

STANLEY CHODOROW LECTURE,

Introduction by HELEN RANNEY

On February 25, 1998

1 **RANNEY:** —today because _____ *[inaudible]* who is the president of the American ISF in
2 either Jordan or Israel. I can't remember the itinerary well enough to be sure of which country.
3 You will remember from the welcome letter, which outlines today's program in a little detail. We
4 will have two speakers, Dr. Stanley Chodorow and Bradley Westbrook. Bradley Westbrook is
5 the University archivist. He was formerly a special collection librarian at Columbia and at Kent
6 State University, has been the manuscript librarian at UCSD and the university archivist since
7 1993. He will share the initial part of this program with Dr. Chodorow and then we will conclude
8 the afternoon by showing some of the Mandeville Special Collections at UCSD.

9 Professor Chodorow is emeritus member of the department of history, and he was on the UCSD
10 faculty since 1968. With Vince as dean of the division of art and humanities and associate vice
11 chancellor of academic planning. In 1993 he became provost of the University of Pennsylvania.
12 In addition to his scholarly pursuits in medieval history, Dr. Chodorow has made many
13 administrative contributions in planning the growth of UCSD, shepherding the campus through
14 accreditation and devising plans for the libraries of the UC [University of California] system in
15 this era of communication and transition.

16 He contributed much to new developments in curriculum and the physical planning of library
17 facilities at Penn, and has now returned to San Diego where he's CEO of the California Virtual
18 Library. And with Mr. Westbrook is engaged in compiling an oral history of UCSD departments.
19 Dr. Chodorow's later publications are concerned with scholarly communications in libraries, but
20 his several books and early publications have articles on topics medieval and he is recognized
21 in scholarly circles as a distinguished medieval historian.

22 It is said that we often try to recreate relationships as we move from one phase of life or career
23 to another. I'm looking forward to the "medievalization" *[laughter]* of the founding of UCSD. A
24 natural expression for Stan, and I bring some thoughts to the table for it. Unlike him, I was not
25 present in 1968, but I came to share the feeling first expressed by King Alfonso X of Spain in the
26 thirteenth century, right, Stan?

27 **CHODOROW:** Correct.

28 **RANNEY:** Later quoted by Dean [Richard C.] Atkinson. "Had I been present at the creation I
29 would have given some useful hints for the better ordering of the universe." *[laughter]* But to
30 return to Stan's tasks, in which department will he find Heloise and Abelard? Since he lacks the
31 resources of a special council, I will not recount the rumors in which he might search out that
32 story. *[laughter]* And we will bring yourself however to admit that even with their limited domain,
33 Heloise and Hildegard were much more skilled administrators than the abbots of their eras.

34 And while I suggest avoiding specific comparisons with Abelard, you should have no difficulty
35 finding rigid, righteous and even arrogant St. Bernard's in the founding department. Indeed, I
36 can think of one department that had five or six and enough for a monastery. *[laughter]* There
37 was, to my knowledge, no figure who even remotely resembled St. Francis of Assisi, which for
38 closer association and generally more beneficent orientation may permit a _____ *[inaudible]*
39 advocacy of some of the founders. Stan, we do appreciate your many contributions,
40 recognized and unrecognized at UCSD, some of which were recounted in _____ *[inaudible]*
41 letter. I couldn't resist the opportunity to put a lighter note on this docket. The platform is yours.

42 **CHODOROW:** Thank you. Thank you very much. And Helen, you did extremely well with the
43 medieval stuff.

44 **RANNEY:** I was at the end of the lines I knew.

45 **CHODOROW:** As Helen said, I got here in 1968. There are here and I've known almost all of
46 you for virtually all that time the founding fathers—once the founding fathers of this campus. I
47 was one of the founding children of this campus. I got here, I think just after sixth grade. I had a
48 particular view of what was happening from being a junior faculty member. And as you will
49 remember from those days, it didn't matter whether you were junior faculty member, you weren't
50 excluded by virtue of that, from the business of the campus from committees, from activities of
51 building the campus because there just weren't enough bodies.

52 We needed all the warm ones you could find. And so junior people like myself and my
53 colleagues who were coming in at that time were drawn into a lot of activities that we would not
54 otherwise, and I don't think current junior people, are drawn into in terms of campus building,
55 department building. In the first couple of years that I was here, for example, I served on a
56 committee that was searching for the founder of the political science department. That's not

57 something a junior faculty member would ever have done in an ordinary, mature campus. But
58 that was a wonderful experience for somebody about how hard it can be to find somebody to tell
59 you the truth, and also what the values of the institution are as you go searching for the senior
60 leadership.

61 The background of the project I'm involved in now goes back really a long way. And I've been
62 fascinated by the foundations of this department for a long time. It is a historical subject and I'm
63 a historian. And it has been something that has been very interesting to me in part because I'm
64 also deeply interested and have done research in the origins of the university. That is the real
65 origin in the twelfth century. And here is an attempt to build a new university. It was also clear in
66 the early days of this campus that this was an institution that was much more guild like, that is to
67 say much closer in its culture to the original university than most of the institutions that I knew
68 about, modern universities that I knew about, which had been corporatized.

69 That is, they had now vast hierarchies, they had lots of Deans and vice presidents and
70 structures which simply didn't exist at UCSD. This was a faculty-run institution when I got here.
71 It was therefore as a young person a unique experience, but one which since those kinds of
72 institutions didn't really exist elsewhere. And my understanding by the way of the other early
73 campuses is that they were quite different. That is Irvine was more hierarchical than we were,
74 run more by its administration than its faculty, and also, they appointed from the beginning a
75 different kind of faculty. Different in its age structure, different in their aims and way they
76 organized it, and so on.

77 And Santa Cruz, well who knows? *[laughter]* But Santa Cruz actually in many respects was like
78 UCSD, but not nearly so successful. I mean, it has become successful because UC campuses
79 become successful over time. But in its earlier days, although it had some of the same
80 characteristics, such as the college system and so on and the interdisciplinary emphasis that
81 UCSD had, it was a very different place. So, I was interested in the history of this institution very
82 early. And then I had the misfortune of being on the committee that technically, I suppose,
83 oversaw the last history, published history of UCSD that by Nancy Anderson. *[An Improbable*
84 *Venture: A History of the University of California, San Diego]*

85 And I was dean at the time and she didn't interview me, or wasn't interested in what I knew
86 about the place, but she wasn't interested in what most of you knew about the place. And I saw
87 that manuscript in several versions. I will be frank and tell you that I urged it not to publish it. It is

88 a godawful piece of history and wrong in many respects. But wrong not just because it gets
89 certain things wrong, but just because it has no conception of what was actually going on here.
90 It became clear to me at that time, reading that manuscript and watching it move toward
91 publication so called, that what was missing there and what was really interesting about UCSD's
92 history was its intellectual history. And so, when I came back from Penn and was on leave and
93 not yet engaged in this virtual university stuff, I wasn't really directly – I was thinking about doing
94 some work on the history of the university.

95 I knew UCSD was something of interest and then Jim [James R.] Arnold called. And Jim had
96 made arrangements with Keith Brueckner and Jim to sit down in the library with Brad and talk
97 about the origins of their two departments [chemistry and physics, respectively]. And Jim called
98 me and asked me if I would come along as a kind of historian to keep them honest so to speak.
99 It wasn't that they needed to be kept honest, but that there were questions. What were the
100 questions a historian would be interested in? You know, "I'm a chemist, he's a physicist, we
101 don't do this for a living, you do, would you do this?" It was an opportunity that was just exactly
102 at the right moment.

103 So, I went to that, and once I did it, it was more fun than I could have imagined it was gonna be.
104 It was terrific and we'll talk a little bit about the kinds of things that reveal. Brad and I decided
105 that we would undertake a real project and start to interview founders and early members,
106 because not in every case of course. David Bonner for example is not with us, Stefan
107 Warschawski [mathematics] is no longer with us, but there are people who were here early
108 enough who help us to understand what the origins of departments are. And that's the way the
109 project got started and it's nowhere near complete. And in fact, one of the things I'll ask at the
110 end is for suggestions about who to talk to since we can't talk to everybody. [addressing an
111 audience member] Yeah?

112 **AUDIENCE:** Do you have any idea why that given the qualms we've had about that history,
113 why do you think that actually—

114 **CHODOROW:** It was a lot of investment in it. *[laughs]* We'll put it that way. I mean that's—

115 **RANNEY:** Did they get any of the investment back?

116 **CHODOROW:** I doubt it. How many of you bought that book? I mean a few people –

117 **AUDIENCE:** [inaudible]

118 **CHODOROW:** – yeah, right. Bought it to tear?

119 **AUDIENCE:** Do you want to ask me what I did with it?

120 **CHODOROW:** Yeah, right. But no, they didn't get it back. It was just lost money. The building
121 blocks of this project really consist of three components as I see it. One is the interviews that we
122 have started to do, which give us the human recollection, the living recollection of what was
123 going on in those days, and I'll come back and tell you how we approached that. A second are
124 records that are in the library in the archives and the records that are most, the ones of course
125 that would be most interesting are the CAP's [Committee on Academic Personnel] records, but
126 we're not gonna touch those for the obvious reasons.

127 Those are records that are very much like the penitentiary records in the Vatican. They're just
128 allowing very special vetted people to get into the fourteenth century penitentiary records. Those
129 people have been gone long enough, almost. *[audience laughs]* And our CAP records are like
130 that. So, I'm not gonna live long enough to see the ones that pertain to the early years of this
131 campus. But the other two committees that are really critical are the graduate council and the
132 CEP [Committee on Educational Policy], which did all the programmatic work of levels of our
133 programs. And those are not easy to come by.

134 So, if anybody in this room has old records from those years, the early years, and the years
135 we're covering are basically from 1960, the earliest years of the campus, through about 1975.
136 Because by that time most of the departments are formed. And they're not complete. They're
137 not mature. But they are formed. And so that's the first period that we are concentrating on. And
138 we would love to get those records. And they obviously exist, or they may exist in the senate
139 office. But getting something out of the senate office turns out to be like getting something out of
140 the penitentiary. So, if any of you have those records in your files, we would love them. Records
141 then are the second.

142 Then the third thing that's important and will be important for research in developing anything
143 like a narrative of the intellectual history of this institution, are the histories of disciplines. Where
144 the disciplines have been, especially since World War II over time, and there are many such
145 books now being written and articles being written that is research foundation to set a
146 background and a context for the recollections of the founding members of the campus, about
147 what they were trying to do.

148 So, let me tell you what we ask our faculty interviewees. We start by asking them to try to
149 remember what their vision was. What was the intellectual vision that they started with when
150 they were recruited and what were the context of the recruitment? Very often the way in which
151 they were recruited, the conversations they had with Roger Revelle and with the other early
152 members of the community from Scripps helped form their own vision, what they could do here.

153 So, the first stage then is a memory of the vision, their intellectual vision, and its relationship to
154 where their disciplines were at the time. What was happening in their disciplines in the late '50s
155 that they were either reacting against or trying to seize for positive purposes, to take in a certain
156 direction. And so, we try to get people to remember what their intellectual program was and how
157 they felt it related to their colleagues in their own fields across the country or around the world.

158 And then to reflect finally on how early recruitments, the first recruitments affected those visions.
159 Because many of those recruitments succeeded and many of them failed. And who came in
160 those early days made a big difference as to what the actual shape of the department would be.
161 We did one other thing, and we'll follow this up with a good deal of research, we interviewed Mel
162 [Melvin J.] Voigt and Andy [Andrew] Wright about the origins and development of the library. I'll
163 tell you about that separately.

164 Because one of the things that's clear about this campus is that its seriousness of purpose from
165 the earlier days was just remarkable. And it was reflected in the fact that for example we didn't
166 develop major league sports programs. We aim to develop major league libraries. We didn't
167 build a faculty club. I can tell you that because I got stuck with the job in 1982/1983 when I was
168 chair of the senate. We put the money into laboratories and into academic facilities, and
169 particularly into the library. It was a practice here from the early days of using the library as a
170 place for, one way of putting it is to launder money. It was getting money across that July 1st
171 boundary that exists in fiscal year by investing extra money in the library and then being able to
172 recover some of it at least.

173 But a lot of that investment in the library stuck. It was not all taken back. It wasn't merely a
174 laundering of the money. And that was going on into at least into the '80s. And it meant that our
175 library developed more quickly than any of the other new libraries in the system. So, we've
176 looked at that as well. Now let me give you an idea, just a background idea of some of the
177 things that are revealed by these interviews because they're very, very interesting.

178 And also, Herb [Herbert F. York] is here, and we talked to Herb twice about the perspective he
179 had sitting as Chancellor, recruiting founders and dealing with the founders who we inherited
180 when he got here. These are obviously people as you well know, very strong personalities,
181 strong vision and trying to recruit their faculty and Herb had to play a major role in a lot of that,
182 and of course the medical school is a major undertaking, which started under Herb and so that's
183 another feature of this.

184 Starting with the first interviews, Keith and Jim revealed very different approaches to the
185 foundation of their departments. In the case of Jim, he had come out of the laboratory in working
186 on Carbon-14 dating and he had accumulated in his early career a number of colleagues who
187 had spread out, but some of them had come to Scripps and already had Scripps by the time he
188 was recruited.

189 And what he revealed as he talked about the early days was not that he was attempting to
190 develop a department that had a particular strike, but rather that he was gathering together or
191 taking advantage of the situation here in San Diego to gathered together a group of chemists
192 who he knew to be terrific and with whom he had worked in one way or another, sometimes at a
193 distance, sometimes in the same lab over a long period of time. So, he was using this
194 opportunity to bring together a group of chemists who were in those early days just
195 phenomenal. Who he knew from his scientific career fairly well.

196 Keith took a very different point of view. Keith took what might be a more formulaic – not
197 formulaic, but formalistic approach, at least this is what he reports. Again, you want to test this
198 against not only other recollections but also get some records against the histories of the
199 institution. What he said was that he did an analysis of what kind of physics could be done well
200 here given that we weren't about to build a cyclotron or any other very large-scale apparatus
201 which would draw people here to do what was being done around the country at that time in the
202 best departments, which was high energy physics.

203 And what he said his strategy was, was to build in certain areas like what is now called
204 condensed matter physics. That and plasma, that were things that he could attract people here
205 to do, really first-rate people, and that would give this department a shape and a distinction
206 without having to rely on what was the dominant area of physics in a lot of the best departments
207 in the country. He took an approach that he was a man of 35 at the time. And that's another

208 thing that's quite striking is that a lot of the founders were not the grand old men of their
209 professions.

210 They were young, just entering middle age. Let me tell you, in the middle ages 35 is the
211 beginning of adulthood. *[laughter]* These people were just turning to be adults. He was a person
212 who had obviously made in his early career an effort to know the really good physicists in this
213 country. He knew the field. He's one of those young people who mapped it in his mind and
214 understood it, or felt he did, and he was taking advantage of that in trying to recruit the right kind
215 of physics department to this other department.

216 One of the things we heard, and this was something that gives you another perspective on the
217 department, unfortunately the earliest leadership of the economics department is not here, but
218 Herb reported on his conversations with Seymour Harris, who was the founding chair. And it
219 gives you just a completely different view of how a department might have gotten started. In
220 Seymour's case, he was a policy wonk. He was a creature of that Boston to Washington
221 corridor, which I got to know quite well in Philadelphia.

222 And there is a kind of person who sees – it may not be the Hudson River, which is the size of
223 the Pacific Ocean *[audience laughs]*, but it's not far west of there that the world ends and Terra
224 Incognita begins. And Seymour was one of those. He arrived here on the West Coast thinking
225 that it would be impossible to found what he would regard as a great department of economics,
226 which would be one filled with people who are interested in policy issues like himself. And
227 instead would have to settle for building a department, which was theoretical. Just exactly at the
228 moment when theory economics was beginning to rise to prominence.

229 Not that Seymour understood that necessarily. But on the other hand, he had good judgment.
230 He knew good ones when he saw them. So that even if it was in his view not the department he
231 would have founded, when he did it, he did it well. So, what you're getting is you interview
232 people, these very different approaches, sometimes accidental as in that case. Sometimes very
233 purposeful. But purposeful in different ways. Obviously, Dave [David M.] Bonner, who we
234 interviewed Jon [Jonathan S.] Singer about the beginnings of biology, one of the first to hear,
235 and what's striking about that is as Jon said he came from chemistry. He wasn't a biologist.

236 He said he thought he could tell the difference between the rat and a rabbit *[laughter]*. But that
237 was of course the point. We used to make a joke, those of us not in biology, who were on this
238 campus a long time, that if a candidate for the biology department saw one of those things they

239 call a squirrel around here, the ground squirrels, run across the path and noticed that it was a
240 squirrel, he was obviously not suited for this department. *[audience laughs]* And in effect, what
241 Jon was recognizing was admitting was that that was the case.

242 But what was striking about what he said, was that Bonner's vision, which was something I
243 didn't understand, and I don't think many people outside the department understood, was not
244 that molecular biology was the only kind of biology worth doing, but that molecular biology was a
245 revolutionary approach to all of biology. And it wasn't that you wouldn't end up doing ecology or
246 plant biology or virology or all the other forms of biology, which in other places it'd have been
247 separate departments. In some cases, you have five or six or seven departments of biology in
248 some of the larger institutions.

249 It wasn't that you wouldn't do those things, but that you would approach them, you would inform
250 them with molecular biology, that that was going to become a unifying principle. And he also
251 recognized the point that's very important and that I have noticed as an outsider, and that is that
252 a lot of the people who ended up in our biology department and then eventually in other biology
253 departments across the country were not trained in biology. They were trained in physics, at
254 least up to perhaps a master's level at the least.

255 And in chemistry, biochemistry and so on. So, he was creating a department which at the
256 beginning at least looked like a specialized department. A small – a sliver of contemporary
257 biology. And what most of us would have said looking at that department in the years following
258 was that his strategy was to focus very, very narrowly on a particular area of biology, which
259 would become very famous very quickly, and that's what we were about.

260 We were about becoming famous and major center in something very quickly. And that was
261 what his strategy was, but it wasn't. Not according to Jon anyway. That the strategy, in fact, was
262 to build a department which would eventually inform all of biology. It's interesting because it
263 gave me a perspective on something that was happening at Penn, where the dean of the
264 medical school there, Helen certainly knows –

265 **RANNEY:** Bill.

266 **CHODOROW:** Bill Kelley. Neutron Bill as he's called. Bill Kelley's scientific program, and it
267 amazes people that he actually has one, but he does, and he's quite passionately devoted to it.
268 His scientific program, the medical school was to form every department in every field with

269 genetics – with molecular genetics and gene therapy, ultimately. And his recruitments are doing
270 that. But in his case, he is working with a panoply of departments that already exist in their
271 traditional department after all. Penn's Medical School is the first one that was founded in this
272 country.

273 It goes back to the eighteenth century. It is a definition of a mature institution. And in order to
274 carry out what he's trying to do, he has to plant people in the different departments who are
275 united by basically molecular biology. Whereas here, without anything on the ground, they were
276 able to do it in a very different way – in a unified way. But the intent, which was important, and
277 which will give us a way of approaching the department in the long run and its history, it was to
278 develop a department which looked like a biology department but had this one unifying
279 approach which has become an effective unifying approach in biology, period, in the last 40
280 years.

281 And Jon at least though, and I agree with him from my own reading, that in 1958/1959/1960,
282 when Bonner was thinking this way and when he was able to come here, having been a
283 maverick at Yale and coming here as a leader, that in those years that was a really visionary
284 approach to biology. It looks obvious now. It was not obvious then since the double helix was
285 1953. And so, it wasn't that old and it wasn't so clear at that point what was going to happen.

286 Looking at some of the other departments, one of the things I was of course interested in was
287 history and my own department. And I got to UCSD I guess four years after the first historians
288 got here, the senior people. And what was interesting in that, and again it chose a different
289 approach. In this case, John Galbraith was in a way the visionary who wanted to hire the first
290 chair. And he eventually as able to appoint – history was a particularly hard field to bring here
291 because without a library you can't be a historian.

292 It was hard to imagine – when I came here for example as a junior faculty member, I'll never
293 forget this, Mel – I got a letter from Mel, which he'll never remember, asking me what journals I
294 wanted. I was a 25-year-old. I knew all about this stuff. So, I said 122 journal titles. Essential
295 *[laughter]* journal titles. You got a lot of energy when you're 25, and not much judgment. And so,
296 he lost it. But the point is that it was very hard to imagine coming here as a historian to a place
297 where you're gonna be able to do your work.

298 You could teach here, but your work was gonna be elsewhere. And I spent most of my time, my
299 library time at Berkeley and UCLA and when I wasn't going to the Vatican. And my colleagues

300 were very similar in whatever the big collections were. So that it was hard to attract historians
301 here. They did attract a very distinguished world-class historian, Geoffrey Barraclough. But
302 Geoffrey was a man who never stayed anywhere very long. When I told my mentor that Geoff
303 Barraclough was at UCSD he said probably not by the time you get here. And that was exactly
304 right. *[laughter]* He was gone when I got here.

305 He was here for two or three years and he was gone. And he also was not, although he was
306 intellectually in discipline a great leader, he wasn't an institution person and builder. So that he
307 didn't actually I don't think ever served as chair. Instead, an associate professor started this
308 chair, that was Gabe Jackson, and we interviewed Gabe. And one of the interesting things that
309 was striking about that department in the early days was that unlike the other departments,
310 which recruited people from the major research universities around the country, the history
311 department first eight or so senior people were all from school colleges. They were all liberal
312 arts college people.

313 Knox College, St. John's College, Smith College – we went big time when we went for
314 Dartmouth. Those are the kinds of places that our first historians came from. Cornell College in
315 Iowa – these were very good historians, by the way. But they had no professional experience of
316 a major research university. And the department that I joined was a small college department.
317 And that department of history had to go through a revolution in the early '70s to turn itself into a
318 university department, a research-oriented department. And one consequence of that was that
319 virtually every single one of the senior faculty who had founded the department left.

320 They didn't just get up and leave, but they left one by one over a period of about four years. And
321 so, following the history of that department could be very interesting. And he asked somebody
322 else to do it because I was too much involved. But it gives you again an idea of some of the
323 variety of the departments. Two of the people, founders we interviewed are here – Leonard
324 Newark in linguistics, and I listened to the interview, I was telling him, just in the last couple of
325 days in preparation for this, and it's a wonderful interview because there's a whole interview of
326 linguistics into the '60s.

327 And in his case, and he'll correct me if I'm wrong, but in his case a revolution had taken place in
328 the late '50s led by Chomsky, which had essentially worn out in linguistics by '61 or '62. It was
329 essentially recognized by then, not by everybody obviously, but recognized that Chomsky had
330 transformed the discipline. And what Leonard thought to do as a beginning was to try to recruit

331 those people to go after Chomsky, who was at MIT. Problem was that Chomsky and a
332 psychologist named George Miller, who George Mandler was also interested in, and we're
333 gonna interview George, by the way, next month.

334 There was a community of people in Boston who were really very close friends and worked
335 together, collaborators, and none of them would come without any of the others. And the one
336 who was the key to the whole thing was Roman Jakobson. And so, Leonard went through the
337 story of trying to recruit Roman Jakobson and this was one of those – well, I'll just say it. This
338 was a case in which there was an attempt at what we might call affirmative nepotism and it
339 failed. And when it failed the whole thing collapsed. And so, none of those senior leaders, those
340 really great leaders, would come.

341 And the result was that he built the department instead based on the best graduate students of
342 all those people. *[laughter]* So that instead of building in effect from the top down in terms of age
343 and stature, which is what all our departments were doing, following the principle of Roger that
344 he had established, built from the top down, senior people who hired the junior people, senior
345 people who established the graduate program, and then when there are enough people there,
346 meaning you've hired a bunch of kids like me, you then build an undergraduate program, so on.

347 In the case of linguistics, it ended up going to the best graduate schools, the best faculty in the
348 country and seeking their best graduate students and building a young department instead of
349 the old one. But, in a revolutionary situation, which is what you are in, if you didn't get the three
350 or four or five senior people who were part of the revolution you were better off not getting
351 anybody else. So, the strategy actually was the only one in which one who could take
352 advantage of this revolution. The other thing that was bound up with that department foundation
353 was language teaching.

354 Because as many of you may know, UCSD was one of the early, not the earliest, but one of the
355 early institutions in which language teaching was taken out of the hands of literature with the
356 complicity of the literature department being found in about the same time. That is, they didn't
357 want to be a language teaching department. They wanted to be a literary studies department.

358 And the linguistics department was going to take on, and one of the reasons Leonard came was
359 that he was recognized as a person who knew a lot about, had been involved in language
360 teaching, and the development of the language program, UCSD language program was it had
361 been a part, was bound up with the foundation of linguistics, which became a department which

362 did this gigantic service for the campus, which was theoretically based. It was based on
363 linguistic theory.

364 But it was in fact an on the ground service to the institution at the same time it was developing a
365 revolutionary core of linguists who were doing and have done very important work, and whose
366 teaching was mostly in the linguistics at the graduate level, since very few students,
367 undergraduates, take linguistics courses. Not that they take courses, but they don't take the
368 major. They don't become – they don't have a clue what it is for one thing.

369 The difference between that and literature, which was based on a real theory that Roy Pearce
370 had during the 1950s had formulated a theory which broke down the traditional notion that
371 literature is really a part of a culture, and therefore it should be tied to its language instruction
372 and tied to national history, the old nineteenth century ideal, which we still are stuck with. If you
373 look at most campuses you'll find that literature departments look like nineteenth century
374 Europe. They are German and French and Italian and Spanish and so on. They're nation states
375 and they behave like nation states.

376 The problem is that they don't have any students anymore. So, they're nation states without
377 armies and they are really in trouble. Really in very deep trouble. And 40 years, 50 years before
378 its time, basically Roy Pearce envisioned a department which would break all that down and
379 which would really be a department of comparative literature by definition, and in which there
380 would be in fact a discipline called literary studies which would unite all those people, and which
381 did unite them.

382 And one of the consequences of that, and I can talk about it as having been their dean for 11
383 years and having therefore had arguments with them about this for a decade, I was one of their
384 projects. They had to teach me what they were up to so I wouldn't do any real damage to them
385 as a dean. The big advantage, and I saw this when I went to Penn and I saw it in other UC
386 campuses of this format was, first of all people talked to one another who usually didn't, and
387 they very often collaborated in ways they never did elsewhere.

388 But also, the duplication of courses and program in most campuses which have individual, and
389 sometimes 10 or 11 individual departments of literature is staggering. There are 10 or 11 theory
390 courses in those places, and they are basically duplicates of one another, fiercely defendant as
391 being independent and different from one another. But if you're an outsider, you look at them,
392 they look the same to you as an outsider.

393 Here, all of that's unified. And because it's unified and because all of the stakeholders are
394 present in a single department, the result is that the theory courses are contested early, what
395 should be in them, how they should be structured, what role they play is dealt with by the entire
396 range of people in literary studies and the result is a much better course. It's not only more
397 efficient, it's also more effective. And this is an institution, this is a department which has been
398 known, well known as a center for literary theory for a long time.

399 The other person was Joe [Joseph R. Gusfield]. We talked to Joe about sociology and Joe,
400 again he'll correct me if I'm wrong, was dealing with a discipline which had taken a turn to the
401 numerical and the scientific and was badly divided between people who were qualitative in their
402 approach to sociology and people who were quantitative, and therefore at one level he came
403 with the intention of creating a coherent qualitative department. But there was something else
404 that came through in the interview that was very powerful and very interesting to listen to, and
405 that is Joe was deeply concerned about bringing intellectuals here.

406 He was looking not just for persons who had written good books and articles in qualitative
407 sociology, but people who he had come to know over the years as having very broad intellectual
408 interests and having real intellectual character. You didn't hear that very much from other
409 founders at UCSD. Most of us, most of the founders were really interested in the professional
410 characteristics and performance of the people that we were hiring, and they were interested as
411 for example Mel [Melford E.] Spiro was, in developing a particular kind of department, a specific
412 kind of department.

413 But beyond that therefore he wanted people who did that kind of work and did it well, but this
414 other value, the intellectual community value you might say, was missing at least from their
415 rhetoric if not from their intentions. It's not that people were not – we're all professional
416 intellectuals, but that's not usually what we as faculty call intellectuals. The fact that we do
417 intellectual work doesn't make us intellectuals. We have a higher definition, a broader definition
418 of what an intellectual is. And it's in Joe's department that that was a positive, conscious value
419 that was applied in the appointment.

420 And so, as you go through and interview these founders and the other early members you begin
421 to get a picture of the different ways in which these would approach. Every one of them seeking
422 to create departments which would become extremely good very fast, and which would be
423 dominated by a group of senior faculty who were already established when they got here, and

424 this is true except for Leonard who tried it but he couldn't make it happen. These departments
425 would be dominated by the senior group which would give them an intellectual and professional
426 character as a foundation stone upon which the future of the department would depend.

427 And within that general approach, every department's really very different in the way they
428 approach this, in the language they actually made the recruitments in their vision in relation to
429 their discipline. I want to talk of course to Sol [Stanford S.] Penner, Paul Libby, to Sandy
430 [Sanford A.] Lakoff and Marty [Martin M.] Shapiro, who were the founding members, the first two
431 members of the political science department. And I would invite you to suggest people that I
432 should talk to. Send me an email or a note, a snail mail note and even handwrite it. I'm a
433 paleographer, I can read—

[END OF PART ONE, BEGIN PART TWO]

434 **CHODOROW:** And if we didn't build a great library, it was hopeless, we were
435 never going to build a great campus. And the appointment of Mel [Melvin] Voigt was a critical
436 element. In fact, he was one of the first appointments. He was here, just told me got here in
437 November of 1960, which was the month in which the campus— that regents actually approved
438 the campus. Because there were already graduate students here, who would have been in big
439 trouble if they hadn't done it.

440 But nonetheless, he was here at the beginning. And he had support from the campus, from
441 Herb [Herbert F. York] who was the chancellor, who had just come in as chancellor at that point,
442 that was exemplary and really far more I think than most of the other beginning librarians had.
443 But there was something he did that made a huge difference in the early development of the
444 library that was just clever as can be. There were three libraries that had to be built.

445 First of all, there wasn't a very clear definition of how you start a library. If you're starting from
446 more or less scratch, of course there was a Scripps library. But the Scripps library was quite
447 specialized, and you had to develop a library for a general teaching and research program. The
448 first step was, and this was something that Mel himself was involved in, was defining what a
449 base library of a research university looks like? How do you get it started, the 75,000-volume
450 sort of teaching collection and so on? How do you start to develop this notion?

451 But beyond that, how do you compete with the other two libraries that were being founded in
452 more or less the same time? And what Mel came up with was a project in which they convinced

453 the regents, and through the regents I suppose, legislature, that UCSD should become the
454 organizer of an effort to build all three libraries. So, you create three base libraries, which will be
455 essentially equivalent to one another. You'd by three of everything. But it would be done here.
456 Be done through here.

457 What that meant to us wasn't that we got more books, although I suspect we did get more
458 books, Mel, if you'd ever admit it. *[laughter]* But that we got the entire apparatus. One of the
459 things you learn when you start to work on libraries – in my other life I've been involved in
460 libraries and I'm chair of the board of the Council and Library Information Resources in
461 Washington. And one of the things I've learned over the years is that a library is not just its
462 books. A library is its staff. It's the ability to process the books, to manage the collections, to
463 build the collections. That's critical.

464 And what this project did was to give UCSD a first-class staff and apparatus for building our
465 collections, which at the beginning built three collections, but then was ours. And I think that
466 made a huge difference in the quality of the personnel and of their experience in building our
467 library over the other libraries aside from the kind of support that the campus gave the library.
468 That was critical.

469 The people, and again, it was a case of leadership and building a staff, and in this case
470 professional librarians, who could take us to a level that was beyond the level that the other
471 campuses were going to achieve. And in fact, in this case, however they're doing in their
472 departments, and some of the departments at Irvine and Santa Cruz are really quite terrific, their
473 libraries are nowhere compared to UCSD's. Nowhere. So that early advantage has really paid
474 off big time.

475 Brad has been helping me, and I'm going to ask him to say something about the way our
476 collection of materials and to add anything he wants to add to what I have said. So, it's not a
477 matter of showing you this stuff that's in the library. You have to go there. But as an archivist
478 and so on, we are trying to collect faculty papers and have had quite a lot of success in doing
479 that, and Brad is the principal there.

480 **WESTBROOK:** Let me segue from what Stan just said about the library overall. Perhaps a
481 really good measure –

482 **RANNEY:** We're all getting old. You'll have to speak up.

483 **WESTBROOK:** I'll try. Perhaps a really good measure of the success of the library overall is
484 its special collections library. In the 30 or 35 years that it's been in existence, it has built
485 renowned collections, internationally renowned collections in three or four, maybe a half a
486 dozen areas, and they happen to be contemporary experimental American poetry, Melanesian
487 anthropology, twentieth century science and technology, Spanish Civil War history and Pacific
488 voyages. And those are fairly lofty collections, I think you'll agree.

489 One of the other places that we've been putting a lot of our energy, however, is in documenting
490 the history of this university which I think we'll all agree will be a wonderful story 50, 100 years
491 from now if it's not one already. And some of the things that we're trying to capture to get that
492 history is the administrative records, the various administrator, such as the chancellor, vice
493 chancellors, a few deans, a few department chairs. Campus publications on a very select basis,
494 not every publication, but certainly the central ones so it captures the cultural and social history
495 of the university.

496 And finally, most important I think as a building block are research papers of the university's
497 faculty, partly because those document in a very low level the administrative history of the
498 university. Those collections include lots of departmental memos, document decision-making
499 process at a very low level, how a program came to be born, why a program went out of
500 existence for instance. They also have documentation for the larger greater issues affecting the
501 campus. Things that start to show up in Academic Senate.

502 And finally, they look outward to the development of disciplines. So not only do they document
503 the history for us, but also the history of the various disciplines that this university has been
504 supporting. And with this oral history project, which owes a lot to James Arnold actually – Dr.
505 Arnold instigated this about three years ago when he came to me and asked me to assist with
506 just preparing his own oral history. And as you can see from the handout that I gave you, there's
507 one instance where Dr. Chodorow assisted as the Interlochen tour, but there were two earlier
508 episodes capturing different phases of Dr. Arnold's life.

509 We are planning to do several more of these interviews one on one with UCSD faculty about
510 recruitment, about the early academic foundations, but also to start maybe looking at certain
511 themes or intertwining of themes. One of the themes that I've been discussing with Dr. Arnold is
512 the co-development of the university in late twentieth century science and La Jolla and how

513 those two things started to come together in the late '50s and '60s, and it's an idea that he would
514 like to pursue very much.

515 That's about all I have to say about these tapes, except to say finally they are being transcribed.
516 The transcription process will probably be complete by June and they'll be available for reading
517 in the Special Collections library. They are available right now for listening if anybody is
518 interested.

519 **CHODOROW:** The floor is open.

520 **MALE 1:** I remember looking at the original history of the campus that you mentioned at the
521 beginning. I immediately put it aside as untruth. In your recounting of some of the research
522 you've done so far, I envision a real problem. How do you avoid this work becoming a puff piece
523 for the university? See, that's the problem –

524 **CHODOROW:** A puff-piece.

525 **MALE 1:** —all the stories you told were heartwarming. Where's the bad news? *[laughter]* I
526 mean there's got to be some in the history of this campus. See, without mentioning any specific
527 departments, something that – I'm sorry, Brad?

528 **WESTBROOK:** Brad.

529 **MALE 1:** That Brad mentioned about university publications, the *UCSD Times*, which gets
530 delivered in the faculty and staff mailboxes, used to be an interesting paper. They'd publish
531 articles by faculty members, controversial, interesting, which bode letters to the editor. And the
532 university calendar was a separate _____ *[inaudible]*. Now they're combined. And you read the
533 *UCSD Times*, it's puff pieces.

534 **CHODOROW:** Right.

535 **MALE 1:** There's nothing interesting to read in there except those of your friends getting
536 honored. So that's part of the corporatization. How does that get avoided?

537 **CHODOROW:** Some of it's avoided by being honest and – not necessarily honest, but bold.
538 And taking risks when you're trying to write this stuff. Some of the negative history, the
539 controversies, the anger, the failures of the system and the individual departments are revealed
540 in things like program reviews that have been done over the years and have to be studied

541 carefully. And in the responses of departments to program reviews, and that's why graduate
542 council records are important.

543 And some, it is actually is in these interviews. I just didn't choose to bring it out, all of it. The
544 other thing I think is that the study of the development of the disciplines will – during the period
545 when these departments were being formed, before or during these departments. Will was
546 beginning to reveal the strains that took place as a result of choices that were made here that
547 were not regarded in the field as good choices. And that's another.

548 You may find in some cases that folks on the campus got along pretty well. Pretty well. But they
549 didn't get along with other members of their own discipline. They were taking risks or they were
550 taking a position, and you'd find that in several departments. You'd find it in anthropology for
551 example, but not just in anthropology. You also will find, and I happen to know it because for a
552 while I was dean of everything except for engineering. Remember, by the way, the first deans,
553 modern deans – there must have been people called deans early on and there was always a
554 dean of graduate studies. But the first disciplinary deans were in 1982, is it right? Yeah, and that
555 was engineering.

556 And then once engineering was formed as a—and that's a major transition that I haven't dealt
557 with yet, and it's going to be very important, because remember that the early departments were
558 founded as flight science departments. We weren't going to do engineering at UCSD and then
559 we moved in the traditional way. And the foundation of the division of engineering and now the
560 School of Engineering was a major piece of that. But once that happened then it was a clamor
561 by everybody else, we need a dean too, and I got to be that person for a while. For two years I
562 was dean of everything else. *[laughter]*

563 And for linguistics. So, I know for example that there was controversy in linguistics between
564 what would you call them, religions? Churches? And they need to be explored. The other thing
565 that needs to be explored is that UCSD started in very special circumstances, partly because
566 there were deals made with central administration that allowed the campus to do things that
567 made the campus different than the other campuses. But over time they had to regress to the
568 mean, both in the salary structure and the support dollars and so on. And there's a lot of strain
569 that I experienced myself, but that is also in the records as that process took place, which was
570 mostly in the later '70s, in the second half of the '70s and on.

571 And by the way, most of us who were here early on, you and especially those of you who taught
572 undergraduates, will remember that the students in the late '60s and up to around '73 or '74
573 were unbelievable. They were absolutely – they were pioneers as undergraduates. They were
574 bright as hell. They were brighter than – and I remember from the middle '70s on, there was a
575 seat change in our undergraduate population.

576 **MALE 1:** They still are unbelievable, but for different reasons.

577 **CHODOROW:** For different *[laughter]* – yeah. And so that's another thing. I remember going
578 through myself personally, this stage where I went away for a year and a half. I came back and
579 the student body was different and I spent two years not only being angry that I had to teach
580 these idiots, but revealing that I was angry, which made my teaching just terrible. I had two bad
581 years before I finally said to myself, this is the student body I've got. I've got to teach them. I've
582 got to figure out how I'm going to teach them. They're different from the ones I had earlier. And
583 that was – those transitions also have to be –

584 **MALE 2:** Stan, as I'm listening to your excellent and wonderful nostalgic remarks, thoughts of
585 inclusion and exclusion came to me. For example, linguistics was not only undergoing a
586 revolution, it was revolutionizing the humanities and social sciences. But who had the vision to
587 see that? Because in many ways one would have thought that linguistics was something of a
588 marginal department to begin a university with. But somebody must have had the vision to
589 understand its importance.

590 Also, I'd never heard much discussion until you and I and Herb and Mark were involved in that
591 committee to try and start a law school. Was law school ever talked about in the early days?

592 **CHODOROW:** In the very early days, I don't know. Herb, do you know? I don't think so. I
593 don't think so.

594 **HERB:** No, as far as I know what you're talking about is the first instance in which we
595 seriously were involved. And part of the inspiration was the new political science department
596 that we wanted to expand its intellectual activities in that direction. Shapiro—

597 **CHODOROW:** Martin Shapiro in particular, but also Sandy [Sanford A. Lakoff] was in
598 political theories.

599 **MALE 3:** Think about the linguistics department that early—

600 **MALE 4:** I want to make a comment, Herb, that the comment you just made about law was
601 brought up very clearly and was agreed not to be raised at the time we were trying to get med
602 school off the ground.

603 **HERB:** Well, that may also be. It's hard to remember that kind of negative. *[laughter]*

604 **WESTBROOK:** No, that's a question though that you may want to explore.

605 **CHODOROW:** That's right.

606 **MALE 4:** I recall Revelle talking in early '60s or even before that about whether it made sense
607 to consider law school and the conclusion was it was not needed in the beginning thing.

608 **HERB:** Well we came to that same conclusion after a much more thorough study. *[laughter]*

609 **CHODOROW:** One of the things that is part of what we are finding and *[inaudible comment]*
610 had said earlier, in the very early days of the campus, which is what we have been focusing on,
611 there's a euphoria here of building and of collegiality and so on, that will break down. So, as you
612 pursue the story into the '70s, there's a good deal of breakdown and that's when you start to get
613 the difficult times.

614 **RANNEY:** And that's the same time the students began to change.

615 **CHODOROW:** And that's when the students began to change among other things. That's
616 right. One of the things that's interesting is there's been a lot of work recently on what the
617 characteristics of a highly productive organization are. And the theorists who are mostly
618 economists and political scientist types and management types in places like Wharton, seem to
619 think that institutions are most productive in terms of whatever their business is, that is in our
620 case it would have been producing articles and books and so on, that they're most productive
621 when they are relatively small and in which there are very few or very low walls, internal walls,
622 dividing people from one another. As interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary units who tend to be
623 most productive.

624 So, one of the things that it'd be interesting to study is whether in fact over as this institution
625 grew and as the walls around departments began to rise, which was inevitable – because also,
626 of course as you get more and more people in any given discipline, their tendency is to spend
627 your time talking to one another and not to talk to all these other guys. There's only so many

628 hours in a day and to the degree which that affected the character of the work, the amount of
629 the work that was being done, and that's hard to judge.

630 But it's something I would certainly want to look at. And the degree to which that image that we
631 all had when we first got here, I mean we were just coming onto the campus. Urey Hall was not
632 very old in 1968. I guess it was open in '64. And so, the upper campus, the general campus was
633 a brand-new place, that there's still memory of that time when everybody was down in Scripps,
634 and in which people were sort of cheek by jowl and were talking to one another all the time. And
635 the students were talking to them all the time. And that experience lasted, the glow of that
636 experience lasted a long time. The question is, what difference did it make? Did it ever really
637 make a difference? Was it a more productive period?

638 You also have to factor in the age. The fact is that if you're 35, you've got a lot of energy and
639 you can do a lot of things, which at 55 or 65 you're probably doing less most of the time. Until
640 you retire. Then you can do more than anything else you ever did before. But that is, you have
641 to factor in that energy and level as well in making these assessments. But it'll be interesting to
642 see whether these modern theories of organization, such as they are, really can be tested in
643 any way in this history. Yeah?

644 **MALE 5:** There was this initial orientation towards graduate institutions, small classes, and
645 that began to attenuate, and that's certainly part of this regression you speak of.

646 **CHODOROW:** When I first got here we were told that we would have 60 percent graduate
647 students. It didn't take many years to realize how unlikely that was going to be.

648 **WESTBROOK:** I don't think we ever exceeded 15 percent.

649 **CHODOROW:** That's right. You knew it because I remember doing those calculations also
650 as a vice, that's right.

651 **RANNEY:** I think we're coming *[inaudible comment]*

652 **CHODOROW:** As we come to a close—? As I say, just one more thing and that is if you
653 have ideas about people we should be talking to and ideas about areas we really want to cover,
654 I wish you would send them to me or to Brad in the Special Collections – Brad Westbrook and
655 we will follow up. This is something we'd like to build a record, which is both an oral record and

656 eventually a paper record of this place so that when I finally do retire I can actually get to work
657 on this. *[laughter]*

658 **MALE 6:** What's the way of communicating with you?

659 **CHODOROW:** The best way of communicating with me I think is care of Special Collections
660 in the library. In the Geisel library.

661 **RANNEY:** You're learning about ____.

662 **CHODOROW:** I'll also give you my email.

663 **RANNEY:** When you're done reading about the campus as it's come along, don't read
664 Anderson, read *[inaudible comment]*.

665 **CHODOROW:** Well, you know one of the things I haven't done yet, and I've been told I
666 should do it in a will, is to talk to the spouses.

667 **RANNEY:** Those were the *[Inaudible comment] [crosstalk]* people they were recruiting.

668 **CHODOROW:** And the spouses, because they played such a large role in the early days in
669 particular in recruitments. My email, by the way, is—that's the other way of getting hold of me.

670 **RANNEY:** Your email's like *[inaudible comment]*.

671 **CHODOROW:** My email is my—

672 **RANNEY:** We're all in the same Eudora [email system].

673 **CHODOROW:** *[laughs]* That's right.

674 **RANNEY:** I think we should draw it as a little after *[inaudible]* schedule. I'd thank Stan very
675 much, welcome him home and thank you. *[audience applauds]*

676 **CHODOROW:** Thank you. It's good to be home. Twenty-nine degrees in Philadelphia.
677 *[laughter]*

[END OF PART TWO, END OF INTERVIEW]