

---

---

### 3 • WE ARE ALL NONTRADITIONAL LEARNERS NOW

Community Colleges, Long-Life Learning,  
and Problem-Solving Humanities

KATHLEEN WOODWARD

---

---

In US public higher education, the twin values of accessibility and affordability, long prized historically, are today under grievous assault. Of the many dimensions of higher education that demand our consideration, I focus on two decisive demographic trends: 1) forging new relationships between public research universities and community colleges to address the challenge of sharply increasing racial, ethnic, and economic segregation; and 2) creating new opportunities for people who are older than the “traditional student” to participate in purposeful ways in what I call *long-life learning*. At stake are the goals of increasing diversity in, and the sustainability of, higher education, with students—including ourselves—recognized as perpetual nontraditional learners. In pursuing these dimensions of higher education, I am building on the catalyzing report recently issued by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences under the title *The Heart of the Matter*. To that end, I expand on the role of community colleges and the practice of life-long learning, both of which are mentioned in the report but do not receive sustained attention.<sup>1</sup>

How might we imagine “A New Deal for the Humanities” in these domains? I first take a brief step back in the history of public higher education in the United States, a history both inspiring and gravely marred by exclusion. In the

conviction that we need a new educational system that is as integrated as undergraduate education should be, I then sketch a broad picture of the place of community colleges in higher education and underscore the need to serve learners beyond the traditional age. Finally, I turn to the role of the humanities in public research universities and suggest that the humanities have fundamental contributions to make to our most pressing public challenges; I offer two examples—the contemporary risk society and climate change. I thus do not begin with the humanities (I confess I find the word provincially academic and, when talking with people outside the academy, refer instead to the study of history, literature, art and media, and language). Nor do I engage what has become a defeating narrative of the decline of the humanities in terms of enrollments and of crisis.<sup>2</sup> The central theme running through my chapter is the power of combining the humanities, as a dimension of the liberal arts, and the practical arts.

## KEY MOMENTS AND MOVEMENTS IN US EDUCATION

Congress passed the groundbreaking Morrill Act in 1862 in the midst of the Civil War with the noble vision of establishing public colleges and universities to serve their communities and create opportunities for higher education under the banner of what we now describe as accessibility and affordability.<sup>3</sup> Today one of the fundamental roles of our land-grant colleges and universities is characterized as *engagement* with our communities, with education and research having a civic dimension.<sup>4</sup> I would stress, however, that the distinctive educational mission of our public universities was envisioned *as combining the liberal arts and the practical arts*. As the legislation reads, the purpose of land-grant universities was conceived as promoting “the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.”<sup>5</sup> To this I will return. Eighty-two years later, the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944, popularly known as the GI Bill, established reciprocity as a foundation of the social compact between citizens and the nation with regard to higher education. It was followed two decades later by the Higher Education Act of 1965, which created Pell Grants for undergraduates in financial need. These three moments in the history of US higher education represent high points of the progressive role that the federal government has played in higher education over the past 150 years.

But this history of inclusion is unfortunately notable for also being one of discrimination. There was a second Morrill Act. Passed in 1890, it specifically addressed segregation: states were obliged to demonstrate that race was not a factor in the admission of undergraduates to their land-grant colleges and, if it was, they were required to create separate institutions for students of color. Some historically black colleges and universities emerged from this provision.<sup>6</sup> In *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), the Supreme Court declared it

unconstitutional for schools to segregate children on the basis of race, concluding that “separate” in and of itself conferred a stigma and therefore could not provide “equal” education.

Over the past thirty years and more, the progressive impulse of the federal government with regard to higher education has diminished decisively, beginning with the election of Ronald Reagan as president in 1980. In the same period, however, the role of the federal government in driving research in the sciences and in health and medicine at public research universities has thrived. This development I will not rehearse. Nor will I elaborate on our states’ defunding of our public research universities. This decline in public support accelerated during the Great Recession that began in 2008, but it had been a long time in the making; in fiscal year 2012–2013, for example, only 3 percent of the operating budget of my university—the University of Washington—came from state support. This story of evaporating state support is well known. It is also complicated by the fact that the federal government today allocates the significant sum of \$130 billion a year in direct grants as well as in subsidized and guaranteed loans to students and their families.<sup>7</sup>

My basic point is this: if, unlike K–12 education, higher education has not been conceived historically as a civil right, we have in the past prided ourselves, and rightfully so, on the strengths of our higher-educational system—in great part precisely because of its openness to the population at large. Higher education has traditionally been understood as a gateway to social mobility as well as a necessary if not a sufficient condition for democracy to thrive. Today the implicit promise of our higher-educational system is at serious risk of ruin,<sup>8</sup> with many of our institutions effectively closed to poor and working-class citizens because of prohibitively high tuition and fees. We are living in a risk society where responsibility for the higher education of the majority of our undergraduates—for education of the public—has effectively devolved from the states to individuals and their families. Once a model for higher education in other countries as well as a magnet for international students, US higher education is now ranked twelfth among developed nations.<sup>9</sup>

At the turn of the twentieth century, William Rainey Harper, the visionary first president of the University of Chicago, imagined higher education as an ensemble of institutions with pathways among them, including extension courses, two-year community colleges, four-year regional colleges, and, of course, universities. The goal was to distribute opportunities for education widely and to avoid exclusively drawing privilege to his university. Indeed, Harper is credited with helping to found two-year colleges, whose mission mirrors that of the founding purpose of our land-grant colleges: a combination of the practical or technical arts and the liberal arts, an honorable conjoining of these two modes of learning. Today there are routes from comprehensive two-year colleges to four-year

colleges, suturing the two kinds of institutions together, at least in theory. But in reality our public research universities devote much more attention to the K–12 schools from which they draw most of their entering first-year students.<sup>10</sup>

## DIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES: SEPARATE AND UNEQUAL

One of the clearest signs of the alarming inequities in higher education today is the vast divide between our two-year schools and our public research universities, one even analogous to the enormous economic divide between the 99 percent and the 1 percent. As income inequality has increased steeply over the past years, so too has educational opportunity. Our two-year schools are the canary in the coal mine, alerting us to a growing racial and economic divide. It may soon be a chasm.

Widely acknowledged to be overcrowded and underfunded, community colleges in the United States serve 44 percent of our undergraduates—almost half of all undergraduate college students.<sup>11</sup> They also serve nearly 50 percent of undergraduates of color in the United States. If the student population of community colleges is extremely racially and ethnically diverse, the proportion of low-income and working-class students has been increasing. As Eduardo Padrón, president of Miami Dade College, wrote in August 2013 in a letter to the *New York Times*, “46 percent of our students live beneath the federal poverty standard, and 67 percent are low income.”<sup>12</sup> Everyone concerned with higher education should read the Century Foundation’s sobering 2013 report on community colleges. Entitled *Bridging the Higher Education Divide*, the report alerts us to the vast disparities in public support of education on both the state and federal levels. Zeroing in on the extreme differences in direct federal support for community colleges, public four-year universities, and K–12 education, the report emphatically echoes *Brown v. Board of Education*: “separate” is not “equal.”

Too many of us in public research universities remain unaware of this growing phenomenon. What was the response when President Barack Obama announced proposals in 2009, 2011, and 2012 to fund support for community colleges? No outpouring of enthusiasm that I could see from public research universities and no action by the US Congress. The palpable if inadvertent stigma attached to community colleges by people from different sectors can be seen virtually everywhere. Consider a *New York Times* March 2013 editorial lamenting the decline of the percentage of recent high school graduates who choose to attend California’s public universities. Community colleges are mentioned only to be disdained as a bad choice in a throw-away line: “Other students have settled for poorly staffed, overcrowded community colleges and are unlikely to move on to four-year colleges.”<sup>13</sup> Surely we should address head-on the worrisome condition of “poorly

staffed, overcrowded community colleges” as a crucial component of our higher educational system, one that needs urgent attention, rather than scorn the students who have “settled” for them.

The stigma associated with community colleges can be seen as well in the way those of us in public research universities often frame the issues. It is common for us to measure support for public research universities in relation to private elite universities.<sup>14</sup> Consider, for instance, Wendy Brown’s eloquent essay in the 2011 issue of *Representations* devoted to “The Humanities and the Crisis of the Public University.”<sup>15</sup> Brown powerfully traces the collapse of public higher education as a foundation for social mobility and egalitarianism. She reminds us of the root meaning of “democracy” and the historical role of higher education to create an educated public, one central to an educated democracy: “Democracy: rule (*cracy*) of the people or poor (*demos*). Democracy is the name of a political form in which the people are sovereign, in which the whole, rather than merely a part, rules the polity and hence itself.” Democracy in this sense has come to its end in our neoliberal economy.

Brown underscores the growing gap between “quality public universities” and “private elites.” When she does refer to two-year schools, it is mainly to dismiss them, noting that they “largely remain institutions of vocational training for clerical, mechanical, and low-level health and service workers.”<sup>16</sup> A similar vision of the community college emerges in *The Heart of the Matter*: “The community colleges that serve almost half of all students in higher education train men and women in job skills; but they also offer broader exposures that develop the talent for a lifetime of career advancement and often a desire for further education.”<sup>17</sup> The “but” and the “often” are telling. Community colleges are perceived as predominantly vocational while liberal learning is associated with four-year colleges. In a sense, we have not moved very far from the Greeks in understanding the liberal arts for free citizens and technical arts for the enslaved.

As underfunded as they are, our community colleges are highly adaptable and expansive institutions. Much more is taking place at community colleges than low-level vocational training. Consider the city of Seattle’s three community colleges, which enroll, along with an allied vocational institute, more than 50,000 students a year. (In writing this essay I learned that these colleges have excised “community” from their names; they are now North Seattle College, Central Seattle College, and South Seattle College.) Courses of study exist for those who wish to transfer to a four-year college. There is even a special pathway in the associate of arts degree track for Asian studies; also available are certificates of completion in film and video communications, database administration and development, biomedical equipment and technology, sustainable landscape management, and nanotechnology, among many possibilities. Most of these certificate programs offer associate of applied arts degrees that include

general education. Quarter-long programs abroad are established in London, South Africa, Spain, Costa Rica, and Florence, Italy. There is in addition an immense array of continuing education courses, including courses in film noir and beginning Mandarin. Available too is worker retraining. Learning outcomes for the associate of arts degree—we would all applaud them—include understanding the “methods and modes of inquiry specific to traditional and contemporary areas of knowledge in the humanities and arts, natural and physical sciences, mathematics, and the social sciences,” as well as understanding “the interdisciplinary nature of knowledge” and “the global society and processes of globalization from mostly, but not exclusively, non-Western and indigenous perspectives.”<sup>18</sup>

Almost 40 percent of the students at Central Seattle College are enrolled in the college-transfer track. One of those students we hired recently as our administrative coordinator at the Simpson Center for the Humanities, where I serve as director. She had transferred to the University of Washington in her junior year and graduated two years later with a bachelor’s degree in the Comparative History of Ideas, our interdisciplinary—and intellectually creative—major in the humanities. When I asked her to characterize the transition to the university, her answer that it was “difficult” did not surprise me. But the reasons did, hitting home my own misguided preconceptions: she found the shift from smaller classes at Central Seattle College to such large classes at the University of Washington daunting, and she missed what was for her easy access to and outstanding guidance from her professors at Central Seattle. I want to add that at the same time she was attending Central Seattle, she also took courses in psychology from North Seattle College as well as from Bellevue College because the three colleges taken together provided a challenging array in her discipline and because it was (bureaucratically) easy to take classes at all three institutions.

What can those of us in public research universities do to create bridges between our institutions and community colleges? To bring our kinds of institutions closer together? The leadership of our public research universities can insist that this is a crucial value and create formal articulation agreements. As faculty we can educate our doctoral students about the rapidly evolving landscape of higher education and call particular attention to community colleges.<sup>19</sup> My hope is that more of our doctoral students will wish to teach in community colleges and ultimately will.

This is an especially propitious time for those of us in public research universities to turn our attention to two-year schools. The mission of two-year schools is expanding to include more purposively the liberal arts; we are also seeing a trend in two-year schools offering four-year degrees in selected fields and dropping the adjective “community” in the process.<sup>20</sup> At the same time, in four-year colleges and in research universities (both public and private), much

attention is being devoted to the skills our students need for the workplace, with competency-based education complementing in-class learning.<sup>21</sup> My point is that the educational purposes of these kinds of institutions are not as divergent as they once were perceived to be. Humanistic skills are needed at all levels of higher education as are technological skills of all kinds. And “vocational” needs to be rescued from contempt. The study of the humanities and the development of skills for the workplace should not be understood as being in opposition to each other. That would entail a dubious argument at best. Pragmatically, it is foolish, perhaps even suicidal.

Anecdotally, I can testify that there are doctoral students at my university and elsewhere who are pursuing degrees in the humanities—in history and in the modern languages and literatures—whose ambition is precisely to teach in a two-year school. They typically keep that wish to themselves, fearing a backlash from their advisors (I am not being melodramatic: “fear” is the right word for what many of them experience—and not without justification). Because many doctoral students in the humanities are motivated by matters of social justice, they correctly regard teaching in two-year schools as working in underserved communities. In addition, as we all know, budgetary constraints at public research universities have resulted in the contraction of tenure-track positions. At the same time, demographic predictions reveal that the number of “traditional-age” students seeking four-year schools will decline in the near future while enrollments at two-year schools are growing.

Objections may be raised that a doctorate, with its focus on research, is not required to teach in a two-year college and that the long time to degree militates against envisioning a future at two-year schools (in the humanities the national median time to a doctoral degree is an appalling 9.0 years).<sup>22</sup> To this, I would respond that departments and indeed entire institutions of higher education across the United States are involved today in recalibrating their doctoral programs to offer degrees that can be completed in five years. To this, I would also respond that both the breadth and research focus of a doctoral degree provide invaluable skills for professors who want to inspire students in two-year schools to undertake complex projects in the future.<sup>23</sup> Finally, I would point to one of the recommendations in the new report from the Modern Language Association’s Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature.<sup>24</sup> The report urges doctoral programs to enable their students to gain expertise in different kinds of teaching, with the corollary that doctoral students be introduced to the wide spectrum of institutions across higher education with their different histories, missions, and student demographics. The community college is one of those important institutions.

What can we do to encourage interest in community colleges among our doctoral students? In our departments we can hold mentoring sessions for them

with faculty from community colleges.<sup>25</sup> Across our departments we can set up working groups of faculty and graduate students on community colleges, as I hope to do. We can urge our professional associations to create task forces on two-year colleges and to purposively include faculty members from two-year colleges on their executive councils, as the Modern Language Association has done. As the director of a humanities center, I can encourage faculty members and graduate students to develop projects with their counterparts in two-year schools (I'm pleased to report that our Simpson Center for the Humanities recently received a four-year grant from the Mellon Foundation which will provide our doctoral students in the humanities with the opportunity to shadow faculty members at North Seattle College, Seattle Central College, and South Seattle College over the course of an academic year). I want to see strengthened, in both our community colleges *and* our research universities, the model that the founding legislation for land-grant colleges underscored 150 years ago: the need for both the practical arts and the liberal arts in a single institution.

## LONG-LIFE LEARNING, SUSTAINING LEARNING

The vision of college as a four-year degree for eighteen- to twenty-one-year-olds on a residential campus remains entrenched in the imagination of many of us in higher education. By and large that is the model of a college education pervading *The Heart of the Matter*. Although lifelong learning is mentioned in the report, it is conceptualized as basically taking place after completing one's education at a four-year college. Learning that comes later is represented as largely untethered to educational institutions and attached instead to cultural institutions—history museums, art galleries, and festivals devoted to the arts and humanities. In this view, postbaccalaureate education and learning are more serendipitous than purposeful, a form of educational tourism or a truncated version of the Grand Tour of Europe undertaken in centuries past.<sup>26</sup> College remains envisioned predominantly for the late adolescent who will become an adult in the course of an education at a residential college. The humanities are defended, often in overblown rhetoric, on the grounds that they provide the strong foundation that will serve people well through all the days of their lives: these young adults, having learned how to learn, having mastered the art of asking the right critical questions, and having become skilled in expressing themselves in writing, will be able to face the future with confidence and aplomb. As we read in *The Heart of the Matter*, although here the language is prosaic rather than soaring, “the liberal arts train people to adapt and change over a lifetime.”<sup>27</sup>

At the same time, everywhere we hear that we are living in an innovation economy, one characterized by the rapid coevolution of globalization and communication technologies. We hear that we can expect to change careers at least



five times, maybe more, over a lifetime, and, in point of fact, on average people in the United States change jobs every four years. Whole new fields and kinds of jobs—ones we could not have imagined—will be created in the future. It is undeniable that we will *all* have to acquire new skills. We will not be able to rely solely on having learned how to learn. We will all need some systematic way to gain knowledge of new and required competencies. The humanities will have much to contribute: in the process of ongoing and rapid change, new concepts and new histories will be needed. A prime example is the digital humanities: as faculty, we need to learn new skills (including, as an example, multi-modal composition, not just *writing*), so that we can teach with these new tools and deploy them in our research; we also need to understand the historical and epistemological dimensions of the digital revolution in communication, including scholarly communication, to name only two aspects of it. Education guided toward a goal—the liberal arts allied with the practical arts—will become increasingly more common, or at least more necessary, even more urgent, than it is now. Education should not and cannot be limited to one part of the life course. This is what I mean by *sustaining education*. We are all nontraditional students now.

Higher education is no longer confined to campus or to young adults. Today only some 15 percent of undergraduates attend a four-year college or university full-time and live on campus.<sup>28</sup> Higher education is being pursued by people of all ages, a practice that will certainly accelerate in the future, and in a wide variety of institutions, including corporate universities and online learning. Louis Soares, who works with the American Council on Education, calls attention to the fact that there are eighty million people aged twenty-five to sixty-four who lack postsecondary credentials and who want to attain them while balancing family and work with education. Soares calls these students posttraditional learners. (He should not have stopped at the age of sixty-four, however, since many people older than that want and need to work, and many of them need higher education too.)

In 2010, 6.1 million students were enrolled in at least one online course in the United States.<sup>29</sup> That seems an epoch ago, with public universities left and right since then creating more opportunities for online learning. Consider that the Georgia Institute of Technology, a public research university, announced in 2013 the development of an online master's degree in computer science that will be low cost and is expected to attain the scale of a massive open online course. Created in partnership with the for-profit Udacity, this degree launched in 2014. In the state of Washington, there are more than 900,000 adults who have attended college but not attained degrees. My own university is developing a series of online completion degrees for those who have begun college-level work; the first, a BA, is in Early Childhood and Family Studies and launched in the fall of 2013. To those who have not completed their four-year degrees we need to

consider those who have already been awarded their BAs and who wish to pursue more education. While interviewing three people recently for a fiscal administrative position at the Simpson Center, I was struck that two candidates were taking courses online; one had a BA, the other, three master's degrees from professional schools.

I've thus shifted the commonly accepted emphasis from *lifelong* learning to *long-life* learning to draw attention to the momentous difference that the increase in life expectancy over the course of the last 150 years has made. When the Morrill Act was passed in 1862, the average life expectancy for both men and women was forty-three years; in 2010, it was seventy-nine.<sup>30</sup> The transformation of higher education is occurring not just because of what we have come to call the digital revolution or because of globalization, but also because of the longevity revolution with the stunning demographic change it entails. The implications of this demographic change for the future of higher education require our close attention just as intently as do other dimensions of diversity, including racial, ethnic, and economic divides in the United States.<sup>31</sup> If the social script for major life events—graduating from high school, getting a college degree, marrying, having children, retiring—had a predictable sequence with chronologically defined points in the past, that is no longer the case. (Indeed, fewer people can afford to retire.) Everyone will need to learn new skills at different points. Mark Hudleston, the president of the University of New Hampshire, put it this way in testimony before the state Finance Committee: the “need for education and skill renewal,” he said, is “constant and society-wide.”<sup>32</sup> In addition to new skills, we all need to learn new ways of thinking about matters that should matter to us all. For it is certain that participating as world citizens in societies of the future will require more education over our lifetimes as we confront a host of challenges, including climate change, the explosion of new biological knowledge that allows us to manipulate living systems, and social injustice writ large across the continents, to name just three.

Every college and university needs to invent new ways to model education across the life course. How can we in public research universities open our doors to older students both at the level of the bachelor's degree and beyond? Online education is one way. Beyond the BA degree available through online learning in Early Childhood and Family Studies at my university, we are also developing courses in an online completion degree program in the social sciences. I would in addition like to see public research universities develop more flexibility in on-campus programs and in hybrid digital/face-to-face programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels to accommodate people whose work and family lives need more supple educational structures: we need to consider weekend and summer programs as well as an expansion of evening degree programs. I would like to see collaboration between continuing education programs—an

honorable branch of universities that the professoriate often disregards—and regular degree programs, with more certificates offered. Faculty from the humanities must play an active role in planning these curricular changes.

If those of us in public research universities don't make these changes, other institutions will be created and practices invented to offer what is needed.<sup>33</sup> A case in point is the new initiative entitled Open Badges, underwritten by the MacArthur Foundation. Its purpose is to spur new ways of accounting for—that is to say, certifying or credentialing—learning that is both academic and technical, but gained outside of the conventional curricula of higher-educational institutions. Partnering with the MacArthur Foundation are Mozilla, the free software community, and HASTAC, the international consortium devoted to learning in a digital age cofounded by humanities scholars and higher-education activists Cathy Davidson and David Theo Goldberg. While the label “badges” has struck some as lacking the gravitas required by higher education, it is a salutary concept. We must find ways to recognize the achievements in learning that take place outside our difficult-to-change public research universities.<sup>34</sup>

In general, what is needed is more articulation—and more formal articulation agreements—among different kinds of institutions of higher education, articulation similar to that envisioned by the president of the University of Chicago more than a hundred years ago, with more modular opportunities in addition to distinctly defined pathways (the opportunity to take a minor at a public research university without having to be enrolled in a major or graduating; the minor could be conceived as a certificate in such a case). In *College (Un)Bound: The Future of Higher Education and What It Means for Students*, Jeffrey Selingo makes a persuasive case for “unbundling” college offerings (as an analogy we may reference consumers who wish to unbundle the cable channels to which they subscribe). Just as imperative is more collaboration among similar institutions (joint doctoral programs in the humanities at research universities, for example). We accept with ease the importance of the interoperability of digital tools. They need to communicate with each other and work together to create assemblages that are informational and intellectual ecosystems. Similarly, we need interoperability in institutions of higher education; we need interfaces that work. Metropolitan transportation systems—busses and subway systems alike—have created transfer arrangements. University libraries have formed collaborative networks with regional institutions. We need to imagine what such interlocking and collaborative systems might look like across the large horizon that is higher education. But at present the relationships among institutions are largely unworkable for would-be students who want recombinant higher education. Students are like Alice in Wonderland attempting to play croquet with a flamingo, trying to transfer credits between one institution and another, or endeavoring to craft a major out of courses taken at different kinds of institutions—or even the same

institution. Taken together, our higher-educational institutions should be *mobilizing networks*, not discrete entities.<sup>35</sup> Our public research universities must be accessible and affordable. They must also be adaptable. We have constructed elaborate organizations whose bureaucratic structures are largely byzantine. They must be simplified. And they must build bridges to other institutions.

## PUBLIC POLICY, PROBLEM-SOLVING HUMANITIES, AND ZONES OF INQUIRY

I have written elsewhere about the future of the humanities, stressing our need as scholars in the humanities to reimagine our research and to find ways to take our scholarship public.<sup>36</sup> This is crucial: in the humanities, narrow specialization and professionalization are strangling us. Along with Bethany Nowviskie, who has a chapter in this volume, I recently participated in a series of workshops devoted to graduate education in the humanities sponsored by the University of Virginia's Scholarly Communication Institute; one of the capacities we fervently believe needs to be highlighted in doctoral education is collaboration (John McGowan also stresses collaboration in his chapter in this volume on the medical humanities). If I have focused less in the previous pages on a new deal for the humanities than might have been expected, it is because I wanted first to step back and view the transformation of higher education across multiple institutions and in light of economic, demographic, and digital change. In the process, I've come to regard a four-year education at a residential college as a luxury. I've come to appreciate the innovations of community colleges.

Allow me to return again to the Morrill Act of 1862, which promoted, in its words, "the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life." How might we recast this in terms of the humanities for the twenty-first century? First, we must challenge the unbridgeable intellectual divide in the minds of many in public research universities, not only between universities and community colleges, but also *in* the university between the humanities and professional schools—medicine, law, engineering, nursing, social welfare, information, and agriculture, among them. The humanities need to be distributed across the university in terms of research and in terms of teaching. Second, following from the first, we need to embrace the idea of applied humanities. Many who passionately defend the study of the humanities in higher education do so by divorcing what is represented as the learning of lowly skills from an education in the loftier intellectual capacities critical to a flourishing democracy, a divorce I find impoverishing. This is how Geoffrey Harpham puts it in an essay that largely turns on the importance of research in the humanities: "The humanities anchor liberal education, the goal of which is not the acquisition of a skill or a set of facts, but rather the fostering of the

experience of intellectual and evaluative freedom that can support the formation of a democratic citizenry capable of self-directed innovation and adaptation.”<sup>37</sup> While I understand the case that Harpham is making, to my mind this suggests, in practice, a misguided disparagement of professional schools and of the work that faculty and graduate students in the humanities and professional schools can do together. The acquisition of skills should be honored. I can still remember Stanley Chodorow, then provost at the University of Pennsylvania, at an annual meeting of ACLS some fifteen years ago recommending that people in the humanities engage the professions, with the potential that such collaboration might “draw us into intellectual work that will have wide influence in society.”<sup>38</sup> Some followed his lead; law and literature flourished for some years. But by and large, his call was ignored. I agreed with him then and I do now.

As I have been stressing, as members of public research universities, we need to underscore the word *public* in terms of access; that includes people of minimal economic means, people beyond the age of the “traditional” student, and people who require flexibility in terms of time (and of course, these can be one and the same). Another key way of thinking of the humanities in *public* research universities is in terms of *public policy*. We can model the combination of the liberal and the practical arts that was crucial to the founding of our land-grant universities by creating interdisciplinary *zones of inquiry*—this is Mark Taylor’s excellent term—around issues of *public policy*, broadly construed. These zones of inquiry would include faculty members from the humanities and across the liberal arts as well as the professions.<sup>39</sup> I am imagining these zones of inquiry as short-lived curricula—five to ten years, renewable, with mini-modules open to many; they would complement rather than substitute for majors at the undergraduate level (although enrollment in these zones in the humanities and social sciences might outstrip enrollment in disciplinary majors); certificates could be offered at the graduate level.<sup>40</sup> Devoted to matters of policy ranging from national security and human rights to health and illness, and climate change around the globe, to name a few prominent areas, these zones would be oriented toward change and the future, meeting students where they are; study—and practice as appropriate—would be grounded in the present with an inflection toward the future and with a goal of inspiring a turn to the past, affording historical understanding. These zones of inquiry would focus on urgent problems and bring faculty together who do not normally collaborate.

Many of us have refused to embrace the language of problem-solving as one of the roles of the humanities, declaring, almost self-righteously, that in the humanities we raise questions instead and insisting that many dimensions of the human condition are not in fact problems that can be solved. We should no longer shrink from the language of problem-solving. Today’s public research university is characterized by an ethos of interdisciplinarity and a commitment to address

the pressing problems of our world—locally, regionally, nationally, globally—as well as a commitment to undertake basic research. We should embrace the commitment to address the pressing problems of our world. They are urgent and we should not be daunted by the charge of presentism from people in the humanities, especially since providing historical framing would no doubt be one of our essential contributions. For as scholars, thinkers, and teachers in the humanities, our role is to provide telling contexts and illuminating examples, to create large frames and to look closely at individual cases, and to create spaces for thought and occasions for feeling that are intertwined. I offer two examples of potential zones of inquiry.

First and briefly, “risk,” which is a mega-keyword in contemporary culture. Imagine a zone of inquiry on the risk society, with modules devoted to the financialization of everyday life and the history of the derivative; the implicit values embedded in statistical thinking and the quantified self; scenarios and accounts of catastrophe, including narratives of illness at the level of the individual and on the scale of global pandemics; comparative histories of accounting and of economic theory about the regulation of markets; affect and risk (I have coined the term “statistical panic”); and, importantly, alternatives to the all-pervasive discourse of risks and benefits.<sup>41</sup>

Second, at more length, consider climate change as a zone of inquiry. Climate change requires decisive, strong, and proactive public policies extending from the microlevel to the global scale. Research universities are uniquely equipped to address climate change and other complex issues of public policy because of the breadth and depth of their faculty, including faculty in the arts and literature, religious studies, philosophy, and geography, as well as economics and the sciences. And history.

In fact it is an historian in the United States—Dipesh Chakrabarty—who has provided the inspiration for many in the academy to turn their attention to climate change.<sup>42</sup> He was well known for his work in postcolonial and subaltern studies; climate change was a new departure for him. Chakrabarty has been in conversation with scientists, policy makers, and engineers. He has read the work of paleontologists and reports issued from the United Nations on development and the planet. He has thought deeply about what is called the “climate justice” position (abbreviated as the West versus the Rest). He understands the terrible irony by which the economic developments of the last two hundred and fifty years, a period that also witnessed the Enlightenment and struggles for democracy around the world, unintentionally caused the phenomenon of global warming. For Chakrabarty, global warming is the shadow that falls on the promise of civilization and its performance over the last two and a half centuries. For him, given human agency at the center of the environmental crisis, the distinction between natural history and human history has collapsed. It is a momentous paradigm change.

As Chakrabarty has argued, making a convincing case for public policy related to climate change is undermined by a failure of the human imagination—both collective and individual—to comprehend simultaneously three vastly different scales of time: geological time on the scale of thousands of years, historical time on the scale of two hundred and fifty years, and the embodied time of the individual, limited as it seems to be to several generations. Thus one of the pressing questions is: how do we bring into the fold of our imagination a future that is so distant with generation upon generation upon generation threatened by our past actions and by what we will do in the near future? How can we imagine what we seem constitutionally as human beings not to be able to envision? How can we come to care, to feel forcefully and not just cognitively, that humans—*we*—are making a decisive, not to say catastrophic, difference of geological proportions—and do something about it? This is work for the humanities: to create occasions for feeling as well as to create spaces for thought.

Many of the humanities centers at colleges and universities around the world are contributing to the study of climate change under the aegis of the Anthropocene. Through groups of fellows, visiting speaker series, conferences, workshops, and websites, they are demonstrating the vital contributions the humanities can make. But generally speaking, such programs of collaboration and creativity last only for a year. A major step would be to create interdisciplinary zones of inquiry that sustain teaching and research over longer periods in areas of public policy. The Consortium of Humanities Centers and Institutes (CHCI), an international organization of some two hundred humanities centers around the world, is experimenting with such a model. Its annual conference in 2012, organized by Debjani Ganguly, director of the Humanities Research Centre at the Australian National University, was on the subject of the Anthropocene. With funding from the Mellon Foundation, the CHCI is supporting a global network of “observatories” (I like this imaginative term)—each of them a zone of inquiry uniting institutions of higher education in a geographical region—with all the participants collaborating under the rubric of Humanities for the Environment. The three observatories are located in Australia, Europe, and North America (the latter is further articulated into three regional clusters—the Southeast, West, and Northeast). To cite an example of the work in progress: the theme of the Observatory in Australia is “Caring for Country,” with a focus on the humanistic tradition of an indigenous ethic in relation to the land from 1768 to 2012 and a reimagining of nature in the Australia-Pacific region.

The biologist Rafe Sagarin has written in his remarkable book *Learning from the Octopus* that adaptation emerges from leaving one’s comfort zone.<sup>43</sup> Let’s create zones of inquiry in our public research universities—they would require us to leave comfort zones that have in fact grown dispiriting—and join others in collaborating on matters of urgent concern: policies for publics. This would be

to take up Grand Challenges, as *The Heart of the Matter* explicitly urges to do. In analogy to Big Science, this would be Big Humanities. It would also be Practical Humanities. And Public Humanities. Humanities for the Public.

## IN CONCLUSION

We are in the midst of a tectonic upheaval in higher education, facing a future in which the constellation of educational institutions will be radically transformed—online learning is becoming a decisive part of the mix—as well as a profound shift in the populations who will both want and require education.<sup>44</sup> What that future will look like, and who will share in it, depends in great part on what we do. There are encouraging signs—ideas and actions—regarding change. Here are two of them. First, Todd Presner has recently suggested—it is both an inventive and a practical idea—that we expand the time frame for what I have been calling a zone of inquiry. Under the unforgettable term “the twenty-year dissertation,” he proposes that universities establish large-scale, multi-, and interdisciplinary research programs in the humanities to which we would commit ourselves for a period of time—say, twenty years.<sup>45</sup> Doctoral students would be admitted into these programs and their doctoral research would constitute a contribution to this area of study; over a period of twenty years would emerge a robust body of interconnected research. One of Presner’s prime examples is critical inquiry related to the era of the Anthropocene—in shorthand, climate change. Second, a new alliance in higher education has recently been created to establish pathways for honors students in community colleges—the program is called American Honors—to four-year colleges and universities, both public and private, with twenty-seven colleges and universities across the country participating, including Amherst College, Stanford University, Smith College, Whittier College, George Mason University, and the University of Puget Sound; the program was founded by Quad Learning, a for-profit company. I expect more colleges and universities will join; I hope to see more public research universities in the mix.

Public research universities—these institutions were established for the education of members of the *public* and to undertake research for the *public good*—have a special obligation to serve their communities and to take the lead in higher education. I understand the mission of our public research universities to be the promotion of “the general welfare,” to echo the words of the preamble to the US Constitution. I take pride in the mission of public research universities to create social and cultural goods, not just benefits for individuals, and to serve our communities which today stretch from the local and regional to the whole earth. Unfortunately, today a university education is regarded by many Americans predominantly as a private benefit and as an investment on the part of individuals.



We need to reclaim our mission and transform ourselves in the process, embracing the liberal arts *and* the practical arts and creating a true *system* of higher education, with institutions articulated each to the other across scales—local, regional, national, global. We need to foster change that is clear-sighted, deliberative, and progressive. We need a new deal first and foremost for the *idea* of the public good and we need to put it into practice: this would be a public policy *for* the humanities.

## NOTES

1. I am grateful to Gordon Hutner and Feisal Mohamed for their invitation to the stimulating September 2013 conference on the liberal arts, the humanities, and the future of public higher education that they organized at the University of Illinois, as well as for their discerning comments on my essay, which emerged from it.
2. Michael Bérubé and James F. English have shown that the narrative is flawed, based on the selection of the years examined and the data available, but the narrative of decline just keeps getting repeated and repeated; see Bérubé, “The Humanities, Declining? Not According to the Numbers,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 1, 2013, available at <http://chronicle.com>; and English, “Who Says English Is a Dying Discipline?,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 17, 2012, available at <http://chronicle.com>.
3. Actually, not all land-grant universities are public, with Cornell University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology being prime examples. And, surprising to me, one university I assumed was a land-grant university is not: the University of Washington.
4. At the Symposium on the University Presidency held at the Ohio State University on August 30, 2013, the two university presidents who responded to the question of whether the mission of land-grant universities remained relevant today—Elson Floyd (Washington State University) and Teresa Sullivan (University of Virginia)—answered yes, with the language of engagement. Available at <http://trustees.osu.edu/presidentialsearch/symposium-on-the-university-presidency.html>.
5. A longer excerpt from the Morrill Act of 1862 reads: “the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life.” See a transcript of the law at <http://ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&doc=33&page=transcript>.
6. In 1994 the Equity in Education Land-Grant Status Act was passed, providing thirty-three tribal colleges for Native Americans land-grant status; interestingly, these tribal colleges comprise a mix of higher education institutions, including four-year colleges and community colleges as well as institutions that offer graduate-level programs and courses.
7. This figure is cited in Robert Zemsky, *A Checklist for Change: Making American Higher Education a Sustainable Enterprise* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2013), 204. The figure is cited as 45% in an October piece in the *New York Times*, the first in a three-part series on community colleges. See Ginia Bellafante, “Community College Students Face a Very Long Road to Graduation,” *New York Times*, October 3, 2014, available at <http://www.nytimes.com>.
8. I am echoing Bill Readings’s influential book *The University in Ruins*, although I confess when I reread it I was surprised by the degree to which he set the humanities, with its

traditions of thought, in opposition to and virtually in alienation from other educational pursuits in universities. See Readings, *The University in Ruins* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996); see also Chris Lorenz, “If You’re So Smart, Why Are You under Surveillance? Universities, Neoliberalism, and New Public Management,” *Critical Inquiry* 38.3 (Spring 2012): 599–629.

9. This figure is cited in Jeffrey Selingo, *College (Un)Bound: The Future of Higher Education and What It Means for Students* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2013), ix.

10. There are welcome efforts to create pathways between two-year institutions and public research universities. Launched in the fall of 2013, the Pathways initiative at the City University of New York is one, notable in addition for the controversy it engendered over faculty governance in relation to curricular matters. The Interstate Passport Initiative, which involves sixteen institutions ranging from two-year colleges to public research universities in four states (Hawaii, North Dakota, Oregon, and Utah) is another, ambitious in its articulation of collaboration among states with students transferring *competencies*, not *credits*.

11. This figure is cited in *Bridging the Higher Education Divide: Strengthening Community Colleges and Restoring the American Dream*, Century Foundation Task Force on Preventing Community Colleges from Becoming Separate and Unequal (Century Foundation, 2013), 3.

12. *New York Times*, August 6, 2013, available at <http://www.nytimes.com>.

13. “Resurrecting California’s Public Universities,” Editorial, *New York Times*, March 30, 2013, available at <http://www.nytimes.com>.

14. Christopher Newfield notes, for example, “The most important trend in the last thirty years has been the growing inequality between private and public universities”; he does, however, mention community colleges as part of the higher educational mix, observing that they “are about basic employability, but not about social mobility”; referencing the knowledge economy, he coins the term “cognitariat” in analogy with the proletariat. See Christopher Newfield, “The Structure and Silence of Cognitariat,” *Edufactory WebJournal* (January 2010): 15, available at <http://www.edu-factory.org/edu15/webjournal/no/Newfield.pdf>.

15. Wendy Brown, “The End of Educated Democracy,” special issue on “The Humanities and the Crisis of the Public University,” *Representations* 116.1 (Fall 2011): 19–41.

16. See *ibid.*, 23, 26, and 31. The American Association of Community Colleges reported in September 2014 that in 2012 as many associate degrees were awarded in the liberal arts and sciences, with graduates intending to transfer to a four-year college, as in the health professions and business, marketing, and management. See “What Are Students Majoring In?” *DataPoints*, American Association of Community Colleges (September 2014), available at <http://www.aacc.nche.edu>. Colleen Lye, Christopher Newfield, and James Vernon stress that higher education should be seen as a civil right and that “systemic solutions” need to be found “across all tiers of public higher education” and common cause needs to be made with K–12; see their “Humanists and the Public University,” *Intr.* to special issue on “The Humanities and the Crisis of the Public University,” *Representations* 116.1 (Fall 2011): 1–18. For a discussion of community colleges as part of the California Master Plan for Higher Education, see Bob Meister, “Debt and Taxes: Can the Financial Industry Save Public Universities?” *Representations* 116.1 (Fall 2011): 128–155.

17. Commission on the Humanities and Social Sciences, *The Heart of the Matter: The Humanities and Social Sciences for a Vibrant, Competitive, and Secure Nation* (American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 2013), 13, available at <https://www.amacad.org/default.aspx>.

18. See <http://seattlecolleges.com/DISTRICT/catalog/printcatalogs.aspx>, 5.

19. For-profit institutions of higher education are also part of the mix, with their enrollments increasing as students transfer down. Meister examines the higher educational system in

California, where an increase in tuition at the University of California campuses results in a relay of transfers, with students ultimately transferring from community colleges to for-profit institutions; students from minority populations are disproportionately part of that relay.

20. See Rob Jenkins, "So Long, 'Community Colleges'?" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 29, 2011, available at <http://chronicle.com>. Located just east of Seattle, Bellevue College, formerly called Bellevue Community College (it changed its name in 2009), offers eight BAs.

21. Consider the example of Stanford University, which recently reconfigured its introductory undergraduate courses in response to the perceived crisis in the humanities and in the conviction that it is crucial to emphasize skills and competencies in the broadest sense, including the appraisal of problems and thus capacities for (re)framing problems and solving problems. In the past, Stanford had general education requirements based on sampling disciplines; the new requirements—Ways of Thinking/Ways of Doing—are based on eight capacities: aesthetic and interpretive inquiry, social inquiry, scientific method and analysis, formal reasoning, applied quantitative reasoning, engaging diversity, ethical reasoning, and creative expression.

22. The Survey of Earned Doctorates, released in 2014 with the figures for 2012, reported the time to degree (from start to completion) for all disciplines in the humanities at 9.0 years. While there are many reasons that can be cited for such a lengthy time to degree (among them, research in archives in other countries, the mastering of uncommonly taught languages, the necessity of working part-time), 9.0 years is simply too long given the many costs (personal, social, economic, institutional) involved. See the *Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature* (New York: Modern Language Association, 2014), 3–4, available at <http://www.mla.org>.

23. Allow me to refer to the experience of Brian Gutierrez, a doctoral candidate in English at the University of Washington who for the past several years has taught courses (predominantly composition courses) at North Seattle College. Recently asked to give a lecture at North Seattle College on how what he teaches is related to his research for his dissertation, he framed his remarks in relation to digital humanities and critical pedagogy. His experience reveals that intensive research is valued at this institution—in great part as a way of showing students the larger horizon of higher education.

24. I was a member of this Task Force, which, in addition to advocating for shortening time to the doctoral degree to five years, also recommends that we identify paths to careers in addition to college and university teaching and develop ways for our students to acquire digital literacies for the twenty-first century. Perhaps the most important recommendation is that our doctoral programs expand the spectrum of possible forms of the culminating research project, commonly called the dissertation, beyond the proto-print book. See *Report of the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study*.

25. If I were in the Department of History at the University of Washington I would want to introduce our doctoral students to Amy Kinsel, a tenured-faculty member at nearby Shoreline Community College who holds a doctorate in history from Cornell University. I quote from an e-mail she sent to the University of Washington's AAUP listserv on May 8, 2014 on the subject of "College, the Great Unequalizer," referring to a story in the *New York Times*: "... teaching at a community college can be extraordinarily rewarding. Students choose to attend community colleges for a number of reasons, but my observation is that the most significant of these are that they are not academically or emotionally prepared to enter a four-year institution, that their personal and work lives are too complicated for them to enroll anywhere as full-time students, or they do not have the financial resources or financial stability to enroll immediately at a four-year institution.

I see my role largely as preparing students who are not yet ready, for whatever reason, to attend a four-year institution to succeed once they get there. My colleagues and I work very hard to maintain academic standards that will allow our transfer students to enroll in upper-division classes at the UW and perform well. Having sent hundreds of students to the UW successfully at this point in my career, I will happily argue that our transfer program provides opportunities for students to earn baccalaureate degrees that would simply have not been possible for them without the access and support provided by community college preparation.”

26. This section of *The Heart of the Matter* refers to online learning as well.

27. *The Heart of the Matter*, 32.

28. *The Condition of Education 2010*, U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics (2010); qtd. in Louis Soares, “Post-traditional Learners and the Transformation of Postsecondary Education: A Manifesto for College Leaders,” American Council on Education (January 2013), available at <http://louissoares.com>.

29. *Going the Distance: Online Education in the United States*, Report of the Sloan Foundation: The Sloan Consortium (2011), available at <http://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/goingthedistance.pdf>.

30. I base the figure of forty-three years on my reading of a Life Expectancy Graph 1850–2000 from the University of Oregon (available at <http://mappinghistory.uoregon.edu/english/US/US39-01.html>).

31. Barbara Vacarr, former president of Goddard College, has called our aging population the new frontier of higher education. See Vacarr, “An Aging America: Higher Education’s New Frontier,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, December 8, 2014, available at <http://chronicle.com>. In terms of racial demographic change we need to take into account the growth of the Latino population; it is projected that in the 2040s the Latino/a population will pass 30 percent while the non-Hispanic white population will decline, falling below 50 percent. See Matthew Countryman, “Diversity and Democratic Engagement: Civic Education and the Challenge of Inclusivity,” in *Civic Provocations*, ed. Donald W. Harward (Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities, 2012), 47–50, available at <http://aacu.org>.

32. Mark W. Huddleston, “New Hampshire State Senate Finance Committee,” FY 12–13 USNH Operating Budget Hearing (April 18, 2011), available at <http://unh.edu/president/concord-testimony>.

33. For example, in June 2014, AT&T and Udacity announced a partnership, under the name NanoDegree, to provide education—a credential—for people who are seeking entry-level positions at AT&T.

34. In the fall of 2013 a pilot project was launched at the University of California, Davis, to experiment with badging—and competency-based learning—in relation to a new undergraduate major in sustainable agriculture and food systems.

35. The wonderful notion of *institutions as mobilizing networks* emerged for Cathy Davidson and David Theo Goldberg in the course of their research—much of it with peers online—for their report for the MacArthur Foundation; see their *The Future of Thinking: Learning Institutions in a Digital Age* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2010), ch. 5 (“Institutions as Mobilizing Networks: [Or, ‘I Hate the Institution—But Love What It Did for Me’]”).

36. See Woodward, “The Future of the Humanities—in the Present & in Public,” *Daedalus* 138 (Winter 2009): 110–123.

37. See also Geoffrey Galt Harpham, “Finding Ourselves: The Humanities as a Discipline,” *American Literary History* 25.3 (2013): 509–534. In his effort to characterize the humanities—his essay is masterful—Harpham distinguishes between facts and the general enterprise of the humanities, and in the following formulation I would not want to disagree with him: “it is still

the case that teaching in the humanities aims not at a mere accumulation of facts or information but at a more general sense of illumination that exceeds the subject being taught and outlasts classroom experience” (518). Elsewhere in “Finding Ourselves,” he writes that the goal of the single-authored project in the humanities “is not to add to our mass of factual knowledge—a project that humanists treat with occasional disdain—but to persuade readers to accept a different understanding than the one they had” (524). See also “From Eternity to Here: Shrinkage in American Thinking about Higher Education,” *Representations* 116.1 (Fall 2011): 42–61.

38. See Stanley Chodorow, “Taking the Humanities Off Life Support,” *The Transformation of Humanistic Studies in the Twenty-first Century: Opportunities and Perils*, American Council of Learned Societies Occasional Paper No. 40 (1997), available at <http://archives.acls.org/op/op40ch.htm>.

39. Mark C. Taylor, *Crisis on Campus: A Bold Plan for Reforming Our Colleges and Universities* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2010). See Taylor’s inspiring chapter “Walls to Webs” (139–180). In Taylor’s vision, to the traditional divisions of the natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities and arts would be added a fourth division—“Emerging Zones.” These zones of inquiry, in his words, “would be organized around problems and themes that lend themselves to interdisciplinary investigation. They would be designed to maximize the openness and flexibility necessary to adjust to the constantly expanding and evolving intellectual landscape. Whenever possible, these Emerging Zones of Inquiry should focus on questions and problems that have practical relevance and prepare students to become responsible citizens who are capable of pursuing creative and productive careers” (145).

40. A graduate certificate in public policy in the humanities is in development at the University of Michigan under the leadership of Sidonie Smith, the director of its Institute for the Humanities.

41. Regarding risk and the humanities, see, for examples, Randy Martin, “Taking an Administrative Turn: Derivative Logics for a Recharged Humanities,” *Representations* 116.1 (Fall 2011): 156–176; on derivatives, risk, and globalization, see Edward LiPuma and Benjamin Lee, *Financial Derivatives and the Globalization of Risk* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004); and on the history of credit and accounting in the West, see Mary Poovey, *A History of the Modern Fact: Problems of Knowledge in the Sciences of Wealth and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998) and *Genres of the Credit Economy: Mediating Value in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008). See also my *Statistical Panic: Cultural Politics and Poetics of the Emotions* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009).

42. See Dipesh Chakrabarty, “The Climate of History: Four Theses,” *Critical Inquiry* 2.35 (Winter 2009): 197–222.

43. Rafe Sagarin, *Learning from the Octopus: How Secrets from Nature Can Help Us Fight Terrorist Attacks, Natural Disasters, and Disease* (New York: Basic Books, 2012).

44. See William Zumeta, David W. Breneman, Patrick M. Callan, and Joni E. Finney, *Financing American Education in the Era of Globalization* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2012); this book addresses the challenge of financing US higher education in the light of rapid demographic change, focusing on racial and ethnic populations.

45. Todd Presner, “Welcome to the 20-Year Dissertation,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 25, 2013, available at <http://chronicle.com>.