

NATIONAL TASK FORCE ON SCHOLARSHIP AND THE PUBLIC HUMANITIES



American Council of Learned Societies
Federation of State Humanities Councils

ACLS OCCASIONAL PAPER, No. 11

ISSN 1041-536X

National Task Force on Scholarship and the Public Humanities

Making Connections
The Humanities, Culture, and Community

James Quay and James Veninga

Rapporteur's Summary
of the Wingspread Conference

Michael M. Sokal

Recommendations of the Task Force



American Council of Learned Societies
Federation of State Humanities Councils

ACLS OCCASIONAL PAPER, No. 11

ISSN 1041-536X

On October 5-7, 1989, representatives of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Federation of State Humanities Councils met at the Wingspread Conference Center in Racine, Wisconsin on the subject of "Scholarship and the Public Humanities." Thirty representatives from learned societies, universities, museums, media, and state humanities councils were invited to identify ways of strengthening ties between the scholar and the public.*

Two state council directors, James Quay of California and James Veninga of Texas, were each asked to give a keynote address providing "the big picture." They chose to give a single speech in order to illustrate their title — making connections — and that speech became the basis for much of the discussion that followed. The theme was basic enough — that scholars devote much of their professional lives to making connections, between their own time and other times, between their own lives and other lives. American society, they argued, badly needed such connections now and will need them even more in the future. Scholars and scholarly institutions need to connect with the American public in new and far-reaching ways.

The humanities, all participants acknowledged, are valuable for their own sake and the nation must support and sustain scholarship because that enriches the common fund of knowledge. Likewise, we must "make the walls separating scholar and society more permeable," in the words of one participant, so that knowledge becomes a public resource.

The ACLS and the Federation will implement recommendations coming from the Wingspread conference through a three-year program. A series of papers will be published and regional conferences will be held. A follow-up meeting to the Wingspread conference is also planned.

The goal of this joint effort is to strengthen connections between scholar and society, between colleges and universities and community organizations, and between the membership of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Federation of State Humanities Councils.

**Support for the meeting and for this publication was provided by The Johnson Foundation, The Pew Charitable Trusts, and The Joyce Foundation.*

Members
National Task Force on Scholarship
and the Public Humanities

Susan Ball, College Art Association
Marjorie Berlincourt, National Endowment for the Humanities
Ellsworth Brown, Chicago Historical Society
Phyllis Franklin, Modern Language Association
Kenneth Gladish, Indiana Humanities Council
Douglas Greenberg, American Council of Learned Societies
Jane Hood, Nebraska Humanities Council
Arnita Jones, Organization of American Historians
Jay Kaplan, New York Council for the Humanities
Stanley N. Katz, American Council of Learned Societies
Adrian Malone, Smithsonian Institution
Sheilah Mann, American Political Science Association
Sondra Myers, Governor's Office, Pennsylvania
Stephen Nissenbaum, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Ronald Perrin, University of Montana
Peggy Prenshaw, University of Southern Mississippi
James Quay, California Council on the Humanities
Dorothy Schwartz, Maine Humanities Council
Bruce Sievers, Walter and Elise Haas Fund, California
Estus Smith, Kettering Foundation, Ohio
Eugene Sterud, American Anthropological Association
Joan Hinde Stewart, North Carolina State University
Nancy Stevenson, Federation of State Humanities Councils
Victor Swenson, Vermont Humanities Council
Darwin Turner, University of Iowa
John Unrue, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Robert Vaughan, Virginia Foundation for the Humanities
James Veninga, Texas Committee for the Humanities
Richard Warch, Lawrence University
Jamil Zainaldin, Federation of State Humanities Councils

Making Connections The Humanities, Culture, and Community

*James Quay
and James Veninga*

Since first presented at the Wingspread Conference of the National Task Force on Scholarship and the Public Humanities, this paper has benefited from the comments of numerous readers. We are deeply grateful for ideas offered and suggestions made. We hope that this publication by the ACLS and the Federation of State Humanities Councils will stimulate additional ideas for connecting scholarship with the public life of the nation. We invite readers of the revised paper to write us: James Quay, California Council for the Humanities, 312 Sutter Street, Suite 601, San Francisco, California 94108; James Veninga, Texas Committee for the Humanities, 3809 South Second Street, Banister Place A, Austin, Texas 78704.

While humanists normally ask their audiences to consider the past as prologue, we ask our audience to consider the present as prologue. We ask you to imagine the conditions of American life in the twenty-first century and to describe a role for the humanities that addresses those conditions. In doing so, we ask you to see beyond the debates of the present hour, beyond the American Council of Learned Societies and the Federation of State Humanities Councils, beyond the Helms amendment and the size of the National Endowment for the Humanities' budget. From such a vantage point, we do not see an impending crisis in the humanities; rather, we can confidently assert that so long as there is a human future, the humanities will be a part of it, for both the subject and audience of the humanities must endure as long as humans endure. What is less clear is the connection between those of us who are professional humanists and the rest of American society.

© Copyright 1990
James Quay and James Veninga

Twenty years ago, Robert Hutchins proposed one possible connection in a book entitled *The Learning Society*. By that term, Hutchins meant a society whose primary goal was the intellectual development of its citizens. Such a society, he thought, would offer opportunities for education to every man and woman at every stage of their adult life. For Hutchins, Athens was the model: "In Athens, education was not a segregated activity, conducted for certain hours, in certain places, at a certain time of life. It was the aim of society. The city educated the man. The Athenian was educated by the culture, by *paideia*."

Were he writing today, Hutchins might not be so eager to embrace Athens as a model for the Learning Society. Feminist scholarship, for example, has taught us to consider more carefully the condition of Athenian women before we champion Athenian society as a model. Writing in 1968, Hutchins believed that machines would do for every American what slaves had done for the Athenians and argued that growing affluence, a dissolving class structure, and an increase in leisure time would combine to make life-long education every citizen's birthright. Twenty years later, we must consider all three of Hutchins' assumptions questionable: Americans in 1987 reported they had eight hours *less* leisure time each week than a decade before; children of the lower and middle classes face the prospect of living standards *below* those of their parents; and the existence of a permanent underclass points to a hardening rather than dissolving of class structure in this country.

The erosion of Hutchins' major assumptions is a caution to anyone projecting a future, but it does not invalidate his argument for a Learning Society. As a scholar and as an administrator, Hutchins knew well enough how much the rate of change had accelerated in this century. He argued that while investment in education is usually justified by promises of increased personal and national prosperity, an educational system's products cannot be known for twenty-five years, and neither national nor personal needs can be reliably predicted that far in advance. Therefore, Hutchins concluded, the Learning Society cannot simply offer a vocational training; it must offer an education, and the most practical education for people of all ages is the most theoretical one, an education informed by the wisdom of the past, an education informed by the humanities.

Some Twenty-First Century Trends

Regardless of whether or not conditions in the twenty-first century *favor* the creation of a Learning Society in this country, we argue that future conditions will *require* that ours be a Learning Society. To begin, let us suggest a few of the influences that promise to affect American culture into the next century.

1. Migrations of people across national borders

Unless a change in U.S. government policy severely restricts immigration, this country — and other modern industrial nations — will continue to attract immigrants. Recent immigration has included large numbers of Southeast Asians and Central Americans, but the demographic composition of immigration to this country will likely change as we move past the year 2000. Regardless of the immigrants' countries of origin, Americans will need to know more about people from cultures quite unlike their own. For political as well as for moral reasons, xenophobia and racial tension are not acceptable alternatives. Public school curricula and textbooks will have to change, and the leaders and workers in those institutions called upon to help the new immigrants settle in this country will have to be educated.

2. Continued population growth

The increase in population brings with it an increase in pressure on natural resources and land, igniting conflicts between the mandates of economic growth and the desire for environmental protection. Ethical questions regarding access to resources are bound to grow as pressure on those resources intensifies. In addition, the increasing population will shape political and social institutions. The formats and forums of public discourse in a large democracy continue to be shaped by the need of the country's aspiring leaders to reach large audiences. The dialogue and debates occasionally found in town meetings may be viable options for small New England towns, but increasingly the monologue of television ads and direct mail campaigns defines the modern American election. At least since the nineteenth century, Americans have lived in an age of mass politics. Their democratic continuation demands both powerful media and citizen capacity to criticize them.

3. Continued development and deployment of information technologies

The amount, storage, delivery, and retrieval of information will continue to grow. Philosopher Hubert Dreyfus has shown how the design of the latest artificial intelligence machines influences theories of human knowing and being. As computers become more widely available and more sophisticated, their languages and the conceptions upon which those languages are based will spread from the hacker subculture into popular culture. The sheer volume of information will continue to require that specialists master particular areas and that generalists discern large patterns. But Americans will need new ways to see forests instead of trees, to turn information into knowledge, knowledge into wisdom. Computer technology and telecommunications may nourish networks while communities wither. Americans may find it easier to communicate with a like-minded colleague in a distant city than talk with a contrary neighbor.

4. Media and communications

The power of the media to shape culture is undisputed. Video cassette recorders have changed American viewing habits in the last ten years, and cable television has uncoupled Americans from broadcast networks. Media outlets multiply, but their ownership is concentrated into fewer hands. Some of us lament the superficial content of much broadcast programming, but also the fact that such programming is often the only common culture that many Americans can discuss.

Literacies Old and New

Looking at these four trends, we can discern the need for at least three literacies in the twenty-first century — literacies informed by the humanities.

The first is a need for **multicultural literacy** — the need for Americans to understand more about inhabitants of and immigrants to this country and the many cultures from which they come. In a provocative essay, "How to Be A North American," Alasdair MacIntyre writes that every society enacts its own history as a more or less coherent dramatic

narrative, inviting its citizens to participate in national life by considering themselves both as characters in that story and as authors of it. Members of a nation of immigrants must come to terms with *two* interdependent dramatic narratives: that of the American people and that of the particular ethnic group to which they belong. As MacIntyre says:

If we do not recover and identify with the particularities of our own community — North American Indian, Spanish Catholic, New England Protestant, European Jew, Irish, Black African, Japanese, and a host of others — then we shall lose what it is that we have to contribute to the common culture. We shall have nothing to bring, nothing to give. But if each of us dwells too much, or even exclusively, upon his or her own ethnic particularity, then we are in danger of fragmenting or even destroying the common life.

MacIntyre is mindful of the complexity of this task and recommends that Americans learn not only the stories of other peoples but also the same stories from rival perspectives; for example, the story of the Little Big Horn from the perspective of the U.S. Army and the Lakota. One of the tasks of a scholar is to recover, analyze, and transmit these stories, including stories found in books that have never been called great and those never found in books at all — stories of women, slaves, and working-class people. If this task is limited to the confines of a single required college course, like Stanford University's Western Cultures course, for example, the breadth of MacIntyre's sophisticated task is reduced to a simplistic choice — *either* we preserve the common culture through a curriculum of great books *or* we expand the common culture through texts reflecting multicultural diversity.

MacIntyre knows that multicultural literacy is not accomplished in required courses but achieved over a lifetime. He recommends a program of adult reading that will require scholars to ask not only what books Americans should read at age twenty, but at age thirty, fifty, and seventy. Hutchins did not foresee the need for multicultural literacy, but in the twenty-first century, it is part of the mandate for a Learning Society.

A second literacy is **civic literacy** — the need of Americans to know about their government, its history, and the political principles

on which it is based. The need for this literacy is as old as American democracy itself. Since it was Thomas Jefferson who wrote so compellingly of the need for an educated citizenry if American democracy were to flourish, it is fitting that a student of Jefferson should restate Jefferson's argument today. In a 1987 report entitled *The Humanities and the American Promise*, Merrill Peterson wrote that the most important public mission of the humanities is improvement of the quality of civic discourse.

Peterson argues that in a democracy, with government deriving its authority from the will of the people, a primary index of civic vitality is the vigor and quality of public discussion and debate. Effective participation in this discussion is made possible not only by guarantees of political liberty, but also by the education of citizens in ways that strengthen and encourage their responsible involvement. All the trends mentioned above have the potential to impair the participation of Americans in the democratic process. Young native-born Americans and immigrants from nations with quite different traditions need the civic education of which Peterson speaks. We have already mentioned ways in which a large population tends to turn civic discourse from dialogue to monologue. Wed to the broadcast media, the modern electoral process creates a new form of demagoguery — thirty-second sound bites and one-minute television spots. United with the new information technology, electronic democracy turns to focus groups and instant polling. Americans in the twenty-first century will need heavy doses of two scholarly virtues — the faculty of critical reasoning and the time to reflect and discuss — if democratic culture is to prosper.

The third literacy is more difficult to label — we are going to call it **community literacy** — and here too we offer a suggestive text, Robert Bellah's recent lecture, "The Humanities and the Survival of Community." For Bellah, communities are defined by common moral understandings and the necessity to reach workable compromises when agreement about those understandings fails, and he finds the humanities, as the disciplines most intimately concerned with cultural heritage, indispensable to thinking and discussion of common moral understandings.

Bellah and others see community as endangered in America. Let us illustrate the danger with a California example. In 1988, the Council

sponsored a conference on “Cultures in Transition: Immigration in the Central Valley” in Fresno, a city of 300,000 in the largely agricultural San Joaquin Valley. A panel discussion of immigration included representatives from the Central Valley’s latest immigrants: Cambodians, Vietnamese, and Lao. Their stories were filled with the grief of leaving one’s native land, the difficult adjustments to an alien culture, and the sometimes hostile reception from their new American neighbors, not to mention the generational tensions created by the fact that children adapt so much faster to the new culture than their parents do.

A fourth panel member, a rabbi, seemed out of place at first but his topic was not — the difficulty of keeping his community together. For Jews in America, he said, community was threatened not by oppression but by freedom. Borrowing a phrase of Walter Lippmann’s, the Jewish community was being eroded by what he called “the acids of modernity.” It was soon clear that those same acids were eroding all communities. Both broadcast television and contemporary mobility threaten the connections to place that bind communities together. Those connections can sometimes be constricting, and we know that the broadcast television’s window to the world can be liberating and the opportunity to leave one’s home can be exhilarating. But these days, we increasingly have the sense that our communal life is out of balance: we need less acid and more base. The threat of the acids of modernity may be the one thing that all ethnic communities share.

Public Service Scholarship

So far we have spent all our time talking about trends and literacies and nothing about scholarship and the public humanities, but we hope the connection is not difficult to see. All too often, the terms “scholarship” and “public humanities” stand in opposition, with scholarship considered the equivalent of “private” or “academic” humanities. We think it more useful and more accurate to consider scholarship and the public humanities not as two distinct spheres but as parts of a single process, the process of taking private insight, testing it, and turning it into public knowledge.

The humanities scholar is granted time for reflection and research, often supported by public funds. She uses this time to journey to and

extend the borders of what is known, but even closeted in her office, with only a keyboard for company, she does not travel alone, for she takes with her methods and insights given to her by teachers and colleagues she respects. As many acknowledgments in scholarly books demonstrate, scholars read their manuscripts to spouses, friends, colleagues, and editors. They read them at professional gatherings and formal lectures. They reshape them based on the response they receive, and then they publish them. *Publication* is the goal.

From one point of view, this part of the process is working very well. An unprecedented number of scholars are doing research and publishing articles in an ever-increasing number of journals. The quantity of scholarly books published grows yearly. One of the reasons for this abundance is that it is driven by a reward system that demands published articles and books as proof of intellectual vitality and as justification for professional advancement. The process has its critics. In *Humanities in America*, Lynne Cheney observes that scholarly specialization has narrowed and deepened as the number of scholars has increased, and that “as specialization becomes ever narrower, the humanities tend to lose their significance and centrality.” In *The Last Intellectuals*, Russell Jacoby believes that the increase in the number of academically-oriented scholars has meant a loss in the number of publicly-oriented intellectuals, and Wayne Booth, in an essay titled “The Scholar in Society,” confesses that “in every field but my own, I find myself ready to ask a simple and nasty question: ‘Just how many scholars of that kind does a society *need*?’”

Privately, many scholars, including the authors of *Speaking for the Humanities*, concede and lament the preciousness and obscurity of some scholarship, but they write that “the recommendation in *Humanities in America* that ‘to counter the excess of specialization . . . those who fund, publish, and evaluate research should encourage work of general significance’ ignores the fact that general significance only develops from specialized and particularized research.” Fair enough. But how is this development to occur? The present system is geared to reward those who generate specialized and particularized research, but who rewards those who carry the knowledge the next step toward the public? Our contention is that the process of turning private insight to public knowledge breaks down at this point.

Wayne Booth notes that America has a history of chautauquas and lyceums and college lecture series and literary journalism, what he called *haute vulgarisation*. “The tradition is not dead,” he wrote in 1981, “but I have the impression that it is pursued these days more vigorously among scientists than among humanists. Where is the Lewis Thomas of literary critics? Where is the *Scientific American* among our journals of literary study?”

The institutions dedicated to preserving this tradition are state humanities councils, historical societies, museums, and libraries, what Lynne Cheney calls “the parallel school.” These institutions are funded by government agencies, private donors, and user fees. They’re doing better in some areas than others, but they’re in place. We don’t need a new set of institutions to complete the circuit. These institutions frequently bring scholarly knowledge to the public. The most direct way is to bring the scholar herself before a public audience. State humanities councils have been doing this for nearly twenty years now and have many successes to their credit, but there is something *ad hoc* about this process.

We need a more systematic way of locating public questions and problems and a more systematic way of surveying the scholarly literature. We need more people in the middle to provide connections. We need more scholars willing and able to relate their disciplines to timely public issues and concerns. We need more scholars able to survey scholarly literature and to interpret the discoveries in a public vein. We are not saying that we need to stop funding the kinds of scholarship being pursued today. What we are saying is that we need an additional kind of scholarship — public service scholarship — that is influenced by and for the benefit of the wider public.

This new scholarship is socially valuable and needs to be respected and rewarded as such. Each of the three scholars cited — MacIntyre, Peterson, and Bellah — brought to bear upon a present and future need his study of the past. The essays cited are examples of the kind of scholarship we advocate, scholarship that addresses important issues of public culture. Not every scholar can do this scholarship. Not every scholar needs to. But we think this work is as critical to building the Learning Society we need as the pioneering work done by the scholar at the margins.

Late last year, when the California Council was updating its scholars file, it sent out a brief questionnaire asking scholars why they participated in public humanities projects, and what benefit they had derived from such participation. Over two-hundred scholars have returned the questionnaire, and though the Council cannot claim that the percentages reported below are representative of the professoriate nationally, it does think the weighting of the responses is significant. The sample is not skewed in favor of scholars involved in public programs, incidentally; about half of the respondents had never participated in a public humanities program, though all would be willing to do so.

Of those who had, ninety-eight percent said their participation was an extension of their responsibilities as teachers, ninety-six percent said it was an extension of their responsibilities as scholars, and ninety-four percent said it was an extension of their responsibilities as citizens. Very few — less than one in six — saw participation as a distraction from either their scholarship or their teaching. Seventy-two percent said participation in public projects had influenced their scholarship positively and eighty-two percent said it had influenced their teaching positively. Not one respondent thought it influenced their teaching negatively. Yet three out of four scholars reported that their participation in humanities projects for the public had had no influence on promotion and tenure decisions.

One might expect this to be true at institutions where a premium is put on research, but in this sample, the reverse was true. Sixty percent of professors at the University of California said it had not influenced their promotion, as did two-thirds of California State University professors, eighty percent of private college professors, and ninety-four percent at community colleges. We have two reactions to these statistics: dismay and admiration. Dismay that colleges and universities tend not to recognize in promotion and tenure decisions the service being performed by public-spirited professors, and admiration that so many scholars persist in lending their time and expertise to public humanities projects despite the lack of formal professional reward.

The alternative to making connections between scholars and the public is the perpetuation of mutual suspicion and hostility and the continuation of cultural polarization, the familiar split between “town” and “gown” and “low” and “high” culture. Those of us working with

state humanities councils often find ourselves fighting two recalcitrant stereotypes: those of the remote, condescending pedant and the anti-intellectual citizen. Our task is to bring the scholar and citizen together on matters of mutual interest and concern. When we move beyond the stereotypes, when we initiate programs on important matters, we find plenty of room for creative interaction.

We all know where the public tends to get its information: broadcast media, mostly television, followed by newspapers and magazines. There may be other sources of information — one's co-workers, friends, parents. But where do Americans get their *knowledge*? Where do they find knowledge that integrates information into broader contexts of value, time, and place? In a Learning Society, scholars would help supply this knowledge.

And we all know the scholar's comfort with what A. Bartlett Giamatti called the "free and ordered space" of the university, with the principle of intellectual freedom, with the opportunity to pursue any thought deemed worth pursuing. But where do scholars go to test the importance of their ideas to the body politic? Where beside the classroom do they carry out their responsibility as scholar-citizens? In a Learning Society, the public would help provide this arena.

Culture and Monoculture

In *Habits of the Heart*, Robert Bellah wrote that "cultures are dramatic conversations about things that matter to their participants." By this definition, American culture is created in part when scholars publish their research before their colleagues. It is also created in part when the public's questions meet the scholar's research and when the public's opinions meet the scholar's questions. If scholars are not encouraged and rewarded for interacting with the public, then the public will tend to get its knowledge primarily from broadcast media, while the scholar will tend to write without his fellow citizen in mind.

In academic circles, we currently hear debate about the relation of the dominant culture to minority cultures in the curriculum, but it is a mistake to define the dominant culture as the culture of dead European white males. The dominant culture is not the culture of Plato,

Kant, Hume, and other luminaries of the Western tradition, but rather, the commercial consumer culture — the monoculture. It might be better called the anticulture, for it works to destroy authentic culture by frequently substituting stimulation for engagement, entertainment for reflection, stars for heroes, and private opinions for public dialogue. It invades our homes via television and radio, inhabiting space that could be occupied by books, stories of one's neighbors and family, and dialogue on important concerns. As Wendell Berry observed sadly in his essay, "The Work of Local Culture," most of his neighbors, who once spent their evenings talking to one another, "now sit until bedtime, watching TV, submitting every few minutes to a sales talk. The message of both the TV programs and the sales talks is that the watchers should spend whatever is necessary to be like everybody else."

Instead of multicultural literacy, the monoculture tends to give us representations of non-whites as tokens or exotics. Instead of civic literacy, the monoculture tends to give us radio and television talk shows on topics of momentary interest. Instead of community literacy, the monoculture tends to give us southern California lifestyle and voyeurism via satellite dish. Instead of engagement, the monoculture tends to give us entertainment.

The monoculture is driven by the authority of demand, translated into ratings. Even when they appear to offer information or knowledge, as Neil Postman has demonstrated, the media really offer us only amusement. They must deliver excitement and the best way to do this is through sex and violence. The images they offer have lovely surfaces but little depth. They offer debates — which can be as exciting as prizefights — but no dialogue — which requires time and trust. Our obligation as humanists, then, is to counter the negative aspects of the monoculture. The texts of the humanities, their tradition of critical reflection and dialogue, their ability to convey compelling stories and real issues, make possible the civic conversation upon which community depends. Without the connecting impulse of the humanities, the pursuit is crippled beyond repair.

Questions for the Cultural Conversation

If the threat is thus defined, the challenge to us is to help foster an improved and expanded cultural conversation. The starting point is for us to listen to our fellow citizens, to take into account their deeply-felt questions and concerns, and to find ways to bring humanistic learning to bear on those questions and concerns. We must, as scholars concerned with culture, as proponents of public service scholarship, make our criticism of the monoculture part of the new civic conversation.

We emphasize again that not all scholars need to do this. Both the scholar's and the public's quest for knowledge extends beyond civic issues and concerns, beyond immediate and contemporary social and cultural problems. Public programs should explore the full range of human experience and thought, but we do need more public service scholarship that connects with the American public on deeply-held concerns. What direction might such scholarship take?

We have identified six major questions that we believe are of genuine concern to the public. We recognize that many scholars are currently at work on more manageable, more specialized aspects of these large questions. By offering them here in their stark public formulation, we hope to remind scholars that simple, direct, compelling, and often enduring questions are the starting point of their own inquiries, and to suggest that a return to such questions can be useful to the scholar as well as to the public.

Can the earth be saved?

Although the threat of nuclear annihilation is still with us, surprising developments in Soviet-American relations and in Eastern European politics have renewed public confidence in the human ability to control weapons of mass destruction. But as one threat to human survival appears to wane, another has emerged — that of preserving the environment so that life on this planet can continue. Growing public recognition of the seriousness of the problems we face has led to significant national and international initiatives to preserve the environment. Such efforts will most likely intensify in the years ahead.

Some think that corrective action will be too little and too late. They predict water shortages, smog alerts in our major cities, power blackouts, more oil spills, the death of the oceans, rivers, and lakes, the continued warming of the planet, nuclear waste dumped indiscriminately, the extinction of animal species at a staggering rate, and the collapse of entire civilizations. Others believe that, because we are aware of the challenge, we can act to prevent these catastrophes. If so, the cost will be extraordinarily high, not only in dollars but also in terms of personal and national sacrifice. We may have to accept controls over our natural resources in ways that we cannot now imagine, including water and energy fuels. Such controls may affect what we eat, how we live, how frequently we will be allowed to use remaining recreational land, how we move from one city to another, from home to work, the materials with which we build our homes and office buildings, how we stay warm in the winter and cool in the summer.

Environmental issues will dominate life in the twenty-first century. The interested public knows that we will be forced to respond to these issues, and to do that, we will need to understand them fully. Ultimately, these issues will be dealt with both privately, in how we live, and publicly, in the policies that we as a people encourage or discourage, pay for or don't pay for. Satisfactory resolution of the issues will depend upon increased citizen understanding of the cultural, economic, and historical forces that have contributed to our environmental crisis as well as upon increased citizen understanding of the ethical dimensions of the crisis and of proposed solutions. Issues of the environment should be a central concern of public service scholarship in the decade ahead.

What is America?

As we prepare for the global challenges of the twenty-first century, we should not underestimate the public's interest in the aims and values of American civilization. Issues related to our national identity have been, of course, at the center of our cultural conversation since the founding of the Republic. But even as the rejection of communism in Eastern Europe is hailed as a vindication of "American" values, problems here at home are casting troubling shadows on those values.

Widespread use of drugs, violence on our streets and in our homes, the crisis confronting our courts and prison systems, make us ask: What's wrong with America?

Frequent outbursts of racial violence, continued evidence of racial prejudice, expressions of religious bigotry, raise serious questions about the American character.

Chronic poverty, hunger, and homelessness in our midst make us question how committed we are to the ideal of equal opportunity and how much compassion we have for our fellow citizens.

The continued growth of impenetrable bureaucracies in government and business undermine our notions of personal freedom and self-government.

The growth of minority populations and the weakening of traditional majority culture prevent the making of easy connections between those cultures that contributed to the founding of the Republic and those that will shape our lives in the next century.

These and many other characteristics of contemporary American society lead to provocative and challenging questions about the aims of American civilization and the future of the United States. The public wants to know what the nation stands for, what it values, what its goals are, and where it is headed. What is America, and what does it mean to be an American?

We see signs that Americans are eager to discuss substantive issues related to American identity and values. Last year, Frances Moore Lappe published *Rediscovering America's Values*, a book in which alternating conservative and progressive voices debate their respective views of freedom and human value. Public response has encouraged the author to create "Project Public Life" to provide groups who want to continue the discussion of American values begun in the book with the means to do so. Teachers of the humanities can make invaluable contributions to such efforts through public service scholarship, helping the public understand more fully the historical and ethical dimensions of what are thought to be uniquely American values.

Can our system of education work?

Many voices of education reform, such as those heard at last year's Presidential Education Summit with the Governors, have based their arguments on the need to keep this nation economically competitive. Other proponents of reform, looking deeper, have argued that our society needs educated citizens who understand the world about them, citizens who are in touch with our nation's history and culture, citizens who can exercise their public responsibilities, citizens who can have the skills to deal with the tough public issues that confront the nation.

At state and local levels, citizen concern over our educational institutions often tends to focus on more immediate questions. Will our children receive from schools the kind of education that will ensure employment? Will we be able to send our children to college? Will skyrocketing costs coupled with diminishing financial aid mean that thousands of talented youngsters will be denied the opportunity to go to college? If so, what will happen to these young people, many of whom are members of minority groups? Will our children be adequately prepared for all the challenges that will come their way in the decades ahead?

Unfortunately, much of the present debate surrounding education reform has failed to acknowledge the many accomplishments of American education in the twentieth century, including the opening of doors for minorities and the underprivileged. To ask the question "Can our education system work?" is, of course, to also ask about quality education — about the curriculum, textbooks, and the preparation of teachers and faculty. But, just as importantly, it is also to ask whether or not this nation is committed to ensuring access to quality education for all qualified students.

One of the most important education issues facing the nation is whether or not we build on this record of accomplishment or allow the doors of education to close on many students. We must ask tough questions about high minority dropout rates in our schools and colleges, about the adequacy of student financial aid through governmental and private sources, about the extent and effectiveness of remedial education and student counseling programs, and about funding priori-

ties. Central to equal opportunity is an education system that allows all citizens to achieve their potential.

Education issues brought into the public arena demand the best insights of public service scholarship. The monoculture provides little insight into these difficult issues. Citizens need and want to learn more about the historical, cultural, political, economic, and ethical dimensions of those issues facing American education.

Can we get along with other nations?

For most Americans, the world has become the “global village” that Marshall McLuhan wrote about nearly two decades ago. Modern technology, especially television, breaks down insularity. As the world gets smaller, communication between peoples increases. International communication now takes place daily among tens of thousands of citizens, in board rooms, market places, museums, and libraries, through teleconferences, telephones, and fax machines.

Citizens sense that what happens in other nations can have a profound impact on their nation and their lives. They sense that the jobs that they and their children will have in the decades ahead will be increasingly tied to the development of a single world economy with closely linked worldwide economic institutions. Famine in Africa, the closing of borders in China, the opening of borders in Eastern Europe, the level of production of remaining oil in the Middle East, Third-World default of loans from developed nations, free trade among nations of the European Economic Community — these and many other developments have important consequences for our economy here in the United States.

Likewise, citizens sense in new ways that political instability in one region of the world may have grave implications for international relations. They are aware of the potential impact of nationalistic fervor, of sweeping social and political revolutions. They see that Third-World nations can paralyze developed nations through terrorism and nuclear blackmail.

Citizens want to know what the prospects are. Will we be able to get along with other nations? What will the threats be?

Increased emphasis must be placed in our public service scholarship on understanding those nations and cultures whose futures bear so much on ours. Citizens want to know more about changes in the Soviet Union, about developments in Eastern Europe, about the history, culture, and problems of Central America, about the cultures and economic rise of nations in the Far East, about cultural and political conflict in Africa. We have an obligation to find new ways of expanding and enriching the public's understanding of other nations and cultures.

Can we control technology?

Some scholars of the history of science, including Jacques Ellul, have proposed that modern technology is literally driving culture. That thought has weaved its way into public consciousness with the result that citizens sense the extent to which technology may be controlling us rather than the other way around.

To argue that technology is driving culture is to acknowledge two basic facts: that we often simply do not know the long-term consequences to society of a particular technology until the technology is in place for many years, and that we deal with ethical implications only *after* the emplacement of particular technologies.

We are still coming to terms with the unforeseen effects of older technologies, including those involving nuclear power. We are less clear about the consequences of newer technologies, especially in biology and medicine. Implanted organs give life to many, but lead to shortages and could lead to black markets for donor organs. Drugs that expand the life span might provide years of happy retirement living, but raise serious questions about how society will pay for this increased longevity. The mass-administration of contraceptive agents might help to control the world's population explosion, but in the wrong hands, they could be used to subjugate whole nations and peoples.

Our challenge, wrote Willis S. Harman in 1976, is this: "Now that man has developed consummate skill in technology — the art of how to do things — can he develop equal ability to choose wisely which things are worth doing?"

Citizens are worried that these issues of technology will be left to the experts. They are concerned by the growing gap between technol-

ical development and human values and by the unforeseen consequences of technology on society and culture. As proponents of public service scholarship, we must encourage our fellow humanists to take on these issues and to connect with the public on the historical, cultural, and ethical dimensions of old and new technologies.

Can we be happy?

This question, which holds a special place in Western civilization, is as relevant for Americans today as it was at the beginning of the Republic. The times are different though, and the threats to personal happiness may be different from what they were before.

Our pursuit of happiness has in large part been shaped by that dominant trait of the American character, radical individualism, and the accompanying quest for personal economic success.

Throughout our nation's history, this pursuit has been beyond the grasp of millions of citizens. If one were born black rather than white, female rather than male, and from the lower rather than the middle or upper class, the odds against achieving material success were long. For those Americans of today who are trapped in poverty, who are unemployed or underemployed, lost in urban housing projects or rural settlements, often ill and frightened, the odds are also overwhelming.

But even for those who achieve economically, those who find the American dream to be alive, happiness often appears elusive. Marriages dissolve and families break up. Stock markets crash. Freeways and blood vessels clog. Wives are battered and children are abused. Deals sour and bosses fire. In what does happiness consist?

Of course the founding fathers did not answer this question for us. The pursuit of happiness is open-ended and Americans, often discontented with the shallow images of success and power provided by the monoculture, are eager to know what happiness might be and what endeavors might contribute to personal fulfillment and accomplishment. Many of the symptoms of present-day unhappiness, from positive endeavors like self-help groups to negative developments like drug addiction, tell us that we feel hollow inside, that we want something more, that the pursuit of happiness at the dawn of the twenty-first century may necessitate dramatic and far-reaching changes in our culture.

Public service scholarship could make a significant contribution to the nation by helping the public understand this contemporary hollowness, by charting the history of our unhappiness, by documenting the historical and cultural influences shaping our quests, by identifying and interpreting the happiness that we do find, by locating alternative understandings of happiness, by relating individual pursuits to collective pursuits. Once again an extraordinary opportunity exists for connecting scholarship with a genuine public concern.

Institutional Connections

Now we must ask a difficult question: How can a deeper, more inclusive cultural conversation that draws upon far more extensive public service scholarship take place? And how can this take place against the background of the powerful monoculture?

Perhaps the long-sought revitalization of public schooling in the nation, as well as the refocusing of undergraduate education, will occur when we recognize more fully the connections that must be made between formal education and the need for new literacies and genuine cultural conversation. No single event could be of more importance to the furtherance of cultural conversation than the development and implementation of curricula whose priorities include familiarizing students with the most important questions facing the nation, curricula that benefit from public service scholarship.

But reform of college curricula is not enough. If America is to be a Learning Society, if American culture is to be a conversation about what matters, opportunities for informal education and cultural conversation must be created. For this reason, the strength and vitality of all those institutions that comprise the parallel school matter greatly.

The improvement of American cultural conversation is the most important task of the humanities community in the last decade of this century. The recognition of this task would have enormous impact on the life of the humanities, inside and outside of the academy. New interest in public service scholarship would lead to new institutional connections of great importance. While it is difficult to talk about specific connections that might flow from the recognition of this important and demanding task, we offer the following prospects.

1. Public involvement in university life

Public participation in college and university life would be increased as new liaisons between the academy and the community are established. One can imagine advisory committees for newly organized programs that include public representatives to discuss connections between our cultural conversation and undergraduate curricula and between our cultural conversation and research in the humanities. One can imagine short-term and adjunct appointments to universities of persons in various professions and walks of life, individuals whose knowledge or experience lend depth and practicality to curricula. One can envision advisors for students from outside as well as inside the university.

2. Academic involvement in public life

With increasing interest expressed by the public and private sectors in this cultural conversation and the questions central to it, it is likely that humanities scholars would increasingly be called upon to provide valuable service outside the university. To respond to public questions, to stimulate discussion among employees, to offer perspectives and tentative answers, to address serious policy and ethical questions, to provide historical and cultural background, scholars would be brought in as consultants, writers, discussion leaders, critics. In doing so, the humanities community would be assuming a role in American society that has been played for a number of decades now by the scientific community, although on entirely different kinds of issues and questions.

3. Multidisciplinary programs

The central questions focusing public service scholarship and enhancing our civic conversation would become the driving force behind curricular development in our schools and universities. Since these questions cannot be formulated or answered in bits and pieces drawn from traditional disciplines, we envision the rise of new and far-reaching multidisciplinary courses and programs. Public school curricula as well as undergraduate curricula would be organized without much regard for traditional departmental lines. Courses connecting the humanities with the sciences, literature with history, foreign languages with foreign culture study, technology with ethics, philosophy with

sociology and psychology, would be primary characteristics of the new curriculum.

4. University-school collaboration

Renewed recognition of the partnership that should exist between public school systems and institutions of higher education would occur. Hundreds of important experiments connecting colleges and universities with our public schools would follow. Many partnership models that already exist — scholars in the schools, university-sponsored summer seminars for public school teachers, in-service school programs focusing on new scholarship — would be replicated throughout the nation.

5. Growth of the parallel school

With increased attention paid to the extent and quality of American cultural conversation, the institutions that comprise the parallel school would continue to grow. Museums and public libraries would begin to get a greater share of charitable dollars and tax support. With renewed interest in community, regional, and ethnic history, historical societies would prosper. The publishing industry would continue to grow as citizens read more and more. The media industry, responding to public pressure to provide more in-depth coverage, would increasingly turn to scholars for insight, expertise, and program planning. Scholars would develop new listening and research skills in understanding citizen concerns. State governments would recognize the vitally important role played by state humanities councils through new appropriations. Federal support for these institutions would also grow, as the Congress recognizes the indispensable role played by the humanities in enriching our nation's cultural conversation through public service scholarship.

6. Growth of public humanities centers

One of the most remarkable developments in the humanities in the past decade has been the founding of public humanities centers and institutes. Leadership for these institutions has come from inside as well as outside the academy. The lectures, conferences, symposia, television documentaries, and publications already produced by several of these centers have reached large national audiences, as seen, for instance, in the work of the Institute for the Humanities at Salado, Texas on the universal problem of evil. As new connections are made between

the humanities, public service scholarship, and cultural conversation, new centers would be established throughout the nation and increasing attention would be paid by existing centers to public issues.

7. Telecommunications

New communication technologies hold enormous potential as outlets for public service scholarship and as important resources for cultural conversation. In small high schools across the nation, in tiny villages and rural areas, students now can have access, through satellite television, to courses that would otherwise only be available in large, affluent urban districts — courses in Russian literature, technology and human values, and American women's history. A world-renown university professor of medical ethics can provide guest lectures to college classes thousands of miles away from her campus. Public libraries, through satellite television, can offer new programs that focus on the essential questions of our time for adult audiences. Conversation between instructor and students, already possible, will be common in the decade ahead. The growth of public service scholarship would lead to increasing use of these technologies on behalf of the humanities.

8. A new reward system

The weight given to traditional standards for university promotion — scholarship, teaching, public service — would change. Colleges and universities, including our major research institutions, would strive for more flexible systems that would recognize the differing contributions that scholars make to institutions, to the life of learning, and to the wider society. Increased recognition would be given for university curriculum development, for collaboration with public schools on curricular concerns, for undergraduate teaching, and, most certainly, for public service scholarship. One of the biggest inhibitors of public service scholarship and of the forging of new connections between the humanities and public life is the way in which the promotion and tenure system frequently operates in American higher education. Scholars from major research universities with national stature should take the lead in promoting revision of the reward system.

Looking to the Twenty-First Century

In these comments, we have assumed that there is in this country an enduring connection between the health and vitality of democracy and the health and vitality of the humanities, a connection we would like to see strengthened by public service scholarship and a broader, deeper cultural conversation.

As we look to the twenty-first century, the great test of our democracy lies in enriching public conversation and extending participation in this conversation to all Americans. There are good reasons for optimism. The writers cited earlier, MacIntyre, Peterson, and Bellah, represent a growing number of scholars committed to public service scholarship.

We think of Americo Paredes' contribution to public understanding of the history and culture of Mexican-Americans.

We think of John Hope Franklin's life-long quest to deepen public understanding of the history and culture of Black Americans.

We think of Walter Capps' contribution to public understanding of the Vietnam War and of the young Americans who fought in that war.

We think of Carol Gilligan's remarkable effort to expand our understanding of ethics and morality.

We think of Riane Eisler's promising re-evaluation of the evolution of Western culture and the partnership model she proposes for meeting challenges of the twenty-first century.

We think too of the many scholars and film and television producers who have collaborated on such large-scale media projects as *The World of Ideas*, *Eyes on the Prize*, and *Ethics in America*.

And we think of the many scholars who participate in the conferences, symposia, exhibits, and local media programs sponsored annually in hundreds of communities throughout the nation by state humanities councils.

This optimism, however, should not keep us from seeing the primary challenge we face — that of strengthening and expanding connections between scholarship and the public.

As we wrestle with our public responsibilities as scholars, as we contemplate new and exciting ways whereby scholarship in the humanities can connect with enduring questions and timely issues, we will be reminded that public conversation on vital concerns, like any honest, personal conversation, can be difficult. We believe such difficulties are signs of vitality, not decline. If scholars in the twenty-first century can make the kinds of connections suggested here, scholars in the twenty-second century will never have to endure discussions about a crisis in the humanities. In a Learning Society, they'll simply be too busy.

Bibliography

- Bellah, Robert N., *et al.* *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- . *The Humanities and the Survival of Community: The 1989 Public Humanities Lecture*. San Francisco: California Council on the Humanities, 1989.
- Berry, Wendell. *The Work of Local Culture: The 1988 Iowa Humanities Lecture*. Iowa City: Iowa Humanities Board, 1988.
- Booth, Wayne. "The Scholar in Society," in *Introduction to Scholarship in Modern Languages and Literatures*, Joseph Gibaldi, ed. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1981.
- Capps, Walter. *The Unfinished War: Vietnam and the American Conscience*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1982.
- Cheney, Lynne V. *Humanities in America: A Report to the President, the Congress, and the American People*. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1988.
- Dreyfus, Hubert L. *What Computers Can't Do: A Critique of Artificial Reason*. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.
- Eisler, Riane. *The Chalice & the Blade: Our History, Our Future*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Ellul, Jacques. *The Technological Society*. New York: Random House, Inc., 1967.
- Franklin, John Hope. *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans*. New York: Knopf, 1980.
- Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Giamatti, A. Bartlett. *A Free and Ordered Space: The Real World of the University*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1988.
- Harmon, Willis. W. *An Incomplete Guide to the Future*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1979.
- Hutchins, Robert M. *The Learning Society*. New York: F. A. Praeger, 1968.
- Jacoby, Russell. *The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of Academe*. New York: Basic Books, 1987.
- Lappe, Frances Moore. *Rediscovering America's Values*. New York: Ballantine Books, Inc., 1989.
- Levine, George, *et al.* *Speaking for the Humanities*. New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 1989.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. *How to be a North American*. Washington, D.C.: Federation of State Humanities Councils, 1988.
- Paredes, Americo. *With a Pistol in His Hand: A Border Ballad and its Hero*. Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1958.

Peterson, Merrill D. *The Humanities and the American Promise: Report of the Colloquium on the Humanities and the American People*. Austin: Texas Committee for the Humanities, 1987.

Postman, Neil. *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. New York: Viking, 1985.

Woodruff, Paul and Harry Wilmer, eds. *Facing Evil: Light at the Core of Darkness*. LaSalle: Open Court Publishing Company, 1988.

Rapporteur's Summary of the Wingspread Conference

Michael M. Sokal

After the keynote address, the work of the Conference organized itself around five panel discussions — each addressing a broad subject area related to the general aims of the meeting — and a final plenary session designed to bring together the major themes that emerged during the course of the conference. Each session opened with brief presentations by three or four participants, followed by discussion and debate in which all in attendance took an active part. The paragraphs that follow present the organizers' initial sketch of the goals of each session, and seek to distill the essence of each, as it emerged from the discussion of the group as a whole.

The Humanities and the Public (Sondra Myers, chair; Adrian Malone, Stephen Nissenbaum, Joan Hinde Stewart, and Victor R. Swenson, panelists):

The future of the humanities depends upon the public's support of the scholar's work. This is true in a real sense for public higher education institutions as well as private ones. By the same token, the fruits of scholarship enrich public knowledge and wisdom. Scholarship and public humanities programs are thus reciprocally dependent upon each other.

There is an increasing demand as well for more humanities content in the curriculum of schools and in programs of vocational and professional education. There is emerging, in short, a broad public recognition that the humanities are important to the well being of the culture, in the classroom and out, of young people and for adults.

What is the role and responsibility of the scholar in responding to these needs? How can we increase public demand for, and support of, the humanities? How can scholars and their membership organizations become more responsive to public needs and interests? How can scholars be helped, encouraged, and prepared to plan a more active role in

the print and television media? How can the public be educated to appreciate more fully the importance of scholarship to society and particularly to the vitality of public culture?

In responding to these concerns and questions, the panelists and others decried the perception that an individual cannot be both a fine scholar and an active participant in public programs, and expressed special concern that this perception has become a self-fulfilling prophecy that prevents scholars from taking part in such activities. By contrast, most who spoke stressed the “good news”: i.e., that (in Swenson’s words) “scholars adore participating in public humanities programs.” The panel described how public humanities programs were able “to weave the arts and humanities into the fabric of state government” (Myers), to sponsor dozens of lively and well-attended discussions of humanities subjects throughout the state of Vermont (Swenson), and to produce films and television programs that effectively reached out to large audiences and of which scholars had good reason to be proud (Malone and Nissenbaum). In doing so, they all described how they abandoned what Stewart called “the dissemination model” and developed new ways to stimulate active public involvement with issues of importance for the life of the mind. Stewart, for example, cited the Humanities Extension Service at North Carolina State University as an example that other institutions might find valuable.

Nissenbaum stressed that academic humanists involved with public programs of all sorts should truly collaborate, and not simply advise. Scholars, he continued, have to learn more about how public groups — museums, libraries, historical societies — reach their decisions. Similarly, scholars have to learn about the technicalities of the new media with which they have to work. He called for “field guides” for humanists who work in museums, on state councils, and with film producers, and claimed that such guides would permit scholars to work better with these groups.

More specifically, Malone discussed his experiences in producing *The Ascent of Man* and *Smithsonian World* and gave examples of how such collaboration worked effectively. In response to a question, he played down the importance of control of the “final cut,” and instead stressed that the early and active interplay of scholar and producer that Nissenbaum and he were advocating would defuse any potential

problems. He especially urged humanists to look to the full range of electronics technology — and not just educational television — as a tool to reach out to the public. He agreed that the educational and academic communities (in their largest sense) had to “reclaim” the Public Broadcasting System. But he emphasized instead the potential of interactive video technology, based on computers, which would actively lead the user — who would no longer simply be a viewer — to think about issues of importance to humanists. The session closed, however, with several participants reminding the conference that traditional approaches still continue to be effective, even as new technologies emerge.

The Parallel School (Jane Renner Hood, chair; Ellsworth Brown, Dorothy Schwartz, and Bruce Sievers, panelists):

Outside the classroom, the public hears, reads, and learns about the humanities through institutions that Lynne Cheney has labeled the “parallel school”: humanities councils, historical societies, museums, libraries, chautauquas, and educational television.

A second tier of institutions includes independent research libraries and humanities centers on or near university campuses whose primary aim is the encouragement of scholarship in the humanities. There have been few connections between these institutions and the communities in which they reside.

To what extent do these institutions constitute a community of common interests? Are there already networks among these institutions through which scholars can, do, or should work? What is the nature of the relationship between the “parallel school” and the humanities councils on the one hand, and scholars and the learned societies on the other? What are the opportunities for collaboration? What are the impediments? What are the shared interests? What can the humanities council and learned society, the ACLS and the Federation together do to support and participate in the work of this “parallel school”? To what extent can humanities research centers and independent research libraries be encouraged and supported in an effort to make contact between the exciting scholarship that they support as a matter of course and the larger public?

Though each panelist structured his or her remarks differently, each argued against the utility (and the use) of the term “parallel school.” Brown emphasized that the “parallel school” shouldn’t be parallel, but should be part of the whole. Public humanities programs and institutions should be integrated into the mainstream of American education. Each panelist also mentioned ways in which this separateness has hurt both the academic and public humanities and, more importantly, American society at large. Brown, for example, argued that humanists should get involved in all the current debates about the future of education, which should embrace them and their concerns much more than they do. Similarly, Sievers cited three “missed opportunities” for the humanities: the failure of the American Association for the Advancement of the Humanities; the debate over the Helms amendment; and “the ongoing vacuum at PBS.”

These concerns led Brown to argue that the public humanities should get support from our cities, counties, states, and all other governmental bodies that support education and, more generally, for a national consortium for the humanities, which would sponsor what he called “a national marketing campaign for the humanities.”

Having made these points, the panelists discussed ways in which scholars had been actively involved in public humanities programs under their direction. For example, Schwartz described Maine’s program for the Columbian Quincentennial, developed by the Maine Humanities Council in conjunction with other institutions. From its earliest stages, it involved both scholars and those representing public humanities institutions. The panelists’ presentations and the discussion that followed both emphasized ways in which this involvement might be increased and deepened. Schwartz, for example, outlined three conditions that must be created in attempts to reach this goal: (1) Scholars should not be mere appendages to, presenters in, etc. public programs. They must be involved from the beginning. (2) Scholars should be more than simply volunteer experts. They must be given incentives to participate. (3) Scholars need a better sense of their audiences, which would help them communicate more effectively. More generally, Brown emphasized that “friendly scholarship” can bridge the gap between academic and public humanities, and described how the Chicago Historical Society has sought, benefited from, and responded to an increased role for scholars in the preparation of its exhibits.

Other discussion focused on how the humanities could respond to concerns about the future of American society that informed the keynote address. In particular, Sievers emphasized “the life of the mind in society” and stressed the “strategic planning” and other initiatives to build public participation that he would mandate if he were “humanities czar.” These included: the preparation of a mission statement for the humanities; the strengthening of institutional connectedness among all organizations; the targeting of specific constituencies to which the humanities should be actively marketed; the making of connections with other groups, including professional societies, special interest groups, and organizations like the American Association of Retired People; the soliciting of direct aid from such sectors of the business community as local advertising councils, the media, etc.; and the expansion of the resources available for the humanities. He closed by outlining the components of a plan. These included the compilation of a database of humanities institutions in an area, which would be useful for teachers, networking, etc., and would serve as “a service bureau for the media”; ethics projects, which most professions seem to welcome; projects involving the humanities and the professions more generally; lobbying efforts to put education in the humanities and the arts on the state agenda; planting “brokers” in the schools, who will establish links between humanities and arts organizations, and the schools themselves; media projects of all sorts; and organizing governors’ cultural advisors.

In response to Brown’s and Sievers’ calls for greater fundraising initiatives on behalf of the humanities targeted at foundations and governmental bodies, the session at large discussed development strategies that had worked and not worked in different contexts. As Stanley N. Katz emphasized, humanities programs that address questions of public policy and local issues attract the greatest support. All agreed, but other participants, including Brown and Sievers, suggested approaches that have worked well in particular environments in gaining support for those humanities subjects not directly related to public-policy issues. As these typically involved adopting the techniques of, or making links with, fundraisers for the arts, the session also debated the similarities and differences between the arts and humanities, and their respective communities.

In particular, Susan Ball and Phyllis Franklin discussed the emerging National Cultural Alliance, which hopes to bring together many organizations — including ACLS and the Federation — concerned with state and federal policies for the arts and the humanities. They emphasized that it originated in the arts community, and that humanities institutions were brought in only as an afterthought.

Higher Education and the Public Humanities (Peggy W. Prenshaw, chair; Douglas Greenberg, Estus Smith, John C. Unrue, and Richard Warch, panelists):

The tenure system is practically universal in institutions of higher education in the United States. Typically, the decision to award tenure and promotion to an academic candidate is based on an assessment of that candidate's (1) scholarship, (2) teaching, and (3) service. Together these criteria, weighed differently in different kinds of institutions, constitute the standards of judgment of the academic reward system.

To what extent does the existing reward structure inhibit scholar participation in programs for the public? If the reward or incentive structure is a problem, what is the nature of this problem? Does it vary among kinds of institutions, such as private and public universities, land grant institutions, public and private liberal arts colleges, community colleges? Are there imaginative programs that reward scholarly involvement in the community?

Universities, whether public or private, sit inside society rather than on its margins. They have a responsibility to the public as educational institutions. How can they be encouraged to exercise that responsibility more fully and effectively? In what way does involvement with a public actually enrich and contribute to the quality of scholarship?

In keeping with the organizers' sketch of this session's goals, much discussion revolved around the way in which universities reward faculty members for teaching, scholarship, and service, and the effects of this reward system on participation in public humanities programs. Prenshaw, for example, argued that the tension between scholarship and service parallels (and is analogous to) the better-known tension between teaching and scholarship. At the same time, all who took part in the discussion emphasized the many intellectual and social benefits

that can accrue to those academic humanists who participate in public humanities programs. Warch, for example, cited Reinhold Niebuhr's comments on the relationship between theology and parish ministry to argue that participation in public humanities programs informs, extends, and enriches both scholarship and teaching. In the same way, Smith (both in his presentation, and in response to questions) emphasized how participation in public humanities programs can help individuals fulfill their responsibility toward society at large. He argued that the American educational system is doing all too little to address the needs of the illiterate and the poorest members of our society, and it should do much more.

Many who spoke in this session thus emphasized that one way to attack the problem embodied in the traditional academic reward system would be to stop referring to participation in public humanities programs as "service" but to redefine it as "applied research" or "performance" or (as Warch suggested) a form of teaching to larger-than-typical audiences. In making this point, for example, Prenshaw cited her own studies on William Faulkner and land-use policy, and urged academic humanists to look for correspondences with other fields, and not simply to the model of traditional scholarship in science. Others who suggested such a redefinition referred to the keynote address's emphasis on "public service scholarship" and much discussion revolved around ways in which this goal might be implemented. In doing so, all stressed the need for systematic mechanisms to evaluate such public service scholarship and Warch, a college president, noted that most colleges and universities are prepared, at least rhetorically, to reward this activity.

While agreeing about the significance of public service scholarship, Greenberg and Unrue both argued that in many academic settings traditional scholarship must remain the faculty's highest priority. Unrue stressed the need for newer universities, like his own, to establish their standing, and that a growing scholarly reputation is an important part of the goals of any university. His faculty want to be competitive in the world of scholarship. Similarly, though with reference to a different kind of institution, Greenberg argued that even if we could change the reward system at major research universities, we should not. He portrayed these institutions as the current and continuing source of much of new humanistic (and scientific) knowledge. He also empha-

sized that both teaching and public programs depend on this scholarship, and that the next generation of both scholars and public humanists will be trained at such institutions.

Greenberg then extended this point and spoke to the question (which others also addressed) of *who* would be involved in public humanities programs. He argued that major universities should encourage graduate students to participate in such programs, and get them involved when they're most excited about the humanities. Doing so would help build their life-long commitment to public humanities programs and would also, through the honoraria they would earn, help support them when they most need such support. Darwin Turner agreed, and urged the Task Force to educate state humanities councils to accept graduate students.

Warch disagreed, however, arguing that such an approach would convince graduate students that public service scholarship was something to be abandoned as an academic humanist matured. He argued instead that participation in public humanities programs should be the reward for faculty accomplishment. He suggested (somewhat ironically) that institutions should make junior faculty members work only on traditional scholarship, and allow only senior professors to do public-oriented work. Prenshaw and other participants, however, stressed the advantages of involving the reservoir of independent scholars and early-retired professors in public humanities programs.

Stanley N. Katz stressed that the problems under discussion were part of a larger problem, and cited the way in which different universities perceive teaching-oriented as opposed to research-oriented Fulbright awards. Despite these discussions, one theme permeated the session: most agreed that academic-based scholars greatly enjoy participating in public humanities program and, typically, do so quite effectively. As Warch noted, reward systems play little role in determining the actions of these professors. Similarly, Kenneth Gladish reported that the Indiana Humanities Council never has problems getting scholars to take part in its programs. He continued, however, by asking how this pool of talent should be used, and emphasized that, in public humanities programs, the best scholars should be asked to do something other than simply repeating what they say to their students.

The Humanities Council and the Learned Society (Darwin T. Turner, chair; Susan Ball, Arnita Jones, Jay Kaplan, and Sheilah Mann, panelists):

The learned society is a membership association of scholars in a particular discipline or subdiscipline in the humanities. Learned societies usually are national with individual members in every state, and advance scholarship and protect or promote the professional interests of their members. The humanities council, in contrast, is a grant-making and program-conducting entity that involves humanities scholars of all disciplines in programs for the public. There is one humanities council in every state, and in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

What is the relationship between humanities councils and learned societies? Are there already ongoing relations among some? To what extent do their activities support each other? To what extent do they operate at cross-purposes? Do humanities councils and learned societies share common missions? In what ways are their missions and objectives not complementary? Do they share common needs? If so, what are these needs, and how can they be met? Are there impediments to certain kinds of relations or relationships? What does one group have that the other group needs?

What is the responsibility of the scholarly association to the public? How can learned societies and humanities councils profitably work together?

The panelists all stressed the benefits that accrue to academic humanists who participate in public humanities programs, and that such participation allows academic humanists to fulfill their responsibilities to the public at large. Kaplan, for example, noted that most academics are not scholars, most scholars are not intellectuals, and public humanities programs provide a major source of feedback for those who participate in them. Such feedback is especially important for teachers at institutions other than major research universities. He also emphasized that public humanities programs enable academics to take an active part in the ongoing debate over the place of learning in our society and an opportunity to have their voices heard by a larger public.

With such benefits in mind, Ball emphasized the responsibility of learned societies to involve their members in public humanities

programs. Both she and Jones described the various ongoing projects that the College Art Association and the Organization of American Historians currently sponsor with this goal in mind. For OAH, these include the History Teaching Alliance, which works with high school teachers and with state humanities councils; joint meetings with such groups as the National Council on Public History and the Society for History in the Federal Government; special sessions (at each OAH meeting) on teaching and outreach programs sponsored by the state humanities council of the state in which the meeting is held; and reviews in the *Journal of American History* of such public history work as films and museum exhibits. She remarked that these activities seemed controversial at first to many academically-based OAH members, but now appear to be working well. She also emphasized the significance of journal reviews, which do more to legitimate the field than anything else. In the same way, Ball described CAA annual-meeting sessions on teaching that have been co-sponsored by state humanities councils and funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE).

All panelists outlined both general and specific ways in which learned societies could work to serve the goals of public humanities programs. On one level, for example, all participants stressed that learned society newsletters should devote more attention to opportunities of all sorts in the public humanities, and should publicize those programs that proved especially effective. On another level, participants stressed the importance of the proliferating models provided by existing and ongoing programs. For example, Turner urged ACLS itself to establish a category of fellowships for public humanities scholarship, while Mann referred to the highly effective chautauqua short-course program in the sciences — sponsored by the National Science Foundation and modeled after the late-nineteenth-century program in the humanities — which is now being phased out despite its great success. She also described how scientists “rotate” into and out of program directorships at NSF and urged humanists to adopt similar practices with the agencies that fund their scholarship and educational programs.

Other participants and discussants emphasized that learned societies should do more to help legitimate public humanities scholarship. For example, Jones remarked that such organizations could help set

standards for training programs for public humanists, and provide codes of practice that would help them deal with such issues as negotiating contracts, requirements of confidentiality and, most generally, ethical concerns. This suggestion proved attractive to many participants and, in the discussion that followed, many suggested matters that such codes of practice might address. In his formal remarks, Kaplan emphasized that such “credentialing” might attract additional scholars to public humanities programs, and Turner also noted that any set of standards established by learned societies in response to an ACLS-backed initiative would carry great weight. He thus called for a “white paper” addressed to college and university administrators on the value of academic participation in public humanities programs, and cited the effect of an analogous statement on teaching loads in English departments thirty years ago.

Most generally, in addition to the points already noted here, the panelists and other participants mentioned others ways in which learned societies and state councils could work together to promote their common goals. These included, among others, “brokering” to initiate joint meetings, projects, and the like, and “preaching” and “lobbying” to expand the role of the humanities in a wide range of academic and public programs. Jones observed that learned societies provide a good pulpit from which to talk people in higher education into addressing questions of larger importance. For his part, Kaplan addressed the need for a permanent liaison between the ACLS and the Federation, or between ACLS constituents and the Federation. He also argued that the two groups are ready for a major joint project, though it wouldn’t be easy to select the right one, and urged ACLS and the Federation to seek one that would give us the visibility we seek and also contribute to national life. Among the possible areas of focus he suggested were education and the media and, in response, Greenberg noted that ACLS will be starting a major program in K-12 education, building on the extremely active programs within the learned societies themselves.

The ACLS and the Federation (Ronald Perrin, chair; Phyllis Franklin, Kenneth Gladish, Eugene Sterud, and Robert C. Vaughan, panelists):

The national consortia of learned societies and the humanities councils are the ACLS and the Federation. These two institutions also

are the national voice and representative of the interests of their members. The ACLS represents scholarship; the Federation (through its membership) the public's interest in scholarship.

How can the ACLS and the Federation profitably work together to advance scholarship and programs for the public? How can these two organizations help join the national interest of the scholarly community with the public's "need to know"? What steps can ACLS take to lead its constituent societies and their members in the direction of undertaking greater support for the public humanities? How can the Federation assist its own state councils in identifying and exploiting the expertise of a wide range of scholars? What steps can learned societies themselves take to make opportunities available for public activities by their members? What ongoing structure of relations can be devised so that communication between the ACLS and the Federation can be made permanent?

In their presentations, all panelists stressed the need to institutionalize connections and to go beyond the personal, and both Franklin and Gladish described the environment out of which these bonds would have to grow. Both, for example, emphasized the historical importance of the National Endowment for the Humanities. Franklin focused on the academic context of further institutional links. She observed that research is a defining characteristic of higher education, but at the same time stressed that the academy already does much to support a large range of public programs. In particular, she noted the institutional diversity of higher education, with its wide range of reward systems, strong regional orientations, and many variations. These distinct practices lead directly to what she described as the great variability in academic careers, and she cited her own studies on early-twentieth-century English Departments, which illustrated this variability even before the "job crunch" of the 1970's (which clearly magnified the phenomena).

Gladish underlined the public humanities context. He noted that most public humanities money is raised and spent by colleges, libraries, museums, and other NEH-supported institutions and public programs, rather than by state councils, which he described as bit players on most stages, most of the time. He noted, however, that many specific suggestions made in the previous sessions of ways in which learned

societies and state humanities councils could profitably work together would help the councils reach their goal of parity with other public humanities institutions.

Having delineated this context, several participants sketched specific initiatives that would promote further cooperation and collaboration, thus responding to Perrin's call for "nuts-and-bolts" suggestions, and offering answers to his opening question, "Where do we go from here?" Franklin sketched several potential courses of actions. The most general included: redefining work in the public humanities as performance or applied research, and *not* as service (as Prenshaw and others had suggested); reminding all parties that there is more than one model for achievement, reward, and success in the humanities; and "mapping the territory" to inform academics what state councils are and what they do. In this connection, she noted the professional ignorance of many scholars, and urged state councils to distribute a directory of their programs to all learned societies. More specifically, she exhorted learned societies to take note of all state council competitions, addresses, activities, successful programs, and so forth, and urged both societies and councils to communicate with each other on funding matters.

In his presentation, Sterud similarly stressed communication and, in particular, urged learned societies to use their newsletters (and, where applicable, their popular magazines) to publicize opportunities for public humanities work by their members. He emphasized that the societies should reach out beyond their memberships, perhaps to all alumni of all departments in their fields, who might also be approached for financial support. More generally, he suggested that the societies might consider changing how they do business and, perhaps, establish vocational or popular arms, much as the American Anthropological Association changed in mid-1980's. He cited the Archaeological Institute of America — which has among its members as many as fifty to sixty percent non-professionals — and many regional groups. He suggested that those participating in a broadly based network might work together on a major national initiative, and focus on a national issue at state (and disciplinary) levels. He mentioned as a potential focus the "Columbian Encounter," which would provide an opportunity to change the textbooks on one level, to reach out to many audiences on another, and,

in general, to demonstrate the importance and establish the presence of the humanities in the American culture.

In his remarks, Vaughan urged all participating to focus on what they can do together for the humanities in the United States, and how they can together transform American culture. Perrin picked up on this point in closing and emphasized that learned societies and state councils each can provide an untapped reservoir of expertise for the other. He also made his own nuts-and-bolts suggestion; i.e., that the ACLS and the Federation ought to establish a permanent steering committee to synthesize what the Task Force has started, and to publish a national humanities magazine, analogous to *Scientific American*.

Recommendations of the Task Force

The deliberations of the ACLS/Federation Task Force produced a number of suggestions for activities. They apply alike to national, regional, and state groups, learned societies, humanities councils, and others who seek to advance scholarship and the public humanities.

The Task Force was asked to be as concrete as possible in their discussions, both in identifying needs and in recommending action. A quick review of what they accomplished will reveal no budget-busting proposals; indeed much of what is proposed involves more a commitment of time than of money.

The proposals can be grouped roughly into five categories: data gathering and information, relations between the academy and the public, cooperation between humanities councils and learned societies, scholarly participation in public programs, and strategic collaboration among education groups for accomplishing common goals. While some of the activities listed below are being carried out jointly by the Federation and the ACLS, they are offered to individuals as well as to institutions in the spirit of continuing the discussion and encouraging action by others.

- I. Collect data and disseminate information to build support for, and encourage participation in, public humanities scholarship**
 1. Survey and determine how varying institutions have encouraged and rewarded scholarly involvement with out-of-classroom audiences
 2. Determine how the operation of the reward system in higher education operates in different types of institutions

3. Determine what methods are being used to identify scholars for public humanities programs in the states; determine whether surveys have been or are being done to evaluate the impact that public involvement has on scholarship
4. Accumulate case studies of humanities in action: projects that demonstrate the difference that humanities can make in a community
5. Develop “field guides” for humanities scholars on how to “get involved” in public programs in media, museums, and other forums, and appropriate roles for scholars
6. Identify resource people in the humanities who can serve as contacts/experts for media

II. Strengthen ties between humanities scholarship and the public

1. Urge state humanities councils to conduct statewide or regional “future visions” conferences that use the perspectives of the humanities to help chart twenty-first century growth and change in the states
2. Undertake/encourage teacher training humanities seminars nationwide linking schools with universities
3. Collaborate with national organizations like the Kettering Foundation to explore ways of bringing the humanities to bear on public policy questions
4. Encourage creation of public humanities centers that help demonstrate the “permeable wall” between scholarship and the public
5. Collaborate with public television and radio to produce humanities programs and feature stories for national airing
6. Create a national database of resources, events, etc. for museums, schools, media — a service bureau of the public humanities

7. Work with service clubs to incorporate public humanities scholarship into their meetings
8. Publish a national humanities magazine equivalent to *Scientific American*

III. Facilitate information exchange between councils and learned societies in support of public humanities scholarship

1. Distribute directory of humanities councils through ACLS that includes information on special initiatives, goals, and funding cycles for each humanities council
2. Encourage learned societies to dedicate one or more sessions at their national conferences to public audiences; inform learned societies of funding opportunities through humanities councils
3. Encourage learned societies to sponsor sessions at national conferences with humanities councils on the role of the scholar in society
4. Publish inserts on public programs in various learned society newsletters; provide deadlines for grants, competitions, etc.
5. Highlight in newsletters of learned societies and elsewhere public humanities activities that demonstrate the value of scholarship to the public
6. Invite learned society members to check-off on dues forms their interest in taking part in public humanities programs
7. Identify members of humanities council boards by discipline and circulate to learned societies

IV. Develop policy and mission statements that endorse the value of public humanities scholarship to the profession and the nation; amend fellowship awards to include programming possibilities

1. Develop and publicize a position statement endorsed by the ACLS and the Federation that recognizes public humanities activities by scholars as worthy of recognition and honor

2. Develop and publicize a position statement endorsed by the ACLS and the Federation that describes the various ways in which scholars participate in public humanities programs, and recognizes that participation as an important professional activity that contributes to the life of community, advances public understanding, and supports the mission of higher education institutions
3. Develop a systematic way of evaluating scholarly contributions in public programs
4. Urge fellowship-granting organizations in the humanities to encourage public programming activity by fellowship recipients

V. Gain recognition for public humanities scholarship

1. Encourage museums to give prominent credit in the body of an exhibit to scholars contributing to the development of the exhibit
2. Encourage learned journals to review exhibits and films
3. Urge presidents and deans to recognize and honor the public contributions of humanities faculty
4. Urge learned societies to recognize scholarly achievement, by means of annual awards or prizes, in the fields of museum exhibition and documentary filmmaking

VI. Win support for public humanities scholarship through strategic collaborations with state, regional, and national groups

1. Establish a permanent liaison between the Federation and the ACLS
2. Enlist support of higher education membership associations for public humanities scholarship
3. Encourage the Council on Graduate Schools to recognize the value of public involvement of scholars; encourage recognition of public involvement as an aspect of graduate training

4. Work with the Council on Foundations to urge the creation of a humanities constituency group
5. Cooperate with cultural advisors to governors to encourage creation of such offices at the state level, and to promote cultural awareness by state government
6. Work with regional membership organizations to build bridges between scholars, humanities councils, and the public
7. Work with organizations of independent scholars and “public scholars” such as archaeologists and historians, to broaden academic participation in public humanities programs; explore opportunities for collaboration
8. Develop a model of collaboration through a joint project involving schools, learned societies, and humanities councils

