Interview with Prof. Sarah Allan 艾蘭 by Kevin K. Huang 黃冠雲

Dartmouth University
March 4 and August 19, 2017

Kevin K. Huang: I thought we could use the story of the early part of your career to draw out what you remember about Berkeley. Maybe we could go back to the time when you were in college and started studying Chinese.

Sarah Allan: I went to Reed College my first semester. There, I took a course on art. It was a world art course and had a unit on China. I had already had some interest in Zen Buddhism and Daoism and that sort of thing, and it suddenly occurred to me that Chinese was something that one could study. But you couldn't study it at Reed. They didn't have a Chinese department yet. So, I went to Berkeley the second semester of my freshman year. I couldn't start language study immediately because they didn't have language courses that started mid-year. I remember that I took a survey course with [Peter A.] Boodberg. It was only a half-unit course, one of the few half-unit courses in the university. It had an enormous audience because a lot of people needed an extra half unit in order to graduate. I can't say that it really impressed me at that point. It gave me certain ideas, but it was over my head. I also took an Asian art course.

KH: With James Cahill?

SA: No, Cahill came the next year, but he was there by the time I returned for graduate school and was very important in my career, too.

My plan to study at Berkeley was upended because I fell in love. My husband is an artist. His name is Nicol Allan. He had a studio in Los Angeles, and a gallery there sold his work. So I moved to Los Angeles. At that time, you could transfer from any University of California campus to another campus. Also, anyone could get admitted if they had the

requirements. It was not really very competitive. You had to have a B average. You also had to have a certain minimal SAT score; it wasn't that much. And you had to have taken certain prescribed courses in high school. So, it was simple to get in, and it was entirely free. I went to UCLA starting in my second year, and that's when I really started studying Chinese. At the same time, I just happened to take an archaeology course with Richard Rudolph.

There really wasn't much reason for me to do Chinese. I think that's not that uncommon. It was something that just occurred to me that I could do. Another reason probably was that I was on the left politically. I was interested in Chinese communism, the ideal of communism, Mao Zedong, and contemporary China, too.

But once I started to study, it was Ancient China that I was interested in academically. Although I've continued to be interested in Modern China, it's more as an observer. At UCLA, I did archaeology and Classical Chinese with [Richard C.] Rudolph, and I worked for him. After I married, my husband didn't make enough money for us both to live on, so I worked on campus to support myself. I worked in the Classics Department, and then worked for Rudolph as a so-called laboratory assistant, but mainly I just worked on his slides. His classes were very good training because he was very methodical, and so I got a very good base in Chinese archaeology. A very systematic one. He went through all the main discoveries, and that has stood me in good stead all the way through my career.

For graduate school, I went to Berkeley. There are a couple of things I should say about Berkeley at that time. One is that for Ancient China, the Oriental Languages Department, as it was then called, was very good. My choice essentially came down to Berkeley and Harvard, but besides the academic offerings, Berkeley was the place to go to at that time. It was in 1966 that I started at Berkeley, and the Free Speech Movement had happened a couple years before. Like me, many others made the same choice. In fact, when I went to Berkeley, it was the first time that the

department had a lot of graduate students. They didn't know how to deal with all of us. It was the place to be, but it was also a very classically oriented department.

KH: How serious were you about going to another school?

SA: Probably the one place I might have really gone was Yale, but it had different requirements and I didn't realize until it was too late, because of Kwang-chih Chang 張光直. They required the Graduate Record Examination, and the other places didn't. I didn't realize it in time to get my application in properly. So, I didn't get admitted. But, there were all kinds of reasons why Berkeley was appealing.

KH: Would you say it was the experience at UCLA, with Rudolph, that got you started?

SA: Yeah, I really wanted to do archaeology in graduate school. Of course, you couldn't go to China, and we didn't really know whether we would ever be able to go to China. I had taken courses on bronzes with Leroy Davidson at UCLA. When I went to Berkeley, Cahill had just done the Freer Gallery bronze catalogue, so he seemed like someone I could work with to do archaeology. But it soon became obvious that it really wasn't possible. So, I just worked on texts, but I kept up with Chinese archaeology as best as I could. In fact, when I was first hired in London, I taught art and archaeology. My appointment was half in Art and Archaeology and half in Chinese. But then, when I got offered a permanent job, I chose an appointment entirely in the Chinese section of the Far East Department rather than in Archaeology. Because of personal reasons, it made better sense for me.

KH: What other recollections do you have of the survey class with Boodberg?

SA: The survey course with Boodberg was in many ways comparative. One of the assignments he gave you was to make a chart that compared events in Europe and China, or Western civilization and China. I didn't know very much about Western civilization, so the comparative chronology was not particularly enlightening to me. I think he assumed more knowledge on the part of his students than most of us had. But his lectures were quite interesting. They were on grand themes, like climate and civilization: how the climate of China affected the civilization. But in thinking about Boodberg as a teacher, it was really his seminars, not the lecture classes, that represented his teaching method. In my own teaching, I try to imitate his method to some extent. It was very Socratic. He would interrogate you about every word. In one course we read, I think, one verse from the *Shijing* 詩經 and the beginning lines of the *Chuci* 楚辭 "Tianwen" 天問 and that lasted a whole term. You would be asked to translate, and usually you would get maybe two words, and then he would start interrogating you on the meaning of each word and why you thought it meant this. Then you would go back and look in the *Kangxi zidian* 康熙字典, which he always used, and various sources. He would also ask you about the meaning of the English word you were using to translate, and what the root of that English word was, and so you would go looking in Old English dictionaries and learning the root of the English word, too. We didn't proceed very quickly. But you had to think about what everything meant minutely as well as the larger framework in which it operated.

KH: Was this in a seminar room with a lot of reference books?

SA: No, we didn't actually look things up in class. I don't know quite how we managed to spend so long on each question. You would have to go back and look those things up yourself, and try to figure out what both the texts and the sources meant. But you'd learn what the relevant resources were, and he would talk about whatever it was he was interested in talking about.

Another aspect of his teaching is that he was very rigid about the use of grammar, the grammatical interpretation. In another course we read Tang

poetry. He would insist on a certain grammatical analysis that required a particular interpretation. My husband always said it was the one course that we students always argued about afterwards, because we were always discussing and arguing about Boodberg's analyses. My closest friend and colleague was Richard Kunst, and he generally didn't accept Boodberg's interpretations. But Boodberg's method showed you a way to think about what you read. He tried to make you think about what the writers were actually saying. Such as, when you were reading the "Tianwen," how did they see the organization of the cosmos? If they talk about eight *wei*, where were they? What was the earth like, how, physically, was the sky attached above it — what are the implications of the way they're describing the cosmos for how they actually saw it? I don't necessarily agree with a lot of things that Boodberg taught now, and I've expanded my interests over the years, but it's still to a certain extent true that the questions that I've dealt with in my career were ones that he brought up when I was a student. Particularly, *The Shape of the Turtle* comes from the questions that he asked when I was a graduate student about how people conceptualized the cosmos.

The other thing, since we've already got onto Boodberg, and I've been thinking about this since you mentioned the interview: my own understanding of Boodberg is rather different than the way that he is usually portrayed. For one thing he sounds too dour in most portrayals. He was very jolly as a person, and very witty and humorous, in a European manner. Although he was Russian, a very proud one, he spoke French at home. When I wrote a review of his Selected Works it was essentially intended as a response to a review by Roy Andrew Miller in Early China.[1] I started thinking at that time about Boodberg's youth, and I think that his background is significant. He grew up in St. Petersburg at a time when the Russian avant-garde was very active. And when he was in high school there, it was a time when experimental poetry and art, movements such as Russian futurism, were flourishing there. The idea of universal languages

1. Sarah Allan, "Review of *Selected works of Peter A. Boodbery*, edited by Alvin P. Cohen," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 45.2 (1982): 390-392.

was also very popular, and I think that may have influenced his approach to Chinese. I have no proof of this, and this is only my own supposition. I think what Boodberg was trying to do was not really just about Chinese. That's why the language that he used for translating was important. His idea, as I understand it, was to introduce Chinese ideas into the Western intellectual world so that they became part of a global intellectual discourse. He tried to do so by making up new words using older forms of English and other European languages that were similar in meaning and historical evolution to the Chinese terms. Translation is important in [Edward H.] Schafer's work, too. How do you translate from Chinese without misrepresenting the original meaning? When you translate Chinese words into English, the terms are not precisely equivalent, but most people just use the words that seem closest to the originals in their translations. The problem is that when you use these apparent equivalents, people think the ideas are the same as those that they are already acquainted with. So, you need to use a different vocabulary. Boodberg had a command of numerous languages, ancient and modern, so he would invent words using the roots of these other languages that had a philological history similar to the Chinese terms. Again, I think that he overestimated other people's education. Few people, even in his own time, could understand the linguistic references. But, his purpose was to universalize the Chinese ideas, so that they could become part of a universal humanities. That is, these words would become normalized in English and become shared ideas.

KH: Did he actually think that these words he was coining would become accepted over time?

SA: I think that was his original hope. That was the point of it. Whether he thought he was successful or not, that's a different matter. But he had a very grand goal. That was the whole problem. He was extremely ambitious intellectually. He was trying to do something that he thought was important. That's what I understand it to have been. Now, this is my personal interpretation. I haven't heard other people put it in those terms. But I think that's what it was about.

KH: It's a very lofty ideal, to draw on the resources of an entire civilization to illuminate another.

SA: Yes, and he's actually drawing on the resources of that other civilization as well, by trying to pull Chinese civilization into Euro-American discourse, by using their own resources, ancient resources, philological resources.

KH: So in your classes, you were putting this ideal into practice.

SA: How each word worked, and what the English terms that you might translate it with meant, that was part of it. But of course we couldn't do what he did. We didn't try to coin our own neologisms. But if we used a term, we had to know what its origin was, and then usually he would suggest and explain how he came to his own conclusions. So, he would explain the root of this word and that word, and then how and why he was doing what he was doing.

KH: Were there a lot of discussions?

SA: During class, he more or less interrogated you. He was very friendly in class, but he was very certain of himself and people were somewhat intimidated. You more or less answered questions and tried to follow what he was doing. He was very approachable outside of class. He was a raconteur. When you hear people following him that weren't acquainted with him talk of him, you get the sense of somebody who was very severe. But he wasn't. He was very humorous. He liked to tell stories and make jokes, in a kind of sophisticated, European manner. He was very amusing.

He came from a very aristocratic background, an aristocratic military background. I used to come to school on the bus, and I'd often meet him walking up to Durant Hall, I guess from a parking lot, and we'd walk together and chat. I remember he told me one time about how he used to

walk barefoot to the university in order to preserve his shoes. He apparently didn't have any resources when he first came to the US, though his family in Russia must have been well off. I remember another story he told was about being captured when he was a cadet. I guess he must have been a cadet in the so-called White Army, even though Schafer says in his necrology he was neither Red nor White.[2] I guess he was only 13 or 14, something like that. He said that he was so cocky and talked so much that he talked his way out — they let him go. He was very charming personally.

KH: That's probably something you can sense from interacting with him, the aristocratic origin.

SA: I don't know how much one would sense it if you weren't already aware of it. I also worked with [Wolfram] Eberhard, who also came from an aristocratic background, but an intellectual one. Boodberg was from a military background. This was something between them—in their rivalry. I don't know the background. Boodberg once told me that Eberhard knew more about China than anyone he ever met. I suspected it was not entirely a compliment — that he meant his knowledge of Western civilization was deficient. That class of European intellectuals often had a kind of intellectual confidence and breadth of education that Americans generally lacked, and both of them, in their different ways, reflected it. Boodberg's ambition, the loftiness of it, probably also came from his background.

KH: Could you talk a little more about Boodberg? From reading the various accounts about him, one sometimes gets the sense that he was rather embittered toward the end of his career.

SA: As a student, what came across to us was not really that he was embittered, although I know that people who were close to him said so and it was probably true, but he was more doctrinaire than he might have been if he had felt more successful in getting his ideas accepted. In other words,

2. Edward H. Schafer and Alvin P. Cohen, "Peter A. Boodberg, 1903-1972," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94.1 (1974): 1-13.

he insisted on his own opinions in a way that he might not have. That did make it in some ways difficult to be his student, especially if you didn't agree with all of his ideas. But, he did accept my thesis when I wrote it and gave it to him, which was not at all the kind of thing he was doing.

As I see it, the problem for him was that his ambition was impossible to achieve. Not only because of the intellectual problems, but also because – and this was not his difficulty but a general one for people in Chinese fields, still today – sinologists are on the periphery of Western intellectual life. In Russia he might have been more central, or he could have expected to be, if it wasn't for the revolution and then everything else. The kind of ambition that he probably grew up with as a young man was in many ways thwarted, and it was thwarted not just by circumstance, but also by its grandeur. So, it was inevitably disappointing that he could not achieve it. The other thing he tried to achieve besides what I mentioned before was to reconstruct a Proto-Chinese, and of course he didn't succeed in doing that, either. Nobody has succeeded, but I think when he learned all these languages, it seemed something he might be able to do. That was also a disappointment.

As his student, I didn't have the sense that I was his favorite. (The student that he was closest to him was Bill Boltz, who also followed him the most closely.) I was simply a student who went into his field, and I was interested in what he was doing. In some sense, in my own way, I absorbed that into my own work. Although I didn't see myself as a direct follower, and resisted it in many ways, I can see in retrospect that he was the teacher that influenced me and my work the most, because I always try to work through the language and what the language means and then go from that to a more theoretical level. He was interested in grand ideas, but not so much in theory. Still, that kind of questioning from the bottom up is my adaption of what I learned from him.

KH: Was it a very conscious choice on your part to direct your research in a way that was distinct from him?

SA: It was. I wasn't really tempted to be a disciple. It's just my personality. (Laugh) I am too rebellious when in a situation where people have authority over me. Being a disciple was never within my character. What I really got out of Berkeley was a combination of the people that were there when I was a student. I always tried to take from my teachers what I found interesting and what it was what they did (as scholars), and I did not worry too much about the rest.

KH: Around this time, there were many scholars at Berkeley who had emigrated from other countries.

SA: Cyril Birch was British. Chen Shih-hsiang 陳世驤 was Chinese, but he had spent some time in England, too, and wrote something with Harold Acton. Of course, there were other Chinese, too, such as Chang Kun. Eberhard of course was German. There were quite a few European immigrants at Berkeley who came before the war, right after the war, or during the war – the Second World War had resulted in a number of European immigrants to the US. The Chinese that were in our department tended to have gone to Taiwan before immigrating to the US if they had not been trained in the US, like Chao Yuen-ren 趙元任. Chao Yuen-ren retired just a year before I got there. He had been a big influence on the department. It was a very cosmopolitan environment, in terms of teachers, not so much in terms of students.

KH: If we may stay on Boodberg a little longer, Schafer mentions that he was very active on campus and organized a lecture series involving other scholars.

SA: He organized the Colloquium Orientologicum. It was a faculty lecture series, and the professors sometimes brought their wives. There were no female professors. It was a kind of social occasion, too, and intellectually quite interesting. It was one of the few instances where graduate students could attend a faculty seminar. It was still going on when we were students there, though I think Boodberg wasn't active otherwise in the university by

then. I had the feeling that Boodberg didn't like institutions. That was part of his general aristocratic air. He wasn't going to do what fonctionnaires said he should. This may be why, and Schafer mentions it in his necrology, he resigned as head of the department during the McCarthy era.

I think I should explain how the program worked at that time. We had incredibly onerous requirements. Maybe this was also Boodberg's influence. And possibly because the department couldn't agree on what they should require, so they just put together what everyone wanted of us and made us do them all. (Laugh) So, to do an M.A. — and an M.A. even in those days was not a very high degree — you had to do coursework. It usually took about two years. Then you had to write a master's thesis. For me, that was the Taigong Wang article that I published later. I was lucky because I'd gone to UCLA, and the UCLA program was patterned after the Berkeley one; it even had the same number system. I didn't have to do a lot of the courses that most graduate students had to do. Boodberg excused me from many of them. He made all these regulations, but he also thought it was okay to waive them. This meant I hardly studied with Schafer at all, because Boodberg excused me from all but one of his classes. This, in the end, was bad for my career.

There was also a master's examination, after you finished your coursework, before you wrote your thesis. And, you had to write an essay comparing something in Euro-American literature with something in Chinese. I did mine on Aristotle's *Poetics* and the *Wenxin diaolong* 文心雕龍. Then you had to translate a chapter from one of the histories that hadn't previously been translated. I had worked on the *Shiji* 史記 for the Taigong Wang article, so Boodberg said I didn't have to do a translation. (I'm not entirely sure that this was for the M.A., the essay and translation may have been a prerequisite for the Ph.D.) You also had to have French and German for the MA. And, for the PhD, you had to have either an upper-level French or German literature class, or a third Oriental language. So I took a year of Korean. I got my M.A. in three years, but that was the quickest that anyone

had ever received it. For the Ph.D., we also had a preliminary examination in five fields. It was an extraordinarily intensive program.

KH: Was Boodberg already directly advising you?

SA: He was assigned as my graduate advisor early on, probably because when I applied, I said I wanted to do archaeology and ancient texts. Students generally had National Defense Education Act fellowships, but I had a different one than most of the students, not specifically for language study (Title IV as opposed to Title VI).

The person I did the most classes with was Chen Shih-hsiang. My basic training in Chinese literature was really from Chen Shih-hsiang. His classes were very good, very solid. They were more a kind of literary appreciation than history of literature. Chen wasn't totally traditional — he was very much influenced by people like Wen Yiduo, but he was very much a traditional Chinese scholar. In his classes, we read a lot of material. The problem with Boodberg's classes was that you hardly read anything. In Chen Shih-hsiang's class, you read a reasonable amount of text. He had a series of classes on Early Literature: on the *Shijing* 詩經, *Chuci*, *fu* 賦, and *Yuefu* 樂府, if I remember correctly. One of my Ph.D. examination fields, Early Literature, was with Chen Shih-hsiang. Chen was very important to my basic training in Chinese literature. Cyril Birch taught fiction, which I was also interested in, but didn't pursue later on.

Another requirement, and this was very influential to me, was a reading list. You were supposed to have read everything on this reading list before you took your M.A. exams. It included a lot of French sinology, including Marcel Granet and Henri Maspero. This influenced my thinking. Boodberg's main inspiration was, I think, primarily from French Sinology. Both Granet and Maspero clearly influenced him.

KH: Could you say more about this reading list?

SA: It must have been Boodberg or Boodberg and Schafer together that made the list. When you arrived in the department, they gave out the list, but nobody asked you anything about it ever again. It reflected their school of thinking, and it represented a cohesive idea of the important scholarship in the field, so I conscientiously read it all. It had what they, at that time, considered the classic Sinological works. That was how I was introduced to French Sinology.

KH: In terms of your training, what was David Keightley's role?

SA: Keightley wasn't there until 1969 or 1970. By that time I'd finished my classwork, so I never formally took classes with him, but I audited his seminars on *guwenzi* 古文字 (palaeography), how to read oracle bones and bronze inscriptions. That was how I was introduced to paleography. For me, it was an extension of the philology I had been doing already. One thing that I've never been able to understand is why Boodberg didn't do more paleography. There was one article that he wrote and published early on, responding to Hopkins, where he refers to oracle bone inscriptions and there may have been an occasional reference later on, but he basically ignored inscriptions. I think that not using excavated materials in analyzing the history of Chinese words or characters, especially oracle bone inscriptions, was an important limitation to his. I don't know why he didn't because there was material available. I also don't know why Marcel Granet didn't make use of oracle bone inscriptions, and this is also, to my mind, a major problem with his research. Many of Granet's ideas are based upon assumptions about historical evolution in ancient China that are completely wrong because he understood China to have been urbanized, or at least to have had cities, at a much later date than they did. Anyang was discovered in 1927, so oracle bone inscriptions were available to him. There was a secondary literature about them. It's possible that Granet thought they were fake, but Boodberg didn't. He even had an oracle bone which he showed me once and later gave as a gift to Keightley.

KH: Even Chen Shih-hsiang, in his articles on the *Shijing*, refers to inscriptional sources.

SA: Yes, and Boodberg did write about them in his argument with Hopkins (about the original composition of the character *ming* 明), so it's not as though Boodberg wasn't interested in inscriptions at all, but he never carried it further, I don't know why.

In any case, when Keightley came to Berkeley and I was introduced to oracle bones studies, it seemed the natural next step from the philology I had already been learning. Keightley's arrival at Berkeley at that time was very critical for my future development. I really do owe him a lot for his introduction into oracle bone studies. Keightley was a very inspiring teacher, and a very good one in the sense that you gained a command of a body of material through taking his classes. He was very friendly with Boodberg, too. He recorded an oral interview for the Bancroft Library where he talks about often stopping to see him at his house on his way home.

KH: Was there competition among students?

SA: There was no competition. In terms of student atmosphere, it was a wonderful time. We were very comradely. We would never compete with one another for a teacher's attention or anything like that. It just wasn't done.

KH: What about gender discrimination?

SA: It was quite significant. Amongst the students, there were three of us that entered graduate school together and were friends. One was me, one was Richard Kunst, and the other was Steven Berman. Steve dropped out. He joined a commune and played classical guitar; I don't know what happened to him after that. One of the funny things is that they gave a prize to the best beginning student at the end of our first year, and they

split it between the two of them. Rick and Steve thought this was gender discrimination, and I think we went out to dinner together with their prize money. However, I wasn't sure whether it was discrimination or not. I mean, it took me a while to find my feet academically when I got there. I think that this is always a problem for women, what is discrimination and what is not isn't usually clear-cut.

Later on, some of the guys in the department wrote a letter to the faculty complaining about gender discrimination. I had nothing to do with it, but the faculty thought I wrote it. (Laugh) So Boodberg called me in and said he was just speaking to me because I was the student he knew best. I don't think that was necessarily so, but, anyway, he denied the gender discrimination, arguing they'd given more PhDs to women than they had to men. Yet, the department had no women as regular faculty. To my knowledge, they did not hire a woman in a regular faculty position for another twenty or thirty years. They did, at some point, give Helen McCullough (in Japanese literature) a professorship, but they hired her as a lecturer (that was the position she held when I was there) at the time that they hired her husband as a tenured faculty member. She was a very distinguished scholar, more productive than her husband, and I suspect her later change in status was the result of affirmative action pressure. Boodberg's advice to me about getting a job was to stick around Berkeley and eventually I'd get hired. Chen Shih-hsiang had the same sort of encouraging attitude. But both of them died before I finished my Ph.D. In terms of my own career, this was very significant.

KH: Could you talk about your dissertation, the preparation leading up to it, the writing, and the defense?

SA: My doctoral dissertation was *The Heir and the Sage*, which was a very unusual kind of work to present for a doctoral dissertation. It was a structuralist application to ancient Chinese texts. I was very careful about getting it approved when I began it, because I knew that my approach was quite radical. I wrote the first half of it when Boodberg was still alive. He

read and approved it. Boodberg had retired, but he remained on my committee and acted as my actual advisor, although Cyril Birch agreed to act as my formal supervisor. After Boodberg died, which was just before I left for England, he was replaced by Edward H. Schafer. So I gave Schafer what I had already written. I heard nothing from him, except one short note about the *yin* 陰 and *yang* 陽 being out of balance in his garden. When I finished my thesis, which was about a year after I went to England, I sent it to him. He refused to sign it on the grounds that it wasn't the sort of work they did in that department. It had been approved early on, and he'd been sitting on it for all this period of time without ever objecting to it. I first got a short letter from Birch that was very complimentary. (All communication was by letter at that time.) Then, after a long wait, I got a long list of demands for changes from Birch that, I assumed, included Schafer's objections. Eberhard was on the committee too and he had been very helpful when I was formulating my arguments, and was always very supportive, but he was in the Sociology Department and did not have much influence in the Oriental Languages Department. Most of it had little relation to what I had done in the thesis. I think I was just being paid back for challenging Schafer during the student protests. It also may have had to do with interdepartmental conflict, but, anyway, I was faced with this situation.

KH: Was Keightley supportive during your final stage of writing the dissertation?

SA: Keightley was not on the main committee, but he was also asked to read it. Fortunately, he read the thesis carefully and gave me reasonable comments, corrections and suggestions. By then I was already teaching in London. If I had been at a university in the U.S., I think that would have been the end of my career. But in Britain, a doctorate wasn't an absolute requirement in those days. Also, my thesis had been read by D.C. Lau, Angus Graham, and Paul Thompson, so I knew there was nothing basically wrong with my analysis. I thought, maybe I can present it to the University of London. They had something called an external PhD for people who

weren't enrolled at the university. There was nothing much I could do to respond to the department's requests since most of the criticisms that they sent to me were irrelevant to what I was trying to do in the thesis, and didn't make any sense to me. So, I mostly just followed Keightley's suggestions, the ones that made sense to me, which included various mistakes and questions, or sensible criticisms. Later, he also suggested that it might be publishable. Then I just sent it back to Berkeley, and said that I've revised the thesis according to their suggestions to the best of my ability. Schafer was the sort of person who would blow his top, but would calm down afterwards. I think that by the time he got my revisions, he didn't care anymore. I got my doctorate and stayed in London.

That's why I said politics affected everything. I think that Boodberg and Chen Shih-hsiang would always have supported me regardless. They didn't mind.

KH: Perhaps this is a good place to turn to the topic of the student protests.

SA: I was at Berkeley between 1966 and 1972, and that was the height of the student protests. The Free Speech movement took place just prior those years, and the Vietnam War became more and more heated. I was involved in protests all along but the crux of my problem in the department were those that happened after the students were shot at Kent State, in 1970. It sparked a national student strike, and all of the Berkeley departments supported the student strike, including their faculty, except for two. One was Classics, and one was Oriental Languages. We thought that as students of the Oriental Languages Dept we had some sort of special responsibility, because we were studying East Asian cultures. (There was no teaching about Vietnam specifically in those days.) So we had a meeting. I was elected as one of two student representatives in our department. The other was David Pollack, who went on to teach Japanese literature at University of Rochester. We then met with the faculty in our department. Schafer spoke for the faculty, and he essentially presented a list of the things that they could hold over our heads. Were we willing to

give up our grades, jobs, and profession? I was so infuriated that I turned my back on him, and said very dramatically that I refused to respond to any threat from any member of the faculty. Things then went from bad to worse in the meeting. Later, we took over Durant Hall. It is a very small building with a hallway, rooms to the sides, and a door on each end. We put tables down the middle of the hallway, and began an ongoing seminar for the study of Vietnamese culture. We sat in the hallway, so that anybody who went into the building to go to a classroom or office had to pass by our tables. And we put up posters everywhere. One interesting thing is that it turned out that our library had very, very little literature of anything having to do with Vietnamese culture, ancient or modern. It was impossible to get much scholarship about Vietnam, so we read what little there was to read, but we didn't get very far with our seminar.

I should also mention that Durant Hall was next to California Hall, where the administration offices were in those days. The police would come into Durant Hall and go up onto the roof of the building in order to overlook demonstrations around California Hall. They came up through the library, which was on the second floor. The librarian, who was Chinese, [Raymond Nai-wen] Tang, knew that the building was vulnerable if the protests got out of hand. He also knew we were all good students and I think he thought as long as we were occupying the building, it would be safe. (Laugh) In any case, he supported us and offered us help should we need it, such as tables, chairs, typewriters. Very practical.

The only faculty who joined our seminar was Boodberg, who did sit down for a brief period of time and listened to what we were talking about. At the time I didn't think too much about it but looking back that must have been a difficult thing for him to do, meant as a demonstration of his willingness to talk to us. I do not know what he thought politically. Actually, the entire department was against the Vietnam war, at least as far as I know. They did not refuse to strike because they were in support of the Vietnam War. Although we were not clear about this at the time, it was because of an unusual historical reason, going back to the Loyalty Oath controversy of the

early 50s, when a law was passed that all University of California faculty had to sign an oath expressing loyalty to the United States. Schafer refused to sign the Loyalty Oath and lost his job. The department banded together, supported him financially, and had him continue to teach. Their position was that you should teach no matter what, and that affected their decision during the strike after Kent State. We didn't know this, and I don't know if it would have mattered had we known about it. But I think it did affect their response to our strike. Later on, there was a different kind of loyalty oath, which was for all state employees, not simply for teachers. And at that time Schafer and most other people who refused in the original controversy did sign the oath, and his job was restored.

KH: Was there much communication between the students and the faculty?

SA: It was very confrontational. You have to think about the situation: four students had been shot and killed at Kent State in ’70. The young men in the department, if they were not in school, would be sent to Vietnam. The situation from our side was always very fraught because of that, and a lot of people who probably would have been in school anyway were not sure about whether they really wanted to be in school, but they couldn't drop out. They also felt guilty about being in school when other young men were going to fight in Vietnam. When people look back on that time, it looks like it was mainly fun, but it was actually very fraught. And it was very serious, because if you returned your draft card, like Rick Kunst did, then you could get arrested and spend up to five years in jail. There was a lot of talk about people going to Canada, and some people in fact did. The big example was Muhammad Ali, who was sentenced to five years in jail after he refused the draft. What was infuriating about Schafer's statement was that we were giving up things, and we had prepared to give up things. They didn't realize or think too much about what the student situation was. I recently saw Cyril Birch, and he still thinks that their stance, which was to teach no matter what, was right. It's not an unreasonable stance, but it wasn't reasonable from our perspective in that circumstance.

KH: Apart from Boodberg, it seems that the faculty of the department all stood in unison.

SA: The reactions of the faculty were mixed. I think they also had disputes amongst themselves about how we should be treated. One of the good things when I was a student at Berkeley was that the faculty, whatever conflicts they had amongst themselves, never brought us into them. Boodberg and Eberhard didn't get on, but they both encouraged me to work with the other one. And, Chen Shih-hsiang's approach and Boodberg's approach were very, very different, but they deferred to each other. Not only did we students not undercut each other, the faculty didn't undercut each other, either. But that agreement amongst them broke down when they were confronted by our protests. To us, they appeared to be sticking together, but I think that later on it resulted in difficulties within the department.

KH: Did this have to do with the passing of an older generation?

SA: Yeah, yeah, the older generation, they were very intellectually idealistic. They weren't careerists. There was a passing of that kind of idealism later on. Not totally. I mean, Berkeley continued to have that, to a certain extent. But they weren't confident of themselves. That was the other aspect of it.

KH: But it was odd that Schafer reacted the way he did, given how he responded during the Loyalty Oath incident.

SA: And he was a Leftist! Which makes me think it was personal, more than anything else. When Richard Kunst refused the draft, I organized a demonstration for him. Schafer told me that he couldn't come to the demonstration, but he would be happy to be a character witness if Rick was arrested. A sign that the Department wasn't unsympathetic, in many ways. But Schafer couldn't stand being challenged. I think his reaction to our

strike was largely personal. It seemed to us to be political; upon reflection, I think what he was saying was, "I was willing to give up this, are you?" However, it didn't come across that way. It appeared to me to be a threat. It came across as, "Are you willing to give up your career by thwarting us?"

KH: What is the reasoning behind this? That is, if you had decided to give up your career and made the sacrifice, then he would have supported you for that…?

SA: It's hard to know. I don't think he thought it out. I think he was just angry. But, we were taking a stand and we had consciously decided we were willing to give things up if we had to. I had even been arrested in a sit-in at the Oakland Induction Center and spent 20 days in jail. The sit-in was timed to occur just before the Christmas break, so I didn't even miss class, and they may not have known about it. Being arrested could lead to losing your fellowship, and not being able to get a job. A standard question when applying for fellowships and jobs was: "Have you ever been arrested?" So, we were taking known risks. Rick was never arrested, but he could have been. We had the idea that you had to be public about what you were doing. Remember that this was coming out of the McCarthy era in which people were charged with secret organizing. We thought we should take a public stand. You should stand up for what you stood for. You took the risk. It was also coming out of the Civil Rights movement in which many people had given a great deal, and we had a Gandhian ideal that people would respond according to their own consciences to passive resistance.

KH: Could you talk more about this incident involving your arrest?

SA: In 1967, I participated in a large sit-in with a couple hundred people, and my husband participated, too. We went and sat in the street, in the doorway, in front of the Oakland Induction Center. We waited to get arrested, and we pleaded no contest (nolo contendere). They had decided to make an example of us, so we were sentenced to 20 days, which is a long time for sitting in a doorway. It was a misdemeanor offense, disturbing the

peace, if I remember correctly. Because we pleaded no contest, we were sentenced right away. It was just at the beginning of the Christmas holidays. One of the interesting things was that you got arrested, and you made this big dramatic statement. But then, we were in a bus, a paddy wagon, and outside everybody was obliviously going about their Christmas shopping, while we were taken to jail. There were about 60 women and about 150 men, something like that.

Being in jail was quite frightening. I would never deliberately do it again. I realized how vulnerable people are in jail, even though we were protected by the fact that we were all arrested together and were in jail together as a group. That meant we were not subject to abuse in the way that someone might be otherwise. We got out just before classes started, at the beginning of the term. I went to class, as if nothing had happened. This was three years before Kent State.

KH: What was the situation like elsewhere in the university during this time?

SA: I never was involved in protests at an organizational or university-wide level. I saw myself as a foot soldier. I didn't have time. It was too hard a field to spend a lot of time on political action. But there were a lot of marches through San Francisco in those years, protesting the war, and a lot of demonstrations on campus, and I almost always participated.

To a certain extent, the students were all active. Of course, some people weren't, but generally speaking, the graduate students were all on the same side. We also believed in being collectivist. I mean, we had a sense that cooperation was how people should behave. That is why we didn't compete with one another for faculty attention.

My department at Berkeley was the Oriental Languages Department, what we would now call East Asian Studies or Language and Literature. Being in this type of department was different than, say, if you were in a History

department, Sociology, Political Science, or something like that. It was traditional, in the sense that you were studying those literatures and cultures, trying to learn what they were about. That gave us a rather different outlook than the disciplinary departments where students were less involved in the classical language and the learning about the cultural tradition on its own terms. There was always a difference between those of us trained in Sinology and those others who were in many ways politically more active than we were, but perhaps not as emotionally involved.

The protesting of the war from our point of view was not just protesting American Policy. It was done with a sense of the need for respect for the people of East Asia. This is something that Americans still have not at all come to terms with. What you hear about is all the Americans who died in Vietnam. The destruction of Vietnam, from the point of view of the Vietnamese, is not much considered or discussed. It was not uncommon to point out that these are actually people that were being bombed, but who they were, and what their history was, were not discussed. And one of the problems with American foreign policy was that most people knew nothing about the history of Vietnam, about French colonialism, all of the historical issues that had preceded the intervention of the U.S. The U.S. was only concerned with stopping communism. It had very little to do with Vietnam itself.

Another major event during this period was People's Park in ’69, when the police force used shot guns against people [sitting on the roof of the Telegraph Repertory Cinema], and James Rector was shot. Student protests got worse, and they declared martial law in Berkeley, and brought in the National Guard from the Central Valley, thus they were not local. They surrounded the campus with bayonets. You were not allowed to have more than three people assemble. So we formed groups and we walked around Berkeley. It was a beautiful, sunny day, cherry trees were blooming. Rick Kunst and I were walking with maybe a dozen other people. What I remember is that we were discussing this abstruse question of Classical Chinese grammar, and suddenly two police cars came up out of nowhere.

We were on a residential street in Berkeley. They zoomed up, parked, got out with their clubs, and started beating people up. I ran behind a house and fell over a fence and lay there for a little while before I got up and walked out. The police were beating the students in the street. I was so angry that they didn't touch me. I walked past and got on the bus and went home, and again it was like nothing was happening when I looked out the window. Rick said the police in the time-honored fashion said to him: "Down on the ground, motherfucker!" and started beating him. He tried to protect himself as best as he could. He wasn't seriously injured. But it was a frightening event.

Another thing to realize is that as these things were happening, at a certain point—and this was true actually before People's Park — the right wing and Reagan as governor had decided that student protests were to their political advantage. So did Nixon. To some extent, they deliberately incited the students. One time, for example, they dropped C.S. gas from a helicopter on campus. In this sense, the far left and the far right had a mutual interest, which was not the same as that of the student body at large. We were involved in protests, but there were people on the periphery on both sides with other interests.

KH: Is this something that you were already aware of at the time?

SA: It was actually that time that I fell over the fence that it suddenly struck me. I felt that to some extent I had been set up. It wasn't as obvious an issue during most of the Vietnam War protests. It became an issue later, and also there became more violence later. Originally the protests were very consistently non-violent. We had the idea of passive resistance inherited from the Civil Rights movement, but that tended to break down around the early 70s.

Second part

KH: Picking up the story where we left off earlier, we were talking about your dissertation and the launching of your career.

SA: Going back to how I got to London before I finished my thesis and started looking for a job. There really weren't any jobs at that time. The baby boom had resulted in a lot of hiring. Then, when we started looking for jobs, they dried up. There weren't the kind of advertisements you had later. You wrote a bunch of letters, and nobody answered, essentially. But, Cyril Birch was British and had taught at SOAS. He went to SOAS on a visit home, and he mentioned me to people there. It turned out that Angus Graham and William Watson were both going to be on leave. So. they hired me to teach on a temporary basis. They originally said for one year, but they actually had money for two years. Then, they created a job for me. I was really, really lucky. I went in '72 and got my doctorate in '74. D.C. Lau invited me to London, probably on the basis of my master's thesis, which was essentially that article on Taigong Wang that I later published.

KH: Was that a big transition, the move to Britain?

SA: It was, but my husband's family was Scottish, although he was born and grew up in Los Angeles. My father was a labor economist, and he liked to go to Europe so he worked himself into comparative fields. When I was growing up, we spent a certain amount of time in Europe. I had gone to school in Belgium, France, and Wales, in Cardiff. I was probably more Europeanized than the other Americans that were hired around the same time. Going to school in Wales was important because I understood how the British school system worked. The real problem in England was that the pay was extremely low. It was really very, very difficult to survive on the pay if you came from abroad and didn't have the backup of a family there or other income.

KH: It must have been exciting to start there.

SA: It was wonderful. The department was wonderful. It was really, really exciting. It was very low-key, but two things were important. One is that neither Lau nor Graham was married (Graham later remarried his original wife). Therefore, they spent a lot of time just sitting around and talking. They were very available. I'd often have lunch with Lau, or we'd go to the pub. He really wasn't a drinker, but he was always very social. He liked to talk about what he was working on. So socially it was very nice. And they were accepting of me as a colleague. Obviously, they were older and more experienced, but the whole situation felt very natural. It was also important that the department did have older women in it. Eventually, though, I didn't get promoted, so I came back to the U.S. Otherwise I would have stayed. To what extent this was because of gender discrimination was not clear to me. After all, I had a number of issues. I was politically left-wing (though I wasn't involved in politics when we lived in Britain because I was a foreigner). I was a woman. And my research was considered radical. When I felt I was being done down, I wasn't sure what the reason was. There were so many ways in which I was proceeding on my own path. I also generally led a rather Bohemian life—my lifestyle was not really the normal academic one. So who knows? But, I was extremely fortunate in the combination of teachers that I had at Berkeley, and then the colleagues that I had in London.

KH: So you were pursuing your interests. You were not thinking about the gender issue in a specific way?

SA: That's true. Looking back, I can see that gender discrimination was a very, very major issue in my career. I wasn't offered any American jobs, even when I applied for them after I'd more or less established myself. I was not offered any job in the US until I was hired by Dartmouth. At SOAS, I was actually paid one year less than I should have been. We were paid by age, and I was keyed in as one year less than my actual age. I always thought that was a mistake, but I never could get them to correct it.

Looking back, I think it's because I was a woman. Considering my scholarship, I normally should have expected to get a chair in England, especially considering who did get the chairs. In England, I was also a foreigner. That played its role. And some of it was personal. Lau and Graham and Paul Thompson always took the attitude "We're scholars" and didn't kowtow to the administration. I followed their lead, so I never was a careerist. I can see that that also affected my lack of promotion. But I think that if I were male, it wouldn't have played out quite the same way.

KH: Do you think Sinology as a field has become better or worse for women?

SA: For women? In the modern field it is a little better, but traditional Sinology is a very bad field for women. I don't see it getting much better. I think it has been a field that has been particularly misogynist. It's still there. Language and Literature departments tend to have more women in them in general. In Chinese departments, women language teachers have long been very common. But, it's frustrating, let's put it that way, to see how little progress has been made. I mean, there are some breakthroughs. But at Berkeley there were no women until very recent times. Now there are several women on the faculty at Berkeley, but you shouldn't have to wait fifty years. When I was a student, it was often pointed out that there had been more women on the Berkeley faculty in the 20s and 30s than there were in the 60s. So, I don't know. It's very discouraging.

KH: The question of gender is interesting to me. When I teach, most of my students, maybe 60 to 70% are women. I find myself faced with this question, even when teaching basic level courses: how do I relate the subject in a way that students can identify with? It's not easy. All of the prominent scholars from the Qing to the present are men. You might find a few women if you looked really hard, but it's a small minority. I always think students would ask these questions. Why should I have any interest in this field that has been traditionally dominated by men? How do I approach the subject in a way that relates to my own interest?

SA: One of the difficulties is that everything has become so genderized in our research. When I was a student, I was never particularly interested in social history. It was suggested to me that I could work on women this or women that. That was when women's studies as a field was just barely starting. But I really was not very interested in that. It's a difficulty for women, because if you really concentrate on women's fate, and you are interested in China, the amount of material is very limited. You tend to have to work in the periphery. The point is to show that periphery is important, and what women's experiences were. But as a woman I think I can also be interested in men, particularly in men's ideas. I am not really interested — and it's not that I don't think other people should be — but in my research I have never really been interested in gender issues. One of the things when you are studying Ancient China is that it is all male. Gender issues are not there. One can avoid thinking about them at all, because the ideas are about being human, and we can see those ideas in that sense, without thinking whether they are male or female. I don't think that women need to be relegated to studying the marginal today because of their marginal role in history. Fortunately, ancient China was not like the Song or later periods in which people were very interested in the issue of how women should behave in society. When you study ancient China, although women were undoubtedly oppressed, because their role hadn't been theorized, gender issues are not raised much.

When I was young, I didn't really think about gender very much. Which is probably fortunate. I was in a department where I felt socially comfortable even when I was the only woman present. That was an advantage. It's difficult when you are continually aware of your position. In American academia, I think that's particularly a problem. If you are continually aware of your position as a woman, then it gives you a level of self-consciousness that makes life harder for you.

KH: Is there a difference between America and Europe, and China in this regard?

SA: In China, all fields are gender-biased. Early China isn't a special field in that regard. But, the fact that I met Li Xueqin 李學勤 and he took me very seriously as a scholar from the beginning was a very important encouragement to me. When I first met him in England, I explained what I was working on. I was writing my "Sons of Suns" article, and I explained what it was all about to him. I could see that he was really interested in my ideas. And then, for *Yingguo suocang jiaguji* 英國所藏甲骨集, I worked with Qi Wenxin 齊文心, too. She is a very impressive scholar. Actually, there were a number of women doing oracle bone scholarship when I first went to China. In terms of gender bias, my feeling is that China has regressed since I first went there.

Working with Chinese scholars has been a great boon to me. I remember one time Boodberg said to me, and this also was a very great encouragement to me, you can never know as much as a Chinese knows because they've been reading these texts since they were children. But because your approach is different from theirs, you can still make a contribution. That's the way that I've always thought of it. It's true, if you're a European or American scholar who doesn't grow up speaking Chinese, you will always have holes in your knowledge, and you have to be careful to realize that, to find out what they are, and not try to cover them up. It's just natural. You're never going to have the same kind of control of the materials that a Chinese scholar at the equivalent level would have. One reason is simply that they can read faster than you can. On the other hand, you can see things as an outsider that you can't see if you've grown up in the culture. It was a surprising observation to me when he said that, because except for some of my teachers I didn't know any Chinese scholars. I also hadn't thought about how Chinese scholars think about things.

KH: There was very little interaction at the time.

SA: There was none, you may not realize this. I recently mentioned it when I wrote something on Early China for the Zhongguo shehui kexue

newsletter, because I had started to realize that the younger generation doesn't realize how absolute the lack of communication between the U.S. and China was in the fifties and sixties. It was only '72 when Ping-pong Diplomacy started, after China was admitted to the U.N., and just about the time I left the U.S. that any communication began to be possible. Academic exchanges didn't start until later. In Britain they started around '74-'75. In America it was a couple years later than that. There were a few delegations before that, but they were extremely limited. I didn't go to Taiwan when I was a student because I hoped to go to the mainland if it ever opened up. After I got to Britain, there were student exchanges first, so I applied for them. The British Council accepted me because I was still quite young. I was really happy that I got accepted. But then I was refused by the Chinese side because I had an American passport, and China didn't have student exchanges with the U.S. So all those years I thought that it was the U.S. government that wasn't allowing me to go to China, and it turned out to be the Chinese government.

When I got a permanent job, Lau made clear I had to be able to speak Chinese. He said, I don't care where you go, you can go to the mainland, you can go to Taiwan, but you have to be able to speak Chinese if you're going to teach in a Chinese department. I couldn't speak at all. We never really learned to speak after the first year. It wasn't considered important. So, I went to Taiwan for a few months. Taiwan was actually a very valuable experience. I had a tutor, but I didn't really study much language. Eberhard was there, for much of the time. I went around with him to different villages, and I traveled with one of his assistants who was Taiwanese, and observed Taiwanese religious and folk practices. I learned so much from that. You could never have done it in the mainland. It gave me a kind of perspective. In fact, my first article after the Taigong Wang article was called “Shang Foundations of Modern Chinese Folk Religion.” That was about the structure of Chinese traditional religion, and it was sort of a beginning for me, too.

Eberhard was amazing. He would talk to people wherever he was. Because he went to Taiwan all the time, if people were Taiwanese, he would talk about their village and its festivals and other practices and where they were from, their history. If they were from the Mainland, because he'd gone all over China, he would say, "Where are you from?" and "Oh yes, I was there in 1930," or whenever. (Laugh) Everybody loved him. I learned a lot from that about how to interact with people.

Eberhard was very Taiwan-oriented in those days. Boodberg's experience of having been in China was very important to who he was, how he saw himself as a scholar. That's clear. Besides French Sinology, it was *Gushibian* 古史辨. That was a very big influence on his thinking too.

Going back to the topic of academic exchanges, for faculty, it was the 80s before there were more than just touring delegations. There were more exchanges in England than they were in the US, or at least they were more easily accessible. In Britain, there weren't so many scholars in Chinese fields. If you were really interested in applying to go on an exchange, you could get accepted. Also in the late 70s, I took some tourist groups. They paid my way and paid me something, and I got to travel all around the country. In the early 80s, I went on a British Academy-Chinese Academy of Social Sciences exchange. By that time, I had already met Li Xueqin in England and begun to work with him. In Britain, there were many Chinese materials that Chinese scholars were interested in researching. I tried to facilitate their access to these materials. *Yingguo suocang jiaguji* was actually Li's idea. I was the only person in Britain who was doing research on oracle bones. I had been working on them since I left Berkeley on my own. Then Qi Wenxin came, and we did the rubbings. By the time I went to China, I had already gotten to know them and some other Chinese scholars quite well in London. So I had already had an entrée into the Chinese academia. That was, again, another very, very lucky break that I had.

KH: What are your thoughts on language training from the time when you were a student to the present?

SA: The best way of learning how another culture understands itself is language. One of the things about learning languages is that you phrase things differently than you do in your own. That is particularly true with Chinese. When students start to study a language, they think you just have to learn how to say what it is you already say in that other language. But in fact, it does not work that way. You have to learn how people express themselves in their language, which is different than in your own culture. Literature also opens a way of seeing how people think that you don't get any other way. The increasing move away from language and literature is part of the increasing move toward provincialization in American culture. There is no real attempt to understand. That issue, to a certain extent, has always been there. That's why the humanities are so critical to civilization. The humanities provide a means of learning to understand how other people think. With Classical Chinese, this is especially true, which is why students really like learning it. They don't think that they are going to be interested, but when they are required to learn it, it can be very startling to them. Suddenly, you can understand what somebody thought or wrote in three or four hundred B.C.E., and you find it even has some relevance to you. You are reading it the way that someone at the time did, the way the person wrote it, the actual language. It feels somewhat miraculous. It's cultural prejudice that prevents this from getting the kind of attention that it should. In fact, this process is a big part of a lot of my work. To try to understand the way in which people think, other people than yourselves, to try to get into that language and see how they were thinking, which isn't just a matter of understanding the words or even the structure of sentences, though they are a part of it, but also understanding the framework in which the different ideas relate to one another. The way that I develop that is not the same as, but in many ways goes back to, Boodberg, because he is the one that first presented me with these kinds of questions.

KH: What do you think is the difference between the scholars of a previous generation and the current one?

SA: If you look just at the field of Ancient China, you actually can't approach it the way we did. It has become a lot more specialized, because there is a lot more material, a lot more people writing. One of the wonderful things about studying Ancient China is that you are able to have grand ideas about it, even now, because you are dealing with new materials, or dealing with old materials in a new way. If you were doing the history of English literature or Ancient Greek, you might use new methodologies, but the materials have already been studied. This was presumably true of the study of Ancient China at the end of the Qing dynasty, but starting with *Gushibian* and the excavations of the early twentieth century, the field has opened up, all sorts of new questions have arisen. The standard of scholarship in our field, and I see this as the editor of Early China, is very high. And the standard of the training of the young scholars is better than for my generation, because regardless of when young European and American scholars began to learn Chinese, they go to China for several years, and they study with Chinese scholars. They have a much greater degree of technical expertise than we had any opportunity to get. Their spoken language is better. At the time that I started, the amount of secondary materials that were available were more limited and it was possible to keep a general grasp of most of the archaeological materials. Even somebody like Li Xueqin says nobody now could do what he did. He himself couldn't do it, because the amount of materials has become too great. You must be more specialist.

When I think back on those years when I was a student, I have fond memories and a great deal of nostalgia. Politically, the Vietnam War finally ended, but it was not an immediate end. When you look back from today, it doesn't seem that we succeeded in much of what we thought we were trying to do at that time. We didn't have the effect that we hoped. We were very optimistic and idealistic, but our idealism has not paid off, in the sense that what we hoped for was not what happened. The world today is a very

discouraging place. It was very discouraging in the 60s and 70s too, but we thought that by doing certain things, we could succeed. Now, it's like a holding operation where you are keeping the worst at bay rather than accomplishing important things. I don't mean in scholarship, but in general. Also, we weren't aware of the risks as much. In some sense I was aware of risks to my possibilities of a career, but I didn't even think about getting a job until I got to the point where I had to have one. I think that was generally true. None of us really thought about what was going to happen in the future. We just assumed that things would work out. It is much harder for young people to do that now. You are aware of all the problems you are going to have, and there are much more specific ones that come with tenure pressures than we had. They existed previously too, but they were not nearly as rigid.

Most of the people I respected the most in my career probably wouldn't get tenure in an American university today. Like Graham, I can't ever imagine him surviving in an American university. Boodberg published next to nothing. He never published a book. There was more scope for eccentricities in those days, more scope for people who didn't conform to all of the standards. The advantage was that it allowed people to do more than they might otherwise have done. I think that is a serious limitation of the American education system. China has also become more doctrinaire about what is required of every single scholar. Even I, aside from all of these other things, didn't publish much in the first ten years of my career. Once I started, I published a lot. That would not be allowed today.

Special thanks to Benjamin Gallant for transcribing the recording of this interview.