rassed to say, to the powerful ways that the first-person literary tradition radically restricts what can be represented about a community. The Calaveras project opened my eyes to the way that multi-author collaborations using other media—oral interviews, filmmaking, etc.—do not just translate the bioregional literary tradition into a new medium but transform it. Because of the widespread availability and popularity of these new-media tools, which have already become the way that most youth create their social worlds, the bioregionalist projects of future generations will become ever more inclusive and complex representations of place. At the extreme end of this new phenomenon, bioregionalism may be expressed through the anonymous, multi-author manipulation of maps that are in the public domain. Professor Galt's and my workshop on countermapping demonstrated to us as much as to our Calaveras audience the untapped potential of technologies like Google Maps and Wikipedia to aggregate and expand knowledge bioregionally. If and when this potential is tapped by local communities, we will have truly entered a new era of bioregionalism.

Suffice it to say that this experience opened my eyes to the ways that effective environmental representation can and probably will be something far different from the status quo that we teach in our courses or even discuss in cutting-edge research. To remain intellectually alive to our subject matter, environmental humanists will soon need to articulate an alternative way of defining what kinds of audiences, producers, and texts count for us. That means altering our models and methods of academic research and communication in order to open them to the writers, videographers, mapmakers, bloggers, and Tweeters who are pushing the project of bioregionalism forward from places like Glencoe, West Point, Wilseyville, and Rail Road Flat. Only once we have digested the idea, so anathema to academic tradition, that *the locals are the avant-garde* will we be able to say something useful about the material and cultural change that awaits us in the carbon-constrained future.

NOTES

1. Robert Thayer, "The Word Shrinks, the World Expands: Information, Energy, and Relocalization," *Landscape Journal* 27.1 (2008) 9-22.

2. I am thinking here of James Howard Kunstler, *The Long Emergency* (New York: Grove Press, 2005); Paul and Ann Ehrlich, *One with Nineveh* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2004); Jared Diamond, *Collapse* (NewYork: Penguin, 2005); and Derrick Jenson, *Endgame* (NewYork: Seven Stories Press, 2006).

3. See, for example, Ursula Heise's *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet: The Environmental Imagination of the Global* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008).

4. The archived project can be found at http://upfromtheunderstory.blogspot.com/

Serious Work: Public Engagement and the Humanities

Serious Work

In my current position as the associate director of a leading humanities center at a public research university, I find myself thinking a lot about a statement Stuart Hall makes in his 1990 reflections on "The Emergence of Cultural Studies and the Crisis of the Humanities." "*Most of us had to leave the humanities,*" he writes, "*in order to do serious work in it*" (Hall 11-12). That provocation has stayed with me. What is the site of the humanities, I ask myself, if one must leave it to work in it?

The question has personal relevance for how I think about my own work, and how I got here. My own academic formation was in twentieth-century American literary, performance, and cultural studies. That, at least, would count as a very recognizable research profile among my current colleagues at the University of Washington. It would register as serious work. But my work at the Simpson Center for the Humanities has quite a different profile. For the past six years I've focused on developing interdisciplinary and intersectoral collaborations engaging academic scholars as well as various local organizations and community partners.[1] If I were to construct my "academic area" now, it would probably be called "project and program development and assessment." That rubric would be considerably *less* recognizable among my university colleagues in the humanities, though quite legible to my colleagues in the professional schools, or my colleagues at various cultural and educational non-profits. Have I left the humanities, then? Abandoned research and scholarship for administration? Who's to care, but for the long years of academic apprenticeship and longings for social membership it breeds? The uneven professional recognitions—together with the more consequential business of building partnerships across sectors inside and outside the university—keep these questions alive and unresolved in me.

This essay takes up Hall's provocation regarding the displacements that enable "serious work" in the humanities, and how we assess its seriousness. It asks how the humanities' less disciplined situations—its diverse localizations and plural citations—might productively shift and expand understandings of the humanities and its work as they are currently conceived at any one site, archive, discipline, or sector. This is a central problematic of my own intellectual and organizational work to build collaborative, cross-sectoral projects that are productive and generative for university-based scholars and other stakeholders. At stake are transformative, as opposed to merely

reproductive, notions of the humanities and of scholarship. My experience has taught me that the public *and* academic potential of the humanities will be greatly expanded if we are willing to recognize and, moreover, re-think the practice of the humanities in other cultural terms, forms, and spaces than those already familiar within the academic humanities.

For the sake of these arguments, let me then suggest a heuristic: the rubric of the "public humanities" responds to the "crisis of the humanities" invoked in Hall's essay and to shifts in public (i.e., state) support for higher education more generally; it takes shape as the project of refiguring the work of the humanities in and against those forms institutionalized as the "academic humanities." "Serious work" in the humanities thus invokes two discourses simultaneously. It refers to critical and creative intellectual, political, and cultural work that makes a social difference *and* it refers to what counts and can be made to count, academically, as "serious work"—i.e., rigorous scholarship.

These are two very different horizons of accountability. One prioritizes issues and agendas identified by communities outside the university; the other answers to more narrowly professional disciplinary judgments. The demands can be divergent, as are the audiences, constituencies, and languages that can recognize and corroborate the value(s) produced in the course of collaboration. The tension between these two modes of "seriousness" lies at the heart of individual and institutional initiatives around public, engaged scholarship, and has been particularly marked for academic formations like cultural studies, women studies, and ethnic studies which emerge in response to late-twentieth-century social movements. Performing, elaborating, and translating the publicly minded work of the former in terms that can be recognized and legitimated professionally by the latter is the serious work of engaged scholarship. Both fronts of serious work are necessary to transform university-based "research, teaching, and service" towards deeper public engagement and social responsibility. The effort to do both at once—to engage, displace, and transform existing paradigms of knowing and scholarship in order to facilitate serious work across the university and in society—is the epistemological challenge that Eugene Rice refers to when he writes: "All the work on reconsidering scholarship—or, as the disciplinary societies prefer, 'the professional, scholarly, and creative work of faculty'—is in the deepest sense an epistemological challenge" (13).

The post-Second World War democratization of U.S. higher education brings into the university new subjects—in both senses of the word—diversifying student bodies, faculties, and academic inquiry. In many respects, however, scholarly gatekeeping regarding acceptable forms of "serious work" remains exclusionary, limiting who participates in academically valued knowledge-making and how (Hong 2008). George Sanchez, director of

the American Studies and Ethnicities program at University of Southern California and chair of the national advisory board for *Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life*, argues that minority scholars, whose educational and professional motivations are much more likely to be identified with community development needs and goals, confront this split and double burden most strongly. "Minority scholars have seen this tension right from the get-go and have tried to find a middle path," Sanchez says. "Often for better or worse, they take on the role of translator—translating what they know from the community into the academy or the other way around. That role means walking a tightrope, with the possibility of a lot of failure along with it" (12). Those who choose to persist are much more likely to be motivated by the desire to transform the institutions that educate them, says Luis Fraga, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement and director of the Diversity Research Institute at the University of Washington. These concerns underwrite the recent 2008 *Imagining America* Tenure Team Initiative report, *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Production and Tenure in the Engaged University*.

Hall's provocation responds to the influx of new student and faculty populations in postwar universities, too, and insists on a critical and engaged relationship to the forms in which the humanities have been institutionalized. In "Emergence," he marks the importance of location and sitedness, noting that "cultural studies was then, and has been ever since, an adaptation to its terrain . . . a conjunctural practice" (11). The Birmingham Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies depended, for instance, on a specific local matrix of humanities and social sciences disciplines, just as it depended on a host of social upheavals, movements, and reforms that bring new subjects (again, in its double sense) into the university. Hall narrates the consequent transformation of humanities and social science knowledges through their multiple displacements from traditional disciplinary and academic structures. In his account, the sites of "serious work" migrate inward from the university's "extramural" peripheries in non-traditional adult education programs; they respond to and depend upon the intellectual and cultural production of new left movements. The project of cultural studies becomes one of understanding these migrations and movements that respond to and participate in the social and cultural changes eroding traditional class structures and national imaginaries, a thinking with others that moves across, unsettles, and reorganizes the internal and external boundaries of the university. That project demands a rethinking of "culture" and "society" and of university knowledge paradigms across the humanities and social sciences. More than an interdisciplinary or counterdisciplinary intervention, though, Hall suggests the possibilities for a whole set of politically informed, *transdisciplinary* knowledge projects that bridge different educational and cultural

worlds. Yet despite considerable interdisciplinary refiguration within the humanities, these transdisciplinary, intersectoral engagements remain liminal, a project of institutional transformation only partially realized.

This is one reason I find myself thinking about Stuart Hall: much in the institution asks me to think elsewhere and otherwise. Many other claims to the humanities are made at my site, which suggestively "centers" the humanities, but also aims to work at its "cutting edge" in projects intended to innovate and transform. At the Simpson Center, the cutting edge has for the most part fostered exchange among the humanities and the interpretive social sciences, with some more limited extension to and involvement of the arts, sciences, and professional schools. Located among the traditional disciplinary departments of the modern university, structures it is intended to bridge and augment, the Simpson Center's stated mission seeks to advance crossdisciplinary academic research *and* public engagement through humanities scholarship. Both those key words, "humanities" and "scholarship," have mixed genealogies. Their rearticulation as *public and intersectoral* projects, not merely professional and interdisciplinary ones, requires critical reflection on their received meanings and institutionalizations. How might a critical notion of the *public* mediate professional ideas about the humanities and scholarship, then, in the interests of broader, deeper, more transformative engagements? That project requires a critical double consciousness that simultaneously engages and displaces received paradigms of the humanities and scholarship.

Mapping the Humanities

The rubric of the "public humanities" that emerged in the late 1980s and 1990s responded to the "crisis in the humanities" of the same period and sought to reorient the work of academic scholarship in concert with other professional sectors identified with the humanities such as museums, libraries, and state humanities councils. By situating "public humanities" and "public scholarship" through a brief genealogy, parallel developments in other fields, and a survey of the kinds of projects they subtend, this essay maps some of the various ways that "engagements" in the humanities are conceptualized from the standpoints of the university and of humanities councils. In so doing, I mean to suggest, first, how these terms have been and might yet be mobilized strategically. Here it is important to recognize that "public scholarship" and "public humanities" can potentially facilitate different kinds of intellectual alliance, inside and outside the academy. Second, the strategic use of these terms needs to recognize rather than efface the uneven histories its serious work builds upon. While the rhetoric of

"public humanities" and "public scholarship" attempts to reinvigorate the public missions of education and inquiry in formal and informal settings, it is important to recognize that access to public and educational participation has deeply unequal histories in this country in terms of race, class, and gender. Indeed, the neoconservative attack on public education and public institutions during this period, especially the critical representational and transformational projects advanced by knowledge formations like women's, ethnic, and postcolonial studies, reacts against the opening of these institutions to new and multiracial populations in the wake of civil rights and liberation movements. These persistent historical realities of exclusion inform and discredit the discourses of "citizenship," civic education, and subject formation that the humanities have relied upon and frequently revert to when seeking public legitimation. In other words, insufficient critical historical consciousness might well lead movements for public engagement to consolidate the exclusionary forms of publicness that have contributed to the very privatization of culture and education.[2]

Trends towards public or community engagements and towards public, engaged, or applied scholarship are not, of course, unique to the humanities. In the last ten years, organizations like the Social Science Research Council and Campus-Community Partnerships for Health have also sought to reorient social science and health science research towards deeper collaboration with non-academic professional and lay communities. As president of the American Sociological Association in 2004, Michael Burawoy called for a "Public Sociology." Each of these new calls attempts to reorient a professional formation towards new forms of exchange. That reorientation suggests that the self-referential structures that have defined and ensured professional legitimacy can no longer secure public legitimacy and support. These calls join other, more historically established subdisciplines like "public history" and "applied anthropology" whose mediating functions and relatively marginal professional standing suggest again the double front of "serious work" that publicly minded scholars must engage.

These new efforts and rubrics respond to a mixture of historical pressures that include progressive, social movement agendas—some have pointed out that "public sociology" repeats as it forgets the interventions of feminist sociology—and also include the regressive restructuring of state support for public institutions in general and public research universities in particular. This confluent, conjunctural mix of political, professional expediencies and commitments means that various invocations and applications of "public engagement" and "public scholarship" can be inflected quite differently.

As a strategic intervention, the construct of the "public humanities" takes its meaning in relation to and difference from the "academic humanities." It is coalitional language, a principle of linkage. The construct is lib-

eral and plural, in keeping with the institutions of higher education and state funding to which it makes its most direct appeals. As such, it names a diverse set of practices intended to build bridges among different publics, professional sectors, and organizational agents, from media brokers to community organizers to educators working in formal and informal spaces. Its deployment always takes shape in adaptation to local terrain and local politics.

That means that specific instances vary considerably, calling upon activist legacies and more traditionally civic ones. The term is often used to invoke all manner of public interaction or interface trafficking in cultural knowledge, ranging from the public intellectual's fifteen minutes of fame, to more extended, reciprocal forms of community-based service learning, to integrated, participatory, problem-based research collaborations. Some projects evolve as hybrids of these various forms, and some result in a variety of public and academic products, from policy and planning recommendations, to museum exhibitions and installations, to new curricula, monographs, and journal articles. In my own six years at the Simpson Center, engagements have spanned fairly traditional forms of "outreach" programming like the public lecture series or seminars for schoolteachers; the emergence of co-conceived research and curriculum collaborations; and program-building initiatives organized around developing greater capacities for cross-sectoral collaboration among faculty, staff, and students. To elaborate such activities and the artifacts they produce as "public scholarship" or "engaged scholarship" is to begin articulate their coherence and intentionality as a set of practices that create and disseminate knowledge of value to publics on campus and off.

To understand how the "public humanities" and "public scholarship" attempt to refigure work in the humanities, it is helpful to recognize that "the humanities" invokes multiple histories and traditions. It can refer to general ethical education for civic responsibility, literate and literacy practices, specific disciplines and their canons, critical modes of inquiry, or an administrative division of the contemporary university. These meanings attach variously to pre-disciplinary, disciplinary, and post-disciplinary moments in the academic development of the humanities. In the U.S., the humanities become codified as disciplines in the modern university in the late nineteenth century, and these disciplinary meanings still tend to dominate practically (and thus imaginatively) within higher education's reigning model, the research university. The organization of the humanities into disciplines in the context of the rise of the research university has the consequence of professionalizing humanities scholarship to the exclusion of the "amateur" versions that thrived in nineteenth-century civic institutions like historical societies and women's clubs. It also recasts scholarship on the scientific model of research.

The Simpson Center, where I work, and where I engage these terms, is also an adaptation to local terrain, of course. But its particular history—including its adoption of public engagement and its unresolved relations to traditional academic scholarship, conceived as research—illustrates much larger trends in the humanities. Humanities centers and institutes emerged in the 1980s and proliferated in the 1990s, predominantly at research-intensive universities, as one partial response to contrary historical developments affecting the humanities and their various articulations. These include the fragmentation of knowledge that follows from disciplinary specialization, the diminishing cultural capital and funding support for the humanities, relative to the sciences and social sciences, as well as the critical demands of postwar and postcolonial social movements and the new university knowledge formations they inspired. Critical engagement with these various forces and conditions contributes to a series of crossdisciplinary "turns"—theoretical, linguistic, historical, cultural, spatial—that implicate the humanities in new areas of study while remaking the questions, approaches, and objects within humanities disciplines. While these developments are transformative of the disciplines, and, in fact, respond to social currents, they also remain largely academic. They largely bypass the *transdisciplinary*, intersectoral project Hall gestures at, which would rework academic knowledge in the context of non-academic spaces and coalitional projects.

Circa 1990: Crisis and Responses

The early 1990s present a particular conjuncture of crisis and response in higher education generally and the academic humanities particularly. In this period, the presidencies of Reagan and Bush (1980-1992) oversee the retrenchment of state welfare provisions, with concentrated campaigns against public services and institutions in general and higher education specifically. In *The Unmaking of the Public University: The Forty-Year Assault on the Middle Class* (2008) Christopher Newfield offers a detailed historical account of these political battles, and their specific focus on higher education as the crucible of an expanding and diversifying middle class and a potentially progressive, majoritarian bloc. These pressures on institutions of higher education, especially public ones, find response in the reconsideration of their public missions. The 1985 founding of Campus Compact and the 1990 publication of *Reconsidering Scholarship: Priorities of the Professoriate* by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Learning constitute two highly visible responses. Revisiting the university's community service and teaching missions, these acts implicitly and explicitly

acknowledge that expressions of the university's "research mission" have created dangerous gaps between the institution and its non-academic publics.

The necessity of public engagement gets forced upon the academic humanities specifically by the so-called "culture wars" of the late 1980s and early 1990s, as neoconservative intellectuals, journalistic and academic, stage well-funded, reactionary attacks on humanities scholarship and curricula that revise Western canons, national narratives, and the relations among culture, society, and politics. These much-circulated and mediatized attacks have the effect of calling academic humanists into the public sphere in their own defense. The "crisis of the humanities" that was invoked at this moment was consequently marked by a pluralization of the objects and modes of academic humanities research; conservative reaction against these developments; and consequent anxieties about diminishing support for research and teaching as state funding for education underwent regressive restructuring.

Humanities centers respond in several ways; indeed, their proliferation in this period constitutes a response in itself. The Consortium of Humanities Councils and Institutes was founded in 1988 consequent to *The Institutional Impact of Institutes* conference at the University of California Humanities Research Institute and an organizational meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS); it saw rapid growth between 1995 and 2001, under leadership of Kathleen Woodward, then director of the Center for Twentieth-Century Studies at University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, now director of the Simpson Center. As J. Paul Hunter of the Franke Humanities Institute at University of Chicago suggests in a white paper for the Consortium, humanities centers fulfill "two major agendas" that answer to material and morale needs. They provide dedicated research time for faculty and graduate students, and they bolster campus atmosphere and build intellectual community by stimulating exchange and innovation via colloquia and conferences. A third agenda—"to develop public awareness and support" (according to Hunter) or "to foster exchange among university scholars and community members" (as the Simpson Center's mission maintains)—suggests the growing awareness in this period of how entwined the fate of the academic humanities is with public perceptions of their work.

The Hall essay with which I began speaks to this conjuncture by offering a long history of the social and intellectual developments underlying the so-called crisis of the humanities and culture wars. Two other documents from 1990—the ACLS National Task Force's report on "Scholarship and the Public Humanities," and Ernest Boyer's aforementioned and influential Carnegie report, *Scholarship Reconsidered*—give other institutional perspectives and platforms. Interventions in a changing intellectual and institutional landscape, these documents provide a starting point for considering how the "public humanities" and "public scholarship" attempt to reorient practices

and values within the humanities.

The report on "Scholarship and the Public Humanities" emerges from a meeting between representatives of the ACLS (a federation of scholarly— i.e., predominantly academic—professional associations) and the Federation of State Humanities Councils (the distributed network of independent nonprofits that receive congressional appropriations from the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH]). Hyper-aware of political battles affecting public funding and support (the report refers to the Helms amendment and then NEH director Lynne Cheney's report, *Humanities in America*), the report invokes and focuses the "crisis of the humanities" discourse. From the vantage point of its main authors, the state humanities council directors James Quay (California) and James Veninga (Texas), it is not the humanities that are in danger: they trust that so long as humanity persists, so will the cultural repertoires and archives associated with the humanities. Instead it is "professional humanists" who are endangered.

This is an important insight. It locates the general discourse of crisis in a particular sector of intellectual work. In grasping this particularity and its limits, it suggests the possibilities for other engagements. The category and concept of the "professional humanities" emerges here through the coalitional work between two different professional associations and its engagement of representatives from the museum and media sectors. It indexes and relativizes the academic humanities—the specialized modes of thought, research, and education particular to humanities divisions and departments within institutions of higher education—as one sector among others working in and on the humanities. These sectors range from local libraries and museums to state humanities councils to national and international funding and lobbying organizations such as the NEH and the ACLS itself. Pressed forward, an intersectoral notion of "professional humanities" can potentially reopen the conceptualization and practice of the humanities through critical engagements with multiple publics.

Unfortunately, the 1990 ACLS report left intact a very unidirectional model of knowledge production and dissemination, one where academic scholars act as the sole authors and creators and other professional humanists act as the middlebrow mediating agents of "*haute vulgarisation*" or the "parallel school" (8). This move suggests the essentially preservative, reproductive character of its efforts to reconcile "Scholarship and the Public Humanities." By leaving this hierarchy of scholarly labor, knowledge, and value unquestioned and undisturbed, the report fails to imagine scholars' public engagement as transformative of university-based knowledge, and more than an extension of service, teaching, or citizenship. It fails to recognize engagement as a collaborative research opportunity and the potential of engaged scholarship to produce co-created, self-reflective knowledge and

new formations of community in the process. As a result, "Scholarship and the Public Humanities" winds up maintaining the separation rather than facilitating the integration of the two subjects of its focus. Missing is a critical rethinking of the purposes and modalities of scholarship itself.

Here enters Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered*. Boyer historicizes contemporary definitions of scholarship that ally it first with the academy and second with the ascendancy and then domination of the research university model. His history of scholarship and the academy points to a paradox: as higher education expands, and as its internal diversity (in terms of class, race, and gender representation) has increased, definitions of scholarly productivity have narrowed to privilege peer-reviewed research publication over all other academic activities contributing to the generation and dissemination of knowledge. The logic of professionalization and specialization that drives this model creates new needs to mediate and integrate knowledge among fields and publics inside and outside the university. Centrally at stake for Boyer is the need to define teaching as integral to scholarship and scholarly productivity rather than apart from it. In the process he problematizes the distinction between the creation and dissemination of knowledge that operates in the ACLS report, highlighting instead the way that knowledge can be transformed through its public and cross-sectoral engagements.

Boyer argues for reconceptualizing scholarship to encourage and recognize multiple forms of knowledge creation and innovation within institutions of higher education. Specifically he aims to depose the hierarchical valuation of research, teaching, and service within the academy. In order to enable more possibility and flexibility in the modes of knowledge production, transformation, dissemination, and assessment, he proposes an alternative paradigm that establishes parity among four broad conceptual frames: the scholarship of discovery (what has been privileged as "research" in the modern university); the scholarship of teaching; the scholarship of integration (signaling interdisciplinary and translational needs and trends across professional and scholarly specializations); and the scholarship of application, conceived dynamically as an interactive, intersectoral project of "engagement."

While Boyer's report is not specific to the humanities—organizations representing constituencies from across the sciences, humanities, professions and arts have seized upon the study—its reconsideration of scholarship has particular significance to the work of the humanities in and beyond the academy. The dominant institutionalizations of research and reward have privileged scientific models and narrowed understandings of humanistic scholarship even within humanistic disciplines. This is an effect of the humanities' relation to sectors inside and outside the university and its own self-understanding. In contrast to the sciences and social sciences, the humanities have

defined themselves apart from state and industrial interests. The classical curriculum of the nineteenth-century humanities drew its cultural value from a precapitalist, aristocratic past and created deliberate distance from the pragmatic and vocational education of the industrial classes. The humanities were consequently encoded as disinterested, universal, and critical as opposed to technological, instrumental, and applied forms of knowledge. The present-day distance of the academic humanities from the practical questions, discussions, and investments currently shaping public policy and advanced technology are one result of this historical self-understanding of the humanities as advancing *disinterested* knowledge, even as this assumption has been displaced and revised by critical theory and the influence of Marxism, feminism, postcolonialism, and other recent projects challenging universalized knowledge claims. By contrast, the articulation of the social sciences to both government and business, and to community/activist engagements with such institutions, has facilitated different kinds of transits between academic study and applied practice (Clawson et al. 2007; Hale 2008).

In *Ivy and Industry: Business and the Making of the American University*, Christopher Newfield attempts a corrective account, charting the interdependent rise of modern corporations and modern universities, and the informing influence of the humanities. He suggests the duality of the university as a liberal institution that simultaneously promotes both economic development, largely through the agency of the sciences, and human development, largely through the interpretative and imaginative agency of the humanities. While the technical skills, scientific knowledge, and humanistic values imparted by mass higher education all inform the development and expansion of the professional managerial classes, scientific and technological research innovation are understood to have a more direct relationship to the productivity of an industrial society and post-industrial knowledge economy. The humanities, historically called upon to shape the sensibilities of aspiring middle classes and immigrants, fulfill a reproductive as opposed to productive function by comparison. The humanities' intellectual autonomy and critical relation to other forms of knowledge also signaled their increasingly marginal relationship to capitalist systems of production. In the modern research university, this division is reinforced (ideologically at least) by state and corporate investment in scientific research, where humanities divisions depend on teaching revenues from state allocations for students. The consequence has been declining fortunes and prestige within the university and society at large, even as the academic humanities have assimilated to the dominant professional norms of research productivity.

Reimagining Humanities Scholarship as Public Practice

Given the eccentric position of the humanities within the modern research university, Boyer's more expansive and inclusive definitions are useful to reimagining and reengaging humanities scholarship as a public practice. First, his notion of at least four mutually supportive forms of scholarship recognizes the relays between the creation and dissemination of knowledge. The traditional, hierarchical separation of research, teaching, and service elides praxis, the processes of mediation through which knowledge is communicated, tested, and reflectively reformed (Swarr and Nagar 2010). His definitions allow education and teaching, and not just publication, to be conceived as sites for producing and disseminating knowledge. Boyer's redefinitions of scholarship thus open avenues for the co-creation of knowledge with communities and sectors inside and outside the university—including students, their communities of origin, and future work sectors. They support well the integration of research, teaching, and public engagement activities, and their legitmation as serious intellectual work.

In many ways, these recognitions have been long in coming to the academic humanities, which have learned to be defensive regarding their research, in order not to be reduced to teaching. Cary Nelson marks these trends which have replaced tenure-track humanities appointments with part-time, contingent teaching positions. My own university makes the distinction between "funded" and "unfunded" research, suggesting the second-class citizenship status Nelson identifies with a grant-driven—as opposed to student-centered—accounting system, while Christopher Newfield highlights the differential treatment accorded faculty with extramural research grants in the wake of California's mandated furloughs and pay reductions for University of California faculty ("The Structure and Silence of the Cognitariat" 2010). When Nelson (AAUP) continues to "recommend the creation of research communities that embrace the dissemination of new knowledge in the classroom—at all post-secondary institutions—as a fundamental part of the research agenda that we can evaluate and reward," he is channeling Boyer's redefinition of scholarship.

In a 2005 contribution to *Profession*, entitled "Valuing the Humanities, Evaluating Scholarship," John Guillory proposes another supportive reformulation of serious work. Suggesting that the so-called "crisis of the humanities" is really a crisis of evaluation—of what counts, and can count, as scholarship—Guillory advances two arguments: "First, *that scholarship must be distinguished from the form of publication as product* and, second, *that the recognition of scholarship as product distorts the nature, scope, and value of scholarship*" (29, my emphasis). Significantly he redefines scholarship as "that which is *not* publication but making public" (32, my emphasis), and

thereby invites us to reimagine the forms and sites of that making. Where academic publications circulate and legitimate scholarship within narrow, self-referential paths, the classroom comprises one possible cross-site for testing, revising, and circulating that knowledge in a less disciplined, more public context, provided that students are conceived as public agents and not simply as pre-disciplinary subjects. Teaching moreover, may span many sites and sectors, formal and informal, in the university and outside it. Indeed, community-based teaching and service-learning programs forge pathways for this kind of scholarly praxis.

What I am suggesting is the need to rethink the pathways between research and teaching and their relation to the "paths of estrangement" Michael Warner suggests characterize public address and circulation. Guillory and Warner both note the nostalgia for an earlier public sphere that informs the figure of the public intellectual. Assuming that rational dialogue is the crucible of public opinion and that political efficacy consists of political position-taking in relation to a broad-based popular audience, this ideology of the public sphere fundamentally misrecognizes the ways that publics operate, not through a widespread culture of rational discussion, but through uptake, citation, and recharacterization in a field that is informal, intertextual, and multigeneric (Warner 2002). Further it misrecognizes the ways these fields are mediated by material as well as stylistic conditions of circulation.

This recognition has multiple implications for a scholarly practice of "making public," and indeed, scholarly practices that facilitate the making and reconstitution of publics. Warner himself suggests that "if intellectuals thought of themselves as involved in world-making projects, it is not clear that intellection would be more effective than, say, corporeally expressive performances" (147), pointing beyond the figure of the public intellectual as critic or pundit to a larger, associational field of "world-making" cultural work. Guillory, too, points beyond the figure of the public intellectual, the sphere of mass publicity, and the practice of political position-taking to argue for the need to make alliances across various sectors of intellectual labor. (And here we should remember Gramsci: all persons are situated intellectuals, though only some are accorded the social function of the traditional intellectual.) How might collaborations across sectors and communities build these new intellectual, cultural, and political alliances, circuits, and transfers? And were academic humanists to recognize themselves as one sector of intellectual, cultural work among many, what other skills and competencies might these world-making projects require of them?

When academic humanists think about their potential contributions to practical politics and public engagement, they frequently highlight critical skills capable of generating self-reflexivity and conceptual shifts among communities of practice. And yet, without other forms of collaboration and

institutional understanding, academic traditions of ideological critique and practices of political position-taking that refuse these actual entanglements may overlook or misapprehend so much context that they cannot do the work of opening viable alternatives for understanding or action. Taking up the position of outside expert, they miss the expertise of others. They miss their own opportunities for self-reflective, transformative learning; they forfeit inquiry.

Here I want to make two arguments. The first is for a *critical* public scholarship that thinks reflexively and imaginatively about the forms of publics and engagements. The intellectual resources of the humanities can bring a lot to this project. But—in my second argument—the humanities also need to engage pragmatically as well as critically. This requires reassessing the kinds of knowledge and skills they traffic in. Elsewhere I have argued that the discourse of "skills," often relegated within the academic humanities to the service sector of undergraduate language and literacy teaching, can facilitate cross-sectoral collaboration, and that academic humanists might begin by specifying the skills generalized and naturalized in "research, teaching, and service" as forms of "practiced knowledge," as opposed to area knowledge. Rearticulating these skills and their applications within other contexts, humanists create new transits and rearticulate the humanities to other forms of cultural work (Bartha 2009).

Organizations like *Imagining America* that promote public scholarship foreground the mutually organized collaborative project as a modality of engagement that yields new research and new relationships. This framing of public scholarship presses forward the question of research design, practice, and outcomes by asking the following questions: What and whom is knowledge for? How is it created, who develops its agendas, and who is recognized as an active agent in its creation? We can also ask, What do the humanities bring to community engagements and cross-sectoral partnerships? What changes in the conceptualization of the humanities and of scholarship in the process? What are the implications for the university, and for how we educate ourselves, our students, and others? If, as Eugene Rice suggests, academic identities have long been split between the cosmopolitan imaginary of the discipline or field, and the local grounding of a particular institution, the local articulations of such world-making cross-sectoral projects begin to rewrite that map by engaging other fields of practice and circulation. These organizations must also address the serious work of attuning institutions and disciplines to the scholarly value produced in and through such projects. *Imagining America*'s 2008 Tenure Team Report, *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Production and Tenure in the Engaged University* builds upon Boyer by arguing for "a continuum of scholarships" that includes public engagement and "a continuum of scholarly artifacts" pro-

duced about, for, and especially with specific publics and communities. It argues for expanding not only *what* counts as a scholarly artifact, but also *who* counts, broadening the definition of "peer" in the process and community of peer review.

Translational Work: American Sabor

An example may be helpful here. *American Sabor: Latinos in U.S. Popular Music* is a major museum exhibit developed through the collaboration of University of Washington faculty, staff, and graduate students together with a Seattle museum, the Experience Music Project/Science Fiction Museum and Hall of Fame (EMP-SFM), and radio station KEXP 90.3 FM. The multisensory interactive exhibit, which opened in Seattle in 2007, explores the contributions of Latino artists and communities to the development of American popular music and culture. Organized around five regional centers of concentrated musical activity—New York, Miami, San Antonio, Los Angeles, and San Francisco—the exhibit traces cultural migrations across genres and geographies by following the movements of people and sounds.

The exhibit, which is now traveling (currently receiving an average weekly attendance of 4400 in Austin) realizes the efforts of a curatorial team led by Jasen Emmons, EMP-SFM's Director of Curatorial Affairs, and UW faculty members Marisol Berrios-Miranda (Ethnomusicology and Latin American Studies), Shannon Dudley (Ethnomusicology), and Michelle Habell-Pallán (Women Studies), supported by graduate students (Rob Carroll and Francisco Orozco, both from Ethnomusicology, who are credited as associate curators), museum staff and contractors, as well as other supporting players, myself and the Simpson Center included. In a recent review of the exhibition for *American Quarterly*, entitled "Synesthetic Sabor: Translation and Popular Knowledge in American Sabor," Priscilla Peña Orvalle honors the "translational and collaborative methodology" that informs the exhibit by offering an account of the process, not just the product, of public scholarship, identifying this process as central to the exhibit's innovations, though not necessarily readable on its surface. She quite rightly names the intellectual challenge of the exhibit as "brokering concepts of space (regional/national), scholarship (academic/public) and representation (aural/visual)," and the intellectual labor of linguistic, stylistic, conceptual, and institutional translation involved in that brokering.

In the terms I've been mobilizing, the scholars had to learn new modes of address to bring their knowledge to bear in a museum context. In their writing and thinking, they had to move from the form of comprehensive (and

sometimes defensive) argumentation that inhabits the traditional twenty-five-page scholarly article to the delimited space allowed for museum wall text—150 words, halved again to allow for bilingual English and Spanish presentations—and still convey complex ideas and histories. The scholars were alive to criticism that might come from other scholars as well as from the particular communities—Los Angelenos, Tejanos, Nuyoricans, and others—whose cultural and social histories they sought to represent and who would engage the exhibit as it traveled. To avoid essentializing or reductive summary, they had to choose words with the condensed and allusive power of poetry, and learn to employ visual objects and material artifacts in their storytelling. Orvalle characterizes the resulting exhibit as "prismatic" and "intellectually and viscerally rich"—"an impressionistic series of lessons" about complex histories of colonization and transculturation conveyed through multiple modalities like listening modules, oral histories, and archival displays.

The museum and the radio station had expertise to lend in these other rhetorical forms, but they also made necessary adjustments to their professional practices and learned new ways of working, facilitating, and representing work in the process. Because scholarship is evaluated on individual terms and is deeply invested in authorship, the museum revised its custom of branding exhibits in its own name to credit the four curatorial leads instead. Both the museum and the radio station had to balance carefully familiar modes of address that would keep their constitutive audiences engaged as they incorporated new musical genres and scholarly content.

The results evinced the partners' investment in negotiating these issues of audience, diversity, community, and accessibility. The exhibition brought new populations into the museum for the first time and circulated scholarship to audiences unimaginable for a scholarly article: 375,000 in Seattle alone, before the exhibit began to tour nationally. At the same time, the significant challenges of collaborating across site-based knowledges engaged all partners in transformative learning experiences that yielded a range of institutional insights, expanded competencies, and new orientations.

Orvalle's focus on the methodology and process of collaboration, and her recognition that it is often elided in the evaluation of public scholarship, is important. Because my own work on that project figured in some of the interinstitutional translation, negotiation, and brokering, I can also say that much of the exhibit's collective labor and the cultural work that enables this kind of multilateral partnership doesn't necessarily translate as public scholarship. Because the culture, indeed the cult, of authorship reigns so strongly in the academy, and because scholarship indexes only a partial yield of such collaborations, it helps to think broadly about the human intelligence (intellectual, administrative, affective) and resources collaboration requires, the divergent systems that reward (and/or efface) them, and how further to repre-

sent the multiple values they produce.

However, when Orvalle writes that "For the guest curators of Sabor, the next challenge is to retranslate their public scholarship for the academy," I think again of Hall, and where academic humanists and academic institutions are prepared to recognize the "serious work" of scholarship across sites and sectors. Boyer intends the proposals of *Scholarship Reconsidered* to facilitate the academic legibility of such an exhibit *as* scholarship, an act of making and circulating knowledge in ways also that remake publics. The exhibit draws on original research—the scholarship of discovery—but also the scholarship of teaching applied to informal learning environments, the scholarship of integration in its interdisciplinary synthesis and selection, and the scholarship of application, or engagement with diverse communities and cultural institutions. The university is active but not centered in that knowledge-making. While the research that informs the exhibit may yet take other forms addressed to more academic audiences, to divide public scholarship from academic scholarship defeats this project of revising who and what can count as scholarly activity.

Lessons

This is one example among many others, notable for its scale, and also for the strongly parallel, vertically integrated logics organizing each of the partnering institutions. My experience at the Simpson Center has made me partner and witness to a range of cross-sectoral projects, including faculty-student media advocacy collaborations with the residents of a Tent City encampment and curriculum-centered collaborations with grassroots organizations working with girls identified as "at risk" by the juvenile justice system. These collaborations negotiate quite different power dynamics and agendas, and necessitate quite another set of adaptive skills, social networks, and contextual knowledges. While many of these exceed current academic training in the text- and archive-based humanities disciplines, the multiple sectors, disciplines, and professional experiences represented in and across the university mean that some of these capacities and resources for serious work exist here. So does the committed recognition among many scholars and practitioners at all levels of the institution that working across sites of practice, inside and outside the university, can yield new knowledge, transformed perspective, and greater social capacity.

My position also makes me privy to ever-evolving debates about what in the serious work of collaboration counts as "humanities" or as "scholarly research." My role as participant-observer/facilitator/administrative coordinator vis-à-vis these projects has taught me the necessity of working with

and against these paradigms of value. They have also taught me that the keywords my work site holds central will be articulated in different ways and very often in different terms at sites of practice beyond the discipline and the department. They have reinforced the value of skills over the construct of the expert. Collaboration across sectors catalyzes innovation and change—intellectual and social—by situating knowledge, challenging habitual frames for knowing, facilitating selectively adapted repertoires, and remaking site-specific practices. It requires the (collective) capacity to coordinate inquiry and activity, to mediate and negotiate, to engage personal and organizational differences and to sustain tensions around them; it requires the will to understand, to inquire, to make things work, and to change, which is to say an ability to implement knowledge in particular situations as well as to reflect upon it. Renewing the humanities through public engagement will require this humility, this curiosity, and this commitment. Assessing public scholarship—scholarship as public practice, undertaken with others and their interests—will require these larger contexts and frames of value.

NOTES

1. I use the term "intersectoral" to indicate work that travels among sectors inside and outside the university. In economics, "sectors" refer to the social organization of industry and activity (e.g., primary [resource extraction], secondary [manufacturing], tertiary [services], and quaternary [intellectual production] sectors); in common discourse, we refer to private (for-profit), public (state), non-profit and voluntary sectors. "Intersectoral" here subsumes and contextualizing the term "interdisciplinary" by specifying interdisciplinarity as one form of collaboration among university sectors, which can include academic and non-academic formations (e.g., student life and activities), some of which are deliberately oriented to facilitate cross-sectoral and intersectoral collaboration (outreach and extension, campus-community partnerships, humanities and service-learning centers, etc.).

2. Thanks here to Chandan Reddy for his remarks at the New Universities symposium session on "The Global University: Beyond Corporatization," 7 May 2010, University of Washington, Bothell.

WORKS CITED

American Council of Learned Societies. ACLS Occasional Paper No. 11, *National Task Force on Scholarship and the Public Humanities* (1990).

Bartha, Miriam. "Keyword: Skill." *Keywords for American Studies* @ http://keywords.nyupress.org, September 2009.

Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* [Princeton, N.J.]: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

Burawoy, Michael. "For Public Sociology." In *Public Sociology: Fifteen Eminent Sociologists Debate Politics and the Profession in the Twenty-first Century*, ed. Dan Clawson et al, 23-64. Berkeley: U of California P, 2007.

Calhoun, Craig. "Toward a More Public Social Science." Social Science Research Council (2004): 12-17. Accessed at http://www.ssrc.org/workspace/images/crm/new_publication_3/%7B0e949 a73-f451-de11-afac-001cc477ec70%7D.pdf, 9 May 2010.

——————. "Social Science for Public Knowledge." Social Science Research Council (2007): 1-31. Accessed at http://www.ssrc.org/workspace/images/crm/new_publication_3/%7B49173559-675f-de11-bd80-001cc477ec70%7 D.pdf, 9 May 2010.

Clawson, Dan et al, ed. *Public Sociology: Fifteen Eminent Sociologists Debate Politics and the Profession in the Twenty-first Century.* Berkeley: U of California P, 2007.

Consortium of Humanities Centers and Institutes website, www.chcinetwork.org. Accessed 16 April 2010.

Ellison, J., and T. K. Eatman. *Scholarship in public: Knowledge creation and tenure policy in the engaged university.* Syracuse, NY: Imagining America, 2008. http://www.imaginingamerica.org/IApdfs/TTI_REPORT%20FINAL%205. 2.08.pdf. Accessed 28 April 2010.

Guillory, John. "Valuing the Humanities, Evaluating Scholarship." *Profession* 2005: 28-38.

——————. "Literary Critics as Intellectuals: Class Analysis and the Crisis of the Humanities." In *Rethinking Class: Literary Studies and Social Formations*, ed.Wai Chee Dimock and Michael T. Gilmore, 107-149. New York: Columbia UP, 1994.

Hale, Charles. *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship.* Berkeley: U of California P, 2008.

Hall, Stuart. "The Emergence of Cultural Studies and the Crisis of the Humanities." *October* 53 (1990): 11-23.

Hong, Grace Kyungwon. "'The Future of Our Worlds': Black Feminism and the Politics of Knowledge in the University under Globalization." *Meridians* 8:2 (2008): 95-115.

Hunter, J. Paul. "Going Downtown: The Necessity—and Hazards—of Telling the Public about Humanities Research." Consortium of Humanities Centers and Institutes website, www.chcinetwork.org/about/library. Accessed 14 March 2010.

Klein, Julie Thompson. *Humanities, Culture, and Interdisciplinarity: The Changing American Academy.* Albany: State U of New York P, 2005.

Nelson, Cary. Symposium on Contemporary Challenges: "Will the Humanities Be Dehumanized?" *Liberal Education* 96:1 (Winter 2010).

Newfield, Christopher. *Ivy and Industry: Business and the Making of the American University, 1880-1980.* Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2003.

——————. "The Structure and Silence of the Cognitariat." EduFactory WebJournal (January 2010): 18.

——————. *Unmaking the Public University: The Forty-Year Assault on the Middle Class.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2008.

Ovalle, Priscilla Peña. "Synesthetic Sabor: Translation and Popular Knowledge in American Sabor." *American Quarterly* 61:4 (December 2009): 979-996.

Rice, R. Eugene. *Making a Place for the New American Scholar: Inquiry #1.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1996.

Rosenberg, Karen Esther, and Judith A. Howard. "Finding Feminist Sociology: A Review Essay." *Signs* 33:3 (2008): 675-696.

Sanchez, George. "An Interview with George Sanchez." *Imagining America Newsletter* 7 (2006): 11-14.

Swarr, Amanda Lock and Richa Nagar, "Introduction: Theorizing Transnational Feminist Praxis." In *Critical Transnational Feminist Praxis*, ed. Swarr and Nagar, 1-20. Albany: State U of New York P, 2010.

Warner, Michael. *Publics and Counterpublics.* New York: Zone Books, 2002.

For a Public Humanities

I met Javier when he walked onto the stage at the Brick Coffee House in Marysville, California, to read from an essay he had written. His essay had been inspired by a series of humanities scholar-led discussions at a local library about the *The Grapes of Wrath*. Javier said reading that novel changed his life. After discussing Steinbeck's classic, he saw his family as modern-day Joads and part of a larger human history of people who had migrated from one place to another. He also realized that he had to play an active role in his community, be informed, and speak out for what was right. Javier's story that evening reminded me of the many times I have heard how a biography, a film, a philosophy class or a visit to a library—in short, a humanities experience—transformed lives, opened doors, and gave people a glimpse of how they can help shape a better future and find the courage to pursue new goals. That evening in Marysville I felt a unique vibrancy and thoughtfulness as the humanities were brought to life by the community. Unfortunately, the humanities departments at the local colleges and universities were not involved. Why not?

My conversations with scholars convince me that they value community involvement in the abstract, but that there are few incentives or structures to lead them beyond the gates of academia. My experiences in Marysville moved me to consider ways of further engaging scholars and the general public. During recent months I met with scholars from the California Community Colleges, California State Universities, Stanford University, UC Davis, UCLA, and USC to talk with them about how the humanities contribute to our democracy. I was impressed by their support for the importance of critical thinking, the role of the imagination, and the knowledge of history as cornerstones to a healthy democracy. But I was also struck by the lack of—with few exceptions—engagement of scholars beyond the walls of the academy. That is, scholars conversed with one another, but rarely ventured outside the academy to participate in public humanities discussions. This lack of involvement with the general public must be addressed if we want to stop the decline of the humanities and the erosion of perspectives that are vital to a thriving democracy.

It seems that the humanities have been in crisis for some time. A recent survey by the Humanities Indicators Prototype, a new humanities database organized by the American Academy of Arts & Sciences, reports that the humanities' share of college degrees is less than half of what it was during the heyday of the mid-to-late '60s (Cohen). One of the keys to reversing this trend is to take our case to the American people. Scholars and institutions must reach beyond the walls of the academy into surrounding communities