Global climate change and the debate surrounding it have been in the public eye for more than twenty years. After twenty-five billion dollars spent on research by the United States alone, we have gained a significant amount of scientific data on global climate, but we have not made advancements in political decisions and policies. Since more scientific knowledge has not resulted in any action in policy-making, it is unclear and even unlikely whether more money and more scientific data will help in the future when these have done little to help us deal with the problem so far. We have been ignoring another piece of the debate, one that challenges, first, the relationship between science and successful policy-making, and second, our assumptions regarding the objectivity of science and facts. The formulation of a new humanities policy, we will argue, can help to facilitate communication between science and policy. To have a more balanced public discourse, the humanities must be able to bring their perspective to the table with as much force as the sciences. Reinvigorating the humanities in this way will require reforms within the academic community to make them more interdisciplinary and more applicable to real world problems.

The humanities have been severed from the practical or “real” world; the “real” world that we actually live in, where change never stops, problems are always occurring, and solutions constantly sought after. Humanists have been criticized for lacking usefulness in practical situations. This is not entirely unwarranted; in recent decades humanists have acted exclusively within the walls of academia. They are expected to learn about an area within their specific discipline, get a Ph.D., teach that area to future academics, and write journals read solely by other academics. Attempts to stray outside
this norm are often met with rejection or even contempt. However, an applied approach to the humanities, we believe, offers hope of making the humanities relevant for policy and for helping policy itself connect better with other areas, such as the sciences. Applied humanities focus on being relevant to the world outside of academia. Different from traditional humanities, which often seem to aim at perpetuating their own, separate world, applied humanities strives to develop connections across the disciplines and to take a more pragmatic perspective in public issues.

A humanities policy will be useful, and possibly even essential, to move forward on emerging problems because it will help us to recognize and to tackle shortcomings within today’s policy approaches, for instance with the problems of addressing global climate change. In this case, policy has postponed action based on uncertainties within the science. However, given that it is unlikely that science will reduce the uncertainty on this issue significantly more than it already has over the past twenty years of research, it seems necessary to move ahead regardless. Humanists could offer a new perspective on the problem, drawing the debate away from the scientific community and bringing attention into other areas of the issue, such as politics and values.

In the case of global climate change, it seems that the debate is less about scientific data, and more about political obstacles. A humanities policy could help us see problems through a broader context, not just within the boundaries of the scientific community. It could allow us to step back and realize that we need to refocus our emphasis on, for example, the political reasons why very little action has been taken to ameliorate the situation. While scientific research has been essential to the global climate change debate, it has not helped to further policy decisions. We seem to have been
traveling on the wrong path, or maybe we have just been traveling on this one for too long. Humanities can help us see beyond the road we are on by showing us alternate routes, therefore acting as a kind of map that helps us become aware of where we are and what means, or road, will get us to where we want to go.

Integrating the humanities with policy and science is inhibited by fundamental assumptions we have about the nature of knowledge. That is, certain distinctions have created barriers preventing the acceptance of the humanities within the public realm, such as that between subjective and objective. Modern thinkers, such as Descartes and Bacon, emphasize the advantages of regarding the things we study as objects, separate from ourselves, in an effort to make science more objective. While this has been useful in that, for example, it helped to remove (or more appropriately, account for) biases and dogma, it also resulted in an unrealistic separation of fact from value. This metaphysical dualism, or positivism, supposed a gap between cognition, on the one hand, and ethics and aesthetics on the other. Therefore, a prominent assumption developed in the scientific community and within culture at large is that we could not gain accurate knowledge about the world unless we distanced ourselves from it.

Positivism has continued to dominate our approaches to acquiring knowledge to the extent that any discussion of knowledge where values are included alongside “objective” facts is discredited as being subjective and irrational. Even the terms themselves objective and subjective are constructs, creating an inaccurate representation of the world by sustaining the belief that something can be purely objective or subjective, when in fact these are much closer and intertwined. When values are categorized as being irrational, we alter the focus of defining and addressing problems to a way that
specifically aims to exclude values. We look solely towards science to produce a solution, and do our best to minimize the influence of values on our decisions. For how can we expect to make decisions if something that is purely subjective, and therefore neither right nor wrong, is in the way?

But, as we said above, problems are emerging that have not been ameliorated through the acquisition of scientific knowledge. While the information discovered has been helpful, it has failed to give the general public a more effective approach to the problem, in our example, global climate change. So what is the answer? Another twenty-five billion dollars for research?

It is necessary to bridge the gap between fact/objectivity and value/subjectivity if we are to make progress with current debates and problems that need more than years of research to move forward. It seems that we do not know how to discuss properly science or values. Therefore, public discourse is harmed by neglecting necessary aspects and connections in the world when addressing global issues. The reintegration of values with how we use and define knowledge, we believe, offers new hope for the lack of action within the global climate change debate and other issues. We propose that an improved humanities policy can help bridge the gap.

The next section will provide a more in depth look at how the humanities currently contribute to society and whether it is possible to measure this contribution. We then attempt to catalogue initiatives that currently exist that could fall under the heading of humanities policy reform, both governmental and nongovernmental.

Measuring the Flow of People and Ideas in the Humanities
One method of measuring the societal contribution of a field is the “impact factor” metric, currently used by the sciences and the social sciences. This measurement uses electronic citation indices, such as the Science Citation Index and the Social Sciences Citation Index, to count how many times an article is cited in the scholarly literature, and then takes this number as a proxy for the importance of the ideas contained in the article. The existing Arts and Humanities Citation Index could be used to create a similar impact factor measurement for the humanities. Unfortunately, such a measure would ignore the flow of ideas from the scholarly community to those outside of it, such as policymakers and the broader public, since these individuals do not typically publish in the peer-reviewed literature of the field. To assess the true contribution of a field to society as a whole, the spread of ideas from scholars to policymakers and the public, not just other scholars, must be measured.

The American Academy of Arts and Sciences has been one of the first organizations to recognize the importance of assessing the contribution of the humanities to society, collecting data to conduct these assessments, and sharing this information with the public and policymakers to justify funding for the humanities and improve the allocation of this funding. Their Humanities Indicators project has focused on finding existing datasets on the humanities and deciding what additional data is needed. Mapping the Humanities project seeks to improve understanding of the historical development of the humanities in the context of the institutions that have supported them,
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1 The website [www.isinet.com/isihot/essays/journalcitationreports/7.html](http://www.isinet.com/isihot/essays/journalcitationreports/7.html) discusses the state of these three citation indices and how the impact factor is reported for the sciences and the social sciences in *Journal Citation Reports*.

2 The report *Making the Humanities Count*, created for the Humanities Indicators project and available at [http://www.amacad.org/publications/monographs/Making_the_Humanities_Count.pdf](http://www.amacad.org/publications/monographs/Making_the_Humanities_Count.pdf), provides a helpful analysis of what datasets are available about the humanities field.
as well as trends in the relationship between the humanities and the sciences. In addition, this project has been given the task of improving the way in which humanities scholars convey the value of their work to the broader public.

We will use this section to explain how datasets uncovered by the Humanities Indicators project could be used to justify funding of the humanities. The influence of the humanities could be measured by taking existing datasets on how humanities scholars allocate their time to the production and dissemination of ideas and combining them with assessments of the impact of these ideas on those who are exposed to them, which could be collected through surveys. This section will explain how, by tracking ideas and people as they spread from the humanities to the public and policymakers, it is possible to generate a meaningful measurement of the contribution of a field like the humanities to society.

Let us begin our discussion of the societal contribution of the humanities by looking at potential ways to assess the impact that ideas from the humanities have on the public as a whole. First, the Impact Factor strategy could be modified to survey the popular press instead of scholarly literature. In this way, it would be possible to measure the number of times ideas generated within the humanities are mentioned in the popular press. Similar types of content analysis could be used for other media commonly used by the public, such as the Internet. Admittedly, such an undertaking could be difficult given the tremendous volume of material discussed in the popular media and the hardship of defining what should be considered an idea generated in the humanities. These difficulties could be overcome by taking samples of newspapers and magazines that represent the popular press, and then using this information to create a representative
picture of how ideas flow from the humanities to the public. For example, one could search the *New York Times* database or *Lexis-Nexis* to see how many times a particular concept, humanities publication, or humanities author is mentioned.

Similar figures on the spread of ideas from the humanities could be obtained by tracking the sale of books. One might also obtain reliable data from attendance and viewership tallies on the number of people exposed to the humanities through television (for example, watching the History Channel), museums, speeches, and other media in which ideas are disseminated. However, tracking the flow of ideas is only the first step in the process of assessing the contribution of the humanities to society. It is also necessary to weigh the impact these ideas have on those who are exposed to them.

One means of assessing the impact of humanities ideas would be to poll members of the public who have been exposed to them. This could be done effectively by asking questions about the individual’s beliefs before and after they are exposed to the ideas, and then comparing the two to determine how their beliefs have changed. Questions could also go beyond beliefs to ask if and how the individual will alter their behavior (possibly including voting behavior) because of what they have been exposed to. In addition, one could even conduct follow-up studies to determine to what extent the impact increases or decreases over time. Similar procedures could be envisioned for those who are about to read a book, look at a website, or read a newspaper review of a book published in the humanities. Admittedly, the surveys are an imperfect measure of the impact of an idea on an individual, since the survey-taker may not be consciously aware of an aspect of the idea’s impact, and furthermore the act of answering the survey may alter the individual’s assessment of the impact of the idea.
Combining the data on the flow of humanities ideas and the individual surveys of those who have been exposed to them would allow one to create a reasonable measure of the impact of an idea on the general public. In theory, one could even assign a quantitative value to the idea’s average impact on the individual who was exposed to it, multiply that number by the estimated number of people exposed to it, and arrive at a quantitative value for the idea’s impact on society.

Similar procedures could be used to measure the impact of humanities ideas on decision-makers, although the complexity of the factors that affect decisions makes this assessment much more difficult. One measurement for which it is easy to obtain data is the number of times humanists are called to testify before Congressional Committees or are consulted for government reports. However, the impacts of such consultations on policy-making are not always apparent, making this a poor metric. To obtain more reliable information on how humanities ideas influence decision-making, it would be necessary to survey staffers, advisers, bureaucrats, and even politicians on the sources of the ideas that inform the decision-making process.

Perhaps the most important way in which the humanities influence society is not by transmitting ideas directly out of the ivory tower, but rather by the training of students who will later leave the ivory tower. In this way, humanities ideas can make it into the discourse of the public and decision-makers. For example, it is likely that almost all policymakers were exposed to the humanities as part of their undergraduate education, and that this exposure influences the policy decisions that they later make. Unfortunately, comprehensive data on the types of curricula required at higher education
institutions in America does not exist, making it difficult to assess the degree to which college graduates who do not major in the humanities are exposed to the humanities.

Reliable data does exist on the educational and career paths of humanities majors after they graduate, though. The report *Life After College: A Descriptive Summary of 1992-93 Bachelor’s Degree Recipients in 1997*, based on the National Center for Education Statistics’ *Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study*, contains this type of data for humanities and history majors. 

Of interest in this summary is the fact that for the 85% of the 1992-93 humanities and history majors who were employed in 1997, only 34.6% of history majors and 41.0% of humanities majors were employed in a field that was “closely related” to their degree. (Table 1) These figures are low when compared with responses from those with degrees in all other fields except social sciences (31.2%), such as biological sciences (49.0%), mathematics and other sciences (65.6%), psychology (46.3%), and professional fields (64.3%). This is significant because it shows that most humanities majors go on to work in fields other than the humanities, taking with them the ideas they were exposed to in the humanities. To further document this flow of people, the report also includes figures on the occupations chosen by humanities majors. (Table 2)

Even students who go on to receive humanities doctorates do not necessarily remain in academia. Data on what type of careers humanities doctorates pursue is found in two sources. One source is the *Survey of Earned Doctorates* (SED), which is compiled from surveys given to all new Ph. D. recipients each year. Of interest in the SED data is the fact that, of the 4,500 humanities doctorate recipients in the United States in 2001
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who planned to begin working immediately after their doctorate, 77.1% were planning to work at an educational institution, 8.9% for industry/business, 1.9% for the government, 5.6% for a nonprofit, and 6.6% for other/unknown (Table 3). Thus, about 15-20% of humanities doctorates decide not to enter academia, thereby spreading humanities ideas in non-academic circles.

Similar data can be found in the *Survey of Doctorate Recipients* (SDR), although this biennial study was only conducted for humanities doctorates from 1977 through 1995, when budget cuts forced the NEH to stop funding the survey of humanities doctorates. The 1995 survey took a sample of 8,829 from the population of those who received a humanities doctorate between 1942 and 1994. Thus, this survey covers those who received their Ph. D. many years ago, unlike the SED. Nevertheless, the data for the field of employment of humanities doctorates is quite similar to that found by the SED, with 79.7% working at educational institutions. (Table 4) The SDR also breaks down the field of employment for humanities doctorates further than the SED, showing in detail to which sectors humanities doctorates are spreading their influence. (Tables 5 and 6)

However, even those with doctorates in the humanities who do remain in academia play an important role in conveying ideas to the public and policymakers. Sufficient data exists on the type of work performed by humanities faculty to generate an accurate picture of how much of their time is devoted to producing ideas for the scholarly community versus how much time they spend passing ideas on to non-humanities scholars, including their students, policymakers, and the general public. One of the best
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5 The 1991, 1993, and 1995 versions of this report can be found for free on the National Academies Press website, with the 1995 report at [http://books.nap.edu/books/0309058449](http://books.nap.edu/books/0309058449). Furthermore, Norlin Library has a hard copy of the 1985 report.
sources of this data is the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty. Interestingly, this dataset shows that humanities faculty spend 61.4% of their time teaching undergraduates, significantly higher than the average for faculty in all fields of 45.9%. (Table 7) Because many of these undergraduates will go on to work in fields not closely related to the humanities, teaching undergraduates is one of the most important ways in which humanities scholars influence the public and policymakers. In addition, this study indicates that humanities faculty spend 7.6% of their time as consultants for outside sources, and 3.1% of their time performing outside service work. Furthermore, they spend 5.2% of their time working with graduate students, some of whom will also leave the humanities.

In conclusion, the teaching of students seems to be one of the most important and best-documented ways in which humanities scholars affect society at large. There are no existing methods to measure the flow of ideas from the humanities to policymakers and the public, although rough metrics could be created to assess these transfers of information. However, the largest outstanding uncertainty in assessing the contribution of the humanities to society is measuring the impact that these ideas, whether they are carried in a book or in the mind of a student, have on the beliefs, decisions, and actions of those who are exposed to them. Some type of polling seems to be the best method of assessing this impact, although it is by no means perfect.

Existing Humanities Policy Initiatives

Currently, government actors have done little to address the need for an interdisciplinary application of the humanities to real world issues. In 2002, the National
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6 A searchable database for this study can be found at http://nces.ed.gov/dasol/tables.
Endowment for the Humanities received $106 million from the federal government. Most of this money (73%) went towards supporting state humanities councils, museums, libraries, historical organizations, community centers, and public television and radio. Another 8% went towards research, and 7% towards fellowships and stipends, almost all of which allows researchers to focus on non-applied subject matters within their disciplines. This leaves 6% of the overall budget for Seminars and Institutes for educators and 4% for Education Development and Demonstration, programs that are used to explore changes in teaching methods and curricula.

However, a search of the NEH website reveals that almost none of this money goes towards interdisciplinary or applied approaches. In fact, NEH rules prohibit the use of funds for programs that involve “empirical social scientific research, specific policy studies, educational or technical impact assessments, … or projects devoted to advocacy.” A few curriculum development programs funded by Focus Grants mention interdisciplinarity, although most of these are aimed at bringing together different humanities disciplines. The only notable exceptions are a program by Erik Fisher at the University of Colorado at Boulder, funded in 2002, to encourage dialogue between humanities and engineering faculty, and a similar program at Georgetown University, funded in 1999, to foster interaction among humanities faculty and social scientists. The story is similar for programs that mention ways of “applying” the humanities. The only program found on the NEH website that received funding for applied work is an “applied philosophy” program at the Rochester Institute of Technology, which aims to teach

---

7 Funding information for the NEH can be found in the Consolidated Federal Funds Report at www.census.gov/govs/www/cffr.html.
students how to apply philosophy to their everyday lives. These three programs received about $25,000 each, a small part of the over $100 million in funding the NEH receives annually.

The only government program which dedicates resources to interdisciplinary humanities issues of practical import is the Ethics and Value Studies program of the National Science Foundation, which received $1.6 million in 2003. Many of the programs funded under Ethics and Value Studies use the humanities as part of an interdisciplinary approach to scientific and technological developments of relevance to policymakers and society. For example, Stanford University received a grant for $290,000 to study “Tissue Engineering: The Morphogenesis of Values of Knowledge in a New Scientific Field,” and New York University received a grant for $20,000 to conduct a workshop on “Internet Research Ethics.” Unfortunately, the majority of the work to be done in applying humanities to real world issues has been left to non-governmental organizations.

The Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation (WWNFF) has mounted what is probably the best attempt currently underway by a non-governmental organization to extend the humanities into the world outside of academia. This foundation is a nonprofit organization concerned with analyzing and promoting education. They identify their three interests as Liberal Arts Renaissance, Access and Opportunity, and Partnerships for Learning. Within the first area, they have three programs, two being directly relevant to this report: the Humanities at Work and The Responsive PhD. The Responsive PhD program is not focused exclusively on the

12 http://www.woodrow.org
humanities, although it does aim to make doctorate education more interdisciplinary and applied, so its efforts along with those of two similar programs will be discussed at the end of this section. The Humanities at Work and Responsive PhD programs were recently introduced under Robert Weisbuch, the current president of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation. Weisbuch has placed heavy emphasis on the foundation’s responsibility to connect academia to the outside world, as is reflected within these two programs.

The Humanities at Work program’s chief aim is to bring humanities Ph.D.’s into the public sector. This program exists as a response to the lack of the humanities in society, or the restriction of the humanities to the academic world. The foundation believes, as we do, that the humanities should be reintegrated into the public sphere to the benefit of both the humanities and society in general. This program provides different types of support to humanities doctorates to link together the area of expertise with the larger community. These come in the form of practicum grants used to provide internships for students; innovation awards for departments that support communication between the graduate student and society; a career resource center and an employer resource center to help, respectively, the student make contacts and employers make contacts; and a National Networking and Mentoring Program. The networking and mentoring program puts students into contact with mentors to help them better make the connection between the pure humanities into other areas of society outside of academia. By making links such as these, the foundation is helping the world experience what the humanities has to offer first hand, and what the world has to offer the humanities.
The Andrew Mellon Foundation has also taken a serious interest in the humanities with their Research Universities and Humanistic Scholarship program.\textsuperscript{13} One of the largest facets of this program is the Graduate Education Initiative, which began in 1990 as an attempt to reform graduate programs in 52 departments at ten universities.\textsuperscript{14} As a byproduct of this program, longitudinal data was collected on the students in these departments to assess how the reforms affected their progress, although because data collection is still ongoing no reports have been released to the public. As the GEI is coming to a close, the Mellon Foundation is considering a new initiative in humanities scholarship. According to the 2001 report, concerns that may be the focus of a new program include: “the promise of cross-disciplinary scholarship and its frequent shortcomings; …the scarcity of jobs available to new Ph.D.’s …; … and the failure of the humanities to make an effective ‘case’ for themselves to the wider public.” The Mellon Foundation currently provides substantial funds for the humanities, although almost all of this goes for funding fellowships within the traditional humanities disciplines. If the Foundation were to decide to focus its new initiative on making the humanities more applied and interdisciplinary, the results would be impressive.

The Virginia Foundation for the Humanities and Public Policy (VFH)\textsuperscript{15} is a nonprofit organization, established in 1974, that provides grants, fellowships, and funding to other organizations and programs. It is specifically interested in applying the humanities to current policy debates and others ways which bring the humanities into the public. Some of the grants are both within humanities and at the intersection of

\textsuperscript{13} www.mellon.org/programs/highered/research/Content.htm

\textsuperscript{14} The Mellon Foundation’s 2001 Report on the Foundation’s Programs for Research Universities and Humanistic Scholarship, which is available on the above website.

\textsuperscript{15} http://www.virginia.edu/vfh/index.html
humanities and public action. The Resident Fellowship Program is funded by the NEH, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and private donations. This program is especially interested on research in the humanities that helps to clarify current public problems. The Virginia Foundation also supports or sponsors a number of other programs, for example, the Virginia Festival of the Book\(^\text{16}\) lasts for five days and promotes reading and literacy with events like panels and speakers. Along the same lines, VFH sponsors other organizations focused on reading, such as All America Reads\(^\text{17}\) and Mother Read/Father Read\(^\text{18}\). The foundation also supports the South Atlantic Regional Humanities Center (SARHC)\(^\text{19}\), which also has multiple programs, such as Public Forums. The Public Forums attempt to connect the public in discussions about the ethical and social aspects within science and technology.

Another program of the Virginia Foundation is the Institute on Violence and Survival\(^\text{20}\) that has fellowship programs aiming to understand violence through narratives and artwork. The emphasis is on exploring and learning about violence and how it changes meaning and culture through our experiences of violence. The VFH’s Center for Media and Culture\(^\text{21}\) makes films and videos illustrating the intersection of media and culture and the effects that one has on the other. The center holds seminars, conferences, and directs the Southern Humanities Media Fund\(^\text{22}\), which awards $110,000 for media projects. With Good Reason\(^\text{23}\) is a radio program in Virginia connected to the foundation
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16 http://www.vabook.org
17 http://www.allamericareads.org
18 http://www.virginia.edu/vfh/mread/index.html
19 http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/SARHC/
20 http://violenceandsurvival.com
22 http://www.southernmediafund.org/
23 http://www.virginia.edu/vfh/wgr/index.html
that brings scholars from universities to discuss the humanities and humanist’s takes on current social problems.

The National Humanities Alliance (NHA)\(^\text{24}\) is a coalition of about eighty associations, including scholarly groups, libraries, museums, university presses, research centers, and state humanity councils, concerned with policy for the humanities for the promotion of the humanities. The NHA has been involved in Intellectual Property Law and with designing and funding programs for the NEH, the Library of Congress, the Department of Education, and more. While they are the only organization that represents the whole of the U.S. humanities community, they do not deal with the question of what humanities can contribute to society and policy. The NHA also organizes the Humanities Advocacy Day\(^\text{25}\). The fourth annual event occurred this past February in Washington, D.C. The main purpose is to gain support and recognition for the humanities in hopes of encouraging more federal funding for the NEH and to create a network of advocates for the humanities.

The Australian Academy of the Humanities (AAH)\(^\text{26}\) is active in connecting the humanities with policy initiatives and cultural and economic life. For example, it is currently working closely with the Australia government as of December 2002, when the prime minister announced four national research priorities: An Environmentally Sustainable Australia, Promoting and Maintaining Good Health, Frontier Technology for Building and Transforming Australian Industry, and Safeguarding Australia. With these four research areas in mind, the government is collaborating with the AAH to expand the involvement of humanities research within them.

\(^{24}\)http://www.nhalliance.org
\(^{25}\)http://www.nhalliance.org/had/2003/
\(^{26}\)http://www.humanities.org.au/
As was mentioned above, many nonprofit organizations have initiated programs that aim to make doctoral education more interdisciplinary and applied, although they do not focus exclusively on humanities doctorates. One of these, the Woodrow Wilson Foundation’s Responsive PhD program, examines doctoral education and looks into the strengths and weakness of programs throughout the disciplines. They identify three areas where improvements are not only needed, but are within reach as well: paradigms, practices, and people. New Paradigms looks at interdisciplinary programs and attempts to define aspects that facilitate research and interaction between disciplines. In researching interdisciplinary activity, the foundation hopes to gain a more coherent understanding of the work done at the intersections of the disciplines. This area also stresses the work of the Ph.D. in society, calling for a kind of scholarly citizenship. Here, the emphasis is on developing academic expertise within the context of the greater society, rather than remaining within the academia. New Practices deals with the professional development of doctoral students, in that it promotes career planning in hopes to better prepare the students for life after they graduate. The second area of New Practices recognizes the lack of pedagogical training and calls for a more organized and structured approach in the PhD curriculum to help students become solid educators. The third area within the Responsive PhD program is called New People. New People addresses the concern that few minorities are pursuing doctorates, and therefore there is a lack of educators and role models to draw in prospective minority students, making it a self-perpetuating system. So far, fourteen universities, listed on the WWNFF website, have become involved in a seminar and a series of retreats to discuss possible ways to implement the concerns of the Responsive PhD program.
A similar program is Re-envisioning the PhD\textsuperscript{27}, funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts, which addressed how the PhD can be redesigned to connect with the concerns and needs of society. From funding of $515,000, this project was able to produce research on doctoral education and identify current attempts at bringing the Ph.D. into the society and out of academia. While Re-envisioning the PhD was concerned with Ph.D.s in general, they were especially focused on humanities doctorates. However, the project does point out that doctorates in general are suffering from a lack within Ph.D. programs of preparing the students for work outside academia, not just among the humanities. This project, which ended in June 2003, resulted in a national conference held in April 2000 at the University of Washington. At this conference, information about promising activities of different Ph.D. programs was presented, such as internships available in businesses and public organizations and experiments with interdisciplinary communication. This project was a major milestone in the attempt to integrate the Ph.D. into society, therefore both benefiting doctorate students by making them more marketable and showing the world outside academia that the Ph.D. is in fact valuable.

Another of the non-profit programs working to improve the process of doctorate education is the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate\textsuperscript{28}. This initiative recognizes that many doctorates are not adequately prepared to work in the settings that today’s Ph.D.’s are placed in, and seeks to train doctorates for changes that are occurring in their fields. The program views doctorates as “stewards of a discipline,” which entails giving them a broader understanding of their field and its relationship to the knowledge production system and society as a whole. To make these improvements, the Carnegie Initiative is

\textsuperscript{27} http://www.grad.washington.edu/envision/
\textsuperscript{28} www.carnegiefoundation.org/CID
conducting experiments in six doctoral departments, including an English department and a history department, to see if productive changes can be made.

While most universities still adhere to the divisions of the disciplines, there are some that offer programs working off the intersections of the humanities with the public sphere. The Public Humanities Initiative\(^{29}\) exists under the English Department in the University of California at Santa Barbara. The focus here is on realizing that divisions between the disciplines are not as separate as we think and investigate the significant roles that the humanities have in all aspects of our lives and society. Another is the Institute for Collaborative Research and Public Humanities\(^{30}\) through Ohio State University, which has two relevant goals: firstly, to connect the humanities with society outside the university, and, secondly, to promote interdisciplinary education within the universities. Northern Arizona University has a B.A. in Humanities with an emphasis in public humanities\(^{31}\) and the University of Chicago has a Cultural Policy Center\(^{32}\) that is created from the connection of the Division of the Humanities and the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy.

**The Road Ahead**

Academic institutions are the best place to begin with reforms to make the humanities more interdisciplinary and relevant to the real world. Unfortunately, due to the institutional structure of universities, change is difficult. Disciplines are often rigidly divided along departmental lines, and the merits of academic research are often viewed within the narrow perspectives of disciplines, discouraging younger faculty from

\(^{29}\) [http://www.english.ucsb.edu/initiatives/public-humanities/](http://www.english.ucsb.edu/initiatives/public-humanities/)

\(^{30}\) [http://www.cohums.ohio-state.edu/hi/](http://www.cohums.ohio-state.edu/hi/)

\(^{31}\) [http://www.nau.edu/~service/studentinfo/humanities.html](http://www.nau.edu/~service/studentinfo/humanities.html)

\(^{32}\) [http://culturalpolicy.uchicago.edu/](http://culturalpolicy.uchicago.edu/)
interdisciplinary work. In addition, efforts to focus on real world problems or to produce work for a popular audience are often viewed with disdain.

The creation of interdisciplinary departments and degree programs is one of the first places to begin. In this way, interdisciplinary scholars will have paths open for career advancement outside of the traditional disciplines, and students will receive the training they need to become the next generation of interdisciplinary scholars. Furthermore, interdisciplinary programs will better prepare scholars for taking on a more public role. Problems do not begin and end along disciplinary lines, and graduate programs should reflect that.

At the same time, efforts should be made to encourage scholars to take a more active role in public discussions. Programs like the President’s Council on Bioethics can serve as the model for how humanists can make a meaningful contribution to public debates. When prominent humanities scholars are seen to be taking on the roles of public intellectuals, the stigma against such applied work will begin to break down. Expanding the use of such councils for a variety of issues will help to speed this process. Furthermore, as these councils expand the demand for humanities scholars to take a more public role will increase, thus providing the impetus for new applied humanities academic programs to supply the needed experts.

Finally, it is necessary to break down the false dichotomy between facts and values in order to religitimize the role of values in public discourse. Moving forward with the above goals will help to bring us closer to this long-term goal. Encouraging interdisciplinary approaches to problems is one of the best ways to reinforce the idea that there are other ways of knowing the world than objective scientific knowledge.
Furthermore, if humanists become more actively involved with real world issues, the public will grow to see that their approach to issues is also valid.

Assessing our Progress on the Road Ahead

There are certain questions to keep in mind while we are striving for the goals above that can help us assess how we are doing. First, we should ask whether decision-making is becoming more democratic? Secondly, are values recognized and used in public discourse? And finally, are humanities scholars more involved in decision-making and public discourse?

As for assessing the products of incorporating the humanities into the public, we can research whether, for example, disciplinary boundaries have become more porous. Have problems, such as the climate change debate, moved beyond scientific factionalism and ceaseless efforts to reduce uncertainty and onto a more direct road to policy decisions? And have more options been provided to decision-makers as a result of the integration of the humanities?

Policy problems, such as global climate change, have become stagnant because of the dominance on the sciences. The false dichotomies between facts and values and objective and subjective have dismissed the humanities from public discourse because they are deemed purely subjective. To reverse this trend, a change in policy is needed to make the humanities more interdisciplinary and applied, therefore reconnecting them with real world issues.