English studies strikes me too often as a performance designed to elicit admiration for itself as a performance. It may impress intellectually, but it does not move one emotionally, ethically, or socially. Our enemies need hardly look elsewhere than to us for fodder for their attacks. And while I abhor the wretched politics behind these attacks, if we can’t do a better job of convincing the public of our value, we should, truth be told, seriously rethink our enterprise. I sincerely hope the twenty-first century finds us doing just that.

Judith Fetterley  
State University of New York, Albany

Somewhere in the mid-twentieth century American academic departments changed their mode of governance from an autocracy ruled by virtually permanent chairs (usually called “heads” to acknowledge their special authority) to the faculty democracy with which we are familiar. Although all-powerful in their individual departments, these heads recognized their mandate to carry out the orders of autocratic college presidents and deans.

The transition to democracy was fraught with many of the difficulties encountered by nations undergoing a similar change of governance. Factions fought one another mercilessly, often omitting the forms of civility that might have allowed them to deal with one another on practical matters despite their differences. Personal enmities masked themselves as conflicts of intellectual belief. Ancient friendships were rent apart forever because of disagreement on some appointment or promotion.

Despite the disruptions accompanying the advent of departmental democracy, the new order has offered some blessings. Whereas the earlier heads and their accomplices kept a tight lid on whatever new ideas the young might want to try out, the single critical approach that often dominated a particular department has given way to a plethora of points of view coexisting (though sometimes uneasily) with one another.

And the new democracy can also be credited with the rise of a fresh literary genre, the academic novel, whose narratives of departmental battles and personal betrayals have provided the profession with considerable opportunity for teaching and research, not to speak of the chance it has given authors to avenge themselves on their colleagues.

Herbert Lindenberger  
Stanford University

In 1997 I was asked to organize humanities outreach activities at the University of California, Irvine. The result was the formation of Humanities Out There (HOT). In our workshops, faculty members and graduate students supervise teams of undergraduates in order to take the methods and materials of the university into the larger community.

I believe that programs like these will become increasingly important in the next century, as economic, cultural, and educational divisions deepen in the wake of the demise of affirmative action and as the humanities fight to define their missions in a world driven by technology and its discontents. In this brave new world, what I call the new outreach may have a role to play in responding to social crises as they are visited on the life of the university. The new outreach will be driven by intellectual content, not public relations. It will take its orientation from the faculty rather than administrators. It will engage all the research disciplines rather than remain the purview of education departments. It will be integrated into the professional lives of its participants rather than rely on the spirit of volunteerism alone.

Initiatives like these have the power to triangulate teaching, research, and outreach in a new style of intellectual work at the crossroads of the university and the community. Guided by the principles of the humanities, our disciplines should emerge clarified and strengthened rather than battered and defensive from our movement.
“out there,” creating a more vital humanities for the twenty-first century.

Julia Reinhard Lupton
University of California, Irvine

When I came to the English department at UCLA as an assistant professor in 1962, I found a faculty consisting of approximately forty members, most of whom were Anglo-Saxon men. There were two women, three Jews, and no blacks or Asians. I was coming from the University of Michigan, which had a clear policy against hiring women but had, at least among the assistant professors, a large number of Jews, one black, and even an Armenian. I heard faculty members tell stories of the kind described in Ludwig Lewisohn’s Upstream—of Jews being told they could not study English literature because they were not the sort that could appreciate it—but that era had passed. Nevertheless, as a Jew from the Bronx, I resented the gender discrimination and racism that were common in the profession. I admired my older colleagues, many of whom had been my teachers when I was an undergraduate at UCLA, for their humane approach to teaching and scholarship, but some of them still expressed anti-Semitic and racist ideas.

Today UCLA’s English department is close to having an equal number of men and women, and from the standpoint of national origins the faculty resembles the United Nations. I was mainly responsible for hiring three women in my field (Restoration and eighteenth century), and they have opened up the field by teaching women writers and themes involving women. It is part of the democratization of the profession, and I could not be more pleased by it.

Maximillian E. Novak
University of California, Irvine

In 1900 departments were new inventions at the larger and more future-oriented universities. So were the major and the PhD program. Autonomy was limited and under negotiation. At smaller institions the department, if there was one, consisted of the professor and perhaps an assistant or two; the faculty worked chiefly as a homogeneous body. By mid-century the department had everywhere become the origin of curriculum, the site of professional reproduction (graduate programs, research, careers), the semiautonomous empire or snake pit in which we make our professional and sometimes emotional homes.

Why shouldn’t this familiar arrangement last another hundred years? Maybe it will, at the more elite universities. But consider the terrible job market for PhDs, the casualization of academic labor, and the inability of our profession to control the conditions of its work. Consider distance learning, the sale of job-related skills and credentials at for-profit universities, the rapidly expanding “universities” within corporations, and the conversion of the traditional university into a business with attention focused on the bottom line in each of its programs. As knowledge becomes a commodity and education a field of investment, the profession will give up its autonomy, and departments will adapt or grow marginal. That takes us only to 2050 or so. Luckily, the 250-word limit on this prophecy now darkens vision.

Richard Ohmann
Wesleyan University

I predict that by 2020 the large umbrella department of English language and literature, as we now know it, will have ceased to exist. To begin with, the British literature department will have split off from United States literature and have become more or less the size of our current classics departments. There will, of course, always be people who want to study Shakespeare, not to mention Woolf or Orwell, just as there will always be a devoted band of classicists who want to read Homer and Plato as well as Greek tragedy in the original. But the mass of American university students will no longer automatically study the literature of a nation now as remote from