



Introduction. Other Criteria: History Writing as a Public Calling

Antoinette Burton

.....

Professor of History, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Abstract • This introductory article raises questions about history’s work in the contemporary public sphere and sets the stage for the issues addressed in the special issue as a whole. Drawing on my experience at a public university in fiscal crisis, I argue that historians can and should contribute to debates about the future of higher education, the role of the humanities in the twenty-first-century liberal arts curriculum, and the fate of intellectual work in a global world.

Keywords • economic crisis, history-writing, liberal arts education, public histories

.....

As a discipline, as a professional practice, and as a teaching vocation, history today faces scrutiny in the global public sphere in unprecedented ways. While History (with a capital H) has always been engaged with and implicated in notions of civic humanism and the public good, contemporary conditions of crisis and catastrophe have thrown the very enterprise of history writing and even teaching into profound question. We live at a time that has generated heated questions about what historians owe the public, which publics if any they should address and what their fate should be in the hands of a declining “public” sphere—where public signifies both a common good and the fiscal support of the state. Irreverent in its own time, E. H. Carr’s 1961 provocation “What Is History?” would read, now, more like “What Is History Good For and Why Does the Public Need It?”¹

Of course, these battles have been joined before, in a variety of disciplinary contexts. In his essay, “Contemporary Art and the Plight of the Public”—written one year after Carr’s book was published—art critic and historian Leo Steinberg began with the following anecdote:

A few words in defense of my topic because some of my friends have doubted that it was worth talking about. One well-known abstract painter said to me, “Oh, the public! We’re always worrying about the public.” Another asked,



“What is this plight they’re supposed to be in? After all, art doesn’t have to be for everybody. Either people get it, and then they enjoy it; or else they don’t get it, and then they don’t need it. So what’s the predicament?”²

Steinberg’s concern was with the “academization” of the avant-garde in the late 1950s: what he called “this useless, mythical distinction” between “on one side, creative, forward-looking individuals whom we call artists and on the other, a sullen, anonymous, uncomprehending mass whom we call the public.” He was equally critical of the way that the art establishment tended to respond to new work, whether it was Paul Signac’s horror at witnessing the “disgusting” tints in Henri Matisse’s *The Joy of Life* in 1906 or Matisse’s shock and outrage on seeing Picasso’s 1907 *Demoiselles d’Avignon*—that “breakthrough” example of modern art at its most ambitious and revolutionary. Steinberg, for his part, shared some of these anxieties and his essay is an exploration of both his own acculturation to the new sensibilities of modern painting and of the inevitable transformation of the new and outrageous to the normal and finally, the authoritative. Though he tends to view this as an inexorable process—from outside to inside, from margin to center, from outré to normative—the dialectic is by no means immanent. In his schema, “other criteria” of judgment obtain because of people’s direct confrontation with contemporary art, especially at moments of significant, if not convulsive, social upheaval. His argument is thus that the “plight of the public” is symptomatic of historical change itself and that “sooner or later it is everybody’s predicament.”

The contributors to this special issue share Steinberg’s conviction that “other criteria” emerge at moments of historical change and that those criteria shape the scholar’s relationship to the public. Our target is not art but history writing, and our shared aim is to think about how the present moment is generating new, different, and at times competing criteria for judging what constitutes history, historical writing, and its institutional and public value.³ Nor is ours a merely retrospective appraisal. During an extended moment when humanistic inquiry is under siege as unproductive in market terms—and therefore endangered in institutional terms—historians are reaching for all kinds of publics in order to engage questions about the past that are of monumental importance in and for the present. They are doing so not simply in reaction to the threat to job security or even in defense of the professoriate per se. Spurred in part by the democratization of expert knowledge via the Internet, in part by the assault on the idea of a public commons, and in part by the fiscal crisis in higher education—which compels all academics to ask whose interests they serve—historians are extending their remit and seeking audiences beyond the walls of academe in ways that may well reshape the practice and discipline for decades to come. At stake is the very notion of authority to which Steinberg, for all his critique, remained attached. Also at issue is the extent to which the discipline itself can survive in its historic forms.

As the articles in this issue suggest, historians increasingly write in all kinds of genres. Though they have long been pundits in the public sphere, many are looking to break out of the enclosures of professional academic writing in order to address a variety of publics: community publics, student publics, secondary education publics, virtual publics of all kinds. This re-orientation requires new forms of writing, new rhetorical strategies, and new methods of address and argument in which few of us have been trained. Indeed, many of us were trained precisely to reject “popular” forms as part of our identity as professionals. Contributors to this special issue were invited to reflect on the challenges posed by contemporary shifts in the vocation of the history writer, whether by grappling aloud with their own re-education, specifying the limits and possibilities of new generic forms, modeling “cross-over” histories, examining the feedback loop between research and teaching, examining the power relations between the professor and her publics, or addressing the indispensability of multiple, flexible kinds of historical thinking for the contemporary present. Our ambition is to sponsor a self-reflexive conversation about the stakes of these developments. We have deliberately posited this special issue as “writing” history rather than the more capacious “doing” history because we want to press the question of the written word in all its contemporary forms—from blackboard to blog to op-ed to fiction to polemic and beyond—at a moment when the technology of *writing* itself is undergoing profound changes, even as the persistently textual character of the digital *reading* revolution is not always at the forefront of public debate.

My interest in these questions stems from my institutional location and its particular collision with contemporary history. I work at a public research university in the United States—the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign—which has been under siege if not assault in the last few years, partly because of the 2008 fiscal crisis and the global impact it has had on markets and lives. To be sure, the crisis in public higher education in the United States predates the collapse of Lehman Brothers and its partners in crime. And it is a crisis that has thrown the very meaning of the word “public” in public education into doubt, given the steady decline in state revenue that actually supports the work of the institution broadly conceived. In what has euphemistically been called a “rethinking of the funding model,” universities have ballooned their administrative sector, raised tuition at alarming rates, and accelerated a long-standing trend toward adjunct and other forms of contingent labor (not just in the domain of teaching labor, of course).⁴ Some scholars have argued that the contemporary crisis is connected to the collapse of American empire in spectacular ways that are only just beginning to be historicized, and to which I can only gesture here.⁵ Beyond the pressure that these circumstances place on academics to be cognizant of and fully engaged with the political economy of secondary and tertiary education (the two are related in ways we ignore at our peril in the extended era of No Child Left Behind), these newly visible and ever-volatile histories call on us as practicing historians to do more than react. They require us to enter

into a variety of conversations—with students and colleagues, with administrators and journalists, with family members and voters and participants in the political process at many levels—in ways that redefine our relationship to a variety of publics and, arguably, re-imagine what it might mean to be a practicing historian as well. As many of our contributors attest, it means subjecting our historical practices to new scrutiny and assessing their success or failure as history via criteria other than those the discipline has traditionally prized. It means countenancing the ways in which being an academic is a new kind of enterprise, engaged with, without being in thrall to, the motors of economic and political productivity.

Speaking personally (read: speaking politically) contemporary circumstances, both local and global, have affected my work in ways I did not anticipate. Despite my research focus on feminism and empire, I was trained traditionally at the University of Chicago and most of my “activism” has been bound up (literally and figuratively) in books and articles. But the events of the fall of 2009, when the California state system was very publicly imploding in the face of budget wars and the faculty there was taking to the streets around the “Save the University” campaign,⁶ catalyzed many of my colleagues at Illinois in new and unprecedented ways. In virtual spaces and in public forums, we argued against the corporatization of higher education both because it is a clear and present danger, and because it is a problem that directly affects populations who most need access to higher education: under-represented minorities, working class kids, and “first in family” college students wherever they come from, illegal immigrants included. We spoke against purely market-driven models of liberal arts education that narrow curricula to offerings that claim to solve real world problems such as sustainability, health, energy, global warming. It is not easy to formulate arguments against such a focus: of course we need environmental histories, histories of business, of energy, of entrepreneurship. Meanwhile, history and the humanities more generally are pushed to gear themselves toward those subjects to the effective exclusion of many other subjects, such as the study of antiquity, of peasants, of poetry, and find themselves at the risk of reduced funding for faculty lines and graduate research if they are not tailored to outcomes that are applicable to contemporary problems.

Historians can forcefully and profitably argue that what we need are courses *on* and programmatic attention *to* global histories of poverty, the ethnography of the global prison industrial complex, the literatures of global social movements, the sociology of global violence and war, the political economy of underdevelopment worldwide. These kinds of courses might be bolstered by cutting-edge research that starts with a critique of global power rather than with a not-so-hidden desire to be incorporated in it by reaping its benefits and making its real material inequities disappear. I would settle for a short, simple multi-disciplinary course pitched to all first-year students on cultures of capitalism, if only so we could devote a few sessions of our undergraduates’ general education to debate about what informed under-

standing of socialism actually is, what redistributive justice means, and what civic goods are worthy of protection from market forces. We need university-level courses—everywhere from Urbana to Cape Town—on the globalized phenomenon of neoliberalism,⁷ not least so that we can understand the accelerating advance of labor regimes that impact adjuncts and our own graduate students. So that, in other words, our undergraduates can fully understand why campus faculty and graduate unions, emerge, organize, negotiate, and strike.

Though they are touted as the new frontiers of research and thinking, and money is constantly being thrown at them so that they can give our students the tools they need for the so-called real world, sustainability and public health and digital technology are, arguably, *subsets* of the questions I mentioned above (the histories of capital, poverty, war and violence, uneven development) rather than the superstructural drivers of the new socio-economic order we are continually told they are. Sustainability and digital technology (I take these as random, non-specific examples) need to be positioned in critical, dialectic, and continuous relationship to the material conditions that produce them as apparently exclusively desirable commodities in the curricular marketplace. At the very least they need to be arrayed alongside research and teaching that map out long-standing histories of environmental racism, the yawning chasm of the digital divide, and the persistence of famine and war in so-called failed states around the world. And they need to ask, of course, why the post-Katrina United States is not counted in that category more often.

Historians might be especially alive to the risible fictions of free market logic to which we are relentlessly subject at this particular moment. Examples abound, perhaps the most common being the dissolution of departments of romance languages, apparently for want of student interest.⁸ As educators we tend to respond to the market call as if the market really is this invisible hand, moving toward everyone's self-interest, or worse, as if that individual self-interest really adds up to a common good. Are we really prepared to let this interpretation stand, discipline, govern us? Do we know no history, no scholarship of the past twenty-five years, and more to the point, have we not been paying attention to the real world since the end of Lehman? Forget Lehman—remember Enron? When, where, and under what conditions, Adrienne Rich might ask, has a corporate model ever realized its own self-stated goal, guaranteed long-term profit for its investors? Here I refer you to Ananya Roy's case against the argument that virtual campuses democratize higher education and reach under-represented communities. She calls this the formula for a "subprime education," modeled on the subprime lending practices of rapacious bankers and speculators that helped to produce the current crises. She calls it "segmented inclusion" that comes at a huge price.⁹ Meanwhile, when administrators and colleagues tell us we should be responsive to student needs, we ought to tell them: actually, faculty should be more involved in driving that need. Corporations (if that

is our touchstone) shape market taste all the time. Why are we not fighting to do this, to claim our professional expertise and demand more of a role in molding how it impacts the student “product”? Otherwise students could teach themselves.

We know that many people, both inside and outside the academy, think that students could be autodidacts when it comes to literature and art, and that such autodidacticism could be cheaply supported by online instruction (good enough for liberal arts curricula, though certainly not in colleges of engineering). Such people think that humanistic subjects are simply entertainment, with little redeeming socio-economic value let alone a serious scholarly dimension. Ironically, business leaders do not typically share this view. As more people, both in and outside the academy, question the value of a humanities education and trivialize or underestimate the critical role that teachers play in transmitting humanist knowledge, we must mobilize against these claims by heeding counterarguments such as those by Norm Augustine, retired CEO of Lockheed Martin. Augustine wrote in the *Wall Street Journal* in September 2011 that, “we lag in science, but students’ historical illiteracy hurts our politics and our businesses.” He goes on to say that history is a critical delivery system for critical thinking, problem-solving, and communication competencies: skills crucial to economic recovery and to civic well-being at all levels.¹⁰

How far do we take these arguments? When do we concede the logic of an instrumentalized liberal arts education, designed to shape student fitness in a corporate workplace, and when do we insist that this is not what education is about? And when, and in solidarity with whom, do we take this moment of decline and collapse and capitalize on it to tear down extant structures and rebuild, History included? Indigenous activists like the Dakotan historian Waziyatawin have argued that this catastrophic moment is one for destruction and reconstruction from the ground up, and that is arguably one pathway out of “the university in ruins.”¹¹ The president of Arizona State University, Michael M. Crow, has a radical model for “the new American University,” which contains the seeds of destruction and the promise of reconstitution, though shaped through the language of entrepreneurship. He is also one of the highest paid college presidents in the United States.¹²

These may feel like issues well beyond our ken as faculty members or as historians. But we can and should engage in debates within our communities not only about the political economy of the curriculum, but about the **content** as well. This is to say nothing of how curriculum changes will affect and alter research agendas. We need to decide what our “core mission” is and make hard decisions about what to scale back on and eliminate. We should also make sure that our “core mission” is a guide to what we value, and we should be willing to defend the specific intellectual and ethical commitments that we think matter in a liberal arts education. Like my colleagues in the University of California system, then, I refuse the inevitability of corporate logics. I especially refuse it in the name of economic necessity at

a time when administrative positions and their salaries grow exponentially and those whose labor sustains the institution—TAs, janitors, administrative assistants, and lab techs—struggle to make ends meet and live in constant fear of losing their barely living-wage jobs. We need spaces outside this logic of instrumentalization and management and the values it implies. We need spaces of creativity and critique. And the university is one of the few places that still has the capacity to preserve those, not as spaces of privilege but of absolute necessity for a thriving civic society, for a pluralistic democratic humanism.

We hear all the time that what I have just described is not simply idealism: it is, literally, history—past and gone. For me this adds to my self-consciousness about arguing as an historian for the continuing relevance of historical studies, and it means that I have to be very clear that what I want is not to preserve the past, but to use the past and the systems thinking it cultivates to drive the admittedly uncertain future, both inside and outside the university. Historians, together with colleagues across the whole university, should be modeling our own creative offensive around what constitutes a liberal arts education for the twenty-first century. I sit on a number of committees that have been constituted because of this crisis; none of them appears to be the place to do this work. Increasingly, central administrators and boards of regents/trustees are absorbing even admissions and curricular content matters into their portfolios, eroding shared governance principles that have been severely weakened in the context of the current moment. Faculty across the disciplines need to be making these decisions and they need to have more of an active, guiding role in the academic mission of the university—in guaranteeing that it is one of the main drivers of the institution as a whole. In other words, they need to take, even to seize, more responsibility for running the university. To paraphrase Gerald Graff, the question is not what conversation you want to overhear, but what conversations you want to actively participate in, with whom, and why.¹³ Being “multivoiced,” is “a necessary job skill in academe,” one that we should cultivate in our students as much as in ourselves, not least because it represents just one kind of professional versatility that is indispensable for survival in the current job market, academic or otherwise.¹⁴

Critics may well read this as a defense of “the tenured caste,” and it is vulnerable to that critique if and when it is detached from the politics of access and diversity in its most robust form. I write from inside a public university: a locus of professional class privilege, yes, but also of opportunity for engaging a variety of publics. Historians of all kinds, and in all manner of academic institutions, must begin to address these questions head on and begin to ground them in undergraduate and graduate curricula. This is especially true where the teaching of public history—the object of unabashed scorn in history departments in many research universities—is concerned. It is here that new forms of public engagement can be imagined, designed, and tested. Equally critical is the necessity of expanding our audience for history:

metaphorically and physically moving beyond the four walls of the residential campus. It is also true, however, that if you teach in the United States and do something other than US history, those possibilities are limited.¹⁵ At Illinois, historians have been crucial to the operation of two projects that extend the classroom into new spaces. One is the Odyssey Program, which offers “a college-level introduction to the humanities through text-based seminars led by professors at top-tier colleges and universities to help adults with low incomes more actively shape their own lives and the lives of their families and communities.” The other is the Education Justice Project, which offers a full range of courses to students in the Danville Correctional Center. Significantly, one of the project’s key missions is to “produce critical scholarship” about the work that goes on at Danville.¹⁶

Students in all spaces and places need inspiration as well as technical knowledge; they need the discipline of learning another language and the skill to recognize in “unfamiliar” terrain both timeless and historically specific trends and ideas and patterns. They need to encounter worlds they did not know existed, to be knocked off their feet, to have their realities queered, to find their place anew because that is what the university has the potential to offer. Further, we as humanists need time and money for research support, to make the new discovery, to develop the contrarian argument, to critique the paradigm shift, and to bring all that back into the classroom. Innovation is great; sure, it’s the American way. But we also need people to study innovation, its design genius, its aesthetic beauty, its consequences for actual people, its payoffs and its violences, and especially its histories. This is what a critically engaged, flexible, adaptive but idea-driven liberal arts education offers those who have access to it. I argue for a faculty-guided curriculum and a faculty-centered administrative vision not just to save my own job or to reproduce myself in undergraduates and graduate students, and certainly not because I think history or historians are, perforce, radical subjects.¹⁷ I call for these things because, having taught in two public universities in my career, I have seen the chasm between public and private opportunity grow ever wider in terms of access and opportunity between those with inherited wealth and those without. And I insist on faculty governance in higher education anew as it becomes the vanishing point of our time, when as an embodied, institutionalized principle it is being subjected to a form of reckless, panic-driven, and market-oriented radical doubt unprecedented in the history of the university itself.

As I hope is clear, I believe the kind of writing and thinking I have produced above—parts of which appeared on a campus blog sponsored by the Unit for Criticism and Interpretive Theory in the fall of 2009—are not only required of us, but they should count as historical thinking at work. In an effort to push this question further in my own work, I have also begun to seek forums where I can address questions of importance to historians—what historical thinking is, what historical methods are, what good history is in a globalizing world—directed to an audience that is favorably disposed but

with whom I don't typically communicate: school teachers. This has taken the form of a small book called *A Primer for Teaching World History: Ten Design Principles*, which is aimed at teachers at the secondary and tertiary levels who might be baffled or even intimidated by the project of teaching Introduction to World History, a course which, incidentally, is linked to a hugely popular College Board AP examination, and which is sweeping the sixth-to-twelfth grade curriculum in the United States in unprecedented ways.¹⁸ For what it is worth, I was determined to articulate why students need historical skills when they think about globalization. I wanted to front-end the payoffs of critical historical thinking in the face of a topic that is relentlessly, almost hopelessly presentist. I wanted to make a case, in other words, for why the present needs history, not simply as a container of ideas but as a skill set, a delivery system for specific modes of reading and writing, and above all as a method for critically engaging the very notion of the global itself.

I conceived my book in a rhetorical register that was cogent and more self-consciously jargon free than I might write in other forums. I utilized direct address and wrote and rewrote for clarity in ways that I had never done before. In addition, the book aims for a hands-on approach; it is a primer that talks about curriculum design and application, which I have to say was hard to do. At times I felt utterly unmoored from all I have tethered myself to in terms of style and argument: not just the archive, but a kind of specific evidence base from which to draw, with which to argue, out of which to fashion interpretive claims.¹⁹ This is not to say that the writing is somehow simpler; far from it. But I intended to reach different readers than I have heretofore aimed for and that required shedding old habits and developing new skills.

The success or failure of the *Primer* remains to be seen. One high school teacher who proofread it said it was quite convoluted and inaccessible. Meanwhile my copyeditor at Duke University Press relentlessly removed any colloquialisms in my prose and stripped most of the URL references out (link rot is a perpetual IT problem and raises important questions for the capacity of traditional print writing to remain "live" to Web citation). I learned a hard lesson: as much as I want to reach a different audience, I still have a long way to go to unlearn the habits of a conventionally trained historian who has mainly written academic scholarship narrowly conceived in the past twenty years. We need more manuals like Curthoys and McGrath's *How to Write History That People Want to Read*, and we need to pay special attention to the question they raise in chapter 2, "Who is our history for?"²⁰ Writing about teaching is definitely considered second-level scholarship in a research university like mine, despite the fact that many historians I work with consider teaching a critically important vocation. But writing about history does not count anywhere near as much as "real" historical scholarship in the context of salary and other forms of assessment. Where in the hierarchy of value it falls in relationship to, say, blogging, remains an open question.

The question of value is at the heart of all of the articles gathered in this issue. Each author raises questions about the extent to which alternatives to traditional historical production are valued, by audiences to whom such work is directed, and by the academic systems that evaluate “history” as such. Though this varies by rank, institutional location, and political disposition, many if not all the contributors seek to have their work viewed as legitimate historical practice precisely *because* they hail a variety of publics. So while Claire Bond Potter’s article about history in the blogosphere takes direct aim at the way “virtual historians” are (still, incredibly) considered to be on the margins of History, and in so doing reveals the mechanisms of policing and regulation at the heart of the traditional disciplinary enterprise, in a very real sense anyone who works at the boundary of academe and the world is in danger of being read as a not-so-serious historian. Heather Streets-Salter’s article suggests that this is true of textbook writers, while Carina Ray’s piece offers a constructive counterpoint: though the move to journalism is fraught, not least with the active and even aggressive responses of readers, it has its satisfactions as well, especially in terms of transnational impact. To be sure, the devaluation of so-called crossover writing is less self-evident than it was even five years ago—though Terri Barnes’s experience trying to get her family history published in academic journals gives one pause on that score as well. Significantly, in locales beyond the United States, the berth for the public intellectual has always been wider, as Ann Curthoys’s article about Australia and Susan Zimmerman’s about the Vienna Global History project suggest. Yet all kinds of perils of location and politics remain. As John Soske’s experience of writing about a hotly contested life history in post-apartheid South Africa and Suvir Kaul’s account of historicizing Kashmir manifestly illustrate, some dangers are clear in anticipation of the writing, while others arise in unlooked for, and even untold/untellable, ways as the process itself unfolds. Few who finish reading Kaul’s piece can fail to ask, “who can say what the best forms of accounting are and who can or should account for histories of trauma and suffering in the present”? Who would draw a fine line between journalists, poets, literary critics, and historians, and to what ends?

Given the political nature of such border crossings, seeking recognition for this promiscuous kind of work as a species of historical practice will likely face skepticism at best, deaf ears at worst. Of course this is not to say that all such work needs to be brought into the ambit of history writing—or even be recognized as such—in order to count. Vijay Prashad’s article models the most subaltern stance in this regard, where subaltern indicates indifference to dominant structures as well as resistance. But it does mean that we need to develop other criteria through which to appreciate, if not to measure, the worth of historians’ variegated work in the world. We will also need to be vigilant against romanticizing our role—we will need to remember, in Barnes’s wonderfully evocative phrase, that the public itself is a perpetually “uneven surface on which to catch” a variety of histories, rather than a

self-evident resting place for them. To return to Leo Steinberg's essay, history worth reading is like art worth looking at: it ought to be a "bad risk" because when it is, it forces readers of all kinds to push it in new, unsettling directions and to create, in turn, new and critically informed publics who ask for different histories, perhaps, than we have been able to imagine, let alone write. In this risk-averse moment in higher education, them's fightin' words.

Notes

Thanks to Linda Mitchell and Dan Gordon for inviting me to guest edit this special issue and to Ann Curthoys, Carina Ray, and Jon Soske especially for the critical eye they cast on my introductory article.

1. E. H. Carr, *What Is History?* (London: Macmillan and New York: St. Martin's Press, 1961).
2. Leo Steinberg, "Contemporary Art and the Plight of Its Publics," in Steinberg's *Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth Century Art* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), 3. This essay, based on lectures given at the Museum of Modern Art in New York in the spring of 1960, was first published in *Harper's Magazine* in March 1962.
3. Thanks to Carina Ray for this formulation.
4. Bill Readings, *The University in Ruins* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996); Frank Donoghue, *The Last Professors: The Corporate University and the Fate of the Humanities* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008); and Christopher Newfield, *Unmaking the Public University: The Forty-Year Assault on the Middle Class* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011).
5. There are many sources I could cite to make this point but one of the most useful is George Packer, "The Broken Contract: Inequality and American Decline," *Foreign Affairs* 90, no. 6 (2011): 20–31. See also Niall Ferguson et al., eds., *The Shock of the Global: The 1970s in Perspective* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010).
6. This can be found on YouTube, via a search for "Save the University." I recommend especially the speeches by Wendy Brown and Ananya Roy, to which my remarks here are indebted.
7. This is a powerful term with many dimensions. In the university context I take it to mean an emphasis on private sector, "flexible" market values and the deaccessioning of public revenue from the tertiary sector. See Joyce E. Canaan and Wesley Shumar, eds., *Structure and Agency in the Neoliberal University* (New York: Routledge, 2008) and Teresa A. Barnes and Amina Mama, eds., special issue of *Feminist Africa*, "Rethinking Universities I," no. 8 (2007).
8. See, for example, Scott Jaschik, "Disappearing Languages at Albany," *Inside Higher Education*, 4 October 2010, <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/10/04/albany> (accessed 27 February 2012).
9. See YouTube speech referenced in note 6.
10. Norm Augustine, "The Education our Economy Needs," *Wall Street Journal*, 21 September 2011.

11. See <http://www.anti-semitism.net/holocaust/wazyatawin-on-holocaust-collapse-and-despair-r-a-g-e.php> (accessed 27 February 2012).
12. Michael M. Crow, "A New American University: The New Gold Standard," <http://www.asu.edu/president/inauguration/address/address.pdf> (accessed 27 February 2012).
13. Gerald Graff, *Clueless in Academe: How Schooling Obscures the Life of the Mind* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003), 157.
14. Donald E. Hall, *The Academic Community: A Manual for Change* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2007), 111.
15. Thanks to Ryan Jones for reminding me of the immediacy of this question.
16. See <http://www.prairie.org/odysseyproject> and <http://www.educationjustice.net/home/> (accessed 27 February 2012).
17. Thanks to Jon Soske for helping me articulate this.
18. Antoinette Burton, *A Primer for Teaching World History: Ten Design Principles* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012).
19. Here I took, and take, unlikely inspiration from Eric Hobsbawm's claim that "almost anything which helps us to answer questions is a source." Panel Discussion, "Conversations with Eric Hobsbawm," in collaboration with the Book Review Literary Trust Indian International Centre, 14 December 2004, 5. Thanks to Sanjam Ahluwalia for a transcript of this conversation.
20. Ann Curthoys and Ann McGrath, *How to Write History That People Want to Read* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2009).