An Oral History of

MELFORD SPIRO and STANLEY CHODOROW

On July 30, 1998

[Background noise in the recording makes parts of the interview inaudible.]

SPIRO: *[inaudible]* —And so, I actually did not want to teach more than one *[inaudible]* over time. I'm very pleased about that. That's very good.

CHODOROW: Well, let me give you some brief background on this project. It is really an effort to record the early history of the foundation of the departments. They were all founded within a period of around twelve years, from about 1958 when Chemistry and Physics started out, to about 1972 or '73 by which time Political Science was ready to go. I conceived of the period up to 1975 so that you're getting a little bit of the actual thing. The real issues for this—at least beginning—series of conversations, have to do with the founders coming here, the vision they had, and the way they perceived that vision in relation to their discipline at the time, and the way in which other major departments had already set patterns ___ *[inaudible]*. And then, finally, how early recruitments, both failures and successes, affected the original vision to the extent that these things can be remembered. And how that shaped the early structure, the intellectual structure. So, we might want to start by saying something about your career just before you came here, and where you were when you were recruited and how the recruitment from your point of view looked, why you came, and— *[inaudible]*

SPIRO: Well, I came most immediately from Chicago where I had been only a short time. I'd been a few years in Washington until I came to Chicago, and I moved to Chicago in '64 because it was, as they describe themselves, the greatest ___ *[inaudible]* in the continent. And the ___ *[inaudible]* was the best department in the United States. But there was a problem when we got to Chicago. Before we moved to Washington we had lived in Connecticut, so we lived in both coasts—and both beautiful coasts—and Audrey, my wife, sort of knew—but I didn't—that it would be difficult to adjust to a place that ___ *[inaudible]* was quite unattractive. We didn't have the beauty of either the countryside in which we had lived, or the ocean and the mountains of Seattle. Indeed, it turned out that way. Not at first, you know, we had to backup. In 1967, I spent the year at the Social Science Research Institute at the University of Hawaii doing research. I don't know what Honolulu is like these days. I haven't been back, but in those days, it was certainly beautiful.

And so, then I got a letter from George Mandler—who was Chairman of the Research Committee—saying that we'd like you to come out and think about becoming the new chair for the department, and I said not on your life. *[inaudible]* I had no interest in going through what I knew would be a considerable effort of starting the department. How do you get people? Because the people that I wanted were obviously established people. How do you get established people to move to someplace which doesn't exist yet? The campus— *[inaudible]* How would you tell people to move and to settle for new PhDs? So, it had to be a department that had instant visibility, ___ *[inaudible]* PhD, so I said no. And then he said to me— I got another letter saying well, I need ___ *[inaudible]* so I can come and just take a look. I said no, I didn't see him. What happened was that by the end of January in Honolulu, I realized that in a few months we were returning to Chicago and suddenly it hit me, ___ *[inaudible]* this is a totally un-academic intervention. It's true. The notion of returning to that dreary landscape, and that didn't appeal to me. So, I wrote to George and I said if the job is still open, I'm going to Washington for some meetings, and I'd be happy to pass through La Jolla either going or coming. And he said it is still open and by all means.

So, the thing is that La Jolla, I decided, was not as beautiful as Honolulu, at least where we were living, but it was beautiful enough. But, he then wisely arranged for me to meet people. And I was extremely impressed. One of the things that impressed me was not only that everybody that I met was so bright and talented, but that this was— It should go under the tourist category. At that time, this is 1968, it was true then that this was truly a campus in which people across lines, across departments, and even across schools—even the Medical School, there were a lot of people that I met from the Medical School—talk to each other and are interested in what they are doing. And the best, the combination of those two variables—very smart people, highly motivated, with knowing that they're starting a new enterprise and across fields and across disciplines, and that nomination left with very few professions. I was almost ready to say "yes, I'll come" even before I returned to Honolulu. Almost, but not quite. And then I made it clear to the Committee that Audrey would have to *[inaudible]* think about her options. She was much— *[inaudible]*

And that Spring ___ *[inaudible]* Bill McGill had just— I remember, it was shortly after he became Chancellor because when I was talking about coming and negotiating with Galbraith, and when I decided to come, the letter of welcome was from McGill. So it had to be sometime in the Spring. So my first answer is that my coming here was not intellectually motivated. It was motivated by the kind of place—physically, geographically, ecologically—in which I wanted to live. I think it's

true to say that if we had remained in Seattle and the offer had come, I think I would have said no. Seattle, both as a campus and as a department, was at best a B plus depending on the department. Whereas Chicago was obviously an A, particularly in the Social Sciences there. I think as I said, I would have said no, because I would not have wanted, I think—I know—to spend the time and energy required to build the Department from scratch. *[inaudible]* —he's the Chairman of the Department already established.

CHODOROW: Existing. It sounds to me as if the physical attraction got you to stop here. The human attraction got you to stay.

SPIRO: That's absolutely true.

CHODOROW: Do you remember particular people who you met on that trip that made besides, you knew George.

SPIRO: Yes. I knew George. There were no Social Sciences. The Economics Department, as you know, was here, but I don't recall that I had met any of the economists. But some of the people that I met that I seem to remember strongly and that kept *[inaudible]* Bob Ehlrich [*?*], those two in particular from Literature. I think that's what ended right for me. Paul Saltman who was in the administration but ___ *[inaudible]* even though I was an academic was another one. Cliff Grobstein was the Dean of the Medical School, and though another administrator, again, he was so bright and so alert and flexible, that I was finding—I remember him very adaptable as a professional, not as a Dean. Av Stroll—those are the ones that remain in my mind.

CHODOROW: Now, how old were you then?

SPIRO: I was 28.

CHODOROW: 28. And once you had committed yourself, actually to doing this job, which you thought was going to take more time than you wished, how did you construct a strategy to carry it out?

SPIRO: Well, I had decided that if I was going to build a department and put in that kind of effort, that I might as well build the kind of department that I would be interested in working at. That's what I— *[inaudible]*.

CHODOROW: [*laughs*] Makes sense.

SPIRO: So, I had a couple of things in mind. Theoretically, I wanted a department to recruit people, a goodly number of people who would be in the field of Psychological Anthropology. Which is the thing—which was my thing most of my career. Certainly, you couldn't have a whole department of Psychological Anthropology and be professionally the best—but it's a good component—but at least a critical mass. No department in the country ever had a critical—by critical mass I mean enough to really launch it ___ *[inaudible]* in Psychological Anthropology. This department that I envisioned would be unique in that sense, it would be different from any other department in that sense. Secondly, I had recently come back from a big research project from Burma and then even before that I'd been interested in Asia and in thinking of a department that ethnographically would have an important component of people who are looking at Asia. Thirdly, I have the notion from my experience, and I had been—before coming here—I had been in three departments in Connecticut, in Washington, in Chicago. In all three departments, the tension between and among the Cultural Anthropologists, Biological Anthropologists, and the Archaeologists was almost— *[inaudible]* Now, my thought was really different. My thought was one could avoid it here because, though I wanted to have Biological Anthropologists and ___ *[inaudible]* Archaeologists, and as you know archaeology in itself is into prehistoric backgrounds. I thought, you can't have a campus, nor would I want to be in a campus, that didn't have those two disciplines. You may recall in the college system at that time, the Third College, which was envisaged by—

CHODOROW: Armand Rappaport.

SPIRO: Right, Armand was going to be the provost, but the conception was— What's his name at Scripps?

CHODOROW: Walter Munk? Carl Eckart?

SPIRO: Not Walter Munk, no, ___ *[inaudible]*.

CHODOROW: Oh, I think I know who you're talking about.

SPIRO: Incredible guy.

CHODOROW: Yes, I know who you're talking about. It'll come to me sometime.

SPIRO: He wanted to talk on Leonardo da Vinci ___ *[inaudible]*.

CHODOROW: Yes, yes. And I remember him. He's a remarkable man.

SPIRO: He was remarkable. He was an ocean— He was a Scripps type, an ocean-ist, but who had incredibly broad and special interests, particularly in the Humanities.

CHODOROW: Very interested in underwater archaeology.

SPIRO: Yes.

CHODOROW: I'll get that— I'll recover that name at some point.

SPIRO: Incidentally he's one of the guys that I met— *[inaudible]*. So, I spent a lot of time talking with Armand, who was going to be the provost and this college was going to be a historically oriented college, you will recall. Now where best to put people in Biological Anthropology, which is primarily human evolution, right, and Archaeology? And Armand thought that was a great idea. And since I didn't want ___ *[inaudible]* our Anthropologists—I didn't want them to be separate, totally separate from the department, but there would be one head, chair or whatever. But they would be in some sense administratively separate from that kind of tension I'm talking about.

He thought it was a great idea, I thought it was a great idea. And then all of that was by the board, we called Angela and company and came into a meeting with the department chair and ___ *[inaudible]* and theoretical ___ *[inaudible]* of Revelle. Were you here in '68?

CHODOROW: I arrived the same time you did, but remember, that I—

SPIRO: I know— You came—

CHODOROW: —a junior faculty member. So, I wasn't in that meeting. But of course, I was in the arena. In which all that took place.

SPIRO: Yes, right. Well, so the new Third College decided that history and historical studies were irrelevant, and anti-revolutionary, and reactionary. And that ended that perception of the Third College. And that, in a sense, ended for a long time until fairly recently with the recruitment of Biological Anthropologists and Archaeologists in the department. We did recruit the Biological—surely some—fairly early, about the fourth or fifth year that we were here, but she was alone and we didn't include an Archaeologist— *[inaudible].* And now we have a ___

[inaudible]. But anyhow, that was another difference between when I was picking the department, between the departments I had been in and what I had ___ *[inaudible]*.

CHODOROW: Within Cultural Anthropology how did you think about dividing up the faculty resources—one of the critical ___ *[inaudible]* of Psychological Anthropology.

SPIRO: Well because I view psychological as part of cultural.

CHODOROW: Right? I understood that.

SPIRO: Sociocultural, right?

CHODOROW: Right.

SPIRO: Psychological being part of that sociocultural thing.

CHODOROW: But you couldn't be unit-dimensional even there, or did you actually think about being unit-dimensional?

SPIRO: No, I at that time—when I made that decision, what I was concerned with was not the dimension but rather the people. Who were the best people? And the best people I thought meant senior people, because as I said, we needed a ___ *[inaudible]* and the administration of that time was very good. They said yeah, senior people, we'll get senior people. Of course, we had more resources around here at that time than we had at any other ___ *[inaudible]*. I mean, if you're going to build the department, that's the time and the place to do it. Well, the question was, as I say, by that time, the question for me were people, and I had two people in mind because they satisfied both my areal interest and the interest in Psychological Anthropology. One was Ganunapa Viasakera *[?]* who was teaching at Duraka *[?]* at the time. And the other was Bob Levy whom I had met when I was in Honolulu. Bob had been working in Tahiti and was planning to work in the fall, and all the essentials were— *[inaudible]*. And indeed I offered both of them positions. Bob accepted, but ___ *[inaudible]* did not. But when I heard a few years later that he wasn't totally happy in ___ *[inaudible]*, I wrote him and he came. In Cultural Anthropology, there were two things outside of psychological in the broader field of Cultural Anthropology that I thought were important to have in a new department because they were at the cutting edge of Cultural Anthropology, including Social Anthropology. One was symbolism, symbolic anthropology associated with the names of Clifford Geertz and David Schneider. And indeed, my notion was that I would be able to lure them here. Well, just about at that time Cliff

took a job at the institute at Princeton so he was not lurable. David Schneider was still lurable but his wife when she came out here— *[inaudible]*.

CHODOROW: Where was he at?

SPIRO: At Chicago. We were all at Chicago. They at one time had been at Berkeley and Chicago raided Berkeley, got them and another guy called Tom Fallers, who since died, and Fred Eggan who was the head honcho in Chicago ___ *[inaudible]* Berkeley now, said that was a great coup. So, I said, a friend can do it, I can do it. I don't want ___ *[inaudible]* but I do want to talk to David, and we'll raid Chicago and bring him here. As I say, ___ *[inaudible]* and David— *[inaudible]*. The other cutting edge at the time was Political Anthropology. At that time Political Anthropology even meant local office politics rather than national. For the most part that's still true. And I had two people in mind and I got one immediately and I got the other shortly after and that was Marc Swartz who had just edited a volume called *Local Level Politics*. But that isn't why I wanted him. He had done some splendid work in East Africa. Both in Tanzania and then Kenya. He did outstanding work.

Now the other was Freddie Bailey, who at that time was at Sussex. Freddie, incidentally, also satisfied my criteria for an Asian-ist, because he worked in India. And Freddie at that time I think was arguably the most creative political anthropologist anywhere. And so, we wanted to get him ___ *[inaudible]*. So, I was rather pleased that we were able, in the first few years that as I remained in the chair, to fulfill some of the great deal of the things that I had in mind when I came. But they weren't the only ones that we brought in at that time—that first contingent—included Ted Schwartz. Now Ted Schwartz was a Psychological Anthropologist. *[inaudible]* He worked in Melanesia, and Oceania was an area that I thought was important. Oceania is not an important—if you look at the world in political terms, Oceania is ___ *[inaudible]* who cares about a small ___ *[inaudible]* the middle of nowhere. The reason that Oceania is important anthropologically is that Oceania and Africa are the two places in which the most important kinds of anthropology really emerged. They were the generators in ___ *[inaudible]*. So, having an Oceania-ist, from that point of view, was important, and the fact that it was Ted Schwartz in particular, and he had worked with two of the people who were important in generating theory from Oceania. Oh, one was Margaret Mead and the other was Kevin ___ *[inaudible]*. So now Kevin himself was one of the most creative people I've ever known. He was at UCLA at the time as an assistant professor, even though he's the kind of guy who should have been a full professor.

CHODOROW: He had worked with the American Museum of Natural History.

SPIRO: Well because of Margaret. So, I felt pleased that we were able to talk. I also brought here a new PhD from Chicago, David Jordan. He'd just returned from Taiwan with his PhD. I thought David was the best graduate student I had met in Chicago. And on the notion that Chicago is the best department in the cosmos, then they have the best anthropology graduate students, right? And David was one of the two or three best of them—so that was approved. And the other person I personally brought in at the very beginning was Joyce Justus whom I knew nothing about but when I went out to Los Angeles to talk to Kev—well this is before all the nonsense started by Angela. I myself felt strongly about having a black person in the department and in this area of Chicago without bending any kinds of standards. And Ted said I have ___ *[inaudible]* for you.

CHODOROW: She was a new PhD?

SPIRO: She was just getting her PhD. So I interviewed Joyce. Incidentally, in those days it was very easy for a chair because you didn't have to get permission. You didn't have to consult with the faculty, right—who were going to give you all kinds of problems—and then you made the decision without consulting with anybody. It was marvelous. So, I interviewed Joyce and I was certainly impressed, and I offered her a job. I think about those days. It was not easy, that easy getting the ___ *[inaudible]* and David Schneider was not ___ *[inaudible]*.

CHODOROW: Do you remember other people who you would have liked to have recruited who you couldn't or didn't?

SPIRO: Yes, I tried to get Bob LeVine who was at Harvard. And he came out, him and his wife. Again, with his wife ___ *[inaudible]* you could see that she was palpably depressed by being in La Jolla. I—

CHODOROW: Basically, a northeastern urban type of person.

SPIRO: No actually, I think she's from the Middle West. I can't tell you. I didn't ask. I tried to get George De Vos who was at Berkeley and who was a Japanese type and also a Psychological Anthropologist. As I think about it, why ___ *[inaudible]*, again it was his wife, she came, she was again palpably depressed, angry. I mean, she was angry at me that I had even tempted him by bringing him down. And you know, I thought whenever we brought recruits that—among other things—we'd take them to Tijuana on the notion they can see the border and

a cosmopolitan place and all that. Instead of turning her on, it turned her off, going to Tijuana, this miserable place on tour. Manning Nash is another one. Manning is an Economic Anthropologist—very creative—who had worked both in Middle America—Guatemala—and in Malaysia and did some very impressive comparative stuff. And besides that, he was just very very smart. He said no. These people who said no, not because of their wives, but because of themselves, all said coming to a totally new place, building the department—instead of being sort of stimulated by that notion they were turned off by it, all the time and the energy and the drain. They didn't want to do it. If I thought about it, I'm sure that there were others, I'm sure. I remember that Audrey and I were entertaining people almost around the clock and they often stayed with us because we had a big house at that time. So, we no longer changed just one set of sheets and put in a new one for the next crew. There were quite a few.

[END OF PART ONE, BEGIN PART TWO]

SPIRO: Here, when I finished my— Well, even before I finished my ___ *[inaudible]*, I felt that I had accomplished what I wanted to do. We had the core of the department. And it was, given the people who run it, a highly visible department. We would have no problem with recruiting graduate students. And I was willing, not even willing, I was ready to turn it over—and I did.

CHODOROW: Let me ask two questions that arise in my mind immediately. One is that having failed with Geertz and Schneider, did you ever solve the problem of symbolic anthropology?

SPIRO: Well, yes. I mean, we did not solve it by bringing in somebody who was—who had the visibility at that time. But David Jordan was, among other things, a symbolic anthropologist, and Ted Schwartz, among other things, was a symbolic anthropologist and so on. And to a large extent, I was ___ *[inaudible]*, the difference being that the people I just mentioned did not push the kind of symbolic theory that David and Cliff did, and which made that field—which gave a certain stamp to that field. But the notion of having symbolic theory represented was represented by three of us. And aside from David and Cliff, given that kind of theory that they were peddling and that was, at the time, the dominant theory in that field, I couldn't think of anybody else that I wanted. There were three important people in that field—the two that I just mentioned and Victor Turner. Victor had just moved from Cornell *[?]* to Chicago and I would have loved to have had Victor, but I didn't even approach him. Nobody who leaves—just left—

who has to leave and move again. I mean that's ___ *[inaudible]*. So those are the only three I would have wanted and two said no. One I knew was unavailable. I decided— *[inaudible]*

CHODOROW: The other question is that once you had your core group—your second or third year, say—how did you actually go about recruiting graduate students? Was it simply announcing that you were all here and students came? And that's it?

SPIRO: That's it. That's it. We announced in two ___ *[inaudible]*, we announced in the American Anthropologists that there was now a Department of Anthropology at UCSD, a research department. Also, through our— *[inaudible]*. And as a matter of fact, our first PhD recruit was through Freddie Bailey. It was a young woman from India. I don't know if you knew her - her name was Manisha Roy. She had an undergraduate degree from Rochester. And I forget how it was—but he had known her through this contact from India. And she wrote to him, as I recall correctly, when he was in England, and for what she was interested in, he recommended she come here. Again, he knew that we had already been talking to her. So, that was our first student.

CHODOROW: Another question is: David and Joyce were the two first junior people. They came with you in 1968?

SPIRO: 1969. I came along in 1968.

CHODOROW: Okay.

SPIRO: So, the recruiting was from here, not before I came.

CHODOROW: Right, not before. And when did you begin to develop a larger cadre of junior faculty? Don Tuzin is in there. And Shirley Strum we mentioned earlier—

SPIRO: I should have mentioned that whether it was in that first three years or perhaps a year later. I'm not sure. We brought in Roger Broderick *[?]*, that's another one.

CHODOROW: Right. And you would have counted him within your psychological—

SPIRO: Psychological group. But when you talk to him, you ask him about what the ___ *[inaudible]* and he represented the cognitive side to psychological anthropology. So, he was different from ___ *[inaudible]* Bob Levy and me. Quite the dynamic. The junior people were, except for David and Joyce, the first here. The first-year contingent. I was not in 1968, I came by

1969. But Don was the first of the junior people that we brought in later. Michael Meeker—but Michael Meeker was no junior. When he was brought here, we brought him in as an associate professor. I think you mentioned Shirley—we brought her in the first three years. She came in fresh out of a PhD ___ *[inaudible]*.

CHODOROW: Right.

SPIRO: Actually, except for Shirley and David and Joyce, I don't recall having brought in a doc. I think that there was nobody we brought in fresh out of a PhD for some time.

CHODOROW: Let me ask a question about the department. The department that you have named remained quite a stable department for a very long time, much longer than most departments. What was the effect of that on the department and on the people who were in it?

SPIRO: Well, one other thing is— I think that it added to— We had, in those days, superb morale. There was a certain amount of arrogance, I think. We thought of ourselves as real hotshots. We weren't like Chicago, the greatest department in the cosmos, but we were a very good department in our own eyes. And so, there was very good morale. We all liked each other. And what contributed to the morale was that people were getting offers in different areas. So that, I think, was very important.

The first one to leave was ___ *[inaudible]*. He went to Princeton, ostensibly. I say ostensibly because it also may have been actually, I really don't know and I couldn't press him. His wife has a PhD in Comparative Literature. In those days, we still had ___ *[inaudible]* and had for many years. ___ *[inaudible]*. She was unable to get a job. They also had a child, a daughter *[?]*. This is not to put her down because she's very, very bright. But she was not the kind of person that you would try to recruit because she still had not published anything. But in order to attract him. Now, there may have been other reasons or that may not have been the reason at all. But that's my ___ *[inaudible]*. And it was— We all felt it keenly. If somebody is leaving us—departing, going elsewhere—maybe we're doing something wrong. Maybe we're not as good as we thought we were. That did have an effect, there’s no doubt. The only other departure was Bob Levy, who took early retirement. So that was, in a sense, another departure.

CHODOROW: But the other question is, what effect did that stability have on productivity of the department members over a longer period of time, say fifteen years?

SPIRO: Yeah, I don't really know what effect it had. I didn't know how David and Joyce were going to be in terms of productivity. But the other people you brought in were people with track records. We knew that they were productive people and indeed they were and are. Joyce turned out not to be a productive person and we gave her a— What did we call it?

CHODOROW: Lecturer with Security.

SPIRO: But all of the others were as we expected. To what extent therefore the stability effect of that, I really don't know. I have no way of measuring.

CHODOROW: Do you have any questions that you think that we haven't been doing? Let me pursue one other thing about symbolic theory *[?]*. Geertz—I don't know Schneider—but Geertz—

SPIRO: Schneider had some ___ *[inaudible]*.

CHODOROW: —became quite famous for a very particular kind of anthropology. And from my perspective, anyway, somewhat controversial. Did that develop later? Was it clear in 1968 where he was going with all of that?

SPIRO: Oh yeah, very clear. It certainly wasn't as clear as it became later. What put Geertz on the map not only in Anthropology, but in the other Human Sciences, was the book he published in 1973, called *The Interpretation of Cultures* and almost everybody who writes uses Geertz, refers to Geertz, uses one or another of the chapters ___ *[inaudible]*. But by '68 he already had made a very—was already very distinguished. And for that branch of symbolic theory, cultural symbolic theory that we ___ *[inaudible]*. He published a book called *The Religions of Java* in the early '60s-'61 or '62 or something like that—which is where he first developed using the graphic materials based on his field work. Then of course, he expanded in different ways as he grew older and he did more research, but by '68, he and David, I don't know which was one and which was two, but they were one and two, the one and two people in that particular—how should we put it—subfield of symbolic anthropology.

CHODOROW: As you think about the recruitments you were making and the way you structured the department early on, were there—aside from your theory of the department, and the intentional actions with respect to building it—looking back, do you think there were certain kinds of intellectual biases that you had that colored the way in which you judged people and ___ *[inaudible]*?

SPIRO: Yeah, I don't want to sound arrogant, but one of the biases was that I didn't want ___ *[inaudible]* and anthropology has more than its fair share. The other bias was I wanted people who— Though they had to have a strong ethnographic grounding—that was critical—but since almost all anthropologists do ethnographic research that would not distinguish them from almost anybody else, except that the ethnographic work has got to be good—but they had to have a strong theoretical orientation. Most people who do ethnographic work are not theoretically oriented. That certainly was a strong criterion and that's a bias, because there are lots of anthropologists who would say that—to have a strong theoretical orientation. And that includes being theoretically sophisticated and writing things, wanting to write theoretically oriented articles that many anthropologists—or at least ethnographers ___ *[inaudible]*, so that clearly would be labeled as a bias. And the other bias, I think, is that though only about one third of the department that we first brought in were psychologically oriented, the bias was that the people who were not psychologically oriented would not be biased against a psychological orientation. Because I have seen that happen, and that's also ___ *[inaudible]*. And that's true, that people who are not psychologically oriented—like Freddie and like Mark *[?]* and, indeed, like David Jordan—were not biased against it.

CHODOROW: As you were thinking, early on, about archaeology, a plan that in some ways was never realized in full but at least there were a few in your company—

SPIRO: We now have three.

CHODOROW: Three now.

SPIRO: We now have three. We now are launching a PhD in Anthropology, but with an emphasis in Archeology.

CHODOROW: How did you think about— I mean, archaeology is a field also where there is, you know, our traditions, intellectual traditions. Some of them are really more like historians and some are anthropologists. How did you think about that and what were you looking for?

SPIRO: We were looking for— Well, first, this happened after I got the chairmanship.

CHODOROW: Right. Okay.

SPIRO: But obviously, having remained a member of the department, I participated in the decision and in the criteria. We clearly wanted an anthropological archaeologist. You know, by

that I meant archaeologists who are comparatively oriented rather than more interested in their site, this site or this site as ___ *[inaudible]* area. We wanted people who were interested in ___ *[inaudible]* and all three of the people we have are precisely that. We launched our search for an archaeologist because Judaic Studies gave us an FTE. They were looking for somebody who could work with them, i.e. a Biblical Archaeologist. And one of the people who applied even though he said he's not a Biblical Archaeologist is Guillermo Algaze. Well, we knew that he would not be acceptable for Judaic Studies. Not because he's not good but because he works in Turkey, right? So, he knows about that part of the world but that's not what ___ *[inaudible]*.

CHODOROW: And he isn't text based.

SPIRO: Well, that's not important.

CHODOROW: It wasn't even important to the job?

SPIRO: They would have liked that, but it was not critical. So, then we hire Tom Levy, who incidentally, not only is he not text based, but he does not work in the horizons that the Bible ostensibly represents. But he was so good that they wanted him anyway because he worked in that part of the world. But we were so impressed with Guillermo, that even though we could not get him through a Judaic Studies FTE, we got him anyway. And actually, whenever we got him, we had no FTEs. Things were drying up, that was a period in which things were difficult, but we got him through an affirmative action FTE; he's Puerto Rican. And so, both of these guys working in the Middle East—in parts of the Middle East, different archaeological horizons—but both of whom are very broadly engaged and are comparative archaeologists. Tom's— the other part of his comparison is Africa and that's how we brought our third archaeologist, Agha Santal *[?]*, who is an African who works in Africa and is interested in kingdoms. And he has worked with Tom in Israel ___ *[inaudible]*. And Guillermo's comparative thrust is the rise of civilization in America—South America, the Incas and—

CHODOROW: Right.

SPIRO: I don't know how I got off on that—

CHODOROW: I asked you about the intellectual bias—

SPIRO: So, we did have a bias. We wanted people who had these kinds of comparative interests and ___ *[inaudible]*. There is talk that we don't have—even though Guillermo is

interested in civilizations of the Americas—we don't have any New World Archaeologists. And I suspect that it ___ *[inaudible]* an archaeologist, it will be somebody who works in the New World. Now David Jordan, who was an incredible person—intellectual, who has had a long interest in New World Archaeology—has been giving a one credit course in Mayan Archaeology and not because he read a book over the weekend, he already knows that stuff. And Guillermo wants him to introduce a regular four credit course, which he may well do. That would not preempt the notion in New World Archeology, ___ *[inaudible]*. In Biological Anthropology, we also had a bias. We were interested in two things. We were interested in evolution and we were interested in primates. And we— *[inaudible]*.

CHODOROW: We had Shirley, who was a primatologist.

SPIRO: We had Shirley, who was a primatologist. Jim Moore, who is both an evolutionary theorist and a primatologist, and the new person who we just brought in, who is a specialist on the brain and the evolution of the brain. She just came this year.

CHODOROW: What has happened—to the extent that you know—to the graduate students who got their degrees in say, the first eight or so years, eight or ten years?

SPIRO: Some of them got academic jobs, a couple of them ___ *[inaudible]*. Others of them have applied jobs, but almost all of them are in anthropology in one form or another. In those first seven or eight years, we did not place them in the greatest departments, nor did we expect to. That has changed since. But we knew it was going to take a long time, until people were willing to come to this new department because we're better now *[?]*.

CHODOROW: Are there other issues? One, for example, is how we talked earlier about the people you met when you came here—helped recruit you. Over time— Over the first six or seven years, the campus was growing fairly rapidly until I think the mid-70s it might have slowed down. The first time it slowed down—

SPIRO: Yeah, yeah.

CHODOROW: Were there other people recruited to the campus and other departments who made a big difference in—

SPIRO: Yeah, Joe Gusfield made a big difference.

CHODOROW: And did you participate in recruiting some people for other departments?

SPIRO: Yeah, particularly for Sociology and Political Science. ___ *[inaudible]* Chair of the Search Committee for Political Science. You may recall that was a long, long time.

CHODOROW: I know because I was on that committee for a few years. I was a junior member of that committee and it was quite amazing. The parade of people who came through who were clearly not going to be appointed here.

SPIRO: Well, I mean, I was almost ready to leave, as a matter of fact, when we ___ *[inaudible]* that committee turned over so often, whether it was the time that I was the Chair or just a member. When we were trying to recruit the Rudolphs—I say Rudolphs because they were a husband and wife team in which they never ___ *[inaudible]* separate—you never see them away from each other. Lloyd and Susanne Rudolph—they were at that time, at least in my view, the best political scientists working anywhere in ___ *[inaudible]*. And we wanted them to come and they were ready to come, but they were vetoed by the Third College at that time ___ *[inaudible]*.

CHODOROW: The Soviet *[?]* I think might have been the proper *[?]* term.

SPIRO: And they had a veto power. This is not when Joe was Provost, this was when—what's his name—a physicist among other things—

CHODOROW: Bill Frazer was Acting Interim Provost.

SPIRO: He was Acting Interim Provost for a long time.

CHODOROW: Right.

SPIRO: And he had no objection to what they did and he shared their political biases. The Rudolphs are practical liberals. I mean, I'm talking about Cambridge type material *[?]*. LA Stephen type, most impressively *[?]*. But they didn't answer the questions that were directed to them by the Third College group in the way that they—and so they said “no” even though the rest of us obviously said yes. And that was the point in which I was almost ready. I had had some options, and I was almost ready to leave, not because of that one decision, but because that's what was happening to the campus. And I said, I just ___ *[inaudible]* at this time and ___

[inaudible]. But then I realized it's happening all over. I mean, where are you going to go? If you don't like that kind of atmosphere, then you leave the academy, you know, you leave UCSD.

CHODOROW: By the way, as the search for the Political Science Department actually turned out, I mean Sandy and— *[inaudible]*

SPIRO: Oh, it turned out very well.

CHODOROW: —it was extraordinary, in the way that it developed. To what extent did the department, as it actually developed, relate to anthropology? Was there any interaction?

SPIRO: No, no, unfortunately there's never been any interaction between the two departments. And indeed, other than dyadic relationships—of Sandy and I or whatever—there has been no— And that interaction is at a social level not ___ *[inaudible]*. I think one of the reasons is Sandy and I are at two opposite poles where we both ___ *[inaudible]* and we are at the opposite poles. I am for policy re-instatement *[?]* and she is passionately against policy reinstatement *[?]*. I think that I'm expected to, but that's one of those amateurish guesses.

CHODOROW: Yes. So, I think we covered—

SPIRO: Okay!

CHODOROW: —a majority of the questions that I have. If you think of something that you wish you should have said, either send me an email or give me a call. And I will if I have a question.

SPIRO: If you have any questions let me know. Okay, sorry to have been late.

CHODOROW: Oh, no problem.

SPIRO: Nice seeing you both, and Stanley, once again, welcome back.

CHODOROW: Thank you. It's great to be back, I have to tell you.

[END OF PART TWO, END OF INTERVIEW]