gary Alan Fine brought up a collection of essays by various people called, A Second Chicago School? Now this is perfect to what I'm talking about. The field often refers to the Chicago School, because the end of the Chicago department where I was a graduate student was undoubtedly the world's dominant department for a long time. And I was not only a reader on this manuscript that I'm talking about—that Gary used here— I wrote the introduction to it. The introduction was a supplication to—contemplated, talk about the history of sociology, post-war, post-World War II. It had gone through a series of changes, which in some respects lift the University of Chicago's position at the department. The second Chicago school that Gary refers to is my generation of people. Modestly including myself, was this another group of very influential sociologists, of whom Erving Goffman is probably most influential, Howard Becker. Chicago was then going through a sense of being beleaguered because sociology had swung towards Columbia [University], and towards Harvard [University]. And yet there was a great interest in serving work, in quantitative work in Columbia—at Columbia. Serving research particularly under Paul Lazarsfeld. And at Harvard, particularly under Talcott Parsons, with an interest in a more formal kind of theory. I had come out of both school in University of Chicago time. And I also taught at the college in Chicago, and the orientation of the department at Chicago was far more qualitative, far more field-oriented, far more closer to social anthropology and looked with askance at quantitative work. The college where I had been a part of, which had a great influence on me, both as a student and later as a faculty member— Because I had been on a staff, of intensely highly capable people, who were probably the best resource.

CHODOROW: Oh, yeah. They all look at the qualities—

GUSFIELD: But I don't know whether other people like Lew [Lewis] Coser, or Phil [Philip] Rieff — Phil Rieff he will know, of course. The orientation—that was far more intellectualistic, Far more vitalist [sp?]. All micro-research oriented. So, I came out of a background also that was more humanistic, influenced by reading Kenneth Westhues, for example. And influenced in turn by instructors who were really in opposition of what was becoming dominant trends in sociology. Mainly quantitative abstract theory. Which we all kind of looked at as a dead end. And by the sixties, the whole tenure I thought of intellectual life for me was changing, in the sense that there was all kinds of new ideas emerging. Although this has no direct reference on the department— [Noam] Chomsky's work in linguistics, [Claude] Lévi-Strauss' work – while I was in Japan, I read Lévi-Strauss' work. It's just a whole different way of switching the movie really from what you would think of as the framework of science, which looks for variables and looks for external

elements operating the individual, to move much more towards the subjective partition, in terms of the agent or the person having any—some kind of interaction. Some that there were— Later on would call the emphasis on language began to emerge which I had largely through the impact that the philosopher George Herbert Mead on the University of Chicago department. So that I had been originally very much interested in literature. So that my orientations were more humanistic than it's true in sociology in general. And they were more oriented towards seeing something other than the kind of framework derived from physics and chemistry. And I was open to it. At the same time, shortly before I organized the department, the thought of it became exposed to what would have been the ethnomethodological paradox. That is, the notion that the frames the people see, the meanings that they get, that to some extent they are conscious of from a logic stance. Their own making to a degree, it is the society that decides. This fit in very well, I thought. The emphasis on the symbols, symbolism. And I had written a book in 1963 which I [*inaudible]* tempers me. Which essentially argued for what I would call a symbolic deception of a lot of public behavior. That is, that a great a deal of the behavior that occurred in public and politics, while seemingly foolish or purely symbolic is the turning point. In many ways, it was enacting out drama that was important because it demonstrated what the dominant cultures were. Didn't affect behavior as such, but it had meanings in terms of what was dominant, what was not dominant. What was it you could say publicly, or what was it you couldn't say publicly. I'm now writing this stuff expanded to an extent. Anyhow, since I was very open to the Ethnomethodologists. Particularly, well the work of a man who was dead by then. [Alfred] Schütz. German. Alfred Schütz, a philosopher and sociologist, and kid of a disciple of his, Harold Garfinkel, at UCLA [University of California, Los Angeles]. And I picked up a book called *The Social Meanings of Suicide*, by Jack Douglas, which was very much in this field. And so that I was very open to doing something which on the one hand would maintain the more humanistic or— I don't want to say philosophical, but more rounded, immediate, field-oriented situational. That was then typical of sociology and I was getting in the swing of it. And at the same time of interest of language, my only work had been historical memories — So I was interested in a department that was for its time different. And I found here when I came, people who were then kind of instrument gained Jack [Douglas], who was—I don't know—chair of history or chair of recruitment committee.

CHODOROW: Yeah. I think he chaired a recruitment committee

GUSFIELD: The school was so small that they had social science recruited. Every time there was a party for anybody at any department, we all went, we all came. And the man who was

head of the committee on academic personnel [*inaudible*], believe it or not. And so, there was a lot of ferment going on. People were very— One thing they didn't want that was very plain to me—they didn’t wat the department to be like every other - they didn't want the balance that existed at UCLA, you have a little of this, a little of that. They didn't want [University of California,] Berkeley. And so, they had— Their negative references were all very much my standpoint.

CHODOROW: Where was Berkeley at that time when this whole tradition—?

GUSFIELD: Confusing. For one thing, Berkeley was going through a great— At that time, '68, an immense political crisis. The whole campus was, well all campuses were, but Berkeley more so than others. Indeed, I had the possibility of recruiting Reinhard Bendix, because Reinhard had a bad heart, he couldn't take the crises. He was dead set against it the whole time—the radical orientation. And he wanted out of the department. He couldn't leave the University of California because he had spent too many years here as far as retirement was concerned. He didn't want to leave California, so he was very interested. But then political science at Berkeley made him an offer. At any rate, there was always that possibility. But I knew that the department I wanted would be a different kind of department. More shaped in my own [*inaudible*]. I did not want the department to become overrun by statistics. What happens in so many departments— Because statistics involve a different mode of thinking—more deductive. Because equations scare non-mathematicians often—not always, but often. It tends to take over in the sense that it becomes the hardest course that many of the students have, so they're spending most of their time and investments. Once they know it, they have to use it. The time and investment in something from my standpoint had created chaos. That worked. So, I wanted to start a department that did not have a quantitative framework. We had to give away some of ours, but not for a long time. Well, I wanted the emphasis to be on field work on social linguistics, language, history, and I wanted to assemble people that consequently be opened to that.

CHODOROW: How did the science faculty see this—going away with quantitative-?

GUSFIELD: To be frank with you, I don't think the science faculty cared. Some of them felt that this was a mistake. That social science should be science. Others felt that was crazy. Social science could not be science, and they were consequently more open to it. But I would say in general, they were indifferent. Also, the thing about the sciences was that they had built up on generally California campuses. There were a lot of people on soft money. That is, they

had professors—full professors on soft money. A couple of years before I came—what the hell was his name? It's always attached to it because a new policy was set up. No. It wasn't here. Morton somebody rather. This was campus-wide. There was a new policy that you could not create a faculty position on soft money but could have somebody on soft money in a research position. Consequently, they had to pick up all these professors who are on soft money now having to be converted to hard money. This meant they had far more professors who had to teach than they had students. Consequently, you didn't have to fight the sciences for new FDEs. They couldn't get any, they didn't want any. They had more FDEs than they knew what to do with. This was particularly hard on the assistant professors, you know, because with soft money they would have been picked up and then put on tenure track and leave them on tenure track at all. At any rate, later on, much later on—just the time before I retired—this did become a problem. Not so much from the scientists as from some of the social scientists. Particularly the Dean, [Michael] Rothschild, who felt that he wanted the department that was much more mainstream. Problem was that the mainstream was there. He came up to me once and said he had been asked by Harvard to head the department that would be more in the mainstream, and he said. The mainstream is pretty shallow. Anyhow, by the time the department gets settled, you're going through an awful lot of conflict of ideas in general and intellectual life. And you're going through a lot of conflict within sociology. There's a dominant paradigm which is common in many ways at Columbia and Harvard, which is no longer as dominant. Consequently, although the department still was looked on by some people as the great hope and by others as the piss within the field. I would never say that, but that was par for the course very much**.**

WESTBROOK: I have another question. When you decided to move the way of qualitative research, were you just going in the place of market pressures? Did you have any expectations of the way Graduate students would be more school in quantitative methods?

GUSFIELD: Now you hit an excellent point. We had never done a good job in getting students jobs. We get them—always had a function to some extent to get them. Got better in the sense that the market got more open. But we always had difficulty, we've never done a good job. Sometimes hard to know, sometimes not. Some of our students have done well in terms of where they went, and what they've done since. I did a study at the University of Pennsylvania department before you came here, I was part of a committee reviewing the department, and so what we did was to go over all the Ph.Ds. What were they publishing, what were they doing? And I'm surprised that there was relatively small output that came from the department. Was at one time the department. I think that it is again a good department. But their people went to

good places, but they didn’t really shape up very well in terms of what they did. We worried about them, yeah. It gave us something to worry about. We did a little better than I would have thought that things would improve. It didn't improve that much, but it improved some— Should we talk about recruitment?

CHODOROW: Yeah. Let's talk about having had this vision and this view of what was happening in the discipline. How and who did you recruit?

GUSFIELD: I don't know whom I started. I recruited a couple of young people. One was a guy who impressed me by something he wrote in a volume that Reinhard Bendix had edited, I guess he was a counselor editor of it, named Randall Collins . Randall has since become one of the major figures in sociology.

CHODOROW: And he's at [University of Pennsylvania] Penn now.

GUSFIELD: He's at Penn now. Now, what's happened to his marriage?

CHODOROW: She has formally decided to— she's a judge. His wife is a judge here in San Diego.

GUSFIELD: A major judge, I think, very important.

CHODOROW: She was like chief judge—

GUSFIELD: She almost became a federal judge, too.

CHODOROW: —And my understanding from Randall is that they—is that she is going to step down and join him. And she's ready to step down.

GUSFIELD: That's a big step for her because she is possibly state supreme court material, if a Democratic government gets nominated. Anyhow, I wondered about that. We tried rehiring Randy. Well, that's a whole other story, he wasn’t interested. At any rate, Randy was down at Wisconsin. I remember he and Judy coming through on their way back to California, stopping at Illinois to talk to me. The other was a guy named Bill [William] Wilde. That was a mistake for many reasons. Anyway, it was a mistake. Both Randy and Bill were getting their Ph.Ds. Bill at Santa Barbara, Randy at Berkeley. Now Randy had written some stuff already. He had an undergraduate work at Stanford and had already written something [*inaudible*]. And he was just an all-around smart guy as I could see it. And historically oriented. Bill had done work on mental

218 health, I think. I don't remember exactly what it was, maybe I'm repressing it. But Bill had been
219 recommended by Northwestern by my friend Howard Becker. He was getting his degree at
220 Santa Barbara and came and as assistant and has been in isolation during the sixties. He came
221 here in 1969 and discovered the sixties. He started smoking marijuana in class. He started
222 giving everybody A's without any assignments. He had classes, of course, of three hundred
223 students. At one point during the crises of '69-'70—the crises involving Third College. We had a
224 senate meeting in the afternoon and we wanted to continue it in the evening. And Bill had a
225 three-hour class he gave once a week in that room and he refused to let the senate come in. Of
226 course, when we got there, they discovered this blue smoke. Poor Bill. He was a smart guy, but
227 it didn't work. Now we come to senior people. I wanted to get Harold Garfinkel from UCLA. And
228 Harold was very interested. Although he wanted a lot of control over future appointments, a lot
229 of control. And ultimately, I felt that as smart as Harold was, he was a very hard guy to work with
230 and that he—. He wanted to really turn the department primarily into an ethnomethodological
231 one. And ultimately, I bought that. He bought that, too. But I was still very much interested in
232 that whole paradigm. And the next year, I did recruit Aaron Cicourel. Aaron was different from
233 Harold in many ways. First of all, he had done real field work. Harold did not most likely. Aaron
234 had done a lot. He had written a wonderful book called "Method and Measurement" which is
235 really a critique quite early of a lot of point taken in research. So, he was both a methodologist,
236 he was a field worker. He was closer in some respects to the mainstream of sociology in the
237 sense that he knew it. He knew quantitative work, and yet he was critical of it. Plus, another
238 thing about Aaron at the time. I knew very little about him as a person, aside from his sense of
239 esteem. He was a native-speaking Latino. He's a Sephardic Jew whose family had traced it all
240 the way back to their exile in Spain. Whose native language was Latino. So, he was fluent in
241 Spanish. And at the time the university was moving very much through the Iberian studies, and
242 Aaron had experience in Spain—he had experience in Latin America— He would fit into the
243 university marvelously. Which he did. In all respects. And he fitted in into my paradigm. But
244 before that, I had recruited two other senior people. Jerry [Jerome] Skolnik, who was then at the
245 University of Chicago, but on exile for California. Born in New York, but he was a Californian at
246 heart. Maybe he instituted Berkeley at heart. He lasted here a year, but he had to get back to
247 Berkeley. He took a job. But he had done a lot of interesting field work in sociology of law, which
248 I was both interested in as a field. I had spent a year of life going to law school. I was interested
249 in it. And he had written what I thought was a very good book. Surprised me. "Justice without
250 Trial," which dealt with police discretion. Once again, how the police go about the process of
251 deciding for you what the charge, when to charge something, it was a very good book, I thought.

The other one's Jack Douglas. And Jack represented that ethnomethodological paradigm. He was known in India. And he travelled to India again in '66 for a book he had. He had written a book called, *The Social Meanings of Suicide*, which struck me as extremely within this paradigm. It was a very good book. Excellent book. Jack went downhill afterwards, but that happens. And Jack had a lot of influence on students—a lot of good influence on the students towards field work, as with Aaron. So, there's both these people. Aaron also had a great deal of interest which has since broadened in linguistics—social linguistics. So that the emphasis on language was there. Developed a whole year really of field work, social linguistics, and theory for students that was required of them. That was another thing we were doing. Most of the departments were moving towards a great deal of choice made by the graduate students. Here there were actual requirements. You say, “Here is six courses—five courses you have to have, period.” And then we gave an examination, which again was not the direction other departments were going. I remember calling Harvard for a Mexican-American student who had done his undergraduate work here. He applied for [graduate] admission, was admitted, was doing very well here and then decided to go to Harvard instead of coming to us. About two-thirds of the year after he had been at Harvard, he decided he wanted to come here. And I called Harvard—tried to find out if they knew anything about him. It turned out that even the person in charge of the graduate students hardly knew him. Didn't know anything about him. It was sad. I'm trying to remember people I tried to recruit. I mentioned Reinhart.

CHODOROW: And Garfinkel.

GUSFIELD: I remember trying to recruit Lou [Lewis] and Rose Coser. Excellent sociologists. Lou was a European intellectual basically. And Rose, also a European lecturer, but much more oriented towards field work. But Lou was a generally a smart man. So, I began looking for people not to fill out a particular program as such, but smart people, more or less oriented towards history and towards field work, towards language.

CHODOROW: Who were they? What were the Coser's name?

GUSFIELD: Well, they both spent most of their career after that. I know them because we taught together in Chicago, at the College. They spent most of their time at one— stayed with the University of New York at Long Island [State University of New York, Stonybrook]. Rose just died a few years ago. [*inaudible*]. Of course, I tried to recruit Dave [*inaudible*]. Dave did come out here a couple times, not to look [*inaudible*]. They had [*inaudible*]. Wasn't so sure. Who else

did I try to recruit? Ah! There were a couple of friends of mine. Fred [Frederick] Davis, who was then at the University of California at San Francisco, came and spent a quarter here. And he came largely attracted by the ways the department or how his own department was oriented. But largely attracted by the thought of being at a big University. And by our own friendship. And then Bennett Berger, who was a close friend—very close friend, who was at the University of California at Davis, where I had also been offered to challenge in the past. And he also came and visited and very much liked it. And both of these people were very much within this orientation this- humanistic. Bennett particularly had a reputation as a fine writer, which is unusual to sociology. As well as being oriented more humanistically. Most of the sociologists were there. That must really depend on the nucleus of the department. I would say generally speaking for a several number of years, we added people here and there, at assistant professor levels. Within two years we hired about four people I think were crucial to our department. Kristin Luker, who unfortunately who brought Jerry [Jerome] Karabell in. I don't know whether he was a guest for a quarter, or—

CHODOROW: I think he was a visitor.

GUSFIELD: We weren't trying to recruit him. Unfortunately, he recruited Kirsten. They got married and then he had a position at Berkeley, so she followed him, but she liked it here. Dick [Richard] Madsen, Andy [Andrew] Scull, and— oh. The third guy, I'm sorry didn't pan out, [*inaudible*]. That didn't work out as well. But bringing in Madsen and Scull did bring a good [*inaudible*] to the department, and Kristin did, too.

CHODOROW: What happened to the department over time? To this collection of people?

GUSFIELD: You know, Jack for various reasons and not get along with Aaron. There were many reasons. Some of which may have been a fight for the domain with the methodology, I don't know. Some of it I think had to do with orientations towards work and chores. Jack was not the greatest, Aaron is. And Jack was a guy who shuns conflict, he can't take it, so he retreated increasingly. He became politically terribly concerned. And that didn't fit in well in general in sociology, but it didn't treat him well there and he made some accusations— I forget the details. You'll find them in what's-her-name's history of UCSD.

CHODOROW: Oh. In Anderson's history.

GUSFIELD: Yes, in Anderson's history, of what she thinks is history. She thinks of Jack as head of the start of the department. In a certain sense, he was the first person to take up the permanent position as associate professor. Never did get through him. His work deteriorated considerably, even after— It wasn't just the concern with the system. He ceased doing field work. He ceased doing sociological work. He was always a very [*inaudible*] guy. Very informed man.

CHODOROW: He was famous in my early years here through his writing. But going back from a meeting, a committee meeting, within an hour he received eleven-twelve single spaced type-written pages on response and commentary and position taking.

GUSFIELD: Denouncing something?

CHODOROW: Very often denouncing a position and all of its holders. But he became very well-known for that. Almost immediately. Because I was here in 1968 as well. We were all serving on committees.

GUSFIELD: Well, lots of things happened to Jack. Even littler than that. He got involved in a possible harassment—sexual harassment case. Which never got public, fortunately— Of course we could never read.

CHODOROW: I will reveal that I was the person that took care of that case. I was one who was acquainted—

GUSFIELD: So was I being the chair of the department. It hadn't really gone anywhere. But mostly it was in the form of letters.

CHODOROW: That's right. It was a case in which he had clearly done it, but he had done it years and years before. Any conceptual of a statute of limitations had run in fairness.

GUSFIELD: And there had been no threat.

CHODOROW: And there had been no threat. But he was misbehaving in a different way. Refusing to hand over materials—research materials. And I eventually got him to do that.

GUSFIELD: To her.

CHODOROW: To her. In fact, the complaint against him was based upon her desire to get those materials. It was a device. And I saw it as such and really took a long time because these things always take a long time. In the end, the answer was that she deserved those materials. He had to give them over. Not the question of whether sexual harassment was taking place.

WESTBROOK: [*inaudible*]

CHODOROW: Yes. That's right. Exactly. And his refusal.

GUSFIELD: I had forgotten that. It's all of those things moved him out in many ways outside of the department. The departments changed. Randy did not like teaching. Never did. And he actually retired, well actually he became a private scholar. I don't know if he retired '74 or after he got in a three-year appointment from University of Virginia in special research professorship. But after that, he didn't want to come back. I wanted him to come back. The long story— What's his name? John Miles was the vice-chancellor. And FTEs [Full-time employments] were hard to come by. And he said he's only going to give him out the stars. Well, the CAP [?] said that he could be considered a star. And there was some conflict within the department about his coming back. It had to do with people who saw him as possibly in league with Aaron. I mean there are factions that have developed which were not intellectual factions. They were personal. And they did develop. Some of them were around Aaron. Personal conviction. I didn’t always agree with him. We were opposites intellectually—and personally too. Although we were close friends. But there was a lot of factions about that. Fred Davis had been chair of the department. I thought he would be a very sweet man. That too precipitated in a lot of factions where he had a guy, an assistant professor named Will [William] Wright. Will is what I call an injustice collector. He would slam the door and make a lot of noise that is just as big an injustice as if you break my leg. You know. He's just one of those persons who came out of Berkeley in the sixties and for whom everything is a cause. He was very hard to take. I recruited César Graña, which was a wonderful recruit in many ways, and not in others César was the head of the Institute of Consciousness at—. What am I blocking out? University of California at—? Outside of San Francisco.

CHODOROW: Santa Cruz.

GUSFIELD: Santa Cruz! Yes, Santa Cruz. I'm sorry. César was an intellectual person. César was really a humanist at heart. His field was sociology of art. Marvelous work done on bohemian and bourgeois, called *Modernity and its Discontents*. Which was a study was based

on French Modernity and French literature in the nineteenth century. Marvelous work. And César was a great conversationalist. Man of great insight. But somehow he stopped writing. He couldn't produce anything. You know what that means at this University. And there were moves to have him even demoted as associate professors. Had him take two straight courses a year. John Miles was involved in that. That got staved off. But César went to Spain on sabbatical and was killed in an automobile accident. Something I deeply regret [*inaudible*]. But he was a wonderful person and all these people had orientations that were still outside the mainstream. Aaron, who has a great reputation in Europe. Has a great deal in Europe. Is not— Well, he's well-known in the United States, as he should be. And he's often seen as the person a little hard to take. He's very critical. Very critic. So, he doesn't get the authority [?] that he should. But he's still in these courses and of course the department. Bennett was, Fred was. Kristin, while she was here— The department moved more historically, more towards history, but still retained in the field—the whole field of culture. That is, how experiences worked and what things mean. And how meanings occurred and the relationship between that and social structures. Chandra Mukerji and Michael Schudson. Michael was recruited really in communications as well as history. Interestingly enough, he had worked with me years before, and for some reason or other, Michael moved to Chicago, which he didn't like. And I fought like hell to have a joint appointment for him, which is no longer the case, unfortunately. As with all communications. And Chandra, who had a rough time as an assistant professor—he were learning to teach, was very shy. And both these people not only emerged as people with considerable importance. Especially Michael. Chandra, too. Dick Madsen, Andy Scull— A lot of factions got formed around Andy.

CHODOROW: Is Andy the other pull to Warren?

GUSFIELD: No. If anything, they were leaked. By that point, in the last five years that I was in the department, Aaron had begun to move away into cognitive sciences. And ultimately, he was tired, and was fully in cognitive science. He had an appointment in sociology, but no money came from Sociology. He was always also in the med school. In the early days— This goes back to the Garfinkel appointment too. In the early days, the medical school wanted to be an integrated school.

[END OF PART ONE, BEGIN PART TWO]

GUSFIELD: So, I said some things about Aaron about it. They were things about Jack, I bet.

CHODOROW: No, it is.

GUSFIELD: Oh! And Aaron. And the medical school. So, the medical school actually had FDEs. Had people from biology, chemistry, from psychology, economics—even anthropology. They had Lola [Romanucci-] Ross, then Lola -Schwartz-Ross, she was married to Ted [Theodore] Schwartz. And Aaron was our medical school person. That's another one of those reasons why I [*inaudible*] Harold. He had no real interest in medicine and such. And no real interest in medical school. He would be very hard person in the first place. Of course, Aaron saw—and rightly so—the medical school as opportunity to do things—to research, the things he wanted to do, and has since done. Particularly on interviewing and case histories. Always case histories on the doctors and patients, how they form their sense of who the patient is and who the doctor is. Particularly how the doctors gain their information. So that in those later years Aaron was moving towards cognitive sciences. Actually, he wrote a collection of essays, a very influential collection of essays he had published much earlier called Cognitive Sociology [: Language and Meaning in Social Interaction]. He didn't like the term them. So, the department changed and the department got a reputation for being a department concerned with culture—in two senses. Both culture with a capital C. Bennett, César, Chandra, even Michael Schudson was interested in newspapers. Had an interest in arts and the media. But also, in the second sense, that is culture in the ways in which those aspects by which we interpret the experience. Sociologists are always really serious about social structure—which had been what I had been doing. And which was very much keeping also with the George Herbert Mead orientations on social interactions. Kenneth Burke had written a book on it a few years ago— And so the department in some respects in its concern with culture has remained such. It has moved much more in a historical area of orientation. Some of this is a function of extramural money. Money in Latin American studies, Japanese studies, some of this was [*inaudible*]. And in a second, it began to move much more into the mainstream. Less emphasis on social value, linguistics, the requirements have gotten very complicated, cafeteria style. And it's been seven years since I've retired, I have studiously avoided meetings. I go to fallopia [?], I go to parties, anything that's food or talk I go, but not where there's arguments. And I try to stay out of everything. At any rate, the department still has a bit of a reputation as being qualitative. When [*inaudible*] became dean, he wanted to bring in some people highly quantitative in orientation, which didn't fly. Didn't fly with the department. Never did quite fly—but we did bring in some younger people who are more quantitative orientation. One of which turned out to be more Andrew Scull. The department is not seen today quite as, or at least I don't see it quite specifically paradoxical, a

little more balanced, but still not quite the UCLA variety. I don't know UCLA's variety history, but in sociology has always been a little of this, a little of that. As against, let's say, the University of Chicago which became more rational choice orientation, or [University of] Wisconsin which is really quantitative. Harvard [University] tried to become highly quantitative [*inaudible*].

CHODOROW: Whatever happened to Columbia [University]?

GUSFIELD: It's floundered. Floundered. Gotten better**,** of course, its key people all studied under Robert Merton, who were brought in because the hope was they would conflict with each other. One would represent the more theoretical, a little bit more humanistic orientation. The other would represent the quantitative orientation. It turned that [*inaudible*]. We became close friends — So that it never quite gelled. But with people like Liza Sheldon Murphy [?], we don't sense the department becoming dominant because those people aren't so dominant. I'm certain Merton has been the most dominant sociologist. But sociology has changed too in the last twenty years. It's much more affected by European sociology. Or even non-sociology. People like [Michel] Foucault, people like, Flejeu. Flejeu [?] especially. And then the whole changes that occur in literature. The field of literary theory. And since in fact particularly I am talking about anthropology, people like David Bruce.

WESTBROOK: There was a theory out there, by people at UC [University of California] Irvine [*inaudible*].

GUSFIELD: When did Murray [?] write this? Murray is a good friend of mine, but I don't see his whereabouts once a year.

WESTBROOK: Very short, it's four lectures that he did. Something called the basic theory.

GUSFIELD: I could find it. It's not a [*inaudible*]. Murray and I were in the University of Illinois together. We see each other.

WESTBROOK: It's a wonderful theory of history of development of literature in the nineteenth century—that is required graphically [*inaudible*].

GUSFIELD: The old new criticism or the new criticism?

WESTBROOK: The old new criticism of Robert Penn Warren and [*inaudible*] they established. [*inaudible*].

GUSFIELD: Well, I got exposed to the old thing at Chicago with people like Elder Olsen and their people.

WESTBROOK: I think those people get kind of linked together. [*inaudible*].

GUSFIELD: But I've been influenced by these people in recent years. I spent a year at Stanford [University] at the Institute for Behavioral Sciences. And I was friendly with Barbara Smith. Gave a seminar for us out there at— I tried to read Grammatology, but couldn't get through it. Heard a lecture there at gate [*inaudible*] of English. When I walked out, I said to Aaron—Aaron was walking out at the same time with us— "I got the first five minutes." He said, "I got the first ten minutes!"

WESTBROOK: How do you respond to that thesis that literature today as co-optive social sciences?

GUSFIELD: Well, I've been working in the other direction. I've been writing things on the rhetoric of social science. Did an analysis of quantitative and qualitative—two major figured—major search? Treating them as literature. Saying, suppose we talk about them in terms of language and in the terms of a piece of narrative I don't like. And I had done a piece—like in 1976—which was a rhetorical analysis of research of drinking and driving. Well, you've heard about it, yeah.

WESTBROOK: Well, a good friend of mine was the Graduate researcher.

GUSFIELD: Oh, who's that?

WESTBROOK: Evan Hansen.

GUSFIELD: Oh, I know Evan, of course.

CHODOROW: The argument that Murray makes on that we've been talking about—it really cuts both ways. That is, it is if literary study has moved to the direction of co-opting materials and points of view on the social science, particularly sociology and anthropology, it has been equally true that coming from the other direction they can co-opt literary tradition—treating it in a way which is actually countered to the notion that literature is art. Or that art is somehow unconnected to the culture from which it rises and absorbing that so-called argument into the materials that reveal the cultural fabric.

GUSFIELD: Yeah, but I take it a step further, I'm trying to write something more elusive about this topic of this in that behavior has an artistic aspect to it. In the sense that people give it meaning. Which is what—

CHODOROW: Which is what's your book about free symbolism of contemporary analogy.

GUSFIELD: Exactly, exactly. I've been more interested in public performance than anything. Erving Goffman was interested in interaction. But Erving had a paper he wrote. He wrote as a person and as a—as writing. So that I've been moved increasingly toward the very much more humanistic orientation. And in that sense, being co-optive to a degree, I've [*inaudible*]. And I think here anthropology comes in.

CHODOROW: Let's talk about anthropology.

GUSFIELD: I don't know what impact the anthropologists had on the department as a field in the department. But certainly, for many years, there was a lot of interrelationship that I had. Many of my good friends were anthropologist. Some of my best friends are anthropologists. So— Roy D'Andrade and Mark Schwartz, but especially Mel. Mel [Melford] Spiro. Not that we had much influence on each other. We don't see eye-to-eye on most things. From politics to— On some things we do. We both like to eat at Piatti's, which we'll do tomorrow. So, this is some of his influence. I've always been very open. I've always been open to anthropology. And when I was in Chicago, Robert Redfield was the dominant figure in social sciences. But Redfield was very humanistic in his field. And very classically trained. And the key person here in anthropology in many ways in the last generation has been Clifford Geertz. And certainly Geertz probably is having an impact on literary theory and as literary theory is having impact on him. And again, Burke had a great deal of influence on the theory. Again, not personally so much, but he was here as a guest for about two weeks. He was then 85 years old. And he drank— If he didn't drink enough, he wasn't lucid. If he drank too much he wasn't lucid. You had keep him in the right spot. I went to pick him up for lunch when he was new to the system. At any rate, I don't know where Wayne Booth fits into all this. But Wayne [*inaudible*]. At any rate, the field of sociology has been more and more open to these aspects of anthropology. There are big conflicts going on in anthropology which have been in recent years about it not so some of these things can't be deal with. The subject enters into so that the extent can element the culture. Others who maintain that is not the case.

518 **CHODOROW:** There was a dispute within the department over an appointment in the last
519 few years. An appointment that was made in the sociology of science, where that issue aroused
520 was in a very sharp way and the department finally voted that it would not make this
521 appointment.

522 **GUSFIELD:** You're talking about sociology?

523 **CHODOROW:** Uh-huh.

524 **GUSFIELD:** Michael Lynch?

525 **CHODOROW:** Uh-huh.

526 **GUSFIELD:** No. I was then retired.

527 **CHODOROW:** Yes. But there are people—

528 **GUSFIELD:** Had I been there I would have voted for it.

529 **CHODOROW:** People said things like, "I cannot abide by the work that that person does. It is
530 totally fraudulent work. Not that he's not intelligent. Not that he's not productive. Not that he is
531 not the kind of person you would ordinarily say, `Let's definitely make this appointment.' From
532 the mythological and philosophical point of view, I regard this work as total cruelty. Will not vote
533 for it."

534 **GUSFIELD:** It's never entirely clear to me. It's almost as if we were dealing with two churches
535 of dogmas of— no methodology. Within the same denomination.

536 **WESTBROOK**: When did this happen?

537 **CHODOROW:** It's been five years ago.

538 **GUSFIELD:** You were here at the time, right?

539 **CHODOROW:** I was the dean, but the not the dean of social science. It may have been and
540 that may be a part of what was happening.

541 **GUSFIELD:** Again, I knew about this, but this goes back to my study efforts to stay out of
542 conflicts.

CHODOROW: But I believe for —

GUSFIELD: It's not just conflicts—stay out of—

CHODOROW: —Bruno DeTorres [?] withdrawal from the department, it was implied based upon this case.

GUSFIELD: Yes and no. Not entirely. His wife—we did not interrupting the education of their daughter. But that was a shame because Bruno had a liberal [*inaudible*]. Again there were others that disagreed with this— I don't know. I don't know Michael's more recent work to come up with that. In his earlier work, I thought, that was published was excellent.

CHODOROW: Do you know what the denominational split is in this regard within ethnology?

GUSFIELD: I don't know what it is. One split has been over conversational analysis. That is the methodologists that have been rearing some of the majorities—very strict analysis on conversation. I mean, apparently at Irvine, a guy named [*inaudible*]. He was a key person in this. One part of the field was moving in that direction. The other part was moving to some extent into more mainstream concerns. Not necessarily mainstream methods. So you get a four o'clock stubby hump picture of a handicapped person. In short, moving into what were generalized areas—general areas of interest. And like Aaron spoke on juvenile delinquency. That's dealing with something that is a topic in the mainstream. Dealing with it from a different standpoint, respectively. That was one conflict. There were also personal conflicts and biases. Hard to talk about it, because I saw it. Everybody there would deny it, of course. But I'm not sure what all the conflicts were in relation to this. I thought just without going into it seriously, that that was a mistake. Once again, I'm out of the department. I'm retired and I have to tell myself that I've retired—

CHODOROW: It's not your department anymore.

GUSFIELD: No, it's not.

CHODOROW: Your field, including the department.

GUSFIELD: I'm beginning to feel it's not my field. It's not Gusfield's.

CHODOROW: Fred, do you have any other—? I think you did very well. You gave us a very good and succinct notion of where the field was back in the late 50s and early 60s—mid 60s. And that is hard to recover.

GUSFIELD: Well again, I have to say I've been thinking about it a lot lately.

CHODOROW: And both because of those two books. And very hard thinking of what the University of Chicago's department was going through at the time. What were we reading? What were opened to? [Talcott] Parsons, the social system, Merton's work, stuff coming up in Lazor's [?] , personal influence, survey research.

GUSFIELD: When I got my masters at Chicago, I was going to go to Columbia. It wouldn't have made sense if I had all my work in Chicago. But I had a job then as an instructor in the college. I wasn't giving that up. I had family. So I stayed.

CHODOROW: When did you get your degree?

GUSFIELD: '54. And at that point, the pendulum, the fulcrum had shifted toward—certainly to Columbia and to Harvard. And by the 70s, began the intellectual—the nature of the intellectual life had changed. In general, the social sciences, not so much— I haven't said anything about relation to the departments. Maybe I should say a word or two about it. We never had any relationships with economics. And that was always something I've regretted. The economics department was not opened to the Econometrics. And their spoken language was very different from ours. Surprisingly, psychologists also moved away. Bill [William] McGuire was here and I was close to Bill. And in general, Bill's a social psychologist, and even that was too much for the— and certainly anything that's smacked with clinical psychology is absolutely. And we had very little to do. I used to see a lot of George Mandler the first year or so [*inaudible*]. And again, so the economics and psychology really played a very little role. I think only once had I been on committee—a Ph.D. committee on economics. I was never on a committee for psychology, but I was on many committees for Anthropology. Anthropology. Is personally close. As the department— I don't know if any of our students took away much work. History— Yeah, we were close to history. Partly out of the interest in Spanish mime. Latin American Spanish [*inaudible*]. It matters partly because there were general interest in history. And I had by then something of a reputation among historians on which made for degrees of relationships. I had strange kinds of relationships from time to time with the art department. Well, I did, personally. I knew a lot of people from the art department, and I still do. I was on a lot of art committees. And

even some of our students were interested in things related to art. All in all, I think the thing I regretted the most about the department was we never really did a good job at placing the students after graduating. I still feel bad about. I still want to increase the student [*inaudible*].

CHODOROW: Yeah. I have to say that is hard. Then that's partly consequence of you being out of the mainstream. Because that's where departments look for their recruits. And look for leaving mainstream departments.

GUSFIELD: And also the topics. Part of the problem of not paying not too much attention to what you would call a program, filling this slot or that slot, especially in the early years, was that we often didn't have people in specialties that were in demand. We never really had and we still haven’t had anything good in gender studies. So that gender studies had done better. In fact, one of our students has just won a major prize. She got into the University of Virginia, which is a really good place to be. She just won a major prize for her book not called [*inaudible*]. Ah! Very good. I get a copy of it, thank you. I find since I've retired, I've done a lot of writing. Although, recently, I've been slacking off. I paint. And I've been doing more painting, but not as much as I'd like.

WESTBROOK: [*inaudible*].

CHODOROW: I should have raised this question the earliest.

WESTBROOK: [*inaudible*].

GUSFIELD: I think I would. Jack Douglas' story is almost— Is the tape on now? Okay, turn it off right now. [*inaudible*].

[END OF PART TWO, END OF INTERVIEW]