Regional Oral History Office
The Bancroft Library

University of California
Berkeley, California

LAURA NADER

Laura Nader: A Life of Teaching, Investigation, Scholarship and Scope

Interviews conducted by
Lisa Rubens and Samuel Redman
in 2013

Since 1954 the Regional Oral History Office has been interviewing leading participants in or well-placed witnesses to major events in the development of Northern California, the West, and the nation. Oral History is a method of collecting historical information through tape-recorded interviews between a narrator with firsthand knowledge of historically significant events and a well-informed interviewer, with the goal of preserving substantive additions to the historical record. The tape recording is transcribed, lightly edited for continuity and clarity, and reviewed by the interviewee. The corrected manuscript is bound with photographs and illustrative materials and placed in The Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley, and in other research collections for scholarly use. Because it is primary material, oral history is not intended to present the final, verified, or complete narrative of events. It is a spoken account, offered by the interviewee in response to questioning, and as such it is reflective, partisan, deeply involved, and irreplaceable.

****

It is recommended that this oral history be cited as follows:

Laura Nader “LAURA NADER: A Life of Teaching, Investigation, Scholarship and Scope” conducted by Lisa Rubens and Samuel Redman in 2013, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 2014.

Laura Nader

Laura Nader is Professor of Anthropology at the University of California, Berkeley, where she has worked since 1960.

Table of Contents—Laura Nader

Interview History by Lisa Rubens vii

Introduction by David Price ix

Interview 1: June 10, 2013

Audio File 1 1

Family background and parents' immigration to the U.S.— Growing up in a small, diverse New England town — Family values nurture the life of the mind and social engagement — Attending Wells College: reflecting on aspects of culture at a women's college; studying Spanish and Spanish literature; defending senior thesis on Mexican revolutionary writers — Decision to study anthropology with Clyde Kluckhohn at Harvard University

Audio File 2 19

Reflecting on the four-field study of anthropology at Harvard — Issues of disciplinary boundaries and specialization in anthropology — Influence of professors at Harvard, particularly John and Beatrice Whiting and Clyde Kluckhohn — Invited to join UC Berkeley's Department of Anthropology —The role of theory in Anthropology — Fieldwork in two Zapotec villages

Interview 2: June 14, 2013

Audio File 3 40

First year at Berkeley: reception in the department; teaching a full load and completing a dissertation — Assessing the status and ranking of the department — Developing collegial relationships — Publishing *Talea and Juquila: A Comparison of Zapotec Social Organization* — Reflecting on the use of comparative study — Thoughts on women centered studies and feminism — Marriage, children and managing family life — A year at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences: Genesis of the Berkeley Village Law Project

Audio File 4 60

Fieldwork in a Shia Lebanese village — Comparing dispute mediation in Lebanese and Mexican villages — Producing first film: *To Make the Balance* — Evaluating ethical concerns of the American Anthropology Association — The intellectual value of indignation — Serving on the Carnegie Council on Children — Enlisted by the National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council to study alternative energy — Writing and teaching about energy — Offers for various university administrative positions — A fellow at the Woodrow Wilson Center — Teaching at Wellesley College and Harvard Law School

Interview 3: June 20, 2013

Audio File 5 84

Teaching at Yale Law School — Helping to found, and involvement with, the Law and Society Association — Evolution of the concept of and course on Controlling Processes — Publishing *Naked Science: Anthropological Inquiry Into Boundaries, Power, and Knowledge* — Working and publishing with graduate students—Collaborating with colleagues and sister, Claire Nader — Writing about taxation — Developing a theory of "lack" — Reflecting on two recent books: *Plunder: When the Rule of Law is Illegal*; *Culture and Dignity*: *Dialogues between the Middle East and the West* — More on the issue of ethics in anthropology

Audio File 6 101

Observations about UC Berkeley's Department of Anthropology and current issues in the field of anthropology — More on interest in, and publications on, energy — Discusses supervising students' field work — Interest in conflict in the Middle East — Reflections on the history of UC Berkeley's Lowie/Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology

Interview 4: June 26, 2013

Audio File 7 121

Comparing students of the l960s to current students — On changes in the administrative structure of UC Berkeley — On issues of gender and ethnicity on campus; concern about separate women's and ethnic studies departments — Interest in academic freedom for faculty, students and at the national labs — Opposing Berkeley's financial commitment to inter-collegiate athletics — Reflecting of the corporatization of the university — The 2012 symposium "Anthropology in the World: Celebrating Laura Nader's Fifty Years of Teaching at UC Berkeley" — Reflections on the Regents of the University of California

Audio File 8 142

Discusses John Yoo's role as alleged author of US torture policy — Evolution of research in and publications on the Middle East — Organizing an exhibit of Arab women artists — Future topics to research — On the relationship between teaching and research — Thoughts on war, vengeance and terrorism — Current book project *What the Rest Think of the West* — Thoughts on "unleashing the anthropological imagination" — What is important to teach her students — On curiosity and optimism

Appendix (C.V. and Bibliography) 162

Interview History

Laura Nader is a distinguished professor in UC Berkeley's Department of Anthropology, was chosen by popular nomination, by the campus community to be the 2013 Regional Oral History Office "Class of 1931" interviewee. This alumni endowment honors a UC Berkeley faculty or staff member who has made a significant contribution to the life of the campus, and Professor Nader more than fits the criteria.

Laura Nader was the first tenured woman in her department. She has taught thousands of undergraduates in popular courses such as Anthropology of the Law, Cultural Anthropology and Energy, Culture and Society and Controlling Processes. She has supervised more than a hundred PhD students, many of whom now teach or work in prestigious institutions. She has published research papers and co-edited books with several of her former students. Professor Nader has served on numerous department and campus committees and has taken principled public positions on many of the controversies that have arisen at Cal. And as a scholar, with ten books and close to 290 publications, her breathtaking range of interests and expertise have led her to be a visiting scholar at Yale, Harvard and Stanford, among other institutions, and a sought-after speaker, consultant and advisor for prominent national and international organizations. As such, Laura Nader is an outstanding ambassador for UC Berkeley.

During June and July 2013, two historians with the Regional Oral History Office, Sam Redman, who specializes in anthropology, and Lisa Rubens, who focuses on university history, spent eight hours interviewing Professor Nader about her life, her years at UC Berkeley, her scholarship and her extensive public service. By all rights an anthropologist of Nader's accomplishment and stature deserves an interview of at least 20 hours; perhaps more interviews will be forthcoming. Nevertheless, in the four sessions during which the following interviews took place, we were able to capture most of the critical influences, experiences and achievements in her long career. And perhaps more importantly, we have documented Professor Nader's razor-sharp intelligence, her vast storehouse of knowledge and vivid recall, her irrepressible curiosity, her congenial personality and the optimistic nature that undergirds her persistent battle against injustice.

These interviews were videotaped in Professor Nader's office on the third floor of Kroeber Hall. We sat on a bench that had been in Alfred Kroeber's office and that Professor Nader rescued when Kroeber died shortly after she began teaching at Berkeley. Nader sat at her enormous desk, a monument to her productivity and engagement. It was covered with stacks of paper, including: students' work for her current courses; the galleys for her latest book *What the Rest Think of the West: 600AD to 2012*; letters from former students, some with news clippings about any number of issues she is concerned with—some she shared with us as we were setting up our camera. Spilling off her desk and stacked on adjoining bookcases were current academic journals on anthropology, sociology and other disciplines, as well as more popular journals on current politics and manuscripts that Professor Nader had been asked to review. There were also copies of her two most recent books, *Culture and Dignity: Dialogues between the Middle East and the West* [2013] and *The Energy Reader* [2010].

At 83, Laura Nader remains a force to contend with. At the end of her oral history she describes several research projects she is pursuing and reiterates a persistent theme in her thinking, the importance of having "scope" — by her definition, a fact-based, contextual, historical approach

to a subject. Perhaps above all, these interviews provide access to the breadth and depth—the scope—of her life and work, as well as her warmth, curiosity, effervescence and deep commitment to her students.

A few video clips from these interviews are available on ROHO's website; we hope they serve as an enticement to explore the many aspect of Nader's life. A curriculum vita and bibliography of publications created by Laura Nader have been included as appendices to this oral history. In addition, a quick search on the internet of "Laura Nader" provides numerous entries: descriptions of her courses; reviews of her books; synopses of her films; reflections by her students. Videos of lectures by and interviews with Laura Nader can also be found on YouTube.

Sam Redman, Assistant Professor of History,
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Lisa Rubens, Historian and Academic Specialist
Regional Oral History Office
The Bancroft Library
UC Berkeley

January, 2014

Introduction: Contextualizing Laura Nader

Laura Nader's anthropology teaches us about the importance of context to reveal otherwise hidden important relationships. The needed context could be historical, power relational, monetary, colonial, or personal, but her work shows us time and again how context can expose hidden causal relationships and hidden connections, or reveal order where previously there was only a disarticulated jumble. It is no simple task to contextualize Laura Nader and her research, but woven through her life's work I find recurrent themes: transparency, justice, breaking silences, identifying and challenging controlling processes, revealing and questioning power relations, and maintaining a critical independence.

This oral history traces Laura Nader's personal and academic roots, describing her intellectual, political, and professional development within an historical context shaping her opportunities, and shows her repeatedly pushing beyond the conventions of her time. Her childhood recollections show parents and siblings devoted to family; her nurturing parents challenging their children to become informed and engaged public citizens cherishing the radical simplicity of democracy's promise. This has the trimmings of a Capraesque American dream; a first-generation immigrant exposed to small-town New England democratic processes demonstrating notions of a public good. Some seeds of Laura Nader's critiques of power relations are inspired by her parents' democratic notions of free inquiry and dissent, and cultivated by her sister and brothers extending this model out into the world. It is difficult imagining even a young Laura Nader at a loss for what to say at a dinner table family political discussion, yet her father's simple advice of learning through asking questions nurtured a core quality of her life's work. And what a career she built by asking profound questions; often questions the elites, referred to by Nader as "controllers," would prefer not be asked so openly and directly.

Professor Nader's academic influences are broad and eclectic. Boasian influences at Berkeley, passed on through Kroeber and others, remained strong throughout the twentieth century, yet Laura Nader's intellectual roots came largely from outside a Boasian tradition. While not trained by Boasians, her commitment to broad anthropological training or approach is a defining feature. Nader's diverse intellectual roots connect her to broad lineages within the disciplines of anthropology, law, sociology, philosophy and history. Clyde Kluckhohn's work had a significant impact, as his *Mirror for Man* pioneered using anthropological analysis to understand the United States and the world, capturing her early professional imagination and modeling an important analytical framework. We find the influences of John and Beatrice Whiting shaping Nader's focus on the importance of cultural comparison, and broad influences from her reading of ethnography, sociology, philosophy of law—particularly the works of Justice Cardoso and William O. Douglas. Her education was outside of the cloister of Harvard's Department of Social Relations, yet her reading Durkheim, Weber, and others more narrowly read by the Social Relations group appears formative. Antonio Gramsci's ideas were instrumental in developing her understanding of controlling processes and coercive harmony. At Berkeley she learned from colleagues like Elizabeth Colson, Alan Dundes, and Sherry Washburn; and she established dialogue with departmental colleagues, no matter what theoretical or sub-disciplinary differences.

While Laura Nader identifies many of the influences contributing to the formation of her political and theoretical orientation, she is marked by her non-alignment with what she calls "ists"—those political movements or academic theoretical camps requiring levels of absolute commitment to entire programs of thought. She prefers her own form of "unencumbered anthropology," and self-identifies as not being "a normal paradigm follower" in the Kuhnian sense.

Her commitment to fieldwork and the premise that ordinary people can teach us about culture, the world, justice, and injustice remains a prevalent anthropological theme through six decades of her work. Her fieldwork, spanning research sites in Mexico, the Middle East, and the United States, explores issues of justice, knowledge systems, power relations, energy, globalism, and social control. Her work often inverts apparent manifest meanings, revealing hidden dimensions of power relations. Her explorations of the ways the rich and powerful use law do not reveal elites seeking justice, but instead finding legal tools to assist in legalized plunder. She recurrently inverts critiques of the other: exploring how western critiques of women's rights in other cultures can be turned back on the west; demanding a "mutual respect and mutual gaze." Her interest in cultural comparison demands an acceptance of difference in ways that do not strip others of dignity. Her work reveals previously invisible relationships between colonialism and missionaries, energy and power relations, democracy and justice, rising corporatism and transformations of American childhood, and between alienation and the "little injustices of daily life." [1]

While never having studied with Professor Nader, reading her work as an undergraduate and graduate student reshaped my understanding of the boundaries and promise of anthropology. Her commitment to studying power relations, elites, and corporations in order to both understand and change the world transformed my understanding of anthropology's promise early in my career, and informs my work examining anthropology's historical interactions with military and intelligence agencies. Long before there was a name for such work, Laura Nader was a "public anthropologist." Her work demonstrates that anthropology has something useful to offer society, and that all anthropologists have duties to share their work and engage with the public. What anthropologists have to offer often challenges the claims and interests of expert knowledge, and her work demonstrates again and again that resistance is not futile, and that using our academic skills to document, reveal, and critique mono-cultural systems helps us gain control over our destiny.

Professor Nader's research exhibits a commitment to democratic processes that trusts people over institutions, and distrusts top-down unidirectional systems of power. For over half a century she has studied the use and abuse of law, and how conflicts are resolved or coercively avoided. Whether elucidating the particulars of American controlling processes, the legal niceties of plunder, identifying scientific possibilities of anthropologists "studying-up," down and sideways as she first posited in her 1972 essay "Up the Anthropologist,"[2] or striking discord over coercive harmony, Laura Nader refocuses our attention on the ways that powerful interests shape the worlds in which we live.

---

[1] A reference to *Little Injustices: Laura Nader Looks at the Law.* PBS Odyssey TV Series, 1981

[2] In *Reinventing Anthropology*, ed. Dell Hymes, 284-311. New York: Pantheon. 1972

Nader's critique of power relations is not reserved for corporations and entrenched bureaucratic structures; this critique also shapes her life in the field and class room and is woven into her life within the discipline and her classrooms. While maintaining high academic expectations, she proudly learns from her students. She vividly recalls with outrage a statement by a colleague that he never learned anything from a student. Nader's awareness of the prevalence of injustice marks and motivates much of her work. As she acknowledges in this oral history, her sense of indignation over justice denied "undergirds" her "persistence," and her commitment to documenting and critiquing the controlling processes of our world is the foundation on which a half a century of her work rests.

While Laura Nader separates ideas from the people espousing them, she does not suffer a bully, and when the powerful blunder within earshot, she lets them know it. Anyone who has seen her publicly correct the misstatements of those in charge knows that she does not shirk from confrontation. But what might easily be missed by those familiar with Professor Nader only through her published work is the depth of her unflinching sense of optimism. This is not the naïve superficial optimism of some lumpen-harmonist-cheerleader, but an optimism rooted in an understanding of the transformative properties of history. I have never met anyone whose severity of critique was equally matched by such deep reservoirs of hope—hope vested in the simple potential of people organized but not of one mind. The roots of this optimism are no doubt in part personal, but are also rooted in an historical understanding of the recurrence of peoples' movements, and of struggles, uprisings, and democratic movements to resist plunder, oppression, and other forms of injustice that can occur when injustice is exposed. Laura Nader's commitment to justice and the potential of anthropology is matched by her belief that people can learn to see through the controlling processes enshrouding their social life. Education, research, engagement, and critical public discourse are the tools she has modeled for us to use to overcome controlling processes.

Laura Nader's work has always been ahead of its time, and I know people will still be reading her a century from now. Her writings on controlling processes, studying-up, plunder, and coercive harmony will retain their relevance so long as there are people embedded in power relations.

David H. Price, Professor of Anthropology
Saint Martin's University
Olympia, Washington

November, 2013

Interview 1: June 10, 2013

Audio File 1

01-00:00:06
Rubens: It's just wonderful to see you and begin these interviews with you. I'm Lisa Rubens from the Regional Oral History Office. This is my colleague, Sam Redman, and it's just an honor to be interviewing you today. You've been selected to be this year's interviewee in ROHO's Class of 1931 University History Series. Alas, a woman of your intellect, accomplishment and long career, should really be interviewed for at least fifty hours and we only have eight hours allotted here. But we're going to do what we can do.

01-00:01:08
Nader: It's okay.

01-00:01:09
Rubens: You were born into a family with a distinct history and it shaped you in many ways. So if you would talk about that a bit.

01-00:01:20
Nader: Well, I grew up in a small New England town, in Winsted, Connecticut, that was made up of many different ethnicities, mainly European and Mediterranean. And it was a contentious town. And the main division as I was growing up was Catholic Protestant. There were all these Protestant churches around town but there was only one Catholic Church. And I don't even think as I was growing up there was a synagogue because there were so few people of the Jewish faith there. But the main distinction was Catholic Protestant.

So we were Eastern Orthodox but my parents wanted us to have some experience church-wise because they thought it would be good but the closest church was the Methodist church. It was the bottom of the hill to our house. So they sent us to Sunday school in the Methodist church, which was very interesting. The woman taught the Bible and so on, and she taught us about life, and it was very good for me because my parents were from another country.

01-00:02:29
Rubens: So tell me a little bit about that. Where were your father and mother born and how did they get here?

01-00:02:34
Nader: My father was born in a town in what was then Greater Syria. It's a town called Arsun and it's in the mountains and when I had an opportunity to go back to that town I noticed my father's house was looking at the mountains and it was the only house in town that was looking towards the mountains. All the rest were faced in, which I thought was kind of indicative of things to come.

01-00:03:00
Rubens: Symbolic anyway.

01-00:03:02
Nader: Symbolic anyway. And my mother came from a town, not a village, called Zahle and there's a song that says Zahle is the spirit, umun el haria, which means the spirit of freedom, because they were always the ones who stood up and defended freedom when the colonialists came or the Ottomans or whatever. It was a Christian town. But even in that town there were several dialects, which is interesting. So the little neighborhoods were very little neighborhoods. They were very close and so forth and there were actually dialects in the town.

Now, my mother came from a family of—her maternal family was major doctors, medical field. But she was one of eight girls in her family and they all grew up to be school teachers because that was the only opportunity for young women in that time. So my dad's father went to Brazil searching for his economic security and he died when my father was three months old. So basically dad grew up with an older brother and sister and his mother. He was the youngest. Dad's older brother became a priest and later advanced in the Christian Orthodox Church. He had to support his family from when he was little. So he migrated out to the United States but he did so at a very special time, which was when the French came into Lebanon. He had—

01-00:04:46
Rubens: And this is—

01-00:04:47
Nader: This is just before World War I. And that was when the encroachment of Europeans again on the Middle East, which has never stopped since the Crusades. So basically he had a choice of either leaving and trying to find his way in a new country or staying and fighting the French. So he had his responsibilities so he had to leave because who's going to support his mother mainly.

01-00:05:14
Rubens: How did he meet your mother?

01-00:05:17
Nader: Well, he came to this country. He started to make his way. He worked in a factory for a very short time, about a month, maybe less. Didn't like that kind of work. Started his own cooperative with other people doing grocery store work and then eventually setup his own business, which was food. Restaurant and bakeries. At that point, when he had enough money, he went back to Lebanon looking for a bride. So he heard about these eight sisters, and there were four left, or more than four. And he heard about some of them were teachers and they were thoughtful and so on. And he heard about my mother and he went and asked for her hand. My mother was meanwhile outside her home town of Zahle in more of the southern part of Lebanon teaching, away

from the roof of her family, which was unheard of in those days. If you were going to teach—her sisters all taught in Zahle. But my mom left the village and went outside of it to teach somewhere, which everybody thought was shocking. But when she heard about this young man who had come to ask for the hand of one of her mother's daughters—she met him and then they were engaged.

01-00:06:33
Rubens: And do you think this young man was particularly attracted to her because she showed more initiative and independence?

01-00:06:37
Nader: It's the family. People married someone from the family because that's what gave importance. When you're marrying someone you don't know, you investigate the family. And there they investigate the morality, the ethics, the possible criminal elements, and health. So if you've had TB in the family that really mars the possibilities for getting married.

01-00:07:01
Rubens: I just wondered if that independent spirit may have—

01-00:07:04
Nader: It could have been.

01-00:07:04
Rubens: —set her above the others.

01-00:07:06
Nader: I think it had to do with the reputation of the family, not the person. Because her family allowed her to do that.

01-00:07:14
Rubens: So they marry, she comes to this country roughly in the—

01-00:07:23
Nader: Early twenties.

01-00:07:25
Rubens: And so what was the family construct? We'll segue way back to the values of the family, for instance that they sent you to Sunday school. But what's the birth order? You have three—

01-00:07:37
Nader: The first was my brother Shaf [Shafeek]. He was the oldest and he became the interlocutor, so to speak, because he was the one who was socialized into this country. So he became the translator between my parents and us basically and he was very, very important to our development. And then there was my sister Claire. She came next. And then I came after, and then Ralph.

01-00:08:01
Rubens: In 1930 you were born?

01-00:08:01
Nader: I was born in 1930 and Ralph was born in 1934. But it was really Shaf that solidified the siblings and the culture of the family and so on.

01-00:08:17
Rubens: You were all raised speaking Arabic?

01-00:08:19
Nader: Well, when he went to kindergarten he couldn't speak anything but Arabic, even though he was born here. Italians the same way, Greeks whatever in that time. And the rest of us were bilingual. Now, when I was about seven or eight—my father had promised her parents that he would bring her back to see her mother and father. And so the years passed and it looked like war was imminent. Something was happening in Europe anyway. So they decided that we should go for a year to see my grandparents and get to know my aunt and the family. We got on the *USS Excambion* in New York City and sailed. It was a three week trip to Beirut, stopping in the Mediterranean along the way. And we spent a year. My aunts tutored me. I was homeschooled. We were all homeschooled that year. And, of course, we perfected our Arabic also.

01-00:09:20
Rubens: So what were the values of the family? You characterized your community as being contentious. Your family thrived on lively debate and real airing of ideas and discussion.

01-00:09:36
Nader: I think generally people in that part of the world, the Mediterranean really, almost generally people—but certainly in the eastern Mediterranean, they love to talk politics for a lot of good reasons, but they're not threatened by speaking politics. In the United States they say, when you get together, two things you avoid: religion and politics. I can't imagine avoiding talking politics. Even today on the telephone with my siblings, we always talk politics. So it was lively. But being in a New England town, which, although it was contentious, they really—when people would visit us from all over the place, they were sort of surprised what was happening at our table because we were always arguing about things. And I actually was probably the least argumentative. And if I was quiet my father would say, "Well, if you don't know what to say, why don't you ask a question?" Or he'd get us to participate. And on Sundays at one point he encouraged us to get through the meal only speaking Arabic and I often won because I was so quiet. I didn't say very much. But they used to say, my parents used to say, "Arabic's a very hard language. If you had to take this in university, it's very hard. You might as well get a head start on it now."

At the beginning, of course, they spoke mainly Arabic but they were in the community so my mother and father spoke English.

01-00:11:08
Rubens: And so did your mother continue to teach?

01-00:11:11
Nader: She tutored in French to people, and then later in her life she tutored in Arabic. She had some interesting students.

01-00:11:20
Rubens: I had read somewhere that you had vowed you would not learn French. That wasn't going to be the language you studied because it was the colonial language.

01-00:11:28
Nader: Yes. I never forgot that when we arrived in Beirut and we had to go through French customs, the disrespect of the French customs agent toward my mother. It really shows how much we were taught to respect our parents. But he was very disrespectful because she was born in Lebanon, even though she was an American citizen with American passport, et cetera. And I just never forgot that. So I never wanted to learn French. At Harvard I did Spanish, which was considered a secondary language. Wasn't considered important. Arabic was not considered a civilizational language at Harvard. Can you imagine? And so I did German, which I never used, and flunked three times, and Spanish, because I took my junior year in Mexico.

01-00:12:18
Rubens: Were there any particular political issues that you remember the family discussing? You're coming to intellectual consciousness by about 1938, '39, the sort of second phase of the Depression—the US will go into another big depression again in '37, '38, and then the drums of war, '39.

01-00:12:43
Nader: Yes. Well, I think it was varied. That's what's interesting about it. My father is trying to get a sewer system in Winsted, Connecticut, our home town, at the same time as he's trying to get a sewer system in Arsun, in Lebanon. Neither one had a sewer system. And so the discussion about sewer systems was pretty important.

And then, of course, the whole invasion of the Middle East by the French and the English particularly in the Fertile Crescent area. And then the invasion after the war, of course, of the Europeans, the Jews and the creation of the State of Israel and the debate about that, whether it should be a homeland or a state or not. And then, of course, all the killings that were going on. And my dad always read the Arabic newspaper. Every week they were killing a poet because their political language was being communicated through poetry, like Darwish, present day. And so we'd hear this poet was killed and that poet was killed. And they killed the leadership and then they'd say, "You know, the trouble with the Arabs, they don't have any leaders. They only have dictators." Well, you killed all the leaders. And the Arabs were complicit. There were many Arabs that were complicit. There were no good bad guys. It was a very complicated situation but it was clear that if our position at home would align with anybody it would be Einstein and Hannah Arendt. Really.

And in ’48, of course, the only opposition to a State of Israel, rather than a homeland, were American Jews who were anti-Zionist. We watched the destruction of those people, the American Council of Judaism, et cetera, silencing them until more recently. So that was one issue.

And, of course, many of the Palestinians sold land. They didn’t think they were creating a state or whatever. And Anthony Nutting wrote a very interesting piece called “Western Beachhead in the Middle East.” And we were never under any illusion that the West wanted to support the State of Israel because they cared about Jews. They wanted a western beachhead in the Middle East, which was the Arab view of what was going on. The nationalist, the Pan-Arab view of what was going on. But it wasn’t just that part of the world, because my older brother was very aware of world history. Now, he was drafted into the Army, into the Navy, at a time when I was still in high school. And before he got out he was very sick and eventually got—he was in the Navy hospital. But anyway he barely could walk, so whatever it was, it was an infectious disease that he might have gotten in Guantanamo because he was stationed in Guantanamo. And when he came home, the first thing he did was buy books. And Ralph was a big recipient of that because he wasn’t yet formed and here was his older brother coming back and buying books and all of a sudden books became more important than the local library, our home books. Because the local library, we used to go to the local library, it was a block and a half from us. We loved going there, and then when you left the library, you had slides you could slide down instead of going down the steps. Kids. So it was a town that encouraged more cosmopolitan views.

01-00:16:46
Rubens: And a family that—

01-00:16:47
Nader: And a family that fit that. Because the town was basically at that time run by manufacturing plants, people in manufacturing plants who kept their business in the town until after the war and then, of course, they went west or south or globalized or whatever. So we have all these empty factories in Winsted.

01-00:17:09
Rubens: Yes. So how about the class consciousness of the family? Your father, of course, was basically a businessman I guess you’d say.

01-00:17:17
Nader: Yes.

01-00:17:17
Rubens: Did he have to deal with unions in his business or—

01-00:17:20
Nader: No, the corporations had to deal with unions. My father often gave—when he was sick in his later years, people would say, “You gave me my first job, Mr. Nader.” So he was special. But in terms of—

01-00:17:36
Rubens: By the way, what was your father's name?

01-00:17:38
Nader: Nathra Nader. He took his father's first name for this last name, which was part of that custom. My mother was Rose Bouziane. The Bouziane family.

The manufacturing class children went to school with us. They didn't go to private schools or be sent away at that time. So they were invested in the town. And the factories were across from my father's business. So my father had come into his business people of all classes. Working class, the medics, the doctors, the lawyers, and he conversed with all of them. Class was determined on the basis of quality of the person. My father got into discussions with all kinds of people. He loved to discuss as he would hold—he had to give them the change but he'd hold the change and then start a discussion. They'd say, "Mr. Nader, you're going to lose your business if you keep bringing politics into this." He said, "When I came into this country I saluted the Statue of Liberty." He took it seriously.

01-00:19:22
Rubens: Did they become citizens?

01-00:19:24
Nader: Yes. Very early.

01-00:19:27
Rubens: And it's so fascinating, your family, and I hate to skim over talking about it. Thankfully, your brother Ralph has written a lovely book that evokes what life was like around the dinner table, *The Seventeen Traditions: Lessons From an American Childhood*. Now two girls, two boys. Was there any sense that girls were limited in what they could do?

01-00:19:53
Nader: Well, my father was often asked that question about, "Why are you sending your girls to college?" especially in a town with that composition. And he would say, "If I could only send two of the four, I'd send the girls because the boys have more experience in life the way the society is organized." And so that was his position. The girls needed college more than the boys needed college.

01-00:20:24
Rubens: And your mother was involved with women's clubs.

01-00:20:29
Nader: Yes. She was always finding interesting speakers. This was about staying abreast of issues of the day.

01-00:20:48
Rubens: So, in fact, how is it that you went to Wells College? Where had your brother Shaf gone to college after he got out of the military?

01-00:20:48
Nader: First he went to a college in Connecticut for a year, and then he went to the University of Toronto. And from Toronto, the exact years I'm not sure, but he ended up in law school at Boston University. It was then when the floods hit Connecticut and he left school to help my father because our business was totally devastated by the floods. So he was trying to help them rebuild the business and he never finished his last year of law school. And Claire went to Coker College in South Carolina to begin with, because somebody in Winsted knew about Coker and then her—

01-00:21:32
Rubens: Is that a women's college?

01-00:21:34
Nader: It's a women's college. And then she transferred her junior year to Smith. And then when I came to go to college, the question was should I go to Smith or should I—and I felt I was too dependent on my older sister. And we were knitting. She always had to sign off on the knitting. And I thought, "No, I better—"So someone in town who had a connection with Wells recommended we go look at it. So we did. We drove all the way. It's a long drive from Winsted. And it was beautiful, located on Lake Cayuga. So that's how—

01-00:22:10
Rubens: So that was it. Was there ever any question in your mind of whether you would go to an all-women's college versus a co-ed college?

01-00:22:18
Nader: No. All the good schools were single sex schools. And then when Ralph applied, I'm not sure where he applied, apart from Princeton, but he went to Princeton.

01-00:22:30
Rubens: Okay, all right. So shall we move to talking about Ralph? I just wondered if there's anything else about the family that particularly you want to highlight. I know you've remained very close with your siblings. Unfortunately Shaf—

01-00:22:52
Nader: He died in '86, I believe. Shaf was—he would do things like—there's somebody who wrote a book about first siblings and last siblings, on their roles. So he interviewed me at some point about that. Claire and I would be in our bedroom, and he and Ralph would come in and he would say, "Okay, let's talk about who's going to do what in the world. What are we going to specialize in?" And Ralph was going to do China and Shaf was going to do the New World, the Anglo world, Claire was going to do the Middle East and I think I was going to do Latin America or something like that. So the whole notion of sort of taking the globe and saying, "Okay, you be a specialist in this

and you be—and then we could all interview each other and we can all cover the world," I think that's rather amazing when I look back at it. So he gave us a common, at least an interdependent geographic knowledge that we could share.

01-00:24:07
Rubens: So literally did he give you assignments?

01-00:24:11
Nader: No. It was just sort of imagining the future and our education. Of course, he'd already been in the Navy so he was—no, maybe it was before, in fact, he was in the Navy. But that was very important, gaining an awareness of the globe.

01-00:24:26
Rubens: And thinking about a career beyond—

01-00:24:27
Nader: And thinking about a career. And the other thing that was important was we had an upstairs porch and in the summertime we laid out all the beds. We had beds on the porch and we all slept on the porch and that was important because we were all under one roof literally. We were not in separate rooms at that point, although Shaf had his room, Ralph had his room next to him, and Claire and I were in one room. But in the summer we were all under the same roof.

01-00:24:58
Rubens: Anything else you want to say about the family structure, about your relationship with your parents in terms of really lasting influences on you.

01-00:25:09
Nader: We had so much respect for our parents and we had reason to, because they were concerned citizens, they were devoted parents. They wanted us to be educated. They were just models.

01-00:25:28
Rubens: They lived a long life, didn't they?

01-00:25:28
Nader: Yes. My father was about ninety-nine and my mother was almost a hundred.

01-00:25:34
Rubens: Oh. So they really saw your career span.

01-00:25:337
Nader: Oh, yes. And every summer I took the kids home every summer to Connecticut because I wanted them to see that. And unfortunately it was at a time when all the parents in Berkeley were worried about their children's vitae and they were sending them to Paris or to France or to someplace so they could say on the vitae, "High school, second year went to France." And I

didn't care about that. But I think my kids didn't understand why they had to go every summer necessarily. I think they probably do now.

01-00:26:10
Rubens: I was just going to ask you one more thing about your mother. I've seen you quote discussions that you had with your mother about the role of women.

01-00:26:25
Nader: I'll give you an example. Because recently I wrote a letter to the *New Yorker*, which, of course, they didn't publish. And I also wrote an op-ed piece since Ralph's always telling me, "You should write more op-ed pieces," about a comparative view on women and what we could enjoy, the reality we could face if we had a comparative view. But the one to the *New Yorker* described my mother at age ninety-six sitting on the couch watching the television description of the abortion problem and pro and con abortion. And she said, "Will you explain that to me?" So I explained it to her. I don't know that I mentioned it before. And she sat up in her chair and she said, "Not their business." And so I said in this note to the *New Yorker*, so, in fact, "Not their business is way more radical than *Roe v. Wade*." Because *Roe v. Wade* gave it to the government to do. So if you look at abortion laws as they come in, didn't come in until the middle of the nineteenth century. It was not their business. In this country, too. It was a woman's business or her doctor or her husband or her whatever. Her mother, father. Whatever it was, it was not the business of the state. So that to me is radical feminism. Our bodies, ourselves is what she was saying.

01-00:28:03
Rubens: So questioning, independence of mind, standing up for beliefs, these were values your family promoted.

01-00:28:09
Nader: Right. My grandmother, my mother's mother, my maternal grandmother, was six foot tall. Her father was the tallest man in Lebanon, six foot seven. And he's famous in the legends about her father and the fights during the Ottomans and all that period and pushing a wall down because he was tall enough to do so and so on. But being that tall. And she married a man who was about five foot seven. And he married her. And he wanted to marry a tall woman so his children would be tall. None of whom were. Only his grandchildren all turned out to be tall. [laughter]

01-00:28:55
Rubens: That's funny.

01-00:28:56
Nader: So the notion of an imposing woman as subservient was not anything that we ever grew up with or had any sense of women being inferior to men, although different.

01-00:29:07
Rubens: Did she have help in the house or did you all pitch in?

01-00:29:09
Nader: When we were little she sometimes had people come in and help clean. She thought it was good exercise so she did it. When people say, “What do you do for exercise?” and she’d say, “I clean my house.” One day, this gives you a little flavor, she was cleaning the vestibule hall with the front door open, summertime, and the salesman came to the door and he said, “May I talk to the lady of the house?” And she said, “She’s busy right now. Could you come back later?” So, of course, he came back later and there was my mother, no longer on the floor cleaning the floor —and she looked familiar to him. But she always thought that was an amusing story to tell. They had their answer. There were very few words but they said a lot. In fact, I’m collecting all of the things. Like she sees a child acting in a certain way she might say, “It doesn’t hurt to be generous.” One line. When my father would be lecturing to somebody whom he thought was impossible because they weren’t listening or they couldn’t dialogue, he’d say, “Simple.” And I had the experience recently of encountering somebody who had been a student about thirty years ago of mine. His mother was a professor on the campus and he taught in a junior college. And I was talking to him about the loss of democracy in our country and the role of the Obama Administration and he was clearly a pro-Obama Democrat. Berkeley. It’s a knee-jerk, you know. So he could not tie in around the notion of losing democracy, which I thought was shocking. I said, “You’re going to wait until the Gestapo come to the door?” He said, “He gave us Obamacare.” I said, “No, he gave us insurance company care.” And no matter what I’d say—and then I was thinking, if my father were there, he’d have just stopped way earlier and he would have said, “simple,” or “ignorant.”

01-00:31:19
Rubens: So you’re collecting—

01-00:31:20
Nader: I’m collecting them. I have a whole list of them. They’re terrific. When we’d fight with each she’d say, “Understand each other.” Period. She didn’t say, “You did and you did.” Today parents talk too much. They extend it too much. They blah, blah, blah. Too much blah, blah, blah. And you never forget the one-liner. And even my daughter said, “That is embedded in my brain. Understand each other.” It’s interesting.

It’s like a proverb. They come from a country and a society with proverbs. Well, we were, too. We had proverbs in New England. Proverbs were knocked out of business by the schools, interestingly. One proverb, an apple a day keeps the doctor away. I grew up with proverbs, New England proverbs. Well, Harvard just spent millions of dollars to prove that that was true, that an apple a day does keep the doctor away because of X, Y, and Z.

01-00:32:34
Rubens: So let's now talk about your undergraduate experience at Wells. Give us a sense of the college.

01-00:32:53
Nader: It's a liberal arts school. It's in a beautiful place. It's surrounded by other schools, which was good. And you could get to Syracuse by train and then you took a bus to Wells. And it had been recommended. So it was beautiful. What could you say? So I arrive with my things and my roommate arrives. And I had been packing all summer long neatly, putting things in the suitcases, and I was so excited and so on. And I got there and I put things in the drawers and so on. She arrived, she took her suitcase and emptied it upside down and it was clear she was a slob. And she said, "I'm sorry if I'm messy but I'm messy." And I said, "I don't mind if you're messy on your side of the room." And she looked at me and she said, "Pray tell, where is the line of demarcation." She was the daughter of a minister who was wild. She had been under whatever at home and so she sort of went wild that first year and we didn't room again the second year. Second year I roomed with a woman whose name was Happy, who did not have a happy life because she was sick later on. She had some kind of disease that made her break out all over and she ended up taking her life after graduation. But she was wonderful and a very smart person. And then junior year I took abroad.

But first year they had a good pattern at Wells of having what they called Chapel Talks, 12:00 to 1:00. And students could do them or they sometimes invited people. Certainly on Sunday they invited some religious group, some particular group. And, of course, this was '48 and the Middle East, Palestine and all that was blowing up. And Deir Yassin had happened, the big massacre in Palestine by the Israelis—they weren't Israelis then. The Irgun or whatever they were called. They had massacred this town. They came in when just—anyway, they massacred men, women, and children. It was a famous massacre. And then this rabbi came in and talked about how barbaric the Palestinians and the Arabs were. He took the Zionist line. And I asked him a question. I challenged him. I said, "What about Deir Yassin?" And then the next day the religion teacher called me into her office and told me I was impolite. I said, "Impolite? He gave a talk and I asked a question. What's impolite about that?" "You weren't respectful. You should respect." She was a Zionist although she wasn't Jewish. So it was a funny time, very strange time. So that was my introduction to get in line, and I was unwilling to get in line.

01-00:35:48
Rubens: Were there imperatives about how a woman should comport herself. Obviously education was important, but was that preparation for a career, or was that so that she could be a—

01-00:36:16
Nader: I suppose both, but I never got into their culture. My mother is a not their business. She was a schoolteacher and she came from—

01-00:36:23
Rubens: But, I mean, did you feel that you had to buck a certain culture?

01-00:36:27
Nader: I just did what came naturally. And I think that's always been my strength actually because I wasn't so nervous about it. I just did what I thought was right. Somebody gives a talk, you disagree, ask a question.

01-00:36:46
Rubens: You had been a good student I assume in high school? We didn't talk about—

01-00:36:48
Nader: Yes, I was a good student in high school and I was president of the Dramatic Club and so clearly I liked doing some of that. And when I went back for my fiftieth reunion, it was interesting because I was voted the student most likely to succeed and I forgot. Which is interesting in itself. Clearly I was not impressed by that. So then I went back and I met all these old kids I went to school with and I said, "I was very shy." I remember myself. I was very shy in high school. And one guy said, his name was, Louis. He said, "You, shy? You were anything but shy." So I had this view of myself as being shy, which I guess I was, really, but not—

01-00:37:46
Rubens: You felt that way.

01-00:37:47
Nader: —orally. I spoke up. So they thought I wasn't shy because I spoke up. On the other hand, we were not allowed to date in high school.

01-00:37:59
Rubens: This was a family restriction?

01-00:38:01
Nader: My mother didn't want us to. She didn't know who these people were. People didn't date anyway like now. And they weren't like the Europeans going out in groups. They were starting to date. And, of course, in a town like that, you date and you get married by the time you're out of high school.

So she wanted something else so she just drew the line there. So when I went to Wells, everybody was dating. And I didn't like the scene. So I did sort of once in a while but I just didn't like the scene because of the whole sexuality and it seemed to me disrespect. So it was only junior year that I really started to date because in Mexico there was a different attitude towards women than there was in the United States. After all, gang rape and everything was going on at Dartmouth while I was at Wells. So it does happen now but it was also happening then, although there's more rape now than there was. So all of

these things. And I'd see people come home drunk, and women. But at least they came home at 11:00 or 12:00. They had to because the dormitory and the dorm mothers and all that.

Anyway, but junior year when I was in Mexico, the Mexicans, because I was dark haired and looked like them, they could identify with me, they respected me and they treated the blondes and the blue eyes like prostitutes. And they say American women are easy. That's a stereotype of American women have. Whatever reason. So I think that that allowed me to date in a situation where I knew I would be respected.

01-00:39:54
Rubens: Sure. Well, so you're in Mexico. How did it come that you did your junior year there? Did Wells have a program?

01-00:40:03
Nader: Well, it was a Smith junior year abroad, so you could apply to Smith junior year abroad. And, of course, Claire had told me about that. She couldn't take it but she had told me about it. And I wanted to learn Spanish. I studied Spanish in high school and I had taken it at Wells and I was a Spanish major. Spanish and literature. And that was how I got into the final trouble, which got me into anthropology, of course.

01-00:40:34
Rubens: We'll get to that in just a minute. I did want to ask what were the cultural imperatives for women at Wells. Was there a feminist impulse? *The Second Sex* had come out and—

01-00:40:59
Nader: Well, yes, there was de Beauvoir's book. But I certainly—

01-00:41:03
Rubens: That was not—

01-00:41:03
Nader: No, feminism. When I was at Wells there were something like twenty-eight percent male and the rest were female professors. So it was female dominated until after World War II and then it reversed. So when they honored me at Wells with whatever they honor alums, then when I went back I said, "Give me the statistics," and they had totally reversed. Twenty-eight percent women and the rest were men. The rest were men! So all the boys came back from the war, went to college, and then took these jobs that women had when I was at Wells. So it was predominantly women dominated. But they didn't have a woman president yet. And, actually, I mentioned that when I went back to Wells to accept an award, and the next year they did have a woman. The president retired. He resigned after my speech. He was a nice man. He didn't resign in anger. He just said, "You're right. Should be a woman president."

And then Sissy Farenthold became president. She was running for governor in Texas. She was terrific. Anyway, so all this—

01-00:42:07
Rubens: So in terms of feminism, then that was just—

01-00:42:10
Nader: There wasn't much—

01-00:42:11
Rubens: It was a liberal sort of centrist—

01-00:42:14
Nader: Yes, there was really no feminist movement. And the whole issue of gays was interesting because we knew who were lesbians. But who cared. And that's another thing about it's not their business. I feel the same way about gays. What is it, making everybody—every time you turn on the radio and they say, "Gay rights," blah blah rights, blah, blah, blah, blah. And I don't get it. And I don't get it because the way I was raised in that part of the world—in fact, there's a homosexual graduate student here. And this business of not their business. I was telling him the story when I was in Egypt and I asked a sociology colleague that I've known at Harvard what's the deal with homosexuality. She said, "There's no big deal. It's just everybody has to get married and have kids and you can have whatever sex life you want." So the primary unit is the family and here the primary unit is the couple. So this guy who's from Iran who's a graduate student here, and I said to him, "So when Ahmadinejad says there's no homosexuality in Iran, everybody here laughs because they know there is. But what he means is there are no homosexual couples." And that's very different. So homosexuality is different in different societies. But there it wasn't the state's business. Now it is the state's business in Iran. And in the Middle East. So this is invasion of privacy. Different attitude about what's the business of the government. Actually, that's what the Pope just said about Catholicism.

01-00:44:04
Rubens: So you were saying that lesbianism was not an issue at Wells?

01-00:44:06
Nader: No, it wasn't an issue. Now, style was an issue. There are certain things you wore and you didn't wear. Okay. That was very much an issue. And I remember I rebelled by—I think I knit a sweater that was too long or something like that and I wore it to the dining room and everybody started to laugh. I think it was a sweater. And I said, "It's the latest style. What's the matter? Don't you know that?"

And actually one time I went to NIH to a meeting and I had to leave early in the morning and I had two pairs of shoes, one was brown and one was black, and they were the same pair of shoes and I wore one brown and one black because I didn't realize what I was wearing. And someone said, "Do you

realize you have on different—"I said, "It's the latest style." So there's this style of ready retorts. Claire and I used to go to New York once in a while because we had a train from Winsted to New York, right? And the guys that ran the train would come in to have a cup of coffee at my father's and then they'd go to the train. And if we were going to be late we'd just call into my father's restaurant and we'd say, "We're going to be a few minutes late." And then you'd hear one guy yell to the other, "Hold the train. The Nader sisters are coming."

So we go into New York and we're at Bergdorf Goodman looking at shoes and we didn't have a clue in the world how expensive they were. So this guy comes out and he puts on the shoes. And so I like this pair of shoes. I said, "How expensive? How much are they?" And he said some outrageous price. I said, "Don't you have anything of better quality?" You see the way in which I was doing it? But I think that's family. It's like contrarian, almost. Because we didn't look like we could afford a pair of shoes for a hundred and whatever dollars, right? So instead of saying, "Oh, that's too expensive." We had retorts.

01-00:46:04
Rubens: You're one-upping him.

01-00:46:05
Nader: I'm one-upping him. Because I knew he was putting me down. So in situations where I'm dealing with power, I'm that way. In situations where I'm dealing with powerless people, I'm the opposite. If you don't have any power, I'm not going to pull this on you, one-up you. So it's one-upping people who are one-upping you.

01-00:46:38
Rubens: Let's turn to how you come to then do your senior thesis as an honor thesis. Isn't that your—

01-00:46:44
Nader: Right. I came back from Mexico. I had had the best Mexican professors junior year doing literature with us. I was very interested in Mexican revolutionary novels and I wrote my thesis on Mexican revolutionary novels. Turned it in the week before graduation.

01-00:47:02
Rubens: And you were looking at leadership?

01-00:47:04
Nader: And I was looking at what impact they had, what leadership, who wrote them, and so on. And they refused to accept my thesis because they said it was sociology, not literary interpretation because I wasn't looking at the quality of the writing or whatever. And this was a week before graduation. "We will not give you a degree in Spanish and literature." So I was devastated. So they said, "Go to the sociology department. This is a sociology thesis." Sociology

professor was Miss Davis, who said to me, “Can’t give you a degree in sociology. You never took a course.” I had taken a course in economics from her, not sociology. I ended up in the president’s office and he explained disciplinary boundaries, which I didn’t understand. And that’s interesting in itself. I didn’t understand that because in Mexico the disciplinary boundaries, they’re moot really. It would have been perfectly fine to write such a thing in Mexico but here the disciplinary boundaries are very strong. And he said, “I’m going to invent a degree for you to graduate. Latin American studies.” So he invented a degree but that didn’t explain to me, “How could you tell me that when I wrote it in Spanish to show how good my Spanish was, too, and you turn me—” I couldn’t understand it. So I called my brother on the telephone that was in the hall dormitory —one telephone for the whole building— and I was talking to him.

01-00:48:33
Rubens: This is—

01-00:48:33
Nader: Shaf. He was at the University of Toronto and he was studying with Ted Carpenter, anthropology, famous anthropologist of the Arctic, whom I met later on. And he said, “I’m going to send you a book.” And he sent me *Mirror for Man*, by Clyde Kluckhohn, which was the best prizewinning book on anthropology and still to this date there isn’t a book that beats it. He was way ahead of his time. And he had two chapters that were very interesting to me. “An Anthropologist Looks at the United States” and “An Anthropologist Looks at the World.” So he was not just interested in Samoa or Navajo or whatever. He had a big picture view of anthropology. I went to Harvard to study with him.

01-00:49:23
Rubens: So before we begin talking about your experience at Harvard, let’s just wrap up your time at Wells. You were able to graduate and—

01-00:49:31
Nader: Yes. Graduated. Worked for a year in New York for the Guggenheim Foundation and the Indonesian Consulate.

01-00:49:38
Rubens: How did that happen?

01-00:49:39
Nader: Well, I needed a job. I kept getting turned down for typing jobs because I couldn’t type. They’d give me a typing test and I would flunk. And then I got smart and went to the Guggenheim Foundation where you had to type. It was a typing job. And they said, “Can you type?” And I said, “Yes,” and they said, “Okay.” They didn’t give me a test. Later I went to work for the Indonesian Consulate.

01-00:50:06
Rubens: Now, what was that?

01-00:50:06
Nader: Clipping. It was great. Had to read the newspaper and just clip the things that had to do with Indonesia and Islam and so on. And I spoke Arabic but I couldn't read it. And so they could read Arabic but couldn't speak it, because they could read the Koran. So we had this kind of funny interrelationship about—

01-00:50:31
Rubens: Starting fieldwork.

01-00:50:32
Nader: Yes, that's right.

01-00:50:37
Redman: Time for one more question maybe, before we have to change tapes.

01-00:50:40
Rubens: So you hadn't, by the end of the four years at Wells, decided what it was your career would be?

01-00:50:45
Nader: No, I had no clue I'd ever be an anthropologist. I read Kluckhohn's book and I thought, "I'm an anthropologist and I never took a course." It was a natural fit.

01-00:50:54
Rubens: Yes. The prescription, as it were, I imagine is that you'd go to work. You must have been anticipating your graduation and what you were going to do. I'm sure a lot of your classmates were getting married.

01-00:51:07
Nader: Yes.

01-00:51:08
Rubens: Yes. And how many were going on to graduate school?

01-00:51:12
Nader: Not right away, there weren't very many. My roommate from Mexico was going to graduate school, Mary Bernice. She was from Bryn Mawr. But the women at Wells, not very many went on to graduate school then.

01-00:51:27
Rubens: Yes, okay. And so during that year that you're working at the Carnegie and the Guggenheim. Did you go out to Harvard to interview?

01-00:51:41
Nader: I took a summer course there. I can't remember when it was. Whether it was the summer I graduated or the summer after that. I think it must have been the summer that I graduated. I must have gone to Harvard. And the only course

they were teaching was a course by [Loren] Eiseley of the University of Pennsylvania in archeology, which is hardly why I went. But I sat in on some other courses and so it was six weeks.

01-00:52:03
Rubens: You knew that's where you wanted to be?

01-00:52:06
Nader: Yes. And I had no clue as to where it stood in the ranking of anything. I just wanted to work with Kluckhohn.

01-00:52:13
Rubens: Yes, okay. Well, why don't we turn the tape.

Audio File 2

A conversation about differences between Wells and Vassar begins before recording starts.

02-00:00:02
Nader: And Vassar was founded by Matthew Vassar, who wanted women who would change the world. And Sophia Smith was somewhere in between. So whether that affected the kind of education you had or not is another issue, I don't know. But clearly there was a prestige there, that Vassar and Smith were more prestigious than Wells.

02-00:00:28
Redman: I just want to begin my portion of this interview by saying it is an extraordinary honor for me as an historian of anthropology to be talking to you. And I want to note that we're sitting on Alfred Kroeber's bench. It had been in his office and it was bequeathed to you. I'm interested now broaching some of your ideas in anthropology and some of the evolution there and some of the influences. But I'd also like to have, if we can, a candid conversation about the course of anthropology as a field and how that's changed dramatically, I would say, since the time that you started doing your graduate work. But let's start with first of all defining Radcliffe and its relationship to Harvard. But I'd like to hear about the Harvard Peabody model of anthropology and the four fields approach and what that was and why it was important for Harvard University at that time.

02-00:01:23
Nader: Well, Harvard, when I went to Harvard, they were two departments. There was the Department of Social Relations, which was supposed to integrate anthropology with sociology and the other social sciences. And then there was Peabody, who refused to integrate, and they were over in the museum. And it was Peabody that had the four fields anthropology. And then the Social Relations anthropologists came out different, as you could expect, because we had to do—the four fields then were biological anthropology, social cultural anthropology, archeology, and linguistics. And we had to do labs. We had to do biology labs and deal with the bones and so on and so forth. I went to the

summer institute of linguistics. But if you were at SocRel and didn't have four fields, then you would have a PhD in anthropology, presumably teaching anthropology in different parts of the country without the four fields background and so you got more specialization as a result. And so that became a counterpoint in every major department in the country, between the SocRel types. And their students may not even know that their faculty were SocRel types, right. All they knew was they were anti-four fields. So four fields in some of those departments became old fashioned stuff. And, of course, the four fields people are mainly now found in very small schools where you only find two or three anthropologists and they have to cover the whole thing.

So I consciously wanted the four fields, having read Kluckhohn's *Mirror for Man*, which is all about the wonderful results of a wide-angled perspective. How can you study the human condition without studying 40,000 years or half a million years of Homo sapiens?

02-00:03:16
Redman: Talk about the differentiation in this era between Radcliffe and Harvard. I know that's a simple question but if you could just explain that, that would be great.

02-00:03:23
Nader: Well, Radcliffe was a women's college and Harvard was a men's college. They remained separate until the seventies, when the separation ended in a very unfortunate manner, by the way. The women's movement didn't help at all in that regard.

02-00:03:38
Rubens: Because Radcliffe became an institute ?

02-00:03:40
Nader: Radcliffe destroyed Radcliffe and gave all the property and the money to Harvard without bargaining. And I remember writing to the president of Radcliffe and saying, "Why'd you do this? At least bargain for some professors that are in women's issues and women professors." When I was there, there was this relationship, all women, all men, and the Radcliffe people were very good at supporting Radcliffe women. There were Radcliffe dorms and so on, which I didn't live in except for a very short time. But then they were supportive. And they presumably wanted to teach women how to finish their PhDs and so on. So it was a little different than being a second class citizen. In a way it was good.

02-00:04:30
Redman: Let's talk about disciplinary boundaries at Harvard as you found them. And it's interesting to me. Kluckhohn is a fascinating character in many respects but one of the things that he's doing is arguably encroaching on the territory of sociology, right? Is that sort of the idea that anthropologists as going off

and studying a non-Western culture, if you would, and the domain of the sociologist was Western societies. And now later on in your work we'll get into this a little bit, in the sixties. One of the things that I found so remarkable about your early work is that you're not only citing anthropologists, you also cite Emile Durkheim and other sociologists. Talk about the boundaries that you found at Harvard and in light of the experiences at Wells, I wonder if some of those boundaries were starting to break down a little bit or if advanced thinkers like Kluckhohn and people like that were then starting to really question and grapple with these more traditional boundaries that had been set up and ensconced earlier in the twentieth century.

02-00:05:31

Nader: I think that that did happen and this is the way I can reconstruct it. First place, anthropologists of my ilk thought of anthropology as the umbrella for all the social sciences. Even though the British called anthropology comparative sociology. But my view is that of course I'm going to read sociology because it's about the human condition. Of course I want to know what's going on in psychology. And we were encouraged for our orals at Harvard, "Go over and find out what's going on in Mem Hall," which was where the psychologists were. "Go over and find out what's going on with the sociologists." So we were encouraged to go and browse basically. Go to their lectures and so on. And they would ask questions on orals like, "What's going on in sociology?" A general question. "Well, there are people doing research on A, B, C," so on.

Later on it was [Alfred] Kroeber and [Talcott] Parsons that had a meeting and they wrote a piece together basically dividing the issues. They divided it not geographically but anthropology was about culture and sociology was about society. Now you have cultural sociology, cultural psychology and so on. But it all emanates really from the umbrella field, which is about the human condition. I don't care what you call—I don't care if there are four fields or none. It's about the whole picture. And that means that if you started teaching in law and you find that the questions are leading you outside of the judicial process, you go outside. You don't stop at the wall. And when I helped found the Law in Society Association, and we thought that that would bring all of the social sciences working on law together in a group that would be mutually respectful and would—because the people that were doing this at the law schools, they were excluded, or in sociology because we were not a group. But once I saw the Law and Society Association going back to this law boundaries, then I exited even though they gave me the Henry Kalven prize for distinguished research [Kalven Prize for Outstanding Achievement, Law and Soc. Association, 1995]. I don't like going there because it's what we tried to do something about. So the boundary question has always been interesting and I like it to be as fluid as possible. Following people's curiosity.

02-00:07:51

Redman: I want to ask if we could stick on biological anthropology for a moment, which is one of my major interests. But I want to ask from your perspective in

particular. Many anthropologists encouraged now today to move away from that subfield entirely. And archeologists and physical anthropologists have often commented that they feel unwelcome at AAA meetings. There's controversy surrounding the repatriation of Native American skeletal remains at university museums that have brought new attention to these issues. But arguably there have been fractures growing in anthropology between the biological anthropologists and the sociocultural anthropologists for several generations. But like I'd mentioned, Kluckhohn, he writes a chapter on skulls and incorporates some of this thinking and critiques it rather than outright dismissing it. I wonder how that influenced you and then as these debates over biological anthropology and human skeletal remains, especially in North America, have become more and more heated, how that has influenced you and if your thinking about those issues have changed at all over time.

02-00:09:06
Nader: Yes. I think that there's always been these fractures. And [Franz] Boas wrote about it in 1904!

02-00:09:13
Redman: Boas and [Aleš] Hrdlička, of course.

02-00:09:13
Nader: Yes. There have always been these phases. Boas said, "I don't know whether anthropology is going to survive or not." I wrote about this in the distinguished talk that I gave in 2000. And the way I constructed that talk, I don't know if you've read it or not, but was I went looking for all the ideas and anthropologists that overlapped. These are the questions you can't answer if you're just a biological narrow anthropologist and blah, blah, blah. But there is the bigger problem now of increased specialization. Anthropologists can and have to specialize but they have to do it within a big scope. And if you don't you're not an anthropologist. So we've had the problem in our department at Berkeley, since Sherry [Sherwood] Washburn. He had scope. Sherry Washburn had scope, no question about it. He started all this primate research. But unfortunately some of the primate students that he trained—or Desmond Clark had scope but some of the people he trained, he said, "Okay, you go dig that hole." He knew what was going on all over Africa but the people that he trained, he trained to dig a hole. The people Sherry trained were to go study langurs or whatever. And so once you get those specialties, without the generalist framework, which Sherry had—Sherry used to say you should be able to teach a general course and you should be able to teach a special course and you should be able to invent new courses. And I've always followed that. So the new course for me was controlling processes. A specialized course was law, the anthropology of law, and the general course first was anthro three. And I taught anthro three for a number of years. We can't get some of our younger, so called fifty year olds, to teach anthro three now. And so Liu Xin has been teaching it three semesters in a row. And why won't they teach it? They don't care about having a lot of students take anthropology. They're specialized.

02-00:11:10
Redman: I'm going to come back to Kluckhohn because he's so important in your work and your thinking. But at first I understand you're assigned to a scholar named Douglas Oliver.

02-00:11:21
Nader: Yes.

02-00:11:21
Redman: Can you talk about that experience and why that intellectual relationship maybe didn't work out as well as your relationship with Kluckhohn and maybe compare and contrast their sort of approach as scholars, if you would, or as mentors?

02-00:11:38
Nader: Well, first, I think Kluckhohn was one of the first feminists at Harvard.

02-00:11:43
Redman: His wife was really influential in his work, I understand, in his thinking, right?

02-00:11:46
Nader: Well, yes, they were colleagues certainly. But I think he was a feminist and you can see that reading his book. Douglas Oliver was not a feminist. It wasn't that he was anti-women but he really didn't think that I was going to do much, I think, so he wasn't going to invest a lot in me. And when my mother came to visit me at Harvard, he gave the class an assignment and he took her into his office and talked to her because he wanted to get some sense of was I serious and so on. Well, he was examining that question rather than believing in me. Whereas Kluckhohn, first month I was there, when he had a big party at his house for the incoming graduate students, everybody drinks too much. But he looked at me and he said, "What makes you tick?" So already I stood out in the early months. They thought I was a foreign student because I never said anything. Well, I didn't say anything because I was scared. I didn't have any anthropology background. I was competing with the Harvard students. So he said, "What makes you tick?" And the answer I gave him is really indicative again. When I look back on it, I think, "I don't know where these answers came from." I said, "That's for me to know and for you to find out." That's eyeball to eyeball. There is no hierarchy. See, it's mutual respect but no hierarchy. Which is kind of interesting for an incoming graduate student.

02-00:13:23
Redman: And this is not only in an era of this but it's in a culture, it's in an institution that so values hierarchy. It's built into the structure.

02-00:13:36
Nader: But a good thing about Harvard is they also value nonconformity. If you go to Harvard the mantle gets put on you and you can do anything you want because you went to Harvard. That's something I've always said about Berkeley. We don't do enough of it at public universities. If you'd gone to

Harvard, you can do what you want. So Kluckhohn, going back to Kluckhohn, he would notice, which Oliver would never notice. Oliver was a Pacific Island specialist, Solomon Islands. And he was a good ethnographer and so on. He taught the course on classic ethnographies and so forth. But he wasn't a warm human being like Kluckhohn. And so Kluckhohn would notice that I was very thin and he would take me to lunch. Because I didn't have any money. And I was. I was eating like one major meal a day maybe. I'd go to Durgin Park and I'd go just at the change time. One meal at Durgin Park could last you for a day. Graduate students were poor. There was no money.

02-00:14:39
Redman: It seems as though the Professors John and Beatrice Whiting who become important in your graduate school time not only because of mentorship but because it seems like they invited you into the home and would give you a meal every once in a while.

02-00:14:57
Nader: No. I have to say that Oliver, Douglas Oliver, introduced me to the Whitings. Because when I complained to him about his style he said, "You should go meet John Whiting. You'd like him more than me." So I went to meet John Whiting. And he used to have these luncheons. So I have to give that to Doug Oliver. But I also have to give it to me because I told him, "You're too stiff," right. So then he gave me the solution once I said that. But if I didn't say anything he wouldn't have known what was going on with this lady. So I went over and I started at the Palfrey House lunches, watching this guy, and he was amazing. "Prove me wrong and I'll learn something I didn't know before." Well, that's certainly not authoritarian. He's telling his students to prove him wrong so he could learn something he didn't know before. And I loved that of course. So we got to know each other. Beatrice Whiting came onto my committee. And when Clyde died suddenly after reading the first version of my thesis, Bea Whiting then invited me to the Vineyard and she would read a chapter every day and I would sleep until 11:00. She said, "Show up for brunch at 11:00," and while I was eating she would tell me what was wrong with my chapter. Well, that's really an amazing tutorial, and especially as she knew my chair, Kluckhohn, had died. And [Evon]Vogt who was at Harvard, he was also on my committee. Vogt was very steady but he just didn't have the charisma or imagination that I was attracted to. He did offer me a job. He offered me a grant to go work in Chiapas with him, Vogt and he was quite shocked that I said no because otherwise there was no money. But I remember him taking me to the faculty club and women had to go in the side door of the faculty club at Harvard. He wanted to convince me. He said, "Why won't you come?" And I had been to Oaxaca, and I loved Oaxaca, as a junior. And I didn't want to be his translator. He couldn't speak Spanish. And I knew that that—again I'd be second class citizen. I wanted to be free. So I was always polite to him and when he came to Berkeley to give a distinguished talk, I introduced him and so on. So it wasn't personal.

02-00:17:15
Redman: So before we get to your first graduate school fieldwork, I want to ask just briefly—I think we discussed that several major figures in anthropology toward the ends of their careers had given lectures at Harvard, had given talks at Harvard pretty early on in your career. I think Alfred Kroeber among them. I wonder if you could talk about that and sort of your introduction to these luminary figures. Of course, Kluckhohn dies within a span that Edward Gifford dies, Alfred Kroeber dies. Lowie dies a few years later. Many of the great early twentieth century ethnographers are at the end of their careers. Could you talk about your encounters with them?

02-00:18:04
Nader: Well, Kroeber I met at Harvard. He was invited. And I remember I think it was Vogt who left the room to get the right sound equipment or whatever he needed. And Kroeber was standing in the middle of this room and nobody was talking to him so I went over to talk to him. It was the polite thing to do. And I said something about [Morris] Swadesh, because Swadesh had just been banished, the McCarthy Committee and so on, the linguist Swadesh. And he didn't have any students, or something about him not having students. And Kroeber said, "I never learned anything from a student," which I thought was really—I was kind of surprised—he said it in a not—he just said it.

02-00:18:55
Redman: Sort of matter of fact.

02-00:18:56
Nader: Sort of matter of fact. And, of course, he was a great believer in women anthropologists. Trained a number of women anthropologists.

02-00:19:04
Redman: Although he encouraged them to move away from archeology, as with Isabel Kelly. He told her, "Be an ethnographer. Be an ethnographer. There aren't any women archeologists." And she just ignored him and did whatever the hell she wanted to do anyway, I understand.

02-00:19:15
Nader: Yes. But anyway, that was the Kroeber encounter. And, of course, he died the fall I came to Berkeley. Right. And I never met Gifford or Lowie, any of those people. I met George Foster. I met him at Harvard. Vogt invited him to Harvard to speak and then I met him when he was at the annual anthropology convention in Mexico, which is where he interviewed me for a job at Berkeley. During the meetings, at a cocktail party. That's the way it was done then. He decided he wanted to hire a woman. Cora DuBois had turned Berkeley down because of the Loyalty Oath.

02-00:19:52
Redman: I wanted to ask about that and any sort of relationship you had with Cora DuBois and what you sort of parsed out in that incident. Please go on there.

02-00:20:02
Nader: Yes. Well, Cora DuBois, when she came to Harvard, she came after I was at Harvard and she taught the anthro, the introductory course. And at Harvard they don't feel any compunction about giving negative feedback. So she said something and they didn't like it and they stamped their feet as negative feedback and she looked at the class and said, "What's the matter? Can't take it?" And then they clapped because she knew how to respond. She didn't just say, "Oh, they booed at me." There's none of this wimpy stuff we get now from professors.

02-00:20:38
Redman: It sounds like you were a great admirer of hers. But she's also in the midst of this loyalty oath controversy. That must have affected a lot of people of that just slightly earlier generation of scholars coming up.

02-00:20:54
Nader: All of this was happening unbeknownst to me, I have to say.

02-00:20:57
Redman: Sure, Yes.

02-00:20:58
Nader: Because it was domestic McCarthy stuff. I'd sort of hear about it but I was not a member of any –ist. I was not a leftist. I was not a rightist. I was raised to be an independent thinker. And if you're not connected with a party or a group of people, you don't know exactly—I heard about all this going on at Harvard. But her relationship and mine were—apart from teaching anthro three with her—she wrote the book about the Alorese, which I read from cover to cover. So it was a respect relationship. I respected her. And I can't remember, shortly before she died—somehow I remember going to see her there. And she is very cordial. Of course, she had her partner with her and it was a time when it was courageous just to be a lesbian at Harvard. So we weren't as close as the Whitings but she respected me and vice versa.

02-00:21:56
Redman: Okay, good. This is something that's been sticking in my mind. I had an anthropology professor critique when I, in a paper, talked about Boasian anthropology as having a theoretical framework. And his argument back to me was, like, well, that's precisely the opposite, is that the Boasians, that was an absence of theory. Okay. Whether or not you buy that or not, I criticize that, I think, in my mind to this day. But Kluckhohn, of course, is thinking, imagining new theories of—you might describe it as social relations. New theories on kinship and the communities, societies. I want to ask about theory and what you think of sort of the old form of ethnography. Do you think of that as sort of having an absence of theory? And in the mid-twentieth century, is there sort of an influence of theories from elsewhere that are brought into anthropology in a new more profound way or is that not an accurate way to characterize it?

02-00:23:09
Nader: I'm glad you asked that. About Boas first. Richard Handler interviewed Cliff [Clifford] Geertz and he asked him what he thought about Boas. And basically he said Boas didn't know much. And what he meant was, in quotes, he wasn't "theoretical," as a lot of Cliff's students thought. He was a graduate student when I was at Harvard. Anyway—

02-00:23:34
Redman: Cliff Geertz was?

02-00:23:34
Nader: Yes. So I think there's confusion about what theory is. Theory is not the same as philosophy. Theory either describes or explains. Philosophy is conceptual, which is different. So if you think that [Michel] Foucault is a theorist and [Jacques] Derrida and [Jacques] Lacan are all theorists, they're basically social philosophers. They work on conceptual issues which are very important eventually to theory. Now, when I was in graduate school, the reigning theory was functionalism. It was attributed to the British via Durkheim. And [Max] Weber was not considered very important. Now, people like Geertz were trained in philosophy. [Paul] Rabinow was trained in philosophy. And the philosophers, the people that had undergraduate work in philosophy rather than anthropology come at anthropology from a different point of view, which is often also foreign and often French and often totally Euro. Now, Geertz brought in Weber who wasn't French. But, still, with the exception of Weber, it's either German or French and predominantly French. And that is bizarre to me. So, for example, when one of my books was reviewed they said, "She didn't even quote Foucault."

02-00:24:56
Redman: Really? Wow.

02-00:24:58
Nader: So I shot back, "Foucault didn't quote me." An anthropologist at Rice, Dominic Boyer, wrote a paper a few years ago about this, saying that when they were interviewing at Cornell and people would come, nine out of ten mentioned Foucault. One didn't. So he said, "How come you didn't mention Foucault?" And he took it as a criticism, this kid, and he said, "I did say discourse." So there's a pressure to be PC about philosophy. Interestingly, the Foucaultians don't use [Antonio] Gramsci, who does have a theory, I think. It's not that power is everywhere, it's that power gets filtered into the people through hegemonies peddled by mainly university intellectuals. He's got a theory. With Foucault, power is everywhere. At least it brought power into the discussion in anthropology, so I'm not complaining about that. But Foucault is talking about France. So you're going to take Foucault and apply him to China? No. I mean these guys were talking about their own time and place.

02-00:26:15
Rubens: What about [Claude] Lévi-Strauss?

02-00:26:16
Nader: Well, Lévi-Strauss, he just published a book, interestingly. The last book before he died. He was in his late nineties. And Lévi-Strauss, he had a lot of imagination. A lot of interesting ideas. And when I said to Kluckhohn I wanted to go to England to study British anthropology for a year, he said, "Don't go to England, go to France. That's where the imagination is." Now, what I liked about the combination of British and French is—{Edmund} Leach writes about the implications of matrilateral cross-cousin marriage and he starts by saying, "Lévi-Strauss has all these theories that are full of baloney. A, B, C, D. But he had one idea that's really terrific and I'm going to pursue it here." Now, that's a really good way to critique. And he writes this fantastic piece. Most people don't even know what I'm talking about. Matrilateral cross-cousin marriage; implications of. It was really an amazing, amazing piece to me.

02-00:27:12
Redman: We'll get back in a moment but I do want to mention the same year as you graduate and your fieldwork is taking place in Lebanon, or around 1961, Edmund Leach is publishing *Rethinking Anthropology*, which seems to be a pretty important moment in terms of British anthropological thinking especially. We can talk about that but maybe instead I want to throw out the story of Gordon Willey. He wants you to look at settlement patterns, but eventually it becomes clear to you, and only via conversations with others at Harvard it seems to come out, that you realize that your work is really centered around the idea of social control. Can you talk about that? And in particular, sorry to use the word discourse here, but I do wonder if there is a benefit of being in a particular graduate school community? As someone interested in the history of anthropology I think one thing that we don't recognize are these hallway conversations as potentially being light bulb moments, as being moments that are really formative in our intellectual trajectories. And I wonder if that comment sort of is indicative of that? That he sort of plants a seed of this idea. And can you tell me a little bit about who he was and how that conversation might have gone.

02-00:28:33
Nader: That was John Pelzel. He was a Japan specialist, as I recall. I don't think he was full-time at Harvard because it seems to me he was sort of peripheral to Peabody but he did teach these various courses. I must have taken one from him. But he was important to me, as you say, by virtue of recognizing my focal interest before I did. And that's always very helpful. Gordon Willey was intriguing to me and the reason I did my first work on settlement patterns was because he had just written a book about settlement patterns in the new world and I liked the fact that he was doing north south archeology because again it was scope. Right? And after he retired he wrote novels and things like mystery stories or whatever. He had a wide imagination.

02-00:29:27
Redman: But that's attractive to you intellectually? Someone who is—

02-00:29:30
Nader: Yes. And the fact that when I first got to Harvard the head of the department was [Earnest] Hooton and he used to have us to tea. You'd have to come at 4:00 and leave at 5:00.

02-00:29:41
Redman: Describe him for me, if you would, Earnest Hooton.

02-00:29:44
Nader: Earnest Hooton was a biological anthropologist of the old school, skulls and all that. And he had children that were slightly off the normal. And so he was interested clearly in questions of brain and so on. Newton Hooton was one of them and Ima Hooton was another. These names, why would you name your children these names? Anyway, he was a character and he was Sherry's professor, Sherry Washburn. But he was a little more rigid. But he did have these teas where we were all supposed to come at 4:00 and leave at 5:00 and we were not to ask for sugar or cream. The rules that were passed down from one generation to another. And Newton Hooton, one of his children, usually served, helped him serve.

02-00:30:33
Redman: These are ridiculous names, they really are.

02-00:30:34
Nader: Or whatever. When [Gordon] Willey took the chair, he, instead of having tea, he said he was going to play tennis. So I'm not a great tennis player but I love to bat the ball, basically. He liked to win. So he used to say, "You're the fastest person on the court I ever played with but you don't"— I didn't play to win. I just played because I thought it was fun, I was getting some exercise.

02-00:30:59
Redman: You could hit the ball around.

02-00:31:01
Nader: He really played to win. So I thought that was another way of getting to know your students.

02-00:31:05
Redman: And some of these casual relationships were important.

02-00:31:08
Nader: I think that's what Harvard and Yale are best at. The casual relationships. Like I have a student now who's at Yale, just started a graduate program. And they have programs where they bring all of the Yale graduate students together, drinking parties and eating parties and all kinds. He knows all these people in economics and physics, the law school. When Elizabeth Colson says UC Berkeley is provincial, that's what she means.

02-00:31:35
Redman: Right, Yes. Elizabeth Colson's another female anthropologist that I want to talk about.

02-00:31:46
Nader: She became a good friend of mine when she became a professor at Berkeley. I was on the committee that hired her. She had been a graduate student of Kluckhohn's, but way before me

02-00:31:59
Redman: I see. So before we get on that, though, I do want to ask—veterans who had arrived on the GI Bill. You've described them as almost having sort of a big brother mentality in the graduate program. That's something to me is really important in the scope of the history of anthropology. When I look at the number of PhDs that are issued between 1940 and 1945, there are almost none because everybody's away at war of that generation.

02-00:32:28
Nader: That's right.

02-00:32:30
Redman: And then when they come back, one of the sort of misconceptions about the GI Bill is that everybody uses it to advance their undergraduate education when, in fact, people are going on for masters in anthropology or masters in fine arts and learning how to draw or be a photographer. But these veterans, I find them fascinating. To go to Harvard and study anthropology, what was the mentality there and what was the relationship between those students and the other students?

02-00:32:56
Nader: Well, we all interacted on the steps of Peabody. People just stood on the steps and that's where we talked very often. There was a "smoking room" downstairs that was lined with railroad cars basically. Railroad seats that apparently Hooton or somebody had designed for the railroads that they didn't want, so they brought them in and they had them lining up like this in a smoking room. Smoking room. Imagine. I remember the steps of Peabody. The smoking room was also the room you eventually had your PhD orals in.

So anyway. So the older guys were just savvy and they would just say—like one once said to me, "You want to make it in anthropology? Make sure you know the history of ideas. Then nobody can ever pull the wool over your eyes." So Geertz comes along, and the [Gordon] Marcus and [Michael] Fischer people, and they start the history of anthropology with themselves basically. You don't know they're cribbing off of whatever, which is why I teach the classic anthropology class here, classic quote, starting with Mooney in the nineteenth century. And so they can see how theory develops and how the history of anthropology develops and they're so surprised that somebody in the nineteenth century was *avant-garde*. Nineteenth century and he was smart? It's a sense of, "We must be smarter now than the nineteenth century."

02-00:34:20
Redman: Yes. There's always sort of this concept of intellectual primitivism.

02-00:34:25
Nader: Oh, Yes, absolutely.

02-00:34:26
Redman: Yes, that's fascinating. Now, do you think that that's partly the case with [Bronislaw] Malinowski? Because of the fact that he's writing in an earlier era, it's almost hard for people to imagine that he could have been forward thinking in certain aspects and they're more easily willing to dismiss it as old fashioned.

02-00:34:50
Nader: Well, even Cliff Geertz, when Malinowski's diaries came out, he attacked them. It was Cliff Geertz's attack on Malinowski's diaries which led me to think, "Who are you to be doing that?" That made me write "From Anguish to Exultation."

02-00:35:04
Redman: So I was going to ask about that at a later time but maybe we can dive into it now if that's all right. So in 1975 Cliff Geertz publishes on Malinowski's ethnographic field notes, more specifically the diaries, right, he keeps during fieldwork in the South Pacific. So as a historian who's interested in anthropology and as someone who works in places like the National Anthropological Archives or the Archives here at UC Berkeley and elsewhere, I think it's important for us to discuss this event in particular. This is in 1975, this publication. And then your response as an anthropologist that has personal papers, records, and field notes. So I'd like to hear the story of your reaction and your thoughts on the possible long-term implications that this might have for the history of anthropology in terms of records and papers and where these ideas come from.

02-00:35:52
Nader: Well, there are long-term implications because Cliff Geertz basically went to do his fieldwork on CIA money. It was MIT money, a group from MIT. But it was basically CIA money. And he was, as I say, not an anthropology undergraduate major, so he was not rooted in the field. But he was a worried about communism type guy. I don't know what kind of field notes he kept. I think the quality of his ethnography always came from his first wife, Hilly, I think. She was a very good ethnographer and I knew her, as well as him, at Harvard. I think he had a flawed character. You would have to have a flawed character to put in a footnote, or to write that about Malinowski. I'll get back to that, that half a million people were killed and not to think that that's part of your article that you should be writing about.

Half million people, it went into a footnote. But when he was writing about Malinowski, he seemed to be surprised at his emotional reaction to the Trobrianders, the native group he studied. Sometimes he liked them,

sometimes he didn't like them. You'd have to be a liar to think that you were not ambivalent when you were in the field. You're not in and you're not out and you're getting all—especially at a time when there was no globalization like we know it today and you're there by yourself. So clearly I knew, having been in the field. Sometimes I hated the Zapotecs, sometimes I admired them. And I was sick when I hated them, too. I had malaria and I had all these things that were going on. It's human. These human things that Malinowski wrote about but it was published by his widow, whom I met in Mexico. And she did it for money. So he hadn't intended to publish them. But once Cliff wrote that, then I decided I would get rid of my personal notes. So my personal, personal notes, which Kluckhohn encouraged me to do because he believed you should do this sort of thing, I got rid of because I don't want to have some Cliff Geertz come along or some CIA agent and so on. It makes you less willing to write about those things. Now it's even worse because the courts can call in your notes. So anthropologists can't keep notes anymore? How are you going to write?

02-00:38:22
Redman: Right. So rather than getting too far ahead of myself, I wonder if I could pivot back then to your fieldwork. You write both about the anxiety and the ecstasy of fieldwork.

02-00:38:38
Rubens: And the exultation.

02-00:38:40
Redman: And the ups and the downs. But also I think it would be good and important to get out there the nature of the project that you're trying to accomplish and why you found it important and then to go back on this question of settlement patterns versus power relations. So I understand you're looking at two villages. You choose the two villages for specific reasons and you go about your study from there. Could you tell us that story?

02-00:39:14
Nader: Well, yes. One of the villages was compact and bilingual. Spanish/Zapotec. The other village was dispersed. So that gave you two different kinds of settlement patterns. But the village that was dispersed was monolingual. And there was a hierarchy of relationships between the two, probably pre-Columbian. The monolingual village of Juquila had higher prestige but the bilingual village of Talea was a result of colonial behavior and the merging of people that had been called in to work for the Mayans. So the composition of that town was heterogeneous. So heterogeneous versus relatively homogeneous here. And a dislike relationship between them irrespective of civilized, being more civilized, something like that.

So I was in between. And they had never seen anything like me, in this monolingual village especially, because I was tall. I was taller than anybody in the village and I had short hair and the women had long hair. Was I a woman

or was I man or was I a combination or what was I anyway? I dared to walk between villages at night with a teenager who was accompanying me. And so this became a legend over time. Now, the first few months I was there I got sick with malaria and hepatitis because I decided to walk the whole area first before I settled on these two villages because again it has to do with scope. What's the context for all this? And the area was called the Rincon. So it was a recognized geographic area by the people there. And so I walked it. And when I went up to the village nearest to Veracruz, Yobego, that's where I got malaria. I walked. So it was a long ten to twelve hour walk, up and down and so on, and bridges that were swaying bridges, made old fashioned style, and monkeys and all kinds of things. But I was sick. I didn't know why I was sick. I just felt terrible. So when you feel terrible you think, "Why am I here? What am I doing? They're accusing me of being a missionary. What am I going to do? They're accusing me of being a missionary, I'm sick," and da-da-da-dum.

So fortunately the Papaloapan Commission, the head engineer who had dropped me at the end of the road, took me in the first time. And so he dropped me at the end of the road. I walked in with a bunch of Indians that couldn't speak Spanish. What was I doing? And then they took me to this family. I was accused suddenly of being a missionary. And there had been some deals with missionaries and houses had been burned down. The Oaxacan government had come in to punish the village and so on. So they had—

02-00:42:03
Redman: So it was a serious implication.

02-00:42:04
Nader: Very serious.

02-00:42:04
Redman: It wasn't just an annoyance to them that they might have—

02-00:42:06
Nader: No. It was a serious implication. Very serious implication. So that's the beginning of anxiety and so on. Because sickness and accusations you're a spy. And I never forget going to one village, San Juan Yaee. Nobody would talk to me. Nobody, even in the bars, would talk to me, which is unusual. And that's where you went. It was a fiesta. So some guy invited me to his house and he was drunk. And since it was the only invitation I got I went.

02-00:42:50
Redman: Wow, that's a remarkable story.

02-00:42:52
Nader: And the women in the house shrunk into the corner when they saw this guy and he said, "Drink," right. Well, he was so dead drunk that I knew that I couldn't possibly drink enough. He's going to fall over pretty soon. So when he fell over I left. I went back to the bars and I said, "How could you treat a woman visiting you like this? We'd never treat a woman in our country like

that." So basically I put them on the defense. And they said, "He doesn't even treat his father well." So they were on my side. Then the whole thing changed colors, changed colors. Well, you got to have some confidence to do—really when I think about it now I think I was very gutsy. I don't know. I was just in my mid-twenties and somehow, I don't know where I got the strength to do some of these things, but you do and you do it because you want to survive.

02-00:43:46
Redman: So there was sort of this classical ethnographic model in some sense that you were trained in. And you'd mentioned taking sort of a classic ethnography course. I wonder if reading Boas, reading Malinowski, reading E.E. Evans-Pritchard, if they gave you any misconceptions about what ethnography would be like. Never that it would be easy but that many of the sort of challenges don't appear in the final ethnographic work. We could talk about a scientism or a positivism that sort of comes out in these classic ethnographies rather than explaining the challenges.

02-00:44:31
Nader: Well, I'll tell you, big mistake in my training which led me to not be able to explain something. What they did was they trained us in archeology up until the Spaniards marched in and then they said, "Okay, now do fieldwork." And it was synchronic, not diachronic. So we didn't have ethnohistory, which is where Eric Wolf comes in. So here I was with this data and this was—I knew what the Aztecs did and all the archeology. And I had discovered something that I couldn't explain, which was harmony ideology. So you can't explain harmony ideology really unless you know that this was a result of colonization. And it took years for me to put those things together.

02-00:45:21
Redman: It's not until your article "Studying Up" that that really starts to come together for you.

02-00:45:25
Nader: Not even stud—.No, it had not much to do with studying up. It had to do with studying backwards. It had to do with what happened to these people historically. And there were a couple of historians, Chance, Norman Chance, I think, wrote about some of the history.

02-00:45:39
Redman: Yes. You mentioned Eric Wolf and the *People without History* as being a—that's an important book.

02-00:45:44
Nader: The book before that on Mexico, *Sons of the Shaking Eastern*. And the Eric Wolf book, *Europe and the People without History*, was helpful later on.

02-00:45:53
Redman: I see, Yes, Yes. So I understand that almost against the advice of your advisor, Clyde Kluckhohn, you determined that you want to go to the field and start

doing some fieldwork. I wonder if you could tell that story and then also why you felt compelled to go to the field before taking your oral qualifying examination.

02-00:46:20
Nader: No, actually, it was against the advice of the other people—

02-00:46:23
Redman: Oh, is that right?

02-00:46:24
Nader: —in the department. They all said, "No, you have to take your orals first." And Clyde Kluckhohn looked at me and he said, "Some people have to do things ass backwards. Go to the field." And I had this little grant, $1,200 grant from the Mexican government that came through the New York Institute for International Education. And $1,200 at that time was a lot, especially since all the money was going to Africa and very little of it was going to Latin America. So Clyde encouraged me to go and that was a good thing. So I then had to call home and tell my parents that I was going to go. And that was a very important thing because my father's response was, "Are you crazy? You're going to go someplace where there's no road?" and he was so upset. And I went to bed the night practically before I was leaving upset myself because that was terrible and how could he not know that that was what I was doing anyway. That was what I was about. And before I could call him back, 7:30 in the morning he called me and he said, "I want you to know the family is behind you whatever you do." That was very important. Very. I can't tell you how important that was. Because if he had really stuck to his whatever—he thought about it, he thought, "This girl's going to be in a dangerous situation. We better be behind her." So I go off to Mexico basically with the stuff on my back, very little stuff, and I get to Mexico and I look up Papa [Robert J.] Weitlaner who's the old time Austrian anthropologist, and he sort of takes me under his wing before I go to Oaxaca. He teaches me a few things about how to ask questions and so on. He was wonderful. Weitlaner. He had coffee every morning at Sanborns. Again, you're informal. And anybody who wanted to talk to him could go have a talk with him. I did a lot. And then I went to Oaxaca.

But then I had to figure out how to get up to the mountains because there was no road. There was only road to Ixtlán and a little beyond. And so I had to negotiate and find out the Papaloapan Commission, would they take me up and so on and so forth. So that took some bit of time. And meanwhile, I connected with a woman who had left the United States because of the McCarthy hearings, Lini de Vries. She had fled one night with her daughter and the reason she was on the list was because she fought in the Spanish civil war. She was a nurse who fought in the civil war in Spain.

02-00:49:00
Redman: Which was common for many American liberals.

02-00:49:01
Nader: Which was common. Apart from the fact that she was Jewish and involved in Hollywood and whatever.

02-00:49:06
Redman: Bad combination at that time, Yes.

02-00:49:07
Nader: But she was terrific. By this time she was in Oaxaca. She had a little store, a tourist store, and she was a nurse for the Papaloapan Commission up in country you cannot imagine anybody going to even on the back of a horse. [She wrote her story in *Up From the Cellar*.] But she was a wonderful woman who helped save my life when I got malaria. I didn't know what was happening at first. I was passing out. And a doctor was there to attend to a measles epidemic or something and he put me on a mule and sent me to Oaxaca. And I got to Oaxaca and I was in the hotel and I was connecting with my family. "I don't know what's the matter with me." And the cleaning lady at the hotel is mopping me up every morning because I was totally soaked in sweat and so on. And my family kept saying, "Go to the embassy in Mexico City and get a good doctor." Well, I couldn't even get down there. I crawled to Lini de Vries' little shop and she just took one look at me and said I should have known better. She put me in a cab and sent me to an army doctor and he, of course, diagnosed me immediately. And then she took me into her home and nursed me until I was better and then I went back up to the mountains.

02-00:50:24
Redman: That's a remarkable story. I wish I could stay on and on on that but I have to sort of wrap-up this tape and I want to get to the concept of harmony ideology. And I wonder if you could sort of explain or delineate the process of that idea coming to you and then also it seems to me that maybe there were some things that you were absorbing in your time at fieldwork that only became clear to you later on when you return and I wonder if maybe you could elaborate on that as sort of an intellectual phenomenon. I think that that may be fairly common, actually, for an anthropologist to be enmeshed in something and then once they return home and have a moment to digest their field notes and experiences, other things may become clear.

02-00:51:04
Nader: Well, harmony ideology. Of course, when I got there, there was so big a problem of studying two villages that I had to do something. And Ralph was at the Harvard Law School and he wrote and he said, "Collect law cases." So I made a deal with the secretary of Talea to please collect the cases in some detail for me. And he collected some sixty cases in one month. And, of course, Ralph was in a law school that was teaching adversarial law at that time. And I was in looking at these cases which were basically give a little, get a little harmony. And so I thought, "Well, this is kind of interesting." And that was in the back of my mind because there was a contrast. And, besides, my father used to take his own cases to court. He wasn't a lawyer. He'd had about a

third grade formal education but he was a visionary and very smart man. And he used to take his own cases because he could do better than the lawyer at arguing the case. So here I was sitting watching these people come in and they said, “You did and you did.” And the man behind the desk said, “Well, you’re wrong and you’re wrong and you both should pay a fine. You five pesos and you ten pesos because you should know better,” or whatever.

02-00:52:12
Redman: Now one of the formulations that becomes clear, and you explain this later in your work but I think it’s probably clear by this point. Maybe this is something that’s become exasperated. But the disconnect in modern American society from the average citizen to the legal system. You mentioned that the average citizen has to hire a lawyer to navigate the legal system. They don’t understand it. Whereas the people that you’re watching sort of go into the court, everyday people who are settling disputes in the setting and that seems quite different and may be surprising.

02-00:52:47
Nader: That was the hope for small claims courts when they first started. But, in fact, small claims courts, there isn’t even one in Berkeley now. So it’s moved to Hayward or Oakland or something and it’s not an issue. But that was a notion, to bring these small claims into this kind of familiar, even urban place like Berkeley. And so we did a study of Berkeley and Oakland small claims courts when I came back here. The importance of the cases. I was one of the first people in anthropology of law to collect cases and analyze them and that was the talk I gave at Berkeley when I was asked to give a talk when I first came here, was the analysis of Zapotec law cases. Numerical analysis. Worked it out. And that’s where my linguistic anthropology came in handy for the categories. It was very useful. And, of course, that was the 1960s. We were having all kinds of confrontations in the court with the Civil Rights Movement starting and all the different movements and then there was the backlash on the movement, which I don’t think you want to get into now but we can because that was when I was invited to [Chief] Justice [Warren] Burger’s conference in Minneapolis and that was where they launched the alternative dispute resolution program in this country.

02-00:54:05
Rubens: I think so. So how long were you in the field?

02-00:54:10
Nader: I was in the field the first time nine months. And then three months the following year. And then almost every year after that I went to visit for a short and sometimes long period of time.

02-00:54:21
Redman: Just briefly, can you connect as an anthropologist—that extended stay is remarkable and as an historian I can sort of echo—to be able to spend nine months in an archive is a similar sort of joy. But I wonder if then the returning

visits, can you articulate for us sort of the purpose, the aim of those? Do you go back with particular questions in mind or when you sort of have a chance to unpack and digest the things that you've discovered in the initial fieldwork? Can you describe sort of the purpose of those follow-up visits?

02-00:54:52
Nader: Yes. I always went back with another question in mind or further. For example, I didn't have any data on the district court and clearly some cases were going from Talea to the district court and so I had to understand that. So that was one reason I went back. And then I had to understand what was happening with the road and how the road influenced the number of cases and the kinds of cases that came into the court. So the difference between now and then is my students can't get immersed like I did because they go to Bolivia and they're there with the missionaries and the same with the human rights people, with the companies. Everybody's there now. And if I were to go back to Talea that would be quite different because of the kinds of people that are there. The mining engineers from Canada that are in that area now. That was really immersion and I think it is similar to your immersion in the archives because there's nobody but you and the archives. But now it's not that way in the field.

02-00:55:54
Rubens: So to wrap up this part of your history, you come back and prepare for and then take your exams?

02-00:56:00
Nader: Yes.

02-00:56:04
Redman: And then what's sort of the reaction to your dissertation work as you finalize it? If there's anything else that you'd like to describe at Harvard. But I think sort of the final question maybe could be the reaction to these ideas now that you're coming out with in the field and as you work them up.

02-00:56:21
Nader: Well, of course, because I had my own data I could now relate to all the stuff I've read. So I was much more comfortable with the materials that I was reading and reporting on and talking about in my orals. And I did have a hard time. I was having a hard time sort of getting my dissertation going. And the best thing that Kluckhohn said to me that I've said to my students also is—he knew I was agonizing over finishing it. And he said to me, "I hope it's not the best thing you ever do." Because PhD students think that this has got to be their *magnum opus* and he just liberated me by saying that. On the other hand it's interesting because the seeds of what was to come were very much in that thesis. The comparison, for example. I've always been one that kept on to a different kinds of comparison when the field dropped comparison. So I wrote *Comparative Consciousness* later on and now I'm doing this book, *What the Rest Think of the West* and so on. It's a comparison, right. A different kind

than controlled comparison. Now, when I was in my orals, I was asked about Talcott Parsons. And it was interesting because I remember saying something like, “I could read Talcott Parsons essays because they were about something but his other stuff I didn’t like at all and I didn’t understand a lot of it. And it was gobbledygook from my point.” So I clearly had an idea of jargon early on. I don’t like jargon and I wanted my parents to be able to read what I wrote.

02-00:57:58
Redman: That’s a very interesting idea.

02-00:57:58
Nader: And actually my girls, especially, think I’m academic in my writing and I’m criticized in academia for writing too clearly and not being theoretical enough or whatever. *Controlling Processes*, my colleagues don’t think it’s theory because they probably don’t read Gramsci in the first place. And so what is theory became an interesting question. So every time I come across somebody who sort of says, “You’re not—“it’s a challenge. So it is anxiety and anguish, et cetera, but that’s what made it interesting. And the recent happening here in our department, where we’re now in receivership with somebody from the history department coming in to do whatever she’s going to do for it, has nothing to do with her. It has to do with intolerance for debate. That our department has always been arguing with each other. We’ve never had consensus in this department. All of a sudden the fifty year olds want consensus or the administration wants consensus? That closes down debate.

02-00:59:03
Rubens: So next week we’ll begin discussing your first years at Berkeley. But in fact, when you left Harvard, you haven’t completed your dissertation, is that right?

02-00:59:11
Nader: No, I came to Berkeley and I hadn’t completed it. I didn’t complete it until the following spring.

Interview 2: June 14, 2013

Audio File 3

03-00:00:01
Rubens: We'd like to start talking about your first years at Berkeley and how you find the department and then start this amazingly productive decade of research and publication. But I first I want to share a quote from George Foster's oral history about why he hired you, after meeting you in Mexico City at the anthropology convention in l959. He says, "I guess I was just struck by her strong personality. She loved the field," meaning field research, "as I do. When she described what she went through in Mexico to get to the field I thought, 'This is a really tough woman.' I've often thought Laura can take satisfaction in her appointment in that she was not the best woman available, she was the best anthropologist available. We could have hired a man just as easily. There was no question of anything like today's equality opportunity employment requirements." It's just a wonderful evocation of you and I wondered if we should just contrast it for one minute. Was Kluckhohn supportive of you going out to a major institution? I thought I had read that he had suggested you consider Bennington.

03-00:01:26
Nader: No. He didn't think that Berkeley would hire a woman, especially because they had been rejected by Cora DuBois. So he said—

03-00:01:36
Rubens: She didn't want to have to sign the Loyalty Oath.

03-00:01:38
Nader: Right. And he knew that I had gotten a letter from Bennington. And I said, "Why would you want to send me to Bennington? You'd bury me there." And that was after I had been interviewed by a University of California person from Santa Barbara. I don't know that I mentioned that.

03-00:01:57
Rubens: No.

03-00:01:57
Nader: But I walked into the room and he had his feet on the desk facing me, which I thought was not very nice, and as I sat down he threw some papers across the table, and he said, "I suppose you know the University of California pays the best salaries in the country." And I just picked it up and threw it back at him and I said, "I suppose you know we're not in this for the money." Needless to say I didn't get that job. But then we had this conversation with Kluckhohn when he said, "The University of California? They'd never hire a woman."

03-00:02:25
Rubens: But in fact they did. So how do you feel assuming your position? Are you nervous? Are you excited? Are you—

03-00:02:38
Nader: My sister and I drove across country, and my colleague in psychology then, Susan Ervin-Tripp, had found an apartment for me in the same building she lived in. So basically I was really—that was wonderful. So we arrived, and there it was, this apartment that wasn't—no furniture in it. But we went and got what we needed. And she stayed with me a month, my sister, until my birthday at the end of the month and then after that she went back home. So that was a wonderful way to come.

And, of course, the department entertained her and me and so forth. They were very sociable at that time.

03-00:03:16
Rubens: Well, I want to ask you about that. You come in as an acting assistant professor, I guess, because you needed to complete your dissertation?

03-00:03:24
Nader: I'm not sure why, but, in fact, they wanted me to give a talk at the end of the first month so that they could change the acting to regular assistant professor. And I said, "That's too early. I'm too busy teaching. Can we do it in the spring?" And so that kind of surprised them because they were asking me to do something and why wouldn't I just do it because they're the boss and I'm not. But then they decided anyway, without my talk, to move me to assistant professor.

03-00:03:54
Rubens: So they liked you.

03-00:03:56
Nader: Well, they were very supportive. They really were extremely supportive. And, as I say, I had three experiences with male faculty in this department. I had the senior faculty that hired me that were so supportive, and I can't tell you, and they opened doors for me.

03-00:04:14
Rubens: This would be Foster and Washburn?

03-00:04:14
Nader: Foster, Sherry Washburn, Ted McCown, mainly those people. And then, of course, the next generation were my peers, with whom there was competition, at least on their end.

03-00:04:28
Rubens: Did anyone else come in at the same time as you?

03-00:04:30
Nader: No. [Eugene] Hammel came in the year after but he had been a PhD student here, so that was different. And there weren't that many people. There were about fifteen people and the department was starting to grow. So it was optimistic. It wasn't like this is a downturn. It was an upturn.

03-00:04:48
Rubens: Well, I want to see how you might characterize how the department set in the academic world. Foster says that it was really his intent to build up this department and that he hired senior faculty as well. He had brought in Washburn. He had also had to deal with the exit of three social—

03-00:05:12
Nader: Cultural people.

03-00:05:13
Rubens: —cultural anthropolist Geertz, Fallers, Schneider, who all left Berkeley at once and went to the University of Chicago

03-00:05:19
Nader: They all went to Chicago but they were—Geertz was only here one year. And Fallers—whatever the reason, they did all leave at the same time. So some of the graduate students said, "We lost Geertz, Fallers, and Schneider and we got this lady from Harvard?" So they weren't as happy as the senior faculty to see me here. So that was an isolating factor. And then I was so young. I was twenty-nine.

03-00:05:44
Rubens: Sure, of course. Well, what did you teach? Were you expected to fill in?

03-00:05:48
Nader: Well, they assigned me courses. They assigned me John Rowe's course, the archeologist. They assigned me South American Indians, about which I was not a specialist, but Rowe was very kind. He gave me all of his notes for when he had taught it. And then I had to teach law and politics. Later on it was divided, law in one course, and politics. And I teach a course on the Middle East. And I can't remember what else I taught that first year. But it was really, you know, it was a heavy teaching load.

03-00:06:20
Rubens: Sure. And no time off for completing the dissertation?

03-00:06:22
Nader: No, I just had to do it. I did it by the end of the year. But the other part was the classes were large. So South American Indians was packed downstairs. They were not small classes. And they were large compared to today, the same courses, should they be taught. Our enrollment has gone down. But I had a style of teaching that was sort of tough. And I remember Sherry Washburn taking me aside and saying, "This is not Harvard. These are kids that are coming from working class families and many of them work and you really can't—you really have to be a little more gentle with them," and so on. I said, "But we have to keep up to standards." So years later this South American Indian class, right, I'm boarding a plane, San Francisco Airport, and this woman comes up behind me and she says, "Professor Nader?" And I said, "Yes." She said, "I took your South American Indians course in 1961," or whatever. And I said, "Oh, really?" She said, "And you read my midterm

exam as a way of never answering questions, good questions. It was a bad exam." I said, "Did I say your name?" She said, "No." I said, "Well, at least I didn't do that" She said, "I just want you to know I have two daughters and they both have PhDs." So sometimes when you're tough it's a challenge. And you want to be fair, but I didn't want to say, "These are not Harvard students; therefore, I'm not going to treat them as if they had as smart a brain."

03-00:08:10
Redman: I heard an anecdote about a graduate seminar very early on where—this was a seminar, an introductory seminar for the first year students where apparently faculty would take turns introducing general fields. And apparently you were expecting interaction and engagement with the students in the graduate seminar and in this one particular seminar the students sat there like bumps on a log, long enough to the point where you became disgusted, I understand, and walked out and said, "If you're not going to participate, I don't need to be here." Do you remember anything like that?

03-00:08:52
Nader: I don't remember that. It's conceivable.

03-00:08:57
Redman: The same person told me that the same cohort came to find you to be one of the best and most popular professors, despite the sort of terrifying start that they had for not participating. And they learned a valuable lesson there. Can you talk about what you expected from your students in graduate seminars and what that was all about and maybe shed a little light on that anecdote.

03-00:09:24
Nader: Well, I think that's where my father comes in, because he would ask us questions at the dinner table and he'd say, "If you don't have the answer, do you have a question?" You had to participate, period, and especially in a university. My goodness, you're here at Berkeley. Well, now, one of the reasons why students sit passively is they're taught to sit passively by some professors and I didn't want to teach them that. And I wanted them to learn to speak up because they've got good minds and they have opinions. So what's wrong with opinions? I want them to voice their—and then I could teach them about evidence. If you got an opinion, what's your evidence? So that was a way of dialoguing. Teaching by dialoguing.

03-00:10:07
Rubens: But you were finding the students here more passive compared to Harvard?

03-00:10:11
Nader: Yes. We were trained at Harvard to speak up. Not that we did necessarily, but we were expected.

03-00:10:20
Rubens: Yes. I think the expectation here was much more of passive recipient. It'll change. The Free Speech Movement certainly encouraged students to speak up.

03-00:10:31
Nader: Yes. When I would ask a student a question in some of my classes, I remember one fellow saying, "I don't like to speak in class." I said, "You don't have to like it. Just do it." So the whole notion that you only do what you like to do and so on, I was challenging.

03-00:10:53
Rubens: So if you don't mind, let me just first finish the question about how you found the department in terms of its substantive recognition.

03-00:11:08
Nader: Well, the department was famous because of Kroeber. He was the dean of American anthropology and he was still alive when I came. He was in Paris and that's where he died. But the department's reputation really sat on Kroeber and Lowie, two distinguished members of anthropology and, of course, the fact that they were in California, farther away from all the Ivy League anthropology. But they had already something, you know, Berkeley.

03-00:11:34
Redman: Can you describe the reaction that the department had when the news came that Kroeber had passed away in Paris?

03-00:11:41
Nader: Well, I just remember that it was sad. [Robert] Heizer was another person that was very supportive of me and he would often come in and talk about the history of the department and talk about Kroeber, because he was very close to Kroeber. And, of course, Krakie [Theodora Kracaw] was still alive and she was here, Kroeber's widow. And so, of course, she was part of the social scene as well at that time and she had not yet remarried. Well, she remarried years later to a man who was very much younger than she was.

03-00:12:11
Rubens: And so with the hiring of Washburn and a couple others, it seemed that it was really preeminent. I guess Chicago was its closest competitors. Chicago, Columbia, Harvard. So you knew you were at a first rate place.

03-00:12:26
Nader: Oh, yes.

03-00:12:27
Rubens: Did you feel pressure? Were these classes anxiety producing for you or did you just tackle them?

03-00:12:33
Nader: No. If I had come from Podunk State I might have felt that but I didn't. So I didn't. I felt it was the same as Harvard. Until Sherry gave me that speech about students here are poorer and so on and so forth.

03-00:12:51
Rubens: What about your relationship? How would you characterize it specifically with Foster? Were you a protégé of him, would you say, or—?

03-00:13:01
Nader: No, I think it was the opposite. He liked people who were his—what's the word? Not quite protégé because I didn't study with him. He liked affiliation. And I think he would have liked it at the beginning if I was, but I was too independent. And he said that apparently at various times.

03-00:13:31
Rubens: Right. That he admired that.

03-00:13:33
Nader: Well, he did admire it, but then on the other hand, if you're Foster, he's sort of paternalist.

03-00:13:41
Rubens: That's the word I was looking for.

03-00:13:42
Nader: And I didn't want to be under anybody's umbrella. So all of his students were basically under his umbrella. May Diaz was hired here because of him and [Jack] Potter was hired because of him and so forth. Hammel was hired because of him. But I was independent. And so I would say that the people who stopped in the office on the way home, Foster was not one of the major people. They were Sherry Washburn, Ted McCown, Bob Heizer. Interestingly, not a one was a social cultural anthropologist. But they all used to stop in because I was always working late. And we'd say a few things and then they'd go off.

03-00:14:21
Rubens: What about Duane Metzger? At what point do you link up with him?

03-00:14:27
Nader: Well, at Harvard because he was a Harvard fellow. He was from the University of Chicago but he was a Harvard fellow and he worked in Chiapas. So we met at Harvard and that's when we got interested in doing this comparative paper. He eventually goes to Irvine with Kim Romney. He hooks up with Kim Romney and goes to Irvine. He might have even been at Stanford before Irvine.

03-00:15:01
Redman: One of the things that has come up a couple of times that might be a good sort of thing. There's a cohort of scholars that comes in roughly around this 1960.

You've mentioned the department was expanding and that enrollments were growing. It might be a good idea to just explain why. Sort of why were more people going to the university? What sort of added to that environment? What sort of made that environment? I understand they needed to hire more faculty because these enrollments, as you said, were growing and growing.

03-00:15:31
Nader: Right. I think it probably was benefitted by World War II and the role of anthropologists in World War II. [Ruth] Benedict and [Margaret] Mead and all the anthropologists that went to Washington, without jobs even, to help with the war effort. And so they thought that, "Oh, anthropologists are useful." They told us about Yap. Schneider was stationed in Yap in the Pacific and they didn't know anything about the Pacific but there we were in the Pacific. So I think they thought anthropology would be useful. And, besides, the Cold War was looking up. And it burgeoned all over the country. In addition, there was the G.I. Bill and the veterans returning to school.

03-00:16:08
Rubens: You'll later write about "The Phantom Factor"—

03-00:16:11
Nader: Yes.

03-00:16:12
Rubens: —in *The Cold War and the University*. It's a very compelling piece, and we'll have to talk about it.

03-00:16:15
Redman: Before we ask about the Cold War—maybe that's the next logical question. But this is the first time we've really—well, maybe we have to briefly mention Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead. But I wonder if we could have just a brief sort of—we'll ask about them again, I'm sure. But your early sort of relationship to them. I know you and Margaret Mead are occasionally listed on some of the same lists and you occasionally cite her work and I'm sure she engaged with you in a similar way. How would you characterize your initial meetings with them or your early relationship?

03-00:16:53
Nader: Well, Ruth Benedict I never met with. I can't remember—

03-00:16:55
Redman: She was older.

03-00:16:56
Nader: I think she died. I think she was not living then. But her *Patterns of Culture* was a bestseller, I think. That was the number one bestseller of any anthropology book.

03-00:17:05
Redman: And then, of course, *Chrysanthemum and the Sword* is the World War II book.

03-00:17:08
Nader: Exactly. Mead, we overlapped in different places, but it was also the fact that she basically adored my brother Ralph. So they overlapped in questions having to do with science and technology and she was a commentator on something that he was invited to give at the Washington, DC Anthropological Society where she challenged him. He was talking about why anthropologists can't study up and so forth. So that was their interaction. And she cared about what he thought about her. And when I would see her at the meetings, if she's read something of mine she would say—at first I'd think, "She doesn't know which Nader I am because Claire and I look alike." And then when she said, "I liked your paper in the [James] Spradley volume," and I knew she'd read it. This was about professional ethics. [see Nader, 1976 C; 42 on Nader Bibliography] And then we were on a committee at the National Academy of Sciences together. And she's a very powerful presence.

And then when I was on the Council of Scholars of the Library of Congress and we were going through her papers after she passed away. And we were going to have an exhibit [commemorating the hundredth year since her birth] and it was going to open at the end of 2001. After September 11, everyone was in a panic. The exhibit was going to be in one of the big rooms at the Library of Congress. And then all of a sudden they just shut it down and said it would be in a tiny little dinky room about this big because it was a danger to the security of the American people. So I was invited to go and address the opening of this teeny-weeny exhibit by this time, wondering why on earth is she controversial, Margaret Mead who cooperated with the war effort and all of that. And there were two reasons that I could see. One, she was a civil rights advocate, and there she was with a black writer, her picture and so on. And the other had to do with women's rights. And apparently that was seen to be controversial, and a threat to American security!

03-00:19:30
Redman: Last question on Mead and ethics. We talked about Malinowski and people revisiting his fieldwork. *Coming of Age in Samoa*, that has, of course, been revisited many times and that's something that a lot of anthropologists use as an access point to sort of just talk about anthropological efforts and lots of questions in anthropology. Can you describe your views on that conversation as it's evolved?

03-00:19:58
Nader: Well, when she died, of course, then this Australian anthropologist Derek Freeman, wrote a book about her work and he criticized her heavily.

And I was asked to review the book for the *Los Angeles Times*. Of course, it was a big hoo-ha. You're attacking Margaret Mead after she was dead? All of

a sudden the profession wanted to defend her and so on, where I think that before they hadn't appreciated her, and not for what she did. In fact, Cliff Geertz said she wasn't important in an interview that someone had with him. He didn't think Boas was important either. Didn't know how to think, he said. (This interview with Cliff Geertz is really amazing.) Anyway, so I reviewed Freeman's book for the *L.A. Times*. Before it came out, Burton Benedict had told me that this man was unstable. But I had already sent the review in in which I sort of challenged the way he did it after she died, after the fact, so to speak. And I was in my office and I looked up and there was this man standing there and I was rather shocked. He said, "And do you know who I am?" And I said, "Yes, you're Derek Freeman." And he said, "And do you think I'm right?" at which point the telephone rings and a graduate student walks in. And I think, "Thank God." We had a short exchange but at the end he said, "Sherry Washburn wouldn't talk to me and Elizabeth Colson wouldn't talk to me. I thank you for this talk," or something like that. And then Sherry told me, "Don't ever answer anything he ever sends you," because he will take two words out and three words and he'll make it all up and so on. And after that, when the *Los Angeles Times* piece came up he kept writing me. "Recant, recant," he said, that I was wrong in the assessment. "Recant." And I never, ever answered him. Then a guy he knows in LA started writing to Ralph and saying, "Your sister should take back what she said about him and Margaret Mead." And clearly just kind of mentally unstable. Apparently, he'd been in and out of mental care.

03-00:22:19

Redman: So you think with time her work will in many respects be revitalized by a clear assessment of—

03-00:22:27

Nader: Well, it still hasn't happened, I think, because all of a sudden anthropologists decided they had to go for European social philosophers and they thought that philosophy was theory and she wasn't theoretical enough. And besides, she was XY and Z. Whatever reason. She was public. And at that time it was not considered—it's still not really considered right to be public. How public is public. If you talk to the hoi polloi—which is very bizarre. This country is bizarre on its attitude of professors speaking to the public compared to any country in the world. Latin America, they put their lives on the line to go out and tell the truth to the people and so on. We're very conservative in that regard.

03-00:23:13

Rubens: Yes. You make that point in your 2000 Distinguished Lecture, that it's incumbent upon -the point is really a call to arms--- anthropologists to make their work accessible to the public.

03-00:23:24

Nader: Yes. We're paying for it.

03-00:23:25
Rubens: I wanted to know if you had anything to do with Elizabeth Colson coming to the university. She comes in ’64. And I know you become quite close with her.

03-00:23:37
Nader: Yes. Well, Colson was at Brandeis when I was at Harvard and she used to see me coming in and out of Peabody Museum or the library where she would go and she took Thayer Scudder, who was one of my colleagues at Harvard, to the field with her. So she sort of was aware of me more than I was aware of her, perhaps. I just knew that there was this woman, Elizabeth Colson. And then at Brandeis, she was chair when Kathleen Gough was fired. And one of the reasons for firing her, of course, was a political thing. But one of the reasons they gave for firing her was she wasn’t a good teacher. And Elizabeth knew she was a good teacher and she was willing to quit on the basis of that rather than the politics. So she avoided the politics. She quit Brandeis. She was hired for one year at Northwestern but then basically she didn’t have a job.

So I think it was Bill Bascom, who was head of the museum and worked in Nigeria, who suggested we should offer her a job. And so I was part of that meeting. She came to Berkeley in 1964. And, of course, it was really wonderful to have a senior woman colleague who had no fear of speaking up. She had a style that basically, in faculty meetings, toned down the exchanges. So they wouldn’t scream at each other or anything. We’re a contentious department, for which I love. But she sort of changed the style of our faculty meetings just by her presence, which was interesting.

03-00:25:40
Rubens: And then she becomes a lifelong friend, someone who reads your work. You read her work.

03-00:25:46
Nader: Yes.

03-00:25:47
Rubens: It seems like quite a lovely relationship. You went on walks together, too. There was a—

03-00:25:52
Nader: Yes, we went on lots of walks. Tilden Park and down by the Bay and so on. At least once a week.

03-00:25:57
Rubens: It’s quite a wonderful introduction you write to her oral history. And you dedicated your book *The Disputing Process: Law in Ten Societies* to her.

Now I was wondering also at this time, we're just up to about '64, there's so much else to talk about. But were you making any relationships, connections outside the department? How did you know Herma Hill Kay at the law school.

03-00:26:18
Nader: There was a meeting of new faculty that Berkeley faculty wives held. We met there and, "Oh, you teach here?" "Yes, I teach here." "We should get together." And then I said, "I'm teaching law." And so we began this exchange and we taught together for a while. But before we did much of that, because this was '63, '64, I suggested we go to the Center [Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences] together to develop what was in my mind, which was this Berkeley Village Law Project.

03-00:26:49
Rubens: Okay, that was already in your mind.

03-00:26:51
Nader: And it was clearly influenced by Whiting's *Six Cultures: Study of Child Rearing*.

03-00:26:56
Rubens: Yes, we talked about that study last week. And so could you just apply to the Center? It wasn't that they came to you or—

03-00:27:05
Nader: Now you apply. At the time you were invited. But you were nominated by somebody who had been at the Center. That's where the support of the senior faculty was very important and I think probably it was Sherry who nominated me there. He was very encouraging.

03-00:27:25
Redman: Before we talk about your year at the Center, I wonder if I could ask about two influences. So Levi-Strauss and structuralism. So I understand there's a '49 publication, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. And then '58, *The Structural Anthropology* is translated into English in '63. And then I want to add there that in the early sixties there are these Cambridge conferences that start to pop-up, arguably leading to more interaction and engagement between the American anthropologists and the British anthropologists. Can you comment a little on the French school, the British school? Is there a fading sort of German influence or to what extent are those things coming in waves?

03-00:28:12
Nader: Well, I think Durkheim influenced the British a lot as a French anthropologist, sociologist. But what was most important about Levi-Strauss was Leach's use of Levi-Strauss's ideas to do really good comparative work and Edmund Leach did a study, matrilateral cross-cousin marriage study, in which he was basing it on some of the ideas out of Levi-Strauss. But he did it elegantly. He's a mathematician engineer first, Leach. Different from Levi-Strauss. But he knew a good idea when he saw it. And he knew that all of our ideas

weren't necessarily good but all you needed were one or two. So he ran with that one. So basically my understanding of people like Levi-Strauss was less direct than it was indirect through people like Edmund Leach because my own taste is not philosophical, particularly, and he was doing an empirical piece of research, whereas Levi-Strauss was doing the conceptual work, which is important. But I was more attracted to the actual application. Of course I had read Levi-Strauss's *Triste Tropique*.

03-00:29:30

Rubens: I wanted to just continue a thread regarding your acculturation at Berkeley. Are you also reaching out and making connections to people in the sociology department? I'm thinking particularly of Reinhard Bendix, who will be interested in law, and Erving Goffman, when he was here, was so—

03-00:29:48

Nader: Yes, Erving Goffman, first month I was here had a party for all the social scientists at Berkeley. He lived in this big house on the hill, up in the hills. And that's when I met him. So he didn't stay much longer after that. He went to the University of Pennsylvania. I can't remember exactly why. But while he was here he was very sociable. He got us all together. Now, what got me in the same room with Reinhard Bendix was the Kroeber Anthropological Society. They had a pattern of meeting once a month in a faculty home and the time that they invited Bendix happened to be in my home. And he would come and give a talk. And the students, graduate students—it was really a wonderful kind of thing which we don't do anymore. Either the KAS [Kroeber Anthropological Society] or the graduate students are too busy. I don't know. I don't know why.

03-00:30:40

Redman: Let me ask about that. One of the things that I was told was that there were these informal sort of gatherings at faculty homes and that they were very pleasant occasions for interacting and engaging and that your home was a not infrequent, you might say, location for these to take place. Can you describe any memories of that and how that came about and your sort of feelings about that?

03-00:31:06

Nader: Well, I think informal exchange is very important, as did George Foster. So he did a lot of this, [Alan] Dundes did a lot, I did a lot of it. And when I got tired Nancy Scheper-Hughes picked it up. But very few people do it. Very few faculty today. And not only that, the student behavior when they're invited has changed. I think the last time I had students to dinner—they're like they're not raised well or something.

03-00:31:36

Rubens: They're not helping with the preparation and cleanup?

03-00:31:39
Nader: Yes. I had fish, I think, or chicken. Oh, I can't remember what. But I was trying to be—and this woman said, "I don't eat meat." Can you imagine saying that, and I had just worked hard to put this dinner together? So I said, "Well, it's a good thing there are vegetables on the table, so help yourself. The same woman, when it came to tea or coffee, she said, "I don't have white sugar, I only have brown sugar." I said, "Well, I guess you'll just have to have it without sugar," or whatever it was. But the presumption was it was a restaurant and I was being treated like the cook of the restaurant. So then I said, "No, I don't want to have these. I don't want to do this anymore for seminars where I don't know who they are."

03-00:32:27
Rubens: There was one other social gathering. There used to be a dinner with Stanford's department of anthropology.

03-00:32:32
Nader: Absolutely. Every year. We went down there once and they came up here. And the idea of going to Stanford now to share a dinner with the faculty would never enter anybody's head. It was a Bay Area thing.

03-00:32:44
Rubens: Yes, San Francisco—

03-00:32:44
Nader: I think San Francisco State was involved also. Sometimes we ate at Spenger's and then we went. But we also had sociable occasions with the faculty down there. We used to go back and forth. No more.

03-00:32:57
Rubens: The department got too big?

03-00:32:58
Nader: No, I just think people somehow got less sociable. I heard a rather prejudiced explanation of this by a professor of chemistry. He said, "When you let the hoi polloi into the university," he said, "then you don't have the sociability that you had before." That was his explanation.

03-00:33:19
Rubens: Well, do you think all the social issues that started to emerge in the sixties and the—

03-00:33:24
Nader: People were pulled in different directions. There was the drug question. There was a faculty member who I won't mention, who is no longer here, but took an early retirement and took a job someplace else. And he'd have us to his house for parties and things. But they were smoking marijuana. And if you didn't smoke marijuana—actually, marijuana, when I used to go with my husband, we were neither one of us smoking marijuana. But marijuana doesn't make you sociable. So it was odd. I used to think that drugs made you

sociable, like alcohol, but it wasn't like alcohol. So maybe the drug thing was a divide. Maybe the fact that there were "ists," the right-wingers, left-wingers. The divide was different, came about differently. Although during the sixties and seventies we had the best faculty meetings and the most extreme right-wing in our department was left of everybody in political science.

03-00:34:23
Redman: Let me ask one question about—gosh, there were so many things that were really interesting that come out of that question. Is this the right time, do you think, to talk about going from sociability sort of off campus to the issue of the Faculty Club on campus? I would love to hear your story of your relationship to the Faculty Club and the Women's Faculty Club on campus and how that evolved for you from the time you started.

03-00:34:55
Nader: Well, it's actually a short answer to that because I was a member of the Women's Faculty Club because I thought that was important. But you could eat at the Men's Faculty Club and check it off. And I didn't believe in merging. It was a time during the women's movement where everybody was merging everything. The gym was being merged. Everything was being merged, and I thought, "That's the way to kill women's culture," because you merged and the dominant culture is going to be *his*. So in fact they tried to merge the Men's Faculty Club and the Women's Faculty Club and the first thing the manager did on Monday morning was to come over and take our dishes. And by the end of that week we were divorced. Now we still have the Women's Faculty Club, which a lot of the men like better than the Men's Faculty Club. But it's the Women's Faculty Club. But that mania for merging as something that was supposed to be good for feminism was just nonsense. I enjoyed the gym. I don't like to go over to the gym now and see all these guys walking around half bare. Why would I want to do that, especially since some of them are my students. So I don't go there.

[Editorial addition: When I first came to Berkeley, the Men's Faculty Club did not allow women to walk through the big center room in order to get to the rooms at the other side. When we had a meeting on that side, we had to climb through the windows to get to the meeting. Barbara Armstrong, who was a law professor, put an end to that discrimination.]

03-00:36:15
Redman: I wonder then if I could switch to the question of publication and then we'll get off of this and then probably return to it. One of your first major publications, based on your dissertation work, it comes out in part of the University of California Anthropology Series. This is the *Talea and Juquila: A Comparison of Zapotec Social Organization*, in 1964. Why is it published there and tell me the story of anthropological publication in that era and disseminating of ideas. If you have an ethnography that you've typed up, how do you share it? How do you show it to the world and how does that process work in the 1960s? It's clearly very different today.

03-00:37:03
Nader: Yes. Well, I think that series, which was a very important series, which some of the faculty of my age later on didn't really appreciate the importance of because they wanted to get things published in more highly rated places—that was to make sure that the ethnography got out and that there wasn't too much delay and so forth. And it was a wonderful series and we had Anne Brower as the editor. Grace Buzaljko came after Anne. But we had to support—part of that came out of our budget and later on they said, "No, let's not do that. Let's get rid of the editor and let's use that money to support someone who helps us with computers." I said, "You can get money for computers, they want to push computers. Why use our money for computers?" I was voted down. There was this computer mania and so on.

And the whole notion of moving away from California and California publications. But it was really a wonderful thing. The interesting thing about that is it was reviewed. My work was reviewed. They said it wasn't written in a professional enough language and I was devastated because I write very clearly, I think. My children think it's still academic. But I write clearly comparatively. And Anne Brower said to me, "When Kroeber is read blind—" they always say that, not written in a professional enough style. And if you read Kroeber, he was a beautiful writer. Absolutely beautiful. I wish I could write like Kroeber.

03-00:38:41
Redman: But he was criticized for the same thing.

03-00:38:45
Nader: Yes.

03-00:38:47
Rubens: I just want to acknowledge that you had already written many reviews of books before that and then you had the essay with Duane Metzger on conflict resolution in two Mexican communities. That's in *American Anthropology*. That was a very important piece.

03-00:39:07
Nader: Yes. That was very important. One, it was comparative and clearly I was setting out on a comparative path. And it was part of the movement to do a certain kind of comparison, which was called controlled comparison, which later on was just totally boohooed by anthropologists who didn't want to do comparison anymore, they just wanted to do their sort of relativism, and all that had come in. So there was a move against comparison compared to what was happening in the fifties and sixties with the Human Relations Area Files at Yale and so forth. Cross-cultural studies at Harvard and elsewhere and there was really a move against it. But I, to this day, am a comparativist. But I think there are different kinds of comparison. I don't do controlled comparison anymore because I think it's an illusion that it really is controlled. But I do what I call comparative consciousness. So that was the beginning there.

Duane Metzger. Then my *Talea and Juquila,* which was a comparison. Then the *American Anthropologist,* Special Issue: The Ethnography of Law on Law, which I edited, that was rather amazing when I think back on it. A special issue, and I was only four years out of my PhD.

03-00:40:26
Rubens: Nineteen sixty-five, right.

03-00:40:26
Nader: So they were open to it, to doing that. A special issue on the anthropology of law, which basically developed partly while I was at the Center for Advanced Study in Palo Alto. So there was kind of a boost there. And we didn't have post-docs in those days but a Center year was like a post-doc.

03-00:40:46
Rubens: And would that be unusual to go to the Center after being at Berkeley for two years?

03-00:40:50
Nader: Well, at that time the Center had an age distribution. They wanted seniors, middle aged, and juniors and so forth. So they had an age distribution and I fit in that place.

03-00:41:02
Rubens: Yes, sure. Sure. Should we—

03-00:41:07
Redman: I have one question about this, the '64 publication again, the *Talea and Juquila*.

03-00:41:15
Redman: You've stated in other interviews that women were somewhat absent from some of your earliest work, due at large part to the fact that you're studying mostly patriarchal studies. Men in positions of power. But you've also reflected that this was partially—perhaps part of your sort of socialization as an anthropologist and being told to you what was important. But eventually you have some studies that emerge out of your work with comparative law and legal cases in Mexico, in particular, that provide data to begin studying women's lives in particular. Can you describe that evolution?

03-00:41:52
Nader: Well, actually, I didn't study women's lives in particular very much. I wanted to re-conceptualize how women were being integrated into the university and elsewhere. So I was going against the grain of a certain kind of feminism, which either wanted to merge, as with merging the clubs and the gyms, or retained unilineal evolution theories from the nineteenth century and really had bought into the notion that it may be bad here but it's probably better than it is anywhere else. So even the anthropologists that went to study the Valley Zapotecs, and I had to review one of these books, she was trying to peddle Western feminism to the Zapotec women, while they were more liberated than

she was. So there really was a reconceptualization that I participated in and the key piece on that was my work on "Orientalism, Occidentalism, and Control of Women." Because I could see it happening here. When I went to Sudan for a Ford Foundation conference, it was a conference that I was invited to, I was asked to speak to the Sudanese Health, Education, and Welfare Department, and they wanted to know about American women. And so I told them. I had three babies, no maternity leave. What? I never got equal pay. What? They couldn't believe it because they believed the ideology that American women's lives are better than anyplace in the world and we still believe that ideology here. Part of our exceptionalism!

03-00:43:43
Redman: But that to me sounds more like Edward Said being influential than Betty Friedan say in that era.

03-00:43:49
Nader: Yes. Betty Friedan— See, I didn't believe that all women were going to be feminists and all men were going to be sexist because my father was not a sexist, nor my brothers. And he was very important in seeing that his children, girls, were educated and so forth. So I thought it was important to realize that American feminism was a reflection of American patriarchy and that they were really doing the job of the patriarchies in other societies that we were going to. So my work there—I didn't believe in women's studies here. No, I believed—

03-00:44:27
Rubens: I want to get to that.

03-00:44:27
Nader: Yes. Because I thought once you ghettoize, you ghettoize it, now they talk about gender after that. Because in a patriarchal society men are vulnerable, too, let alone whether they can be sexist or feminist. They're also vulnerable. So you can't change the role of women with thinking that you're not going to change the role of men. They were fighting the military wars. So what came out of this? Now women can fight wars, too. And the women in the 1970s were talking about women for peace. So we fell right into that whole patriarchal thing and what happens with women in war? Rape rate unbelievably high and the people who are in charge of doing something about it are people who are promoting rape basically by not—because it's illegal and because they participate in it. So there was a lot of stuff that was going on that was against my grain in the feminist side.

Now, I wanted maternity leave for women because I knew what it was like to be doing all this stuff without having maternity leave. And I think I mentioned before, I don't know whether you filmed it before, but this business of Ted McCown saying, "Why don't you quit having your babies on your time? Why don't you get the university to give you time off?" So I called and asked, "Well, is there maternity leave at Berkeley?" And she said, "This is faculty or

non-faculty?" I said, "This is faculty." "Tenured or non-tenured?" I said, "Tenured." She said, "I'm afraid, Professor Nader, you'll have to have the baby on your own time." And I said, "Well, what if I said I was clerical?" She said, "Well, then the chair of the department can decide whether to give you maternity leave or not." Well, I was furious. So when I got a letter from Bowker about serving on a committee for him, I said, "Dear Chancellor Bowker, when I was in need the university did not serve me. So now you're in need. I refuse to serve the university until you have a decent maternity leave policy." He calls in Mike Heyman. He says, "Mike, we don't have a maternity leave policy?" Mike calls me and says, "We don't have a maternity leave policy? What do you want?" I said, "At least the semester or quarter with pay, whatever we're on." And so that's how we got maternity leave.

03-00:46:36
Rubens: Oh, that's fantastic.

03-00:46:38
Nader: It was rather incredible.

03-00:46:40
Rubens: Maybe in light of that story, we should acknowledge that you were married in 1962 after being here two years.

03-00:46:48
Nader: Yes.

03-00:46:49
Rubens: Your husband's name?

03-00:46:50
Nader: Norman Milleron. He was working at Livermore Labs then, physics. He was a vacuum specialist.

03-00:46:58
Rubens: And how many children did you have?

03-00:47:01
Nader: We had three children, one born in '64, a girl, Nadia, one born in '67, a boy, Tarek, and one born in '70, a girl. Rania.

03-00:47:22
Rubens: How did you manage? Sixty-four alone, the number of publications, you're going to the Center, generating the Berkeley Law Project, Village Law Project. How did you manage at home?

03-00:47:34
Nader: There are two answers to that. One, a hugely supportive family. My mother and father and siblings, whenever I was in need, they helped. And I'll explain that. The other was my contact in Mexico, Lini De Vries, who was there as a result of the McCarthy investigations, she said, "You need help and I know

somebody at the American embassy and you can bring somebody from here, from Mexico, as a mother's helper legally." And so she arranged for that to happen and this woman came and she was the first woman to go north from her village of Tepoztlán and, of course, I was like her big sister. And she worked. She was a mother's helper, not a nanny. She did the cleanup and all that and she took care of the children but I did all the cooking and I put the children to bed and I bathed the children. She went dancing Friday night at the International House. She and another person that we brought in, Professor Susan Ervin Tripp, took English for foreigners at night two or three times a week. So they were both learning to be bilingual and they were having fun with young people at the I-House and they had Sundays off and so on. And it was aboveboard. But then all this other stuff about immigration happened. She was with me for two and a half years.

Carmen. She went home during the summer to Tepoztlán and then I would go east with the children to my parent's home because I wanted them to know my parents. And then I would usually stay there for anywhere between ten days to two or three weeks, come back and do what I had to do here and take care—my husband was here and so forth. And then I'd go back in August for a family reunion. All of us got together in August.

After Carmen left we had one or two attempts from Mexico and they didn't any of them work out as well as the first one had. One of them had a nervous breakdown while she was here because she lied to me and I didn't think she was lying and so I was nice and I wasn't supposed to be nice to somebody who lied and she got all mixed up and everything. And I sent her back to Mexico and that was an interesting experience, too, because she later became a doctor herself, which you can do in Mexico paid for by the government.

03-00:50:25
Rubens: So you toughed it out? You were doing it all.

03-00:50:28
Nader: Yes. Basically. But the children helped too!

03-00:50:30
Rubens: You had written a piece that argued working women didn't seem to be any less attentive to their children that women who didn't work outside the home.

03-00:50:39
Nader: Well, I wrote that at graduate school, because I did that under Dave Schneider. It was about kinship, and I compared the Tallensi in Africa, who took very good care of their children, worked all the time, et cetera, and the Alorese in the Pacific and some other group in the Pacific where they had lots of leisure time and so on and they didn't take care of their children at all. And I said there's no necessary correlation. Necessary correlation between how much and so forth. And basically I just taught the children to respect my time and I washed and put them to bed, told them a story, and then went into my study.

By nine o'clock I was in my study, right on the same floor. And, of course, if they got into a fight then they would come knocking at the door and they'd say, "Mama, Tarek was mean to me," or whatever. I'd say, "This is Mom's time. I have my work to do. You have to calm down," and so on.

And, of course, Norm was working at the Berkeley Lab, by that time; and he would go up to the lab after dinner. So he was gone. All the boys go up to the lab at night. And to go up to the lab at night was an experience. Here are all these guys back at work and their wives are home contemplating divorce unless they have a job themselves. So the whole working woman thing, it's never been solved. And the whole notion of federal support like we have in Canada or in Sweden or other places, I don't know why we're so stingy with each other in this country. Canada is more civilized.

03-00:52:09
Rubens: I read a note in Theodora Kroeber's papers in which she posited that women hurt themselves because they just don't have enough help.

03-00:52:17
Nader: And Bea Whiting told me, "Put all your money into help," when I started having children because you'll wear yourself out, which, of course, my mother told me, too. And I did.

03-00:52:29
Rubens: So it sounded like you had a minimum.

03-00:52:30
Nader: I had a minimum.

03-00:52:30
Rubens: You also took children on field trips, to conferences.

03-00:52:37
Nader: Well, I wanted to take one at a time because I wanted to get to know them better and vice versa and so on. And if you got three at one time then it's another story. So I took Nadia to Lebanon with me one summer when I was doing fieldwork and I had a student there that I wanted to visit who was doing fieldwork. So I visited my graduate student and she was on the Berkeley Village Law Project. And then I took Tarek when I was invited to the Sudan. I took Tarek and my father and they went to Lebanon and I went to Sudan and then I met them and then we all went to Spain together because my father had never seen Alhambra. He wanted to see it. And we went to Morocco together that time. And Rania was supposed to go with me to Lebanon but the civil war started. So she never did go with me. She went later with my mother, but when my mother was ancient. But not as a child.

03-00:53:40
Rubens: And we should just say, sort of wrap up this chapter, that your children have been extremely successful.

03-00:53:46
Nader: Well, I don't know what success is but they certainly—the oldest is a lawyer and the next one is a PhD in ecology and the youngest became a PhD in infectious disease. Those are other stories.

03-00:54:03
Rubens: Yes, of course there is so much more to say about that aspect of your life.

Perhaps in the time remaining, we should talk about your time at the Center because it really is an incredibly productive time and then it takes you in other directions. You had come in there knowing you wanted to do this comparative law project with students but you then convened a conference. Was that part of what you did?

03-00:54:36
Nader: Right, yes. Yes, I did. And that conference resulted in the law and anthropology special issue. And I had sociologists as well as anthropologists from Berkeley involved in that. And, of course, Paul Bohannon was at the Center and he had already published his work on law in Africa. [Floyd] Lounsbury was there. He's a linguist from Yale. And there was a man named Stone who was a lawyer. And there was an Indian anthropologist, seems to me, who was working on American stuff. Now I'm not remembering. Rob Burling was there, a linguist, as well. And there were all these other people that weren't even in anthropology but there were about five anthropologists there at the time. It was a great year.

03-00:55:26
Rubens: Yes, absolutely.

03-00:55:28
Nader: And Paul Bohannon was a wonderful colleague, especially. He was especially. As was Lounsbury. Lounsbury had a hard time writing things. He published not very much but what he published was very good. But he was a perfectionist. And when I showed him my work and I said, "What should I do?" he said, "Just send it out." He encouraged me, in other words: "Don't be like me. Send it out. You'll get a reaction and that'll be terrific."

03-00:55:54
Rubens: All right, so we'll turn the tape.

Audio File 4

04-00:00:14
Nader: Well, since we're talking about the period between 1960 and '84, there are two things that should enter in. One is the continuation of fieldwork, where I'd done fieldwork. And I came in 1960 and then I went, 1961 summer, I went to southern Lebanon and studied a Shia Moslem village.

04-00:00:37
Redman: What brought that project about?

04-00:00:37
Nader: What brought it about was the Islamic law question, that people were always saying everybody was part—the Middle East, they're all Muslims. Well, what does that mean in terms of the relationships between Muslims and Christians and Jews and Jews and whoever? So I wanted to know whether Islamic law ever got to the village level because it was an urban law. So I went to investigate this. And fortunately my family has connections in Lebanese politics. One of my mother's cousins, who was a doctor in the parliament, his brother was the ward heeler and he had connections to all these villages in Lebanon, Shia's included. So when I came looking for a village he was very helpful. And I noticed that something was happening when I was staying in his house. There was a busload of people that came to the door and then all of a sudden the husband and wife, who were in bed with their coffee, there were all these villagers in there asking their advice about their problems. So this is very intimate. And they were Shias. And so I went to one of these villages and tracked some of these cases that went across the line because my contacts were Eastern Orthodox. My relatives were Eastern Orthodox Christians. And here were their Shias in the bedroom of the Eastern Orthodox Christians asking them to solve their problems. WASTA making they called it. WASTA making is looking for remedies to disagreements, usually.

04-00:02:15
Redman: You've mentioned the urban centers as being the strongholds of Islamic law and then maybe out in rural areas I wonder were there other aspects of dispute resolution that you were witnessing.

04-00:02:39
Nader: Yes. Because what I found out was, in the first place, when Americans think about the Middle East as being tribal, there is such a thing as tribal but they really don't understand that it's lineages. Kinship relations. So what I did then was to look and see how Christian villages saw these and the use of WASTA across the board. So the Shias and the Christians were both using these mediation techniques that were called WASTA. Remedies for problems.

Now, this village in southern Lebanon was split ideologically into two parts, the As and the Bs, although they were all interspersed with one another. And I was interested that the same techniques were being used for mediation there as being used with the Zapotec and how did that work, because they were both sort of harmonious. And so then I wrote this piece comparing the Zapotec with the Shia. And, of course, I couldn't continue that work because the Israelis were already in south Lebanon at that time and the feelings between the Syrians and the Lebanese, it was politically very dangerous and I wasn't able to go back.

They were putting together the handbook of Middle American Indians and the person who was supposed to write the piece about the Trique Indians quit. He wasn't going to do it. I can't remember what happened to him. So they said, "Please would you go and write this piece about the Trique?" Well, I had

never been to Mixtec Trique country ever, because I was in Oaxaca but I was in the Zapotec mountains. So I went to Mexico and I went to the INI, the Instituto National Indingenista. And I said, "This is what I've been asked to do and can you facilitate this for me?" And they said, "The Trique will never accept you because they don't take outsiders, let alone a woman." And I said, "But I have to do this job." See, it was very interesting because I wasn't easily dissuaded. I said I would do the paper so I have to go get the data. So you make it easy for me to get the data, get in there. So eventually they did and they sort of protected me. They were protective. And I got the data and I wrote the piece on the Trique and I've never been back to Trique country since. But I did. That was my obligation because I agreed. And I wrote the one on the Zapotec also for the handbook. So I was clearly still doing fieldwork. And now the Trique migrate to New York state.

And when I was at the Center for Advanced Study, in addition to writing Herma Kay's husband was interested in filming and I thought, "Well, maybe Ralph Tyler," the head of the Center, "would give me some money to go with Herma down to do the film." That was called *To Make the Balance* [which is the literal translation of a phrase for an informal conflict resolution system]. That was the first film I did. And I was already pregnant. I was three months pregnant. My doctor said, "You can't go." And I said, "Why?" He said, "You'll lose the baby." And I said, "Well, tell me what I should do to protect myself." He said, "You can't go." So then the nurse that I knew that left the country because of McCarthy was in Oaxaca and she's a nurse and she said, "If you're going to lose the baby it's probably a good idea. Shouldn't have it anyway. There's something wrong. So just go." So we get to Oaxaca. My husband goes with me. Me and my husband and the guy that's flying this dinky little plane, who is a missionary. We flew in and we were circling above. There's a place you could just drop down and land. We dropped. I get out. I'm supposed to be met by a donkey and somebody from Talea. And then my husband and this guy take off. And that was how I went to do this film. So I get on the donkey and we ride for three hours and we get to Talea. Mind you, I'm pregnant, right?

Meanwhile, Herma Kay and her husband, I can't even remember now how they came in, but he was a little spoiled. He said to me, "I've been all over the world," but he didn't say he'd been all over the world where there was a Hilton Hotel. He was bothered by the situation. He brought in a lot of footage and so on and left with a lot of the footage un-shot. And the Zapotec couldn't believe this guy because they thought he was a sissy. And they said, "If we had to pick who was pregnant it wouldn't be you, it would be him," because he was such a sissy and he wouldn't eat anything. He'd say, what did he say, "I only eat avocados with coldwater shrimp," or something like that. They could not believe his fussiness. And they left early.

04-00:07:23
Redman: Talk about the decision to make a film. And you'd mentioned before the concept of anthropological work as being public, as being sort of a fraught venture.

04-00:07:33
Nader: Yes.

04-00:07:35
Redman: What was the reaction to your decision to make a film and then against that sort of background, why would you take the risk early in your career to make a film like that?

04-00:07:46
Nader: Because there was opportunity. And so I just grabbed the opportunity. And Stanford actually had a film center. We didn't here at Berkeley. And they helped me get it produced and then it was distributed by the University of California extension. But I realized when I looked at the footage, and ever since then when I look at footage, it's not the same as being there because you see things in the footage you never would have seen because you were busy writing down what the case was about. You see the expressions on their faces, you see the body movements and so on. So I learned a lot. That's why I got into styles of dispute resolution, because you could see the styles. You could watch the body movement, whereas you couldn't do that if you were just saying it's male against female, the issue is this, and this is the conclusion. So it enriched my data collection.

04-00:08:36
Rubens: But the original goal of the film was to document what an ethnography is.

04-00:08:42
Nader: Yes. Margaret Mead had already done films. There was a movement in the discipline to do—filming was becoming important. Before Margaret Mead there were films also, of course.

04-00:08:54
Redman: I have a couple questions about fieldwork, that maybe this might be an interesting time to look into. So I understand you're on the AAA planning and development committee between 1968 and '71 and then again between '75 and '76. And one of our colleagues, and someone I admire very much, and I know you've worked with him, as well. Historian and anthropologist David Price has pointed to the fact that the AAA made some pretty serious errors in the fifties and sixties in terms of articulating its stances on things like race, gender, and the war in Vietnam. So this would have been an important time to be making policy decisions, trying to influence policy decisions for the AAA. But then the AAA eventually I guess shifts its policies at some time, trying to prevent more radical anthropologists from quickly pushing through motions and resolutions at annual meetings by requiring that they first submit measures in advance to be published in the newsletter, I believe *Anthropology*

News. And then later on there's the Beals Committee that you help do some work with on ethical issues in anthropology. But let's first get to the AAA and sort of policy decisions in the AAA and then I want to ask that more specific question about fieldwork and fieldwork ethics as that ties into the experiences that you had. But first could you maybe give me a perspective on that AAA planning and development committee experiences in the sixties and seventies, what that was for you.

04-00:10:32

Nader: Well, you're looking at somebody who didn't ask to be there. So I wasn't ambitious to participate in the AAA. And eventually when they asked me if I'd run for president, I said most people who would vote for me weren't members and I declined to run for president. So you're not looking at someone who was there for ambitious reasons. I was there for what I thought were ethical reasons. And I had a suspicion that since I'm not an –ist, I didn't have the paranoia that you would have if you were "a red baiter" or a communist or a whatever –ist. So in a way I was slightly naïve, to say the least, and I just thought there's wrong and right. They shouldn't be divulging names to a government internal securities committee or something like that, of people they thought were left and they shouldn't be pointing to spies among the anthropologists in the ways that they were doing it, especially during the Cold War period, after the war. And there are all these things that I wanted to just say something about. And I was a little disturbed also that when George Foster was president of the AAA, he got rid of—the head of the AAA then was no longer an anthropologist. He thought it would be better to have an administrator that was from the outside. And, of course, that's a way in which you can get things really going wrong because you can infiltrate that way, as happened in psychology and sociology, actually, infiltration of outsiders and then they can point fingers. CIA had its finger in a lot of these things. And I didn't like the man that George appointed either. I didn't think that he was using money in the right way and I've never wanted to give money to the Association because I remember him taking me out to the fanciest restaurant. And I said, "Who exactly is going to pay this bill?" He said, "Oh, they pay all my bills." He was disrespectful of the fact that these were membership and it was a non-profit and so on.

And they were making dumb decisions. Well, first Wenner-Gren made a dumb decision to sell the castle and then I think George bought the building in Washington, which they should have kept. And then with the "expansion" of whatever, whoever, whatever. They sold the building. What a dumb thing to do because now it's worth millions, right. You should have kept the building and rented something. So there were all these decisions that were being made that I thought—it was practical. My participation was kind of at the practical level.

04-00:13:06
Redman: Okay. Now, there's a Beals Committee a few years later on ethical issues in anthropology and I understand the records for which are just now being processed by the Smithsonian Institution. But it leads to the establishment of a permanent committee on anthropological ethics and I understand that at one time you provided either several folders or boxes of information to the American Anthropological Association surveying anthropological ethics in Mexico. Why were you interested in this question and was there a concern that anthropologists were abusing indigenous tribes by the Mexican government for certain information? But more importantly, what was at stake here?

04-00:13:46
Nader: I can't even remember that. I can't remember I had boxes of anything. I can remember that I blew the whistle on what happened in Chile during the Cold War. I was the first to do that and I sent a note to Howell, F. Clark Howell. But I don't remember, honestly, a box of anything to Beals. I remember connecting with him in some way. My position on ethics was this. They were defining an ethical code that would prevent hurting the people that we study, which was studying down. So it would be like indigenous people. What they were doing with the ethics code at the same time without realizing it is if we decided to study up we would also have to protect the Pentagon or whoever the powers that be were, even if they were unethical. The way the code of ethics was being written meant we couldn't have an Edward Snowden. And I didn't want to do that because I wanted to be able to study up, down, and sideways, and I wanted transparency. And so that was my issue with the ethics code.

04-00:14:58
Redman: Thinking back to—

04-00:14:59
Nader: Where did you get this information about the boxes?

04-00:15:01
Redman: This is from an archivist who processed the papers for American Anthropological Association.

04-00:15:06
Nader: It would be interesting to find out what's in them and where they came from.

04-00:15:12
Redman: Now, a question that harkens back then is did you think at all was going—the issue of funding is obviously very critical and where the funding was coming from. You had received funding from the Mexican government to do your dissertation work. Talk about the emergent sort of debates about those ethical issues, of thinking not just where the funding comes from but what was behind the institution that made the grant, which obviously became a big issue in terms of funding coming from the OSS or CIA. To what extent were

anthropologists aware of where their funding was really coming from? And this must have been an issue that people were conversing about at these meetings.

04-00:16:02
Nader: I think few people were aware or even thought we should be aware because they were so needy for money to do the work that they would—

04-00:16:10
Rubens: It was a lot of money.

04-00:16:10
Nader: Yes, it was a lot of money. So you could seduce an anthropologist to go to Africa if you said the Ford Foundation is going to put X million dollars in research in Africa. Even though they wanted to go someplace else. I wanted to go to Mexico and if they had given me ten times the money to go someplace else I wouldn't have gone because I wanted to go to Mexico. And I think principle has long roots in our family. So when the BP deal came here—you know, all these people said, "A half a billion dollars, Laura." And I said, "You guys are like dogs in heat. All you see is the money. I'm looking at the consequences. What are you doing taking money from a criminal corporation?" "What do you mean?" "It's a criminal corporation. X, Y and Z cases all over the world." It has to do with your ethics. Would you take money from somebody who says, "You can't publish this or you can publish that?" Later on that stuff starts to come out, where you can say certain things, you can't say other things. I wouldn't do that. And a lot of anthropologists wouldn't do that if they knew where the money was coming from. But they don't always know. So they didn't know for example. I don't know whether Cliff Geertz knew where his money was coming from but at that time it was pretty apparent the CIA was giving money to MIT and so on and Harvard was involved, I'm sure. So it was slowly becoming an issue. Now it hit the fan with hiring of the military, hiring anthropologists or not. That became a big deal in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars.

04-00:17:43
Redman: The human terrain in objects.

04-00:17:44
Nader: Yes, that issue. And, by the way, David Price is an anthropologist who does history as well.

04-00:17:49
Redman: Right, right. Last question on this, AAA, I guess. Then we can go back to something else. But the AAA ad hoc committee on Simon Fraser University in British Columbia. I understand that the issue was the AAA was investigating the department of political science, sociology, and anthropology at SFU and AAA had some problems, I understand, at this time with the issue of having Canadian members making binding decisions in a supposedly national organization. What do you remember about that debate?

04-00:18:20
Nader: Well, I remember that Peter Carsten and I —he is from South Africa originally but was teaching in Canada— were put on a committee by George Foster to go up and investigate the firing of Kathleen Gough.

04-00:18:36
Rubens: Once again, Yes.

04-00:18:37
Nader: Once again. And she was an excellent ethnographer and anthropologist and is clearly political and so we went up to investigate that and we basically cleared her but didn't help her get her job back. But she was cleared. Once you're accused, it's very hard to clean it up, even though the reality says something otherwise. So that was my experience with Simon Fraser.

04-00:19:07
Rubens: Then there's the issue of anthropologists who were financed by and thus really colluding with the federal government to conduct studies about pacification of rebels in for instance, Vietnam or Chile.

04-00:19:21
Nader: Right. We had that right here in the department. There was Herb Phillips.

If you're sort of politically clueless in the way that I was, that is, I didn't have a pack of people who were part of some organization that I was part of that was looking at this. So I at the time was really naive, until I wrote the *Phantom Factor*. That's why I called it the *Phantom Factor*. I didn't really understand what was going on in the department. Why was [Gerald] Berreman and Phillips, why were they sort of at each other and what was going on at UCLA at the same time? Because it had to do with Thailand and Cambodia and so on. Then when I did get clued in, of course, I could understand what was happening here and elsewhere and it was related to government meddling in anthropological affairs that was affecting the discipline and affected what we studied. In 1969 I wrote "Up the Anthropologist." That was published in a book called *Reinventing Anthropology*, edited by Dell Hymes. He was in this department but he moved to Penn before the book came out. But if you look at that book today, it's as good today as it was then and it keeps getting reissued because those issues are not resolved yet in the field.

And so studying up, "Perspectives Gained from Studying Up," was circulating in the underground sociology. I got letters from all over the place of people who had already read it before it came out. And, again, somehow, when I wrote that, I didn't realize what a big deal it was just to say it out loud. And I said, "Look, we're not doing good science." I didn't say, "I want to save the people of the world." I said, "You can't do good science, you can't understand what's going on in the Oakland ghettos if you have a circle around the Oakland ghettos and you're trying to explain black, blah, blah, relations, if you don't know that the banks are violating the redlining laws. So it's

connected to the banks that create the ghettos," et cetera, blah, blah, blah. So you got to study up and down to have good scientific conclusions. And that was the issue. And that's probably what made some people mad, because they couldn't dismiss it as saying, "Well, she's just one of these Catholic workers," or whatever they sometimes say about Nancy [Scheper-Hughes]. "Wants to save the world and so on." But I said, "You are scientists." And I've used that with hard scientists, as well. "You say you respect the evidence. This is evidence. Why are you disregarding it? That's not good science you're doing." They can't deal with that.

04-00:22:32

Redman: You cite Sol Tax in that essay, in particular his comment that most anthropologists of the era weren't working on the most pressing problems of the day, which he describes as population, solution, and war. I would say that those are still some of the most pressing issues of the day, as you'd mentioned this book gets reissued. Tell me more about that comment because to me it says increasingly not only were anthropologists not talking about studying elites in a way that you'd talked about but also they weren't talking about studying elites in the context of these pressing problems. We weren't talking about how elites managed war, I guess you might say, or population and pollution. Was there a reaction to that idea, as well?

04-00:23:22

Nader: You see, Sol Tax was pretty sophisticated and he was an advocate for American Indian rights and doing something about the horrible way in which our country had, and does still, treat Native Americans. And, in fact, one of the first conferences I went to was a Sol Tax conference on Native Americans. I went with Gerry [Gerald] Berreman. It was either the first or second year I was here. So he was at another level of sophistication and he had written this book about penny capitalists in Guatemala and he was clearly aware when he picked that title that the Indians were being called communists basically. And so he called them penny capitalists, which they were. So he was also politically aware. Now, what we were doing in anthropology was focused on participant observation. We weren't doing archival work. If you focus on participant observation you have to go someplace where they'll let you participant observe. And the elites of Philadelphia are hardly going to let me go to their parties to write a book about the elites of Philadelphia. So there's where you have to be interdependent on the archives and on historians and other kinds of information, which is why I say we need comparison, we need ethnography, and we need history. And those are the three things that are in my pieces. Those three things. So Sol Tax was, again, sophisticated and one of the things he said before he died, I think, was that this country will probably break up into different republics or different whatever. It's too big. Which I thought was interesting. I've never followed that up. And I knew his daughter was in graduate school after I was but I think she wasn't quite as active, either intellectually or otherwise, that he was. But he was great. He did the Voice of America series.

04-00:25:19
Redman: Could you talk about your relationship with the Voice of America series?

04-00:25:23
Nader: Well, I did one called "Perspectives Gained from Fieldwork" and it was reprinted and reprinted and reprinted. And I think that that's partly what leads me to this piece of the book that I'm putting now together, the selections, *What the Rest Think of the West*. "Perspectives Gained from Fieldwork". Perspectives gained from going and seeing somebody else. And it's very important that we don't study ourselves for American anthropology, whereas in India and in Brazil and in Mexico, that's all they do is study their own people. Right? They don't get out and that's a different kind of anthropology.

04-00:25:59
Redman: Last question. Describe the intellectual value of indignation.

04-00:26:03
Nader: Well, I think it's, in the sense, what undergirds my persistence. It's outrageous, right? I just think that things are happening. It's outrageous how we treat children in this country. It's outrageous that there's been fracking in California without the legislature getting involved and regulating the fracking. It's outrageous that a public university is taxing children and parents the tuition that they're taxing. Why aren't more people outraged? And that goes back to my mother being asked by *Time* magazine, "What makes Ralph tick?" She said, "Why don't you ask what makes the other people not to tick?" And so there's this sense of indignation that I think is important. David Price, he's indignant, and why shouldn't he be? So are some of the other people that are on the forefronts of our field; not everybody has to be indignant. I think that you should be able to leave space for people that are just curious about sleep patterns worldwide or humor or whatever. That's part of the picture. But for some indignant takes you to the front line and the new questions. And it's not just true of anthropology. It's true of science in general, I think.

04-00:27:21
Redman: What is anthropology?

04-00:27:22
Nader: Well, for me anthropology is the study of the human condition from the beginning to the present. Everywhere. In the streets, in the steppes, in the tribes. I don't know how I put it sometime. But it's about everywhere. So that means it includes all the other social sciences, as well, because in order to understand we have to—that's why I read sociology. I get irritated with their quantitative delusions in political science and sociology and psychology sometimes.

04-00:27:54
Redman: But there's the potential for insight.

04-00:27:55
Nader: Yes, there's a potential. They say the way you know you're an anthropologist is when you go have a conversation with a sociologist or when you go and have a conversation with a psychologist and they say, "Oh, where are they? What planet are they on?"

04-00:28:11
Rubens: Would you agree with this? Underlying your indignation is also an optimistic belief that conditions or situations can be ameliorated, improved.

04-00:28:19
Nader: Well, history shows that change can come about. So people always ask me, "How can you be optimistic given what you know?" [For one thing, teaching sustains my optimism.] I had an interesting experience this morning. I was going across the street to mail a letter and this car comes up and the driver pulls the window down. She said, "Professor Nader, I took a course from you ten years ago." And I said, "You remember it?" She said, "Controlling processing." So these ideas stick with some students; that's important.

04-00:28:50
Redman: Is this a good time for me to talk about the Berkeley Village Law Project?

04-00:28:56
Rubens: Well, I think maybe we can pick that up in terms of a whole link of what you do with alternative dispute resolution.

04-00:29:03
Nader: Yes. Since you want to talk about the seventies. Seventies and eighties, the really key things that happened are the Carnegie Council on Children. That gets me into a whole bunch of people who don't have anything to do with anthropology.

04-00:29:17
Redman: How did that come about? You've mentioned meeting people that are outside of anthropology. So who exactly gets hooked into that study?

04-00:29:25
Nader: Well, Ken Keniston was the head of it but I think it was the Whitings that probably recommended me because I believed in family. What a comment. And we were supposed to look at the condition of American children today as compared to what we were ten years ago or twenty. Every ten years they used to have these things. So we met once a month in different places. And when we met in Berkeley I was in charge and I said, "Okay, we're interested in children. For the first time we should meet some." So we went through the Berkeley public schools. We met the superintendent. We met the principals. We met some teachers and we met some kids. Yes. We're going to talk about kids without meeting kids. And they told us what they thought about the playground and the whatever. It was really very interesting.

04-00:30:20
Redman: Talk about briefly the question of human subjects and working with children, I would imagine, and working with—the way I understand it is that when you're working with vulnerable populations, however that's defined by your human subjects board, there are potentially different ethical parameters. Just in terms of the course of thinking about that, how on the Berkeley campus and how that's evolved, were there ever questions in terms of, for instance, working with children or working with prisoners?

04-00:30:50
Nader: Well, I was on the human subjects committee so I saw how it worked and basically it was very selective. So experiments were being done by LBL[Lawrence Berkeley Lab] that were not under human subjects. We had a nuclear reactor right here on the other side of campus and that was under human subjects. So they seemed to be going after the social sciences and they seemed to be using the psychological model. And, actually, the person that's in charge of human subjects right now is an animal specialist. I can't remember. She's a veterinarian I think. And it's gotten to the ridiculous point. They're not protecting anybody. They're protecting their jobs. So I've seen them try to stop some of my students, for example, from either getting renewed, a student who was in Syria studying Palestine camps. Another student who's been studying a waste disposal plant in Kettleman City and the trouble that they give them and hold them up from their funds, et cetera. So I have no respect for them at all. It's gotten to be a government bureaucracy. I talked to Phil Lee when he was chancellor at UC about this and I said, basically, "I'd like them to accuse me because I think this whole thing should be public." So now they tell us that our undergraduate papers should be subject to human subject, et cetera Talk about creeping totalitarianism. So I refuse to do it. And let them take me to court or whatever they want. At least this will be aired. So it's really unfortunate. Maybe well-meaning to begin with but unfortunate.

04-00:32:26
Redman: But I'm glad I asked because that's really interesting comments and I appreciate your offering that. Do you have anything else to add on the Carnegie?

04-00:32:36
Nader: Well, the Carnegie ended up having to go to Washington to give a report. And since *All Our Children* was rather critical of the United States, especially compared to other industrial societies—

04-00:32:46
Rubens: That comes out in 1977.

04-00:32:47
Nader: Yes. So we went and we were supposed to meet with the president but the president didn't meet with us so we met with the vice president Mondale and it was very—Carter was president then.

So we met with him and we met with the HEW. And at the HEW, basically they asked us to keep our mouths shut and the boys were going to discuss the report. So there was Ken Keniston and the guy who headed HEW and somebody else. And then when we met at the White House there was a vice president and Ken Keniston and the head of the Carnegie Corporation and we were supposed to keep our mouth shut. So there was a nun on this committee and the way she dealt with the HEW meeting is she fell asleep and she snored throughout the whole thing. That was symbolic, right? And what were they afraid of? So they were afraid that we would say anything that was critical. We cannot deal with self-criticism. We're boasting, boasting, boasting. Exceptionalism leads to delusion.

04-00:34:03
Rubens: The import of the report was—

04-00:34:04
Nader: The import of the report is we got to do better. We're not treating American children very well. And so there was a lot of debate, et cetera, and there were good young people on it. Hillary Clinton was involved before she went off and married Bill. She was on the staff although she was at Yale. And everybody talked about her ambitions in the future and so forth. And Marian Wright Edelman, who now runs the Children's Defense Fund in Washington also a part of it. The people involved were wonderful people. There were judges and people that became judges and there were just plain folks, as well, and there was one anthropologist, psychologist, and so on. So that was interesting.

04-00:34:46
Rubens: Was this what you would call public service, professional service kind of duty?

04-00:34:50
Nader: Yes, it was public service. No question. Then I was asked to be on the National Academy of Sciences [NAS] Breeder Reactor Study and that was also a public service. But I am amazed as I go through my files how much public service I was involved in and what an education it was. So energy. Are you kidding me? The chairman of my department, Jack Potter, said, "Laura, you're not going to get promoted for doing energy work in this department." I said, "Jack, you don't think I'm doing it to get promoted, do you?" And we were putting out a report which came out, *Energy Choices in a Democratic Society*. The corporate people had offices. I couldn't get our department to give me an office. Elizabeth Colson lent me her office for the summer so that we could do it. I couldn't even get the department to give me a key to the Xerox room at night. We were working until 2:00 a.m. sometimes in the morning trying to get this report out.

04-00:35:47
Rubens: So you're doing this report at the same—'75 is when the Committee on Nuclear Alternative Energy—

04-00:35:51
Nader: Yes. And it came out in '80. By '80 I was at the Wilson Center and by '80 I had gone through six different revisions of this report that was written with scientists, and mainly hard scientists and economists. And I remember being on the phone with a NAS fellow who said, "I'm sorry, Laura, you're going to have to revise it again." And that was when I said to him, "Either you're ignorant or you're corrupt. Either you publish it or I'll go to the press." So they published it. But that was when I was at the Wilson Center, when I was interviewed by the MITRE Corporation to give a talk on energy. I was brought from the Wilson Center by limousine to the MITRE Corporation and then I was introduced and so on and we had lunch and they said, "We'd like you to talk about your work, everything but energy because you're going to talk about energy after lunch." And after lunch the head of the MITRE Corporation comes and takes me downstairs and on our way down, I didn't realize what a big deal it was. You see, in a way, that's a good thing. Just like the guy screaming at me saying, "You talk to us like you're talking to the next door neighbor." This was on television from Stanford. Anyway, I write about it in some of my stuff.

So they can't understand the frankness, the forthrightness. So anyway, the head of the MITRE Corporation is to introduce me. On the way down I say to him, "How many people are going to be at this talk?" He said, "A hundred." And I said, "You didn't say 101, you didn't around a hundred." He said a hundred. That told me about the hierarchy, how that place was organized. And I had the back of an envelope. And he introduces me and he says, "Every once in a while we have to bring a non-scientist here to talk to us. (Mistake number one.) And so I went down to the National Academy of Sciences and I was reading this stuff and I said, 'Who wrote this crazy scenario about the year 2010?' He said, 'Oh, this crazy anthropologist from the University of California. I present to you this anthropologist, Laura Nader." Well, how do you react to something like that? You could only give a funny talk about them. And they were laughing all the way through it. Then they published the talk. It was the most received talk of any talk they'd ever had copies of and then *Physics Today* published parts of it, most of it. Then it was republished in *ChemTech*. Then it was republished in *Industrial Physicist*. And, of course, I got letters from all these scientists and engineers about the different republications. And the most recent was republished because a geologist had told the industrial physicists, "This is as good now as it was in the 1970s." And they put it out and mainly the readers were engineers and they attacked me. So I use that to show my students you can't be thin skinned. You have to keep your cool.

04-00:38:38
Rubens: And the import of what you're saying? Let's make sure we get this here. That the scientists have—

04-00:38:45
Nader: Barriers to thinking new. They're conservative. Once they get on a nuclear track they can't think of anything else. It's going to be nuclear.

04-00:38:55
Redman: Once you put that out, then it's being republished and republished by other scientific disciplines. Did that surprise you?

04-00:39:03
Nader: Well, I'm never surprised because I'm always busy. I have to pick up the kids and so on.

04-00:39:09
Redman: Right. So I guess what was your reaction to that?

04-00:39:11
Nader: My reaction? That's good. It was good. And Paul Feyerabend, who's a famous philosopher of science, read it apparently and he wrote me and he said, "I didn't know you could write so well." It was an off the cuff talk.

04-00:39:24
Redman: Talk about Thomas Kuhn.

04-00:39:28
Nader: Well, Thomas Kuhn was here at Berkeley when I first got here, so he was in a circle of people that I know, although I wasn't in that circle. And he had just written his book on paradigm shifts. He was up for tenure and didn't get tenure because of his book. I mean, what? You can't criticize science in this country. And when my book, *Naked Science*, came out, it wasn't reviewed in this country. It sold more outside the country than in this country. So we've got labs and that tells you about—and then I got involved because my husband was fired after twenty-five years from the lab with no social security. Shocking, that story by itself. And you realize that American scientists at our national labs do not have academic freedom, they do not have tenure, unlike scientists in Switzerland or France or some other places. So they can't speak up. And, of course, [John] Gofman, [Arthur] Tamplin, the famous whistleblowers from Livermore, they basically got kicked out of the profession. Tamplin had to go to Sweden to get a job and Gofman came back to Berkeley where he was tenured, and he's a doctor, as well, so he had some recourse. So that tells you something about the way big science is organized in the United States.

04-00:40:44
Redman: It's remarkable and confusing to me that the same campus that would have the Free Speech Movement would have such an attitude about academic free speech.

04-00:40:56
Nader: Well, I think they were young people who were doing that. Wasn't administrators who were doing that. And somehow along the way—You see, you asked me what I think and so on. I didn't think. I had to work for tenure and then I got involved in other issues.

04-00:41:16
Rubens: You were tenured in 1965, a pretty quick achievement.

04-00:41:23
Nader: Yes, yes. And then I didn't discover my salary discrepancies with my colleagues until 1979.

04-00:41:32
Redman: Can you tell that story for us?

04-00:41:33
Nader: Well, that was interesting because I came into work one day. And some students had written all the salaries on the elevator door and I looked and I could not believe where my salary was in comparison to my colleagues of about the same stature and age and so on. Gerry Berreman and Gene Hammel. I was making twenty-seven five in 1979. They were making fifty-five. I mean, that's a huge discrepancy. And so then it was the whole thing of how to get that corrected, which it never got corrected because every time they put me up they put them up. So the only way it ever got "corrected" is that I taught longer than they did and so every four years you get a cost of living increase and so on. But I think that that salary discrepancy, which the department eventually tried to do something about, and which was never really settled at any level except by Chancellor Tien, because when I came up for extra scale, they were divided in the budget committee. And so when they're fifty/fifty it goes to the chancellor and he just made the decision on the case. It was a no-brainer. Just look at the record. It was a no-brainer. So you realized that there's a huge selectivity and the selectivity leads you to lose trust in the institution. And Chancellor Tien had such respect because he wasn't like that. Chancellor Tien was the most honest, straightforward, and wonderful chancellor of all times at Berkeley. There's never been anybody like him. He even used salary to student support.

04-00:43:12
Rubens: Let's make sure that we cover what you have on your list of things to discuss. Did we do enough on the Carnegie Children's Commission?

04-00:43:19
Nader: Yes, we did as much as we're going to do on the National Academy energy study, because basically I followed that up— I started teaching courses on energy but I didn't ever teach courses on children. I think I taught one seminar on children. So that was a one short deal that lasted five years and the other lasted five years but then it went directly into my research on scientists and dogmas and all that. I could do a book on dogmas about children and have

written some things about it because this whole notion that was dispelled by the Carnegie, it's very convenient for a country to say that parents aren't being good parents and that's why their kids turn out the way they do. But who's raising America's children, which was the piece I wrote for the *Harvard Educational Review*. It turns out it's not just parents raising America's children. I watched really good parents lose their kids during the 1960s to drugs and everything else. So when the whole society's involved in deciding what our kids eat and what they get taught in school and what they—et cetera, et cetera, we're all raising America's children. Hillary [Clinton] put that out in some corrupt form. We need a village or whatever she called it. But that was where it came out of. And that's very, very controversial to say that. You mean you're going to blame corporations for our child rearing? So when one of my students went to work for Ralph, Linda Coco, she did a study on marketing to children. And all the marketers she talked to said, "It's not our business whether kids buy this or not. It's the parents business to stop them from buying it." And so you have on the campus, this spring, there was a mall right outside this building. Why, I have no idea they did that. And the first group that came in were selling videogames on the campus. And my students are addicted to video games and they're selling them on the campus and you're telling me that's their parents that are doing all—it's not fair.

04-00:45:22
Rubens: What about the World Health Organization? Was there—

04-00:45:27
Nader: I didn't do anything with them. WHO.

04-00:45:28
Rubens: I saw something about WHO and I didn't know if you were involved with them at all.

04-00:45:35
Nader: Not that I can remember.

The other thing that maybe we would say is during this time, did I mention that I was invited to be administrative?

04-00:45:46
Rubens: No, that's what we were going—

04-00:45:48
Nader: Yes, I think—

04-00:45:48
Redman: We will. Yes, also could you describe maybe competing offers, outside offers that you had in general?

04-00:45:54
Nader: Well, you had to have outside offers they said in order to get promoted and so they said that's why your colleagues are making more than you, because they

got outside offers. And I asked [Evon] Vogt who was on my committee at Harvard, what about this outside offer? He said, "Well, people ask me if you would be willing to move to so and so?" And I said, "What do you say, Vogtie? He said, "I say, well, your husband's in Berkeley and so it's unlikely." So they discouraged the outside offers. Now, I did get outside offers for administrative positions. So Irvine, for example, connected, asked if I'd be interested in being provost down there and I said, "I don't think so." And said, "Well, Laura, would you come down and interview anyway? These guys have never interviewed a woman." So I went down.

04-00:46:35
Rubens: When is this about?

04-00:46:38
Nader: This must be in the seventies.

04-00:46:40
Redman: Wow.

04-00:46:41
Nader: So I went down and they started to interview me by asking me orals questions. Like what was the origin of camel nomadism? I thought that was really funny. And after the third question I realized they were giving me the orals. That's the only thing they ever did with women. So then I looked at them and I said, "Why should I come take a job here?" And then they started to sell it to me because that's a man's thing. "Why should I come to take a job here?" you know. So they tried to sell it to me. I was asked if I was willing to be considered for president at Radcliffe. I was asked to be provost on this campus. I was asked to be on equity committee on this campus. I was asked to be a trustee at Stanford University. And I didn't take any of them because I didn't want administrative jobs, somebody telling me what to do.

04-00:47:32
Redman: Why is being an academic administrator not necessarily a public service? Can you parse out for me why serving on the Carnegie Commission is a different public service enterprise?

04-00:47:46
Nader: Well, I also served on the Academic Senate committees here.

I do service there still and I served on a committee having to do with the national labs. I call that public service. The only way you could be a really good servant in the administration at Berkeley is to be the chancellor, maybe. Maybe the provost if you had a weak chancellor, like George Breslauer's position. But the rest of it is get in line. I've seen really good people. They just get into the administration and they have to get in line. They take their orders and so on. And I remember Burton Benedict saying, he was one of the first deans of social science, and he said, "My job is to say no in twenty different ways." That's what they're told. So not creative.

04-00:48:28
Rubens: Even within the department there's a story about—

04-00:48:31
Nader: Yes, in the department, of course, you could be creative if the department backed you to be putting forth the anthropology's needs to the administration. But if you were expected to be the administrative voice in the anthropology department, you can't be creative and that was what John Rowe's argument was in the early sixties. And that's why we turned to an executive committee. So we didn't have a chair for a long time.

04-00:49:05
Redman: So you were vice chair between 1968 and 1971 and then maybe you could pick up from there sort of how the system changed.

04-00:49:14
Nader: Well, then the university was angry. How can they say there's one department out of line? They're listing all the chairs of departments and they come to Anthropology and they have to put down executive committee. So they really were angry about it. And it was only when Stanley Brandes became chair that I guess he made an agreement and he got the department to agree that we were being punished for being an executive committee and not being a chair, having a chair, and so he agreed to be chair and then they relaxed a little bit and now they're back after us again.

04-00:49:43
Rubens: You were never chair?

04-00:49:45
Nader: I was never chair and it was unclear why I was never chair. First because they had an order. First it was going to be Hammel, Berreman and then Nader. When they got to Nader they sort of changed the rules. And then later on the group of the women faculty especially wanted me to come up for chair and there was a vote between me and Pat Kirch and I said, "Unless it's unanimous I won't do it." And, of course, the men were terrified I was going to be chair. I don't know why they were terrified. Honestly, I don't understand. I've probably done more for this department than everybody but George Foster. I mean, even to providing the beautiful rugs downstairs that are in the Gifford Room. I thought we needed a little bit of beauty and I got a rug dealer here in Berkeley to basically donate. Those are $4,000 rugs. And then we got one for the library, as well, and the chairs. The building is not exactly warm. Just some way to sort of warm up the building.

And then, of course, the department did sponsor the Symposium in 2012. [Anthropology in the World: A Symposium Celebrating Laura Nader's 50 Years of Teaching at UC Berkeley]. It's really interesting because I'm apparently not so controversial that I wasn't considered for a provost job or even Radcliffe president, but too controversial at the department level.

04-00:51:03
Rubens: Now, we have, and we'll take up some of the conflicts within the department and how the department fragments. We have ten minutes.

04-00:51:11
Nader: We talked about fieldwork, didn't we?

04-00:51:16
Rubens: Oh, Yes.

04-00:51:17
Nader: And we talked about the Wilson Center? No.

04-00:51:19
Rubens: No, we have not talked about the Wilson Center.

04-00:51:22
Nader: The Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington, DC, I was there for a year and that was a wonderful time for me to write. And I was writing a number of things.

04-00:51:34
Rubens: This was 1979 and 1980?

04-00:51:36
Nader: Yes. And, again, it was interdisciplinary. James Billington, who invited me, he's now the Librarian of Congress. He was then head of the Woodrow Wilson Center. And there was a lot of interaction between the government people who came to speak and the interdisciplinary Wilson Center. And, of course, it was when the Soviets were in Afghanistan and there was a lot of politicking around and so forth. So it does make you more sophisticated. I don't know what else—cosmopolitan—I don't know what the word is to use. You're not so parochial, as if you're just in anthropology. And that's when you realize that they need anthropologists' voice. And so you speak up and you ask the questions and everybody says, "Oh dear." And that was when I went to Talea with the PBS people and made the film, *Little Injustices*. I then went back and showed it to the Wilson Center, and they were very upset because they thought it was negative criticism of the US legal system. It was a beginning criticism. So that was when I became aware that it was very hard to look in the mirror for Americans and I became more and more aware of the problems of exceptionalism.

04-00:52:52
Rubens: Were you working on a project specifically or did the film generate out of—

04-00:52:55
Nader: It was law. It was little injustices. And it compared their ability to go into court there with our inability and the whole industrial system. This was prior to *No Access to Law* coming out.

04-00:53:09
Redman: Exactly. That's what I was trying to say. It seems like it's the—

04-00:53:12
Nader: So no access to law? Are you kidding? In America? The land of the free for the unfree. Although I never was an –ist I became really worried about that because once you can't take criticism and you really think you're the best of everything, then you can't be practical about the way you solve your problems, the way you connect with the rest of the world and you're in delusion. You're delusional. So I think that became my interest thereon, to reduce the hubris, to be able to look in the mirror like Clyde Kluckhohn had said in his *Mirror for Man*. Now, he was a man who saw this, because he was also interdisciplinary in government, in and out of Washington, the Korean War and so on. So that's a thread in anthropology that's not too prevalent today.

04-00:54:06
Redman: I found a published group of papers from a seminar you gave in 1975 that—then your graduate students, the Kroeber Islanders.

04-00:54:18
Nader: Oh, yes.

04-00:54:20
Redman: And one of the amazing things to me is you argue in sort of the outset that since World War II there's sort of been a narrowing aspect of anthropology and encouraging students to sort of blow that up and, you know—but the question is in terms of teaching practical ethnographic fieldwork in that era, many of the students did fieldwork projects in the Bay Area. But they're starting to do things like studying social science organizations. They do fieldwork projects where they're studying the department of anthropology. They're studying how orals committees are put together. And similarly, just one last question on that. David Mandelbaum does a survey in the sixties of different teaching methods in anthropology. It seems like, though, you're learning as much from your students in these seminars as they're learning from you, in a way.

04-00:55:16
Nader: Yes, because you have to understand who you're teaching. In the law course I began asking them to write complaint diaries and that was one of my introductions. Holy mackerel, I've been thinking they're all like a bunch of Wells undergraduates and these kids are not. Sherry was right. They're not like Wells girls. Women were living with their boyfriends. They couldn't tell their parents. They were being abused by the boyfriend. They couldn't tell anybody. They had no legal rights. And then I realized there's a whole new world there, that I'd been teaching these people as if they were like—and I didn't know who they were. Now I know who they are. And I started with the graduate students doing this kind of work but I realized it would put them in prejudice because nobody wanted to hire an anthropologist who was working

on the United States. You hire an anthropologist who worked with the Booga-Booga. [Nader's term for "primitive people."] So David Serber, one of my students who did the work on insurance, couldn't get a job in an anthropology department because they said, "We don't teach courses on insurance in this department." Biggest industry in the United States, right? We don't teach courses on it. And so David really—he ended up very—he got a job at Carnegie Mellon but he wanted to be in an anthropology department. And he ended up committing suicide. So at that point I realized I'd better move this out of the graduate into the undergraduate because they're not vulnerable. They get experiences and they started—

Of course, then I went to Wellesley in 1983, '84, under the Luce Professorship at Wellesley, and I was affiliated with the Harvard Law School. And at Wellesley I started a series of public talks that focused on issues from Orwell's book 1984. And then, of course. I taught a course there on controlling processes and then came back to Berkeley and continued to teach.

04-00:57:13

Redman: It seems as though we're turning to the George Orwell texts. *1984* was an important book for you around that period of time and I wonder if you could sort of briefly encapsulate that. And, in particular, you had mentioned the idea of self-censorship at one point as being an idea that stuck with you at that moment.

04-00:57:33

Nader: Yes. Well, I was shocked because when I'd say something that I didn't think was any big deal people would say, "Well, that was so courageous of you to say that." That's not courageous. This is the United States of America. Why is it courageous to say what you're looking at? So what I learned from the beginning teaching it is that *Brave New World* is not taught for the most part in American high schools but *1984* is because it's about them. It's about Eastern Europe. So I taught the two together because, in fact, that's what's happening now. The two are together in our country today. So that was the beginning. And when I taught it as a seminar, I think I mentioned to you, that Professor [George] Akerlof audited the class. He became a Nobel Prize winner a few years later. And I just found some material from him. And he gave me a book called *The File*, which was interesting, about some of this stuff. So he was aware. But then he got shut up because his wife got into the Clinton Administration and now you couldn't get him to say anything public for anything because he said some things publicly and he got into trouble, even though he was a Nobel Laureate.

04-00:58:36

Redman: I wonder if you have any questions to wrap up this session.

04-00:58:40

Rubens: I think we should maybe end for today and then just do a little planning. But you were going to talk about some health issues.

04-00:58:53
Nader: Yes, I think it might be important to point out that when I went to Yale Law School in 1974, I was also diagnosed the summer before as having breast cancer. And so I was operated on in New York but I was always puzzled as to why at the age of forty-one I had gotten breast cancer. And then we put two and two together. And when I was at Harvard they sent me to the Harvard Medical School over a non-issue of having menstrual cramps to a program that was experimenting with women and menstrual cramp problems and it was a hormone research and I was put on a very high dose of hormonal materials. So I myself connect what might have happened to me.

And I went back to check it out when I was at Wellesley and Harvard in ’83, ’84. I went back to see Dr. Sturges, who was doing that research and he was retired. And I went with Maybury-Lewis’s wife and I went to his home and I said, “I need to understand about this research you did.” I said, “What were you intending to do?” and I said, “And how many people did you have as your sample?” And he said, “I had twenty.” And I said, “Well, I want to tell you my story.” So I told him my story of the zigzag, what had happened, and that I was diagnosed with, had breast cancer and so forth. And, “What did you do with the other sample? With the sample?” I’m like, “What ever happened to the other nineteen people?” He said, “Oh, I threw the research materials away after five years.” I said, “But the British said it doesn’t show up for fifteen years.” He said, “I disagree with the British.” Anyway, but the long and short of it, at the end of the interview, I said to him, “Knowing what I’ve told you today would you do anything different?” And he said, “If I were to do it differently, I would have had—I had nineteen nurses and one scientist. I would have had twenty nurses because they don’t complain.” And Maybury-Lewis’s wife said, “I don’t know how you stopped from slapping his face.” So I’ve been very careful to tell students be careful not to be a guinea pig as an undergraduate or a graduate student because they’ll tell you it’s research. I said to him, “Will this hurt me?” and he said, “Well, this is research,” and I thought, “Well, I’m doing research.” But he never answered the question will it hurt me. In fact, the answer would have been, “I don’t know and this is a gamble.” And you paid a dollar to be in this research program each time you went. A dollar. A dollar to get sick.

04-01:01:33
Redman: Wow. That’s a remarkable story.

04-01:01:35
Nader: So he never took responsibility. And then years later, of course, part of the health issue was I had to have radiation and then years later, of course, the radiation has its own side effects. And so it’s a zigzag and somebody should write the story, one patient, many medicines, because one doctor almost killed me and Dr. Haagenson who operated on me, saved my life, at the New York Presbyterian Hospital.

04-01:02:01
Redman: Well, unfortunately we have to leave it here.

04-01:02:03
Nader: That’s all right.

04-01:02:04
Redman: Thank you.

Interview 3: June 20, 2013

Audio File 5

05-00:00:03

Rubens: Sam and I want to have a jam packed session in our allotted time to talk about the evolution and the maturation of your thought. And I think this will come out by first looking at a few particulars. For instance, one significant milestone in your career that we haven't talked about yet, is your semester at Yale Law School in 1971. And could you say how that came about and what that experience was?

05-00:00:34

Nader: Well, that was one of several law schools that I had to do with, which we may mention later. But Yale was very important because at that time the legal missionaries that had gone to South America and other places were coming back to American law schools and talking about law and development. And one of these people was David Trubek. And there were several at Yale. [Bill] Felstiner was at Yale and Rick Abel was at Yale. But David Trubek invited me to come to Yale and teach a course with him on law and development. So that's what took me originally. But, of course, when you're there you're observing the law school, what's going on, the debates that they're having, the conferences you participate in and you're learning how lawyers think and how they think alike because the thing that was amazing about the legal missionaries is that it never occurred to them that you can't transform a legal system of another country by just taking the curriculum in our law schools. You have to take the Bill of Rights and the Constitution. But you can't go to Brazil and just take the Socratic method and say you should be using it. So they had some issues and I was trying to figure out what the issues were. And, of course, it was a kind of imperialism. I mean it wasn't a kind of imperialism, it was legal imperialism, which I think they didn't realize because they were mostly lefties. They're doing good. So that was the Yale part of it.

And we taught together but we never published anything together. But it launched a whole series of participation and conferences, which finally led, I guess, to the Pound Conference in Minneapolis when the Chief Justice of the US Supreme Court invited me to speak. And, again, I was the only social scientist invited. I was in a state because I left my glasses on the airplane. I had to run back to the airport terminal. And I had this little note of points I wanted to make. And, of course, as soon as I gave my talk, people came right up to the podium and said, "No, no, no. It can't happen that way." [Herman Kahn, the futurist who was very important at the time came up.] And also, the attorney general came up to talk to me. They wanted me to have lunch with Chief Justice Berger and Attorney General Levi and each one came up to invite me and so on. So I had an opportunity to ask some questions. It was really a wonderful opportunity in how they think and what's going on.

That was where they launched the alternative dispute resolution movement, which was a hegemonic movement to change the protests of the 1960s and early seventies from disputing, taking cases to court like civil rights and consumer rights and environmental rights and Indian rights, et cetera, into mediation instead. They thought it wouldn't happen, until maybe the year 2000; but it happened way before then. It was such a powerful movement. And they just silenced everything. So now we've got a legal system basically with very few plaintiffs. Citizen plaintiffs.

05-00:04:04
Rubens: Like a flattening of—

05-00:04:05
Nader: Total flattening of the civil justice system. And, of course, the government is the plaintiff in the criminal cases. So we basically destroyed our open access to law.

05-00:04:20
Rubens: But at that point you had been pretty active in the founding of the Law and Society Association.

05-00:04:25
Nader: I was. I was one of the founding people and what we wanted to do was to give voice to a lot of the people in the social sciences and the law schools who wanted to look at the sociocultural questions that were being raised and they were all marginalized. We thought, "Well, if you have a law and society group then we can have meetings and we don't have any boundaries." But I realized they have boundaries. The sociologists had their boundaries. The lawyers had their boundaries. And I didn't want boundaries because the questions went beyond the boundaries. And it was then that I was really moved toward bringing together my work on power and control into something called controlling processes. Because first I was focused on power. But then I realized that if I were to talk to students about power they'd say big deal. They know. Somebody has the power and somebody doesn't. What they don't know is how they get it. And how they get it in a democratic society is not just, "I grab the power," it's done through all kinds of innuendos, cultural modes, and what we call hegemonies or what Gramsci called hegemony.

So I began to put that together with what was happening in Zapotec country, which was harmony, a harmony ideology. And I never published that book until about 1990 because I couldn't figure out what the explanation was until I realized that everywhere European colonialism went, missionaries went. And the missionaries in Mexico had gone in before the Spanish military and they introduced Christianity. And in this town they realized the way to keep the outside out is to outdo them. Not be troublemakers. To be mediators. Keep things harmonious and then they don't interfere. And they saw what happened when they weren't harmonious. So then I realized harmony ideology is a pacification process. And the same thing is happening here with alternative

dispute resolution. So that was really a realization. I remember I was on sabbatical one semester and I told the family, "I don't want anybody to be home during the day." And I just took book after book, ethnography off the shelf and I looked up missionaries to see. And it was happening everywhere. Everywhere where western colonialism went, Christianity went. And it's still happening.

And, of course, 1984 was coming up and by that time I was at Harvard Law School, '83, '84, and Wellesley and I taught a course in Wellesley about controlling processes. It was a very interesting bunch of people. And because I was at the Harvard Law School, I realized the law schools really didn't want me to talk about lawyers or law schools. They wanted me to talk about mediation. So I made a list of all the people I wanted to talk to and I just had lunch with them all during the time I was there. Because I was interested in what they think. And that was very useful, that year.

05-00:07:34
Rubens: Were there some people there that were particularly influential?

05-00:07:38
Nader: Well, the critical legal scholars, like Duncan Kennedy, were just sort of coming to the fore. And I was interested in how abstract they were going to be or how concrete their work was going to be. It ended up sort of going the literary direction and they fizzled out. But at one point in time they were talking about the politics of law and that was interesting to me.

05-00:07:58
Redman: Can I sneak in just one? You mentioned Jerome Franks *Courts on Trial*, which I understand was published in 1949 and then Edmond Cahn's *Sense of Injustice* in '64. I wonder if you can connect how people at Harvard and Yale—were they interacting or engaging with those types of books and were there other anthropologists that were interested in those questions, as well, or were you feeling pretty unique in that intersection?

05-00:08:22
Nader: Well, I think I was more interdisciplinary than most of them reading this. Edmond Cahn's son, Edgar I think was fired from—he and his wife started this law school, Antioch Law School. I can't recall exactly but I think in the process of firing they had written this article or maybe they wrote it before. They closed the law school down. He eventually opened it again. His father wrote *The Sense of Injustice* and he then was the next generation and it's his father's work that most interested me. I knew him personally, Edgar Cahn, the son, but not the father. But it was his work that engaged me, because nobody was talking about *Injustice*. And later on I wrote a piece about the words we use. I was invited to a Yale conference just a few years ago and see how these things all come together? And the conference was on justice. And I said, "How can you talk about justice without talking about injustice?" I end up writing an article, "The Words We Use." I do believe we might have

mentioned this. And it was put in the epilogue of the book, as if it were an afterthought. In the meantime, an Italian anthropologist heard about it. He translated it. He put it in a book that he was publishing in Milan, in the front. So it's just the difference between, again, the way scholarship here or elsewhere—I mean how can you talk about justice without talking about injustice?

05-00:09:48

Redman: These are really important questions and I do want to stick to law schools. That's our primary—but I want to just ask really quickly, the issue of translation. I'm especially interested prior to the internet. Keeping track of your own work and publications as they're republished and maybe translated into different languages. That must have been a gratifying thing for you but how did you keep track of that and were you interested to see how your own work was published or republished and where it appeared and under what circumstances it was—

05-00:10:20

Nader: Oh, yes. I still to this day don't know, for example, the citations in Japan. I know that there were some Japanese scholars here that were interested in my work and so on. But they were on a different level. They were wanting to go towards jury trials rather than the reverse, getting rid of them. But Brazil it was very clear there was a lot of interest in my work. They invited me to give a distinguished talk there. I think I was the first North American anthropologist who ever gave a talk in Spanish to them. [Coercive harmony: The Political Economy of Legal Models] And they published it. And then I tried to get it published in English with the Harvard *Negotiation Journal* and they hemmed and they hawed and they so on. And then I pushed them on it and they edited it. They edited it out so that it sounded like I was pro-mediation. I said, "I'm not going to do this." So I pulled it and published it in the *Kroeber Society Papers*. But it had been already published in Portuguese and Spanish in Latin America. So that really got around.

And where else? Well, I was interested that the *Harmony Ideology* book, which apparently people were really waiting for because it was pivotal because of the ADR movement, I think I had thirty-five reviews. That's the maximum reviews any book of mine ever got, I think. So I did follow some of that to see where it was and what's happened.

And then at Stanford I taught a course with several people at Stanford. [John] Merryman was one. He did work on intellectual property. And Jim Gibbs was part of that, social anthropologist. And there was a Chinese scholar whose name I can't recall now, and me. And we were talking about law in non-western societies. And they assigned me Islam. But they already had a text book that had problems. Clearly the part on Islam wasn't written by somebody who knew much about Islamic law. I even didn't know much about Islamic law, but I knew enough to know what was unstoppable. So I disagreed with

the book in my lectures and I debated with Merryman and the others, the lawyers and the Chinese and so on. And then the course got reviewed, I think the second or third year we taught it. And they had this woman come in to review. And here we were, four of us sitting there like detainees. And she was telling us what the students thought. And they thought that I was too outspoken, that I challenged the reader. How could you do that? That I disagreed with my colleagues. Dissent, you see. And that that upset them. And, anyway, they went through the four of us but I got the sort of brunt. "Do you have any questions?" she said. And I said, "Yes." I said, "Would the course have been more successful if we said nothing about the errors in the reader? If we all agreed and were harmonious and loved each other and so on? Would it have been a better course? Would they have learned more? And besides, who invented this anyway, this review process?" Turned out it was Jim Gibbs, who was an anthropologist at Stanford and I was really shocked. So it told me a little bit about Stanford, the campus, what was thought about free and open inquiry.

But they have invited me several times. I gave a talk there on women, Islamic women. It was the "Orientalism/Occidentalism" paper. They could not believe what I was saying. They could not believe that Arab countries had maternity leave when we didn't. And I said, "I'll show you the data." So it shows you how blanketed our minds are and why. And is it true in every culture or is there something about the way we do it here that's a brave new world style that Huxley talked about? So I puzzled about things. I puzzled because I never really understood why do students love the course Controlling Processes so much? Why do they remember it? Like the woman who said, "I took a course from you ten years ago." And I said, "You remember it?" And she said, "Yes, it was Controlling Processes." Why do they remember it? They don't remember any courses from one semester to another; who taught it and whatever it is. Their memories are worse than seventy-five year olds. So it opens their eyes to something. But why are our eyes closed? We're not looking at reality in this country and many people are saying this now.

05-00:15:51

Rubens: So should we talk just a little bit more about your conceptualization of controlling processes? Because you talk about that you added—it's not just hegemonic Gramscian notions of social control but it's also culture.

05-00:16:04

Nader: Well, hegemony is instrumental culture, basically. And so let's go to the Mintz lecture. The Mintz lecture was very important and I think I was the fifth or sixth person to give the lecture. And after the lecture Ashraf Ghani came up to me and he said, "You did it again." I said, "What?" He said, "You left them dumbfounded." What were the issues? The various issues were harmony ideology, and I used the Zapotec example as pacification, a form of pacification. I used the student's work on breast implants, where it's women's choice they said in the Congress, and I wanted to show it was not free will and

that we should challenge the issues of choice when in fact we're being programmed to think that we need breast implants. And then the third had to do with science at the Smithsonian. So these were all three hot topics. Gender, ADR basically, and science. And it isn't that it generated a lot of questions. It generated dumbfoundedness. That's what to me is puzzling. So teaching it to the class, can you teach it in one lecture? No. But what really cinches it is when I say to them you have to write a paper and that's when I say, "You have to write a paper." "What about?" "Find a controlling process in your life and tell me how it works." So they discover themselves. I'm not telling them what to think. I'm not telling them what's an important issue.

So I interwove the teaching with the research and I respect good work, whether it's done by undergraduates or PhDs. Again, it's an egalitarian notion. It's not quite acceptable. And I'm looking at our own society. Sociologists study the United States but they study poor people mainly. Diversity, black people, Indians, whatever. Not even Indians but—see, it's the questioning like—that's why I think comparative consciousness is so important. Because I listen to Amy Goodman on Black History Month and I think of a cabdriver who when we passed the Holocaust Museum in Washington, I said, "Don't you think there should be a slavery museum?" And he said, "Oh, first there should be a Native American Museum. Those poor devils really got it." So I listen to Amy Goodman and I think of that guy. He's black but he knows the blacks replaced the Indians in Washington, DC. And so he's being fair. And I think, "Why don't we have a Native American History Month?" And now I've got people thinking about why don't we have a Native American history. Maybe we'll have one. If we have one, I think it's very interesting that we don't, we have to confront the fact of plunder. We have to confront the fact that we came here and we took the land and they're on reservations and there's an injustice and these people who were treated this way, fought in American wars for our military and they've been really good "Americans" and we should do something about that. Can we give the land back? Probably not. But can we do better by them on the so-called reservations? Can we stop uranium mining on reservations? There are a lot of things we could do as a people.

05-00:20:21
Rubens: So can we talk about controlling processes in terms of your understanding of energy resource and science, because I think you had that wonderful article on how narrow or limited much of the thought about energy is.

05-00:20:32
Nader: "Barriers to Thinking New About Energy." I think I want to say something about *Naked Science* related to your question. Because I was elected head of Section, the steering group of the AAAS. And so the person who has that position is supposed to do something at the AAAS meetings. And it happened to be that time when we were going into the Gulf War. So before anything started, Bush came on, a picture of him from ceiling to floor, and he told us

how wonderful science was, we could rule the world basically. It had brought us so much progress and it was wonderful, blah, blah, blah. Meanwhile, I had invited all these social scientists, including sociologists, to come and talk about the issues that they thought were important in ethno-science and techno-science. So techno-science would be what Bush is talking about, what happens in our labs. And ethno-science stems from the traditional knowledge movement, understanding of traditional knowledge. Now, there are people in anthropology who study science but they like to differentiate between science and knowledge and I don't. And I think the reason they differentiate is there are institutions of science they say. So that makes it science. Whereas the other is knowledge, it's just people who do their own experiments and over several hundred years they figure out that this is the way to grow this crop or that medicine or whatever. And this was amazing. And I was so agonizing over the title of the collection. We sat here with my students and we wrote up all kinds of titles and all sorts of things. You know who came up with the title *Naked Science*? Ralph. In the middle of all this he calls and he says, "Well, tell me what it's about." And after I did, he said, "naked science." I thought, "What a great idea."

We had the subtitle all set, *Anthropological Inquiries into Boundaries, Power and Knowledge*, but naked science summed it up. It's about unmasking. It's really about the practice of science. So we had people talking about navigators in the Pacific, like Ward Goodenough. It was totally intergenerational, which I loved, too. This trendiness stuff doesn't go well in my mind. Sometimes it does. So Ward Goodenough talked about navigation in the Pacific. Are you kidding? You have to have a lot of knowledge to cover the territory these people covered, moving from one land mass to another. And then they did hunting among the Cree Indians and the laws and traditional medicine in Chiapas and Charlie Schwartz from Berkeley's Department of Physics did physics. And [Hugh] Gusterson, who worked at Livermore Lab, was in there. So we were basically mixing all these things in one book. And it went out for review. How can you mix real science with—come on, Laura. And these are anthropologists reviewing me. So it's so interesting to find not only the paradigms in other people's dogmas but the paradigms in anthropology.

So I think I mentioned how I finally got that published. Maybe I didn't. But what happened is it was turned down, I think it was either Little Brown or Columbia. And then it stood at Princeton. They wouldn't either say yes or no. And then Rutledge came by and said, "Do you have anything we could publish? We're very interested in your work." And I said, "Oh, sit down. I'll tell you the story." I told him everything and I gave him all the bad reviews. And they said, "We know about politics, academic politics. We'll take care of that." And they put it out. It's actually a wonderful volume and apparently my most highly cited.

And now I'm teaching it. Started last year teaching a course on science and power and I'm using that and I'm using Malinowski's *Magic, Science and*

Religion, and I'm using some things on Islamic science because we've got some famous people who have worked on Chinese science. But Islamic science we haven't. It's still a real question mark. And we like to think of Islamic science as a translation of Greek science for the West. No, there were things going on way before Copernicus in Baghdad. And it's debatable. See, again, it's a black hole and more people are starting to work on it, like George Saliba. And it's very interesting. And they had different ways of supporting science, which I think is key to understanding what kind of science happens.

So the "Barriers" paper was at the MITRE Corporation. We haven't talked about that?

05-00:25:48
Redman: I think we talked a little bit about the lecture but we need to get back into that I guess.

05-00:25:55
Nader: All right. The MITRE Corporation had invited me. The MITRE Corporation is a big corporation that deals mainly with military and security questions. They weren't very diversified when I was talking to them.

05-00:26:09
Redman: Primarily engineers?

05-00:26:11
Nader: Primarily engineers but not all. No, there were a lot of scientists, as well. So that talk was received with great laughter because I was talking about them. And they published it and then it got republished, I think I mentioned, in *ChemTech* and *Physics Today* and *Industrial Physicist* and so on. But the interesting thing which we didn't talk about is that the letters that were sent to me, the hundreds of letters which I have on file by physicists and engineers and so on from all over the country, and some from outside the country, they were enlarging my picture. "I don't know how you could have seen these obvious things the short time that you were doing this and let me tell you some more." And they came from LBL, from Lawrence Berkeley, from labs all over the country, from Nobel laureates who understand the importance of creativity. And you see the thing that attracted them, I think, was barriers to thinking new. Because scientists like to think they think new. That's what makes for progress. But as Kuhn points out, new comes in from the side usually and normal science is just repetitive. It's what's going on now at LBL, I think, with some exception.

05-00:27:30
Redman: I wonder if you could talk for a moment about, aside from getting official registers of data, these letters that are sort of unsolicited responses to your work and they're sort of influencing your thinking. Can you talk a little bit about the intellectual impact of that over the course of your career, giving

these talks and then getting letters maybe a year later or six months later in response to it.

05-00:27:58
Nader: Well, you have to realize that in the science business, the first thing I learned from those letters is there's no such thing as a stereotypical scientist. There's huge variation. There's as much variation as we have in the anthro department probably. There's some people that are crooked, unethical, just do it for the money or for the notoriety or whatever, and there's some people that have got new ideas, they get kicked on the can, and there's some people and so on. There's a wide variety. And that's illustrated by the letters. So the piece I wrote, where I incorporated some of them, is called "Magic Science and Religion Revisited" because Malinowski talked about where you get science among the Trobrianders is where they have experience. And on the open seas where they don't have experience, they have magic. And we don't have experience in what's going to happen if there's a nuclear war. So it's kind of magical. Nuclear becomes kind of magical. A lot of science is magical because you're in new territory. So these scientists were trying to point out to me the censorship and the paradigms. And as I say, the Nobel laureates, it's fascinating that they sought to write. I mean handwritten letters. This is not emailing. And a son of a Nobel laureate wrote to say, "These scientists today are not scientists. They're technicians. Differentiating. It's not like the people who used to come visit in my home, that my father and mother used to have. For instance, Niels Bohr, the great scientist." So it gave me further insight. Published them, some of them. They're on file. Anybody wants to see them, then they should probably go to The Bancroft Library.

05-00:29:48
Rubens: Religion is something you've always paid attention to, of course the role of missionaries in your early work, in the law, in your new work on how the west is seen historically in other cultures.

05-00:30:02
Nader: Yes. See, I think that the thing that I'm very grateful for— that when I get to a boundary I do not just stop. I go beyond. I follow the question. If the question means new territory I go into new territory. And that to me is the essence of what it is to be a good anthropologist. You have to go into new territory. So I never was interested in religion particularly until I realized the role of missionaries in disputing. When you look at the comparative data you realize missionaries are very important. Then you look at anthropology and there's hardly anything at that time written about missionaries. Now we have written about missionaries. But they were so important. How could we have left them out? Well, that's why discoveries are made. And other people began to notice. Oh, missionaries, we should really talk about the missionaries.

So one of my students, Laurel Rose, did fieldwork in Swaziland, I believe, and I was testing my notion about missionaries. She didn't agree with me. She said, "No, it's the tribal people that want to have this mediation." And I said,

"Well, why don't you describe a tribal meeting to mediate." She said, "Well, first—" and then she looked at me—"they have a prayer." I said, "Okay. That's it. So don't tell me the missionary's not involved in the turn the other cheek."

05-00:31:34
Rubens: So you were looking at religion that way in terms of how it framed—

05-00:31:40
Nader: Yes. Religion affected law. And, of course, it does here in this country today. All you have to do is listen to these congressmen talking about what they're going to do to abortion and you know that there's law that they're trying to pass and it has to do with their religious beliefs, which is quite shocking, I might say for a democracy and separation of politics from religion.

05-00:32:02
Rubens: You began teaching the lecture course Controlling Processes in 1984

05-00:32:16
Nader: Yes. I taught a seminar the year before. That's when a Nobel laureate, the economist, George Akerlof participated, as I mentioned before. He was a participant, along with somebody who was visiting the campus from the defense department. So it was very interesting. The graduate students and these two people and so forth.

05-00:32:39
Rubens: You were eventually named one of the most distinguished teachers on campus. It was a very popular and incredibly well attended course.

05-00:32:51
Nader: The department supposedly put me up for a distinguished teacher campus-wide and so they had people that were going to come in and, I think I mentioned this, come in and observe. And I did not get that award. What I got was the social science dean who awards a teaching award as well. But I think they just didn't—they sat in on a course. They just couldn't figure out, because I didn't have points. I wasn't doing, what is it called?

05-00:33:22
Redman: PowerPoint.

05-00:33:22
Nader: PowerPoints. In fact, I have a piece in my reader about why PowerPoints are pointless, written by the guy who started PowerPoints. Too much information so they don't pick up anything. And they didn't understand the fact that I was talking. I wasn't reading notes. I was referring to my notes but I was talking. And I was bringing in everyday news. The *New York Times* this morning said. Or today's reading is about eight—it was about 1890 or 1865 to 1910 or something like that. "You think that has anything to do with your lives today? Well, look at what the *New York Times* just wrote about." Blah, blah, blah. So these things are all still here. So they get interested because it's contemporary.

And they go, “Oh, oh.” But the people who were observing thought it was bizarre because it appeared that I was bouncing from one thing to another, whereas what I was doing is trying to stimulate a mode of thinking where you can make connections.

05-00:34:30
Redman: Can you talk for a moment about teaching with graduate students? Have you utilized TAs? Or at Berkeley we call them graduate student instructors. And how has that shaped the nature of your experience teaching a course like Controlling Processes? More on the undergraduate side than when you’re starting to work with larger classes.

05-00:34:49
Nader: Well, I taught Anthro Three with GSIs and they were pretty good. I enjoyed doing that. But I was running the course.

05-00:35:00
Rubens: And Anthro Three was?

05-00:35:01
Nader: Introduction to social, cultural, anthropology. And I think a lot of faculty now delegate to the head TA, teaching assistant, running the TAs. I never did that. They’re my TAs. I wanted them to do something in sections that would buffer the course. But I think once in a while there was a little trouble because somebody thought that they could run the sections better than I could tell them to run the sections. But that was very rare.

In the Controlling Processes class they didn’t give me graduate student instructors [GSI]. There were people who GSI’d it but they did it as readers because the department never cooperated with the most interesting course that I ever taught. And I never will understand except it didn’t fit the usual—it didn’t fit the topics. You see, when Lowie was at Berkeley he taught a course called Comparative Society. And Comparative Society cut across politics, religion, whatever. Law and so forth. And then as we became specialized in anthropology, somebody taught the law course, somebody taught the politics course, somebody taught the religion course. And so we stopped having this cut across. Controlling Processes was going back to what Lowie was trying to do because it cut across. I had a section on religion, I had a section on science, had a section on politics, law, personal whatever. So it actually was going back to go forward to try to integrate more the thinking of undergraduate anthropologists.

05-00:36:42
Redman: Can you tell the story of your sign on your office door here? How it says the Laboratory of Controlling Processes. What’s the story behind that sign?

05-00:36:50
Nader: Well, the story was that the whole notion that somehow, whether anthropology is a science or not, and the archeologists I think were—they had

labs but we didn't have labs and they were more scientific or the course was. And so I thought, "This is a lab," so I put a sign on the door. And it's very interesting because when the people from the university came in looking around, I don't know what they've got in mind. But the guy said, "Well, we were interested in looking at your office." And I said, "This is not an office, this is a laboratory." He looked at the sign. He said, "Oh, Yes, I see it is." And, you see, Junko has a lab across. She's an archeologist. Well, I have a lab, too.

05-00:37:44
Rubens: That's great. I wondered if you also wanted to talk a little bit more about publishing with undergraduate papers and what the reception was of that. Why you chose to do that.

05-00:38:02
Nader: Well, the undergraduates, they're not so fixated on career and so you can inspire them to work on subject matters that they think are more interesting. For example, for the project that led to *No Access to Law*, I had people from other campuses, a student from Williams College came here, women from East Coast colleges. I don't know exactly how they heard about me. They came and knocked at the door and said, "I hear you're doing something interesting on dispute resolution and can I participate." And they participated to begin with, with no pay at all because I didn't have any money. But I wanted to pay them. So we eventually got a grant from the Carnegie Corporation to do this work and they got reimbursed for their time and they got published. And I think I've said before that people really don't understand a certain egalitarian mutual respect notion between people like me and my students. I don't care whether you have a PhD or not. [Edward Burnett]Tylor is the father of American anthropology supposedly. Did not have a PhD in anthropology. I don't know if he graduated from high school. Maybe. So this is something recent, credentialing and so on.

05-00:39:23
Rubens: Gatekeeping.

05-00:39:24
Nader: Yes. So I did that research jointly with them and then I did some other work also with graduates and undergraduates. Of course, *The Disputing Process* was totally with graduate students.

05-00:39:39
Rubens: By the way, we couldn't find anything about Harry Todd, with whom you edited *Disputing Process.*

05-00:39:46
Nader: I think he decided to quit academia and he became a travel agent at one point and then I lost touch with him. I don't know where he is.

05-00:39:52
Rubens: How is it you came to collaborate with him?

05-00:39:55
Nader: Well, I started by collaborating with Klaus Koch, my first PhD. He was going to do it jointly with me. He got so irritated —because nobody kept to deadlines, he was really Prussian oriented— that he quit and so then I asked Todd if he'd do it with me. And he agreed. I thought it would be a boost for him but he chose to do something else in life.

05-00:40:25
Rubens: You have collaborated with many on books, up to one of your most recent books on law, *Plunder: When the Rule of Law is Illegal*, with Ugo Mattei in 2008.

05-00:40:45
Nader: Right. Well, Ugo was the first colleague that I collaborated with. All the others were either former students or students. And I published with students because I thought it would be a useful thing for them to help launch them in their work. The funniest paper I wrote in this regard is the one I wrote with Ellen Hertz, who teaches in Switzerland. And she was a student here. She got a joint degree, from the law school and the anthropology program. And it was a book about American pundits and we did Thomas Friedman. And what are you going to do with a propagandist? Fifty percent of the time he's right, 50 percent he's sort of off base. And so we Thomas Friedman-ed Thomas Friedman. And we did to him what he always does to everybody else, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. And it is one of the most humorous takeoffs. It is nothing like anything I've ever written before.

I insisted that Ellen be a senior author because she was now a professor. Editors reviewed it and they said, "You can't do this." This is disrespectful. And we want you to do blah, blah, blah." And Ellen said, "I don't want to waste any more time with them." I said, "We've already invested all this time, Ellen. I'm not going to give up at this point." Interestingly enough, when it got reviewed later, it got reviewed as one of the best papers in the book. So I was vindicated vis-à-vis her. But when I invest time, it means I'm not with my family. And I'm not about to waste it because I'm mad at somebody who's criticizing my work. I'm just going to pursue it. And the same thing happened with a paper I wrote with my sister on regulation.

05-00:42:43
Rubens: How did that come about?

05-00:42:44
Nader: Well, I was invited to talk about regulation but Claire had the data and she was in Washington. So I said, "Well, let's do it together."

05-00:42:50
Rubens: She was at the AEC?

05-00:42:57
Nader: No. She was doing public interest work in Washington, after her work at Oak Ridge National Laboratory. And we went to this conference together. I thought I mentioned this but maybe not. We went to this conference together and our essay said something very simple. It said that when you deregulate at the government level you may reregulate elsewhere. So every organization regulates, either at the university, the professional organization, or the corporate world. There's always regulation. So it moves. And when I finish my presentation, Phil Selznick, who was a sociologist here, said, "I'm sorry Professor Nader has chosen to write her paper in a spirit of alienation." And alienation? He even wrote a textbook where he said what I was saying. So what's he doing? And I went to lunch with him afterwards and said, "What's going on here? You wrote a book called *Law in an Industrial Society.* You never told us what industrial society you were talking about in the whole book." So there's only one, US centric. But you learn from these experiences.

05-00:44:15
Rubens: Was there another collaboration you had with your sister?

05-00:44:16
Nader: Oh, by the way, this was actually turned down by her editor, eventually. First it wasn't going to be published. "No," Noll, at Stanford, now said, "No, it got bad reviews." I responded, "Send me the reviews." One review said you could quibble with this but in Nader style it's very interesting ideas or something like that. And then the other one was what I would consider a fine review. And he said they're bad reviews. Well, all right. I'll send it out to three law professors. Somebody at Wisconsin, somebody at Stanford I think I mentioned. No, that was the Yale piece. So every time you get a bump in the road like this, again, I invested the time, I wrote the piece, I'm going to see it through.

05-00:45:01
Rubens: And you sent it out to these—

05-00:45:02
Nader: I sent it out to these law professors, and then I sent them to the editor without their names because it was very clear that they weren't written by me. And he had to publish it. Again, when the reviews came out it got kudos because it was interesting. It was different. It raised new questions. And that's what we're all about, I think.

I am not a normal paradigm follower like Kuhn talks about. He talks about the normal paradigm. And if you look at these questions here they're all challenging something. You don't just look at law if religion is in fact framing it. You don't just look at Western science if in fact we're in the process of borrowing a lot of ideas from non-Western peoples and calling theirs knowledge and ours science. Each one of these points challenge issues. You don't study Islamic women without realizing they're also looking at our

women. There's an interaction going on here. And the piece on human rights. You don't point fingers at the Chinese about what they're doing in their prisons if the Chinese can't come to California and see what we're doing in our prisons. So mutual respect and mutual gaze runs through a lot of these and sometimes it bothers people; makes them feel uncomfortable. And honestly I guess I don't believe in the kind of exceptionalism that people attribute to their nation. Exceptionalism is a kind of nationalism, I guess, which is not to be confused with patriotism. The Germans thought they were exceptional. It leads to trouble. I think you have to have mutual respect in a world that's smaller and smaller.

05-00:47:12

Rubens: Regarding working with your sister. There was something that you did with her when she was with the Atomic Energy Commission [AEC].

05-00:47:22

Nader: No, she was not at the AEC. She was the first social scientist at Oak Ridge National Laboratory and she worked in the office of the director, Alvin Weinberg, I think it was. And she was one of the very first people to talk about the effect of government and militarization on American science. Whereas, for example, Kuhn, in his famous book *Structure of Scientific Revolution*, has sort of an internal perspective. To my mind, I can't remember, but I don't think he ever talked about where the money was coming from. But Claire was talking about government money—he who pays the piper calls the tune. And it becomes more militaristic and it becomes all about security and then pushing nuclear and so on and so forth. And I think that was a very important part of her contribution. She was one of the first. But she's never wanted to teach strictly in an academic situation and she's more activist in the public interest work.

She co-edited a book, *Science and Technology in Developing Countries* while she was at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, but I wasn't involved in that. [We did write an essay together, "A Wide Angle on Regulation," published in *Regulatory Policy and the Social Sciences*, R. Noll, ed. University of California Press, 1985.]

05-00:49:31

Rubens: Now there were a couple of, it seemed to me, sort of oddball things you were involved in. For instance, with a tax association in California, this is in l978.

05-00:49:44

Nader: Well, that was during Proposition Thirteen. Everybody was talking about tax. And, again, there was nothing much in anthropology about tax. And when I was looking through my ethnographies I'd look in the index—that's why indexes are very important. I'd look under taxation and I saw how it started, how taxation started in Africa, how they got them. They forced them to work in the labor field, workers, African workers, by saying you have to pay a certain amount of tax. And if they didn't have any money they couldn't pay

the tax. And so then they punished them if they couldn't pay the tax. So they forced them to go into the colonial labor camps very often. So I got interested in the whole taxation. And then somebody came along and it was published.

Then the Wilson Center in Washington contacted me; this was after I left the center. (I had been there '79, '80.) They asked me if I'd write something and they were willing to pay me some minimal amount of money. So I revamped my first paper and sent it to them and they wouldn't accept it. And I think they wouldn't accept it because of my last paragraph. I went from talking about the Inca and taxation among the Inca to what happens when the U.S. government doesn't like what you're doing and they can mess around with your income tax. That it's used as a controlling process. And so they said, "Here's your money but we're not going to publish it." And then there was an encyclopedia of anthropology and they said, "Is there any topic you think we should put in this?" So I sent my piece on taxation and it was published.

05-00:51:33
Rubens: That's a clear example of your interest in policy issues that leads to research.

05-00:51:42
Nader: Well, subject matters that we're covering; contextualizing public issues more than policy. It's like we cover kinship but you don't cover the fact that in Africa people were selling their children so that they could pay taxes. That they didn't ever—

05-00:51:54
Rubens: But it came out of your inquiry about the 1978 Proposition Thirteen that limited taxes for homeowners in California.

05-00:52:05
Redman: I wonder, is this a time where I could ask about the theory of lack?

05-00:52:09
Nader: Oh, yes.

05-00:52:13
Redman: So I have down a definition that you've written. But instead maybe I could just say that it's this idea of resources and how it gets—again answering the question of why, right. So it's not just about power but why do power structures develop the way they do. Resources. Why are they divided the way they are. Can you unpack that for me and describe the theory of why?

05-00:52:41
Nader: I'm not sure how that came up. But the philosopher Emerich de Vattel in Switzerland, I think it was in the early 1800s, wrote a piece about the world belongs to all mankind. The land belongs to all mankind. He elaborates this. I used his material. But some people know how to use it better than others because the others lack either the knowledge or the imagination. And then in Chinese law publications, I began to notice the "Chinese lack law."

Elsewhere, that Brazilians lack development. It's always about they lack something. And the word lack just kept coming up. We brought rule of law to the Iraqis because the Iraqis lack a rule of law, which was not true at all. So you could look at almost any incursion to any part of the world and it's justified by lack. And it's very interesting because when I gave this talk on lack at a plenary talk at Hastings Law School —and it was to a comparative law group—people from all over the world. People are so grateful from other parts of the world that you recognize this. Because it's confusing. It's colonization of the mind, I call it, and they're here to study but then they sort of know they don't lack this if they come from China because they have other legal control modes. But they're being told that they lack, that you better go back to China and do something about X, Y and Z, which is not saying there's not such a thing as lack. People could lack water; they could lack a lot of things. But it's used as a controlling process to justify the take.

And even to this day, this is not something just in the past, in the so-called colonial period. Look at [Paul] Bremer. Bush sent him, unbeknownst to Congress, to Baghdad because they lacked. They didn't have any WMD so they had to give some reason for being there. They lack rule of law. All of a sudden, all over the United States, all the newspaper were talking about rule of law, take rule of law to Iraq and Iraq lacks rule of law and the aid groups are going to teach them about the rule of law in the rural areas and they lack protection for their women and they lack and they lack. And one of the things I haven't mentioned is that my brother reads the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and the *Wall Street Journal* every day and he knows what my interests are, so he clips for me and he sends me these clippings. I began getting all these clippings from all over the country and so on and so on. And I had some students research this, or the librarian. It was the best example of how to get out of the embarrassment of their not having weapons of mass destruction. We're going to be good guys now. We're going to take rule of law because they lack rule of law. So I ended up writing a piece that I gave at a conference at the Max Planck Institute in Germany. And Ugo [Mattei] wrote a comparable piece and that's how we came together. I read his paper and he read mine. And I remember, he was standing right here and I said, "Ugo, that was a terrific piece. You should write a book." And he said, "No, you should write a book." And then he looked at me and he said, "Let's do it together." I think I mentioned this before.

05-00:56:27
Redman: And that's how *Plunder* came about?

05-00:56:28
Nader: That's how *Plunder* came about. Now, what's interesting about *Plunder*. Why was it translated into six different languages? It's sort of like thirty-five reviews of *Harmony Ideology*. You can't predict that. Why? See, I was interviewed for my new book. Is this all right to bring that in?

05-00:56:51
Rubens: Oh, yes.

05-00:56:52
Nader: I was interviewed for the new book, *Culture and Dignity* by the BBC in England, London. I had to go in at five o'clock in the morning to KQED in San Francisco, to be interviewed. And it was about us and them and they had two other people on. And what was interesting, at the end, the fellow who was interviewing thought my book was about us and them but in a much more PC way. And he said to each of the other two, "If you were such and such, what would you do?" And to me he said, "If you were a white male, what would you do?" And I said, "I don't want to be anything but what I am. I like myself the way I am. I don't care about people's gender. I don't care about their preference. I don't care about their color. I care about their character." You see, that's cutting through the whole diversity PC. I don't care whether Obama is black or green or blue. I care about what the consequences are of what he's doing. And I'm not sure why I feel so strongly about that. It is a family trait. And, of course, that's why Ralph said to Obama when he was first elected, "Are you going to be an Uncle Sam or an Uncle Tom?" and everybody jumped all over Ralph. Of course, he's an Uncle Tom to my point of view. And he was telling him something. And so the PC then becomes something of a controlling process and there's PC right and PC left. And Berkeley is very PC. So if you want to study PC there's no better place. Knee jerk Democrats all over this town who are very intolerant of any other position and who don't even criticize the Democratic—they don't even criticize themselves. So you don't have to think. You're just knee jerk. And so that becomes something of importance which I haven't looked into. My father used to say, "What the Democrats say about the Republicans is true. And what the Republicans say about the Democrats is true."

Audio File 6

06-00:00:00
Redman: I'd like to carry on with the main issues that we were talking about in the previous section with law and energy and controlling processes. But I'd like to step back for a moment and think about the history of anthropology and how it was unfolding on this campus in particular, but nationally and internationally, as well. I've heard you talk about the history of anthropology in terms of moving from the unilineal evolutionists to the growth of the multilineal evolutionists, then the structural functionalism that's more defined by Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown, the early twentieth century. Then there's the interpretivism and the anti-positivism that comes along and questions many of these sort of assumptions. Following that, there's maybe this post-functionalism movement and post-modernism movement. And I'd like to ask in particular how that unfolds on this campus. And we talked a little bit about Foucault as being on this campus but we haven't really dived into that and how the department reacted to his presence but then also the ideas and the linguistic turn that was becoming so important for so many.

06-00:01:26
Nader: Well, I don't think you can talk about anthropology on this campus without talking about anthropology in the United States. And the best advice I got from the veterans who were at Harvard when I was there was you must know something about the history of ideas and anthropology. Because I know something about the history of ideas and anthropology, when the trend goes from A to B to C to D, it sounds like we've left A behind as we went to B and we've left B behind as we went. It sounds like it's in fact an evolution of our ideas when in fact it is not. Many of these things are present all the time. So in unilineal evolution I jokingly say that the feminists are a bunch of unilineal evolutions. They really think it's better here than it is anywhere else. With the scientists, they really think it's better here than anywhere else and always will be because of science. And you read it all the time in science today. So unilineal evolution in the society, even in anthropology, is still with us. Functionalists, we're all functionalists. Marx was a functionalist, for goodness sake. Such thinking puts trends in a different light. And I think that it's important not to because that way you can build on the things that we have learned and that have stood the test of time.

06-00:02:44
Redman: So, for instance, Malinowski is sort of dismissed when instead those ideas can be reapplied and looked at. You could take Malinowski and then compare it to feminists or compare it to scientists.

06-00:02:59
Nader: Right, right.

06-00:03:00
Redman: And see maybe new insights.

06-00:03:02
Nader: Yes. For me it's very energizing. E.R. Leach, Edmund Leach, Sir Edmund Leach, he was so far ahead of his time. In 1929 the letter he wrote to his father and mother trying to explain why he was flunking out or not doing well in school because he was so brilliant, et cetera, and he wasn't doing well. And his explanation is as good today as it was then. But he is so interesting today, why would you not want to read Leach versus some of the drips that are writing today. I took a course in philosophy at Wells College and I don't care when is a chair a chair and all that sort of stuff and that turned me off totally. Except for people like Bertrand Russell, the English philosophers. I liked the English philosophers. I don't like the French philosophers. And especially when they get translated. Often they don't get translated the way they should get translated. But Foucault really energized my colleague Paul Rabinow. And that's great. And he became a specialist in Foucault. That to me is wonderful. That's why we need different kinds of people. I'm not Rabinow. He's not me. Can we talk? Yes. We talk. We argue. Sometimes we really don't like each other's arguments and so on. But I believe in that kind of intellectual dissent.

Now, Kroeber founded the department at a time when Californians were still hunting and killing California Indians. And I always say there has to be, one of these days, just like we have Black History Month, there has to be Native American History Month, if we can face the realities. And my colleague, Bob Heizer wrote a book about the destruction of California Indians. He was a good friend of Kroeber's. So this generation then comes along and says, "Ishi. Kroeber was sort of racist. He had Ishi on exhibit" and so on and so forth. Well, as compared to what? Even now, look what's happening on Native American reservations in California now. Where are the anthropologists? They're not even paternalistic or whatever you want to say that generation was. So we're very good at looking back and seeing what they weren't, the previous anthropologists, rather than looking at what they contributed. So with regard to Kroeber, I always respected his intellectual work. And one of the things that I now find myself going back to read is *Configurations of Culture Growth*. He spent years on that. Probably lost a lot of his life research on that. He wanted to understand civilizations at a time when everybody was studying villages. Are you kidding? Here's a man who had a vision and wasn't their vision but respect him for what he did. I started out studying villages, too, and now I'm writing a book with a global perspective. It's entitled, *What the Rest Think of the West*. It covers Japan, China, India, and Islam. So it's good to just follow your curiosity and have some respect for those. Does that mean, I think, all anthropologists are equal and deserve equal respect? Well, everybody's been at Berkeley. No. There'll be some people who are totally forgotten and probably should be.

06-00:06:27

Redman: So wrapping back around to the last question on Foucault. He maybe had an energizing factor for some of your colleagues on the campus. Were you aware that he was a visiting professor here and—

06-00:06:45

Nader: No, I wasn't aware. Anthropology, I think, did nothing about that. Foucault is a really interesting thinker. For me, not as interesting as Gramsci but at least he brought power into the picture and people started talking about power. What's bothersome about Foucault is not Foucault, it's the people who quote him all the time and never read him. That's what's bothersome. So it becomes so trendy that if you just—like one of the people who reviewed my *Harmony Ideology* said, and she didn't even quote Foucault, "What?" And I said, "Well, he didn't quote me either." So it's a trendiness that I think I like to avoid. And when he was here, I don't know what was happening in the year he was here. Maybe I was having children. Maybe I was sick. Maybe I was at Yale. I don't really remember his presence even.

06-00:07:33

Redman: That's fair. Well, first I want to ask about—we talked about the ethics committee, the Beals Ethics Committee in Mexico and we talked a little bit about funding issues as far as where money was coming from. I would argue that more and more is being written comparing the story of American

anthropology and Latin America and Asia at that time, especially emerging from the sixties and seventies. But can you contrast for me any differences that the American Anthropological Association or American anthropologists had in their attitude towards anthropologists working in Asia and in Latin America. Were there differences there in terms of how people were talking about ethics?

06-00:08:25
Nader: Oh, there are huge differences.

06-00:08:26
Redman: Can you describe that?

06-00:08:28
Nader: Well, it's hard to even remember it because sometimes the people who didn't agree with the ethics committee, or even having ethics, there are a variety of reasons. Maybe that's why *Reinventing Anthropology* came up. I think I mentioned this earlier. You can want some ethics regulations but they can limit your work because if you're only protecting the Booga-Booga and you can go and study the Pentagon and you also have to protect the Pentagon, then you can't bring things to light you want to bring to light. So my own personal thoughts about this is I would never work for anybody who told me that I couldn't publish something. But now we've got different questions of ethics. So if I go to Zapotec country or the Middle East and I collect material they can take my data, whether it's on computer or not. They can subpoena my work. And I don't know what I would do under those circumstances. I think I'd go to jail. Because you have to respect the people who are giving you information. And it hasn't always been. As I say about the scientists, you get about as much variety in anthropology. So all this business about the human terrain program that came up. And very good debates that came out in the association. Not necessarily very well attended by people but pretty good. And some of the people that were working for the human terrain were there and stood up and told us what they thought. They were clearly making a lot of money. So money can buy anybody, even an anthropologist. So ethics codes. We have ethics codes in the Hippocratic Oath. It's just not implemented. Look at all the medical malpractice cases there are that just go unresolved by law because of tort cops.

06-00:10:26
Redman: Can we talk about the journal in particular, *American Anthropologists*. And you eventually write an article "Who Reviews the Reviewers" that in particular is talking about what you'd mentioned with sort of a lack of recognition of good work at the undergraduate level and sort of this concept of status as playing in, even where there's supposed to be the concept of blind peer review, which is maybe something of a farce. Can you tell me, though, about how that fits in with the story of anthropological publication and in particular with the *American Anthropologist*, the journal, the flagship journal, and your experience with that over the same course of time.

06-00:11:15

Nader: Well, when anthropology gets specialized, then you have specialized journals that deal with politics and law and so on. Like the *Law & Society Journal*. And people stop sending anthropology of law pieces to the *American Anthropologist*. So I have seen the *American Anthropologist* sort of deteriorate in terms of scope and debate and that sort of thing. And I think that edits has something to do with that, whether it's considered an honor to edit or a problem. But my paper that I gave the distinguished lecture was published in it. Now, what's interesting is I've never heard any consequential comment on it. It got wonderful acceptance when I gave it orally. People stood up and gave me the usual ovation but I didn't think that it stimulated the kind of thought it should have stimulated, which was about all the interaction that was going on within the field that wasn't going on in the *American Anthropologist*. You have the archeology and the book review section. I won't mention the name, but somebody who was in our department was head of the book review area. And then one time they allowed us to go in and buy the books that weren't reviewed because they were sent to them but they weren't reviewed. So there were tables full of these books. And many had to do with power. So they were clearly avoiding issues of power in the choice of what to review. I don't think any of my books have been reviewed for a while in the *American Anthropologist*. I get kudos on my energy book but I don't think they would ever think to review it. Well, their reasoning would be too much to review, too much stuff, publications. So we don't seem to have a ranking of quality. Nobody knows what quality is.

There's too much personalismo now in the university and I think certainly in anthropology. Who you invite to give a talk. When I was a committee of one and had to invite distinguished lecturers, I would find out who's at the Center for Advanced Study, an anthropologist, and I would see to it they were invited. I cooked the dinner myself. Now we have money to take them to dinner. We do have money but people don't want to be bothered about that. But who do they invite? They invite either people that are their friends, whether they're interesting or not. Or people that need a boost, young people, et cetera. We had really distinguished anthropologists. Firth was here and Leach was here and all the people. Evans-Pritchard. All these distinguished people. If you were to ask an anthropologist today, to name five distinguished anthropologists they would like to have dinner with, I don't think we'd have much agreement. The field has expanded.

06-00:14:16

Redman: Can you continue describing that for me in terms of the general growth of the field of anthropology? We talked about Harvard with the GI Bill and the impact that that had on this department in particular. But that's of course the case with anthropology in general. It's growing as a field during the same period. It's in many ways diversifying and there are benefits to that but obviously there's the proliferation of journals, the proliferation of the number

of books. I can see that carrying both good and bad things for trying to keep up with an advanced field.

06-00:14:56

Nader: Well, see, I think that's why we need to recognize the importance of what Robert Merton, the sociologist, recognized, sociology of ideas. We need to have the anthropology of ideas and then that helps you think about what are the issues that have been carried through. Would we know when there was a paradigm change except to say we went from unilineal to multilineal to whatever. But I want to go back in regard to what you're saying and just say that I was for years appointed by the chair to do something about the distinguished lecturer, because George Foster left money for a distinguished lecturer in our department, which is really wonderful. And at first it was supposed to honor retirees, but then we got to the end of that. There were no more retirees for a while and we covered them. And then there was a year when I said to the faculty, "Who would you like to come?" I always asked the faculty. Maybe one or two had ideas but most said, "I don't know." And then when I invited Graeber—I may have mentioned this. When I invited David Graeber, faculty jumped all over me. David Graeber. Not everybody but they said, "Why did you invite him? He just lost his job at Yale."

06-00:16:22

Rubens: His field is?

06-00:16:24

Nader: He's an anthropologist, did work on Madagascar, who studies social values and economic theory. He's studied anarchism. He's also an activist. And he just wrote this now famous book called *Debt: The First Five Thousand Years* and he came to Berkeley and talked about debt. Well, everybody wanted to hear about debt. Talk about a really important subject. The students were there, the older people were there and so on. It was a huge success. And then when I was doing the symposium I did the same thing. I said, "Who would you like to come?" And then not much response. And so I thought, "Well, who should I pick for the good of the department?" I should point out since there aren't so many jobs for anthropologists today, that you don't have to be a professor to be an anthropologist. So I invited Gillian Tett from the *Financial Times* and I invited Ashraf Ghani, who runs for president in Afghanistan. And then there's the anthropologist who is not very well known, like [Joseba] Zulaika, but he's doing important work on terrorism, which is certainly in the news every day here. So everybody that I picked was sort of to educate the audience. And we all need education.

06-00:17:39

Rubens: Did the department go?

06-00:17:40
Nader: Yes. It was pretty well attended. Not by everybody but it was very well attended. There were hundreds of people so I couldn't keep tabs on everybody. But yes, it was very well attended. Some people didn't but—

06-00:17:54
Redman: I wonder if you could describe were there growing concerns about physical anthropology in the department or how did those concerns evolve? And I wonder in particular about the question of pre-history, as well, not just in terms of human origins but—

06-00:18:19
Nader: Again, this has to do with scope. There are people in the department who can't stand the notion of four fields. And I don't care whether there are four, five, or none. Anthropology, if it says it's the study of the human condition writ large, has to study the past and the present and the biology and the language to my mind. And I don't understand quite this fixation about four fields except maybe they see them as too independent. That in fact they're not fulfilling the original purpose of having all of these people in one department. As you can see, the archeologists wanted a house for themselves. And so there wasn't a common purpose. So that was one of the things that was going on here and in every department of anthropology across the country.

I had a very amusing exchange with one of my colleagues, who I won't mention, and he was saying, "What do we need biological anthropology for in an anthropology department? They study animals." No, it was about primates, I think. It was about primates. "Why are we teaching a course on primates? Why do we need a course on primates in anthropology? And I looked at him and I said, "Because we are primate." And the look on his face was rather shocking. That's the first thing I teach the kids in my energy class. I bring in Katie Milton. She talks about monkeys and how they conserve and how they use their natural resources. And I said, "I don't want you ever to forget that humans are animals." So if you have a notion, and this person does a lot of philosophy, is more abstract, that somehow there's something different about—after all, was the archeologist that named us *homo sapiens* and then later *sapiens sapiens*, which led me to write the piece about how *sapiens* is *homo sapiens*. *Homo sapiens* may end up destroying the world.

06-00:20:39
Redman: One of the things that we've mentioned were the concept of –isms or trends or people following one thinker or another. This will be my last question on the nature of the anthropology department before I get back to energy. Did you see certain trends at various times catching on in the anthropology department? It seems as though the tradition of dissent is somewhat borne out of the nature of you don't want an entire department to be dominated by post-modernists or you don't want the entire department to necessarily be interpretavists. But to what extent have trends in anthropology come, in your

view, to dominate or come to have influence or sway in the department? To what degree?

06-00:21:23

Nader: We had a lot of ethno science when I first came here. Brent Berlin was here. There were people interested in the linguistic turn. Dell Hymes was here and others. Language and culture, back to that and so on. And it was a very rich period. But like you say, not everybody wants one dominant paradigm. And we have never had a dominant paradigm tolerated because we have dissent. But the university doesn't like the dissent. They want to know, "Well, what do you really stand for, Berkeley anthropology?" "Well, we stand for diversified thought. So they've been very unsupportive of the notion that we could do a lot of different things and we don't have to have one notion because they see it as you're fighting. And probably we are but so what. As long as we're not hitting each other or it's not physical. It's mental debate. What I don't like is when you stop talking with people you don't agree with, which is the niceness epidemic. When the niceness epidemic hit the people that are now fifty year olds, then they get upset if there's dissent. Then they want to leave the room or they don't want to go to a faculty meeting because someone's going to say XY and Z. Or they cry! That's very destructive.

06-00:22:40

Redman: You write an article that's mainly about ADR, alternative dispute resolution, in *Anthropology News* that references dissent, as there being a need for—up to the point of—well, violence as being an extreme and then complete pacification as being another extreme of disagreement, or into sort of forced hegemony and pacification. There's a balance there between opening up dialogue and disagreement and debate before it escalates into anger and violence. Can you unpack that for me a little more and how in your view that actually plays out in human societies?

06-00:23:28

Nader: Well, we've always had mediation in this country. What was different about ADR mediation is that it was in a four cornered cage. So if you didn't like what was mediated you couldn't appeal. Before you went to mediation, if it didn't work, you went to arbitration. If that didn't work you could go to court. But now if you mediate you have to leave off your possibilities of having your day in court. And that's a big issue in this country now, that people cannot have their day in court. That came as a result of this whole ADR movement. And it was really the corruption of our civil justice system like you cannot believe. The corruption of our civil justice system has destroyed American access to what we think of as rule of law. Justice.

06-00:24:21

Rubens: By corruption you mean the—

06-00:24:23

Nader: I mean the sabotage of the plaintiffs' access to law, so the destruction of it.

06-00:24:28
Redman: So I know Chief Justice Warren Burger is influential in this thinking and we've already talked about the writers like Frank and Kahn. And you reference Justice Cardozo in some of your work, an earlier justice. And what's fascinating to me is in one of your lectures you mention Clarence Darrow's legacy as being marginalized as people sort of talk about him as though he was a radical lawyer. This got me thinking. Are these examples of sort of the antithesis of what Burger represents to you? Are there legal thinkers, scholars, justice that you admire their approach? Were there people dissenting, for instance, the alternative dispute resolution?

06-00:25:19
Nader: Justice Douglas was the longest reigning Supreme Court justice and he knew what liberty was. He wrote a book on it. He wrote about twenty books. And he traveled the world. And I've been reading recently his autobiography of his court years. And he talks about this. He basically says we are a pretty conservative country. And so we go through these ups and downs. He's one of the best people. Well, what led me to rereading him is I got a call from Charles Reich. about a month ago or six weeks ago. And he had read an article I wrote for the *Iowa Law Review* called "Rethinking Salvation Mentality." It was about terrorism and then the sort of anti-terrorist security state which is again ruining our democracy. And he'd read that and he wanted to talk. So we get on the phone for about forty-five minutes. And at one point he said, "This is the darkest time in American democracy ever." Now, Charles Reich was a professor of law at Yale. He wrote *The Greening of America* and he wrote *Opposing the System*, which was totally thought to be nothing, which I use in *Controlling Processes*. And if you ask him what he's doing now he's writing a biography of Justice Douglas. Now, he was not his clerk. And I said, "Why don't you write your own autobiography?" because he was very forward. He happens to be gay but I don't care about that except that it did affect his—I'm sure it affected his whole career. And very intelligent. Highly, highly intelligent person. And he said, "I'm writing my autobiography through writing the biography of Justice Douglas."

So at different points in my life, either because of their initiative or my initiative, I have run into these thinkers in the law that were really saying something. Look at Roscoe Pound. And Roscoe Pound was at the Harvard Law School when Ralph was. He was ancient. And he had a little dinky office that they gave him. And Ralph used to go talk to him. And why wouldn't you talk to Roscoe Pound? Right? At the Harvard Law School. You're at the Harvard Law School because your career, down the line, you're going to head for a corporate firm or something. And Ralph was interested in ideas and injustices.

So the same with me. I'm interested in ideas and as they come across—I gave the Cardozo Lectures at the University of Trento, in Italy.

06-00:28:28
Rubens: That was in 1996.

06-00:28:29
Nader: Yes. And it was Ugo who called it the Cardozo Lectures. Well, Cardozo was very interesting to me for this. He always said, "No matter how objective we may try to be, we must never forget the fact that we see with our own eyes." Well, that's profound. That's related to *What the Rest Think of the West*, that we don't even know about. Yes. We see with our own eyes. We see the rest of the world with our own eyes and we call it scientific objectivity.

06-00:28:57
Redman: How about Oliver Wendell Holmes?

06-00:28:59
Nader: Wonderful. "The law is one big anthropological document," he said.

06-00:29:05
Redman: There you go. I wonder if we can come back around to energy. Your work focuses on central dogmas and one of the things that I find so fascinating is questioning consumption and the nature of what historians call the American way of life. The concept of an American standard of living and that that somehow equates to a particular style of energy usage or patterns of consumption. You question some of these assumptions. I'd like for you to explain that to me and tell me why. Is it more important to look at the production of energy or how people use it or both? Why?

06-00:29:57
Nader: I start way before that. And that's what my book *The Energy Reader* is all about. It's about the last 40,000 years or more. We've always had energy. It was human energy or wood energy or whatever. But then along came the Industrial Revolution. Now, the Industrial Revolution brought about the concept of progress as we know it. Meaning technological progress. Thomas Jefferson thought this was going to be an agricultural society. He had no idea. It was not in his compass that we were going to be an industrial.

So with the concept of progress in an industrial society, then you need a different kind of energy then wood and the amount of energy we'd had 40,000 years prior. So it was a very short period, 200 years out of 40,000 that this change happened. So it was very fast and very sudden and intense. And Americans are very creative technologically. And in my book, *What the Rest Think of the West*, that's one of the first things they say. Even the Crusaders said this about the Europeans. They said, "They have no culture, no civilization—but they have technology." They recognized right away that they had technology and they were good at technology. So here we have this country that at the turn of the century, 1901 or whatever, the president of the American Chemical Society said, "By the 1970s this country will be running on solar energy." But by the 1970s it wasn't running on solar energy. So what happened? What happened was war. Militarization and the discovery of

nuclear. Nuclear energy. Nuclear bombs first, then nuclear energy. So when I got into this it was sort of—again I was studying dogmas. Energy dogmas. And because I was at the National Academy of Sciences doing the study *Energy Choices in a Democratic Society*, with a group of interdisciplinary people, including physicists, I became very interested in what some people may call prevarications. But I don't think they were. I think they believed what they were saying. So they would say things like, "Solar's expensive. Nuclear is cheap." Well, then, some guy who was part of the Massachusetts Department of Economics said, "But you're not life cycling. You're not life costing." Life costing means you start at the beginning with the uranium mines among Native Americans, the cost to the retirement of the energy plants, to dealing with the waste and so on. Then you say how expensive it is. So as compared to what? If you life cycle solar, certain kinds of solar—there are many different kinds—compared to that, passive solar, it's very cheap.

And you ask the question I mentioned, that how come the Lawrence Lab has taken millions of tax dollars and has never solarized anything, not even at the lab. And then you investigate who's head of solar at the Department of Energy and they're mainly people trained in nuclear. And then you begin to realize sort of how paradigms dominate and how dogmas come to be. And then you begin to think, "These guys, this is a religion for them." So it's time dimension. It's the variety of choices. It's the mindsets that get firm and can't change and that goes for even the solar people. You got a solar mindset. That's all you can—whatever. Or like Rosenfeld on conservation. I asked him what he thought of fracking. He said he didn't know much about it. He's a conservationist. He wants to paint all the roofs white. Which is good but that's one of the things that happens when you specialize. You don't have a big picture.

So who gives the governor, Jerry Brown let's say, a big picture when he says, "What should I do about energy?" Well, this particular government had a position on nuclear. I hope he doesn't change it. And he thought it was a bad thing when he was a young man. But I'm a little worried because he comes from an oil and gas family. And what is he going to do about fracking? Crazy. We have drought and we're going to do fracking? Requires a lot of water. So then you have to examine. So you see how one thing leads to another. Consequences

Now, in terms of my intuition about putting out this reader, after all, I had to teach a course first to show that there was interest. I expected forty-five people the first time I taught it and there were 265 people. So the young students are ahead of the older faculty. The undergraduates are ahead of the graduate students because they see where the future is going. All you have to do is listen to the radio, for God's sake, and listen. They're talking about energy all the time. So these kids come in. Then we put the reader together. And they're still coming. In the first place I thought, "These kids aren't going to have jobs," but this is an area where it's possible. If they're going to have

jobs they should be educated and have some scope. Now, how many kids that take energy courses at UC Berkeley have a 40,000 year look? Zero except for this course. But this course has more students in it than any other course on energy on the campus.

06-00:35:36
Rubens: And this is the Energy, Culture, and Social Organization course?

06-00:35:43
Nader: Yes, that's right.

06-00:35:45
Rubens: Okay, energy course. You had taught as early as '79 I think, a course on the ethnography of energy policy.

06-00:35:51
Nader: That's right. It did have undergraduates in it but it was for Energy and Resources Group [ERG]. It was sort of taught in conjunction with them. And I don't think I ever had more than about forty-five or fifty people in it.

06-00:36:04
Redman: Can you connect your thinking on international river disputes to energy in terms of resources?

06-00:36:11
Nader: Yes. Of course, oil is in our minds today but water should be in our minds because that's the next oil. And you can get along without oil but you can't get along without water. And I think I was alerted to that issue because I was sent a manuscript of an international meeting, I can't quite recall, but on water. But this manuscript didn't have good material on the asymmetrical power that was involved in understanding the distribution of water, let alone the corporate. I wasn't even thinking about Bechtel in Bolivia at that time. And then years later I had to write a piece for Gulliver. I think it was Phillip Gulliver's Festschrift, and I thought, "Well, this is something. Maybe I'll go back to that and see what happens in international rivers," because the conference was about international rivers. The Tigris, Euphrates, the whole thing.

And I had a wonderful research assistant who knew how to use the library. Roberto Gonzalez, one of my graduate students. And he came up with a lot of good material. It was just great. And, of course, what was interesting is I didn't expect to find what I found but it was between mediation and the World Court. And if you were the weaker party you wanted to go to the World Court. And if you were the stronger party you wanted to mediate because you'd control the mediation. So you take any one of them, the Upper Danube versus the Lower Danube, the weaker party wanted to go to the World Court. You take Spain and Portugal, the weaker party wanted to go to court. The Ganges. The river disputes in India, the same thing. So it was totally unique. There were no exceptions. And the American, right on the border between us and

Mexico, the same thing. The Mexicans wanted to go to World Court. And, of course, we eventually pulled out of the World Court, along with the Soviets, because we weren't getting the results that we wanted. But that's exactly why they wanted to go there. So that was really a turning point article in terms of the role of law in mediation as solutions to major resource conflicts between countries. We're talking here about conflicts between countries.

06-00:38:56
Redman: When we started the interview, after talking about your family and your upbringing, we talked about your first experience with fieldwork. I wonder if you can tell me a bit about then becoming a faculty member and supervising graduate students who have gone off into the field. Obviously there's much to say about supervising their intellectual development. But what about just in terms of the more practical side and then the emotional side of seeing a student go off to the field if they have struggles? If they had health issues the way you had, did you identify with them in a certain sort of way? What was that experience like for you?

06-00:39:39
Nader: Well, I really wasn't prepared to do fieldwork and I don't particularly believe in methods courses either. That isn't the kind of preparation I want. I was not prepared. I didn't know what diseases there were or anything. And Nancy Howell wrote a book about that for anthropologists, really recounting all the difficult diseases and sicknesses that anthropologists went through, especially when they were going into areas that didn't have medical access and they couldn't get out fast and so on. But some anthropologists got killed, murdered, and so on. So she thought those occupational issues were very important. And I couldn't agree more.

On the other hand, I didn't want to tell him where to go because I think you have to want to go someplace and that's your responsibility. So Klaus Koch wanted to go to West Irian and that was New Guinea. And he was my first PhD and he was German. He wanted to be an ethnographer from when he was a little kid and so on. And he had his appendix out I think before he went, of his own. Because he knew he was going to be someplace that he wouldn't know what to do. So I decided I would visit those that I could because I never was visited. And I visited Cathy Witty in Lebanon and John Rothenberger in Lebanon. Then I visited the student, Carl McCarthy who was in Lichtenstein. And Bavaria another one. And so I didn't get to Ecuador. I didn't get to all of them. But where I could I visited them.

And I found out something rather interesting, which is that anthropologists are so nervous about losing rapport that they leave the important questions until the end. So if you're studying conflict, you study everything but conflict until the last month. You say, "Oh, my God, I'm supposed to collect data on this stuff." And so when I went into John Rothenberger's village first, I said, "What have data do you have on conflict?" Oh, he said, "They're nervous

about that." I said, "Well, John, this is your thesis." So you learn about the avoidances and so on. And not everybody's the same. So the advice I had to give him wasn't the advice I had to give Cathy Whitty, who was in the same country, Lebanon. So that's why it's good to visit. And I think the Whitings visited their people in the Six Culture study. That's probably what inspired me to think about that.

In the write-up, what I did that was innovative to the time, and I think is still innovative, is I thought the newer graduate students should also be on the committee of the graduate student's thesis so they could see how you take field data and turn it into a dissertation. And I think that was very good and we should have continued that.

06-00:42:56
Redman: Can you connect the Cold War to the experience of your students in any particular way? Were there any experiences in particular that you—because what's so interesting to me is that your students aren't just doing fieldwork in the Middle East. They're not just doing fieldwork in Latin America. It's a really global sort of experience. Were there any instances where they ran up against difficulties that you might have seen as influenced in particular by the Cold War?

06-00:43:33
Nader: Well, I did have a student actually who went to Russia just as the shift was being made from Soviet to Russia, during that period. And he was a very bright Stanford Law/Stanford Business anthropology at Berkeley student. But he didn't see my role as his advisor as much as facilitator. And he could have used some advice. He didn't get into trouble as far as I know there. He could have because he had the kind of personality that—he was a little—he could have. Whatever I did, his parents were very grateful to me, whatever I did. That was the Russia end of it.

Now, I had a student who went to Israel, who's American Jewish, and she changed her field when she was there to a more psychoanalytic subject. And so I asked Herb Phillips if he would serve on her committee as chair and I stayed on as second. And then I realized he didn't give a damn. He didn't care. He said, "Just sign it." I said, "I'm not going to sign it without reading it." He said, "She's not going to change it." I said, "Herb, I don't know about you but I don't do that." And so I ended up being the chair, although he got credit for being the chair, and that was the whole Israeli situation. That was not entered into her topic so much but it was—anyway, that wasn't exactly Cold War.

No, I don't think many of my students were. My colleagues were involved in Cold War issues, in Southeast Asia, for example. .

06-00:45:20
Redman: Last question on the students. Have you discouraged students from going to any particular place for one reason or another? You've mentioned never telling them to go one place because they have to have a desire to do that. But have students come to you with seemingly hare brained wacky ideas of where they want to do fieldwork and you might encourage them for one reason or another to look elsewhere?

06-00:45:45
Nader: There were only two students I was very worried about in this regard. One was studying a Palestinian camp in Syria. And it was volatile. And she was a combination of black African and American white so she wasn't exactly blond American or anything. But she was very dedicated and good student and survived it but I was very worried about her because also the permissions weren't coming through for the IRBs at Berkeley.

But the most serious one was the last student, I just finished her dissertation, who worked in Kettleman City, California, which is full of very serious environmental issues. And she got cancer when she was in the middle of that study. And I said, "I do not recommend you to go back. I don't care if you're taking your own water and your own food, just don't go back. Focus on the company material, which you can do through the library." And I don't know that she obeyed me. But of all of the years, of fifty-five students, that was the one student I told her do not go back.

06-00:46:59
Redman: That's really remarkable. So maybe to conclude I wonder if we can think a little bit about anthropology and opening up a little bit of the dialogues between the Middle East and the West. It's fascinating to me the human terrain project. Going back, of course, there were—for a long time I think there have been anthropologists making recommendations to the government, to the US government about what to do in the Middle East and, of course, there were British anthropologists, I'm sure, making similar recommendations. I think of Henry Field, in particular, in my research who, with Project M, they sort of imagined this world of being an empty blank slate. Then they said, "Well, what if we took these people in Brazil and put them in Australia? There's blank spaces there." It's sort of bizarre to our minds. But I wonder if you could talk about the evolution of that influence of anthropologists trying to be the sort of conduits and to what extent it's been successful. And obviously it seems as though there's been a lot that's been missed, where anthropologists have been less successful in trying to translate a culture to another audience.

06-00:48:34
Nader: Well, E.R. Leach worked with the Kurds. That's the first thing I read of his. And there's a woman, a British anthropologist, I think British, who worked with Palestinian children in 1930s. Those were just strictly ethnographic. They were not involved. It was not studying up/down. It was pre-colonial, post-

colonial. Whatever it was, they weren't involved in looking at the influence of Europeans. And, of course, then there came along the whole business of establishing a state, a Jewish state. I don't think there were any anthropologists involved in that. Not that I know of. There might have been some Israeli anthropologists. And there was Patai, who wrote about the Arab mind, who was really a pretty bad anthropologist. He was stereotyping. But what was more interesting is the avoidance of anthropologists except for the archeologists, who wanted to dig. And, of course, there's Robert Adams, who—not Richard Adams, Bob Adams—who worked in Iraq and Mesoamerica and he did some very interesting work. And all of these archeologists, and even when Iraq was being bombed all they cared about was the archeology.

06-00:50:03
Redman: Cultural heritage, Yes.

06-00:50:04
Nader: The cultural heritage. So that's why I wrote my "Breaking the Silence: Politics and Professional Autonomy," [*Anthropology Quarterly*, 2001] because here the Israelis went into Lebanon, which was the area where I couldn't go back to do fieldwork with the Shia because the Israelis were occupying south Lebanon. And nobody was observing what they were doing. The *New York Times* was saying things like they were taking water and soil out of South Lebanon into Israel. They're a colonial power and they were acting like previous colonial powers. There was a very interesting piece by a foreign minister of England, Anthony Nutting. He wrote an interesting piece in the *New York Times* that was as good as any anthropologist could have written, which is "Western Beachhead in the Middle East" and he was taking the Arab viewpoint of the state of Israel. Not the settlement or a homeland for Jews but the fact of being a Jewish state. And, of course, it goes back to the Crusades and so on. And that was really the best thing I've ever seen written on the Arab viewpoint of what it meant to have the British come in and basically allow the Irgun and the early settlers to do the things that they did. And let me tell you, there was complicity on all sides. The Palestinians were complicit. There was complicity on all sides. So nobody was clean. But the people that suffered were the people who didn't have any power.

06-00:51:44
Redman: What would you like to add on the issue of Cold War anthropology? And you've mentioned colleagues in particular as being influenced in one way or another or marked by the Cold War. What can you add for us on that?

06-00:52:00
Nader: Well, I think there is silence. That's always the big issue. There are things going on in this department. I called my piece "The Phantom Factor: Impact of the Cold War on Anthropology" because I didn't even know what was going on in the department and who was giving material on the Thais, Cambodians for the military and what people's positions were. And it should

have been much more open than it was. The association tried to open it up but for the most part it wasn't open, but partly because a lot of people were getting money for their research. Even Chomsky said it was a good time for research in linguistics. And Richard Lewontin, the biologist at Harvard also said the same thing. So people want money for their research and that's not a good reason to participate in some of the things that we participated in. It gives a black name.

06-00:52:52
Redman: And that's something that's not unique to that era necessarily. That continues to this day you might argue.

06-00:52:58
Nader: Yes, it continues to this day. But I think the important questions are what isn't there. That is, what are the silences? We can study what we do but what is it we're not doing is just as important, which is why I called one of the chapters in my new book of "Breaking the Silence."

06-00:53:19
Redman: Can you describe the reaction of your colleagues, professional colleagues, to *Little Injustices* and the success that that film had and their reaction just in general to the very notion of making a documentary film and what it did.

06-00:53:37
Nader: Well, before I talk about documentaries, which I will, and let me just say there is an anthropologist, Ted Swendenburg, who did a study about the Palestinian revolt in the 1930s. He wrote a book, *Memories of Revolt.* His father was a chaplain at the American University in Beirut. And he was looking for a job after he got his PhD. And he was a very, very good anthropologist and he came in second everywhere because, again, he was breaking a silence and they didn't want people to break the silence. He came in second for a job at Columbia, second at Stanford, second at Berkeley, second all the way around. He ends up in Oklahoma, Arkansas I think now. [This was about discrimination.]

On the question of film, I think the department now is very interested. We just hired someone to do media. But I don't think any of my films ever left the department. And they weren't considered material for promotion review. Now audiences that have seen them have been very appreciative. *Little Injustices* is sold worldwide and we just signed a contract for the distribution of *Losing Knowledge: Fifty Years of Change,* about the double edge sword of progress in Talea.

06-00:54:48
Redman: Yes. So Lisa suggested that I ask a question that's actually just related to my own personal interests, of course, and that's the Lowie Museum. You'd mentioned at one point in an interview going to the Smithsonian, I believe by the eighties, and perhaps Sol Tax had left by that point. You sort of describe it

as being a little bit of an intellectual dead zone in some sense. The anthropology department, that is, at that moment. That there are other places with more active anthropology. What's interesting to me is that George Stocking describes the museum, Anthropology World, in the thirties as—he calls it an intellectual backwater. But at the same time there's all this activity in museums in terms of New Deal work, the WPA, workers going through and organizing collections, cataloguing collections, building new exhibit dioramas. In the seventies the Lowie Museum is growing. It's changing quite a bit. What about the nature of the relationship between anthropologists and museum anthropology and how that was changing in this era? Can you describe that for me?

06-00:56:05
Nader: Yes. Well, first I want to say that the Smithsonian in the 1870s was the intellectual heartland of America, and of anthropology.

06-00:56:14
Redman: And then forward to the 1970s.

06-00:56:16
Nader: And it wasn't any longer. And that may be because of the proliferation of departments of anthropology that weren't museum departments, that Boaz was very interested in having anthropology not be a museum discipline. So all of a sudden we've got anthropology departments all over the country and that changes what happens at the Smithsonian. Now, with regard to Lowie, the issue here has always been, even before NAGPRA, this is all valuable material. Who owns it? Well, the university owns it, so the regents own it. And there's always been that in the background. So when NAGPRA comes along then you're going to give back some of this stuff? Are you kidding? And some archeologists, like bio-archeologist like Tim White, they don't want to give any of it back. And people began to split, like Sherry Washburn on one side and Burton Benedict on the other side. And Sherry said, "Would you want your grandfather's bones to be on display in a museum?" And so on. So it was a lot of debate having to do with giving back and also having to do with how museums represent people. And the revolution and rethinking about museums really started in Canada, in western Canada, Vancouver. And they have a beautiful museum there.

06-00:57:43
Redman: The University of British Columbia, the Museum of Anthropology. Yes, sure.

06-00:57:45
Nader: That's right. It's a beautiful museum. But the attitude of who is the museum for, anyway, and who represents the Native Americans and do they have any say in how they're represented. And, of course, some California native peoples have come and drummed here and marched and complained about a lot of things happening under Lowie and lack of representation and so on. And some of the Lowie directors wanted them to find a way to give master's

degree to Native Americans so that they could be in the museum. Why master's degree? Why not make a Native American head of the Lowie if you've got good ones. But then there's this politics that was happening with NAGPRA that allowed the university to come in and take out a museum employee, one of our PhDs in medical anthropology out of the museum, telling her that she could not step back on the campus without being arrested. And then I had to get her a lawyer. She got her case "mediated" and she can't come back to take a job at the university for ten years and it's unclear what she did because she was never accused of anything specific.

06-00:58:51

Redman: Stepping back on the NAGPRA question. Before NAGPRA is officially passed in 1990, I understand that Stanford returns the vast majority of its osteological collections, mostly California and Indian material. It's reburied. Then NAGPRA comes along and governs the nature in which things are returned. So not federally recognized tribes, for instance, can't—this is a major issue at the Hearst Museum. What's your view, observing, maybe not necessarily as a scholar working in that area, observing this heated debate as it came about on campus? Because it wasn't just with NAGPRA in 1990 that this becomes an issue, right? It had been an issue before that. What's your view on how this develops?

06-00:59:46

Nader: Well, I think it's a good thing that NAGPRA was passed into law. I think they should give it back. But sometimes they don't know where to give it back to so there's some issues there. But Stanford didn't even have very much. Stanford didn't even have an anthropology department, barely when I came here. They had been very few years with an anthropology department. And so I just think that it's the material culture that is of interest to people who are in power. And it's the spirituality which is of interest to those whose bodies are in the museum. I just think it's the height of hubris to not take that seriously. And it just is a continuation of the way we've treated Native Americans and still do. So I never got into the debate like Nancy Scheper-Hughes did, which was good for her and always about Ishi and so on. Was a lot done about Ishi. But I'm not so sure what great things came out of that. But it wasn't my big issue.

06-01:00:47

Rubens: You had opposed the renaming of the Lowie to the Hearst.

06-01:00:53

Nader: Yes, I did oppose that and I carried a sign in.

06-01:00:59

Rubens: What was your argument?

06-01:00:00

Nader: They took the sign away. The sign said, “Money over education equals ignorance.” And unfortunately, I would love to have had it, but they took it away.

06-01:01:13

Redman: The idea that Phoebe Hearst being a wealthy benefactor to the museum.

06-01:01:17

Nader: Yes. But it was her niece that came to Burton Benedict or Burton Benedict went to the niece and he got some piddling amount, like $80,000. The remaining didn’t come through the department. Benedict just did it. And I think the procedure by which he did it was improper. And we got enough buildings around here named after companies and corporations and so on and Lowie was a professor. So the two people who built the department were Robert Lowie and Kroeber and the building was after Kroeber and the Lowie Museum. Now there’s no Lowie Museum. I still call it the Lowie.

Interview 4: June 26, 2013

Audio File 7

07-00:00:03
Rubens: We thought today that we'd start with an overview of what is now a fifty-three career at the University of California.

07-00:00:20
Nader: That's right.

07-00:00:21
Rubens: And I just want to point out, and we'll talk about it later, that in March, 2012, a symposium was sponsored by the Department of Anthropology to honor your career. That's quite an acknowledgment. And you didt not want the focus to be only on your scholarship and teaching. You wanted to have speakers who could educate the audience about critical issues at play in today's world. It was quite a different world when you began here.

07-00:01:17
Nader: Well, 1960 was an important year. It was the beginning of a decade of wakeup America on issues having to do with everything from civil rights to consumer rights to environmental rights to women's rights to Native American rights and so forth. But when I came here it was fairly quiet in 1960. The department had somewhere about fifteen people in it. I was the first woman. And they were recovering, you might say, from the departure of Cliff Geertz and Tom Fallers and Dave Schneider, who went to Chicago. Geertz had been here for one year and didn't much like it. They went to Chicago where they felt they could do what they wanted. But I didn't know much about that except that Schneider had been my professor at Harvard in kinship, so I knew him. I knew Faller's work because he worked in the Middle East. And Geertz I knew at Harvard because he was finishing up when I was there. So these were known characters to me. But the department was very warm, generous, hospitable, and very much a family at that time. It was sort of the last of the WASP faculty. So it was the beginning of a sort of opening up and, of course, the WASPs eventually were moved to the backseat and Jewish intellectuals moved in their place. And so, of course, the last one in the door shuts the door, and that's another story which we might touch back on.

But I found the students very good. I was thought to be a little hard on the students because Sherry Washburn said, "These are kids that have to work as well. They're not like Harvard," and so on. And basically he was telling me I shouldn't expect so much. But now when I go back and read some of those papers that I kept, I realize the quality of writing then was so much better than the quality of writing today and my expectations have dropped, along with the time and the technologies and all the distractions that students have, plus the debt. At that time the tuition was very low.

07-00:03:47
Rubens: I don't think they called it tuition. Student fees.

07-00:03:49
Nader: They called it fees, student fees. And my husband a few years earlier had graduated from Berkeley in physics. He paid $28 a semester in fees. And, of course, my lawyer said, "I couldn't have gone to law school if it were today because I wouldn't have the money." And the debts are so large. So all these things you take into consideration, that we've gone from kids who could read prior to the computer technology, videogame revolution, and they could write, literally could write with their hands. Now they don't learn discursive writing.

07-00:04:20
Rubens: An erosion of some of the basic instruction courses in writing.

07-00:04:25
Nader: But who became in the sixties more ideological than I find my students today. My students today I think just want to—they want to do good and they want to improve the world that they're in and so forth. But I wouldn't say that they're any kind of –ist particularly. They want to understand what's going on if they're active mentally. Otherwise they're careerist. And at that time, the notion of you going to college as a trade school was not something that was acceptable. It was a liberal arts education still. So people took anthropology. There were large classes in introductory course in anthropology. Six, seven hundred people. Sherry Washburn had over 1,200 one year. That we don't have today because people are majoring in business and so on. So that's the student end of it.

On the administrative end, which I think would be worth saying something about, Clark Kerr was chancellor of UC Berkeley [1952-1958], and president of the UC system [1958-1967]. And Clark Kerr was an educator and I don't think we've had someone of that caliber as an educator since. He certainly respected education, the purpose of the university. The rest haven't been fundraisers. Our present chancellor, Robert Birgeneau, has basically been a fundraiser and a rah-rah football fan. So that's a major change in a university that goes from being a liberal arts oriented university to a more corporate, and that started under President Gardner, our corporatization of the university. And then you've lost it. Then you're putting money into aquatic centers and the football stadiums and you're putting the university in debt and it becomes a show, a showplace.

07-00:06:17
Rubens: The claim, of course, is that with the decline of public funds, of state support, that privatization is the watchword of the day.

07-00:06:21
Nader: Well, it isn't privatization actually. It's corporatization. The state is reducing support but maybe there's a reason why the state is reducing. Maybe it has to do with how the university's acting towards the people that were funding the

university. I think we owe them a huge debt. The land, the buildings, the facilities. But then there's more to administration than dealing with the changes in finance. The dean, when I came here, was a dean of all liberal arts. There wasn't a dean of social science, a dean of humanities, and so on. There was one dean who covered the waterfront. And now it's cut up into four different kinds of deanships and so it got more and more cutup. And the priorities? Academics are second to football?

07-00:07:02
Rubens: And more bureaucratic.

07-00:07:02
Nader: And more bureaucratic. And, of course, as is discussed in a book that's just come out, the *Fall of the Faculty*, by Benjamin Ginsberg, there is the takeover of administrators in the university who aren't for the most part educators. So unlikely would it have happened what happened just now to the Department of Anthropology. It was a different set of values. The Department of Anthropology just a few months ago was put into receivership. So you have a dean of social science who then asks us — instead of our picking the chairs or voting for who we want to recommend, as we used to do, which was more democratic— now she asks for letters saying what our preferences are. She holds the data. She interprets the data. This is authoritarian. And then she says, "Well, there's nobody that could do it so we'll put somebody from history as your chair." Well, it's shocking. In the first place, there was somebody. So there was Stanley Brandes, who was chair twice before, and he could have done it for a year before we appoint somebody else.

07-00:08:07
Rubens: And the claim is divisiveness?

07-00:08:09
Nader: The claim is divisiveness and my outrage is that it's hypocrisy and lying. So when they say there's nobody that could do it, that was outright not untrue, which motivated Paul Rabinow and me to write to the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. So all of a sudden this is a big change from 1960 to now. And why anthropology? Why are they doing this to anthropology? Why is divisiveness, which has always been a stimulating characteristic in our department, why all of a sudden is that a problem? Why all of a sudden do we all have to get along with each other in the same department with no disagreements and everybody has to be nice? I spent forty years writing about that. My book *Harmony Ideology*, right. And the work that I did in *No Access to Law* on alternative dispute resolution. That's going from due process law litigation to alternative mediation, et cetera, where both parties are treated as if they were both equally innocent or equally guilty. So there's been a dramatic change. So we've basically gone from a more democratic university to a more authoritarian situation where the data is held by somebody outside the department. I asked her if I could see the data. She said, "No." I said, "Even if you take the names off?" She said no. I said, "Why should I trust you?" So

there's a loss of trust. In the sixties and seventies I can't imagine a dean doing this sort of thing.

And anthropology was much more respected than now. Of course, there's been all this stuff in the newspapers now about the humanities and social sciences being such a limited major, that liberal arts education is going out the window and so on. So people are at least aware of it nationally. But that's been very important.

07-00:10:06
Rubens: Just to return to your point about the 1960s being ideological. How much of an upheaval did you find the Free Speech Movement, the antiwar movement, and a successive number of protests that became more focused on the university?

07-00:10:28
Nader: Well, by ideological, I mean that basically Marxism was in vogue still then and so if you're an –ist then I don't care what kind of an –ist you are, there's some kind of ideological notions that enter in there. But the purposes that they were working towards I never had any disagreement with. We shouldn't have been at war. It was not declared by Congress. I don't believe in wars that are not declared by Congress. There's a reason for that. And there should be a civil rights movement and there should be a gender movement and so forth. Now, then, of course, you look back and you say, "Have we gotten far with all of that? Did it all happen?" Well, look at the voting rights, the Supreme Court now on the voting rights. It's backlash. They gutted it. And look at Texas telling women what to do with their bodies. So what has happened is what often happens in our country. It's the only way to look at it to have any hope at all, which is things change. And in 1919 this university, under Colonel Barrows, he was a military man, it wasn't exactly free and non-authoritative. He ran it like a military situation. But then it changed and you had different presidents who were—that's where leadership is important. And if you don't hire educators and you only hire people that are supposed to raise money for you from the corporate world, or national security experts, then you've got what you got.

Now, Tien was a different story and he was a different story. He himself said to me, "I'm the first Chinese American and I have to be perfect." Like I was the first women and I had to be perfect. Published twice as much as the boys and so on. But he was a wonderful model. But he couldn't be president. Why couldn't he be president of the university? Because he's a Chinese American and you have to be American born because of the national laboratories. The university supposedly manages the national laboratories. I say supposedly. They basically are pretty hands off. And we wanted to do something about that. I can't remember whether we've talked about that.

07-00:12:47
Rubens: We really haven't talked about that and I'd love to get to that in just a minute in terms of academic freedom. So is there anything to say specifically about if the department was riven during this movement?

07-00:12:57
Nader: No. The interesting thing was the department was very cohesive because the most rightwing anthropologist was left of the most leftwing political scientist. They were very conservative compared. George Foster was very conservative but he wasn't pro-war and he wasn't anti-civil rights and so on. It was a given. So it was very cohesive. All our meetings in the Gifford Room were arguments about what basic strategies we should be participating in.

07-00:13:30
Rubens: So basically the department supported the resolutions? That was the Committee of Two Hundred?

07-00:13:34
Nader: Yes.

07-00:13:35
Rubens: They defended the students' votes.

07-00:13:37
Nader: Oh, Yes. You see, the department's always been out front and sometimes we have been penalized. I just found something from the Academic Senate in 1992 that Charlie Schwartz in physics put together a resolution about the salary of the chancellor in the Senate. The salary of the chancellor should not be more than twice that of a full professor. That was 1992. Out of the six or seven signatures, five were anthropologists. So anthropology has sort of always been—and they aren't exactly radical anthropologists or anything. They're from Jim Anderson to me to—I can't remember who. So anthropology has always been more open to right and wrong rather than simply recognizing who's got the power. Consequence thinking.

07-00:14:27
Redman: Can I ask a question just for a sentence or two on sort of that transition there, from the older anthropologist and then during the sixties. Was there any sort of conversation about a chance of attitude toward positivism or more interpretivism and post-functionalism or were there any sort of theoretical shifts at that point or was it more of a subtle—

07-00:14:51
Nader: Yes, I think there were theoretical shifts. It was very much anthropology is a science when I first came here and ethno science was big and so forth. And then along came the interpretivists, basically influenced by people like Cliff Geertz and one person who wrote a piece about anthropology since the sixties who didn't even know what was happening in the sixties. But that piece became very influential and so everybody thought, "Yes, positivism is erased, interpretivism is here," and that was when I remember Elizabeth Colson

saying, “Cliff Geertz’s effect on anthropology is mischievous,” because he could write well, she felt, and think well, which I would question, but the people who were following him were not as clever.

07-00:15:39
Redman: It’s interesting the rise of computational analysis against—and sort of the possibilities for positivism, you might argue, in comparative analysis and then at the same time some of these may be articles or essays or movements to wipe away positivism.

07-00:15:56
Nader: Right. William Geoghegan was a faculty member here and he was into mathematics and computational work. Gene Hammel was, as well. Geohegan ended up I think leaving the university and going to work in a corporation. But there was that. Extremism, I say. And the reason I say that is because I believe in using whatever works depending on the question. See, they were both focused on method. Both the positivists were looking at method and the interpretivists were looking at method. I’m looking at the questions. What questions do you have and what methods do you need to answer those questions? If it’s computation, use computation. If it’s interpretation, use that.

07-00:16:40
Redman: Last question on this. Has that helped you work with different types of students? I would imagine that students come with different questions and then different thinking about how to answer those questions, how to go about writing a thesis on it.

07-00:16:55
Nader: Well, I’d say I’ve had a variety of students but I’ve never had any students get PhDs with me that are absolutely one or the other.

07-00:17:03
Redman: Interesting. Go ahead.

07-00:17:05
Rubens: Well, just to return to a few of these milestones. How about the issue over divestment from South Africa that became a huge cause here on the campus.

07-00:17:21
Nader: It was on the campus but not in the department. It’s one of those things you say, “Yes, of course.”

07-00:17:30
Rubens: But it was not one that you took up?

07-00:17:31
Nader: No.

07-00:17:31
Rubens: And then that really led to the American cultures requirement and that was a pretty novel development here on campus, that all undergraduates would be required to take a course where groups were looked at comparatively, there had to be three groups—

07-00:17:49
Nader: Right. I never particularly had much to do with them either. I think we should all have an understanding of American history, which includes things that Howard Zinn wrote in his book *The People's History of the United States*. So if that were the model. For example, they wanted to have my Controlling Processes course open as an American Cultures class and I said no. No, I don't want anybody to take it because it's a requirement. So I had people who really wanted to take it and not just to fill a requirement. Besides, I didn't think American Cultures was a great requirement.

07-00:18:37
Rubens: So you were in favor of the program but not necessarily a participant in it.

07-00:18:43
Nader: No, I wasn't a participant.

07-00:18:44
Rubens: By the way, did you follow Sheldon Wolin's campaign to rethink the role of the university. I think this was in the 1970s and grew out of his support for the Free Speech Movement and opposition to the war in Vietnam. He used the word "rededication."

07-00:18:58
Nader: Sheldon was a political theorist in Berkeley's Department of Political Science. He later went to Princeton. Wolin really believed in democratic ideals. He was and is a wonderful model of how to think about democracy. He's a sophisticated political theorist.

07-00:19:09
Rubens: And I didn't know if you had any association with him.

07-00:19:11
Nader: No, I didn't. I was just trying to survive.

07-00:19:14
Rubens: Yes, you were involved in a lot of things.

07-00:19:19
Nader: The gender issue was something I was involved with.

07-00:19:21
Rubens: And now that's exactly what I want to move to. There was the whole development of women's studies and then there were issues in your own case of maternity leave, of unequal pay. There were a number of lawsuits that came up when women were denied tenure.

07-00:19:37
Nader: I came across, by the way, a long interview that the women geographers did of me, which I made a copy of for you. And apparently I went into quite some detail on the gender issue because they never forgive the first women. There's something about breaking the taboo and coming in. And any woman who comes after is fine but that first woman has always got kind of a stigma. And this has been written about nationwide. The first woman always has something. So I never did get equal pay. And what was interesting, and what I had to say earlier, is I thought that bringing more women on the campus would be helpful. But I must say, we have a woman dean now, I think she's the first women dean from the Department of History. And she's nothing special. So in my last promotion where the department asked for a certain amount and I didn't get what they asked for, I had a back and forth with her.

And for reasoning, I couldn't make it up because books that I wrote—my recent book was called a textbook when it's not, I'm referring to *Culture and Dignity*. And you don't get much credit for textbooks but it isn't a textbook. And then the plunder book, which has been translated into six languages. I didn't get credit for that because—I think I mentioned this—because of this and that. So when I asked some of my colleagues on the campus, "What would you say were important things to talk about in the development of the university in the last several decades?' there were two issues they brought up. One had to do with gender. That you can hire a woman but if she gets too smart then you put her down. And we have examples in our department of that and elsewhere. And then the other thing that came up, which some of the diversity faculty on this campus refer to as the Jewish mafia, and some of the people that I talk to, say that if you're Jewish you have a better chance. And that's like if you were a WASP you had a better chance, right, before the Jews came onto the campus. The last one in the door shuts the door. And so there's this feeling, right or wrong, that "if only I was Jewish I would have gotten my promotion."

And that has to do with the same clubbiness that the WASPs were often accused of. And I said to this woman, "Do you think it's political?" to one woman who brought it up. And she said, "No, I think it's ethnicity," which is kind of interesting, too, because I don't think of religion in terms of ethnicity. One control group took over from the other control group, presumably.

07-00:22:38
Rubens: And you're saying this is campus-wide?

07-00:22:42
Nader: I'm speaking campus-wide because I asked people in different—just to get a sense of what—but the diversity people will refer to the Jewish mafia. That's what they call it.

And, of course, you could have said any kind of—but I think the feeling is that people are not getting promoted on the basis of the quality of their work.

That is what I think is the core issue here. It's more personalismo. And I noticed among all of my fifty year old faculty that personalismo is very important. And that's—

07-00:23:17
Rubens: How are you defining that?

07-00:23:19
Nader: We used to criticize Latinos. The reason things don't really move in Latin America is because you choose somebody on the basis of whether you know them and they're buddies with you or not, rather than the quality of the work. And so personalismo here, I'll give you an example. We have a lecture series in the department and we used to invite major figures in anthropology. We brought [Raymond] Firth and [Meyer] Fortes and E.R. Leach. I think I mentioned this before.

And now it's, "I want to bring so and so because I know them. I want to help them. I met them at a conference, and they're buddies." It's like you're trading goodwill or something rather than you really think anybody—and so they're not very well attended. And then at the same time we stopped inviting ourselves. [And I no longer know what my colleagues are doing.] I think it's very important for some of the faculty to speak to the general population interested in anthropology. And so one replaced the other and I didn't think that was too healthy. Personalismo.

07-00:24:25
Rubens: So in terms of your relationship to Women's Studies—

07-00:24:33
Nader: I was a supporter of women's studies but I didn't want it to be a department—I wanted it to be taught in departments. You should integrate it into the departments' offerings. Because if you don't integrate it, you can just dump women's studies or dump ethnic studies. I wasn't for that. I wanted to have that as temporary but integrate it into the department.

07-00:24:53
Rubens: So it was an important focus that should be integrated into the disciplines.

07-00:24:55
Nader: Right. Because with ethnic studies, for example, then we stopped teaching anything on Native Americans in the anthro department, the department that was known for its work in that field.

This whole business of ethnicity and diversity being defined in terms of that, I really think has been very destructive in the university. Extremely destructive. And I was recently interviewed for my book on a BBC program and at the end—the theme was us and them. And at the end the man said to me, I don't know whether I had spoken about this or not—the man said to me, "Well, Professor Nader, let's say you're a white male. What would you do?" And I

said, “I don’t want to be anybody but what I am. I like myself the way—“I think I said that. “And I don’t care what people’s color or blah, blah, blah is. I care about character.” And, again, that has to do with the quality of the person. And I think so-called diversity has been a disaster. I teach about this in Controlling Processes, this whole business of so called diversity. We have to have a certain number of people.

07-00:26:00
Rubens: And just to sort of round that out. Are there hires that you can speak to or contest over hires in the department over the issue of diversity that really were contentious?

07-00:26:12
Nader: In a hundred years plus, we’ve only had one black American in our department. And at every point where we tried to get somebody hired, something would enter in. Either a woman would be put up instead, or whatever reason, we never hired another one. Then the same thing happened with Hispanic Americans. There was a very good candidate. He’s published more than all the candidates that had applied and somehow he ended up getting a job at a state university and one of my colleagues said, “That’s where he belongs.” On the other hand, we’ve hired almost 40 percent plus foreign born. And the foreign born I think in some of our colleagues minds was hiring diversity. The whole reason for affirmative action was not foreign born, it was American born. And so when I say to them, “We need to hire American born,” they say, “What do you mean American born?” I say, “I mean American born. Born in this country that had troubles, the four groups that were discriminated against.” Either Asian Americans or Native Americans or Black Americans or Hispanic Americans. The right needs to be wronged. The wronged needs to be righted. And somehow I didn’t have much luck with that. And we hired foreign born that mainly came from well to do families.

07-00:27:43
Rubens: The department certainly began to hire many more women by the 1980s.

07-00:27:50
Nader: We did get numerous women but they were in some ways a disappointment.

07-00:27:57
Rubens: Because?

07-00:27:58
Nader: Because many came in actually wanting to be like the boys. Like this present dean. And you could take all these women that are in administrative positions. It’s not nice what I say but I said to one woman who was an equity advisor, I said, “You have two kinds of women on the campus. There are the women who do research and are totally dedicated to their research and are doing wonderful work. And then you got the kiss-ass women who don’t do a lot of publishing and are basically doing the administrative work that the men used

to do." As the saying goes, "some administrators are failed academics.". And so it doesn't cut. And, of course, that's the point when I began to say quite loudly that you can be a man and a feminist and you can be a woman and a sexist. The notion that you have to be female to be feminist and male to be sexist is just nonsense.

07-00:28:59
Rubens: Historically that's true.

07-00:29:00
Nader: Absolutely. The person that hired me was George Foster and it wasn't a woman that hired me.

07-00:29:05
Rubens: Right. And he said he didn't hire you because you were a woman. It was because you—

07-00:29:08
Nader: That's right. And I say that. So me and Colson and [Phyllis] Dolhinow were hired for our work. Dolhinow did primate stuff. And then after that, if you started hiring women because they were women, in a way that's a burden for them because they have to play that role, that they're here to whatever. And it wasn't fair to them either.

07-00:29:33
Rubens: A little segue here, but since we're talking about women, I'm wondering if you can talk about how gender did play into your career. There is you, *qua* woman, then there's you who write extensively about women. There are just numerous ways in which you are paying attention to—

07-00:29:51
Nader: Much of which was not supported by feminists because I have a very different and comparative view of the rest of the world. But let me just start with your first part of your question. When I first came here and was the first woman in the department, I wasn't very self-conscious and I wasn't what you would call a feminist in the present term. I wasn't. But because the gender discrimination issue came up in the country, I was in a good position. So Elizabeth Colson and I were on all these committees in Washington because they needed to say they had a woman on the committee. We were often the only woman on the committee. And that was really a gift. It was very, very nice. So for the first while it was good because we could participate without being self-conscious about representing women only. We were just doing our job.

07-00:30:59
Rubens: As anthropologists.

07-00:31:00
Nader: Yes, as anthropologists. And then later on I think people became very self-conscious about it and then later on there was a rebellion and women didn't want to be known as women anthropologists, they just wanted to be known as

anthropologists. So it goes through different cycles. But to say that my life was improved intellectually especially because we have women on the campus or in the department, not at all.

07-00:31:28
Rubens: Was Nancy Scheper-Hughes a student of yours when she was here?

07-00:31:33
Nader: No, but she was a student while I was here. We became very good friends. She of course became a colleague. Colson was the closest colleague, probably, to me. I've also mentioned that I was close with Susan Ervin-Tripp, a colleague at Berkeley in the Department of Psychology.

07-00:31:45
Rubens: For one of the international conferences at which you spoke, I don't know if we mentioned this, was it in Egypt or in Saudi Arabia, that you're sent and you said, "I'm not going to be the only woman."

07-00:31:56
Nader: Two conferences. One was Saudi Arabia and one was Damascus. Before the Saudi Arabian I said, "I'm not going to come, be the only woman, the first woman at a conference in Saudi Arabia." It was a conference that was all males but I was the first woman invited. And I invited Sue Ervin-Tripp to come with me because they said, "Invite somebody." And then the Damascus one I said I didn't want to be the only "lady" at the conference and they invited twenty other women scientists. Twenty. And the same time I was on the CNAES [Committee on Nuclear and Alternative Energy Systems], we discussed the report on energy I worked on for the National Academy of Sciences, and I was one out of 300 men working on the project, and they just told me they thought I was handling it very well and they never added any women, in spite of my request that they include qualified women.

07-00:32:51
Rubens: I have a few other questions to ask you about your stance on the university. What about the issue of academic freedom. I know that one of the ways that you get into it is when your husband is fired from the Lawrence Berkeley Lab.

07-00:33:04
Nader: Well, about the same time as the LBL situation, there was a question of academic freedom having to do with one of my colleagues who didn't let students ask him questions in class. Biological anthropologist. And he was the one that started his class by saying something like, "I think that Chinese and whites are smarter than blacks and Hispanics and if you don't like that, don't take this course." And he didn't let them ask questions in class. This was Vince Sarich. He just passed away. But he would have them come to his office. Well, now, if you're a five foot tall Hispanic woman and you want to challenge that, and Sarich was a big, tall man, it's not going to be easy. So we had a symposium in the department—well, it was off campus actually. I

remember Nancy was there and Paul Rabinow and myself and Sarich to his credit. This is probably in the late seventies, early eighties.

Anyway, I wrote a piece then for the *San Francisco Chronicle* in which I said students should have academic freedom also. It's not just faculty. Then the question extended to the National Laboratories because that became a big issue. And it was partly because my sister was at the Oak Ridge National Lab, my husband was here at Berkeley, having been at Livermore. And there were questions about who was getting fired and not. And he ended up getting fired for reasons that never were clear to me. In fact, when I asked his boss why he got fired he said, "I'll never tell." And I said, "Never?" And he said, "Not 'til the ship goes down."

07-00:35:04
Rubens: Why do you think he was fired?

07-00:35:06
Nader: I really don't know whether it was political or—I don't know. And that was Maynard Michael and I've tried to find him to see if I could find an answer to it. But that led to a larger question, plus what my sister had observed at Oak Ridge National Lab. She was in the office of Alvin Weinberg, the head of the lab, working very closely with him. And she noticed all of this sort of censorship that was going on. You can't have free science if people think they're going to be fired. So there are a bunch of us that started to work on the question of the labs. Owen Chamberlain from chemistry, Nobel laureate, and Frank Newman, from the law school, he had been a Supreme Court Justice, California. And Keith Miller from mathematics and Bob [Robert] Bellah from sociology. Me. Anyway, quite a group.

And we tried to do something about the labs, either to separate the labs from the university or to really manage them and academic freedom was on the front burner for me. How can you have free science? And Gofman and Tamplin had just basically been fired from Livermore for—I think I talked about this before, Gofman was a medical doctor and a physicist; Tamplin is also a physicist and he could never get a job in this country after that. But they spoke their mind in front of a Congressional committee, I think. And it's been written up in a whistleblower book. But they were doing us a favor because they were saying that the acceptable dose of radiation was set at a much lower level than the AEC should set it for the health of people. So it had to do with the dose of radiation, what was considered acceptable for human health. And we need to know that.

And Gofman survived because he was a professor here, as well, and also a medical doctor, and he fought to the end on that question. He was a wonderful man. But we eventually did get into the contract something about academic freedom but I don't have any idea whether it mattered, whether people feel protected or not. When I was giving a lecture at the Los Alamos labs on

barriers to thinking new, I had scientists come out of the woodwork there talking about how they'd been demoted. Sounded very much like what was going on with my husband. So it was all throughout the system. And then there were these scientists who, after the Soviet Union fell apart, they wanted to use the money to do something else besides militarism and they lost the battle also. So it's clear that these labs were set up during World War II on a military model and they're still on a military model. And my advice to the new president of the university would be either manage the labs actually or get rid of them. But you're basically giving them credibility being part of the University of California, when you're not managing them and interfering when they do these things.

I have a huge file on the lab so I must have spent a lot of time. Tom Hayden was involved, and the hearings that were had and then they had a big event on the other side of campus. I had forgotten how much time actually I spent on that issue with this group of people who were terrific to be with because they could talk about academic freedom for scientists.

07-00:38:50
Rubens: And academic freedom continued to be a concern of yours. You weighed in when UC President Atkinson reformed standards of academic freedom.

07-00:39:19
Nader: Yes. Vince Sarich was the biological anthropologist that didn't answer questions in class. Actually, Alan Dundes told me. Sarich didn't let students ask questions in class. I said, "Why?" he said, "They can come to my office to—" He had a lot of office hours for them. He said, "It disturbs my performance." I said, "Alan, what do you mean disturb?" But, you see, you could have that conversation with Alan. And he did spend so much time with his students. He was very beloved so I guess it could work the other way.

07-00:39:47
Rubens: Could we talk a little bit about the recent opposition on campus, well throughout the university system as well, to the increasing corporatization the university: the decline of public support, increases in tuition, the expanded reliance on corporate sponsorship. You wrote an essay *The University in Crisis: Public Good or Private Good*. And this is in the KAS Papers.

07-00:40:31
Nader: It was a special issue of the *Kroeber Anthropological Society*.

But that was so helpful because people like Dr. [Stanton] Glantz from UCSF, the man who blew the whistle on tobacco, he knew a lot about how that happened and who really had power and influence because he was on the university-wide budget committee.

07-00:40:50
Rubens: Understanding the true realities of politics is his piece.

07-00:40:52
Nader: Yes. He was terrific and there were a lot of good people who wrote in that issue. It wasn't just anthropologists.

07-00:40:56
Rubens: Charlie Schwartz, Nancy Scheper-Hughes, both have pieces.

07-00:41:00
Nader: Yes. And Jerry Brown carried that issue around Sacramento for a while. People said it was very helpful. And I did an historical look because the whole notion of public education and its value, whether it should be private or public—my goodness, we started with Thomas Jefferson. In a democracy you have to have public education, people educated so that they might be able to defend themselves from those who might predate against them. So that is a long-term issue and it's still an argument. What society, what country, would do what we're doing to the young today in America if they weren't committing suicide? What country would take its young people and saddle them with so much debt as they graduated from college that they couldn't be creative because they're in debt. It's like we were saying earlier about the publishers. We're lousy businessmen and we're lousy in running a country where we say we want innovation. So who gets to innovate? People that don't finish college. It's really just tragic. It just doesn't make any sense. Americans can be generous in certain ways and they can be so stingy. I just can't comprehend it.

07-00:42:24
Rubens: And that shift of what is the function of the university. To make an educated citizen as opposed to just making a person ready for a job.

07-00:42:34
Nader: I remember being in Frankfurt and having somebody take me around to the museums after World War II and they rebuilt Frankfurt after the terrible bombings. And the museums were all open to the public and free. And I said, "How did that happen?" She said, "Well, Germans think that their citizens should be cultured." So I went to Burton Benedict or whoever was down here at the museum and I went to the Harvard Museum, too, talked to somebody at the top. And I said, "Harvard's got a lot of money. Why don't you make it free?" And it's a certain stinginess that comes in at the wrong time. What are you trying to do? You only want some people to be cultured? What? And the same thing with Burton Benedict. He said, we can't do that." I said, "Why not? Just go out and get some money particularly targeted to make it free." There's a lot of people with money in this state that might think it's a good thing for Americans to be cultured. It's just lack of imagination.

07-00:43:44
Rubens: Well, and that's what you're arguing in this piece on the university in crisis. That, sure, we have to find a way to make up the costs that are not coming in from the state, but that there are more creative ways of doing it, including

separating the intercollegiate sports from the general fund, which is another point that I wanted to make. You get involved with eight—

07-00:44:11
Nader: Yes, a total eight people, mainly on the other side of campus, or mainly in the hard sciences, which was about academics first.

07-00:44:18
Rubens: How did that come about that you joined?

07-00:44:18
Nader: Well, we objected to administrative priorities that put football and basketball above academic needs. And each one heard about the other objecting and then somebody said, "Well, why don't we get together and talk?" So we all got together and talked. And we just agreed that it's so hard for one person to be a whistleblower that we needed a group. And, of course, Brian Barsky was the head of that. He's a computer scientist. He's taken the brunt of the criticism. But he can certainly stand up today and say, "I told you so," or "We told you so." We're over a billion dollars in debt for the stadium. This aquatic park they're about to make the same mistake again. Are you kidding? So what are you doing? Again, the insanity. It just really makes you wonder. Where are these people?

07-00:45:01
Rubens: But you join in? This is part of your being a good citizen and also correlates with your sense of outrage about how this institution to which you've dedicated yourself to is so—

07-00:45:13
Nader: If the faculty are badly treated in a university it's because they don't respect themselves. There's a reason we have tenure and that has to do with being able to speak up, say what we think. And to participate as citizens in the university, never mind beyond. So we have an academic senate. But the Academic Senate only works if it's free from administrative interference. It can only be free from administrative interference if the faculty respect themselves and don't feel indebted to the administration. There are too many people that are in awe of power.

07-00:46:01
Rubens: I think the faculty Senate showed its bold stripes when it opposed the repression on the course on Palestinian poetry. I think that's what generated Atkinson's clampdown on definitions of academic freedom and then there was a proposal made in the Academic Senate to codify this position.

07-00:46:18
Nader: Right. There have been a number of times in the history. But if you go to regular Academic Senate meetings, people don't necessarily participate. And people lie. [Brian] Barsky got up and he quoted a colleague about the budget of the football industry on campus and the colleague was sitting there and he

said, “I never said that.” The hypocrisy and the lie. Bald lying. Saying things like, “Are you kidding?” That they keep repeating, “We had to have an outside chair for our department because there was nobody that had experience that could do it.” But there was. There was Stanley Brandes. He did it twice and he was terrific. What an insult to him. And so how can people get away with that? The nicest way I can phrase it is to say many people are suffering from fried brains.

07-00:47:23
Redman: What do you mean by that?

07-00:47:25
Nader: I mean their brains are categorized or overloaded with technology or multitasking in such a way that they can’t connect the dots, or aren’t connecting the dots.

07-00:47:33
Rubens: Do we have time to move to a discussion of the national security state?

07-00:47:36
Redman: Yes.

07-00:47:38
Rubens: Before we began these interviews you mentioned that you are outraged by the university’s complicity with the Patriot Act.

07-00:47:51
Nader: Right. And before that in the Clinton administration. .

07-00:47:54
Rubens: Well, it goes back to your piece “The Phantom Factor,” in *The Cold War and the University*.

07-00:47:59
Nader: Right. I didn’t know anything much about Cold War and the university until I was asked to write a piece for a book called *The Cold War and the University*, which was supposed to be edited by Chomsky, although it was really edited by the editor or the publisher. And because I didn’t know anything I started from scratch and I started in the department by having a seminar, which I have on record, asking people what they thought about the Cold War and the university, et cetera.

07-00:48:34
Rubens: You had professors come in to speak.

07-00:48:36
Nader: I had professors come in. Oh, it was all voluntary. And some of them were very involved. Like Berreman was involved and Phillips was involved and George Foster was involved, and so on, in what was going on contemporarily. So at least I had a sense of what was in the minds of my colleagues. And then

I said, “But this story is going to be mine. My story as I piece it together.” So I went back in time and without Suzanne Calpestri in the anthropology library I could not have done this work. She absolutely worked. Found me documents I couldn’t have found that weren’t published and so on. And I pieced this together, the phantom factor. And I called it “The Phantom Factor” because it was not easily noticed. It was in my department. Maybe I’m not a good observer but I didn’t see what was going on between faculty.

Then today is very different. Today we have a Homeland Security office on the campus. Today it’s in your face, the national security state. Whatever happened to arm’s length? We used to say the university has to be arm’s length to be able to pursue truth and beauty. Right? The ivory tower is no more. Maybe it never was. But it certainly is totally in bed with the national security state. Now, what does this in bed with have to do with? Money and power. Once you succumb to money and power, forget truth and beauty.

07-00:50:06
Rubens: I think you particularly were outraged by the British Petroleum deal, and. before that there was the Novartis. These corporate research programs with the university have raised questions about academic freedom and issues of undue influence.

07-00:50:14
Nader: Yes, the big Novartis takeover. Criminal corporation. It was a criminal corporation. It’s corporations on campus. I think I mentioned that BP scientists can go into Berkeley labs and see what they’re doing but not vice versa. How could you sign a contract like that? Awe. Awe is so interesting because you got people in the university— George Foster comes from a wealthy family. Sherry comes from a—a lot of those people came from wealthy families. They were not in awe. George Foster was not in awe in the sense that people who are upward mobile that are in awe of power, whether it’s criminal power or not. To me that’s so interesting. Why?

You asked me about what I want to teach students. A lot of young people, and people from certain classes who have not had the mix with power, are trusting. They suffer from what I call “trustanoia.” They’re in awe. Awe is a kind of respect. You have to earn respect. I don’t care. It’s why I say I don’t care what color you are. If you’re a crook and you’re black, you’re a crook. And if you’re white and you’re a crook, you’re a crook. I don’t care. So there’s something that’s been missing. I don’t know how those people are raised but they’re innocently raised, which is the controlling processes. These kids are innocent.

07-00:52:25
Rubens: They can’t “question authority.” That was such a ubiquitous command in the late l970s.

07-00:52:28
Nader: It's supposed to be nice. But the reason they take the course is they hear that it can be liberating. And, actually, I'm not telling them what to think, I'm telling them it's okay to say it out loud. That's the important thing. They think these things. They may even recognize that BP is a criminal corporation but they can't get up and say it, not even to each other. So this is self-censorship. And I think I mentioned earlier I had a conversation with the head of the Social Science Research Council, Elbridge Sibley. I remember his name because when I said to him, "I'm worried about censorship in this country," he said, "There'll never be government censorship in America. Self-censorship works too well." And that's a very incisive observation. Self-censorship.

07-00:53:20
Rubens: And at the same time the picture isn't all dismal. You have then at the symposium [Anthropology in the World: Celebration Laura Nader's Fifty Years of Teaching at UC Berkeley] in honor of you, someone talking about the civic lessons they got from your courses. How their eyes were opened wide and—

07-00:53:36
Nader: The symposium, I never wanted it to be a celebration of me, even though people want to celebrate a person, often retiring professors, and of course I didn't retire. Maybe they hoped I would. Retiring professors. You have a symposium in their honor and you charge people to come to give money to the university. I did not want that. I didn't want to be the center of anything. I wanted to show anthropology. I wanted to show off the field because of the possibilities that anthropology brings. It's the possibilities that I felt weren't being recognized even in the department. So I brought people from other parts of the world, as well as the United States, and outside of academia, like Gillian Tett from the *Financial Times* or like Ashraf Ghani from Afghanistan to make certain points. Like Zulaika, who is a Basque writing about terrorism. Great work on terrorism that hasn't been recognized. So that was very important. Very well attended.

07-00:54:39
Rubens: And for the record, many of the sessions are on YouTube and there is a volume of the *Kroeber Society Papers* [Volumes 102/103, 2013] that has included transcripts of several of the presentation or comments on presentations. Your brother Ralph was a speaker.

07-00:54:58
Nader: He commented on Zulaika's presentation on mythologies of terrorism.

07-00:55:01
Rubens: And Robert Reich, the former secretary of labor under Clinton, from the Goldman School of Public Policy.

07-00:55:07
Nader: Yes. Economist. Wonderful. Wonderful person. He's educating Californians. Not only are his classes full all the time, he's doing what we should all do. He's on TV, he's on the radio.

07-00:55:22
Rubens: He writes extensively in newspapers and popular journals.

07-00:55:22
Nader: Absolutely. He's absolutely a model of what you want a professor in a public university to be. He's giving back. He's not just taking. He's giving back.

07-00:55:39
Redman: I think we have time for one more question on this tape.

07-00:55:41
Rubens: Should we talk about your piece on the UC Regents?

07-00:55:48
Nader: Oh, yes. Well, I was actually invited to write that piece. I wasn't necessarily so sure they should be elected because if you look at some of the people we elect to Congress and so forth, it's not always a happy—

07-00:56:08
Rubens: Who asked you to write that? That was '94, wasn't it?

07-00:56:13
Nader: Might have been the editor asked me to do it. But I think Charlie Schwartz suggested me. He thought it would be better than if he did it. He did believe that they should be elected, I think. So I wrote this piece. Didn't we get into this at all? Didn't we get into this earlier?

07-00:56:37
Rubens: Not that particular argument.

07-00:56:39
Nader: Well, let me just say I wrote it and then there was a TV show and I was on the TV show with some people who were going to argue about whether the regents should be elected and it was hosted by a corporate lawyer and when I was going on, I said to him, "If you had your wish for the University of California, what would you wish?" He said, "A place where men wear jackets and ties." And I said, "Well, the women are very well dressed." He said, "Yes, they're castrating the men."

07-00:57:11
Rubens: Oh dear.

07-00:57:13
Nader: See the comments that people make? And then we went on the show. And I think the only people here that saw it or heard it were the police, the UC Berkeley police because they came up to me. They said, "I'll never give you a

ticket on any of your cars. That was great. It was absolutely—" because it raised the question of the regents, the most unregulated regents in the country, compared, for example, to New York State. They're very unregulated. They're all businessmen.

07-00:57:42
Rubens: It's a patronage system, right?

07-00:57:44
Nader: Patronage. They're businessmen, they're not educators, and they're making decisions having to do with education. So what are we doing having the regents not be educators? We need some people who have good minds that know how to think about more than being businesspeople.

07-00:58:02
Rubens: It was Birgeneau really who was promoting local governing boards so that each campus could have more autonomy.

07-00:58:12
Nader: More bureaucracy. More bureaucracy. I mentioned earlier the Benjamin Ginsberg book, *The Fall of the Faculty.* The sub-title is*: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why it Matters.* We need much less administration. It does matter. A lot of money is going into administration. Look, originally administrators were supposed to serve the faculty and the students. Now we're serving staff. We're paying for them. And that's not what administrators are supposed to be about. So there's so much bureaucracy in the university. People at the local staff level are going crazy with the changes. If you come in and a new job, then you have to change the whole system and you have to re-teach them what to do with the system and so on. They hire companies to tell us what to do. They hired a company to tell us that, "Buy this building down on Fourth Street so that you could take all the people, for example, in anthropology that are staff and take them down there," and none of it's going to be face to face anymore. You're getting rid of face to face. What if there are mistakes? We have to go all the way down there? They say, "Well, we're going to have these special cabs that go back and forth.

They paid money for that. It's unbelievable. So if you hire another administrator, then they have to have a whole staff that comes under them.

07-00:59:27
Rubens: I think Birgeneau was arguing that you could have more flexibility and freedom if you were not under the heavy hand of the regents.

07-00:59:37
Nader: We have plenty of freedom. He was a terrible chancellor, if I do say so. He was a nice man but not a leader, not transparent.

07-00:59:42
Rubens: Because?

07-00:59:43
Nader: Because all he knew how to do is say, “Go, Bears, go,” with whatever. And he wasn’t an academic chancellor. He was distanced from the students. He appealed to the police too readily. He didn’t reduce the administrative apparatus. He only increased the administrative apparatus. He turned it over to George Breslauer, basically, a lot of the academic stuff. One layer on top of another. We used to be able to go, if we had something in the department that was wrong, we’d go see the chancellor. You can’t do that now. First you have to see this and you have to see this and you have to see this and maybe you might go see the chancellor. What kind of baloney is that? We’re not able to get to the people that are supposed to be serving us.

Audio File 8

08-00:00:01
Rubens: When we were talking about the national security state being exemplified in some of the policies here on campus, did you have a particular position on John Yoo, the Berkeley law professor who wrote a—

08-00:00:19
Nader: Absolutely. I think if he violated the law he should be prosecuted and go to jail. And when I said that to my colleague Herma Kay she said, “What about academic freedom?” I said, “It doesn’t have anything to do with academic freedom. It has to do with a criminal act. He has to be prosecuted. If he’s found guilty he should go to jail. It has nothing to do with academic freedom.”

08-00:00:46
Redman: Could you define central dogmas? What are central dogmas?

08-00:00:53
Nader: Well, central dogmas are those rules or ideologies that govern professions or disciplines that are never articulated very straightforwardly but you know when you’ve hit a central dogma when you violate it. So I would say a central dogma in anthropology was you study down. But nobody said you study down. But you don’t study up, down, sideways. You study down. And it was put forth in science very well by Thomas Kuhn in his book on scientific revolutions, where he called it normal science but he was referring to dogmas. And that the new ideas don’t come in from normal science, they come in from the side or from somewhere else. That was a very revolutionary book in 1960, for which he didn’t get tenure at Berkeley.

08-00:01:57
Redman: Remarkable.

08-00:02:00
Rubens: I’d love for us to turn to your new book, *Culture and Dignity*. And speaking about a central focus of yours. You’ve been writing on the Middle East, on Muslims since—well, you write an article in 1962 on the use of language in

the Middle East— since 1965, after you had spent a summer in a Shiite Muslim village.

08-00:02:28
Nader: Libaya, in Southern Lebanon.

08-00:02:31
Rubens: And I'd love to hear the genesis of finally putting together all of this work that you've done. You are writing, publishing continuously throughout the seventies, eighties, nineties, and this book is published in 2013. There's a beautiful, beautiful introduction that speaks to your own family background and your being sensitized to the formulation of "us and them."

08-00:03:10
Nader: There's no doubt that my first invitation to give the lectures in Cairo in 1985 was an opportunity to pull some things together. But I had to think about what am I going to talk about. Well, I'm going to talk about the work that I'm doing but I want to talk about it in such a way that it's interesting to a Cairo audience. And I was doing work on energy. So I talked about energy and I talked about non-violence. And what was interesting to me was the reaction to those particular two topics. One was a verbal fight basically between two Egyptians. Egyptians are very polite. They never yell at each other. They might joke but this one nuclear engineer stood up and he said, "This is the worst talk I've ever heard." And this other fellow stood up and said, "This is the best talk I've ever heard." And one was pro-nuclear and the other was anti-nuclear and that's what took me to the—which I mentioned before, I think. It took me to Mubarak's home to talk to Mrs. Mubarak, who had studied anthropology at the AUC. {American University in Cairo}

But the one that surprised me a lot was the one that I gave on non-violence in the Middle East, because people think of "Middle Easterners," in quotes, especially Arabs, as terrorists or before that violent war-mongering whatever. Muslims, Jihads, and all the rest. Our daily newspapers continually beat this drum. There's no context.

And so if you go back in history, or even if you read the Koran, which we had to read when I was at Harvard with my first course on the Middle East—interestingly, we had to read that. You realize that has nothing to do with Islam, that Islam has periods—the period from the seventh century to the present periods of war and periods of peace, and so on, just like the Swedes. The Swedes ravaged Europe at one point and now we think of the Swedes as being peaceful people. So what are the seeds for non-violence, if, during this period, we want to see less violence in the Middle East? And so I focused on those aspects of Middle Eastern culture that are the seeds. Then I left, came back, got caught up with everything. And then we had a chance to publish them. Had it in the back of my mind.

And 2004, ’05, I was invited back to give another set of lectures to AUC, which is not quite usual. But I think they felt that because I was in between cultures, in a way, because my parents came from Lebanon and so on, that somehow I could communicate. And a series of lectures then and then they kept saying, “Well, when are you going to publish the lectures?” So I talked to the AUC press and I wanted to publish in Arabic. Anyway, that didn’t go anywhere. And I got caught up here.

But finally I was very motivated because we were at war. First we went into Kuwait. They went into Kuwait and then we went in after them with the first George Bush and then we went into Iraq on a pretense. Then we went into Afghanistan after 9/11 in 2001 and why do they hate us and all this stuff. The hysteria that was basically going on about Islamoaphobia in this country. And I thought it was important to clarify some of these issues because there is so much propaganda and so much emotion. Not that I have no emotion but you have to use your brain, as well. So I decided to put that out as a book. And they had another title chosen. They had *Politics and History in the Middle East*, or something like that. Totally boring. And I kept saying, “No, *Culture and Dignity*.” “Why dignity?” “Because everybody’s talking about dignity.” They’re talking about our dignity. American’s dignity? But you couldn’t get Americans to talk about dignity also. Look at American blacks. They’ll tell you about dignity and the lack thereof and the treatment and so on. So I prevailed on that and it came out.

Now, the one lecture that was least understood in Cairo in 2005 was the lecture on corporate fundamentalism. And it would probably have been the least understood here. It was the hardest chapter to write and to rewrite and to rewrite because, one, we think of fundamentalism as being a religious phenomenon and we don’t think of business having religion, although Weber talked about this and so did Durkheim. But the other is that it was happening and they weren’t connecting the dots just like we’re not connecting the dots. And what was it that was happening? Corporate capitalism and the technologies that accompanied corporate capitalism, the fundamentalist type of capitalism, that’s not the only kind of capitalism, was affecting the lives of their families. In the Middle East the primary unit is the family. That’s the primary unit. It was being attacked. Never mind bombing Baghdad. And how is it being attacked? Well, they didn’t know how it was being attacked. They knew that their kids had cell phones and they bought them for them and they knew that their children had computers. But they didn’t realize that these are age segregating phenomena. So their families were being stormed, as they are in Japan and Korea and everywhere now worldwide. Generation gaps. So they didn’t really understand that chapter and I’m not sure it was ever successful. Maybe it was just too far ahead of its time. But it was very important to show that our fundamentalism, religious fundamentalism in the United States, is related to the same phenomena.

08-00:09:28
Rubens: I was interested in the chapter on normative blindness and unresolved human rights issues.

08-00:09:33
Nader: Oh, yes.

08-00:09:34
Rubens: And at first you said that that came out of a paper that was given in Houston at the Rothko Chapel. The Rothko Chapel. Oh, that must have been—

08-00:09:45
Nader: Yes. I gave a version of it, excuse me. I first gave a version of it at the AA meetings. Then I developed it for a talk at the Rothko Chapel in Houston where they have talks that are sort of—they're not really religious talks but they are—

08-00:10:07
Rubens: Ecumenical.

08-00:10:08
Nader: Yes, something anybody would hear and had religious components because of the good and bad and so on. And then I tried to get it published here and I couldn't get it published. And I asked some of the people on the campus, human rights, where I could publish it and I sent them. And they said, "Oh, well, we know all this stuff. It's already been published." "No, not really." And then I was invited to publish it in Brazil and they took it right away, which is interesting. And I think the reason they took it is because human rights started really with Eleanor Roosevelt and the US had a big part in that. It's a wonderful thing that happened. But it had a tone of American exceptionalism written into it that other countries don't like. So if you tell the Chinese, "You should do better with your prisons and treat your people better," well, they could tell us the same thing. Look what's happening in California prisons or prisons anywhere. Abu Ghraib.

We have our own Abu Ghraib's here. So they don't like that. So if you give them a voice, as I did in this paper, it shows that human rights have to be accepted everywhere on the terms of not American universalism but on terms that would impact us equally. Not that all jails are the same but we know the Chinese jails are pretty bad. If we're going to go look at their jails, they should be able to come and look at ours.

08-00:11:52
Rubens: Guantanamo.

08-00:11:53
Nader: And Guantanamo. Terrible.

08-00:11:55
Redman: And connecting in a little bit. A couple of other ideas. But both salvation mentality and—oh, do you want—Go ahead.

08-00:12:03
Rubens: I just have one other question, about your attention to the Middle East. In response to the first Iraq war, you organize the ICWA, a council for women in the arts, and put on an exhibit at the National Museum of Women Artists. Were these Iraqi artists or artists from the Middle—

08-00:12:29
Nader: No, it's Arab women artists, from Morocco to Iraq. When Clinton became President, the first thing he did was bomb Baghdad and killed this Iraqi artist. And I thought, "If they knew that these people had civilization, maybe they wouldn't do such terrible things." It was kind of naïve on our part. But we thought instead of talking politics about it we should talk art about it.

08-00:12:55
Rubens: So you were working with some other women?

08-00:12:58
Nader: I was working with Etel Adnan, who's a very famous, now famous, Arab artist and poet, poetess, who lives partly in the United States and partly in Paris, and Salwa Mikdadi, who is a Palestinian art curator.

08-00:13:15
Rubens: How did you know these women?

08-00:13:16
Nader: Well, I'm not sure how we first met. I met Salwa because her brother went to school with my brother, my older brother, and I think she introduced me to Etel Adnan or maybe Etel Adnan—

08-00:13:32
Rubens: I didn't know if you had a particular interest in art or—

08-00:13:34
Nader: I didn't have any particular interest in art, which is interesting. Then I have a lot of interest in art since that time because I realize it's a very important language and many people who are in authoritarian countries can express themselves through art politically better than they can in language because they end up in jail or killed if they did it for language, like poetry. So a lot of these women artists were in authoritarian settings, like the Algerian artist under the French, or the Egyptian artist under Nasser, who put her in jail, or the Palestinians in Israel who were put in jail or isolated or sent away or whatever. So there are various ways to respond and I hadn't realized how powerful the art world was there. And apparently if you go to places like Cuba, the art world there really tells you what's coming up in Cuba because they feel free to do it. Nobody knows what they're doing is questioning the status quo.

08-00:14:32
Rubens: Yes. And then you talk about the Botero Exhibit only being shown—

08-00:14:34
Nader: Oh, the Botero exhibit here was really quite shocking because he cared about Guantanamo, about Abu Ghraib. It was happening. People were shocked but the shock never lasts very long here. We have a short memory. But Botero had a long memory, and he made these art pieces which he then could not exhibit in the United States. But it was the head of the Latin America Center, Harley Shaiken, and Beatrice Manz and a librarian on the other side of campus that arranged for him to have an exhibit in a Berkeley library and he came here. He didn't have any idea what was going on on campus, that that's why his exhibit ended up there. And he gave all of the Botero art to Berkeley, millions of dollars' worth of art which we immediately put into storage. But then he had stipulated that one or two pieces should be shown every year. And I understand but haven't seen—[Chris] Edley at the law school in fact has a couple of them up. I haven't seen them.

08-00:15:36
Rubens: Well, I just wanted to acknowledge this exhibit and the publication that you edited with—

08-00:15:46
Nader: The other two women. *Forces of Change*. The largest exhibit that the Women's Art Museum ever had in Washington, and largest attendance, because they couldn't believe that there were Arab women artists.

08-00:16:01
Rubens: The last thing I just wanted to say about *Culture and Dignity* is you say, despite all the ethnographic work that has been done, it's still a part of the world with disinformation and misinformation that's rampant. And you mentioned that since '51, when Carlton Coon's book *Caravan* came out, there's still not a general book about the area that has had the same circulation.

08-00:16:29
Nader: That's right. It's interesting because Carleton Coon was seen to be a racist because he was a biological anthropologist. But he was anything but racist in this book. It's the most open. And, of course, he traveled in and out. He was the first person into Yemen. He had sort of an interesting World War II experiences in North Africa and so on and oil, I'm sure, entered into his connections. But the book itself was a wonderful—

08-00:16:58
Rubens: And so how's the reception of *Culture and Dignity*?

08-00:17:01
Nader: Maybe it's too early to say but people who have actually read it were inspired. It's going to be used in some classes, I know. One here at Berkeley this summer.

08-00:17:10
Rubens: It's a very accessible book. There's a lot of history.

08-00:17:12
Nader: It's very accessible. I want people who read this to understand. And, actually, the translation into Arabic is happening. Somebody wanted it translated in Morocco because they thought it would calm things. And I'm not sure why it had on this person a calming effect. He thought it would be a calming effect. And I believe the publishing house Wiley-Blackwell is going to translate fifty books that they publish into Arabic and this is going to be one.

08-00:17:41
Rubens: It's online actually.

08-00:17:43
Nader: Is it? I didn't know that.

08-00:17:45
Redman: Can I ask a question on war? I don't want historians to oversimplify opposition to war, US involvement overseas just solely based on these major conflicts. So we could go from Vietnam to the Gulf War in the early nineties to Iraq. But, of course, US involvement overseas—as you've mentioned, the Congressional difference between World War II, declaring a war, versus the growing military activity, but then the clandestine military activity in particular. I don't want the opposition to war to be overshadowed just by these major events. Can you talk about some of the other instances? I'm thinking in particular of Grenada, for instance. But things like that, where maybe it wasn't as large of a national conversation but you were thinking about it.

08-00:18:40
Nader: Of course, I don't believe in war that's not declared by Congress because you don't have a debate and you have to have a debate. Why in fact are we going into Grenada? Do we think it'll be good for the United States to do that, et cetera. You don't get a debate when it's just an executive order. And there are too many executive order wars, which allows the country to sink into empire rather than—we say we're a democracy but I notice lately nobody uses the word much. My father used to say if you want to spread democracy you have to be one. And certainly if you're an empire that's contradictory. You can't be an empire in a democracy. So people are confused about what's happening in our country. And so when they're opposed to war, I notice that very few people raise the issue of we never declared war.

08-00:19:34
Redman: It's interesting to connect back to another thinker that is usually described in different context. Alfred Thayer Mahan, who is a naval theorist who in many respects influences the growth of area studies, you point out. But I want to ask then about how he would respond to this and Max Weber and Emile Durkheim. It seems like the concept of colonialism is radically changing in some sense but there are echoes of where these thinkers—things can be so

applicable. We're talking about the great white fleet, in one sense, and we're talking about drones in another sense. But there are these connections there between some of those ideas and current debates. Can you unpack that for me a little bit?

08-00:20:28

Nader: Well, the whole notion of an area study, an area defined by a military person, why was he interested in defining it? And Mahan didn't include some things. He did include others. He didn't include Greece, for example, in the Middle East, whereas there's a lot of compatibility between Greek culture and the Levantine culture and so forth. So it has to do with the notion of exceptionalism, European exceptionalism. Which, for a long time, Americans weren't involved in that. The bad guys were the Europeans. Because America was a land of the free for the unfree and a lot of people came here fleeing these terrible situations. The French were in Lebanon. That's one reason my father left Lebanon. And he left and he came to the United States because the land of the free. So unfortunately that gets muddied up. And then the economics of area study enter in and they get firmed. So then you have someone who specializes in the Middle East but doesn't specialize in travel, let's say.

And so in this book of mine, *Culture and Dignity*, I wanted to have people understand people had been walking the globe for a long time and traveling, and Mohammad Ali, after Napoleon was in Egypt, decided he better find out about this country called France, the Franj. And he sent twenty-six people with Tahtawi as the leader and he spent six years there and so forth. And he goes back and forth to teach the Muslim Egypt about who the French are. And, of course, six years is a long time. You get to know a place pretty well.

08-00:22:21

Redman: You'd mentioned using a sabbatical to finish up some writing. Obviously that's not a normal sort of moment. But if you could sort of encapsulate what a normal day might be like when you're writing a project like this and finishing a project. You had mentioned asking for undisturbed time and I thought that was very interesting. Can you just talk about a quick summary of a typical writing day, what that's like for you.

08-00:22:50

Nader: Well, unfortunately I never had the luxury to be either like Margaret Mead or George Foster, who used to get up every morning and write for two or three hours before they had breakfast, or very early. I never had that kind of a schedule possible because I was raising three children and I was married and had other obligations. I think before I write. So when I was nursing I was thinking, "Well, how am I going to end that article on whatever," and it was peaceful because me and the baby in a room. It was really a very peaceful time, the quiet, only time I ever had any quiet. So that's the sort of—I do my thinking. And then I scribble. Like I scribble. I write. And then I go to the typewriter and I'd do a first draft. Now, what I used to do is go to the

typewriter and do a final draft because I didn't want to have to type it and retype it and retype it. But now we do a lot of retyping, et cetera, because it's going to go to the computer and then you're going to fix it and so on. So it's a different process.

For example, in thinking about what I was going to talk to you about, I sat down and I thought. For some reason, I outlined a new book and it was called *Thinking About Knowledge*. And all unfinished questions that I still have that I've started with my own work entered into it. Like when is science scientific? That was one of the questions. Because I've recently looked again at Thomas Kuhn's book and I realized Kuhn was innocent, too, because he talked about science as if it were not being funded by somebody and the funding, of course, often determines how normal science works. And he also talked about Copernicus and he didn't seem to understand Islamic science had already done this work on astronomy and so forth 500 years before. So he was innocent. So I said Kuhn revisited as an essay.

And then I have one I'm thinking about, that could be titled "Unilineal Evolution is Alive and Well," because if you believe in progress, then we're the ones who are making progress, right, in Silicon Valley and so forth. And unilineal evolution, progress and non-linear evolution is all tied together. And a bunch of other topics that I have not finished my thoughts about.

08-00:25:26

Redman: Can I ask the same question about teaching? What a normal teaching day is like. And maybe, even if it's not a day, preparing for a lecture. And we talked about when you first arrived at the university and then now. Can you talk about when you were first drawing up some of these lectures and then revisiting some of these lectures as your career evolves, as you're bringing in new ideas from reading. How do you rewrite and reframe these lectures as—

08-00:25:57

Nader: Yes. One of the things that has certainly changed, because for my early lectures I wrote every word. I was terrified. And I got up and I read, which would be terrible to do today. I just can't imagine. But you got to start somewhere and that's where I started. Of course, I read very widely. And that kind of surprises the students. They say, "You bring in so many interesting things that are happening," in their world, because I realize in order to communicate with them I have to be in their world, our world, actually. And so I bring in, "Well, did you see what happened in Texas today? That was really amazing, right. You think I'm going to teach a course on law and not raise those issues having to do with abortion law and what's going on with that? Of course I'm going to raise it." So I was outlining what I'm going to do in my law course this fall because I haven't taught it for a few years. And it's going to be very different. It's so easy to go back to an outline, but it's boring. And, besides, things have happened, changed, and I've written new things about law. And one of the things, of course, I was thinking about was

unilineal evolution. I just wrote a piece that's coming out at the end of this year about vengeance. Now, why am I writing about vengeance? Because that's what I see is in Washington. It's vengeance. You get Bradley Manning. It's vengeance. You get Snowden. It's vengeance. You get these people. Osama bin Laden. That was vengeance. Now, vengeance is not due process. So you can't double talk and say, "We want to spread the rule of law," when in fact what you're spreading is something that we used to call barbaric, vengeance driven.

08-00:27:44

Redman: I want to let Lisa ask questions on the vengeance question. Let me just ask the last question on the research and teaching. You did such a great little encapsulation. It seems as though you don't see those things as distinct, as necessarily separate. That these ideas that you're getting from original research, from revisiting literature, they feed into your teaching and they make your teaching more dynamic.

08-00:28:11

Nader: Yes. I never understood the division between research and teaching.

08-00:28:14

Redman: Yes, talk about why—

08-00:28:14

Nader: Never understood that.

08-00:28:15

Redman: —that's kind of a mystery to you. Because it seems like there often is in this university, and elsewhere, an imagined difference between teaching and research.

08-00:28:28

Nader: I'm laughing because one of my students went back and dug up the original MITRE Corporation talk that I gave on barriers to thinking new about energy. And when it was republished in *Physics Today*, parts of it were taken out. And one of the parts that was taken out was when I said I've only been screamed at by physicists and engineers. When I was giving a talk at Stanford and this guy stood up after us and he said, "You're awful." I think I mentioned this earlier. "You didn't have this and you didn't have that. You talk to us as if it was the next door neighbor." Well, see, that's what I do in class and that's a consistency. I'm not going to talk to you any different than I'd probably talk to the cab driver. It really makes life a lot simpler. Why should I talk any differently? So there's this quality that bothers people in power and the students like it because they say, "She respects us," and they say, "She treats us like grown-ups so we act like grown-ups," things like that. So it's a style that upsets some people and makes other people happy, especially if they are younger and more powerless.

08-00:29:41
Redman: That's really great. That's really interesting.

08-00:29:43
Rubens: And part of the style has also been this dialectic, more than a dialectic, maybe synergy, between the public service and your own research. You are called upon to serve on a committee, for instance on energy, or more recently terrorism in this country. Maybe we should move to that.

08-00:30:06
Nader: That's all right.

08-00:30:07
Rubens: Tell us about your ideas on "rethinking salvation" regarding counter-terrorism. We were going to get at that earlier. Salvation being a concept used as part and parcel of the American justification for—

08-00:30:24
Nader: For doing all kinds of bad things. Presumably because we want to save them, want salvation and so on. But I start that paper with a quote from Roscoe Pound and from Thurman Arnold. Because Pound says to us, "Look, there's barbarism and there's civilization. And during a period of barbarism there was vengeance. And once we moved away from vengeance to the rule of law we became more civilized." So if you are listening to the news and listening to people in power talk about the killing of Osama bin Laden or how to go after Edward Snowden, you realize they're not really thinking of due process. They've already hung these guys. And maybe what happens, like John Yoo, but we don't know that, either about John Yoo or Osama bin Laden until we have due process, which means a case that comes to court and these things are opened up and debated. And then you come to some conclusion, which you might be wrong about but you do. At least it's public.

08-00:31:36
Rubens: Now, don't you come to write this piece because you're brought in to evaluate the National Research Council—

08-00:31:45
Nader: No. Actually, it was a professor at the University of Iowa Law School who had a conference on terrorism and he asked me to be one of the participants. And my husband had just died so I said I couldn't go to the conference but if he still wanted me to write a paper I would. So he said, "Absolutely. So write your paper."

08-00:32:08
Rubens: So it caused you to look into the report that had been done.

08-00:32:12
Nader: [Yes. I did include the NAS study as part of my piece.] Also, I'd already read Joseba Zulaika's materials before I invited him to the symposium, Anthropology in the World. And so I thought, "Why are so few people talking

about something that, one, costs the taxpayer a huge amount of money, that causes our reputation and our dignity a huge amount of loss, and not enough people are paying attention to it." So terrorism. And, of course, at the highest levels we've got people like Obama. That is part and parcel of the whole vengeance barbarism notion. But what I wanted to show was that it's the construction. I wanted to basically underscore what Zulaika was saying. Terrorism is a construction. Edmund Leach talked about this. That your terrorist is my friend and vice versa. So it's a construction. But it's a very destructive one, whether state terrorism or non-state.

08-00:33:20
Rubens: Well, it also sets up and sets in motion—

08-00:33:21
Nader: A self-fulfilling prophecy, which is what also Zulaika says. So I wanted to make a point of that. I asked my colleague Ugo Mattei, "What'd you think of this article?" He said, " I thought it was wise." Because I was trying to take it apart so anybody could read that and understand what's going on. And I said, "Well, what'd you think of the ending?" He said, "Well, that was creative." And I borrowed from Atul Gawande, the doctor who talked about a checklist for doctors before they go into surgery. Like the top of the list is wash your hands. And his checklist has saved lots of lives in hospitals where they've used it. And so I said, "We need a checklist in the law." And the checklist idea originated with I think the American military. That's a good idea. So first is there a violation of the law. If we're a democracy, a rule of law—you can't go tell the world they should have rule of law when you're violating the law yourself. So then there's this checklist. So they liked it a lot. But it might have gotten buried.

08-00:34:31
Rubens: Really thought provoking.

08-00:34:34
Redman: You talk about different responses that you had, especially during the review process, to work. I wonder what for you, in your own revision process, has been the hardest piece or the hardest project for you to finalize and finish for one reason or another.

08-00:34:51
Nader: Well, one of the hardest pieces was "Missing Links," because it was supposed to be a commentary on Ward Goodenough's summary of twentieth century anthropology. Ward is a very nice man and friend. And so I would write the commentary. Then I would send it. They'd give it to Ward. He'd incorporate parts of it into his evaluation of the twentieth century, which left me with no critique. So then I'd go back to whatever and so that's why I called it "Missing Links." And eventually it went but I had to rewrite it several times.

Now, several people were very upset that I even criticized Ward, and that goes back to your question about positivism, because he was a positivist. But he wasn't dogmatic. I could talk to someone like that. See, that's the interesting thing. Some people you can talk to. Like I met a physicist the other day at an art exhibit and he said to me, "Oh, you're the woman." Russian. Russian from a Russian Jewish family that's cultivated in science. I mean several generations of scientists. That's how he was described to me by another physicist. And he said, "Oh, you're the woman in anthropology that teaches about energy." I said, "Yes." And he said, "Well, I understand you don't know much about the technology." And I said, "I'll leave that to you. I'm going to teach what you don't teach, which is about the human component, because that's the basis of it. I'll start with that." And then we went on and I said, "I'm interested in when science is scientific." And he said, "Give me an example." I said, "Well, Alvin Weinberg." I gave the example of nuclear power being too cheap to meter. I said, "That's a piece of propaganda. That's not a scientific statement." He says, "You're right." And then we went back and forth. And I thought, "Here's a man you could dialogue with." He's cultured in the best sense of the term. He's not dogmatic. He's not defensive but neither was I because when he said, "Oh, you're the anthropologist that teaches a course and you don't know anything about the technology." And I said, "Well, my reader covers that. I've got physicists and so on in the reader." And Ward Goodenough, you could dialogue with him. But the people that thought I was attacking him are dogmatic.

08-00:37:21
Redman: Very interesting.

08-00:37:24
Rubens: So let's talk about your newest book, *What the Rest Think of the West*. Have you finished the book?

08-00:37:34
Nader: This is about 90 percent done because I had to find the pieces. Some of them had to be translated still.

08-00:37:44
Rubens: So it's an edited volume.

08-00:37:46
Nader: It's an edited volume because I want them to speak for themselves. So we start with a Buddhist. Going from China, west for him was India. And he was translated by a Britisher in the nineteenth century. How he did it I don't know. But it was very interesting writing because it was very ethnographic. He talked about their agricultural practices, their manufacturing practices. And the caste system. So the caste system was there in the seventh century. That was where I start. And then you proceed through. So the selections are going to cover China, Islam, Japan, and India during different times. And these are people who have something to teach us. And I'll give you the scientific

example. One of the things I learned by reading this Egyptian who went to Paris for six years is that he didn't feel compelled to be solely objective. So where did the notion of objectivity come from anyway? See, it makes you think. Because he tells you what he's seeing, which you could say is objective, and then he tells you what he thinks about it, which you could say is subjective. But at least you know where he's coming from. So the physicist always calibrates the instrument. And in the case of social scientists, we're the instrument. So basically you know where he's coming from.

So there's a Chinese intellectual, Liang Qichao. He was pushing China to be democratic in the late 19th century, around 1890 something. And there was a coup in China and he was kicked out. He went to Japan. He's still insistent on democracy. We haven't discussed this. Okay. So he's in Japan. He says, "I'm going to go to the United States and see democracy at work." He'd read de Tocqueville.

So he comes to the United States, says, "I want to talk to two people." He was considered the most important Chinese intellectual of that period. "I want to see JP Morgan and I want to see President Teddy Roosevelt." JP Morgan says, "I'll give you five minutes. I never give more than five minutes." He said, "From JP Morgan I learned about American capitalism. And I learned that American capitalism will destroy American democracy," and that's what de Tocqueville warned about. Even de Tocqueville. Then he went to see President Teddy Roosevelt and he said, "From Roosevelt I learned about American empire and that will destroy us." He goes back to China, 1903 he publishes. Goes back to China and he says, "We don't need a democracy. We need a strong central government because this is what's going to happen to us. It's coming." So it has happened to China. They're state capitalists now, right. And there is American empire. Our ships are in the Pacific. It's really amazing foresight

Then there are descriptions about American women and about American technology and about the various European observations, as well. So to me if that doesn't make people curious enough to go back and read the originals, and for each one of these I have a brief introduction. Thirty-three pieces.

08-00:41:41

Redman: You mentioned early on the question of William McNeill and the rise of world history as a question. The thing that's so amazing to me is the concept of the multi-vantage points here. It seems that a criticism of world history could be that it's limited by the author's sort of vision and their ethnocentrism that will enter into the story. Can you talk a little bit about your desire to combat that? Maybe you'll run up against that in terms of this book, sort of adding different perspectives and letting these figures speak for themselves in some sense, or these societies speak for themselves in some way.

08-00:42:23
Nader: Because there have been books, like *When Asia Was the World*. There have been books that summarize these others. But I think it's important to get as close to their own words as possible, because it comes across very different. To read Liang and to have me talk about him is very different. You get a much more holistic picture. So that's why I wanted to do that. But we are missing at this time an interest in world history at a time when we're globalizing. We talk about climate change. That's the world. It's not talking about European climate change. It's talking about everybody. And so I think it's important that we enlarge our perspective, including in anthropology. Because there is this gap I spoke of earlier between the archeology/pre-history and then the contemporary world. So there's a gap there in the historical dimensions.

08-00:43:19
Rubens: You address that, right, in the lessons learned in *Culture and Dignity*. You talk about unleashing the anthropological imagination to do that. You argue that we need a broader compass, to include history simultaneous with ethnography and comparison. And here you're adding in the people's own voice.

08-00:43:37
Nader: Yes. And I did that with the Zapotec. You see, with the Zapotec I used those three methods or frameworks: ethnography, comparison, history. And they run through all of my work. And so I think that what became interesting to me, maybe it was the nineties, when anthropologists started saying, "We must give the other," the other then became a word, "voice." And I thought, "Give them voice? Just listen to what they're saying." So when they did this festschrift for Edward Said, I wrote the piece called "The Other is Not Mute," which is what he was trying to say in much of his work. Now, some of my colleagues say things like, "Well, these people have observations but they're not—" basically what they're saying is they're not professional. So how do you know if it's true? I said, "It has nothing to do with true. It has to do with their perceptions. If they see it that way, then that's worth paying attention to." If the Arabs see what we're doing in the Middle East now as a Crusade, a continuation of the crusade, it doesn't matter from their point of view whether it's true or not. That's what they perceive. If they perceive Israel as a western beachhead in the Middle East, that is what's fueling their movements. We're talking about China snubbing us because they didn't give us Edward Snowden. But just a week before when President Obama met with the Chinese president, he snubbed him. The Chinese president waited twenty-four hours before President Obama showed up. So you have to see the whole picture as much as you can.

08-00:45:44
Redman: We have about fifteen minutes.

08-00:45:47
Rubens: Okay. I wanted to ask one more question about this. You talk about in *Culture and Dignity* the persistence of American arrogance and that we don't understand the idea of blowback.

08-00:46:02
Nader: Question of hubris. The term blowback was invented by a CIA agent in 1964, according to Chalmers Johnson.

08-00:46:13
Rubens: Chalmers Johnson is the—

08-00:46:14
Nader: He documented that. And Chalmers Johnson —a political theorist who was at Berkeley— of course, himself thought that we were fighting the Soviets, that we were the military industrial complex because we were trying to protect ourselves. But when that ended, the Soviet Union ended, and we continued militarizing it, then he realized it was Empire and then he changed his tune before he died. He wrote all these very important books. Now, do all Americans suffer from hubris? Our policymakers suffer from hubris. There's so much variety in our country, I wouldn't want to pin that on all Americans. But there is a very strong sense of exceptionalism in the media, no question. And that connected with the concept of technological progress. There's an interesting film that just came out, *Can We Survive Progress Planetarily?* I use it in my energy course. It's a very good film.

I was talking to my grandson, fourteen years old. He's interested in physics. And I said, "I want to send you something." We were talking about energy. And I said, "Tor, do you realize that we have destroyed more of the planet in the last 200 years of progress than in the previous 40,000 years?" "I never thought of it that way." Well, neither did most physicists. But they aren't going to say, "I never thought of it that way." They're going to say, "Well, what do you mean? We've had more progress and blah, blah, blah."

08-00:48:06
Rubens: So I'm wondering if in the time left, if we want to make any concluding statements about the direction of anthropology. Because one of the things you talk about also in *Culture and Dignity* is—you bemoan the dirth of a critical commentary. You say there are hegemonies in anthropological scholarship that silences observers. Stereotype strategies of subordination are instilled by the concept of lack. That was what I wanted to get at.

08-00:48:40
Nader: We can never forget the fact that American anthropologists are American. Or if we're Pakistani we're Pakistani. You are influenced by the culture you grew up in, even as an anthropologist, and that's where Cardoza was so wise when he said, "No matter how objective we may try to be, we must never forget the fact that we see with our own eyes." And what's happening is too much specialization. The one field that has to be generalist is the field that studies

the human condition. And if all of our faculty are specialized then they won't volunteer to teach Anthro Three because, one, some don't want to teach Anthro Three, which is curious. Maybe they're afraid. But, two, some don't feel they can. But that's where you remember what the field is about. So it came my turn, I had to teach it, and it was hard, and Aihwa Ong recently decided to teach it.

And it was hard for her the first year and second year it was easier. But you get a sense of the whole field. Now, what's happened with the specialization is we've hived off into others disciplines. So I got in the mail the other day the *Journal of Legal Pluralism*. It was a trend in anthropology and in the social sciences to look at more than one legal system interacting. More than one legal system is always—I think it was a trend, a fad. I never participated in it. So I got left out of this whole trend, whatever. Look at the subtitle. *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*. So now Zapotec law is called unofficial law. Used to be called customary law. Unofficial law? What does that mean? That it's illegal? What does that mean? Then I look at the papers and why it was sent to me and there's a paper about harmony ideology revisited. And I read it and I think, "Nice paper. Shallow." It's shallow. They have no idea of the history of ideas. I'm glad she cited me but the papers in the whole journal are too shallow. They have no sense of the development of ideas.

08-00:50:58
Rubens: So that's what's led you to think that you might write about that.

08-00:51:01
Nader: Yes.

08-00:51:06
Redman: Berkeley's new chancellor, Nicholas Dirks, an anthropologist and historian. What advice would you give him in leading the university given your experiences? And you'd mentioned meeting him once. But I wonder if you had an opportunity to sit down with him, what you might share with him.

08-00:51:34
Nader: Well, he's coming into the university at the same time as we're trying to find a president for the university. So let me just say something about that. Jerry Brown mentioned to me that somebody that was being considered for that job, the president, didn't know why we had to have a president. And Brown said, "Well, there are 1,400 people over there in Oakland." "What do we need them for?" "Well, we need them for the national labs but apart from that I'm not sure what they do. Why don't I know what they do, the 1,400 people over in Oakland?" So if we have a president, then he's going to affect something about the chancellorship. So the first thing about a job that you get is you can't want it a lot. And I think that Chancellor Dirks wanted the job a little too much, such that he embarrassed some people, embarrassed his wife, and so on, when he was questioned about divestiture in Israel and about the football

and all that. But now he's here so he's in charge supposedly. But why was he asked these questions in the first place?

What would I tell him? First make sure the plumbing works. I mean literally. The toilet in the women's room has been fixed at least ten times in the past year. So probably that's true across campus. There's a lot of deterioration. But why start with that? Because you start with the roots. You make people feel like, "Yes, we got to shape this place up." The second thing I would say is you have to decrease the amount of administrative apparatus." So if we have a conference on administrative takeover, which I hope we have this coming year, you have to explain to the governor, or whoever's governor, why do we need all these administrators. What are they doing? Well, some of them we need, they say, because the federal government now requires A, B, C, D. Yes. But do we need them all? No. Thirdly, we finally have an intellectual who's a chancellor. So act like an intellectual. Go up to Sacramento, talk to people like an intellectual, not like a beggar. And all this business of going out. If you're going to go out to ask for corporate money, do it with dignity. Tell them about the purpose of the university. Be an intellectual with the corporate people. And, of course, all this would probably be helped if the governor appointed the new regents, more intellectuals. We've got only businessmen at the regents level. So we need more intellectuals. Is that too much to ask of the university? We don't need businessmen, we don't need, "Go, Bears." Which is not to say we can't have sports. It's just that the balance is skewed. And he's got the wisdom. He's smart.

08-00:54:32

Rubens: An article in the *San Francisco Chronicle* recently report on a conversation between Jerry Brown and Dirks; that Brown had read Dirks' books and was interested in his ideas.

08-00:54:38

Nader: Well, it also was in the alumni magazine. It was okay. Yes. Well, Jerry Brown makes a bigger effort, I think, to be an intellectual than the chancellor to be a politician. Because you are a politician if you're a chancellor, along with being an intellectual in other things because you have to try and get things for your organization. And if I were the chancellor I would take advantage of that relationship, ask him, "What do you think the university should be?" Right. He probably did. I don't know.

08-00:55:24

Redman: Yes. Well, I hate to wrap up this interview altogether, but we're coming to the end of the tape. I wonder if there is anything you particularly want to note here, to make sure we cover.

08-00:55:41

Rubens: Why don't you mention on tape that some students of yours are putting out a book called *Studying Up, Down, and Sideways.* Taking your important essay, early essay and—

08-00:55:53
Nader: Yes. Basically I said to them, "I've never wanted followers," when they had this session at the national meeting. I said, "I never wanted followers but why not launch yourselves by standing on my shoulders. Just launch yourself. You've written all these books and you've written some wonderful dissertations. So use me," is what I said. "Use me to launch the work you're doing." So we had a meeting at Mills College where one of them was and we went around and I said, "Let's change the titles." And I can't remember what I said but I made them say it very simply, the titles, because they were too complicated. I said, "You can communicate." And they found that sort of very—

08-00:56:50
Rubens: Exciting or liberating?

08-00:56:49
Nader: Exciting. One of them was *When is Up Down?* And they sort of played with it. "Play with this, your ideas, because they're very interesting." One is doing work on bankruptcy and so on. So I guess I do the same thing with these younger colleagues as I do with my students. You asked me what do I think is important to teach my students. I think it's important to teach them where they are in the world. So in reorganizing the law course this fall, again, I'm going to get all these questions about power and control and law and the rule of law and empire and so on and the example, maybe I should end on, is this paper that I just wrote on vengeance. Because when we started in 1960, my first student went to New Guinea. Did I mention this?

08-00:57:42
Rubens: In another aspect I think.

08-00:57:45
Nader: Right. And we still believed that somehow there was an evolution from stateless societies to state societies and that they were inherently different. And, in fact, you go from vengeance to vengeance today. There's plenty of vengeance in state societies. So where is the civilizing component? In other words, I want the students to think about these questions rather than just to swallow. I'm going to use probably the *Life of the Law* book, I'm going to use *Plunder*, and then I'm going to use a series of essays, some of which are old essays, some are young, recent ones. But, again, what's recent is not always the best. So you have to know the history of ideas and the field and so on. I don't know what else to say.

The university hopefully will change. These are seen by many people as very dark times in America.

08-00:58:42
Rubens: Well, maybe in conclusion, I want to note your indefatigableness. You are someone who just keeps going. You have an extraordinary wellspring of curiosity. You have enthusiasm. And you have optimism. You really have this

belief that things can change, even though at the same time, you have indignant outrage at how some things persist. How exploitation—

08-00:59:18

Nader: Right. If you have any sense of history, Lisa, you know that things change. Certainly at this University, things have been bad at times. And then progress is made. The trouble with us is whatever we want we want now. And I remember saying to an old, old friend, I said, "It'll take a hundred years." And she said, "I'm not willing to wait a hundred years." I said, "Well, if you look at how change happens, sometimes that's what it takes." It was a few decades after the Pilgrims landed before we had our revolution. So if you know anything about history, you know it changes. And could it only change into a brave new world or that of *1984*? It could. I'd rather think it wouldn't because there's some wonderful people writing and thinking today and trying to get things going and so forth. Focus on that.

08-01:00:42

Redman: Well, with that we'd like to say thank you so very much for your time and insight.

08-01:00:43

Nader: Yes, you're welcome. Thank you.

End of Interview

LAURA NADER
Curriculum Vita

Born: September 30, 1930, Winsted, CT; Married: to Norman Milleron; Three children.

EDUCATION:
Wells College (Latin American Studies) B.A., 1952. Thesis: The Concept of Leadership in Mexican Revolutionary Novels
El Colegio de Mexico (Smith College), 1950 – 1951, Linguistic Institute, University of Michigan, 1955 (summer)
Radcliffe College (Anthropology) Ph. D., 1961. Thesis: Social Organization and Settlement Patterns in Two Zapotec Villages

POSITIONS:
Professor of Anthropology, Department of Anthropology, UC Berkeley, 1960 – present
Visiting Professor, Yale Law School, Yale University, 1971 (fall)
Henry R. Luce Professor, Wellesley College; Harvard Law School, 1983 – 1984
Stanford Law School, 1985 – 1987

FIELD EXPERIENCE:
Oaxaca, Mexico: 1957 – 1958, 1959 – 1960, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1967; Lebanon: 1961 (summer); New England: 1965 (summer); San Francisco Bay Area: 1972 – 1976; Morocco: 1980 (summer); Oaxaca: 2006 (intermit film project)

HONORS:
The Morgan Spanish Prize, Wells College (1952)
Radcliffe College, Grants-in-aid (1954 – 1959)
Thaw Fellow, Harvard University (1955 – 1956 and 1958 – 1959)
Peabody Museum, Grants-in-aid intermittent (1954 – 1959)
American Phil. Association Grant for the Linguistic Institute at the University of Michigan (1955)
Mexican Government Grant (1957 – 1958)
Milton Fund Grant (1959 – 1960)
Fellow, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, CA (1963 – 1964)
National Science Foundation Grant (1966 – 1968)
Wenner Gren Foundation Grants (1964, 1966, 1973)
Carnegie Corporation Grant (1975)
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (1979 – 1980)
Wells College Alumnae Award (1980)
Radcliffe College Alumnae Award (1984)
Presiding Section H, AAAS (1988 – 1992)
Outstanding Achievement Award, The Society for Women Geographers (1990)
American Academy of Arts and Sciences (1991)
Kalven Prize for Outstanding Achievement, Law and Soc. Association (1995)
Council for General Anthropology (AAA) Distinguished Lecture (1955)
Mintz Distinguished Lecture, Johns Hopkins University (1955)
Cardozo Lectures, University of Trento, Italy (1996)
Wellness Foundation Grant (1993 – 1996)
Distinguished Lecture, American Anthropology Association (2000)
Distinguished Lectures, American University Cairo (December 2004)
Distinguished Teaching Award, University of California, Berkeley (2009)

SERVICE COMMITTEES:
American Anthropological Association, Planning and Development (1968 – 1971, 1975 – 1976)
NIMH, Cultl. Anthro. Comm. (1968 – 1971, Chair to 1971); Soc. Sci. Research Training Review Comm. (1975 - , Chair 1976 – 1978)
Social Science Research Council (1968 – 1972)
National Science Foundation, Advisory Committee (1971 – 1975)
Trustee, Law and Society Association (1967 – 1972)
Trustee, Center for the Study of Responsive Law (1968 -)
Vice-Chair, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley (1968 – 1971)
Member, Carnegie Council on Children (1972 – 1977)
Nat'l Acad. of Sci., NRC Assembly for Behavioral and Social Sciences (1969 – 1971, 1973 – 1975, 1975 , member of Advisory Committee)
National Academy of Science, Comm. on Nuclear and Alternate Energy Systems, (1976 – 1980)
Comm. On Behavioral Aspects of Energy Consumption and Production (1980 – 1983)
Editorial Committee, Law and Society Review (1967 -)
California Council for the Humanities (1975 – 1979)
Council of Scholars of the Library of Congress (1988 -)

MEMBER SOCIETIES:
American Anthropological Association
Society of Women Geographers
Law and Society Association
American Association for the Advancement of Science

Laura Nader
Department of Anthropology
University of California
Berkeley, California
June 2013

1. 1961 Review of *Pagan Rituals and Beliefs among the Chontal Indians of Oaxaca, Mexico*. by Pedro Carrasco, *Journal of American Folklore*, (January-March) 74(291):78-79.

2. 1962a Review of *The Virgin's Children*. by William Madsen, *Journal of American Folklore*, (January-March) 75(295): 66.

3. 1962b "A Note on Attitudes and the Use of Language." *Anthropological Linguistics*, 4(6): 24- 25. (Reprinted in *Readings in the Sociology of Languages*, Joshua A. Fishman, ed.).

4. 1963a Review of *Now We Are Civilized: A Study of the World View of the Zapotec Indians of Mitla, Oaxaca*. by Charles M. Leslie, *American Anthropologist*, (April) 65(2): 438-440.

5. l963b (with Duane Metzger) "Conflict Resolution in Two Mexican Communities." *American Anthropologist*, (June) 65(3):584-592. (Reprinted in *Man Makes Sense*, Eugene A. Hammel and William S. Simmons, eds., Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 1970; *The Social Organization of Law*, Donald Black and Maureen Mileski, eds., New York, N.Y.: Seminar Press, 1973).

6. 1964b "Perspectives Gained From Field Work," *Horizons of Anthropology*, Aldine Press, Pp. 148-159. (This article was delivered as a Voice of America Broadcast and distributed as a V.O.A. Pamphlet in 1963). (Reprinted in Hoebel, Jennings & Smith, *Selected Readings in Anthropology*). (Revised for 1976 edition of *Horizons of Anthropology*).

7. 1964b *Talea and Juquila: A Comparison of Zapotec Social Organization. University of California Publications in America Archaeology and Ethnology*, 48(3): 195-296.

8. 1964c "An Analysis of Zapotec Law Cases." *Ethnology*, (October) 3(4): 404-419. (Reprinted in *Reader in Law and Warfare*, Paul Bohannan, ed.).

9. 1965a "Choices in Legal Procedure: Shia Moslem and Mexican Zapotec." *American Anthropologist*, (April) 67(2): 394-399. (Reprinted in *The Social Organization of Law*, Black and Mileski, Seminar Press).

10. 1965b "Communication between Village and City in the Modern Middle East." *Human Organization*, Special Issue: Dimensions of Cultural Change in the Middle East, John Gulick, ed., (Spring) 24(1): 18-24. (Reprinted, Institute for International Studies, Berkeley).

11. 1965c "The Anthropological Study of Law." *American Anthropologist,* Special Issue: The Ethnography of Law , Laura Nader, ed., (December) 67(6): 3-32. (Reprinted in *Readings in the Sociology of Law*, Rita James Simon, ed., Chandler Publishing Company; *Law and Anthropology*, in The International Library of Essays in Law & Legal Theory, Peter Sack and Jonathan Aleck, eds., Dartmouth Publishing Company Limited, 1992).

12. 1965d *American Anthropologist,* Special Issue: The Ethnography of Law, Laura Nader, ed., (December) 67(6):3-32.

13. 1966a (with Klaus F. Koch and Bruce Cox) "The Ethnography of Law: A Bibliographical Survey." *Current Anthropology*, (June) 7(3): 267-294.

14. 1966b Film –*To Make the Balance*. Written, directed, and produced by Laura Nader. 16mm, black and white, optical sound, 33 minutes, University of California, Berkeley: Extension Media Center.

15. 1966c "Variations in Zapotec Legal Procedure." In Summa Anthropologica en Homenaje al Roberto J. Weitlaner, Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropologia e Historia, Secretaria de Educación Publica, Pp. 375-383.

16. 1967 Review of *Turkistan: Notes of a Journey in Russian Turkistan, Kokand, Bukhara and Kuldja.* by Eugene Schuyler, Geoffrey Wheeler, ed. *Science*, (May) 156(3776): 791-792.

17. 1968a "Cross Cultural Growing Up." Review of *The Transition from Childhood to Adolescence: Cross-Cultural Studies of Initiation Ceremonies, Legal Systems, and Incest Taboos,* by Yehudi Cohen, Chicago: Aldine, *Contemporary Psychology*, 13(2): 88-90.

18. 1968b "Conflict: Anthropological Aspects." *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* David L. Sills, ed., New York, NY: Macmillan, 3: 236-242.

19. 1968c Review of *Anthropology and Early Law*. by Lawrence Krader, ed., New York: Basic Books, 1966, *Wisconsin Law Review*, (3): 959-961.

20. 1969a "The Trique of Oaxaca." *Handbook of Middle American Indians,* Volume 7, Ethnology Part One, Robert Wauchope, general ed., Evon Z. Vogt, Volume ed., Austin, TX: University of Texas Press Pp. 400-416.

21. 1969b "The Zapotec of Oaxaca." *Handbook of Middle American Indians,* Volume 7, Ethnology Part One, Robert Wauchope, general ed., Evon Z. Vogt, Volume ed., Austin, TX: University of Texas Press,. Pp. 329-359.

22. 1969c *Law in Culture and Society*. Laura Nader, ed., Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 454 pp.

23. 1969d "Law in Culture and Society—Introduction." *Law in Culture and Society*. Laura Nader, ed., Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, Pp. 1-10.

24. 1969e "Styles of Court Procedure: To Make the Balance." *Law in Culture and Society*, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, Pp. 69-91.

25. 1969f Review of *Women and the Law: The Unfinished Revolution*. by Leo Kanowitz, *California Law Review*, (November) 57(5): 1288-1296.

26. 1969g "Up the Anthropologist—Perspectives Gained from Studying Up." *Reinventing Anthropology*, Dell Hymes, ed., New York: Pantheon Press, Pp. 285-311. (reprinted in *Anthropology for the Eighties*, Johnetta B. Cole, ed., New York, N.Y.: Free Press, 1982; *Anthropology for the Nineties*, Johnetta B. Cole, ed., New York, N.Y.: Free Press, 1988; *Reinventing Anthropology*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1999).

27. 1970a Review of *We Talk, You Listen*, by Vine Deloria, Jr. *Chicago Sun Times*, (October 11).

28. 1970b "From Anguish to Exultation," Mexico (Oaxaca)/Zapotec; Lebanon/Shia Moslems. *Women in the Field: Anthropological Experiences*, Peggy Golde, ed. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, Pp. 96-116. (reprinted in *Women in the Field: Anthropological Experiences*, Peggy Golde, ed., Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1986)

29. 1970c Review of *Ifugao Law*, by Roy F. Barton, *American Anthropologist*, (December) 72(6): 1526-1527.

30. 1971a Review of *Bedouin Justice: Law and Customs Among the Egyptian Bedouin*, by Austin Kennett, *American Anthropologist* (April) 73(2): 349.

31. 1971b Review of *A Law of Blood: The Primitive Law of the Cherokee Nation*. by John Phillip Reid, *New York University Law Review*, (October) 46(4): 859-861.

32. 1972 "Some Notes on John Burton's Papers on 'Resolution of Conflict,'" *International Studies Quarterly* (March) 16(7): 53-58. (Reprinted in *The Theory and Practice of International Relations*, Fred A. Sondermann, William C. Olson, and David S. McLellan, eds., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:Prentice-Hall, 1970).

33. 1973a (ed. with Thomas W. Maretzki) *Cultural Illness and Health— Essays in Human Adaptation*, Laura Nader and Thomas W. Maretzki, eds., Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

34. 1973b "Introduction: The Culture of Hea1th." in *Cultural Illness and Health—Essays in Human Adaptation*, Laura Nader and Thomas W. Maretzki, eds., Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, Pp. 1-10.

35. 1973c (with June Starr) "Is Equity Universal?" *Equity in the World's Legal Systems—A Comparative Study*, Ralph A. Newman, ed., Brussels, Belgium: Establishments Emile Bruyland, Pp. 125-137.

36. 1974a (with Barbara Yngvesson) "On Studying the Ethnography of Law and Its Consequences." *Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, John J. Honigmann, ed., Chicago, IL: Rand-McNally College Publishing Company, Pp. 883-921.

37. 1974b "Perspectives on the Law and Order Problem." *The Quest for Justice: Myth, Reality, Ideal*, Melvin J. Lerner and Michael Ross, eds., Canada: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada Limited, Pp. 65-81.

38. 1974c Review of *A Childhood for Every Child, The Politics of Parenthood*. by Mark Gerzon, *Harvard Educational Review*, (Fall) 44(2): 482-485.

39. 1975a Comments on papers by Davis, DeFleur, Entwistle, Reiss, and Short. *Social Policy in Sociology*, N.J. Demerath, O. Larsen, and K.F. Schuessler, eds. New York N.Y.: Academic Press, Pp. 267-273.

40. 1975b Review of *Law and Social Change in Zinacantan*, by Jane Fishburne Collier, *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, (January) 23(1): 150-154.

41. 1975c "Forums for Justice: A Cross-Cultural Perspective." *Journal of Social Issues*, 31(3): 151-170.

42. 1976a (with Elaine Combs-Schilling) "Restitution in Cross-cultural Perspective." *Restitution in Criminal Justice, First International Symposium on Restitution*, Joe Hudson, ed., Minnesota Department of Corrections. (Reprinted in *Restitution in Criminal Justice*, Joe Hudson and Burt Galaway, eds., Lexington, MA: Heath Publishing Co., Pp. 27-44.

43. 1976b "The problem of order in a faceless society." *American Courts and Justice*, Prepared for Justice ’76: A National Citizens’ Assembly on Improving Courts and Justice, July 4-6, 1976, Glenn R. Winters and Edward J. Schoenbaum, eds., The American Judicature Society to Promote the Effective Administration of Justice, Pp. 169-182.

44. 1976c "Professional Standards and What We Study," *Ethics and Anthropology: Dilemmas in Fieldwork*, Michael A. Rynkiewich and James P. Spradley, eds., New York, N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons, Pp. 167-181.

45. 1976d (with David Serber) "Law and the Distribution of Power." *The Uses of Controversy in Sociology*, Lewis A. Coser and Otto N. Larsen, eds., New York, N.Y.: Free Press, Pp. 273-291. (Reprinted in *The Sociology of Law: a Social-Structural Perspective*, William M. Evan, ed., New York, N.Y.: Free Press, 1980).

46. 1976e (with Linda R. Singer) "Dispute Resolution...Law in the Future: what are the choices?" *California State Bar Journal*, (July) 51(4): 281-286 and 311-320.

47. 1976f "Human Factors in Nuclear Energy." *Sierra Club Yodeler*, (June) Pp. 6,7,15.

48. 1976g "Anthropological Charting of the Frontier." *The Frontiers of Knowledge*, Judith Stiehm, ed., Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California Press, Pp. 63-78.

49. 1976h Interview –"Research Priorities in Science.” *The Center Magazine*, Santa Barbara, Pp. 67-70.

50. 1976i "Studying Up." *Psychology Today*, (September) Pp. 132.

51. 1976j (with Samuel P. Huntington, Mustafa Safwa and Edward Said. Moderated by Edward Stewart.) “Can Cultures Communicate?” An AEI Round Table held on September 23. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Pp 1-33.

52. 1977a "Powerlessness in Zapotec and United States Societies." *The Anthropology of Power: Ethnographic Studies from Asia, Oceania, and the New World,* Raymond D. Fogelson and Richard N. Adams, eds., New York, N.Y.: Academic Press, Inc., Pp. 309-324.

53. 1977b *All Our Children: the American Family Under Pressure*. by Kenneth Keniston and The Carnegie Council on Children, New York, N.Y.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. (Nader was a council member).

54. 1977c (with Norman Milleron, Joseph Palacia, and Cathy Rich) "Belief, Behavior and Technologies as Driving Forces in Transitional Stages - The People Problem in Dispersed Energy Futures." *Distributed Energy Systems in California's Future: A Preliminary Report*, M. Christensen, M. Simmons, and P. Craig, eds. Rep No. LBL-6831, Berkeley, CA: Lawrence Berkeley Lab, Pp. 177-238.

55. 1978a Review of *The Zapotecs: Princes, Priests, and Peasants*, by Joseph W. Whitecotton, *American Scientist*, (March-April) 66(2): 247-248.

56. 1978b (with Stephen Beckerman) "Anthropology: Questions for an Ethnography of Energy." *Anthropology Resource Center Newsletter*, (March) 2(1): 2.

57. 1978c Review of *Law and the American Indian: Readings, Notes, and Cases.* by Monroe E. Price, *American Anthropologist*, (June) 80(2): 399-400.

58. 1978d (with Jane Collier) "Justice - A Woman Blindfolded?" *Women in the Courts*, Winifred L. Hepperle and Laura Crites, eds., Williamsburg,V.A.: National Center for State Courts, Pp. 202-220.

59. 1978e (ed. with Harry F. Todd, Jr.) *The Disputing Process— Law in Ten Societies*. Laura Nader and Harry F. Todd, eds., New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 372 pp.

60. 1978f "Preface." *The Disputing Process— Law in Ten Societies*, Laura Nader and Harry F. Todd, eds., New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press, Pp. ix-xvi.

61. 1978g (with Harry F. Todd, Jr.) "Introduction: The Disputing Process." *The Disputing Process— Law in Ten Societies*, Laura Nader and Harry F. Todd, eds., New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press, Pp. 1-40.

62. 1978h "Taxation in Other Societies." *Courses by Newspaper*, sponsored by The California Tax Reform Association Foundation and the California Council for the Humanities in Public Policy, Pp. 26-27. (Reprinted *Humanities Network*, (Fall), 2(4):,4, 1978).

63. 1978i (with Stephen Beckerman) "Energy as it Relates to the Quality and Style of Life." *Annual Review of Energy*, 3: 1-28.

64. 1978j "Hit and Run - Multinationals on a Collision Course with Humanity." in *Responsibilities of Multinational Corporations to Society*, Vol. I., Proceedings, June 1 and 2, 1978, Council of Better Business Bureaus, Project on Business Responsibility, Washington, D.C.: The Council of Better Business Bureaus, Pp. 60-76.

65. 1978k "A conversation with Laura Nader." *Sierra Club San Francisco Bay Chapter Yodeler*, (October) Pp. 6-7, 15.

66. 19781 "The Direction of Law and the Development of Extra-Judicial Processes in Nation State Societies." *Cross-Examinations: Essays in Memory of Max Gluckman*, Paul Hugh Gulliver, ed , Leiden: E. J. Brill, Pp. 78-95.

67. 1978m Review of *Scientific Elite: Nobel Laureates in the United States*. by Harriet Zuckerman, *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, Nuclear Referendum in Austria, Revolution in Iran, Chinese Military Strategies, (January) 35(1): 40-41.

68. 1979a "Disputing Without the Force of Law." *Yale Law Journal*, Special Issue on Dispute Resolution, 88(5): 998-1021.

69. 1979b (with Eugene Hammel) "Will the Real George Foster Please Stand Up? A Brief Intellectual History." *Essays in Honor of George Foster*, Berkeley, CA: Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers, Pp. 159-164.

70. 1979c (with Norman Milleron) "Dimensions of the 'People Problem' in Energy Research and 'The' Factual Basis of Dispersed Energy Futures." *Energy*, (October) 4(5): 953-967.

71. 1979d Review of *Wasita in a Lebanese Context: Social Exchange Among Villagers and Outsiders*. by Frederick Charles Huxley, *The Middle East Journal*, 33(4): 511-512.

72. 1979e "Barriers to Thinking New About Energy." Speech presented as part of the MITRE Lecture Series, at The MITRE Corporation, McLean, Virginia, on November 6, 1979. Pp. 1-17.

73. 1979f "Complainer Beware." *Psychology Today*, (December) 13(7): 47-60, 98.

74. 1979g "What of cause and prevention." Letter to *The Radcliffe Quarterly*, Cambridge, MA: Radcliffe College, (June) Pp. 59.

75. 1980a "The Vertical Slice: Hierarchies and Children." *Hierarchy and Society: Anthropological Perspectives on Bureaucracy*, Gerald M. Britan and Ronald Cohen, eds., Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, Pp. 31-43.

76. 1980b "Foreword." *Energy Choices in a Democratic Society*. The Report of the Consumption, Location, and Occupational Patterns Resource Group Synthesis Panel of the Committee on Nuclear and Alternative Energy Systems National Research Council, Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, (April 21) v-vi, 136 pp.

77. 1980c "Serving Self, Not Others." Review of *Ethics in the Practice of Law*, by Geoffrey C.

Hazard, *Yale Law Journal*, (June) 89(7): 1442-1449.

78. 1980d (Laura Nader, ed.) *No Access to Law - Alternatives to the American Judicial System*. New York, N.Y.: Academic Press, Inc., 540 pp.

79. 1980e "Preface." *No Access to Law - Alternatives to the American Judicial System*, Laura Nader, ed., New York, N.Y.:Academic Press, Inc., Pp. xv-xix.

80. 1980f "Alternatives to the American Judicial System." *No Access to Law - Alternatives to the American Judicial System*. Laura Nader, ed., New York, N.Y.: Academic Press, Inc., Pp. 3-55.

81. 1980g (with Christopher Shugart) "Old Solutions for Old Problems." *No Access to Law - Alternatives to the American Judicial System*, Laura Nader, ed., New York, N.Y.: Academic Press, Inc., Pp. 57-110.

82. 1980h Review of *Changing Veils: Women and Modernization in North Yemen*, by Carla Makhlouf, *The Middle East Journal*, (Summer) 34(3): 511.

83. 1980i "Does Solar Energy Determine Lifestyle?" *Proceedings Open Workshop on Solar Technologies*, October 23-24, 1979, Washington, D.C., SERI/CP- 741-683, 5 pp.

84. 1981a "Barriers to Thinking New About Energy." *Physics Today*, (February) 34(3): 9, 99-103. (Reprinted in *Chem Tech*, (November) 1981).

85. 1981b Film— *Little Injustices - Laura Nader Looks at the Law*. Terry Kay Rockefeller, producer; Jacqueline Judd, narrator, Odyssey Series, Boston, MA: Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) Video, color, (59 min.).

86. 1981c Interview –"Little Injustices— Laura Nader Looks at the Law." Conversations with Laura Nader, by Linda McCrudden, ed. *Odyssey*, Boston, MA: Public Broadcasting Associates, Inc., Pp. 25-27.

87. 1981d Letters: New Thoughts on Energy – “The Author Comments.” in *Physics Today*, (October) 34(10): 13, 15.

88. 1981e "The Politics of Energy - Toward a Bottom-Up Approach." *Radcliffe Quarterly*, Energy, (December) 67(4): 5-6.

89. 1981f Remarks –*The Dellums Hearings: Social and Political Implications of the OMB cuts on Social Research*. Berkeley, CA: Institute for the Study of Social Change, the University of California, Pp. 68-71.

90. 1983a "A Comparative Perspective on Legal Evolution, Revolution, and Devolution." *Michigan Law Review*, (March) 81(4): 993-1005.

91. 1983b “Two Plus Two Equals Zero - War and Peace Reconsidered." *Radcliffe Quarterly*, Special Issue: Nuclear Disarmament Before It’s Too Late, (March) 69(1): 7-8.

92. 1983c Review of *Margaret Mead and Samoa: the making and unmaking of an anthropological*

myth. by Derek Freeman, *Los Angeles Times Book Review*, (Sunday, April 10).

93. 1983d "Who Reviews the Reviewers?" *American Anthropologist*, (September) 85(3): 660- 662.

94. 1983e "A Hermeneutic Approach to Mankind." Review of *Local Knowledge -Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology,* by Clifford Geertz, The Book Review, *Los Angeles Times*, (Sunday, October 2).

95. 1983f (with Philip Parnell) "Comparative Criminal Law and Enforcement: Preliterate Societies." *Encyclopedia of Crime and Justice*, Volume 1, Sanford H. Kadish, editor in chief, New York, N.Y.: The Free Press, Pp. 200-207.

96. 1983g "1984 and Brave New World –The Insidious Threat of Covert Control." *Radcliffe Quarterly*, (December) 69(4): 2-3.

97. 1983h “To measure the place of man and the life of other creatures.” Review of *The Way of the Animal Powers Vol.1: Historical Atlas of World Mythology*, by Joseph Campbell, The Book Review, *Los Angeles Times*, (Sunday, December 11).

98. 1983i "Resolving Disputes in a Democratic Society." *The Center Magazine*, (September/October) 16(5): 52-63.

99. 1984a "From Disputing to Complaining." in *Toward a General Theory of Social Control*, Donald Black, ed., New York, N.Y.: Academic Press, Pp. 71-94.

100. l984b "The Recurrent Dialectic Between Legality and its Alternatives: The Limitations of Binary Thinking." Review of *Justice Without Law?* by Jerold S. Auerbach, *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, (March) 132(3): 621-645.

101. 1984c Review of *Bruno Gutmann 1876-1966: A German Approach to Social Anthropology*, by J. C. Winter, *American Anthropologist*, 86(1): 165-166.

102. 1984d "Listening to the Voice of the People: An Anthropologist Urges an Integrative Approach to the Devastating Problems of Our Time." Graduate Society Medal Winner, *Radcliffe Quarterly* (September) 70(3): 13-14.

103. 1984e "A User Theory of Law." Fourth Annual Alfred P. Murrah Lecture, *Southwestern Law Journal*, 38(4): 951-963.

104. 1984f "Sharing Work and Confidence: Mothers and Daughters Among the Mountain Zapotec." *Radcliffe Quarterly*, (December) 70(4): 7-8.

105. 1984g "Dispute Resolution - Law as Marginal or Central (Manipulative and Motive)." *A Study of Barriers to the Use of Alternative Methods of Dispute Resolution*, South Royalton, VT: Vermont Law School Dispute Resolution Project, Pp. 5-18.

106. 1984h *Energy Use: the Human Dimension*. Paul C. Stern and Elliot Aronson, eds., Committee on Behavioral and Social Aspects of Energy Consumption and Production. Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. National Academy of

Sciences, New York City.: W. H. and Freeman. (Nader was a Committee member.)

107. 1985a Review of *Aesthetics and Ritual in the United Arab Emirates: the Anthropology of Food and Personal Adornment among Arabian Women.* by Aida Sami Kanafani, Beirut: American University. Distributed by Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press. *The Middle East Journal*, 39(2): 386-387.

108. 1985b "Women Who Could Rule America. Laura Nader: Vice-President of the United States." *Radcliffe Quarterly*, (March) 71(1): 17-18.

109. 1985c (with Claire Nader) "A Wide Angle on Regulation: An Anthropological Perspective." *Regulatory Policy and the Social Sciences*, Roger G. Noll, ed., London: University of California Press, Pp. 141-160.

110. 1985d Answers to –"Where is Dispute Resolution Today? Where will it be in the Year 2000?" *Dispute Resolution Forum*, Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Dispute Resolution, (April) Pp. 5.

111. 1985e "Introduction – Property, Power, and Law in Middle Eastern Societies." *Property, Social Structure and Law in the Modern Middle East,* Ann Elizabeth Mayer, ed., Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, Pp. 1-24.

112. 1985f Review of *Recognizing Islam: Religion and Society in the Modern Arab World*. by Michael Gilsenan, *International Journal of the Middle East*, 17(4): 391-393.

113. 1985g "A User Theory of Legal Change as Applied to Gender— Introduction." *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: The Law as a Behavioral Instrument, 1985*, Gary B. Melton, ed., Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 33: 1-33.

114. 1986a Focus on People—"Making the Balance: Law Among the Zapotec of Mexico." *Contemporary Cultural Anthropology,* Second Edition, Michael C. Howard, ed., Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company Limited, Pp. 344-347.

115. 1986b "Enforcement Strategies and the Catch They Yield at the SEC." Review of *Wayward Capitalists—Target of the Security Exchange Commission* by Susan P. Shapiro, *Harvard Law Review,* (April) 99(6): 1362-1373.

116. 1986c "The Drift to War." *Peace and War: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Mary LeCron Foster and Robert A. Rubenstein, eds., New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, Pp. 185-192. (Revised and reprinted in *The Anthropology of War and Peace: Perspectives on the Nuclear Age,* Paul R. Turner and David Pitt, eds. and contributors, South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, 1988).

117. 1986d Panelist – *Nuclear Winter: the Anthropology of Human Survival*. Proceedings of a Session at the 84th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, December 6, 1985, Washington, D.C., M. Pamela Bumsted, Organizer, Los Alamos National Laboratory Document LA-UR-86-370, Pp. 39-44.

118. 1986e (with Andrée Sursock) "Anthropology and Justice." *Justice: Views from the Social Sciences*. Ronald L. Cohen, ed., New York, N.Y.: Plenum Publishing, Pp. 205-233.

118. 1986e (with Andrée Sursock) "Anthropology and Justice." *Justice: Views from the Social Sciences*. Ronald L. Cohen, ed., New York, N.Y.: Plenum Publishing, Pp. 205-233.

119. 1986f Review of *Law and Politics in Aztec Texcoco.* by Jerome A. Offner, *American Anthropologist*, 88(2): 477-478.

120. 1987a "Cultural Control." *The Center Magazine*, (March-April) Pp. 50-59..

121. 1987b "A Radcliffe Plan for the Development of an Interdependence Perspective in Higher Education: In Commemoration of Harvard's 350th Celebration." The Project on Interdependence at Radcliffe College. Working Papers Series No. 5., Pp 1-12.

122. 1987c "The Subordination of Women in Comparative Perspective." A.S. Barnes, ed., *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development*, Special Issue: Women in the Americas: Relationships, Work and Power, (Fall-Winter) 15(3-4): 377-397.

123. 1987d Letter to the Editor –"'No' Vote Had Positive Side." *Register Citizen*, (Wednesday, July 1).

124. 1988a Review of *Women Without Men: Gender and Marginality in an Algerian Town.* by Willy Jansen, *Middle East Journal*, (Spring) 42(2): 329-330.

125. 1988b Review of *The Persistence of Patriarchy: Class, Gender and Ideology in Twentieth Century Algeria*. by Peter R. Knauss, *Middle East Journal*, (Summer) 42(3): 519-520.

126. 1988c "A Litigious People?" Review of *Praying for Justice, Faith, Order, and Community in an American Town* by Carol J. Greenhouse, *Law & Society Review*, 22(5): 1017-1022.

127. 1989a "The ADR Explosion—The Implications of Rhetoric in Legal Reform." *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice*, Ontario, Canada: University of Windsor, Pp. 269-291.

128. 1989b "The Crown, the Colonists, and the Course of Zapotec Village Law." *History and Power in the Study of Law: New Directions in Legal Anthropology*, June Starr and Jane Collier, eds., Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, Pp. 320-344.

129. 1989c "Post-Interpretive Anthropology." *Anthropological Quarterly*, (October) 61(4): 149-159.

130. 1989d "Orientalism, Occidentalism and the Control of Women." *Cultural Dynamics*, (July) 2(3): 323-355. (Reprinted and transl. "Orientalisme, Occidentalisme et contrôle des femmes." *Nouvelles Questions Feministes– Revue internationale francophone sexism et racism: le cas francais*, 25(1): 12-24, 2006).

131. 1990a "The Origin of Order and the Dynamics of Justice." *New Directions in the Study of Justice, Law, and Social Control*, prepared by School of Justice Studies, Arizona State University, John R. Hepburn, series ed., New York: Plenum Publishing, Pp. 189-206.

132. 1990b "The Comparative Functionalist Diffusionist Method in Anthropology." *Wetenschap en Partijdigheid: Opstellen voor Andre J.F. Kobben*, Frank Bovenkerk, Frank Buijs, and

Henk Tromp, eds. Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, Pp. 215-221.

133. 1990c *Harmony Ideology: Justice and Control in a Zapotec Mountain Village*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 336 pp. (Reprinted in Paperback, 1991. Spanish translation: *Ideologia armónica: Justicia y control en un pueblo de la montaña Zapoteca*, Oaxaca, Mexico: Instituto Oaxaqueño de las Culturas, Fondo Estatal para la Cultura y las Artes, 1998) .

134. 1990d Review of *Muslim Preacher in the Modern World: A Jordanian Case Study in Comparative Perspective*. by Richard T. Antoun, *Middle East Journal*, (Winter) 44(1): 153-154.

135. 1990e "Academic Freedom." *San Francisco Examiner*, (December 21), A-27.

136. 1990f "Processes of Constructing (No) Access to Justice (For Ordinary People)." *The Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice*, Ontario, Canada: University of Windsor, (Summer) 10: 496-513.

137. 1991a "Whatever Happened to the Flat Earth People?: a view from the 21st century." *The Radcliffe Quarterly*, 75th Anniversary Issue Voyage to the Future (March): 8-10.

138. 1991b Review of *Charity Begins at Home: Generosity and Self-Interest among the Philanthropic Elite.* by Teresa Odendahl. *American Anthropologist*, (June) 93(2): 483- 484.

139. 1991c "Harmony Models and the Construction of Law." *Conflict Resolution – Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, Kevin Avruch, Peter W. Black, and Joseph A. Scimecca, eds. New York: Greenwood Press, Pp. 41-59.

140. 1992a "Trading Justice for Harmony." *NIDR Forum*. National Institute for Dispute Resolution, (Winter): 12-14.

141. 1992b Review of *Power and the Ruling Classes in Northeast Brazil: Juazeiro and Petrolina in Transition.* by Ronald H. Chilcote. *Social Science Quarterly*, 73(1): 208.

142. 1992c "From Legal Process to Mind Processing." *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*, (October) 30(4): 468-473.

143. 1992d “Foreword.” *Gifted Women,* by Howard Schatz, San Francisco, CA: Pacific Photographic Press, Pp. 1-3.

144. 1992e Interview - “Anthropologist, Laura Nader.” *Working Women for the 21st Century: 50 Women Reveal Their Pathways to Career Success*, by Nelda Lateef, Charlotte, Vermont: Williamson Publishing, Pp. 135-140.

145. 1992f “Introduction.” *The Cheyenne Way: Conflict and Case Law in Primitive Jurisprudence*, by K.N. Llewellyn and E.Adamson Hoebel, Delran, New Jersey: The Legal Classics Library, Division of Gryphon Editions, Pp.3-23.

146. 1993a “Paradigm Busting and Vertical Linkage.” Review of *Ethnography Unbound: Power and Resistance in the Modern Metropolis*, by Michael Burawoy, Alice Burton, Ann Arnett Ferguson, and Kathryn J. Fox, *Contemporary Sociology*, Symposium, (January) 22(1): 6- 7.

147. 1993b Review of *Gender in Crisis: Women and the Palestinian Resistance Movement* by Julie M. Peteet, *American Ethnologist,* (August) 20(3): 640-641.

148. 1993c Review of *Obliging Need: Rural Petty Industry in Mexican Capitalism*. by Scott Cook and Leigh Binford, *American Ethnologist*, (November) 20(4): 885-886.

149. 1993d Encyclopedia Entry –"Law and Society - Anthropological Aspects." *Estratto Dal Volume III Della Enciclopedia delle Scienze Sociali*, Rome, Italy: Fondata Da Giovanni Treccani, Pp. 133-140.

150. 1993e "When is Popular Justice Popular?" In Sally Engle Merry and Neal Milner, eds., *The Possibility of Popular Justice: A Case Study of Community Mediation in the United States,* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Pp. 435-451.

151. 1993f "Controlling Processes in the Practice of Law: Hierarchy and Pacification in the Movement to Re-Form Dispute Ideology." *Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution*, 9(1): 1-25.

152. 1994a "Comparative Consciousness." *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*, Rob Borofsky, ed. New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, Inc., Pp. 84-96.

153. 1994b (with Salwa Mikdadi Nashashibi and Etel Adnan) “Arab Women Artists.” *Forces of Change: Artists of the Arab World,* by Salwa Mikdadi Nashashibi, Lafayette, CA: The International Council for Women in the Arts; Washington, D.C.: The National Museum of Women in the Arts, Pp. 1-36.

154. 1994c “Should the Regents be Elected?” *California Monthly*, (February) Pp.15-16.

155. 1994d Comment—“Cultural Anthropology’s Future Agenda.” *Anthropology Newsletter*, (September), Pp. 76.

156. 1994e Editor— *Essays on Controlling Processes*. Berkeley, CA: Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers, Number 77.

157. 1994f “Controlling Processes.” *Essays on Controlling Processes*, Laura Nader, ed., Berkeley, CA: Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers, Number 77, Pp. 1-11.

158. 1994g “‘Solidarity,’ Paternalism, and Historical Injustice: Perspectives on the Development of Indian Peoples of Mexico.” *PoLAR (Political and Legal Anthropology Review),* (November) 17(2): 99-104.

159. 1994h “A Reply to Professor King.” *The Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution*, 10(1): 99-103.

160. 1994i “La civilización y sus negociadores - La armonía como técnica de pacificación.” Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Association of Black Anthropologists Annals, Pp. 1-12. (Reprinted in Sao Paulo: Editora Academica, Licoes Alternativas de Direito Processual H. Wanderlei Rodrigues, eds., Pp 113-131, 1995)

161. 1994j “Harmonia coerciva: a economia politica dos modelos jurídicos.” *Revista Brasileiria de Ciéncias Sociais* 26(9): 19-29. (Reprinted in English, *Essays on Controlling Processes*, Berkeley, CA: Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers, Number 80: 1-13, 1996).

162. 1994k Review of *Zapotec Women.* by Lynn Stephen, *American Ethnologist*, (November) 21(4): 1078.

163. 1995a "Civilization and its Negotiations." *Understanding Disputes: The Politics of Argument*, Pat Kaplan, ed., Oxford Providence, USA: Berg Publishers, Pp. 39-63.

164. 1995b “Grumblings About Elitism in Anthropology.” *Practicing Anthropology*, (Winter-Spring) 17(2): 52-53.

165. 1995c “Coercive Harmony – An anthropologist and a former federal judge debate the purpose of mandatory ADR.” *California Lawyer*, Expert Opinion, Moderated by Nina Schuyler, (May) Pp. 37-41.

166. 1995d Comment on –“Moral Models in Anthropology by Roy D’Andrade.” *Current Anthropology*, (June) 36(3): 426-427.

167. 1995e (with Roberto J. Gonzalez and C. Jay Ou) “Between Two Poles: Bronislaw Malinowski, Ludwik Fleck, and the Anthropology of Science.” *Current Anthropology*, (December) 36(5): 866-869.

168. 1995f “Energy Needs for Sustainable Human Development from an Anthropological Perspective.” *Energy as an Instrument for Socio-Economic Development*, José Goldemberg and Thomas B. Johansson, eds., New York, N.Y.: United Nations Development Programme, pp. 42-48.

169. 1996a (Editor and Contributor) *Essays on Controlling Processes*. Berkeley, CA: Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers, Number 80.

170. 1996b “Coercive Harmony: the Political Economy of Legal Models.” *Essays on Controlling Processes*, Laura Nader, ed., Berkeley, CA: Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers, Number 80, Pp. 1-13.

171. 1996b *Naked Science - Anthropological Inquiry into Boundaries, Power and Knowledge*. Laura Nader, ed. and contributor, New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 318 pp.

172. 1996c “Introduction - Anthropological Inquiry into Boundaries, Power and Knowledge.” *Naked Science - Anthropological Inquiry into Boundaries, Power, and Knowledge*. Laura Nader, ed. and contributor. New York, N.Y.: Routledge, Pp. xi-xv.

173. 1996d “The Three-Cornered Constellation: Magic, Science, and Religion Revisited.” *Naked Science - Anthropological Inquiry into Boundaries, Power, and Knowledge*, Laura Nader, ed. and contributor New York, N.Y.: Routledge, Pp. 259-275.

174. 1996e Letter to the Editor—“Behind the Camouflage.” *San Francisco Chronicle* (Monday, April 28), A16.

175. 1996f (with Tim Plowman) “Anthropology and Everyday Scholarship.” Review of *Law in Everyday Life*, Austin Sarat and Thomas R. Kearns, eds., *American Anthropologist*, (September) 98(3): 8-10.

176. 1996g “Regulating Household Talk.” *Social Interaction, Social Context and Language –Essays in Honor of Susan Ervin-Tripp*. Dan Issac Slobin, Julie Gerhardt, Amy Kyratzis and Jiansheng Guo, eds., Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, Pp. 219-233.

177. 1996h “Taxation.” *Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology*, David Levinson and Melvin Ember, eds., New York: Henry Holt and Company, Pp. 1286-1289.

178. 1996i “Cultural Control.” *Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology*, David Levinson and Melvin Ember, eds., New York: Henry Holt and Company, Pp 265-267.

179. 1996j (with Mariane Ferme) Review of *Transplants Innovation and Legal Tradition in the Horn of Africa* (*Modelli Autoctoni e Modelli D’Importazione Nei Sistemi Giuridici del Corno d’Africa).* Elisabetta Grande, ed. *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, (December) 45: 209-213.

180. 1996k “Stop the Community Killers.” *The Voice*, Winsted, CT, (October 15), Pp. 5.

181. 1997a “The Phantom Factor: Impact of the Cold War on Anthropology.” *The Cold War & The University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years*, by Noam Chomsky, et al., New York, N.Y.: The New Press, Pp. 107-148.

182. 1997b *Law in Culture and Society*,(Paperback edition with a new Preface) Laura Nader, ed., Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 454 pp.

183. 1997c “Controlling Processes - Tracing the Dynamic Components of Power.” Sidney W. Mintz Lecture for 1995, *Current Anthropology*, (December) 38(5): 711-737.

184. 1997d “Reply” to Comments on — “Controlling Processes - Tracing the Dynamic Components of Power.” Sidney W. Mintz Lecture for 1995, *Current Anthropology*, (December) 38(5): 732-735.

185. 1997e “Postscript on the Phantom Factor—More Ethnography of Anthropology.” *General Anthropology*, (November) 4(1): 1, 4-8.

186. 1997f (with Roberto J. Gonzalez) “Big Science Isn’t the Only One With Answers.” *Los Angeles Times*, (December 29), B5.

187. 1997g "Legal Anthropology." *The Dictionary of Anthropology*, Thomas Barfield, ed. London: Blackwell Publishers, Pp. 281-284.

188. 1998a Review of *Women of Lebanon: Interviews with Champions for Peace* by Nelda LaTeef. *The Middle East Journal*, (Spring) 52(2): 291-292.

189. 1998b Review of *Universities and Empire: Money and Politics in the Social Sciences during the Cold War*, Christopher Simpson, ed., *College & Research Libraries*, (September) 59(5): 488- 490.

190. 1998c "Response to Andre Gunder Frank's Review of *Naked Science*." *Social Epistemology*, 12(4): 335-344.

191. 1998d (With Jay Ou) "Idealization and Power: Legality and Tradition in Native American Law." *Oklahoma City University Law Review*, Special Issue: New Directions in Native American Law, (Fall) 23(1): 13-42.

192. 1998e "Comments." In "Symposium: New Directions in Comparative Law," *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 46(4): 751-756.

193. 1998f "Bourque Should Rethink This One." *Winsted Journal*, Winsted, CT, (August 31).

194. 1999a "The Influence of Dispute Resolution on Globalization: The Political Economy of Legal Models." J. Feest, ed., "Globalization and Legal Cultures" (Oñati Summer Course, 1997), 7 Oñati Papers 87-98, Oñati, Spain: International Institute for the Sociology of Law. Pp. 87-97.

195. 1999b Comment on— Peter Pels' "Professions of Duplexity: A Prehistory of Ethical Codes in Anthropology." *Current Anthropology*, (April) 40(2): 121-122.

196. 1999c "Pushing the Limits — Eclecticism on Purpose." *PoLAR (Political and Legal Anthropology Review)*, (May) 22(1): 106-109.

197. 1999d "In a Woman's Looking Glass - Normative Blindness and Unresolved Human Rights Issues." (Portuguese title, "Num espelho de mulher: cegueira normativa e questóes de direitos humanos nâo resolvidas.") *Horizontes Antropológicos*, Special Issue: Cidadania e Diversidade Cultural, 10: 61-82.

198. 1999e (with Roberto J. González and Jay Ou) "Towards an ethnography of museums: new directions from the museum experience." In "Academic anthropology and the museum: back to the future." *Focaal* 34: 107-117.

199. 1999f Review of *After the Fact: Two Countries, Four Decades, One Anthropologist*. by Clifford Geertz, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, *Journal of the History of Science Society, (ISIS)* 90(3): 626-627.

200. 1999g “The Globalization of Law: ADR as ‘Soft’ Technology.” In Proceedings of the 93rd Annual Meeting – On Violence, Money, Power and Culture: Reviewing the Internationalist Legacy. March 24-27, 1999, Washington, D.C., *The American Society of International Law*, 93: 304-311.

201. 1999h “Thinking Public Interest Anthropology-1890s-1990s.” *General Anthropology*, (Spring) 5(2): 1, 7-9.

202. 2000a Comment on— “Reconciliation and Revenge in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Rethinking Legal Pluralism and Human Rights.” by Richard A. Wilson, *Current Anthropology*, (February) 41(1): 91-92.

203. 2000b (with Roberto Gonzalez) “The Framing of Teenage Health Care: Organizations, Cultures and Control.” *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry*, (June) 24: 231-258.

204. 2000c “Preface.” *NAPA Bulletin*, Special Issue: The Unity of Theory and Practice in Anthropology: Rebuilding A Fractured Synthesis, Carole E. Hill and Marietta L. Baba, eds., 18(1): v-vii.

205. 2000d Remembrance of Sherwood Larned Washburn. *California Monthly*, (June) 110(6): 55.

206. 2000e Letter to the Editor –“Voters Must Distinguish Rhetoric from Truth.” *Daily Californian*, (November 7) Pp. 7.

207. 2000f Letter to the Editor –“Nader’s Record.” *San Francisco Chronicle*, (September 23).

208. 2000g Interview - “A Conversation with Laura Nader.” *California Monthly*, Q&A by Russell Schoch, (November) Pp. 29-32.

209. 2000h Letters to the Editor –“Critical Thinking—Laura Nader replies.” *California Monthly*, (December), Pp. 4.

210. 2000i Public Statement –“Misplaced Energies.” *Nader2000*, Nader 2000 General Committee, Inc., (November 4).

211. 2001a “The Underside of Conflict Management — in Africa and Elsewhere.” *IDS Bulletin*, Special Issue: Making Law Matter, Rules, Rights and Security in the Lives of the Poor, (January) 32(1): 19-27.

212. 2001b “Law Matters - Transmitting hegemonies of conflict resolution.” Jef Verschueren, J.-O. Östman, and M. Meeuwis, eds, Text is a transcript of the presentation given during the ICM symposium. *International Communication Monitor*, (March 26) Pp. 51-59.

213. 2001c “Crime As A Category.” *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice*, Jeff Berreman, ed., 19: 326-340.

214. 2001d “Anthropology!” Distinguished Lecture, American Anthropological Association, 2000. *American Anthropologist*, (September) 103(3): 609-620.

215. 2001e “Harmony Coerced Is Freedom Denied.” *The Chronicle Review Page*, (July 13) B13.

216. 2001f (with Anne Whiteside) “Criticism of Chagnon Not New.” *Anthropology News*, (September) 42(6): 3.

217. 2001g “Law - Contemporary Cultures.” *Oxford Encyclopedia of Mesoamerican Cultures – The Civilizations of Mexico and Central America*, Davíd Carrasco, editor in chief, New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2: 112-114.

218. 2001h (with Roberto González) “Perspectivas Sobre El 11 de Septiembre: Dolor, Coraje y Razón.” Boletín Diario de Campo, México City, México: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (INAH), (Noviembre) 38: 3-7. .

219. 2001i “Breaking the Silence-Politics and Professional Autonomy.” *Anthropological Quarterly*, (Winter) 75(1): 161-169.

220. 2001j “Culture and Energy Usage.” *Macmillan Encyclopedia of Energy*, John Zumerchik, editor in chief, New York: Macmillan Reference USA, 1: 309-316.

221. 2002a *The Life of the Law: Anthropological Projects*. by Laura Nader, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 262 pp.

222. 2002b “Introduction.” *University History Series – Elizabeth Colson: Anthropology and A Lifetime of Observation*, Interviews Conducted by Suzanne Riess in 2000-2001. Berkeley, CA: Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, The Regents of the University of California, Pp. iv-viii.

223. 2002c “Sleepwalking Through the History of Anthropology: Anthropologists on Home Ground.” *Anthropology, History, and American Indians: Essays in Honor of William Curtis Sturtevant*, William L. Merrill and Ives Goddard, eds., Smithsonian Contributions to Anthropology, (44): 47-54.

224. 2002d Letter to the Editor, *The Voice*, Winsted, CT (March 15).

225. 2002e “Missing Links: A Commentary on Ward H. Goodenough’s Moving Article ‘Anthropology in the 20th Century and Beyond.’” *American Anthropologist*, (June) 104(2): 441-449.

226. 2002f Opinion—“Barriers to Thinking New About Energy.” *The Industrial Physicist*, (August/September) Pp. 24-27.

227. 2002g “Introduction.” *Essays in Controlling Processes, 2002*, Laura Nader, editor and contributor, Berkeley, CA: Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers, Controlling Processes, (Spring) No. 87: 1-6.

228. 2002h (with Elisabetta Grande) “Current Illusions and Delusions about Conflict Management—In Africa and Elsewhere.” *Law and Social Inquiry, Journal of the American Bar Association*, Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, (Summer) 27(3): 573-594. (Reprinted in *International Dispute Resolution*, Vol. III, Carrie Menkel-Meadow, ed., (April) 2012).

229. 2002i (with Elisabetta Grande) “Reply – Current Illusions and Delusions about Conflict Management – In Africa and Elsewhere.” *Law and Social Inquiry, Journal of the American Bar Association*, Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, (Summer) 27(3): 631-633.

230. 2002j Opinion – “Energy Barriers.” *The Industrial Physicist*, (October/November) Pp. 12-14.

231. 2002k “The Life of the Law - A Moving Story.” *Valparaiso Law Review* (Summer) 36(3): 655-675.

232. 2002l “A Wide-Angle on Dispute Management.” *Willamette Journal of International Law and Dispute Resolution.* 10: 37-46.

233. 2002m “Moving on— Comprehending Anthropologies of Law.” *Practicing Ethnography in Law – New Dialogues, Enduring Methods*, June Starr and Mark Goodale, eds., New York, N.Y.: Palgrave MacMillan, Pp. 190-201.

234. 2003a “Departures from Violence: Love Is Not Enough.” *Public Culture*, (Winter) 15(1): 195-197.

235. 2003b Review of *Studying Those Who Study Us: An Anthropologist in the World of Artifical Intelligence*. by Diane E. Forsythe, *Isis*, Special Issue: 50th Anniversary of the Discovery of the Double Helix, (March) 94(1): 201-202.

236. 2003c *Le forze vive del diritto—Un’introduzione all’antropologia giuridica.* Elisabetta Grande, ed., Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 179 pp.

237. 2003d “Fragments of Identity, Power, and Control.” *In Charles V in Context: the Making of a European Identity*, Marc Boone and Marysa Demoor, eds., Brussels: Brussels University Press, Pp. 299-312.

238. 2003e “Crime As A Category—Domestic and Globalized.” *Crime’s Power: Anthropologists and the Ethnography of Crime*, Philip C. Parnell and Stephanie C. Kane, eds., New York, N.Y.: Palgrave Macmillan, Pp. 55-76.

239. 2003f “Iraq and Democracy.” Roy Richard Grinker, ed., *Anthropological Quarterly*, (Summer), 76(3): 479-483.

240. 2003g Letter to the Editor— “Edward Said.” *The Atlantic Monthly*. (November) 292(4): 32.

241. 2004a “The Link Between Justice and International Law.” Review of *Toward a Just World: The Critical Years in Search for International Justice*,” by Dorothy V. Jones. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 10(3): 297-299.

242. 2004b “The Harder Path – Shifting Gears.” *Anthropological Quarterly*, (Fall) 77(4): 771-791.

243. 2004c Letter Regarding “Terrorists and U.S. Policy.” *Harvard Magazine*, (September/October) Pp. 9.

244. 2005a Review of *Threatening Anthropology: McCarthyism and the FBI’s Surveillance of Activist Anthropologists.* by David Price, *The Historian*, (September) 67(3): 536-537.

245. 2005b (with Ellen Hertz) “On The Lexus and the Olive Tree, by Thomas L. Friedman.” *Why America’s Top Pundits are Wrong- Anthropologists Talk Back*, Catherine Besteman and Hugh Gusterson, eds., Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, Pp. 121-137.

246. 2005c “The Americanization of International Law.” *Mobile People, Mobile Law- Expanding Legal Relations in a Contracting Law*. Franz von Benda-Beckmann, Keebet von Benda- Beckmann, and Anne Griffiths, eds., Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, Pp. 199-213.

247. 2005d “Law and the Theory of Lack.” *Hastings International and Comparative Law Review*, (Winter) 28(2): 191-204.

248. 2005e (Guest editor and Contributor) “Coercive Harmony: the Political Economy of Legal Models.” *Controlling Processes – Selected Essays, 1994-2005*, Berkeley, CA: Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers, No. 92/93, Pp 7-22.

249. 2006a (with Stanley Brandes) “Alan Dundes (1934-2005).” *American Anthropologist*, (March) 108(1): 268-271.

250. 2006b “Rediscovering Energy Issues – A response to Harold Wilhite and Annette Henning.” *Anthropology Today*, *(*April) 22(2): 22.

251. 2006c “Naturalizing Difference and Models of Coexistence: Concluding Comments.” *Racism in Metropolitan Areas*, Rik Pinxten and Ellen Preckler, eds. New York, N.Y.: Berghahn Books, Pp. 173-182.

252. 2006d “Human Rights and Moral Imperialism: A Double-Edged Story.” *Anthropology News*, (September) 47(6): 6.

253. 2006e “Orientalisme, occidentalisme et contrôle des femmes.” *Nouvelles Questions Feministes, Revue Internationale francophone – sexisme et racisme: le cas francais*. Natalie Benelli, Ellen Hertz, Christine Delphy, Christelle Hamel, Patricia Roux, and Jules Falquet, eds., 25(1): 12-24.

254. 2006f “Promise or Plunder? – A Past and Future Look at Law and Development.” *The World Bank Legal Review: Law, Equity and Development, Volume 2,* Ana Palacio, editor in chief, Washington D.C.: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Pp. 87 -111. (reprinted in *Global Jurist*, (August) 7(2), Article 1 (Frontiers): 1-24, 2007.)

255. 2007a Review of *The Nuclear Borderlands: The Manhattan Project in Post-Cold War New Mexico.* by Joseph Masco, *American Ethnologist,* (November) 33(4): 4043-4044.

256. 2007b “Law – The Missing Link in Policy Studies.” *Anthropology News*, (April) 48(3): 35.

257. 2007c (with Hugh Gusterson) “Nuclear Legacies: Arrogance, Secrecy, Ignorance, Lies, Silence, Suffering, Action” *Half-lives and Half-truths: Confronting the Radioactive Legacies of the Cold War,* Barbara Rose Johnston, ed., Santa Fe, New Mexico: School for Advanced Research Press, Pp. 299-316.

258. 2007d “Introduction: Registers of Power.” *The Practice of Human Rights-Tracking Law Between the Global and the Local*, Mark Goodale and Sally Engle Merry, eds., Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, Pp. 117-129.

259. 2007e “What’s Good About Conflict?” *Anthropology News*, (September) 48(6): 14-15.

260. 2008a (with Roberto J. González) “Fifty Years: From Autonomy to Dependence.” *Berkeley Review of Latin American Studies*, Berkeley, CA: Center for Latin American Studies, University of California, Berkeley, (Fall) Pp. 24-31.

261. 2008b (with Ugo Mattei) *Plunder: When the Rule of Law is Illegal*. New York, N.Y.: Wiley-Blackwell, 283 pp.

262. 2008c “Homo Sapiens and the Longue Durée.” *Journal of Developing Societies*, 24(1): 83-94.

263. 2008d Review of *An Invitation to Laughter: A Lebanese Anthropologist in the Arab World* by Fuad I. Khouri, *American Anthropologist*, (June) 110(2): 262-263.

264. 2008e “Notes on ‘Men, Animals, and the Law.’” *Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers*, No. 97: 50-62.

265. 2009a “What the Rest Think of the West – Legal Dimensions.” *Hastings International and Comparative Law Review*, (Summer) 32(2): 765-777. (Also available at Berkeley Electronic Publishing, *Global Jurist*: vol. 9. ISS.1 (Advances) Article 3, http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/gj.2009.9.1/gj.2009.9.1.1289/gj.2009.9.1.1289.xml).

266. 2009b “Amending the AAA Bylaws.” *Anthropology News*, (February) 50(2): 3.

267. 2009c “Law and the Frontiers of Illegalities.” *The Power of Law in a Transnational World: Anthropological Inquiries*, Franz von Benda-Beckmann, Keebet von Benda-Beckmann and Anne Griffiths, eds., New York, N.Y.: Berghahn Books, Pp. 54-73.

268. 2009d Opinion –"UC Has Lost Touch With Its History." *Daily Californian*, (Monday, July 13) Pp. 6-7.

269. 2010a (with Alison Dundes Renteln) "Introduction to Part IV." *Cultural Diversity and the Law – State Responses from Around the World*, Marie-Claire Foblets, Jean- François Gaudreault-DesBiens, and Alison Dundes Renteln, eds., Proceedings of the Colloquium "The Response of State Law to the Expression of Cultural Diversity," Brussels, September 2006, Brussels: Francqui Foundation, Pp. 843- 850.

270. 2010b "Epilogue -The Words We Use: Justice, Human Rights and the Sense of Injustice." *Mirrors of Justice: Law and Power in the Post—Cold War Era*, Kamari Maxine Clarke and Mark Goodale, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Pp. 316-331. (Reprinted in *Annuario di Anthropologia*, Ugo Fabietti, ed., Milan: Metemi Publishers, Pp. 106-124, 2008).

271. 2010c *The Energy Reader*. Laura Nader, ed., Oxford, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell Publishers, 548 pp.

272. 2010d "Preface." *The Energy Reader*. Laura Nader, ed., Oxford, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell Publishers, pp. xv-xix.

273. 2010e (with Leticia Cesarino and Chris Hebdon) "Introduction." *The Energy Reader*, Laura Nader, ed., Oxford, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell Publishers, Pp. 1-16.

274. 2010f "The University in Crisis: Public Good or Private Good?" Berkeley, CA: Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers, Number 98, Special Issue: The University in Crisis, Pp. 37-44.

275. 2010h "Side by Side—The Other Is Not Mute." *Edward Said - A Legacy of Emancipation and Representation*, Adel Iskandar and Hakem Rustom, eds., Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, Pp 72-86.

276. 2010i "When Did *Homo Sapiens* Peak?" *American Anthropologist*, Special Topic: On Nature and the Human, comments edited by Augustin Fuentes, (December) 112(4): 517- 518.

277. 2011a "Ethnography as Theory." *HUA: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 1(1): 211-219.

278. 2011b (with Roberto González) Film – *Losing Knowledge: Fifty Years of Change.* Roberto González and Laura Nader, producers, Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Media, DVD, color (40 min).

279. 2011c "The Global Perspective." *Anthropology News* (May) 52(5): 10.

280. 2011d "Editorial." In "Anthropology Revisited: Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers Numbers 99/100: 2011." Berkeley, CA: Kroeber Anthropological Society, 100(1): 1-2.

281. 2012a “Rethinking Salvation Mentality and Counterterrorism. In “Ten Years After 9/11: Rethinking Counterterrorism,” *Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems*, 21(1): 99-118.

282. 2012b “Comment: Diapraxis Response to Jonathan Benthall, AT 28(1).” *Anthropology Today,* (August) 28(4): 26.

283. 2012c Review of *Gray Panthers.* by Roger Sanjek, *American Anthropologist,* (December) 114(4): 710-711.

284. 2012d “Contrarian Possibilities- Introduction.” *Guess Who’s Coming to Dinner*, Ine Pisters, An van. Dienderen, Chia Longman, and Lisa Dikomitis, eds., Gent: Academic Press, Pp. 287-297.

285. 2012e “Energy Choices – Humanity’s Role in Changing the Face of the Earth.” Review of *Crude Domination: An Anthropology of Oil*, Andrea Behrends, Stephen P. Reyna, and Günther Schlee, eds., and (Reprinted in *Flammable Societies: Studies on the Socio-economics of Oil and Gas*, John-Andrew. McNeish and Owen Logan, eds., *Social Analysis,* 56(3): 108-116.

286. 2013a Plenary Remarks – “Law and Intercultural Competence.” *Pacific McGeorge Global Business and Development Journal*, Derek Takehara, editor in chief, Presented on August 8, 2011 at the *2011 Pacific McGeorge Workshop on Promoting Intercultural Legal Competence (The “Tahoe II” Conference) in Lake Tahoe, California),* (26)1: 123-129.

287. 2013b *Culture and Dignity – Dialogues between the Middle East and the West.* Laura Nader, ed., Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 240 pp.

288. 2013c “Afterword – Maximizing Anthropology.” *Cultures of Energy: Power, Practices, Technologies,* Sarah Strauss, Stephanie Rupp, and Thomas Love, eds., Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, Pp. 317-323.

289. 2013d “Of Area Studies and Intellectual Boundaries.” *Anthropology News, In Focus* (January/February), Pp. 5.

290. 2013e (with Paul Rabinow) “Berkeley Didn’t Have to Look Outside Anthropology Department for Interim Chair.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Letters—Correspondence from *Chronicle* readers, (June 5).

In Press

1. “Vengeance, Barbarism, and Osama Bin Laden – Full Circle.” *Anthropologia Dell a Vendetta*, G Lorini and M. Masia, eds.

2. “‘El indio, ‘los pobres,’ y la injusticia de los siglos.” En *La Etnografia en Mexico*. INAM, Mexico, D. F.

In Preparation
1. *What the Rest Think of the West– 600AD to 2012*, Laura Nader, ed.

2. “Questioning the Validity of Statistics in Assessing Breast Cancer Treatment.” In Cushman Haagenson—Pioneer in Breast Cancer Research.

3. Forward in *Studying Up, Down and Sideways*. R. Stryker and R. Gonzalez