

An Oral History of  
**GABRIEL JACKSON and STANLEY CHODOROW**  
On October 1, 1998

[MARGINAL AUDIO QUALITY]

1   **CHODOROW:**   The purpose of these conversations is to reminisce about the origins of  
2   importance at UCSD. My purpose— my principal purpose— is to do kind of intellectual [*inaudible*]  
3   Questions I've been trying to get at with various people are questions about their vision at the  
4   time or the vision of the first members of the department. The relationship of that vision to where  
5   the profession was at the time, and where the discipline was at that time, and the way in which  
6   the early recruitments up into the early seventies affected that vision. You have the accidents of  
7   who can recruit and who can't, so reminisces, for example, about who you tried to recruit and  
8   couldn't; who you did succeed in recruiting; and what difference that made in terms of the  
9   structure— the intellectual structure— of the department; and any reflections you might have on  
10   where it went once you could call it established. There were probably sixteen or eighteen  
11   members of the department from about 1972; at that point, you might look at what happened as  
12   a result of certain recruitments, and anything you wish to say about any of those things are  
13   important. Let me start by asking a question that has come up again and again. As I understand  
14   it, you were the first historian to arrive, but that Barraclough had already been appointed as was  
15   arriving.

16   **JACKSON:**   Barraclough and Stavrianos. It was supposed to be one of Roy [Harvey] Pearce's  
17   famous troikas with the two established men—Stavrianos and I, as the junior member approved  
18   by them as the junior member.

19   **CHODOROW:**   Right. And you two would have come as associate professors.

20   **JACKSON:**   Yes.

21   **CHODOROW:**   And Barraclough, of course, was then senior professor.

22   **JACKSON:**   Yes—No, Stavrianos, too. He was—

23   **CHODOROW:**   Oh, he was more senior.

24 **JACKSON:** Oh, yes, he was. He was a full professor and was already well-known for his  
25 world history text. And I would say the idea of the department was to be a world history  
26 department, and I liked that because I've always liked breadth; I've always liked perspective;  
27 and that part of it was fine for me. But then, of course, when Stavrianos pulled out and  
28 Barraclough took a year's leave of absence before coming, and was then very, very arbitrary  
29 and personal about things after he got here, it left me, in effect, the founding chairman of the  
30 department without having wanted be and without having been hired with that in mind either;  
31 that, in a sense, was accidental. Now, I should say Barraclough was very good to me in the  
32 sense that he approved all the suggestions and appointments that I made. Galbraith, who was  
33 the chancellor, didn't sign anything that I was recommending until it also had Barraclough's  
34 approval. Barraclough, whatever his reasons were, he approved the things I did.

35 **CHODOROW:** Why did Leften Stavrianos withdraw at the last minute? The irony being that  
36 he's now here— in retirement.

37 **JACKSON:** I just have no idea. See, I came out here in late August with the family, and the  
38 girls were only five, six years old, so they're just like twenty-four hours' worth of work without  
39 thinking about why the presumed chairman hadn't actually come; and Galbraith just told me,  
40 "Jackson, you're it." The relationship with him was very good, too. John Galbraith and I liked and  
41 respected each other.

42 **CHODOROW:** When you talked about being a World History department, what was the  
43 structure of the traditional department at that time, and how would this have differed?

44 **JACKSON:** I would say it would have differed not so much— The world history idea was that  
45 you should always be conscious of the world; that everything you were doing should be in a  
46 perspective of the world, not just of the west, or of Greece, Rome, Middle Ages, modern times,  
47 that kind of thing. It's not that they thought in terms of everybody has to be working in world  
48 history; it's rather that to get a department where they thought in comparative terms and value  
49 terms on the whole human scale rather than "we're going to develop French history or we're  
50 going to develop German history." And I would say in that sense, frankly, that the only  
51 appointments about which I really felt successful in getting that kind of spirit were Frances  
52 Tanikawa, who left later to go to Emery with her husband, and Curtis Wilson; Sam Baron was a  
53 professional in Russian history; Guillermo Céspedes was a professional in Colonial Latin

54 American history. I don't think these guys really cared at all about the world history and its  
55 [inaudible]

56 **CHODOROW:** Frances was in American Diplomatic history and training, although she never  
57 finished her degree. And, of course, Curtis was a historian of science.

58 **JACKSON:** He was a historian of science.

59 **CHODOROW:** One of the strategies that clearly followed early on— aside from the junior  
60 people who came out of the major graduate schools— was that the more senior people came,  
61 typically, from liberal arts colleges rather than other universities. Was that a strategy or was that  
62 an accident?

63 **JACKSON:** I would say that was an accident because, you see, I had taught at Wellesley  
64 College and Knox College, so my contacts really were in that world more; and also, because  
65 you could get high quality people at a lower price. To get somebody as good as Sam Baron,  
66 who had already been professor of history in a major state university and so on, would have  
67 been more difficult. And I would say— you have to compare my memories with those of Roy  
68 Pearce and maybe [Richard] Popkin — but I think that since they had a relatively untested  
69 associate professor acting as chairman, they were also— they were holding back; they weren't  
70 giving history the money for the big FTs that they gave to philosophy and literature.

71 **CHODOROW:** [inaudible]

72 **JACKSON:** I think that was largely between Galbraith and Barraclough. Now, that's my  
73 impression from the results; it's not that I was in on any such negotiations. But Barraclough was  
74 medieval historian who then became the editor of the *London Times World Atlas*, and he wrote  
75 a book on world history. I think it was— Galbraith wanted to bring Barraclough— it was  
76 another thing that was characteristic of all the recruiting here was "instant greatness"— get a lot  
77 of famous people right away. The scientists, of course, had done this— sometimes successfully,  
78 sometimes not— recruiting big names. In that sense, Galbraith used his personal friendship with  
79 Barraclough to sign up Barraclough.

80 **CHODOROW:** And Galbraith's own field was the British Empire, which was a form of world  
81 history.

82 **WESTBROOK:** [inaudible]

83 **JACKSON:** I'm very skeptical about everything that you're now saying. I don't about for the  
84 scientists, but the Department of Literature actually became a set of fiefdoms. I taught in the  
85 humanities program as I believed in it strongly for the entire twenty-year period that I was here.  
86 And the literature people— it was impossible to get them to teach any history. The philosophers  
87 were good about really— you know, the idea was one-third history, one-third literature, one-third  
88 philosophy. I think the historians and the philosophers really— either they refused to take part or  
89 they did that way if they taught in humanities. Sam Baron never taught in humanities, but he  
90 was perfectly frank about the fact; he wasn't interested in that aspect. But I remember one  
91 colleague in literature when I was a chairman of the humanities committee, and I asked him to  
92 submit— we all submitted a reading list— there was absolutely nothing that resembled history  
93 on the list. So, I asked him about, and he pointed to Gibbon's autobiography— that was history.  
94 I don't think that the actual development of the Department of Literature did cross borders and  
95 so forth in the way that the propaganda suggested.

96 **CHODOROW:** Did it make it a difference in those early days that Popkin was developing a  
97 Department of Philosophy that was dedicated to the history of philosophy? Did it make a  
98 difference, for example, to relations between the two departments?

99 **JACKSON:** I think it did, just for real intellectual contact between philosophy and history.

100 **CHODOROW:** Was it contemplated it all that the curriculum of the department would reflect  
101 the world history emphasis or ethos?

102 **JACKSON:** I don't really know much about that because, you see, what also happened was  
103 that because of the Vietnam War, the Civil Rights Movement, and all the upsets, after the first  
104 two years, my energy was on campus matters in relation with the public and so on. I really had  
105 very little to do with the inner workings of the Department of History after the— I was  
106 responsible for Frances Tanikawa, Sam Baron, Cespedes, Curtis Wilson, Ramon Ruiz. After  
107 that I was, of course, on ad hoc committees, but I wasn't leading the department in terms of  
108 "what kind of guy are we going to recruit?"

109 **CHODOROW:** Who were the principal American historians in the first American historian you  
110 hired? Frances was here earlier. Is there a senior person— before Harry?

111 **JACKSON:** No, no. There was just—

112 **CHODOROW:** There was Armin [Rappaport].

113 **JACKSON:** Yes, Armin— I'm trying to think of the guy who writes on the Supreme Court—

114 **CHODOROW:** Oh, Mike Parrish

115 **JACKSON:** Mike Parrish.

116 **CHODOROW:** He and I came the same year.

117 **JACKSON:** Yeah, yeah. You mentioned at the beginning recruitments that didn't work. I  
118 wanted very much to bring from Vassar a professor of American History, whose name I cannot  
119 remember now, but it was nixed in advance. They wouldn't even bring him out for an interview  
120 because he hadn't published enough. He then went on to become a full professor at Stanford—

121 **CHODOROW:** It's Carl Degler.

122 **JACKSON:** Yeah. We could have had him here in 1970 if— and there was the business of  
123 "well, you know, if he hasn't already published several books" and so on. He published one  
124 book; it was an excellent book.

125 **CHODOROW:** Was there a stirring at the time that you were fully involved in the department  
126 about things like women's history or what became later known as ethnic histories of various  
127 kinds within the American— ?

128 **JACKSON:** Not right at the beginning, no. I think that came immediately with the third college  
129 movement, whenever that was.

130 **CHODOROW:** '69— '68,'69— yeah, so that's right. What—

131 **JACKSON:** I remember everybody telling me how great it was when I hired Frances  
132 Tanikawa— that it was a minority and a woman at the same time when they were just getting  
133 started on that sort of thing. But it wasn't a question of teaching; she wasn't teaching Japanese-  
134 American history or anything like that.

135 **CHODOROW:** What would you say was a consequence of building the department early on  
136 from essentially two sources: one was the small college experience— the liberal arts college  
137 experience among the more senior people— and the coming out of big graduate schools—  
138 Cornell or Harvard or whatever— UCLA— these are the places where the younger faculty came  
139 from. Did that make a difference from your point of view? How did it interact with other

140 departments with mostly being built from major university departments? I mean, Mel [Melford]  
141 Spiro's and [Joseph] Gusfield's recruiting was done mostly at major universities.

142 **JACKSON:** Well, wasn't that just as true of history for filling the younger positions? I mean,  
143 from the beginning, you and Parrish and so on, you all came from major graduate schools.

144 **CHODOROW:** The question is whether the fact that the senior faculty had a particular kind of  
145 academic experience— whether that made a difference in the way in which constructed the  
146 department and the ethos of the department. Did it emphasize teaching, for example? Did it  
147 have an effect on the way the graduate program developed?

148 **JACKSON:** I really just don't know. It doesn't set off bells; it doesn't—

149 **CHODOROW:** It doesn't strike you.

150 **JACKSON:** Yeah.

151 **CHODOROW:** Now one of the things I lived through as a junior faculty member was that  
152 when Ramon Ruiz came, he seemed determined to change the nature of the department. How  
153 did that play out and what did it mean, from the point of view of the senior leadership?

154 **JACKSON:** Well, there I think it was— There, I would say, it was quite personal, in the  
155 sense that I didn't really enjoy being chairman. I was sort of in there because there was nobody  
156 else at the moment; and when Ruiz sensed that, he looked upon that as an opportunity. He did  
157 want to become a chairman, and he did want to lead and develop a department and so on. And  
158 so then I was in the way for him— the fact that I was still there. But I would say that as of,  
159 maybe, '71 or '72, Ramon wanted to take the initiatives, and then the question would be whether  
160 Armand or Galbraith— no, Galbraith was gone— Things sort of polarized around his  
161 leadership: do you want to do what Ramon is suggesting or don't you want to do what Ramon is  
162 suggesting? By this time, I was budget committee and state library committee and all that kind  
163 of thing. I wasn't really that closely involved in the department development.

164 **CHODOROW:** What was it that Ramon wanted to do that was creating an issue?

165 **JACKSON:** Well, I think he wanted to be very clearly in charge. He wanted to hire quality  
166 people, but he wanted to hire quality people who would definitely vote for Ramon Ruiz—  
167 whatever Ramon wanted. I mean, I think that aspect of his personality was very evident; he

168 didn't try to hide it; it was clear. And so, for me and everybody else, it sort of became a question  
169 of "well, if things you think are good about what he's doing— fine; the things you don't like— and  
170 he gets mad if you say the things he don't like."

171 **CHODOROW:** Was there a difference in the way he wanted to recruit? Were there  
172 differences in people? Did he have a theory or anything of that sort about how to recruit a first-  
173 rate department?

174 **JACKSON:** No, I think we all agreed about standards. We didn't have problems deciding  
175 which of the candidates were worth interviewing and so on. What I'm saying is rather, when a  
176 person was here, it was obvious that a very big thing for Ramon was "is this person going to be  
177 my friend or not my friend?"— that kind of thing.

178 **CHODOROW:** Maybe more like, "Will he vote with me?"

179 **JACKSON:** Yeah, yeah.

180 **CHODOROW:** Do you remember the discussions that led to the first tenure cases— the first  
181 tenure cases in the department? First promotions, and whether there were intellectual issues  
182 that were raised in those discussions? The kind of work that was being done?

183 **JACKSON:** Well, certainly, with you and— [*inaudible*]

184 **CHODOROW:** Mike Parrish.

185 **JACKSON:** Yeah. With you and with Mike Parrish, there was no question— I mean, there  
186 was no controversy. Everybody agreed that you were both excellent teachers, and you were  
187 both real scholars. No problem there.

188 **CHODOROW:** [*inaudible*]

189 **JACKSON:** Well, we had a problem with a Russian historian who was highly recommended  
190 by Arnold Mayer and didn't really do much after he got here. From my point of view, that was the  
191 most obvious case of a person being favored because he voted with Ramon. It was not, then, a  
192 real intellectual judgement that was being made. If you name some of the other people in the  
193 department, I might remember more.

194 **CHODOROW:** What about Nauen you know, Franz?

195 **JACKSON:** Oh my gosh, yes. Well, I would say in Nauen's case, he was a fantastic lecturer;  
196 he may have been too good for undergraduate, in the sense that too much meat— too much  
197 stuff— to absorb. He was weak on the further research and publication— and Ramon was  
198 chairman by that time— and just came down on that like a ton of bricks; he was not published  
199 enough. And Roger [Alain] De Laix, also. I don't think De Laix was as intellectually impressive  
200 as Nauen, but the two of them— from the point of view of promotion in a university  
201 department— the weakness was a lack of further publication.

202 **WESTBROOK:** *[inaudible]*

203 **JACKSON:** No, Baron— No, he came here as a full professor. Actually, he has published  
204 more since leaving UCSD, as a matter of fact, than he— That is, he had one important book  
205 and several articles all having to do with the early Marxist leadership in Russia; but since going  
206 to North Carolina, he's done a lot of publishing.

207 **WESTBROOK:** *[inaudible]*

208 **JACKSON:** No, no, no—

209 **CHODOROW:** A junior person who replaced Baron and came as an addition *[inaudible]*

210 **WESTBROOK:** *[inaudible]*

211 **JACKSON:** No, no, not "they"— I'm talking about an individual. No, Sam Baron was—  
212 There was no question of his— I can't think of his name— it was the younger Russian historian.

213 **WESTBROOK:** It was Rob—Robert Edelman

214 **JACKSON:** Is he still here?

215 **WESTBROOK:** Yeah, he got tenure. *[Inaudible]*

216 **CHODOROW:** Was there a shift in the emphasis on the work that was being done by  
217 members of the department away from politics, law, economic history, and toward a social  
218 history. Did you notice the difference at a given time?

219 **JACKSON:** No. It may have happened, but I— My own personal interests were really tied  
220 up with the humanities program and with the world history. And, in a certain sense, part of my



221 taking early retirement was that these were losing causes; and I'd been here for eighteen years,  
222 and I'd seen enough of losing causes.

223 **CHODOROW:** Eventually, of course, there was a world history establishment leading to what  
224 is now fifth college of Eleanor Roosevelt College, which I chaired; I chaired the development  
225 committee when we created the Making of the Modern World course, a two-year world history  
226 course; Which now suffers from a very serious lack of faculty; it's very hard to find faculty to  
227 teach it, it's a hard to teach course. There's a lack of interest because the part was the  
228 professionalization, which is narrowly focused [*inaudible*]...because there are five programs that  
229 need to be filled with faculty now, and there's a lot of competition for the best talent. Let me talk  
230 about that. You wrote on the Spanish Civil war; a very nice book on Spain in the Middle Ages.  
231 You've recently written on twentieth century boom. That was characteristic of people who were  
232 teaching the humanities early on— that they had very broad interests; they had— what I'll call—  
233 wide education.

234 **JACKSON:** Yeah. And if you look at Popkin's and Stroll's publications as philosophers, it gets  
235 broad with interest.

236 **CHODOROW:** Was that something which, upon reflection, was extremely important in the  
237 early days of the campus and became less important as more and more humanities faculty  
238 arrived?

239 **JACKSON:** Yes. Well, here I would say was an interesting psychological thing. The  
240 scientists— or at least the vocal scientists— very much supported the kind of thing that Popkin  
241 and Stroll and I were here for. And the more the literature— and then sociology, anthropology,  
242 economics and so on— they came in much more with the strictly professional interest of their  
243 own rather than the broader sort of thing. But, of course, their word on ad hoc committees, or  
244 budget committee and so on, became as it should— much more important than the sentiments  
245 of those physicists and biologists who'd said, "Oh, it's great to have these broad-minded  
246 philosophers and historians around." So I think that's true. In other words, that there was a  
247 narrowing of spirit or a more strictly professional outlook as the humanities and social sciences  
248 developed, precisely because they were now larger departments; they were on their own; they  
249 had more votes, so on and so on. And also the scientists were being deluged all the more with  
250 letters of recommendation to write for this and that candidate, and so they couldn't pay that  
251 much attention any more, and so on. But I'd say that was true.

252 **CHODOROW:** You think that change of attitude was tied to the kind of departments we built  
253 in the social services.

254 **JACKSON:** I think so, yeah.

255 **CHODOROW:** And the kind of people who came here and, in those departments?

256 **JACKSON:** I'd say especially economics and anthropology. They had very clear parameters  
257 even within their own field; not just anthropologists for anthropologists, but a certain kind of  
258 anthropologist; a certain kind of economist. And I think that was just a very different spirit from  
259 the original history and philosophy outlook about how to build the university.

260 **CHODOROW:** One of the things I'd like to talk about is the origins development of the  
261 Revelle program—the humanities program in particular— but we've heard from several  
262 scientists who participated in those discussions, and who regarded the humanities program as  
263 the model of the kind of program they wanted. They used a broad interdisciplinary program that  
264 represented their view of what humanities should be like. Were you a participant in those early  
265 discussions with Sigurd Burckhardt and others?

266 **JACKSON:** Yeah, yeah.

267 **CHODOROW:** What was going on there? How were you talking about this program? And, in  
268 particular, how did the original conception of the program get played out in reality? I had to deal  
269 with the later stages of reality, when it's hard to find faculty when subject A became a big issue  
270 for us when, you know, cutting down the number of courses you had to take from six to five and  
271 so on. What was it like at the beginning from vision to reality?

272 **JACKSON:** Well, I would say— You see, the vision was that Roger Revelle, [Keith]  
273 Brueckner, Jim Arnold, John Singer — all these major personalities that I met when I was being  
274 recruited and before I even got started here— here were men who said every scientist should a  
275 real background in the humanities; flexibility, imagination come from the humanities; they don't  
276 come from doing more equations. So, of course, we felt very supported. Now I say that kind of  
277 spirit, or an equivalent of it, for all the respect I have for Mel Spiro and his boys or the  
278 Department of Economics and so on, I don't think there was anything of that kind. There was  
279 just a question of "this is our kind of anthropology, and we're going to get people who are  
280 excellent at it and who are published" and so on.

281 **CHODOROW:** Did you find as you taught the course— Was this a course in which you  
282 conceived of it and then when you got into it in the first year or two, discovered that you had  
283 created essentially a course that nobody could deal with? That the students couldn't keep up  
284 with it, or they weren't ready for it or anything of the sort? What was the experience?

285 **JACKSON:** There was some of that. For me, personally, my students at Wellesley had been  
286 so much better prepared— they wouldn't brighter; they didn't have higher IQs— but they were  
287 so much more literate in the courses I taught there that I really had to remake myself as a  
288 humanities teacher in that sense, because the students here were very bright, but they came  
289 from homes where people didn't listen to classical music and they didn't read Plato and so on  
290 and so on. So I would say the actualization was problematic, but at least for the first, I'd say,  
291 three years, I felt very optimistic about because there was this very real support behind from the  
292 scientists; then later on, not so much.

293 **CHODOROW:** Did you— In the early days, you mentioned earlier that you had looked at  
294 other faculty members and reading lists. Was there a formal consultation process where the  
295 staff of the course got together once a year and looked at what they were going to do, and then  
296 had a conversation about it?

297 **JACKSON:** Yeah, yeah. The first couple of years, it was more than once a year. I'd say we  
298 had two or three meetings of humanities lecturers to exchange suggestions, and the idea being  
299 that the reading lists ought to come out roughly one-third, one-third, one-third. As I say, that part  
300 of it worked with the philosophers and the sciences, but it didn't work with the literature.

301 **CHODOROW:** Not even from the beginning?

302 **JACKSON:** Not even from the beginning.

303 **WESTBROOK:** [*inaudible*]

304 **JACKSON:** Well, if you name some of the people who taught.

305 **CHODOROW:** David Crowne certainly taught in the program. Stephen Cox, but when did he  
306 first come?

307 **WESTBROOK:** [*inaudible*]

308 **JACKSON:** Yeah, that's it. I had a picture in my—

309 **CHODOROW:** Did Alazraki teach the humanities program?

310 **JACKSON:** I don't think so.

311 **CHODOROW:** Bob Elliott?

312 **JACKSON:** But in any case, he was very much a literature, literature, literature man— and  
313 Bob Elliott, too. See, the theory of these guys— including Sigurd Burkhardt— the theory was "if  
314 you read literature correctly, you've got the history, you've got the philosophy" and so on. All the  
315 real meat is there in the literature.

316 **CHODOROW:** That's interesting. It's come around because they make claims on all other  
317 disciplines, from the culture—

318 **WESTBROOK:** [*inaudible*]

319 **CHODOROW:** Imperialist literature department. Was the relationship with— You've  
320 mentioned Roy Pearce several times? He was instrumental in helping getting the department  
321 started at the time because he was here first.

322 **JACKSON:** Yes, yes.

323 **CHODOROW:** And what happened after that? And I will tell you that— by the way— when I  
324 got the job here, what happened was that I ran John Picchero at Cornell, who was the Danteist  
325 there, and he said, "What are you doing?"; and I said, "I'm looking for a job"; and he said, "Write  
326 to Roy Pearce, he's creating a history department at UC San Diego." And Roy had obviously  
327 talked to him about possibly coming and being a Danteist. And so, I wrote to Roy, and Roy  
328 passed on my letter on to Armand, who was then chair; and that's how that happened. So that  
329 Roy, obviously, was playing a critical role at some point, how long did it last and how did  
330 relations work it?

331 **JACKSON:** I would say that your appointment is about the end of that period. By the time  
332 both Armand and I were here, and also making senior appointments— bringing in Sam Baron,  
333 also— by that time. Because he was chairman of the history search committee; he was the  
334 principal person who interviewed me. Now I don't know whether this history has anything  
335 relevant for your work, but for me it's always been very important. I had never had tenure offers

336 because I was on the Cohn-Schine list from the McCarthy period, you see, of people who were  
337 suspected of having been communists.

338 **CHODOROW:** You wrote about the Spanish Civil War.

339 **JACKSON:** Well that was— yeah. And with a sympathy for the communists, as they put it—  
340 or as the Reaganites would put it. Well, this monkey was on my back still in 1965; I mean,  
341 thirteen years after I'd gotten my Ph.D. Somebody around the table, after they had interviewed  
342 me and decided that they wanted to make an offer, somebody— I don't remember who— said,  
343 "Of course, you'll have tenure." And I said, "Yes"— it was a white lie; I did not have tenure. I  
344 certainly would have had tenure if not for the McCarthy era; but, in fact, I didn't. However—

345 **CHODOROW:** You were an associate professor with that table?

346 **JACKSON:** No, I was an assistant professor at Knox College, and— again— because of the  
347 political thing, it had been indicated to me that I might or might not get tenure there, so that  
348 that— They didn't then go investigate it. And that brought me here as an associate professor,  
349 and that's what ended McCarthyism for me— personally.

350 **CHODOROW:** But, of course, at the same time, they were hiring people like Stanley Moore,  
351 who had actually been fired from Reed College during the McCarthy period. So there was some  
352 positive action of the part of this campus to defy that history.

353 **JACKSON:** I think that was true, because a lot of the scientists had also been victims.

354 **CHODOROW:** Is that right?

355 **JACKSON:** Yeah, yeah.

356 **CHODOROW:** [*inaudible*] \_\_\_\_\_ had been?

357 **JACKSON:** Yeah. Although it's also true that Stanley Moore was very anti-communist by the  
358 time he got here.

359 **CHODOROW:** Nonetheless, life-long student of Marx.

360 **JACKSON:** Yeah.

361 **CHODOROW:** You know, it's interesting that you say that because I didn't know that. I knew  
362 that he was quite aristocratic— his manner.

363 **JACKSON:** And he had a lot of money, yes.

364 **CHODOROW:** But that he had, himself, a political position, but that was something I was  
365 unaware of. Because he was always the person who was the— the person who never quoted  
366 Marx to you because he knew it was on the next page; he knew it was on the page before it,  
367 too, you know. [Laughed] He ducked. What other important characters stand out in your mind  
368 from that period— the sixties— who made a difference in the intellectual life of the campus, and  
369 what people thought they were going to achieve here?

370 **JACKSON:** Gosh, if I had a list of faculty— I'm sure if saw some names, things would occur  
371 to me. But it's twenty years that I haven't really thought about it. Have you got a catalog here? I  
372 mean, if I just saw the names—

373 **CHODOROW:** Why don't you pause this for a second and we'll— When John Stewart  
374 came here to both be a provost and to help found the arts department, what difference did that  
375 make to the presence both of John and then of these artists who are now coming on the  
376 campus? It must have been in the sixties when you were first here.

377 **JACKSON:** Yeah. Well, I think that very definitely added a feeling of intellectual breadth to  
378 the campus. In a sense it was difficult because John Stewart's concept of comparative  
379 cultures— or cultural something— then became a sort of rival of the humanities. I mean, I  
380 remember feeling, you know, since we're in trouble anyhow, it's too bad that the John Stewart  
381 type of approach to humanities isn't— along with the humanities program rather than— but  
382 since each college was supposed to have its own characteristic first two-year program, so then  
383 they began to emphasize the difference. The humanities was the standard WASP version of the  
384 Western history and so on; and the comparative cultures was actually more in the world history  
385 line. I would agree that that was so, and Guillermo Cespedes taught in that program with the  
386 same enthusiasm that I taught in the humanities program— and we didn't think of them as rival  
387 programs— but if one was characteristic of Revelle College and the other was characteristic of  
388 John Muir College, they looked like rivals.

389 **CHODOROW:** What about the fact that John created— intended to create— departments in  
390 the arts that would be almost devoid of the humanistic approach to the arts? That they would be

391 dominated by the artists, by musicians, by composers, or by visual artists who were practicing  
392 artists, instead of having the traditional dominance really by the musicologists, music historians  
393 on the one side, and the art historians on the other. What effect did that have, and how did  
394 people react to that from the traditional humanities departments?

395 **JACKSON:** Well, I don't know how people reacted other than myself. I thought it was a fine  
396 idea that the music and the arts should indeed be the creative people in the field rather than the  
397 scholars about it; that seemed to me fine. But for some reason that I never understood, the  
398 Revelle aristocracy and the sciences aristocracy just never took John Stewart seriously. I don't  
399 know why, and I definitely don't agree. I think that what he was trying to do in the arts and music  
400 were excellent— adding drama later. And had some— I mean, he won some victories. There  
401 were some very good things that came out of it— the experimental music programs; and Tom  
402 Nee as an excellent conductor for that kind of music, working with the composers.

403 **CHODOROW:** Did you ever play any [*inaudible*] \_\_\_\_\_?

404 **JACKSON:** Yeah, yeah. And I thought that was fine. I never understood why— You could  
405 just tell in the informal discussions that the full professors in the humanities department— I  
406 mean, philosophy, literature, history— had a weight with faculty opinion that John Stewart didn't  
407 have.

408 **WESTBROOK:** [*inaudible*]

**[END OF PART ONE, BEGIN PART TWO]**

409 **CHODOROW:** ...would have been, in a sense, the handmade context for creative writing in  
410 the Department of Literature.

411 **JACKSON:** Yeah.

412 **CHODOROW:** And so John Stewart's conception of the arts was just exactly along those  
413 lines?

414 **JACKSON:** Mmm hmm.

415 **CHODOROW:** I mean, if you reflect on this, the conception that the scientists had of literary  
416 study and arts was very unusual at the time, and remained so; and would have made only really

417 two departments centrally humanistic in the traditional sense— history and philosophy— [they]  
418 would have been the only two departments that were humanistic in the way that Berkeley,  
419 UCLA, Harvard— any of the other institutions that you can name— thought of the humanities;  
420 whereas, literary studies would have been dominated by writers. And, of course, the arts were,  
421 in fact, dominated by artists, and not by the students of them.

422 **WESTBROOK:** *[inaudible]*

423 **CHODOROW:** Gabe, was there any, in your time— and this a real question because I don't  
424 quite remember when it started to happen— was the philosophy department standing by its  
425 original vision or did begin to change? It has since changed, and history is now a minor part of  
426 the philosophy department. But the question is— when did that happen? Did that happen while  
427 you were here or did it happen after you were gone?

428 **JACKSON:** I think it certainly happened after 1974-75 because, until then— maybe it  
429 happened after Popkin left— and there was another fellow, the troika, in that department with  
430 Popkin, Stroll and a third man who—

431 **CHODOROW:** Saunders

432 **JACKSON:** Saunders— Jason Saunders.

433 **CHODOROW:** Who, I think, was in the classics— classical philosopher.

434 **JACKSON:** Yes, he was a classical philosopher; but again, my memory of him in the  
435 humanities program was of the breadth. Yes, history is important, not just technical philosophy.  
436 So that as long as those three were the principal— and then [William] Bartley, [Georgios]  
437 Anagnostopoulos— I'd say at least to the mid-seventies, that broad conception of a philosophy  
438 department was there.

439 **CHODOROW:** There's another question that has come up in previous discussions, and that  
440 is that, during the early sixties when the science community on the campus, in effect,  
441 established— although not larger— began to think about building in other fields in the  
442 humanities and social sciences. They created what has been described as a committee, but  
443 which Herbert York describes, in fact, as a very informal network of what had been called "the  
444 bombings"; and they were from other campuses— particularly Berkeley, UCLA, and other  
445 places— who were consulted in the recruitment of people to be members of these new



446 departments. Do you remember ever dealing with any of those people outside of the campus in  
447 the early days of history?

448 **JACKSON:** No.

449 **CHODOROW:** So, they were already gone by 1965 or '66 when you got here? They were no  
450 longer playing a significant role, so far as you were concerned.

451 **JACKSON:** Well, again, in the interviews that brought me here— Ed Goldberg [?] and Jim  
452 Arnold and Keith Brueckner— they were all important. I felt that I had really substantive  
453 interviews with them, just as much as with Roy Pearce and so on. And, in fact, that's where I got  
454 the idea— these guys really want a serious humanities program.

455 **CHODOROW:** Do you think that over the time, the attitude of the scientists towards building  
456 strong humanities programs changed?

457 **JACKSON:** Yeah, I think it must have, because I remember, particularly, an occasion in  
458 which I tried to explain to John Singer why things were difficult for me inside the Department of  
459 History; and he sort of treated it as utopian.

460 **CHODOROW:** That is, he thought you had a utopian view of what the department was like?

461 **JACKSON:** Yeah.

462 **CHODOROW:** And so, toughen up was his message? And do you think that reflects their  
463 view that, in effect, these departments were now started and they were on their own, and they  
464 weren't going to support, or more, play a role in them at all?

465 **JACKSON:** Somewhat that, but somewhat also that the life of the whole university was  
466 becoming so much more complicated. That is, when there were three or four active top people  
467 in each department— and three or four of this one, three or four of that one— you could really  
468 work with colleagues across departments. When the departments had thirty people in them,  
469 your social life and your political compromises and your diplomatic problems and so on, became  
470 more and more inside in the department. And I think it was that; I don't he meant to be  
471 unsympathetic— I think it was, "Oh gosh, don't give me another problem" sort of thing.

472 **CHODOROW:** What about support in terms of resources? Was it your impression that the  
473 science community— which in the sixties was very supportive of the humanities— whether they  
474 continued to be so, or was there any change in that?

475 **JACKSON:** I think they continued to be so in spirit. It was harder for them because the feds  
476 were tightening up; and also— and I don't know at what point the federal government began  
477 telling UCSD, "You don't have enough women on the faculty; you don't have enough women or  
478 minority graduate students"— and threatening to lower funding if something wasn't done about  
479 it.

480 **CHODOROW:** So then forcing, essentially. So you were in a profession that the Affirmative  
481 Action Plans— the early ones— were stimulated by federal government pressure?

482 **JACKSON:** Yeah. And here, too, the social sciences— especially economics and  
483 anthropology and psychology— to them, it was a joke that history was really serious about  
484 getting black and Hispanic— "Okay, you can take those people who aren't prepared. We're a  
485 world class department. Those people would suffer if they came here" and so on. I remember  
486 being very discouraged and mad about that toward the end of the seventies.

487 **CHODOROW:** Was it a recognition on the part of the history department that recruitment of  
488 women and minorities would change the intellectual complexion? In other words, what people  
489 were interested in studying within in the department, or did they actually think they were going to  
490 black historians who were interested in European history and knew all the traditional fields. Did  
491 they understand? What kind of—

492 **JACKSON:** Oh, yes, I think there was a clear understanding— and welcoming the idea. And  
493 there, too, there was— in that sense, for instance, to build up some Hispanic. I can remember  
494 very well Ramon saying, "You know, actually, the blacks have been more conscious of this;  
495 they've done more up to this point." And no matter how much we disliked some other things he  
496 was doing, that's fine. We have a Hispanic as chairman of our department— and he recruits  
497 Hispanic graduate students— that's fine. I say, boy, to find that in the departments of  
498 psychology or economics or anthropology— no, sir.

499 **CHODOROW:** So there was a division within the fields? Literature would have been closely  
500 aligned.

501 **JACKSON:** Yeah, yeah. Literature, too.

502 **CHODOROW:** That's interesting. What affect did the recruitments of people have on the  
503 programs, like Revelle's program or Muir's or eventually Third College? Was this connected  
504 directly to development of Third College? The recruitment of minorities and—

505 **JACKSON:** Oh, yeah, sure, sure.

506 **CHODOROW:** And so, their teaching was dedicated to Third College to a larger extent than  
507 traditional white faculty?

508 **JACKSON:** Yes. Of course, Stavrianos taught in Third College, too.

509 **CHODOROW:** When he finally came back.

510 **JACKSON:** Yeah, yeah. After retiring from Northwest, he came here and taught part-time for  
511 a number of years.

512 **CHODOROW:** As an adjunct faculty [*inaudible*] ...it's been an interesting conversation.

513 **JACKSON:** Okay. Me, too. Is Jonathan Saville still around?

514 **CHODOROW:** He's retired. And he's— You know, what he became was a critic.

515 **JACKSON:** Yes.

516 **CHODOROW:** And when he moved from literature into theater, his writings were seen in a  
517 compilation that were really quite voluminous. Criticism in music and theater is where he's very  
518 active, but he never again did the kind of scholarly work for which he would have, in fact, been  
519 rewarded. I tried as thee, to argue for his promotion for professor on the grounds that he was a  
520 very productive writer, who had a very important role in the cultural life of this city— it wasn't  
521 bought. The Committee on Academic Personnel, which is what the budget committee became—  
522 it was renamed— would never accept that honor. It didn't that he was now in theater and not in  
523 literature, and should not be required to do literary scholarship of the kind that he did earlier in  
524 his career. [*inaudible*] Okay.

**[END OF INTERVIEW]**