

Thoughts on Humanities at UCF

Bruce Janz

Draft: Oct. 2, 2003

Revised: Oct. 28, 2003

I want to think about what humanities here looks like, and what it might look like. To do that, some context is required, which I will provide. It may be that everyone already knows this, and if so, please just move on to the thoughts about our specific situation. And, part of my purpose with all this is to start a conversation. This is by no means a final analysis; it is more like “does this sound about right?” If it doesn’t, it still serves its purpose as a starting point. At times, these thoughts might ramble, although I’m trying to form chaos into order here. Please forgive the provisional nature of all this.

I also understand that discussions about the nature of the humanities here in the department have been going on for a long time, and that there may be very few official records of those conversations. I’m hoping that what I write here provides the occasion for those who have been around to recall and relate those ideas to those of us who have just arrived.

On to some general background concerning humanities.

Humanities as a Pursuit Within the University Context

The term “humanities” has come to mean different things in different universities (and I don’t claim that this list is comprehensive):

1. General/Liberal Studies: This refers to foundational study, and is represented by the members of such groups as the *Association of General and Liberal Studies*. Courses tend to emphasize general skills and knowledge that extends across disciplinary boundaries, and also in some cases have emphasized content that will “make you a better person”, as opposed to preparing you for a specific task. In some cases this is an attempt to recover some analogy of the mediaeval trivium, the liberal arts which were basic to all areas of knowledge. Many people do not see this as either a research area or, properly speaking, a discipline. but supports other research areas or disciplines, and is mainly for students in their early years, to inculcate a broad cultural understanding before they go on to specialize.

At UCF, of course, we already have liberal studies. It does not have the sense here that I have just outlined, though. In fact, it is not seen as foundational, but rather as interdisciplinary (although I would actually see it as multidisciplinary; see below), and serves as a potential program nursery, as well as a place where students can construct a program that does not fit into existing disciplines. It has no faculty hired directly to it, but draws on existing disciplines.

If our humanities program is to define itself, this is perhaps the most important comparable local program we will have to distinguish ourselves from. We know that we’re doing something different, of

course, but exactly what that is, and how it is perceived, will take some thought.

2. Cooperation of Disciplines: Probably the most common sense of “humanities” in most universities is as the cooperation of a set of disciplines. This may be in institutional form, as in a faculty, or in more deliberate form, such as in a humanities centre. Typically these centres provide resources and programs that can serve all the disciplines involved. The key here is that humanities deliberately comes after disciplinarity, as a conscious effort to find commonalities between already distinct and established disciplines. This version of humanities does not tend to face charges of dilettantism or irrelevance. On the other hand, it also tends not to challenge the home disciplines in any radical manner (although there’s nothing necessary about that).

Right now I don’t see an obvious place where this cooperation occurs here. Disciplines seem comparatively isolated and internally defined. There are opportunities such as the honors college’s support of interdisciplinary courses, and those such as Kristin Congdon who have done a great deal of work on the borders of disciplines, but at least in the non science areas it seems that there is room for a specific site where cooperation and disciplinary dialogue might occur.

3. Great Books Programs : This refers to the program initiated at the University of Chicago, and carried on at such places as the Great Books Foundation, and Malaspina College in BC. The most prominent current exponent of the Great Books curriculum is St. John’s College, with campuses in Annapolis and Santa Fe (see <http://www.sjca.edu>). The program emphasizes overarching concepts, represented by the “classics” texts of Western thought. I only put classics in quotation marks to indicate the vexed nature of the category for many. These concepts come out of the “great questions” or perennial issues of human concern, ones which are assumed to transcend cultural/ethnic/gendered boundaries and bind all humanity together (although, Adler’s original core list of 137 authors and hundreds of books only included two women, Jane Austen and George Eliot). The controversy over Great Books concerns the often-discussed issue of canonicity, or what should be included and why. A related issue is the possibility that the “great questions” represent only a subset of humanity, and not all of humanity (and, further, that it may not be “great questions” but “great answers” that are the goal here). There may be an evaluative sense of culture here (even a Matthew Arnold notion of culture as the study or pursuit of perfection - “high culture”). But Great Books programs can be somewhat less prescriptive and more critical as well (e.g., the Malaspina program is a “watered down” Great Books program, more willing to take critical perspectives into account).

I don’t see anyone doing a Great Books program here. This is one way the honors college might have gone, but I don’t think they did, to their credit.

4. History of Ideas: Although many Great Books programs are also vitally concerned with the history of ideas, I am differentiating them here. Great Books programs tend to prescribe the right ideas that everyone should know about. History of ideas programs tend to be more interested in accounting for the ideas we have and where they came from, the contexts in which they emerged, and also their limitations. In other words, there is a less prescriptive feel to these programs. History of ideas was a break-away from history, particularly the history of philosophy. It was originally seen as “soft” history.

The University of Washington has a “Comparative History of Ideas” program, which is interdisciplinary and emphasizes what they call “parallel thinking”, or multiple forms of understanding of a problem.

However, not all history of ideas programs are focussed on problem-based research. In fact, that’s historically something that is found more in interdisciplinary programs. History of ideas programs can be critical (like Helen Sheehan’s course in Ireland <http://www.comms.dcu.ie/sheehan/philosophy/histidea.htm>) or it can be fairly conservative.

There’s nothing exactly like a history of ideas program here, as far as I can tell. Depending on how we framed it, this would be a possibility for us, although we would have to be clear that we are not limited to historical ideas. Of course, we couldn’t call it the history of ideas - the history department would not be pleased.

5. Cultural Studies: While it is a bit misleading to call cultural studies humanities (after all, cultural studies has resisted both disciplinarity and humanism, if not humanities), it does make sense to identify cultural studies as a historical way of resisting more positivist or quantitative analyses of society and human experience.

Cultural studies resists location in a specific department, but in fact it usually ends up there anyway. I typed “cultural studies” into the UCF search engine, and most of the top 20 hits were my pages. That suggests to me that the phrase doesn’t have much currency here. There are certainly some in English who do this, but the department doesn’t seem to officially emphasize it as one of their strengths. It may be that the term “cultural studies”, like the term “postmodern”, is a term whose time has past. It seems to be used less than it once was, and because of this might be a term to be avoided. What might have changed is the associations of cultural studies (and for that matter, postmodernism) as primarily destructive or relativist enterprises. Cultural studies has had bad press because its tradition of questioning the status quo has not always been accompanied by its ability to present new ways of understanding human meaning and value.

This would also be a possibility for us, but it should be noted that cultural studies has tended to critique most of the other approaches to humanities that I’ve listed here. We would either have to make this solely a cultural studies department (and I think that wouldn’t actually work for us, given the departmental history and given the place in the curriculum we have), or we would have to be deliberate about framing the humanities to be broad enough to include both historical and critical approaches.

6. Interdisciplinary Programs: Interdisciplinarity has often emerged “from the ground up”, that is, from specific interests of two or more disciplines. Sometimes, though, it has existed as a category or academic unit, general enough to house new or emergent interests. Sometimes it has been seen as a kind of nursery for new programs, which eventually become their own academic units. Interdisciplinarity has often been seen as collective problem-solving (that’s how it almost always appears in technical disciplines); it is unlikely that we would be comfortable with that version.

As already noted, the liberal studies program is deliberate about its interdisciplinary focus. But it isn’t clear to me that they’ve thought very carefully about what interdisciplinary actually means. Don’t tell them I said that - it doesn’t mean that they don’t do good work down there, because I think they

do. But their version of interdisciplinarity seems to mainly be a way of constructing a program out of existing UCF elements, that have not been organized yet by the faculty or administration. That isn't necessarily interdisciplinary - it might just be multi-disciplinary, or pluri-disciplinarity. It is hard to be interdisciplinary if the disciplines are not made to interrogate each other, to raise questions about the questions they ask, and to question their self-definitions.

7. Transdisciplinary Programs: These are programs that focus on a meta-language or meta-method. Several non-humanities versions exist, like systems theory. Semiotics could be seen as a humanities version, and there are departments that define themselves in terms of a particular method. Stand-alone cultural studies departments can be like this as well, although they aren't necessarily.

I don't see anything like this here. And, I have to say, I've never been a big fan of approaches of this sort. They always seem to have less self-critical space (or room to be critiqued by others) than other types of interdisciplinarity. Plus, I just don't like any one story that claims to tell it all.

8. A friend of mine, Ross Emmett of James Madison College at MSU, suggested this as another way of doing humanities: "What about the large number of programs in which writing becomes the vehicle through which humanities intersects with other parts of the university? Here [at James Madison], for example, what used to be known as American Thought and Language was the home of most of the university writings courses, which all students were required to take. So writing took place within a humanities (not specifically composition) setting. There may be other variants of this."

We have the history of humanities' involvement with the LINC program here. This tends to be a version of humanities that is driven by English departments or writing centers, though, and seems less to be a place of research.

These models of the humanities rarely come in pure form. If you look at actual programs, many of them try to use combinations of these. Sometimes this is because the program is expected to serve multiple masters, sometimes because the program hasn't been thought through all that well ("let's just make a program out of what everyone around happens to do"). But there are a couple of points to be made in this exercise:

1. If humanities is to find an identity here, it means both figuring out internally what we do, and also figuring out how we distinguish ourselves from other units on campus (and for that matter, in the state). Simply saying that we are interdisciplinary, for instance, doesn't distinguish us from liberal studies. Identities are for ourselves, but also for other groups of people, and it might be worth figuring out who those people are, and what their misunderstandings (or lack of understandings) about us might be.

2. These goals are not all congruent. Some are harder to reconcile than others. Depending on what model(s) we want to adopt (or others I haven't mentioned here - this list probably isn't complete), we will have to anticipate problems, and recognize the points where we will disagree & find a way to deal with them.

Humanities as a “Discipline”

It might be objected that humanities isn't a discipline. That is true - it positions itself before or over or under or beyond disciplines as defined in the modern university. But it has to behave like one within the university structure, especially the way it has been done in UCF's context. It is funded and staffed like other disciplines, even more so here than at other universities where a humanities program might just draw from existing disciplines.

There are challenges from the rest of the university towards humanities as a discipline, especially in times when budgets are tight. Humanities is perceived as unproductive, in the sense that students are not provided with productive knowledge but with general knowledge. Those teaching humanities are sometimes perceived as dilettantes, borrowing from legitimate fields to construct a narrative that has no real way of being challenged.

Usually, humanities programs have justified themselves in tight times by arguing that you can't have a university without reflection on issues in the humanities, and that no one else can really take care of the history of culture and ideas, ethics, and general education needs. Note, though, that this relegates the humanities to a service area, existing to support the “real” research which happens elsewhere. The cost of not being perceived as a discipline (and I'm speaking in university organizational terms here – Foucauldian qualms about “disciplinary” knowledge are still possible) is to be regarded as expendable.

Given the outline of approaches to humanities that I've already given, though, it might be worth our while to make ourselves look as much like a discipline to the outside world as possible, even if we might actually both want to move between disciplines and subvert disciplines. Of course, in this university's structure, we aren't a discipline because we are part of the philosophy department. But we aren't a stream either - that implies we're a subdivision of philosophy, which isn't true, despite the close relationship. Nor do we behave exactly as if philosophy is a subdivision of humanities (and, I don't think we should). Are we a program? Maybe that's the closest word. A unit? Don't really like that word, too vague and business-like.

We might think that these words don't matter, what matters is the reality. But the words do matter to people outside. We have to not only be clear, we have to seem clear (to alter the “justice not only has to be done, it has to be seen to be done” phrase).

There's another aspect to the disciplinarity of the humanities that should be mentioned. I think we need to actively cultivate relationships with other departments, particularly those which teach in areas similar to ours. That includes history, film studies, art history, English, classics (we don't have a classics department, but someone named Edward Shaw has a “Classical Humanities Portal” on the UCF system), and probably several others. This might be difficult, because these are exactly the disciplines that are likely to resent our version of humanities. But there will be people within these departments

who are open to what we want to do, and not see it as a threat. I'm much more interested in building connections than walls.

Humanities at UCF

Doug Evans and I worked on the exit exams for humanities graduates recently. As in earlier years, students didn't do all that well. There could be various reasons for this - the questions might have been too difficult or too vague; the students might not have had anything in common that they could have been tested on; the students just didn't know the material. Of course, this exam is a strange thing anyway, an exam which from the students' point of view is meaningless (no grade attached), which they can't study for, and which they could just therefore put down anything. And yet, the dean's office requires some form of assessment of the graduates.

Going through that exam highlighted some of the questions for me about humanities, and they settle into the following:

1. How do we best serve the students, and what does "serving the students" mean?

This is worthy of some philosophical reflection, I think, and I believe we might find ourselves differing on exactly what a humanities education does for the students. At one level, we could agree on banalities like giving them "critical thinking skills" and "ethical judgment skills". All true, but that doesn't get at the purpose of these things. Are we imagining, like Plato (or Matthew Arnold) that reflecting on the best thinking we can expose them to will make them better people? Or, are we making them culturally savvy (in the sense of having the ability to interpret and question culture)? Or, are we making them culturally literate (in the sense of giving them cultural recognition abilities)?

One might say, we're doing all of them. But there's the problem - doing one might undermine doing another. Getting them to think great thoughts might undermine their ability to critique those thoughts (after all, what great thoughts are left if they all get subjected to critique?) On the other hand, focussing solely on critical ability might overlook the fact that they need to understand just what it is that they are critiquing, and this might come from having reflected on a body of received knowledge in a culture.

So there's a tension here. There are ways out of the tension. One would be to "teach the conflicts" (to borrow a phrase). Not just the historical conflicts, but the intellectual ones. And, not as triumphalist narratives, but as live battles. Another would be to have an undergraduate theory course that foregrounded the differences within humanities, that is, which was up front about the fact that there isn't a unity of method or approach in the humanities, and that we can't even regard the various approaches as all reconcilable in some way.

2. How do we best serve the faculty involved in the program?

We all have the courses we want to teach, and the courses we have to teach. Why do we have to teach particular courses? Because we believe that they are an important part of an undergraduate's

education, even if they don't particularly interest us. So, what are those courses? Are there courses that we can agree on, that our humanities undergrads should have in order to proceed to more senior courses, or in order to graduate?

One day when I was dreaming, I came up with about 20 courses that I thought could be fun to teach in a humanities context. I didn't seriously think that they would all be offered (or even that any of them would). It was more to get them out of my system. Programs aren't built on just asking what everyone loves to teach, and then just assembling those courses and calling it a program. That doesn't help in future hiring, for one thing. At the same time, one of the things that distinguishes a university from a community college is that a faculty member is hired to create curricula, not just to fit in to an already established curriculum (this maybe is unfair to some community colleges, which have been very innovative. But most don't give their faculty enough time to think about anything but getting through the basics. Just ask Harry). So, it is important to me that faculty are able to teach at least some of what they really want to, and that which dovetails with their research.

Teaching is, I think, an impetus to research, when it is done properly, because we are forced to continually rethink the basics of our field. That's what both philosophers and humanities people do, they go back to the beginning (however that beginning is defined - definitionally, historically, logically, etc.). So, I'd like to find a way that we can produce students that have a clear body of knowledge and expertise, while at the same time allowing teaching to enrich faculty as well.

3. **How do we create a program that has integrity?** By "integrity", we could mean several things:
- a. a clear sense of identity, such that a student can easily tell someone what the program is about;
 - b. an identity within the university, such that other faculty recognize what the people involved in the program do.

I've already dealt with some of this, and will deal with more below, so I'll put it off addressing this question for the moment.

Where Do We Want Humanities To Go?

Undergrad Humanities

The central question we need to answer is this: What do we want a student who comes out of our program to look like, or to be able to do? Are we looking for them to have a specific body of knowledge? A specific set of skills? This is a harder question for humanities to answer than for philosophy, precisely because philosophy has the history of disciplinarity while humanities doesn't.

Given that we have a humanities program which is a blend of several of the models outlined earlier, we have a few choices.

1. We could continue to find common ground, and build a program that is internally and externally coherent. Most disciplines have some unifying aspect that they try to deliver to students, whether it be a common set of introductory courses, a common substantive body of information (shared “facts”), a common set of texts (like the Great Books), a common set of methods, a common narrative or group of narratives, or a common object of analysis. But it also has to be externally coherent, which means that it has to be identifiable by other disciplines and the administration as having a clear identity. The fact that the program is within the philosophy department already gives it some of that identity, but we don’t want to just be a form of philosophy.

The problem with this approach is that it will be difficult to find something that is shared. The existing humanities faculty might be able to all agree that, for instance, the lower level courses should be surveys, but surveys of what? Can we agree on shared content, or would we want to? I know there have been discussions about this in the past. Can we agree on common grand narratives, even if they are ultimately deconstructed? A common text, maybe? Can we agree that students will learn specific analytic skills? Without finding something that we can agree on, it will be difficult to make this one work.

2. We could define streams within humanities, something like “Classical Humanities”, “Cultural Humanities”, and “Religious Studies”. Students could declare a preference for one of those streams, and we could make sure, in constructing the programs, that they would have elements of all of them there. Likely it would mean that we would have to agree more on elements of the classical humanities stream, that is, agree on enough that students could be tested on it in the exit exam.

Benefits: Students would know more clearly what they are getting in for. Faculty could generally be left to pursue their own interests, to the extent that they fit into a particular stream.

Drawbacks: 1. Staffing streams might be more difficult. Declaring that streams exist means making a commitment to them. 2. There would still be a wide divergence of student experience in the lower-level courses.

3. We could emphasize critical skills, rather than substantive content. So, the students would not be assumed to share a body of knowledge, but would be able to do things such as analyze a text, a visual object or production, or a culture object, ritual, or practice; apply different analytic and critical tools to those texts, objects, or productions, such as feminism, critical theory, psychological humanities, history of ideas, etc.

Benefits: This makes the program more open, as these skills can be applied or learned in a wide variety of places.

Drawbacks: It is hard to divorce skills from content. It is no accident, for instance, that cultural studies approaches have generally underestimated history (it is all, as Foucault said, “history of the present” anyway), while what I’m calling “classical humanities” has seen history as a centre-piece of the discipline. So, even being specific about what a critical skill might be could be difficult.

Harry Coverston and I are currently reviewing the existing humanities course offerings, including comparing them to other programs within the state (see Appendix 1 for the list of humanities courses on the UCF books). This should help us figure out where we are, at least, and see what has been offered, and what might be needed under different versions of our undergrad program.

Here's my tentative opinion for now - I think it is too early to give up on looking for a common approach. That may come, but for now I'd like to see if we can find a unified humanities undergraduate program. Streaming does have advantages (and we've already done that, in recognizing a distinct religious studies minor), but opting for that now just ignores hard questions, rather than dealing with them. I do think, though, that we need to review all our courses to determine whether they are doing what we want them to. We could well decide to keep them as they are, but we should at least consider whether, for instance, we want to organize the basic level courses thematically rather than in terms of a vague time period.

Graduate Humanities

Moving past the humanities certificate as quickly as possible would be a good idea. Certificates are for professional purposes, to provide "certification" as a qualification.

Recent graduate programs tend to be organized around themes that suggest an identity while being broad enough for growth. English's "Texts and Technologies" program is a good example of this. This is probably due to the fact that these programs have to be sold to administrations and governments whose first question will be, why do we need a graduate program here, especially when another public institution down the road already has one.

There are graduate programs that have a focus or theme. I've spoken about Trent University's Methodologies program (now known as the "Theory, Culture and Politics M.A."), for instance. They have as their stated areas of focus:

1. Textuality, semiotics and discourse
2. Culture, nature and technology (including media)
3. Gender, body and psyche
4. Science as discourse and knowledge
5. Social and political theory

I don't think ours would be (or should be) identical with this, but I like this way of proceeding. It also defines a centre that they have there. We already have one stated departmental aim (that is, applying to both philosophy and humanities), that of "knowledge, society, and responsibility." That's a good place to start - maybe we should unpack that, and figure out what the humanities version of it might be.

As I see it, in humanities we have existing strengths in a number of areas (these come of our discussions

that Suzanne, Claudia and I had):

1. Sustained reflection on methodology, including contemporary critical methods.
2. “Grounded” humanities, that is, connecting humanities research with specific areas of practice, as opposed to purely theoretical work.
3. The ability to establish links with other people & departments (Kristin has done more than any of us on this, but all of our work has the potential to bring us in direct contact with other disciplines).

One way to set up a humanities graduate program with some immediate strength, would be to use existing faculty as “core” faculty in a program, and then carefully choose people from other departments and negotiate with their chairs to have some of their existing graduate courses count for our program. This would potentially allow the establishment of graduate streams. This might be a tricky political process, as other chairs may not want to see their faculty associated with this program, or distracted from what they consider their own concerns.

My current provisional opinion is that we should build on the existing strengths I’ve identified above, and give a graduate program as much definition as possible, using something like the Trent list as a guide.

Humanities Outside of the Main Campus

We have the benefit of an emerging humanities program at Cocoa, with Shelley, Tino, and a new person, as well as Jane at Daytona. I think this is an opportunity for all of us. There are facilities at Cocoa that give them options that the main campus doesn’t have, like the humanities centre performance space. Shelley and Tino can certainly work in a more focussed manner, given the small number of people and the fact that they are starting something new. It will be worth drawing on their work to inform the main campus program.

Humanities Outside of the Curriculum - A Humanities Center?

To this point, I haven’t seen too much humanities activity outside of our classes and programs. It would be worth talking about whether we want that to happen. There are reasons for considering it:

1. It can be enriching for faculty.
2. It can be a good way of establishing an identity on and off campus.
3. It can attract reputation and funding.

This typically is done through something like a humanities center, which can identify a group of activities as having a home. If we decide to move to a new building, there may be opportunity to have space for a centre like this, which goes a long way to establish the support of the university if we go out to find

funding. And, if we decide to move, that would be a perfect time to establish a humanities centre (or before the move, even). A new place is easily linked with a clear identity.

And, the space at Cocoa, if we can connect that with humanities programs, would give us another strong argument to say that the university is committed to seeing the humanities flourish.

Centres typically engage in some or all of the following kinds of activities (active links to examples are given on my “Best Practices in the Humanities” page, at <http://pegasus.cc.ucf.edu/~janzb/humanities/bestpractices.htm>) Please note that, in listing these I am not even remotely suggesting that we should be engaged in all these, or necessarily even any of them. This is intended as a list of ideas of what has been done elsewhere. It isn’t comprehensive, and it is evaluative (that is, I’ve decided what I think are the best practices). So, take it in the spirit of starting conversation, nothing more.

1. Instructional and curricular development

- ! developing new courses, especially interdisciplinary ones (e.g., Wisconsin). We already have the honors college involved in this, but
- ! overall curricular plan (Arizona State)
- ! international courses/tours
- ! Student internships (U. Washington)
- ! Master's/Doctoral Humanities Program (Trent)

2. Faculty Development & Research Support

- ! funding faculty research (Wisconsin)
 - " research networks (Calgary)
 - " focussed research networks or projects (UC Riverside)
- ! Collaborative Research (U. Washington)
 - " Society of Scholars (U. Washington)
- ! funding faculty training (e.g., conferences, seminars)
- ! Faculty fellowship (e.g., DePaul Centre for the Humanities)
 - " course-load reduction
 - " student assistance
- ! Conference/Exhibition/Performance grant (U. Georgia)
- ! aid in grant development & writing (Kansas)
- ! funding distinguished professorships (Kansas)
- ! publish occasional papers or preprints (UC Riverside)
- ! Work in progress talks (Utah)

3. Campus Humanities Contributions

- ! lecture/colloquium series (almost all humanities centers)
- ! high profile visiting lecturer (almost all humanities centers)

- ! campus-wide theme for a semester or year (Cornell, Wesleyan)
- ! develop links between humanities and technical disciplines
- ! interdisciplinary seminars structured around a specific theme (Kansas, Wisconsin)
- ! Humanities Week/Humanities Festival (Wisconsin)

4. Community/State Humanities Contributions

- ! compile a list of people willing to speak to humanities issues in the community - media directory
- ! resource development (archives, library, etc.)
- ! Public panels or discussions on issues of local, national, or international humanities interest.
- ! Orlando/middle Florida place research
 - " history/art/culture of the region
 - " society of locals interested in humanities (New Generation Society of Lawrence Kansas)
- ! K-12 teachers humanities workshops (Wisconsin, U. Texas)
 - " Teachers as Scholars - (U. Washington)
- ! Seminars/resources on humanities texts for specific audiences (lawyers, doctors, etc.) (Dallas)
 - " Humanities in the Workplace (U. Texas)
 - " citizen/scholar newsletter (U. Texas)
 - " UW/Seattle Humanities Forums (U. Washington)
 - " Clemente Course (U. Washington)
 - " Short courses in interdisciplinary humanities for community people
 - " Wednesday University (U. Washington)
- ! Prize
 - " Delta Prize for Global Understanding (U. Georgia)
- ! Philosopher's Café
- ! Identify groups that could benefit from aspects of humanities & discuss programs - e.g., NGOs, community groups, seniors groups

5. National/International Contributions

- ! membership in the Consortium of Humanities Centers and Institutes
- ! visiting scholars program
- ! post-doctoral scholarships/fellowships
- ! conferences (CIRLA)
- ! book series
- ! publish or support scholarly journals (Kansas)
- ! email discussion group
- ! website
- ! humanities links with other universities (e.g., African, Asian)
 - " exchange of faculty
 - " mutual development of resources
- ! Development of research tools (Getty)

6. Examples of Specific Humanities Projects in Humanities Centers

- ! The Center for the City (Dallas)
- ! Modernism, Modernity, and the Humanities (Simon Fraser)
- ! Humanities and the Public Sphere (Simon Fraser)
- ! Human Rights and Democratic Development (Simon Fraser)
- ! Our Own Backyard (Simon Fraser)
- ! Education in the Community (Simon Fraser)
- ! The New Information Order (Edinburgh)
- ! Microcosms: Objects of Knowledge (UCSB)
- ! Encyclopedia of New England Culture (U. New Hampshire)

As can be seen, the range of possible activities is extensive. But whatever we decide to do has to grow from the interest and energy of the department. Personally, I would like to see us find something that we can believe in, and that can be seen by the rest of the campus (and the community) as “value added”, that is, something that really contributes to an understanding of contemporary life. But from the point of view of identity as well as raising money, I think we should consider some form of center (or whatever we’re allowed to call it). At the very least, I’d like to see us able to support things like faculty travel and research, and perhaps be the forum for a high-profile lecture series.

Well, that’s my current sense of the state of things here, and where we might go. Let the discussions begin.

Appendix 1: Current Humanities Courses on the Books

- from the Fall 2003 UCF catalogue

HUM 2211 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Humanistic Tradition I: An interdisciplinary, multicultural study of the arts and sciences contributed by diverse human traditions to world civilization. Focus is on ancient civilizations and the cultural heritage stemming from them. Primary sources (in translation) are emphasized.

HUM 2211H AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Honors Humanistic Tradition I: An interdisciplinary, multicultural study of the arts and sciences contributed by diverse human traditions to world civilization. Focus is on ancient civilizations and the cultural heritage stemming from them. Primary sources (in translation) are emphasized. Honors content.

HUM 2230 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Humanistic Tradition II: An interdisciplinary, multicultural study of the arts and sciences contributed by diverse human traditions to world civilization. Focus is on modern civilizations and their contributions to the Global Village. Primary sources (in translation) are emphasized.

HUM 2230H AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Honors Humanistic Tradition II: An interdisciplinary, multicultural study of the arts and sciences contributed by diverse human traditions to world civilization. Focus is on modern civilizations and their contributions to the Global Village. Primary sources (in translation) are emphasized. Honors content.

HUM 3251 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Contemporary Humanities: PR: ENC 1102 or C.I. Multicultural study of Philosophy and the arts of the 20th century.

HUM 3255 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Modern Humanities: PR: ENC 1102 or C.I. Multicultural study of Philosophy and the arts of the modern period.

HUM 3320 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Contemporary Multicultural Studies: PR: HUM 2230, Junior standing, or C.I. Studies the confluence of diverse cultures making up North America in the Information Age, focusing on complete primary sources in philosophy, literature, visual arts and music.

HUM 3401 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Asian Humanities: PR: HUM 2230 or C.I. An interdisciplinary survey of the cultures of India, China, and Japan, concentrating on their traditional art, literature, religion, philosophy, and music.

HUM 3417 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Hindu Thought and Culture: PR: HUM 2230, REL 2300, or C.I. A survey of the development of Hindu thought and culture from vedic times to the modern age, with emphasis on religion, literature, philosophy, art and music.

HUM 3419 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Islamic Thought and Culture: PR: HUM 2230, REL 2300, or C.I. A survey of the development of Islamic thought and culture, concentrating on religion, jurisprudence, philosophy, science and art.

HUM 3431 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Ancient Humanities: PR: HUM 2230 or C.I. Development of Ancient Greek thought and culture with emphasis on philosophy, religion, literature and art.

HUM 3435 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Medieval Humanities: PR: ENC 1102 or C.I. Development of Medieval thought and culture with emphasis on Philosophy, Religion, Literature and Art.

HUM 3552 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Christian Thought: PR: ENC 1102. Christian thought from 4th century to present, concentrating on human nature, social justice, the state, war, and attitudes toward women.

HUM 3553 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Moses, Jesus and Muhammad: PR: HUM 2230, REL 2300, or C.I. Deals with the main themes of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam as found in the teachings of Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad.

HUM 4301 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

The Classical Ideal: PR: HUM 2211 and HUM 2230 or C.I. The search for order and form in the arts of various times and cultures. Concerns reason, structure, objectivity, harmony. Open to all Juniors and Seniors.

HUM 4303 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

The Spiritual Ideal: PR: HUM 2211 and HUM 2230 or C.I. Concerns works of art reflecting spiritual insight or the spiritual quest; mystical impulses contrasted to ethos and pathos.

HUM 4330 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Performance Theory: PR: Junior standing and HUM 2230 and either PHI 2010, PHI 2011, PHI 2101, or C.I. Traditional and contemporary theories of performance with a focus on linguistic performatives, bodily and virtual performances, self-identity, and the politics of performance.

HUM 4393 AS-PHIL 1(1,0)

Portfolio: PR: Last semester as Humanities major. Presentation of a representative sampling of student's best undergraduate work, with appropriate revisions, including a cover narrative indicating development

of humanistic knowledge and skills. Graded S/U.

HUM 4516 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Religion and the Arts: PR: One of: HUM 2211, HUM 2230, ARH 2050, ARH 2051, or REL 2300. Art, music, dance, and ritual practices in religious traditions, with emphasis on the contemporary.

HUM 4554 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Religious Quest and Human Dilemma: PR: ENC 1102 or C.I. Nature of the sacred, death, and future life and how they relate to human existence.

HUM 5802 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Applied Contemporary Humanities: PR: HUM 5803. Development of an application research project relevant to contemporary cultural issues, using Humanities theories and methods

HUM 5803 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Theories and Methods of the Humanities: PR: Senior undergraduate standing and at least one of the following: HUM 3251, HUM 3320, or PHI 4808 or Graduate Standing. Approaches, concepts, methods, and theoretical issues in the Humanities with an emphasis on critical analysis of diverse disciplinary and interdisciplinary theories and methods.

REL 2300 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

World Religions: Basic features and historical background of Confucianism, Taoism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.

REL 2300H AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Honors World Religions: PR: Permission of Honors College. Basic features and historical background of Confucianism, Taoism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Honors-level content.

REL 3131 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Religion in America: PR: REL 2300. Religious traditions in America, their relationship to politics, popular culture, media, and society.

REL 3162 AS-PHIL 3(3,0)

Healing: Culture, Art and Praxis: PR: Junior standing. A theory of the culture-specific nature of illness, including soul loss, spirit intrusion and the medicalization of deviance.