

Harvey Sarles

- Youth and education 1-
 - music, pre-med, sciences 1-2
 - computer science job, mid 1950s 4
 - the linguists at Buffalo State 6
 - cross-disciplinary interests 7
 - graduate school at the University of Chicago 8
 - body and mind 9
 - field work, Chiapas 10
 - healing 13-14
- Sarles' teaching positions, University of Pittsburgh - psychiatry 13-14
- Influences of Chomsky 15
- Sarles comes to the University of Minnesota, 1966 17
 - Meehl, Paul 17
 - Jenkins, James 17
 - Hoebel, Ad - Anthropology 19
 - availability of funding 20
 - decline of field linguistics 21
 - fragmentation of Anthropology Department 23
 - decline of generalists 24
 - "culture wars" 25-26
 - experimental courses 27
 - academic job market in crisis, mid 1970s 28
 - bureaucratization of academy, 1970s 29
 - loss of community 30
 - Commitment to Focus, U-2000 31
 - anti-intellectualism in American society 32
 - decline of liberal arts 32
- Careerism, 1990s 34
 - academic entrepreneurs 34
- Loss of sense of purpose 35
- Intellectual challenges, 1994 37
- Demise of Humanities Department 43
- Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies 44
- University of Minnesota Extension Service 45

Interview with Harvey Sarles

**Interviewed by Professor Clarke A. Chambers
University of Minnesota**

**Interviewed on October 19, 1994
University of Minnesota Campus**

Harvey Sarles - HS
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: I am doing an oral interview with an old colleague, Harvey Sarles who came to the university in 1966 and has occupied many different departmental homes since then. It is Wednesday the nineteenth of October in the afternoon. The interview is being conducted in my office at 833 Social Science. Harvey, as with other persons and as we spoke before the machine was tuned in, it's kind of fun to get a brief intellectual academic autobiography . . . where people came from, why . . . in your case, your intellectual interests are focused from time to time but are really cross departmental from the very beginning. You can start in kindergarten if you want or wherever it seems appropriate.

HS: It's probably important in my case to know that I was a privileged child. I was the first child in a whole generation of people and the first boy in two generations in my mother's family. Then, there wasn't another child for five years so, I got a lot of attention.

CAC: [laughter] You're speaking of an extended family?

HS: Yes, extended family. I got a huge amount of attention and was kind of God's gift. Part of my biography also is that I had some really bad accidents during that time. These days, people get into child abuse and I'm rethinking all of that but I busted my skull. I had a fractured skull and I lost an eye all by accidents and a few other things. It's been good since that time.

CAC: When you were a child really?

HS: Yes, and that's part of my story because part of my interest in the world is in human nature, and partly I know that I'm passing, as it were, wearing a prosthesis since I've been seven. I

know that when people look at me, I know that I'm no where like people see me as. That's always been a hidden story and it's probably a large part of my interest.

CAC: That's very traumatic as a kid.

HS: I don't think so. I think I handled it okay. It's been strange though because it's a continuous kind of sense that I'm not who I appear to be and that's a lot of, it seems to me, my intellectual story; that in a certain sense, it makes me reflect critically on who that I am all the time and then also then to ask Who is anyone and how did we get to be? That's sort of my main intellectual interest.

CAC: Bravo.

HS: I was trained, as I said earlier, as a violin player and did not at that time go into it because it looked like all the orchestral players in Buffalo, which had a pretty good symphony, that I knew were very penurious, and didn't have any money, and I didn't want to do that. It's kind of ironic because today's orchestral players do really very, very well compared to professors. That was my training and it's still a great deal of my interest, that is, sound, listening to sound. I walk through the world with a violin playing so that I examine the nature of the sound of every room as if I had a violin and were playing. That's a lot of how I walk through the world is with the violin in my mind examining space.

CAC: So, you were identified early as a kid having real talent? You could have been a professional musician?

HS: Oh, yes, sure. I was quite close and could have gone to music school but I decided that this was not me. I didn't like high school. I was wonderful through eighth grade and then in high school something was not good. I left early and went to college during the Korean War. They let us quit high school and I went to the University of Buffalo briefly. I'm not sure that I ever found myself or woke up intellectually till somewhat later. I was a super bright kid and a great sort of arithmetician but never figured out what intellectual life was about and was raised around people who had no idea of what it all meant. There was an idea of going to become a doctor because that was going to guarantee a good life and all of that.

CAC: You were first of a string of children, boy children, to this family?

HS: No, there was just a sister after that. I was the first in the extended family.

CAC: Yes. Were any college educated?

HS: Nobody in my family up until that time had been college educated. All of my first cousins are a generation younger than I am, just about, so it's kind of an oddness. I just saw one who's forty in London a couple of weeks ago. I was an undergraduate major in pre-med, a general

science major, and spent a year. I did get into medical school. I started out in physics and found that concentration in physics was not very exciting. They developed a general science major, and I graduated with a fair amount of math, and a good amount of biology, and geology—which I probably love more than anything; I had a wonderful, wonderful lecturer at the time—and the other sciences, that is, some physics and a fair amount of chemistry.

CAC: But not much of the humanities, the arts?

HS: A little bit. I was apparently good at it. I wrote for the school newspaper and was very, very adept. I could write out of my head, just about. I could write almost anything. It was ironic because I lost that ability later on as I became more in the subject matter. I lost the ability to write and it's taken me a great number of years to recover what I was very adept at. That's been interesting and probably a lot of my story as a teacher.

A couple of things happened to me that are important in my development which is that I had a couple of teachers, one in high school and one in medical school, who were very, very . . . Their idea of teaching was to punish people and they saw me as talented but somehow not up to my abilities—particularly the one in medical school. I don't know if you saw *Paper Chase*, the original, but this was about Harvard Law School and there was a suicidal student because the teacher was riding him; and that, literally, happened to me in my [unclear] anatomy class. I was made a fool of, which had never happened to me before—a little bit since.

CAC: [laughter]

HS: I just began to hate the whole practice of medicine.

CAC: God!

HS: It seemed very nasty, and damaging, and very arrogant, that doctors put on their white coats and it was a whole . . . At that point, I was very interested or became interested in social class issues and it seemed to me that medicine should not be all of this arrogance and differentiation among people. It ought to be something about serving and curing. At that time was probably when I woke up intellectually. I remember I was relearning the violin—one time among many—about the same time we were doing the anatomy of the hand. That was a very exciting moment for me to do the anatomy of the hand and then look at my hand working, a very adept left hand playing the violin. I couldn't believe it. That was a very, very large awakening for me and probably was a major moment in my awakening intellectual life, which I say came much, much later than most people. You know, I was this super bright kid but then could never find myself.

I left medical school, and fooled around for a little while, and took some courses, and wound up needing a job because I had met my future spouse—with whom I'm still hanging out, the same person. At about that time, I walked over to a place, which was in Buffalo on the south skirts

which Cornell University had taken over, called Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory where I just did little mathematical things for a couple of months. Then, strangely in one of those great accidents of fate, this was the moment when the first large computers were developed, the 704, 705 IBMs [International Business Machine], and I became a computer programmer, a systems analyst, and learned all of this on the job. This was a time in the early 1950s, middle 1950s, when there was no money in academia. There was a lot more money in industry. We were funded mostly by navy projects.

CAC: Not until Sputnik went up and then money started . . .

HS: That's right, after 1957 things started getting real good. Most of my colleagues—I was just a twenty-three year old kid—were professors; so, I had as my colleagues, mathematicians, physicists, statisticians, all at my beck and call. I played bridge with them and we were all in a large room together . . . many, many interesting conversations with some of the most thoughtful people I ever met all working at Cornell Aeronautical Lab . . . just enough money to make a living because there wasn't any living . . . three thousand bucks or so.

CAC: You found your way to a string trio or a quartet?

HS: Not at that time. No, there wasn't much of that going on. That was another awakening just before I met my spouse and maybe, it was in that context. At Buffalo at that time, a wealthy family had left money so that the major string quartet—which turned out to be the Budapest, luckily—had to play the full Beethoven cycle every year; and they played Cesar Chávez where I first heard that people could hit the violin, that it could be a percussive instrument, and it had all sorts of range of sounds that I didn't know about, and people played in assembles. I'd never had that experience.

CAC: Ah.

HS: It was only orchestra music and solo stuff going on that I got brought up in terms.

CAC: I see.

HS: This is part of my intellectual . . . It was a desert, in many ways, where I was brought up.

CAC: That's engaging.

HS: I had a wonderful upbringing. One interesting thing is IBM, at that time, didn't have any manuals. They assigned a person to us in Buffalo. We had to go every couple of weeks for over a year to New York to the IBM center at which you learned about IBM, and having to wear a coat and tie, and all of the interesting things about how IBM and its patronage system worked. It was an interesting story about American industry. Then, we came back and I got to write the manual for our people, after which time they never let me touch the machine again. I basically

learned on the machine from the people there and then came back and did the manual. That was very interesting and instructive. I learned how to program and learned how to think in . . . I don't know if you're adept at computers but we had to think in what was called machine language and still is. I learned how to do octal arithmetic, learning then about decimal arithmetic which I had merely assumed. So, I began to understand the nature of mathematical thinking.

CAC: Sure. This was ground floor learning.

HS: Well, right on the machine. We taught ourselves. There were no courses. There were no departments. In fact, my colleagues all began departments of applied mathematics for computer sciences. This was the beginning. We taught ourselves the courses, for example, in numerical calculus. We basically taught ourselves how to do this out of a book. That was my first teaching experience with my colleagues in a course in numerical calculus. A little piss-ant kid with all of these older, thirty-five to fiftyish year old people, all with Ph.D.s and most of whom had had at least assistant professorships somewhere. It was a very good moment.

Then, the person that I was going to marry and I did get married at that time. I guess before I got married, the people who were going to begin a department of anthropology in linguistics at Buffalo had been with the state department. I don't know if you know the whole story about [Dwight D.] Eisenhower and [John Foster] Dulles and how they shifted the State Department. We had been, during the second world war, a State Department which thought about the language and culture of other places. My teachers began the army language school with them. They were all in Washington during this time and associated with the study of cultures. Then Mr. Dulles sort of was an America-first notion, this old kind of Protestant idea of America being the center of the world and the rest of the world being in some measure away from us and lower than us.

CAC: The *city on the hill*.

HS: Exactly. Mr. Dulles absolutely had a city on the hill mentality and he changed the state department. He literally changed it. To my understanding, it's mostly still the same way . . . part of our foreign policy. That's another long story.

CAC: I think part of that was the perceived risk that if you became immersed in a culture, you might come to represent that country to the United States rather than the other way around.

HS: It was the whole argument that is raging today in the so-called curriculum debate about absolutism and relativism that if you were a relativist, if you used other persons perspectives, it would take away from the city on the hill mentality and you might very well begin to represent that differently.

CAC: Yes.

HS: We were beginning right around that time—it was 1952—our great Manichaeian opposition to world communism and this was then seen as the place which should represent good in the world. My teachers, who ran the Foreign Service Institute, got purged and they began this department at Buffalo.

CAC: Ah! Gosh!

HS: It was two linguists: a man named Henry Lee Smith Jr who was the boss at the Foreign Service Institute and a guy named George Trager who was one of the better linguistic thinkers of the time. They brought along with them a man named Ray Birdwhistle, who was into body motion, a former dancer who was an anthropologist. They came to Buffalo and the person that brought them . . . this is another accident . . .

CAC: What a chance! Yes.

HS: Yes. I got into this because my wife was the chief bottle washer and baby sitter for the dean of Arts and Science at Buffalo at that time, and his family. I got to be kind of part of the family. I hung out with them and all the people that came in, I got to meet. These people were my people. I was one of them. All the things that they thought about were things that I thought were wonderful to think about.

CAC: [unclear] get them out of the Chinese linguistics program [unclear]?

HS: No, but they knew all the people who were. This was all one group that . . .

CAC: Because that was the fall of China [unclear], too.

HS: They were all part of one group because they had all worked together in Washington during the war. They were the people that wrote all the geographies, and did all the orthographies, and developed all the methodologies that were used. I don't know if you know about Edward T. Hall? He was part of that group. He, then, moved to Northwestern.

CAC: Sure. I hadn't realized that he had been.

HS: His book, *The Silent Language*, is dedicated to George Trager. So, that's my upbringing, this undercurrent of linguistics.

CAC: And now you're really getting turned on?

HS: This was very, very exciting, yes. I decided that mathematics—wonderfully, stupidly—that being this computer person . . . in two years I had learned all there was to know . . . never got past my first five years of being told how smart I was but at this point, I really did know something.

CAC: Sure.

HS: But it seemed these were not my talents. The computer world is a world of people who are very ingenious and I thought it was fun to be ingenious but it seemed real quick [snap of fingers]. It's sort of like they were all chess players and bridge players who have different mentalities but I wasn't. I also at that time, when I was at Cornell Lab, began to see very, very deeply something that had begun to interest me in undergraduate school but I hadn't pursued it—the difference between the different disciplines and their different kinds of mentalities and approaches. Yes, I got into this. This has become a large part of my study at the university of all the different disciplines . . . by realizing by course in, I guess, differential equations which is the one after calculus usually. It's a professional course for all engineers. I was a math major or general science major taking differential equations with the engineers. It was clear that the mathematicians and the engineers went about this course in a totally different way, absolutely differently. I learned the course. I got total insight into it. I got out of the exam after twenty minutes and got, I think, 100 on it. I just did really well on it and they stayed there for two hours. But by the next year, the engineers were using it, and understood it, and I had kind of just let it go by. It was an insight moment for me. This is part of my problem, I had these moments of great insight but then I didn't pursue anything. That's how the computer world seemed to me.

CAC: You're piling up an agenda of things you want to do later on.

HS: Apparently, I didn't realize that but I've always loved wandering across disciplines to see. The mentality of different people . . . and that includes a lot of things about where you have arguments across disciplines . . . it got me . . . what you're oriented toward. When I was at Cornell Lab, I was the computer person. I had to work with all these other people getting programs on the computer and each different kind of person . . . it definitely broke down by professional orientations. Every time you do a calculation in the real world, you lose some accuracy because by the time you start multiplying numbers and each real number is kind of false, about half off at some decimal point, you start losing accuracy. The mathematicians understood that but physicists didn't care.

CAC: [laughter]

HS: The engineers absolutely didn't care. They're into integers. You know, they're into big stuff. If it's a building and you might fall down, you put in more steel. They have a big bulky imagination and they want cases. I learned about the fact that there were different people who want cases, the case study people, which I later learned also included medical people, and law people, and social work people. They think through a whole series of cases. That's how everything is taught and abstraction and generalization follows. The mathematicians want the generalization to begin with and cases, that's easy. [laughter] So, it turns out that mathematicians and engineers have a terrible time communicating. I occasionally get to broker those conversations because one of the things I got into was mental sets or how they perceive.

Later on, this has been one of my great pursuits is how to broker those kinds of conversations. They can understand each other; it's just that they go about it in quite radically different ways and they appear to be talking past each other in many ways. What my attempt to do is always to kind of explain them to each other and that works.

After that, I went back to school. I just fell in love . . .

CAC: Still at Buffalo?

HS: This was at Buffalo, yes. I took a master's at that point and then went to the University of Chicago. During that time, one summer, I was at the linguistic institute where I met all the linguists. At that time, it was a knowable universe. There were like 500 people and I got to meet them all. My teachers really ran the field and my career looked really, really good. This is part of the story because there was a revolution just as I came out—this is going ahead of myself—brought in by a guy named Noam Chomsky.

CAC: Ah ha, you bet.

HS: The people he overthrew were the anthropological linguists.

CAC: The ones that you were training with?

HS: The ones that I was training with who at that time really kind of had that field because they were the central people in Washington and had put out their own publications.

CAC: Your [unclear] and paradigm changes real fast?

HS: It was revolutionary. None of them saw it coming . . . really, really fast. I've seen a number of those and I've studied them. You have to outlive a lot of them. Longevity is very important in this academic idea game.

CAC: I talked recently with a microbiologist and I said, "What happened when you had the DNA and the molecular work?"

HS: Yes. Chemistry has been taking over biology.

CAC: All they had to relearn in one year . . .

HS: Sure.

CAC: They just had to retool completely.

HS: We had a big fight at my Ph. D. level. They wanted me to learn Chomskyianism in order to get out and I said I thought they ought to talk to my mentor about that and not talk to me. He was pretty loose about that. Also, at Buffalo, I did my first field work. I went to Taos, New Mexico, with my teacher who was the person who had done Taos linguistics. They had been attempting to expand linguistics. I should explain this orientation a little. They were much more in the Chicago School tradition, which I believe is about to come back in—we'll see. There's an American philosophical tradition which begins with Charles Sanders Peirce and moves up through [William] James and, eventually, through [John] Dewey and [G.H.] Mead and came into this building where we're sitting through somebody named Greg Stone who had a long . . .

CAC: Oh, heavens! I didn't know he was the end of that line.

HS: He was. He was kind of a tragic person and the field became tragic.

CAC: He was, yes.

HS: He was considered the brightest of them—if that's interesting—of that one branch, the sociological branch. There was also an anthropological branch which was less into symbolic interaction, that is, about talk but more into body language. My field basically, through my studies with these people, is about the language and movement. I'm also into the body, that is, as we're sitting here, how we're sitting, your hand on your head, and leaning a little in some relation with me, and if you do it a little bit off like that—I can't demonstrate—the situation falls apart.

CAC: Partly I'm protecting a bad eye so that . . . [laughter]

HS: [laughter] Then I have to make some adjustments to that, too.

CAC: Sure.

HS: That's been my subject matter. I really love to see—and my violin is both the sound and the movement—how a body knows this stuff; so, I've always been interested in the relationship between body and knowing. There's body and intellection. In most of western thought, the body was just emptied, and disappeared, and you send your mind to school.

CAC: It's all here. Yes.

HS: It's all in the head. I come from a tradition where the language and the bodily movement are all part of the same thing and we'll see if this is coming back in. Charles Peirce, when he begins this, says that in order to understand philosophy and logic you can't just be there, you have to do something. You have to extend the line of a triangle to see what it's like after you've extended it. You can't simply look at a triangle and believe you understand the nature of . . .

CAC: Triangleness.

HS: This turns out to be triangleness, the Pythagorean notion of our being. You have to do something, and that gets us back to the human, and leads through this whole Chicago School to my line again. So, I get a degree. I spend a couple years in southern Mexico, which was very important, in the middle of this place called Chiapas, interestingly. Yes. At that time, it seemed kind of sleepy.

CAC: Frank Miller was there just about the same time.

HS: Yes, he was just ahead of me. We were Harvard, Stanford, and Chicago. I was at the Chicago part. We were somehow or other all part of this whole Chiapas . . .

CAC: I'm going to back up just a second.

HS: Sure.

CAC: The Taos Institute, Taos, New Mexico, what was there?

HS: Taos was just where my teacher went and did his field work.

CAC: Oh, I see. But he was working on Indian languages?

HS: The Taos language. Yes. Taos happens to be where there is a Taos Pueblo . . .

CAC: And you worked with some of that yourself?

HS: Yes, for at least a little while? We were working on something called para-language. This was the attempt to extend linguistics at that time. Linguistics itself had a wonderful method called phonemics. Phonemics is the only method I know which really allows you to get into other people's cognitive structures because you take a language you don't know anything about and through phonemic method—which I won't get into—a procedure which allows you to understand the way people of a totally different language put together their own sound structure.

CAC: Now, was Bob Spencer's work in that line?

HS: No. No. He had done some work in linguistics but he basically was in language . . .

CAC: He could catch on to an unknown language to him very fast.

HS: Yes. He's more what I call a polyglot. Linguistics is all about the structure and to me it's a cognitive approach to other people's thinking. You get inside the development of their

thinking, that is, how they see the world. Bob was more into kind of joining their language and doing it that way. We were interested in the way they structured it.

CAC: Okay.

HS: It allowed you to get into their unconscious, as it were. We called it out-of-awareness and there are some technical differences between an approach to the unconscious and approach to the . . .

CAC: But you had to live in Taos for a couple of years?

HS: No, just for a summer. I lived in southern Mexico for two years with a family with a wife and child.

CAC: And with your wife with you?

HS: Yes, spouse with me and we took a five-month old to southern Mexico, which was interesting and probably pretty foolhardy but we did it. It was good. It was very good. It was a wonderful time for us and we very much enjoy Mexican culture.

CAC: What specific project were you working on?

HS: I was working on the so-called Chicago project and we were attempting to . . .

CAC: With Indian or language?

HS: This was all in the Highland Mayan. I did a grammar of the language called [unclear], which is the language of one of these towns where the Venustiano Carranza . . . where the Commandante Marcos took over briefly. It turns out to be a volcano. It's really interesting to be on an extinct volcano where a lot of mythology is trying to explain why there should be water up about 7,000 feet above sea level when there's no apparent water around.

CAC: [laughter]

HS: That was interesting to figure out where the water comes from and then contrast the mythology that sprang up about that because obviously you need a god inside the mountain—that makes it a very central place to the world.

CAC: I've always thought that myself.

HS: Right. Or to see that there are 9,000 feet of water about twenty miles away and there's a large water head out there. We tried to explain all of that to ourselves and to everyone else. [laughter]

CAC: Were you alone or was there a team?

HS: We were in a separate town from other people but we came together frequently in San Cristóbal, which is the center of all this recent uprising. That's the center of the government there and the center of where the Chicago School project was.

CAC: I suppose I shouldn't interrupt on this because it's so engaging . . . that some of the newspaper accounts—the ones in depth—about the Commandante suggest that it is the power of his language and they can't figure out where the imagery is coming from, at least by the . . .

HS: They've got some very smart ideological thinkers involved here. I don't know if that person, Marcos himself, is all that bright but he obviously . . .

CAC: But the poetry of it as well as the . . .

HS: Extraordinary. The rhetorical power of it is quite amazing. It doesn't sound to me, listening to his accent . . . The way I can tell it is I can understand everybody from around there but I don't understand him; so, I assume he is not local.

CAC: All right.

HS: I don't know where he's from but he's not a Chiapanico.

CAC: Okay.

HS: But he's very fascinating and very clever. I don't know whether it's him or he's the spokesperson for some other people. Nothing would surprise me. They have a long and strong case and it's just mind boggling. I tell all of my political colleagues that in order to understand where we are in the world, the contrast between a first world and a third world country is right here; and they should stay away from the border and get into Mexico and stay there for at least six months, maybe a year, and begin to understand something very, very, very different. Then they begin to understand NAFTA [North American Free-Trade Agreement]. To talk about it from a point of view either of a capitalist or of a labor person is without experience and the experience is very crucial. In my thinking about different contrastive ways of thinking about the world, both the Mexican, that is the ladino or mestizo view and the Indian view . . . this was very wonderful to be in a place where those cultures had been living side-by-side for 400 years without much blending. Then, in some towns where they were blending in that moment, that was fascinating to see how a wholly Indian town could wipe out its memory in a single generation. I was in several towns like that. It turns out if you deny it for about eight years, your kids never find out anything about the language or that they really are Indians and you can . . . There were two towns there where, literally, everyone had just disguised or lied. They had joined the national culture and, literally, had suppressed publicly to everyone around there and with one another that they were in fact Indian people, and that they actually spoke the language but they

never allowed anyone to speak it; so, they totally assimilated as a whole town. Quite amazing. That was fascinating to see.

CAC: Amazing and shocking, if I catch the expression on your face. This is a dismaying thought to you as well?

HS: It's fascinating to me because it sort of says to me that in the history of the human condition—I wrote a piece once . . . I wrote a lot of pieces . . . called "Eight Years from Barbarism"—that the memory of people only has to be . . . I guess, my widest generalization is how we get to be and how we are. I think becoming an anthropologist, one has to become or grab what I call a total intellectual [nealism?] and work back from that early on. You have to take the wondrous trip that nothing in the world has any meaning except what we give to it and there is no meaning given in the world. Then what we give to it then becomes fascinating, that that becomes the most wondrous thing, that in fact, we create meaning in the world and that we're able to do this.

CAC: I hear echoes of existentialism which was strong in the 1950s.

HS: I kind of picked it up. I'm not sure where. A lot of my re-do of the university, which we may get to, is really a kind of steal out of Kierkegaardian critique, particularly a book called *The Present Age*.

CAC: I came in the fictional door with [Albert] Camus.

HS: Oh. A friend of mine actually gave me Camus in the field, *The Stranger* . . . in Spanish . . . is where I first came upon it while I was living in San Cristóbal. I first came across Camus at that moment. I guess that might have been a large moment for me, that was in these formative times.

CAC: Now, you're in your mid to late twenties?

HS: Yes, that right, late twenties . . . twenty-seven, twenty-eight. I was also reading heavily in the philosophy of science. I began with another person who is very much a process person as Alfred North Whitehead in the *Concept of Nature*. I spent a great deal of time with Whitehead and [unclear] what happened when Chomsky comes along—this is right about the time when I get out of school. I went to the University of Pittsburgh, the Department of Psychiatry, because this is where the support was for looking at interaction behavior, particularly in the curing profession between psychiatrists or psychologists and patients; so, we got very interested in the nature of what cure meant, which I'd been interested in in medical school but that was not a much shared interest by people in medical school. It's becoming interesting now because South and East Asians are coming and it turns out to be cheaper to think about holistic medicine and nutrition.

CAC: [laughter]

HS: Western medicine is very much into symptoms, and drugs, and allopathic approaches; and I was interested in what it meant to be sick and to be a person. I guess, I had another insightful moment before I went to medical school, for whatever reason I can't remember why. I got interested in curing; so, I went to some faith healing summer tent services in Buffalo and they seemed to heal people. I got interested in Lawrence; and so I became quite interested in what sickness was, and who got to heal and cure people, and what that meant. That was not a good topic for a freshman medical student to be into at that time. I think that that was not well received. [laughter] But I think I was right and I still pursue that.

CAC: Were there native healers in Chiapas?

HS: Sure, all over the place. They had a double kind of line. There were western sicknesses and native sicknesses and you had doctors and curanderos; and they had a pretty distinct idea of which was which, and went to the right kind of doctor for the right thing . . . a whole set of ideas of medicine and how you . . .

CAC: And women, female curanderas?

HS: Both. It depended and I was never exactly sure what it depended on. I was interested in how they put together the universe, that is, how the Indian universe was constructed; and I spent some amount of time trying to see where that was because they had a whole level, a sort of a Dante leveling of the world and I was curious as to how they put that together. That came up because we had gone home very briefly during the two years for about a month, and came back; and we flew back to the states and drove back to Mexico. My chief informant was really surprised that we could drive back because he had the United States and Mexico on two different planets and that started a whole conversation, which still intrigues me.

I started working in this Department of Psychiatry and had a joint appointment in Anthropology where I began my teaching. I was lucky enough to mentor with somebody who showed me how to do syllabi and all that stuff. That was very good. I could teach one course a year, and spent a lot of time teaching, and began to think about teaching as dialog, which is the name of the game.

CAC: Now, you must have known at that point that you had too many questions?

HS: No, I was really an innocent.

CAC: I mean for a traditional academic career, you had too many questions?

HS: I was never interested in one so I really didn't know. I didn't pay it much attention, Clarke. I really have been a naive and an innocent about that.

CAC: Okay.

HS: All my life, still to this moment. Part of becoming a good anthropologist is to sort of treasure the naive, the child in you; that is, you're supposed to ask these questions because you're really delving into people's lives and have to understand them in whatever terms they bring to the world. So, who am I to take my American judgmental stroke to anybody. My idea of the world has been to transform what I call the anthropology of the exotic—which I think most anthropologists do because they go away—into what I call an anthropology of the ordinary. The really interesting stuff is the ordinary stuff we do because that is so complicated. It's all about our growing up, and forming our bodies, and being the people we are. I've always thought you ought to pursue the subject matter and I never did get the academic life to this day.

CAC: [laughter] Oh, you've heard some of us say it, however.

HS: I know that. One of your colleagues who lived down the hall, a distinguished colleague of yours, told me at one point when I got into all these things that he thought I'd be much happier at—he was the head of the Consultative Committee; perhaps, you know who I mean; we were next door neighbors up here—a good undergraduate college where I could explore all of my different issues rather than at the university where we were supposed to be specialists. I thought that was nice of him to say "a good undergraduate college."

CAC: [laughter]

HS: I've never been able to tame this. What I did when I got blocked was make a subject matter out of it. That's been my approach every time there's been a blockage . . . that I became intrigued by these revolutions or changes or blockings to understanding and that became something which became a subject to study.

CAC: In the meantime, you must have had to pick up Chomsky, if you're going to be close to this field at all with linguistics. I mean you had to pick it up?

HS: Yes, I read him. I didn't want to do it.

CAC: You studied it?

HS: Yes, but I had decided by that time . . . I had written some stuff that I thought was very important—I still do—and it still hasn't much hit the light of day. It's very much in the Chicago School and G. H. Meadian tradition where it's an argument that goes that goes back to Plato. The emergence of Chomsky drove me into the philosophical literature, you know. How could some guy [unclear], all of a sudden take over the fields? I watched it and I was part of it. He took over linguistics. He took over anthropology. He took over philosophy. He took over psychology and almost everything else around. I was amazed by it.

CAC: But he had heroic power?

HS: He was quite extraordinary. He wrote real well and he had some wonderfully protected mentors. He had a guy named Marcelo Dascal who was on his side and I can't remember the other one, but he had some very powerful people who helped promote him. He came at a time where—strangely enough for all of the criticism he's had of the government—a lot of the money he used was NDEA money, that is National Defense Education Act of 1959, or whatever. He was bankrolled because—it's interesting how this developed . . . [laughter] He got a lot of money out of MIT [Massachusetts Institute of Technology] for translation machines; so, he had a huge group of people supporting this who were well supported by the government, kind of against the government, and I always thought that was interesting and ironic.

CAC: I suspect he became heroic also because for persons not on the inside of his own field, his position and his visibility on the anti-war movement was such that it gave a . . .

HS: That was a little bit later. His first major work, where he took over psychology literally, was he killed off B.F. Skinner, who was by that time already at Harvard. Skinner's book was *Language Behavior*, something like that. Chomsky's first important piece was in *Language* which is a review, "The Linguistic Side of America." He wrote about an eighty-page piece which was extremely well received. Linguistics was kind of tired and psychology was kind of tired, that is, the psychology of behavior. That was his first move. He first moved into psychology and he brought a kind of Cartesian philosophy around that a number of the philosophers loved. So that by the time I came here, it was just hitting now and he was also in the war movement where he had some backing. I was asked, literally, if you didn't go along with him, you had to leave the room. It got very popular, literally, at this university with some very important people. If you asked questions here, you were asked to leave. No questions could be asked. No critical comments could be made. This was the first real big lesson in . . .

CAC: Of him or . . . ?

HS: No. Of people who were studying about him. You couldn't approach it critically. You kind of had to learn it and kind of buy it. His promise was that he was going to explain the human mind in about fifteen years.

CAC: Yes.

HS: He came in with this extraordinary promise that he would explain language which would then explain the human condition.

CAC: [unclear]. Sure.

HS: Very, very quickly.

CAC: In what disciplines did you find this set of mind operating here?

HS: Philosophy. This was a very important Philosophy Department at that time. This was meetings with people like [unclear].

CAC: [unclear].

HS: Yes. And Paul Meehl and [James] Jenkins in Psychology. These were the leading people at the university. They were just then forming a Linguistics Department. But the Chomsky discussions really were very particular and restrictive, and he took over philosophy, and he still owns a lot of the philosophers. He took over . . . I don't want to get into my critique of philosophy because it's a long story which is still unwinding. Psychology then rejected him some years later and it is now rejecting it in an increasingly large way but it was my first revolution that I was part of. As one of my teachers said about me—Trager—that the best he could say about me, because I wasn't following him, was that I was the only one of his students who didn't become a Chomskyian.

CAC: [laughter]

HS: In order to get a job in general in that field, everybody converted, literally converted, and that was very fascinating to me because all the people I grew up with basically became Chomskyians and that became the way of the world.

CAC: We're not talking PC [Political Correctness] but we are talking a mind set within the academy which resists persons who ask lots of questions.

HS: Oh, absolutely. You're absolutely shut out. I found that already though in my Department of Psychiatry in Pittsburgh because unless you were a psychiatrist—I worked with many psychiatrists, and psychoanalysts, and trained M.D.s—there were a number of cut-offs. If you didn't have an M.D., you literally were not allowed to say certain things or be part of that. There were a number of metaphors. "The bucket of blood one" always was kind of interesting to me, that this is to explain the boundary between social scientists and physicians, that a drop of blood in a bucket of water looks like a bucket of blood and that sort of accounted for how physicians set up their boundaries.

CAC: Ah.

HS: I got to see a lot of that. I got to deal with psychologists, and anthropologists, and physicians, and nurses, and all of their relationships with patients, that is, active psychiatric patients, active psychotic people, in a number of different settings for four years, and how all these different people related to one another and that became very fascinating . . . forensic, that is, lawyer psychologists and psychiatrists. So, I dealt with lots of different people and knew

about the boundaries very well. I was already beginning to know about that but I hadn't seen a field change until I came here.

CAC: But you hadn't seen the barriers of the boundary raised against you?

HS: Some of them had because I couldn't penetrate being a physician. They tried to seduce me at that time. They offered a long, two-, three-, four-year, big support if I would become a psychoanalyst; and I decided that I should not do that, that I should stay out of that, that I didn't want to become, as it were, seduced into a particular frame of mind . . . that I was interested in the human condition or human nature. It was beginning to look like human nature is what I was interested in at that time and I didn't know exactly what my subject matter was but I know that I didn't want to sell my soul to a particular outlook which I thought was more restrictive as it might be opening. I knew that somebody was trying some number on me out of power it felt like. But I hadn't experienced the revolution. That sort of emerged around 1966 when I came here. It was just the beginning time . . .

CAC: And what brought you here? Now, it's 1966.

HS: What brought me here is a strange . . . It wasn't clear. It became clearer later but there was a revolution going on in psychiatry and that's the one that has lasted. It's just now going to change, I believe. This is when the biological thinking and the pill pushing took over psychiatry. Up until that time, it was almost all psychoanalytic and therapeutic and it was just beginning at the behavioral psychiatry, behaviorism biology. The giving of pills rather than talking therapy began to take over psychiatry in a major way and there was no more money for research positions. See, I had had a full time research position.

CAC: Ah.

HS: I expected never to be an academic.

CAC: They were emptying the insane asylums?

HS: That's right. There were no jobs is what happened. They were emptying the psychiatric institutes of social scientists, more to the point for me.

CAC: [laughter]

HS: I think the emptying of the institutions was a little later after they began to do this seriously.

CAC: It happens awfully fast when it sets in though.

HS: When it happens it happens quickly and I sort of sensed it but I couldn't see it coming. My teachers . . . I was at Western Psychiatric Institute. Ray Birdwhistle and his buddies were at Eastern and they were all fired, too. All the anthropologists were and people interested in body communication and interaction lost their jobs at that moment. Everyone. There were no jobs. One [unclear] person, a guy named Al Shefflin, who was a psychiatrist/psychoanalyst high up, had to take a clinical job as an associate professor in New York and it killed him. He had a very early death.

CAC: So, in 1965, 1966, you're available?

HS: Yes. So, I was looking for a job and Ad Hoebel—this was a very good department; I think we were ranked the tenth, twelfth, in the country—offered me a job. It was basically his show.

CAC: How did he find about you?

HS: I guess I went to the national meetings and I had a good reputation. I came from Chicago, and I had a quick mouth, and I had been doing some—I think they thought it was kind of mysterious work but it sounded good . . .

CAC: Ad Hoebel was so traditional.

HS: Well, his tradition was Boasian, however . . . this is all students of [Franz] Boas. The tradition included . . . in order to be a real anthropologist, you had to be a cultural anthropologist, you had to be a linguist, you had to be a physical anthropologist; that is, the issues of language, race, and culture were all of a piece and if one person didn't do them all, at least they had . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

HS: . . . a very powerful guy. He was doing large courses and we had huge enrollments. I got to teach right away in Ford Hall-155, which holds 168 or so people. My classes, at least for several years, were full. I was told, later, it was because anthropology was in and psychology—which usually gets most of the students for a lot of reasons which I can explain—were over-subscribed; and so, they came over to sociology and anthropology. It was somewhat accidental. At that moment, we had the huge influx of baby boomers and all those people . . .

CAC: But at the graduate level, Ad had also had good connections with NSP [Northern States Power Company] and a good fellowship program for graduate students?

HS: Yes. I think it was called NIGMH at that time.

CAC: I see.

HS: He brought in a huge amount of money. My graduate students were fully funded, all at graduate school and going to the field. I mean, it was wonderful. We had money for everything that anybody could want. It was breathtaking. For whatever reasons, at that time when the rest of the university expanded, Ad kind of decided that we shouldn't expand and this was part of a problem that continued. So as say Sociology and Psychology and the other sort of sister disciplines went up to thirty, forty people, we stayed at about twelve to fifteen. That turned out, probably, historically not to have been a real good idea. But in any case, we made that decision. At least for awhile when he was very active, it was a very happy place, and a very good and productive place, and we all bowled together, and partied together. That lasted for several years, up until the time he retired. We decided not to expand. During this whole period, however—and I should have known this from Chicago—the Boasian idea began to lose sway as a British social anthropology kind of took over and that was much more of a sociological tradition, what some critical people would call imperialistic anthropology; that is, instead of going out and being a relativist—doing the Margaret Mead and the Ad Hoebel thing of finding out how people think, going and finding out the legal systems of other people or their various kinds of systems—the approach was much more systematic and structural. It seemed to be in the name, for example with the British government, of working with all the colonial people, that this was a model much more constructed to keep people from acting out. It was as much political as it was anthropological in the Boasian sense. In the Boasian sense, you go in and find out what's happening and in the British social structural sense, you find out because the government doesn't want this whole situation to explode. It seems in retrospect to have been a kind of colonialist anthropology and that one basically took over as Boas died and his students lost a good bit of their power in the world. This was happening gradually as all of these people got older . . . the Meads and the Hoebels got older. The younger people were mostly trained in this British tradition and took up with Chomsky. They took off on a branch of anthropology that accepted Chomsky and linguistics, particularly Levi Straus whose structural anthropology became very powerful. The cultural anthropology became less and less important. Also, their interest in linguistics in anthropology or physical anthropology lessened and that's still mostly true. Most of the good physical anthropologists are in medical schools or dental schools not in anthropology departments. The linguists basically formed departments of their own and they almost all became Chomskyians. Chomsky said early on that the linguistics that anthropologists did was what he called—in a derogatory way—salvage linguistics. The picture being that you got the last remaining speaker of language X.

CAC: Ah. Okay.

HS: There was no other point of understanding all these languages because really the important idea of linguistics was to understand the human mind. There was a generalization from people at MIT in a small white room to the whole universe of human beings. The field tradition of

linguistics was immediately killed and nobody took my courses in field linguistics after about 1968. This whole tradition died out.

CAC: What you're suggesting—at least what I'm hearing—is that a Boasian tradition that Mr. Hoebel represented here was being subverted in many ways?

HS: That's right.

CAC: I'm wondering now—he was, as you know, a close personal friend in the neighborhood and I got to know him quite well and he took a very early retirement . . .

HS: Right. He's saw no future in the field.

CAC: I speculated, partly, that he made enough on his textbook that he didn't have to continue teaching and it gave him an option.

HS: I think he was more disconsolate. He was more melancholy . . . as you say some people are more disconsolate. He saw the field getting out of control.

CAC: That's what I'm wondering.

HS: He said he didn't see any future . . .

CAC: He didn't share much of that with me.

HS: He did with us. My spouse remembers this well that he said that he didn't think there'd be any anthropology in thirty years . . . partly it was the wrong field and partly because all the Boasian idea was that the anthropologists should give voice to the natives and there were no more natives. They've all become bureaucrats and they've all joined the rest of the world and become their own anthropologists; so, the purpose of anthropology, in the best Boasian sense, was already won. There was no point. He saw the field as having lost its meaning.

CAC: You're suggesting that his perception was pretty on target?

HS: Oh, I think it was exactly true. He tried to pull together the field and nobody wanted to be in the field that he represented anymore. This was an old [M.F. Ashley] Montagu field, the human rights field for example, these ideas of Boas . . . Boas and his students, including Hoebel, really literally brought all of the human people into the human family. I believe that they accomplished this—Montagu particularly.

CAC: Ad, after retirement, stuck with world federalism.

HS: This is the outlook. They were the people that wrote the U. N. [United Nations] human rights ideas. This was Montagu and [unclear]. This was all the group that did that; whereas lots of people saw savages and primitives—and so many still do—it was the Boasian people who brought them all into the human . . .

CAC: Do you have any sense at all that the American Indian movement was part of the subversion as well, for Ad and others close to him?

HS: No, I didn't think so. I didn't think that affected him. I don't know that.

CAC: Okay.

HS: I joined it. I was part of the jury selection committee of the Wounded Knee trial and I was asked by one of the people who worked with [] Kunsler to do that but I didn't have any sense that he opposed that.

CAC: Do you work with Doug Hall?

HS: I knew Doug Hall. He was not part of that trial.

CAC: Okay.

HS: I knew him because he was a neighbor and his wife, Marian Hall. She was in the Ed School, I guess. He took up a number of the cases of the people who were down and out but this was [William] Kunstler and it was a national trial. The local people, Leventhal and Ken Tilsen, who were part of that were much more secondary. We were brought in again from this national point of view rather than being locals and my wife and I as people who could read body language. Basically, that's what we did. I know we were successful, whether we were good or not . . . but it definitely worked . . . but that's kind of moot. A number of people in Ad's generation got totally turned off. We had people who sort of totally bought a psychological point of view. You wrote a manual if you wanted to go out to the field. You didn't do it in terms of participant observation. You basically took a catalog out with you and filled it in. This was a lack of respect in a certain way for the field tradition; that is, the person who went and kind of got into the native thought process—which is the Boasian training—was less and less regarded as important as people brought in different methodologies. I think all of that sort of took the joy of the field away. It certainly did for me and I believe it did for him.

CAC: Did the field ever come back?

HS: I don't think so. No, I don't think it's a field with a mission where . . .

CAC: There are persons who do field work.

HS: There are people. There's been a very smart critique of anthropology. As far as I know, it isn't much carried on here. The Anthropology Department—I don't want to get into the gossip of the place—partly after Ad left, people got not to like each other very well; and we didn't have good management after he lost interest in the place. He was a wonderful manager and, of course, a very elegant person in mind. The other people there, I guess, got into smaller issues and just didn't pursue the larger issues anymore and I think didn't respect the larger issues anymore.

CAC: Well, it happened faster than eight years, my friend. It happened faster than eight years, you were speaking of earlier, to wipe out a culture and a language.

HS: It happened by about 1968.

CAC: Yes.

HS: I know that it was already changing in his mind by about then. I'd only partaken of it for a couple of years but it took me awhile to realize that there was a lot of anger around that I didn't know much about. We bowled together, Ad and I. [laughter] I only realized that there was some anger around when one of the people on our bowling team didn't show up out of some fit of pique that I didn't understand. I only began to be part of that after awhile.

My own interests, at that point in linguistics then, everything was golden in my career. I had developed some ideas. I have a grammar, for example, of interaction and discourse of this whole tradition out of G. H. Mead. I thought that I had moved a great deal and it got a fair amount of play until about 1974 and then it wasn't interesting anymore. There was a whole series of issues that certainly were not selling well in the world and this partly happened in career; although, I think it's having a turn at the moment. I think like wide and narrow ties, I might have outlasted this whole revolutionary period.

But there's more to this story because at the same time the field of biology, which I am a part of, also had a couple of revolutions. There was the move to look at behavior, animal behavior and human behavior, very widely and I was part of that. All of a sudden—we were in England for a year and I came back—I was no longer welcome at these meetings; so, there was another revolution going on, the Lorenzian and ethological revolution which developed, eventually, into socio-biology; so that biology itself is having a kind of a naturalist . . . opposing the nature/nurture revolution. Still my closest friend at the university is a biologist and he's much more like an anthropologist. He's an ecologist at the moment. We're now starting to see a whole bunch of fields in turmoil. I've been part of a number of them and began to study them because it began to get interesting. Not only was I not at home anymore among the linguists and less among the anthropologists but the biologists were starting to draw lines and there was that revolution. Konrad Lorenz sold this idea of animals being terribly important—and I love that—but then he sort of took this idea that the people who should tell us about human nature were then biologists who basically derive their ideas from animals. I didn't like that at all. Because out

of the Boasian tradition was this marvelous kind of world democratic idea and out of this comes a philosopher king notion of human nature that our nature is itself so obscure because we are so conceptually—these are Lorenz's words—above all other species that we can't see ourselves; so, there's no point to observe us. This took the observation of humans away. It really stole the whole point and that these people, namely the Lorenzians, should basically tell us how we are. I found myself—from what I thought was intellectual subject matter—to be enmeshed in metaphysical issues through Chomsky and now, all of a sudden political issues. I was seeing that the subject matters which I thought . . . You know, you just really wanted to understand human behavior; I never understood why except that it intrigued me totally. I was beginning to understand that these issues were deeply philosophical and I didn't know anything about that.

CAC: And therefore political?

HS: And deeply political and I didn't know much about that. I had been really an innocent. I was brought up at Buffalo in a very non-political setting. I literally didn't know anything. I lived through the McCarthy era and, even then, remained a total innocent, and thought that scholars were honest, and had great integrity, and only was beginning to learn about racism and racial thought. Then, this started to develop in the real world. That, again, became a subject matter for me.

CAC: Forgive me for interposing here . . .

HS: Yes.

CAC: . . . I think you're number thirty-nine on my list of persons and I've drawn from many, many different departments and disciplines. I think what I'm hearing here is a fragmentation in the fields that you're talking about—and they are overlapping—that's is really two-fold. One is ideological-political-theoretic, and so forth . . .

HS: Intellectual in the broadest sense.

CAC: Yes. On the other hand, I think I'm also hearing that there is a specialization, not only by mode of inquiry, but a specialization as these different disciplines define themselves . . .

HS: Oh, yes.

CAC: . . . and establish career lines; so that what you have—I'm trying to make sense for myself, therefore, for these people who will listen to it later—a double whammy here in subversion. I mean, there are two forces that are related but they are separate, right? There's a fragmentation that comes into the university?

HS: It happens in a number of different ways. I discovered this in a lot of places. I tried to be genuinely—and I still believe I am—interested in human nature. All these institutional issues become important. You have to study the institution to see how it works and I got into this a lot in medicine because I realized that psychiatry was always sort of an orphan child of medicine. I had earlier been in medicine and realized that the medical people and the surgical people ran the place. I got involved with these chronic disease physical medicine people. I only learned later that they were really homeopaths and allopaths [unclear]. I knew that they all had some strange lines and that they didn't talk to each other over certain ways and that the people who got into chronic diseases were kind of considered to be people that the medical people didn't want to deal with. I understood that there was a whole shifting of issues in the medical world. I began gradually to discover it in the rest of the world.

CAC: You discovered that there's a hierarchy that falls out of this?

HS: Oh, absolutely, yes. It turned out, as far as I could see, to follow the mind/body split of Plato. It's true in the Ed School where the people who do curriculum and psychology are way above the people who do kinesiology and athletics. There's a hierarchy which follows that line all the way through.

CAC: And brain surgeons are the best?

HS: People who deal with the head are the best, yes. So, the brain surgeons, the neurosurgeons, are at the top and philosophy is the top of the intellectual heap. Deserving or not, it turns out that people will give them credit because somehow they are seen to control the ideas. A lot of it is style and they learn how to talk well enough. We may get back into that. I learned, for example, that one of the questions is Why do our schools fail? The question is Who advises the schools? It turns out, to a large extent as this works, that the [unclear], that is the behaviorists, who don't observe people but have replaced teachers with learning . . . it's a psychology of learning that took over; so, you always examine the kids and don't ever get into the interaction. Basically, these people took over the National Institutes of Education some years ago; so, it's they who train, who give the money and train the people, and they are the advisers to the school teachers. So far, interestingly, they haven't been blamed for the whole failure of the schools. They've been able to stay kind of clean and outside this battle but it is a certain kind of a way of thinking and it's a mental set which I'll blame on Skinner because he can take it and would appreciate it.

CAC: He's a Minnesota man.

HS: Yes. And he's very good. I just read a biography of his. He is a very intriguing man. It was his kind of mind set that took over and kind of took teachers out of the classroom so we began not to count them as very important people. Teaching became facilitating rather than an intersecting or a dialog between minds. It was Skinner who did that. The politics of that are very important in understanding the American situation at the moment. It's tough to say that one

because there is a lot of resistance to the idea that these kind of strands have taken a hold in American life and go on because once the jobs are controlled and the monies are controlled with a certain outlook that lasts for at least as long as the people who are bound to it live and usually a generation or two beyond the person who develops it. I began to see these much more general trends. In the biology, you could also watch socio-biology starting to take place and this is becoming increasingly powerful right in the moment because the conservative, progressive split that is now developing . . . It's probably best reported, at the moment anyway, in a book called *The Culture Wars* by James Davison Hunter. He talks about the culture wars and the conservatives pick up the naturalist idea that life is kind of fixed. At the beginning, genetic material is determining and at this moment this is now taking a large resurgence. In 1994, there's a series of books which have just been reviewed. *The New York Times Book Review*, a very liberal, moderate journal, is now saying that all these issues about the fixity of the human species has to be thought about in a very serious way and it gets a fairly positive review; so, we're now moving into a moment where the old issues that Boas had thought, and we fought against somewhat in the 1960s, seem to be visiting us again in a large way and we're starting to build prisons and all of this. So, we begin to see, again, how ideas that you think are kind of fixed and disappeared in some progressive sense, in fact are more like cyclical and they show up, I believe more or less, each generation and we're at that moment now, at a developing path. There's a great deal of anger about crime and they seem, to me at least, to be directed, again in the Boasian sense, at issues which used to be thought of as racial. It's coming again, ironically, in the name of culture, which I thought was change. We're at that moment right now.

CAC: Did you see the piece on Berkeley High School?

HS: Yes, I did.

CAC: That speaks to this.

HS: Yes, it speaks exactly to this because we've lost, somehow . . . The question that arises in the *New York Times Book Review* is, with a population in which the people, as they put it, with lesser abilities—by which I think they mean people who were born with inferior mentalities and propensities toward crime—increasing in our population can the great United States of America remain competitive in the world and what should we do about it? That's the issue as they raise it. We're moving into what I think is a very critical and fascinating political moment and we'll have to see how it plays out in the next few years.

CAC: Now, you're speaking of many different disciplines, although for a long time, you did this variety of work within the family of anthropology as a departmental budgeted home?

HS: I did for many years, yes.

CAC: And as long as Ad was there, as an intellectual home as well?

HS: Well, but I also wandered all the time because my colleagues . . . It seemed to me that you had to know what everybody's approach was. I didn't know whether somebody had some truth . . . I mean, all these fields are changing and I had to check and see . . .

CAC: Except in your own reading, how did you become peripatetic in that sense?

HS: I literally took my little body to all these places. I wandered to the Dental School. I wandered to the Medical School. I learned this one fairly early. This Medical School, the Department of Psychiatry, was controlled by a very powerful Department of Psychology. We had psychologists who literally were extremely important. The MMPI [Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory] and Stark Hathaway kind of controlled that whole game; so, whereas I could penetrate the medical school at Pittsburgh where I could wander and people would talk to me, it was a lot harder here because basically psychologist ran the game and anthropology was not particularly welcomed. The game was already pretty much a closed game and psychology kind of controlled it; so again, it was not only an outlook, it was a kind of departmental politics.

CAC: And with cross-appointments?

HS: Oh, yes, with cross-appointments. Most of the people in psychiatry also had an appointment in psychology. I began to see a very large old university which had preceded me in which psychology had, and still has, an extremely large sway.

CAC: But it made it difficult for you—I'm making a statement that really is a question—to establish a career within a large university because you were wandering about?

HS: I suppose. What happened, I think . . . because I did very well with deans. I had a guy named Gordon Kingston, who died tragically early, a dean of university college, and you could get all kinds of monies during the 1960s for experimental courses, and the guy who was . . .

CAC: You were able to set up experimental courses under university college?

HS: Under university college and under CLA [College of Liberal Arts]. There was a lot of money in that. I was very well received there. There was a wonderful man in Speech Communication named [Don] Smith who became vice-chancellor and he left.

CAC: Oh, yes.

HS: Things got very tight here starting about 1972, that this great era, blue sky era through the 1960s, in which you could try things and they would seem to be very open. Even though these revolutions were happening, I could always find colleagues in support for all kinds of things.

CAC: Why did it happen in 1972, 1973?

HS: I think that's when the money and the job market changed. All of us who had been hired in the blue sky days never thought we would stay here. Nobody ever needed to get along with anybody because we figured we'd be someplace else in five years and this place was full of people who thought they'd be someplace else . . .

CAC: [laughter]

HS: . . . and never learned how to behave very well with one another. I guess, at least for a number of years, I felt I was also culpable in part of this game. We were always thinking of someplace else, and kind of moving on, and then we found ourselves here, and there was no place to go, literally. I remember a discussion with an important person in my field in 1972 saying he had never seen the job market this tough, never . . . and he had started in the early 1950s.

CAC: And it hasn't recovered? It's now twenty years and it hasn't recovered?

HS: That's right. In many senses, it has not recovered. It's not gone anywhere.

CAC: But many departments in 1963—I'm estimating—to 1973 did that expansion that Anthropology did not, so that by . . . History almost doubled the size of its department in ten years . . .

HS: That's right. Sociology did. Geography did.

CAC: And there are other examples.

HS: They all did. It was only Anthropology. I think Geology didn't do much but those were decisions made not because the deans wanted us to. Those were decisions made locally. This was a time when there were department chairs. Then, the structure of the university changed. I guess, I'll give you Wangenstein's story because he's the one who was my mentor, Owen Wangenstein whose name is on the Medical School. He taught me a lot about the politics of universities and a lot of his analysis—besides being existential and Kierkegaardian—is Wangensteinian. He told me that it was about that time that the place became bureaucratized, during the 1960s as I understand it, and I think this is true with the military. I know it's true of all the church structures because I had friends in the American Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church in America. They also became bureaucratic; that is, the people who took over these structures were much more bureaucrats than theologians and preachers. They were much more structural.

CAC: You see this starting in the 1960s but exploding in the 1970s?

HS: Yes, it took hold. It definitely had taken hold by the 1970s. The structure here . . . I couldn't get money anymore because instead of talking to the dean—who was, you know, a big

thinker and trying to think of the institution—the deans had all set up committees and the committees turned out to be bureaucrats. The people who got on committees were the people who were penurious. They saved pennies and were not about to . . . It became very bureaucratic. You gave money to your buddies and the whole structure tightened up in this way. There were all these committee structures so that the deans, instead of making decisions personally which they still wanted to do, they did—this is what I learned from Wangenstein—abdication of administration. Rather than judging their people, they set up a whole set of committee structures through which they basically could avoid making this kind of decision. In fact, they really didn't spend much time knowing their faculty or judging them. Part of why Wangenstein thought we had gone radically down hill in the five years—this was when I was talking to him—since he had retired was that the only way people judge people was if they got good job offers from someplace else. It was during the 1960s when we began to have margins and centers of knowledge; that is, the money, and the jobs, and the funding began to be located in certain centers, a great deal in Washington, wherever the large foundations were . . . a great deal of it in New York. The idea of there being a pyramid of universities, usually with Harvard or Stanford or one of those at the top, took hold and we began reading the *Chronicle of Higher Education*; so, we began watching everybody else. We began to think of ourselves not as the University of Minnesota, which had its own mission, but with respect to a number of peer universities.

CAC: Hoping to become the Harvard of the Midwest?

HS: Well, that was that story. What I really learned was that was a kind of a cover for the way administrators think. This literature starts coming out in 1973. There's a piece called *Leadership*, a very important book that then became a training manual in the 1980s for administrators. It's a very cynical book by Kohn and March called *Leadership and Authority of the College President*. By this time, administration takes on a life of its own and college presidents instead of being people who are present become people who are sequestered and become the head of a whole administrative way of organizing and everybody becomes removed from the faculty. They begin to read the . . .

CAC: Even though they may emerge from the faculty?

HS: Yes but . . .

CAC: Once they achieve the function of a different office, then they change?

HS: It happened. I watched a number of people become deans and vice-presidents and I was here during this period. Many of them were close enough to watch. Let's say it's on Friday afternoon when they are going to be dean on Monday . . . well, they begin redressing themselves. They buy a whole wardrobe over the weekend. They go to Daytons or wherever and they spend a lot of money and manicure themselves and by Monday they're starting to think administrator.

There's a radical shift. Partly coming from being a little boy during the Nazi era, you wondered how such wonderful intellectual people as the Germans were got into this kind of Nazi story and as Hannah Arendt's last book about this—she thought it was evil at first—and then Eichmann in Jerusalem is [unclear], it's [unclear] that they become bureaucrats. They begin, instead of think for themselves and thinking about the mission of their organization or the institution, that is what it should be, they begin thinking about how their careers will be with respect to other people's careers and begin thinking only with respect to who they are . . .

CAC: And the careers of others whose they can . . .

HS: So, then administration takes on its own life and it turns out that Kierkegaard wrote a piece about this in the—I can't remember the date—maybe 1858 called *The Present Age*, and it's a wonderful piece, and it sort of is my inspiration for how this university ought to go about its next phase which is to talk about the study of [unclear].

CAC: You find these things setting in, anticipated in the 1960s . . .

HS: Late 1960s.

CAC: . . . and then consolidated in the 1970s and 1980s?

HS: Yes, it became really ironclad in the 1970s.

CAC: And retrenchment is a chief force but not the only one?

HS: No, it's a mental force. Money is always, from my point of view, an excuse because you can go out and get more money. The University of Minnesota has never, as far as I know, really tapped its alumni in a serious way. I know that right now they're attempting to get money from all over the state. The person who is having stakeholder's meetings, is kind of running the publicity, is David Speer—Padilla, Speer [Beardsley, Inc.] We talked at some length about this and he says that the people who love the university are almost all over sixty-five and particularly over seventy because that's the time when this was *the* university and, in a certain sense, we have given that up and we went into a decline. I've tried to catalogue the decline to understand that. Two of my colleagues recently have left, one to go to Illinois and one to go to Chicago and the one at Chicago says that the faculty there is no better there than the faculty here but they think of themselves as being very, very good and it makes them good because they tell each other that, tell one another that all the time. The faculty at Illinois is not quite as good as the faculty here but they tell themselves they're very good. A university in decline tends to underrate itself. It tends to look back to some prior day of this whole nostalgia thing of when we were very good. A lot of it is done by the people who were hired as bureaucrats. The middling bureaucrats around here look back to the 1950s rather than developing in the present and saying to the faculty here that they're very good in developing and that we can be the best in the world. We tend to underrate one another and both my colleagues have watched that. That's always been my

sense here, that instead of letting the young people grow up and take on this greatness, they basically look to the greatness of some past and the present is never quite as good. It tends to undercut the present and I think that's the major—to me—sadness. I hope I can somehow help to turn that into something else here. That's my present quest.

CAC: I talked with a colleague the other day who used the phrase—I had not heard it before, maybe, it was original with him—the melancholy of the professoriate.

HS: Yes, you said that.

CAC: That struck me as kind of a . . .

HS: There's a demoralization that's occurring and a lot of it is . . .

CAC: It's more than a loss of morale. We say morale is poor. We haven't had a raise in three years, you know. But I think it's much more than . . .

HS: No, they've lost a sense of meaning of the place. What these places are paying for now—and it isn't just the University of Minnesota; this is system wide—they all choose peer universities. In the last Graduate School re-do, they have seventeen peer universities, eight above and eight below and we're sort of in the middle. What this means practically is that the administrators will be doing well in their careers if they go up a few notches but not well if they go down a few; so, it's basically an administrative outlook. Our graduate dean, for example, suggested that we mimic in our Graduate School the University of Wisconsin, which is considerably better than we are. I said, "We shouldn't mimic the University of Wisconsin. We should hire Donna Shalala" . . . that we do not have the kind of people that have the vision to remake a grand university. And she's the kind of person—she's now the head of Health and Human Services, or whatever it's called with the Clinton Administration—who has the kind of scope that we haven't seen in the kind of administrators we've had here, as far as I can tell in the recent past.

CAC: This runs, what you're saying, counter to the rhetoric at least in Commitment to Focus which seems to speak of quality, and a definition of quality, and focusing limited resources on what we do well, etcetera. Now, what do you make of that rhetoric then?

HS: I think it's mostly rhetoric. I called it, last year when this U-2000 came up in a CLA assembly meeting, a pretext—with all of the possible meanings of that term—that it was not yet a text. It really didn't have any content. It's a way of telling the people, of saying that we have a grand university and everything's okay but as far as I can see, we've declined considerably and a great deal of this is mismanagement; so, I assume it's an administrative effort to kind of act as if we're doing a good job and meanwhile we're moving toward a model of corporate efficiency

without saying what a university is or ought to be. It seems to me that we have not been doing that job.

CAC: I'm going to back up two sentences.

HS: Sure.

CAC: You speak of mismanagement and, yet, the phenomena that you're describing are evidenced . . . Stanford, Princeton, Ohio State, Michigan . . . so it's not peculiar to Minnesota alone?

HS: Well, it's a mind set of the whole. What happened in this whole bureaucratization that took place in the 1960s is that these people were much more into . . . It's part of the piece that I'm working on now. It's called *Aspects of the Crisis and Meaning*. It's a general, widespread, certainly a Western, phenomenon if not global. It's partly why we're returning to religion. People lost meaning in their lives. I think part of it is explainable in terms of our institutions. We began to be for sale; that is, authority has moved toward celebrity through our whole society and I think this is caused by the rise of the market economy, television, and all kinds of things that have happened. We begin to pay more attention . . . If you have seen *Quiz Show* in 1994, I think this will be an important movie. It's about the selling out of knowledge toward celebrity and money. I think this has happened generally in the society. You don't see learned people on television much anymore. We've all disappeared. There was a time when some of the better heads were also entertaining, would show up on television as authorities, and they basically don't show up anymore. We really don't have much authority in the world. People don't trust the truth.

CAC: What institutions do they really trust?

HS: My view is they don't trust any. This idea that we have integrity and speak with truth is being undermined. It's all over the country. I think Harvard, Princeton . . . I think Columbia, Yale all have hired presidents who were mainly known as money raisers rather than as people with intellectual and institutional vision; so, I don't think it's particularly here. I think they spend a little more time managing their whole institution. My understanding of the difference between a Harvard and here is not in the quality of faculty but in the quality of management. That's what I've been told, that they pay much more attention to the kind of detail, and make stronger judgments, and keep their people motivated. The way of conferring importance is that the people up to the top have say that people are very good, and praise good work, and announce to the world what this good work is, and show why it is, and not that we serve industry or serve the state but that we do it in the name of what are important issues of the times. We don't do that very well and our administration doesn't seem to represent knowledge. They basically want to make sure the place stays afloat and meanwhile the Liberal Arts are declining in a fairly serious and rapid way. That's a long story. I guess my positive story out of this is, I've been doing this analysis of this place in particular but with respect to other places and out of this kind of crisis

you can do a lot of positive work because you can change a place in a very large way out of a significant crisis if people are feeling melancholy and down rather than a place which is kind of muddling along fairly well. In a certain way, I welcome the deepening of the crisis because it sets up the possibility of doing something important . . . out in the larger community at least, in terms of the people with money, and the citizens, and the legislators, and governor who don't want to lose an institution probably more than the people inside who mainly haven't done much of an analysis and mostly wring their hands rather than doing something. That's been my analysis.

CAC: Let's go back to the corporate model for a moment but then I want to come back to what you were saying earlier about citizens out there who have an affirming view of the university.

HS: We'll call it love. I think they love it. They love the whole idea . . . it's a matter . . . they really are in love with it.

CAC: Because of their own experience here?

HS: Yes. That includes, strangely enough, our governor, by the way. I've spoken to him about this. He came in 1957. He got an M.A. in English. It was wonderful. All the people he dealt with were wonderful. Then the next story he tells . . .

CAC: But there are a lot of us around still, Harvey, and we're just as wonderful—I'm not speaking of myself . . .

HS: But you've undergone the decline. There's this whole thing of seeing one another and people not thinking that you're wonderful because if you were wonderful, you wouldn't be here. That's what the Harvards and the Chicagos do. You know, this is a guy that you . . . you might not have a question right now but next year . . . this is the bottom line person, the person who really, really knows his stuff or her stuff in the world is right here in this room. That makes everybody feel good and there's a sense in which that's what's going down. There was a sense in the 1950s that this was the place where you wanted to be because all the good people were here and if you could only take enough courses, you could get to meet them all. That sense, that's what we've lost.

CAC: But empirically, a lot of these people are still here.

HS: They're definitely here, yes. Many of them have grown . . .

CAC: I don't know how the image departs from the reality. These people are here.

HS: Oh, I think that that has to be kept up in all kinds of talk. There was an underground for the good teachers, certainly during the 1960s. You know, they were well-known. The *Daily* checked on the ratings of teachers and they actually published it. There was a piece they

published called "Salvage" for several years; so, that there was kind of statement about who the good and worthy teachers were. That's hard to find now. There's very little. We've become much more isolated. I mean, there are a number of other things that have happened. Computers came in. We stay at home.

CAC: Ah!

HS: We're all supposed to be looking for money. We're all supposed to be entrepreneurial. We're writing, not for our own departments, but for people in other places. The community that's at this university, many others too, is really a community with your fellow people in your special, say, the history of social work or what have you . . . labor. You're writing not for people who are in your department but for other people. Part of the specialization that occurs in the 1960s and 1970s is that most departments hire one of everything and that meant that they became non-communities of a sort, as long as the people holding them together, like the Ad Hoebels . . . once they retired, the glue that held community together kind of disappeared. That's been true everywhere. There's very little discussion at a university right now.

CAC: Yes. It wouldn't surprise you that I've heard this from people in very diverse disciplines—and you have, too?

HS: No, I'm sure it's pandemic, as it were.

CAC: Yes. But then when I press on it—and perhaps, it's because these are experienced persons who are, if not at career's end, mature career persons—they don't see any way to restore that lost sense of community. It's often put in those terms.

HS: Yes.

CAC: It's a loss of collegiality, that's the term that appears.

HS: Without question. But that's happened almost everywhere.

CAC: Yes. But you think it's the specialization of knowledge that's a major factor?

HS: Well, that's part of it. The other thing is that the people who are running . . . The administration has become quite separate. They have a kind of community of their own. There's a lot of money. They don't stay anyplace. They're kind of a floating crap game as it were.

CAC: From their perception, the pressures are such that they can't be in a presidency longer than six or seven years and . . .

HS: I think it's running about three and one-half around the country. That's long. Five years is quite long.

CAC: Yes. They say that it's not the career ambition. They are saying that the pressures in the job are such that you run out your . . .

HS: That's the way they constructed it but that doesn't have to be.

CAC: You don't think that's . . .

HS: No, if you look historically over any long period of time, this is just, from my point of view, a small habit that a number of institutions got into at a certain period and they all read *Leadership and Authority*—which I do highly recommend . . .

CAC: Okay.

HS: . . . it is an extremely cynical book . . . if you'd like to see the bureaucratic mind at work; there's a chapter in this book by Cohn and March which is extraordinarily cynical—and it makes it easier to run these places.

CAC: But they all work too hard, Harvey.

HS: Yes, but they don't do anything which is about . . . They really are very hard workers and they deserve all the money, I'm sure, that they get but with respect to thinking about the nature of the future, keeping the world afloat, creating meaning, developing in our students . . .

CAC: Ah, but somebody told me the other day, Harvey, they don't have time to think.

HS: I know that!

CAC: That the calendar here before them everyday is such that they cannot do . . .

HS: To me, these are life's arrangements. If they're looking to get to be up their list of peer universities that's true. If you want my ideas to shift this place so that we become the place, we get out of the Harvard pyramid . . . We've got a large institution and a very ebullient cultural oasis here and we become the place which takes on the hard issues of these times. The world has moved very, very fast in the last thirty years. Technologically it's been . . . We understand the globe at each instant. That never happened in the human condition before. We get all of our information representationally through television. People do not read anymore. I know that any executive that reads more than three-quarters of a page on something is very rare. They've all got to be quick reads so they don't get any time to sit and study. They're not thinking about the future. They think about how this place is with respect to how all of their other colleagues think about these kinds of places. But that's not necessary. That's just habit. It allows them to run the place without keeping afloat a place which doesn't have any obvious purpose. They've lost a sense of purpose.

CAC: How do you restore that sense of purpose?

HS: I think that we have an opportunity to make this place—quotes—important. That literally if we get out of this pyramid, we can become *the* university in the world. We take on the hard issues.

CAC: Name me five hard issues.

HS: Critical analysis of science and technology and how it's reframing the human condition. The whole growth—our mutual friend Judy Martin . . . I've talked to her at some length about this—that is, the world is now moving toward cities and we don't know how to govern cities at this moment. We have to do a whole rethinking of the nature of cities with respect to everything else, but cities in particular. We've got to explore how to make cities livable and keep them afloat because this is very fragile business. If you've been in Mexico City or one of these places lately . . . if that's a model, it's always on the edge of ruination. I think Judy is a person who could grow to be able to think about that. She's of a generation which has that possibility . . .

CAC: But somehow the institution has to give her the green light to do that.

HS: I am expecting that we will somehow get that. Another one is about the nature of teaching and curing because I think we're at a moment in both of these . . . These, to me, are the place where people yield to you their body or spirits and that is to me a sacred . . . I assume the world is secular because I'm worried about religion, that it's fundamentalism coming, arising. I believe that the people who do this are in a sacred area. We have to take responsibility for all of this stuff. That's three. Another one is the sustainable world. There's a commissioner friend of mine at the state government who would like to head up a institute or a center for the study of the sustainable world. That's four. There are a couple more. We're at a strange moment in the whole question of reportage. I just had lunch with a member . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

HS: I believe that you can create someplace important and what I mean by that is that this has to become a place to do this, to shift the university. I don't think that most places and most people think that it can be done, particularly with a tenured faculty . . . that this is not a place which is forward looking. Most of my experience with the faculty is most of them are not. I do believe that you could create a place which is important and what I mean by that is that you start hiring all the old guys and women in the world who have some thoughts, who are still alive at your age—and it would include you—and want to bring these thoughts to bear and you become kind of a special little group who thinks that this is the place where it's happening. If people like the president of the university, and the business people, and others think that this is the place where the issues that are important are being raised and talked about in the world, then a whole

bunch of people will want to come here. I believe out of a kind of a place in crisis, you could recreate something like that. So, you'd need probably different people maybe running the place but certainly deciding how it's going to work, and then you invite your faculty to partake of this, in what I call the study of the present age and, gradually, I think the university would move in that direction. You train your students to be the people in the world who will be able run the businesses and the governments because their going to learn how to think critically and analytically about the world we're moving into—which I believe is changing very, very rapidly. It's going to need some very, very good people who trust their own analytic abilities and thinking abilities to be able to stand on their feet in the future. I guess, I do have this vision—it's a fantasy—that that can come to pass. I guess, I think we can engage the political people, and the business people maybe, and the faculty to do that. I've been talking actually with the teamsters people [unclear].

CAC: There's a saving remnant in the faculty, I have no question about that . . . a saving remnant in the faculty who are capable of doing this.

HS: I have no question that they're capable of doing it. Whether they will do it or not, I don't know.

CAC: I mean capable of making that decision . . .

HS: Oh, I think so if they can see that the people in charge will also go along with that.

CAC: But what you're saying also is that there has to be a change in the reward system?

HS: Absolutely. The reason I use the term *important* is because we have to believe that the reward system centers here . . . that if people give rewards, that the rewards are kind of meaningful.

CAC: But the rewards the last twenty-five years, as I listen to others, have increasingly gone to those who were specializing and . . .

HS: And bringing in money, in particularly . . . the people who were visible to the outside in some form or another, either being able to get jobs or being able to bring in money; and that's had a very internal splintering effect on the faculty, so it's created some stars and a bunch of people who then become isolated and think less of themselves. I met a number of extraordinarily gifted people who were brought here as gifted people and became isolated during this period. Some of them kept on going and were growing and others became very melancholy, very upset and isolated because they didn't get the rewards of the place and became basically quite marginalized. That happened to me for awhile. Again, like everything else, I make a subject matter out of it so it becomes . . .

CAC: [laughter]

HS: Well, marginalization and isolation is really interesting and then how to overcome in your own life and make something out of these ashes is, I think, quite interesting. There's a lot of literature about this among the ancients.

CAC: You are currently in a department that calls itself Cultural Studies and Comparative Literature, which is a very new department. As I glance at the folks I know, it's Art; it's Humanities; it's History; it's Languages—German at least . . . you yourself of diverse background . . . what is the meaning of this department?

HS: A little bit of history, I guess . . . When a man named Wlad Godzich came here, there's a large shift, I guess, in European thought. Let me give a little bit of context because I think it requires some. The history of philosophy in the twentieth century has mainly been to become philosophers of science; that is, they decided that philosophy had no meaning in and of itself, and it should become the handmaiden—or whatever word we're using these days to be politically correct—of science, and it would become the people who tried to be clear thinkers about how science should proceed. The other people who became analytic philosophers basically had a kind of an analysis of language which has stayed . . . fairly early in this century it basically followed the ideas of Vichtenstein and a few other people. It kind of, as I can see it, reached an impasse some years ago and a few people have gotten off that but philosophy basically is not interpreting life at the present time. What people regard as the central intellectual discipline has, in fact, kind of faltered in its ability to look at what Kierkegaard calls the present age and to serious take us into our own lives as we're living them, a time of great change. There are no philosophers that I know of in the world who are now helping us unpack what change means and why we adjust to it so poorly and all of that. In the field of comparative literature and critical theory, a number of thinkers in France and Germany over the past generation have attempted to take some ideas which are against this strain. It probably particularly started out with Kierkegaard but he got kind of sidelined, but particularly following Friedrich Nietzsche, who I read a great deal of in my low days. Nietzsche is a wonderful person to read when you're very down because he spent a lot of his time being down. There's a whole kind of way of getting into him because he lived at the edges of all existence but if you do it when you're down, you really understand him a lot better than if you're kind of up or neutral.

CAC: I read him when I was a junior in high school.

HS: Oh, wow.

CAC: I didn't have the wildest idea what that was about, not the wildest idea.

HS: I forbid my students to read it until they are forty, which intrigues them. These are people like Martin Heidegger and others who are post Heideggereans who then are re-looking at Plato, re-looking at the Socratic tradition, re-looking at the West, and kind of attempting to get back in touch with our lives; so, in a certain sense at least for awhile, this whole movement of critical theory, out of a number, again, of post-Nietzscheans, post-Heideggereans, using a variety of these

ideas, come with political ideas, usually neo-Marxist and are attempting to say that, in fact, there is a way of critiquing our lives. Vlad Godzich comes in—a very, very smart man with one of the quickest mouths in the West, and one of the quicker speakers in the world, and his mind was pretty quick, too, but his mouth was very, very impressive how quickly he could speak and get ideas out—and he develops a very, very ambitious, exciting moment of comparative literature in which he would basically reframe the nature of the world. He got a lot of students here and some faculty interested in this . . . who joined him.

CAC: His home was what?

HS: I'm not sure where he started out . . . in French, maybe. I'm not sure. I think he was kind of a Lone Ranger.

CAC: Okay. But he was in a language department?

HS: In a language department but he basically began to develop this speciality in comparative literature, and got it to be kind of a program after awhile, and brought a whole bunch of people to develop money, and develop the Humanity Center after awhile. He also aggravated a great number of people because along with his ambitions, he had a kind of an arrogance, a public arrogance, all the stuff that goes with that; so, he attracted a number of people and repelled a great number of people. I had requested to the dean, at that time Fred Lukermann, that I thought it would be not be good for me to stay in the Anthropology Department; so, for a few years I went into what I call Liberal Arts limbo or LAL, in which I was a dean's person. Godzich was interested . . .

CAC: You really were free-standing?

HS: I really was. I had a dean as my chair.

CAC: Like Barbara Knudson?

HS: Yes. There were several of us like that.

CAC: Yes. [unclear]

HS: He was actually never free-standing. He was in university college. He never was free-standing.

CAC: That's about as free-standing you can get, to be in university college.

HS: He was the only faculty person.

CAC: That's true. That's pretty free-standing.

HS: Maybe, he was in his own way.

CAC: [laughter] It's interesting that Lukermann is the person in those four cases . . . I mean, who made the arrangements to make it possible.

HS: He did. By the time I came around, he had been burnt several times; so, he did it with a lot more hesitation by then. He was at least open to this and somewhat supportive.

CAC: [unclear] was another one.

HS: Yes. During this time, I had gotten the idea there was no talk and no community around—certainly by the late 1970s. I was on the various senate committees and I was part of the people who were part of the MEA [Minnesota Education Association], the beginning of the MEA. We tried to organize the place; so, I got to see all the lawyers and people who represented the university in the state and I got a pretty good idea of all of the business, the legal practices of the faculty, the administration. I began to see the world from all these different perspectives and, literally at one time—I got to know them from my senate service—began to interview everyone, sometimes with another friend or two and sometimes alone; so, I got to talk to almost every officer of the university, or at least several deans . . .

CAC: Did you do these interviews on tape?

HS: No, I just did them. They're in my head, in my little thesaurus of background.

CAC: Okay.

HS: I formed something called the Center for Comparative Thought around 1980 in which I tried to get some of the better thinkers at the university, or anybody who wanted to talk with me. That included people like [Yi Fu] Tuan and Godzich . . .

CAC: Oh, my.

HS: . . . and my friend Phil Regal in the Biology Department who is still my closest intellectual friend. I tried to get Judy Ann Martin. I got several administrators, sort of middling high administrators. A friend of mine named Stanley Williams, who I still talk to, and Joe Mestenhauser used to join us and partly instructed us and taught us about administration; that is, they kind of guided us. We were always kind of continuously studying the nature of how this place worked so we were involved in that. We ran a number of public kind of events. One that is, I guess, the most memorable is we literally had a three-day symposium with invited speakers on the nature of the disciplines—that I understand a lot of people thought was very good. We examined what was going on at that time. At about that time, I also . . .

CAC: Did you use college money for this?

HS: No, actually we got a little money from the Anthropology Department and the rest of the money came . . . we charged people and a little of the money came from . . . part of our group was a woman who thought this was a great idea and she worked in the Extension Department. She was part of the convening of whatever these things are, symposia. Donna Dacus was her name. She joined us as a kind of general intellectual discussant. She thought this university needed this so we found some people and we never got hardly any money. We asked at one time and we got turned down in some really strange places and decided that we needed to be free of money. Harlan Cleveland wanted us to be part of his thing. We decided that we'd be better off free-standing, not part of Humphrey or anything, after awhile. You can run all sorts of things for free. It's really cheap. You can get rooms and arrange things.

CAC: Sure.

HS: We had kind of a discussion group for several years. About the same time, some of the people at KUOM radio found this interesting and I did an interview show for two years, weekly, called *Issues in Education* where I took up everything from questions of tenure and academic freedom to how deanships work and all the kind of things we'd been discussing. Why this university is in decline to . . .

CAC: Now, we don't have KUOM to reach an audience.

HS: I understand that and that's a shame. We've done, I think, a very poor job of being a university which takes the issues of these times out to the people and I hope we can do that. I mean, we should be discussing it. In this moment of 1994, we should be discussing Haiti and we should be discussing what's going on in the Middle East in a public forum because it's, again, a complicated time and people at the university should have somebody here to discuss. Just as people can take their problems of horticulture to some very good people in Horticulture and problems of bugs to entomologists, people ought to be able to take their political and other issues to people at the university and at least get a sense of discussion from different points of view of what's going on in the world. We should be publicly informed and we're not at the moment. I got to do that for a couple of years and did a weekly program. I did about 220 some programs but was engaged in this issue when the pressure of having to do a half hour program every week . . . as you're doing these kind of things, you know that you have to kind of be thinking about this and stay very active.

CAC: You have to do a little homework.

HS: Homework. I did that over the years and that was part of my apprenticeship in this whole business. I talked to some of the regents, some people in business, and got to see various points of view about the place; so, that's been part of it. At that time, after this, Godzich, when he formed his department, invited me in. We had certain issues in common—the issue in literature of the body, that is the human body, came up at that time and it looked like it was going to be

a very central issue—and for that reason but I guess we enjoyed each other a lot and had similar interests . . . overlapping anyway.

CAC: [unclear] program, the department was also being fragmented [unclear].

HS: That was happening, yes. That's part of this moment in history. That's part of this two culture story. We're moving into a moment of people who are becoming conservative or, as they're calling them right now, neo-conservatives versus another group of people. A great deal of it has to do with the cyclical battle in what Martin Lipsit calls *the continuing cyclicality* in a fluid society of people gaining power and then a new group wanting to gain power. Basically starting in about 1970, not only did we have the university tightening up but as we had had a number of women rejoining the world and coming to the university, starting maybe in the late 1950s with the baby boom, there began to be a kind of a war over jobs in a tight market between older, mostly white and to a large extent ethnic men, that is European ethnics, who had only recently in this generation come into the university, had taken over the university in a very traditional kind of high culture sense . . . that depiction of knowledge, called the Great Books or Great Men tradition. The younger people coming in were mostly women and some people of color. It's mostly a younger women's/older men's battle and it became part of the political correctness of the curriculum debate. This particular debate emerged in the Humanities Department with a vengeance. It took place between the people who basically represented Great Books. I have the stories from everybody. I've interviewed everybody on all sides on this. I guess, I won't give everybody's stories.

CAC: God, you should have been doing this project ten years ago.

HS: Yes, right.

CAC: Then you would get it all on tape!

HS: [laughter] My problem though is how to overcome this, how to kind of co-opt this argument. I have some ways of doing it, which I'd be happy to share with you but I don't think I want to lay out strategies here.

CAC: All right.

HS: Basically, the argument was between new people who were in a sort of neo-Marxist vein that their idea was all of this whole . . .

CAC: Well, deconstructionists?

HS: Deconstructionists . . . this whole question that the people in literature are kind of funny like everybody is kind of funny. They believe that the world is all in books and most of this is

an argument within the Humanities, that is, not about the reality of experience but about the reality as it is presented to us historically

CAC: In printed words.

HS: Books and printed words. So, it's an argument about how to read particularly but it turns out to be politicized in a number of ways. On the one side are these old guys who say Western thought is great because it has all these great ideas and it's been the wonderful tradition of the world's smartest, and most productive, and most insightful, and thoughtful, and scientific. The other people, the other side, claim that really this whole issue is political because in the doing of this it's been a boys' game, a men's game. It's been great men, really, and that the other people in the world who existed, that is women and people of color—it's been white men—were taken out of this game and that then politicizes everything. The response at the moment is not to depoliticize it or argue about the issues but to respond to it politically; so, at the moment, we basically have an argument in the name of intellection which is basically political. It's gotten very strange and complicated. But at the moment it's a particular issue about the next generation, that is, younger women wanting a place at the university in the world of work and the society, as opposing older guys who developed their own careers—reasonably certainly from their point of view—in the older traditions of Great Books and the enlightenment ideas.

CAC: I would say that the Great Books is pretty well faded . . . pretty fast, too, hmm?

HS: No, I think there's a great number of people keeping it alive. I don't know who you hang out with but if you hang around in Folwell Hall, the battle goes on, depending . . .

CAC: I see. But not in the Humanities Department?

HS: No. In the Humanities Department, they basically split. The two people—one of whom has just retired, Bob Tapp—who kept that alive have set up through the aegis of one of your colleagues . . .

CAC: Jim Tracy?

HS: . . . through Jim Tracy, a kind of subgroup which gives Western civilization . . . A man named George Kliger is doing that. He has more or less aligned himself with the neo-conservatives. The new dean coming in, I guess, became heir to this. I don't think our dean, Julia Davis, brought this. She just came in when it was coming to a head, I believe, and the ideas were already set up and, basically, she tried to end the Humanities Department. What actually happened was it may have been phased out because the CLA assembly kind of went along with the idea of phasing it out. Instead, the political actuality of this is sort of more fun. They wanted then to blend them, perhaps, with Comparative Literature and in trying to avoid

this, one of our graduate student's mama was a very big shot in the state legislature. The mama called up [Nils] Hasselmo who then told the provost to do something about this.

CAC: [laughter]

HS: What they did then was blend the old Humanities Department into Comparative Literature and it is now called Cultural Studies, which has become a cover term for, I guess, most people who are thinking of a kind of a critical approach to society from many different perspectives and is becoming a very important idea in this moment because everything can now be conceived of as culture, replacing what . . . I think everything was seen as communication in the 1960s and 1970s. Culture . . . corporate culture, CIA [Central Intelligence Agency] culture, everything is now culture. Cultural Studies becomes the place which can study everything under the sun. I see this as a wonderful . . .

CAC: Feminist Studies added a big ingredient to that?

HS: Oh, yes. Everything is now containable within this. I think what culture represents to the world is the idea that the world is changeable, if you study it across the board. If you look at corporate culture for example . . . if a new CEO [Chief Executive Officer] comes into a company on Saturday and people get to go to a party with the CEO and the CEO's family and by Monday, they're pretty much taken over. If they're going to live with this person, they basically have the outlook of the CEO. That corporate culture to me means that it is changeable and you can kind of take a culture and move it into a different phase. It can happen in a reasonably fluid and quick time.

CAC: So, it could happen in a university?

HS: That's my belief coming out of this that if you can kind of control the reins of the culture and create a different kind of mind set. The people's mind set to me is just a mind set. It's an historical set of incidents by which they got to think in a particular way and if everybody else is doing it that way, they think that's more or less at the level of human nature and the way God meant it to be; but in fact, it's just historically as accidental as anything else so it can be changed.

CAC: I have a law of *inertia and momentum* which runs against that. Once things get going and have gone for a long time, boy! it's hard to stop them.

HS: I understand that in usual moments but, I guess, this is an unusual moment and, I guess, I feel like this is something I would . . . If you want to develop a critique of the world, which I think needs some critique, it's very hard to do it as a singular person. It'd be really a lot of fun and give us . . .

CAC: Well, it can't be departmental.

HS: No, I think you need something much larger. An institution like this which is beginning to look critically at the world, which is not trying to have a directly political agenda but has a kind of intellectual and socially thoughtful agenda, which is interested in the future of the human condition . . . I think you could really do something with a place this size and that's my vision.

CAC: There is an article in the current issue of *Social Service Review*, the lead article for September 1994, suggesting that the coalition, the alliance between Hull House and the University of Chicago in 1890-1914 is a model to which modern urban universities should return to address . . . in those days it was the issue of immigration, labor exploitation, and so forth.

HS: Still is in Chicago.

CAC: Yes. I challenged you to name four or five. You name four or five, okay? So that there is an agenda and the modern urban university, which the University of Minnesota is . . . here we are in the metropolitan area, unlike Purdue and even Wisconsin or Illinois . . .

HS: None of them are urban. We're the only urban one. Actually, it's starting and where it's starting, there is a faltering of social work and the whole medical model of pathology. I think there is an attempt to replace this with a much more activist learning model.

CAC: The graduate students that I talk to are certainly there but the faculty, again, are quite entrenched in the political model.

HS: What's happening is that the University of Minnesota by law has this Extension Service and there's nothing by law stopping the Extension Service from working as a teaching university in the urban area because in the rural areas, the Extension Service offers all sorts of help in almost every arena of people's lives.

CAC: Sure.

HS: There are apparently some people in our Extension Service who are beginning to work in the urban areas and I believe that we can reestablish . . .

CAC: The Center for Urban and Regional Affairs at various times has done . . .

HS: Has done parts of that, yes. This is now being done through Extension. They have a little more license to do this because they're supposed to help people economically and they're supposed to be able to work with food, and training, and clothing, and do all the kinds of things that people need to do to live . . . teach them how to use their money and all those sorts of things. So, the university by law, and charter, and history can, in fact, do that. It just hasn't been doing it because it's much more oriented toward Land-Grant, meaning rural. That can be reclaimed. I think we could reenter the place but I think we have to reenter it without this sense that we're an arrogant removed place which doesn't belong to the people.

CAC: Yes.

HS: I think we need to reclaim some notion that the university belongs to its citizens whether it's Land-Grant or some other . . . since that seems to be so attached only to Agriculture, that may be hard to reclaim . . . but some concept in which the university belongs to everyone—without losing its sense of excellence. The problem is how to find the balance and that's why I think the question of making this place important, taking up the issues, might inspire the citizens to think that they were in a really interesting place.

CAC: I'm sure you have many more reflections but I get a sense for this afternoon that we're kind of coming . . .

HS: Winding down?

CAC: . . . now to final closure. Are there any things that you would like further . . .

HS: I guess I think that I'm trying to be somebody who is trying to bring ideas at the moment and because the world has come at us, I guess I think my job is to rethink the whole Western tradition. Deconstruct, as it's used, is a kind of a term of the neo-Marxists, is really, as far as I can see, an idea that's been around since Augustine. He wrote a book called *On Christian Doctrine*; so, it was an old fight between literalism and interpretation. The Catholic church is based on that. I think there are a number of models around which we have to revisit. They're in our heads. We have Aristotle, and Plato, and those people in heads and in order to think out our futures, I think we have to look at all the world's traditions and neither defend them nor castigate them nor merely take them on but begin to think of them critically as they take us into the future. I guess that, from my point of view, is how I see myself best and what I hope a lot of people around this university can imagine doing in various ways.

CAC: To return full circle to where we started with autobiography, I kind of read as we talk and I listen to you, that although your own career has had ups and downs, and you've had to stage it in different places, and there were times of marginalization and times of exhilaration, that by-and-large boy! you've been engaged. You've really liked what you've done?

HS: Oh, almost always, although I always have my bags half packed because I don't . . . The institution has a lot of sway over my thinking and I don't like that. Partly, it seems to me, the grace of being alive is to grow old gracefully and to seek wisdom and I like being with you because I feel like I'm with somebody who is gaining in age and also in some wisdom with a great deal of grace.

CAC: [laughter]

HS: I admire that and I'd like to follow in your footsteps. That makes me feel real good.

CAC: That's a place to end the conversation right now!

HS: Good. I'll sign off.

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:

Hermes Transcribing and Research Service
12617 Fairgreen Avenue, Apple Valley, MN 55124
(612) 953-0730