**UCSB WE1S Focus Group 3**
**Non-Undergraduate Group**
**5 June 2019**

**[Transcription begins at 06:47, after the initial eating/unofficial remarks]**

A:          Thank you all so much for being here, we're really really excited to have you. Thank you for taking the survey and for indicating your interest. We're really pleased especially to have a very wide range of positions within the university, a wide range of different disciplines, so we are really pleased to that conversation. I just wanted to start by giving a little brief information about why we are doing this. So, the What Every1 Says Project, the goal is to think about how people talk about the humanities, feel about the humanities, live the humanities, and we're mainly doing this through printed sources. So our main corpus is newspapers and other forms of media, mainly in the US but eventually with a broader, global reach as well. And so, we really wanted to add human subjects research as a focus because we wanted to understand if the viewpoints that we're seeing in the media map onto or diverge from the opinions of the people who are in our own community here. So that's what we need your help with, and we're really excited to have your expertise here today. So I will just give a little information first about the informed consent handouts that you all have in front of you. So, one side has the focus group information, there's an extra one at the end. So the key point here is just that this is being recorded; you'll notice that we have some recorders set up here. The only purpose of this recording is for our own benefit, to listen back to it and remember what people said. The recording itself will never be made public. Anything that you say or write down an today, if we include in the future publication, it will not be attached to your real name at all, so everything will be anonymized. And you can leave at any time, you don't have to participate in

anything you don't feel comfortable with. You're completely in charge of how much personal information you share with this or not. Does anyone have any questions about that?08:55 **[silence for a few seconds]** Ok, great. The next thing is to introduce ourselves. So my name is **[A]...**

**[skipping introductions/icebreaker activity 09:10 - 15:26 ]**

**A:** So we're just going to share the agenda before we start. So, we're going to have three parts today, and I'm sorry I'm standing. It's just because this cord isn't long enough and I didn't want people to trip! But, we mean it to be a seminar discussion. So, the first part that we are going to have is about 30 minutes of open discussion about our experiences in the humanities. And one thing that would be really valuable I think is the diversity of different disciplinary perspectives, so I really hope we can speak about that that. Then in the second part, we will move to a brief presentation about our digital humanities methods in the project, and some of our preliminary results, and then in part three we will have an opportunity to ask feedback from you, which will be really valuable for us, so we'll be sharing some of our materials and some of our preliminary results and asking for your suggestions. So, without further ado we can start with Part One. So, **[C]** and **[R]** will be facilitating this discussion, and so they have some questions to start us off.

**C:** Ok, yeah, so just a couple of questions to get the conversation going. But really feel free to take the conversation in whatever direction feels natural to you. We're not married to this particular list of questions at all. So first I'd like to just ask you all, so what words or values come to mind, or are associated with the "humanities", for you? 16:55

**R:** Free association **[laughter]**

**Speaker 5:** "Classics"

**Speaker 2:** The first word I thought of was "caring" and I have no idea why.

**[Participant:** Awww...]

**Speaker 5:** Because it's humane, it's the same word.

**Speaker 2:** I suppose

**Speaker 7:** "Literature".

**Speaker 6:** "Liberal Arts"

**Speaker 3:** "Openness"

**A:** "Openness", that's nice...

**Speaker 6:** I would *not* associate it with "science", it's always contrasted. Like, not for me personally, 'cause I do research with the humanities and science, but you always see them as separate entities and, applications and things. "Media".

**Speaker 2:** I always think I guess, of like, humanities is asking interesting questions that may be... in like the contrast with science, where like, science is really like "what can we observe?" or something, and then humanities is less, is more like, "ooh, what's a good question we can think about?" And like, draw from other kinds of sources that aren't necessarily, like, countable things.

**R:**   Hayles calls that "investigating problematics" as opposed to "solving problems" **[laughter]**

**L:**   I like that one

**AL:**   I had a different kind of word: "mainstream". So this is kind of an ironic and bitter pill to swallow, you know, because my family is of immigrant ancestry and we were all engineers coming to this country. That is my dad's generation. I wanted to do something that was more mainstream. So I thought, humanities was it. Whereas engineering was thought of as kind of a niche profession. And the irony now, of course, is that it sort of reversed. Now we think of engineering is the mainstream, ad the humanities as not.

**Speaker 6:**   I also am sad to say, I think of, um "not affluence" **[laughter]**. I don't want to say "poverty", but is that is something different? But...

**Speaker 7:**   I was gonna say "underpaid" yeah **[laughter]**

**R:**   Mild poverty **[laughter]**. MODEST income.

**Speaker 6:**   "Modest income", I like that too.

**Speaker 5:**   I always associate it with "fine arts", but I think that's 'cause that's what we hear "Humanities and Fine Arts" all the time.

**R:**   What about, like, socially?

**Speaker 5:**    What do you mean, "socially"?

**R:**    Well, do you think of the humanities, as an abstract, academic sort of thing, all the time, or do you think of it in terms of "social" or "cultural"?

**Speaker 1:**    I feel like the study in humanities is an abstraction, like, it's just--

**R:**    Yes, certainly it is. We're talking about associative thought. I mean, it is an abstraction that has several disciplines under it.

**Speaker 5:**    I don't think of it outside of academia really.

**R:**    Fair enough

**A:**    Me neither

**Speaker 6:**    It's also one of those things that I don't remember ever being *told* what it meant, it was just something I... like you keep hearing over and over and its just sort of... Yeah, it's this nebulous thing that, it pops up in academic context, but I don't it hear much outside of this world.

**Speaker 1:** It's kind of ironic because like, humanities... like, we just said, like, "modest income". Like, humanities, at least for me is a social science. It studies that type of thing, It's interesting that it only takes place within a university. **[noises of affirmation]** When like, it's specifically usually NOT studying university interactions.

**Speaker 5:** I remember the first time I heard the word "humanist" used for the librarians who are humanities librarians, and they were saying they were humanists, and it jarred a little bit, I thought, "Wait, wait. That to me is a different kind of word, or a different association at the time

**R:** It is an overlap that is somewhat misleading.

**Speaker 5:** Right...

**R:** "humanist philosophy", etc. Then again philosophy is a humanities discipline, so... **[laughter]**

**A:** So is that what you're called, **[Speaker 5],** in the library?

**Speaker 5:** Yeah. Well, there are a few librarians who refer to themselves as that. I always say I'm a "humanities librarian". But we are separated, quite distinctly. There are three, the three separate groups of librarians and our paths do not cross. Except I'm always confused. I always say, "Wait, History. Where does history fit?" Because I have a colleague who sits on both committees, social science and humanist. So I'm never sure what we go and call a human. **[laughter]** So, I'm always forgetting which is which.

**R:** So History's kind of in the middle? In the library?

**Speaker 5:** To me, it's a social science.

**{Participants:** Oh!]

**Speaker 7:** Yeah, I actually, when I was filling out the survey for this thing, I also was like, "hmm, is humanities...do I associate...?" 'Cause like, in high school, History was a, was like social science, it was synonymous, but then in college, people always talked about history as part of the humanities. Because I think of social sciences as being social--both social science and traditional STEM as being quantitative, or having the capacity of being quantitative, whereas I think of the humanities as the disciplines that are strictly nonquantitative. And a History is not quantitative, at least in my mind.

**Speaker 2:** Yeah, at least the way we're taught History, like in high school. Your first exposure to history is not, like, from a quantitative perspective.

**Speaker 7:** **[agreement]** Right, right.22:31

**A:** I'd be curious to hear from, to hear from the science perspective. If you feel that the humanities is a part of your life. Like, is it a part of your academic experience at all, is it a part of your, um, home life or your personal life?

**R:** Or would you call it something else?

**A:** Yeah, would you, like, would you break it apart into different things like literature, or art--

**R:** Netflix. Or film **[laughter]**

**A:** **[Speaker 1]**, do you have your hand up?

**Speaker 1:**     Um**,** I don't know. Mine was more of just a...me being a hard-headed linguist **[laughter]** Like, if you taught the word "enactive" in humanities. So like, it inherits the name, and **[unintelligible]**

**A:**     Ok.

**Speaker 2:**     I will say as, as linguists, we kind of have this like identity crisis as a field, as whether or not we're more of a humanities discipline or more of a social science discipline. Um, and there's been kind of a tension between those different approaches to Linguistics, for quite some time. So this is something that I personally think about a lot when I'm thinking about my academic development and my career trajectory, and everything **[noises of affirmation]**

**Speaker 6:**     It's true. I did my dissertation in like, an Applied Linguistics kind of sense and it was this big discussion with my advisor: "Do the social science IRB, or do I go to the other one?" It's... yeah.

**Speaker 5:**     And what felt right?

**Speaker 6:**     And I don't remember what we did.

**Speaker 5:**     You don't remember?

**Speaker 6:**     I don't remember!

**Speaker 5**:     **[to Speaker 2]** How about you? What feels right to you as between those two?

**Speaker 2:**   I, um, I don't like choosing things **[laughter]**.

**[Participant:** Good answer]

**AL:**   That makes you a humanist! **[laughter]**

**R:**   I'm kind of queering disciplines myself...**[laughter]**

**Speaker 2:**   Yeah, so, as a queer person I'm exercising my right to not choose **[laughs]**. So yeah, that's still a tension that I personally am struggling with. Um, I like the idea of being able to be a part of both approaches to my discipline. Both of, like, humanities qualitative side, and also the more quantitative social sciences side of it.

**AL:**   I wonder whether this is a secret fault line that exists within every field in one way or another, other different proportions, even the fields that you think of as most humanistic, like Literature departments, have always had a secret love for science. So what we call close reading, in the era of the New Criticism, 1930s, 40s, and 50s. You look at some of their essays, and they're full of diagrams and graphs, as if you could *graph* a poem. As if they wanted to study poems the way a scientist will study something through a microscope. On the other side of the equation, you have scientists who have a deep love of literature, Shakespeare, You have a whole sort of communication side of science, people who spend their careers talking to the world about science. Billions and billions of stars, you know, who am I imitating? **[laughter]** There, Carl Sagan. And then you have these departments that are in the middle, that have for decades and decades, have had this internal civil war, right? I once to asked a colleague here, "Is our department on campus called 'Communications' or 'Communication'?", I forget which it is, but there's an ideological fault line. One of them is quantitative, and the other is more social sciency, soft, cultural linguistic turn. So maybe every department has this kind of secret split.

**Speaker 7:**   Am I the only engineer in this room, or like, hard, quote-unquote "hard scientist"?

**[Participants:** Yep. I think so]

**AL:**     Son of an engineer, but that does quite cut it! **[laughter]**

**Speaker 7:**     When you were talking there, like, it's present in all disciplines, like, I think that, like in my experience, in my department, like people would say once you start going into science communication, then it's not science anymore. Which seems kind of ridiculous, but like, I think, like... people... I don't think there is this sense of conflict in my discipline, in Mechanical Engineering. Like, I think that there's the sense that it is strictly quantitative, and once you start trying to communicate, like your results, to the public or...like, not necessarily, yeah. If you're communicating your results to other people in the field, that's like still science, but if you're trying to communicate it to a lay audience and like, kind of "removing" the like, quantitative rigor in order to convey it through like analogy or something like that, and then it's no longer "Mechanical Engineering", it's like "Science Communication" which is... So it's like its own discipline. It's like someone else outside the field is interpreting what goes on in the field and is like, communicating it to the outside world.

**R:**     So it's like all or nothing. Like you can't be "a little bit dead" you can't be "a little bit non-scientific" you're just not **[laughter]**

**Speaker 7:**     I guess. Yeah, I guess I just, I never hear people talk about like, the "humanistic side" of Engineering. I guess, actually the only place I can think of hearing that is in Design because people talk about human-centered design a lot, which is, like, um... So it's not... I guess that Design becomes sort of like not "science" anymore, it uses science as a tool to create things that will work in the physical world, but in terms of the... the *purpose* of it is informed by like, humanistic concerns.

**Speaker 5:**     What didn't Steve Jobes, Jobs, famously say that the iPad was a marriage of tech and humanities? Liberal arts?

**AL:**     Liberal Arts, I believe he said **[Noises of affirmation]**

**Speaker 5:**     Yeah. That's what you were describing.

**Speaker 7:**     Right, because the science behind it... You don't need to understand people in order to see how it's implemented, but the *why* is all about people. And that kind of, like, sorry, I've been talking a lot...

**Participants:**     That's okay! That's good, it's very interesting.

**Speaker 7:**     I, uh, come to think of it, like, when I think about why I do science, there's like two aspects of it. One is that, just that I find how it works interesting. But the *why* I chose my specific field is also largely informed by the fact that I think it will be useful to people **[noises of affirmation]**

**R:**     Well, it's interesting--just to push on that a little for everyone at the table--I think that within most disciplines--with a few notable exceptions, like sociology or social work--there is a sort of schism between applying it within your own discipline, talking to your own people, as it were, and 'translating' outside of that, 'translating' to other disciplines. And in fact, even within the humanities, which I think should and is a profoundly human- centered field of study, you get a deep disdain for having... you know, "Why should I have to write readable papers?" **[laughter].** "But not--scientists don't have to, why should the burden of readability fall on us?" And while I *get* it--I get why we're salty about that--I also disagree. So I think perhaps that's something of the same phenomenon that you're talking about, [**Speaker 7**].

**C:**     So I'm curious like, what you would find, say, within... like with your colleagues or maybe the people you aspire to be like, like maybe professors, um, or inventors. Like, how do they think about... Do they like, read books and then talk about--? Like, how does humanities enter into, into your work? Or into their work?30:00

**Speaker 7:**     Um, I would say it's kind of frowned upon, in a way. Like, I'm sure lots of people read novels and like, I...**[laughter]**.

**[Participants:** But it's done secretly! In private!]

**Speaker 7:**    **...**I love novels, and I play music and I like to act. Like, I'm very...I've always been very into humanities and it's always made me feel sort of like a weird engineer, because everybody else just wants to like, play with cars **[laughter]** in their spare time, whereas I've always sort of gone to humanities things in my spare time. And, um... But, yeah, it's sort of like when you're in the lab or in the research office, like you just don't talk about it. Or it's like you might talk about it, but then it's like, "okay, like, work ends here and now we're just having a discussion as like, non-... as lay people." But, it, it's like there's a sort of strict... You just like, you keep it out of the science.

**Speaker 6:**    This makes me think of the word  'well-rounded-ness'. I often hear people advocating for the humanities, for STEM students, for this "well-rounded-ness". And it sounds like you have many diverse interests, whereas some of your colleagues have--or your peers have--a very narrow set of interests that are directly related to your field, so that that came to mind.

**Speaker 5:**    But now, "STEAM" is the thing.

**[Participants: Right, true 31:31]**

**Speaker 1:**    **[to Speaker 7]** I thought it was interesting what you said about, like, in conversation you transition from "a scientist" to like, "a lay person" in conversation.'Cause I, I don't know, cause like even having conversations with my friends and stuff, I find myself like bringing up humanities topics because they're applicable to just...If nothing else, like maybe to the dynamic of the conversation going on! And so I don't...that's really crazy to think of them as like so separate. At least to me **[noises of affirmation]**

**Speaker 4:**    But I'm just confused now, because, I'm feeling like...are we talking about humanities as the study *of* all those things, as being books, music, art, history, whatever you wanna... Or of the *consumption* of those things? Because I feel we're all kind of talking about both, and I don't know if that's your idea, or...for me it's very separate!

**A:**     Yeah, I think--Okay, can you explain that?

**Speaker 4:**     Okay, well, I mean "humanities" for me, the group under which a couple of disciplines have been categorized for one reason or another, and I'm just wondering...so I remember distinctly, like, in "Intro to Linguistics":  "Linguistics is the most scientific of the humanities and the most humanistic of the sciences". That was, I think, probably more or less literally what it said, and I was like "Okay whatever". And I've just been thinking about, does it *matter* whether what you do is grouped under one or another category? Like, for example, I've been doing some conversation analysis lately, and here that's very clearly in "Sociology". For me, it's always been under "Linguistics". And then I was just talking to some other people. Does it matter, I mean, does the work differ, when it's produced under a different category? For me, humanities, to be very honest, is just that overarching thing that is, that a couple of disciplines are happened to be named.

**Speaker 5:**      But I think it does differ depending on the category you've put yourself into. I think it does, at least in the academy here, we seem to separate things... Like for example, "Writing 2" has a big unit now. All "Writing 2" students are following genre conventions. They're looking at the discourse narrative. You know, "how does the scientist talk, how does a social scientist talk?"

**[Participants: [Agreement] Sure, yeah]**

**Speaker 5:**     And they're comparing those. So they're, they're considered quite separate, and we're taught that they're separate.

**Speaker 4:**     Yeah, and I mean, they're separate when you want to, I don't know, submit papers to journals or...like in places where, or go for grants, or something like, they're like "Are you humanities, or are you social sciences?"

**Speaker 5:**     Right

**Speaker 4:**   But I feel, for me, that's more imposed upon what I do--

**Speaker 5:**   Of course! Yes, yes, I agree that, I agree that it's imposed. Yeah, yeah. Because if you were just talking to a random person at dinner about the work you do, you wouldn't say "I'm a social scientist and this..." I mean, you just talk about the work you do.

**[Participants: Yeah, exactly. Yeah]**

**Speaker 5:**   And they might interpret it in under one of those umbrellas, but maybe not.

**R:**   **[laughs]** Or if you're like me, you describe your project and they say, "But how is that *English*?" **[laughter]**

**A:**   I'm curious about...do you find this distinction between the sciences and and the humanities for instance as something that is in the European education system as well or...

**Speaker 4:**   Yeah, it is, yeah, yeah. Um, So where I did my Bachelor's, which was in the Netherlands, it was a Liberal Arts College, and they definitely were like, oh, "the Social Sciences Department", " the Sciences Department", and "the Humanities Department". And even going like, before that in high school, we have to...at a very early age, like, we're tracked, but also according to specialization or like, what you wanna do. And I remember...so there were four, which... one was more like "social scientific" than like, a "humanities" one. And then like, um...

**R:**   Medicine?

**Speaker 4:**   Yeah, "medicine", and another scientific one. And I really wanted to go for the humanities one, and I remember that...So my parents went to talk to teachers, you know, and they said, "Oh no, but that's such a shame, like, she's smart. Why would

you let her go into the humanities?" **[laughter]** Really, that happened! My parents were like, "Wow", you know? **[laughter]**

**Speaker 5:**     Where did you end up?

**Speaker 4:**     In the humanities! I mean they were like "Do what you want".

**Speaker 5:**     Good for your parents!

**Speaker 4**:     Yeah, but that's... Yeah, even at like age 14, that is, you're put into different or... you choose what you wanna do, so that distinction surely exists.36:06

**AL:**     So this whole discussion puts its finger on one of the strategic designs behind this WE1S project, that this focus group is part of. Um, we're looking for media discourse in particular, searching for words like "humanities" and "liberal arts" that occupy kind of a bridge position between the purely institutional use of such terms in a broader... My metaphor has always been kind of a "cosmic background radiation" of the concepts: Literature, History and Philosophy, and so on. It's that cross-over point between the very tightly disciplined institutional sense of what these terms are for, and the looser social valences of these terms are really interesting, right, right now. It's where all the change is happening, and that's where it's coming home to students as they're choosing their majors, and having discussions with their parents. The terms on the organization of knowledge are doing one thing inside the university, and they're doing some things very different outside the University, in this kind of collision, right? Right, that, right now, we wanna study. 37:12

**Speaker 3:**     I hope that you'll sort of advocate through all of this for the breaking down of that barrier, of the sort of strict hierarchies that we've been talking about, right? The humanities versus the social sciences versus something else. Because yes, absolutely, even today I have, you know, when I think of Humanities versus social sciences, I also have the same idea of, you know, "this is technical, and rigorous" and "this is quite not so much", even, you know, though once you break it all down, everyone has

ultimately has physics MB **[?]**, and most people have computer science MB **[?]**, and so, you know, yes, there is some distinction between how different disciplines are using the methodology. But at the end of the day, they're all kind of converging to similar, similar things and so...

**R**: Yeah. That actually dovetails really well in terms of the public. So we've been talking a lot about the academy, we've been talking a lot about perceptions and about the tension between study and consumption, which perhaps is a bit of a chicken-and-egg problem, because most people got into the study of the humanities 'cause they enjoy consuming cultural texts. But what role do people see the humanities playing publicly, in the world outside of college classrooms? And just to sort of nudge your thinking, we're thinking things like libraries, museums, performances, pop culture, etc. What role might the humanities play in the public? And again, let's think in terms of what we might consider "the humanities", that doesn't necessarily get called that.

**Speaker 1:** So, in the list [on the handout], there's "communities and social issues", and like, I don't know, it's something I've thought for years, but I feel like we...like need to push humanities *down,* if that makes sense? Like, we only have History and social science...

**R:** Aren't we far enough "down" already? **[laughter]**

**Speaker 1:** Yeah, no, like the academy's looking at it through the school system. So that like, we're learning about like human interaction, like how this works in a systemic way in like, middle school or high school **[noises of affirmation].** 'Cause these kids who are learning how to interact with the world might benefit from that. Like, that makes a lot of sense to me!

**R:** Expand it beyond the higher education?

**Speaker 1:** Yeah!

**Speaker 7:** When I think of "humanities", outside of academia, like when it's, yeah, like in academia, I think of the humanities is either "the study of people", or... Well, I--no, actually, that's totally not true... 'cause like social sciences is all like studying people. So I guess...yeah, History is sort of a funny one, but if you are not thinking about History, then like the study maybe of human artifacts, or like, of human art? **[noises of affirmation]** It's like, I guess when I think of "humanities" outside of academia, it, it all sort of gets subsumed under like "art and entertainment", I guess you could call it? Like, like libraries, museums. Like, anytime someone is consuming some sort of written, or painted, or auditory work it's all sort of like this... for the purpose of enjoyment. And I actually think of like, "humanities" as kind of...like, the stuff that makes life worth living, in a way? Because like, sure, we can make lots of fancy inventions and stuff like that, but why? What provides the fun in people's lives? And so I guess I think of like, humanities as *that*. 41:03

**AL:** So we're again to the value discussion now. So, besides the entertainment and enjoyment value, you can add on other values to that, that the humanities seem to accrue in general society. There's an acronym that you may know, "GLAM", G-L-A-M, for "gallery, library, archives, and museums" space, so when you add those kinds of institutions to the entertainment institutions, then you add the values of heritage, history, in that sense. Many nations around the world, have put a lot of money into their "GLAM" sector, their galleries, libraries, archives, and museums, because it has to do with "national heritage", and their sense of identity as a, as a social group.

**Speaker 5:** And it also encourages when I think of as "lifelong learning". I mean, that's a phrase we throw around a lot. But that's why *I* would go to museums and performances. I...you know, tell me more! **[noises of affirmation]** It's an eagerness to keep "open", and learn more. So I think "lifelong learning" might be one of the--I didn't think of it when you said "what are the associated terms we come up with?" when we hear that. But that's my new one.

**A:** Yeah, I think that's a really interesting question, the question of values, of what would be the *ideal* version? I actually just--the class that I just finished teaching today, the final paper was to imagine a Utopian university, and to imagine the role, particularly

for us as literature, but I think we could broaden it to all of the humanities. Um, and I had the students imagine what would be the ideal version of this, how would the humanities work? Either in relating different departments to each other, or relating the academy to the public? I would love to hear, hear your thoughts about what would be the utopia. What should we shoot for?

**Speaker 3:**   I imagine that that would be possible, you know, because of the inherent--cause I think **[Speaker 4]** also touched on this, but the inherent tension with the humanities trying to do *both*. So, the one side trying to gain the respect of all of the other disciplines by saying, "Yes, we're also very rigorous, we're also very technical. Respect us!" Right? But then at the same time going "Oh no one addresses the public as much as we do, and we're trying to simplify, we're trying to make it difficult as well as simplify, at the same time". And if you're trying to do both, you're going to end up doing neither. And so, until that's resolved, I can't imagine this, utopia existing.

**Speaker 5:**   I think, the, a Utopian University, in my mind would have to *reduce* the competition in some way.

**A:**   The competition of...?

**Speaker 5:**   The grading, the, the...

**A:**   Oh, the competition of students?

**Speaker 5:**   Yeah, "win or lose", sort of. I mean, those are the two extremes. If you could somehow say "It's okay. We're not being graded. Now, let's enjoy this class." **[noises of affirmation]**

**Speaker 6:** I was gonna say, we actually, sort of, take that approach in our department as much as we can, as much as the university system allows us to. For example, we *don't* give exams at all. Like, it's all projects. It's all actual *use* of the language. And this for me, is, is sort of a Utopian program? **[laughs]** Within the greater--

**Speaker 1:** That's in German, right?

**Speaker 6:** Yeah. [**laughter**]

**AL:** Which, which program is that?

**Speaker 6:** German! I think, um, at the highest level the professors do, but in the first through third year we, it's all project-oriented, all-

**[AL: Good]**

**Speaker 6:** -actually using your, your tools rather than...it makes it more learning *through* German rather than learning *about* German.

**Speaker 5:** Yeah, I love that!

**Speaker 6:** It makes me very happy. It's part of why I stay here, despite the low pay for professors[**laughter**]

**Speaker 7:** What about about the competition between *academics?* 'Cause I feel like that also drives a lot of this sort of like, posturing. **[noises of affirmation]** In all disciplines.

**Speaker 2:**     It seems like...when we you said "competition", what I thought of was that... and I thought of , the competition for prestige? And about... like, it makes me think of like "social capital". [**Noises of affirmation**] Like, often--for me, the in case of growing up, like, knowing stuff about the humanities--and then I'm thinking about like, knowing stuff about classical music composers, or artists, or a like, certain type of classical music and a certain type of artist--would give one "social capital" in the eyes of others, or "cultural capital", or some kind of like, wealth that wasn't financial, and wasn't the sort of technical wealth of being an engineer, say. So there's... Yeah, I don't know, there...my sense is that it's part of this as well, is, is how all these terms linked to the amount of prestige the people that know about it or the people that use it can kind of...yeah, have access to because they're a part of *either* the, like the STEM or *either* the social science, or *either* the humanities.

**Speaker 6:**     I've been kind of...I don't know how to say it well, I've been rolling it around in my head, but kind of related to that: I have a mild association-- or distinction, I should say, probably--of the humanities being more "feminine", "soft". And the masculine: "hard science". And it's coincidental, perhaps that the fem--like, when we do budget cuts the first things to go: "humanities, not so important" What does that say about--

**R:**     Emotional labor

**Speaker 6:**     Yeah! **[laughter]** What does that say about our broader values? I'm not sure but, the--it's rolling around in there somewhere.

**R**:     It's interesting because we're talking about value, and we tend, in late capitalism, to always associate "value" with "economic worth", right? Or "potentiality". And so I wonder if we could, you know, if we have time, maybe we can unpack this term "value". What is the "value" of studying one thing or another, and specifically within the humanities. If there is any?

**Speaker 7:**     One thing I value in the humanities, is--like I was saying earlier--it's that it's enjoyable. And that was like... no, I thought, "Well, maybe that is a little simplistic."

Like, I *also* think that good fiction for example, has the ability to like, cause metacognition. About like, what it means to be a human? Or what it means to be a human in a certain culture or society, um, in a way that no other discipline does. In a way because it's the study of like, the human condition. Or like it's specifically addressing it. And I think social sciences can do that as well. But like, I guess...yeah, I guess the only hard science that I can think of that might do that would be like, Neuroscience or something like that, but in my discipline, we don't study human beings. 47:53

**Speaker 5:** Well, well, I'm trying to play...I agree with that...I'm trying to play with the word "value" and I'm not sure I understand it. But to me, the humanities--as opposed to say, the hard sciences, or those... Let me think, how wanna say this...it, we look at...if we're a humanist we look at what is "valuable" in our existence here on Earth. It's the way we live our life, and even the way we die. So in order to understand that on a human level, you have to *think* about it. And you have to decide that there's a value in studying and talking about it, and thinking about *that,* as opposed to "profit-and-loss" sorts of value. So the definition of that word, "value", is...interesting when it's applied to "humanities". And I think the value in humanities, at least as far as I see it, is when...if I'm sitting on a little mountain top, thinking about my space on this Earth, that's an important and valuable question **[noises of affirmation]** I think that's what we're exploring.

**AL:** **[Theorist]** thought that one of the things that the humanities does is not that unique in this regard. Social sciences and other fields do this as well. But it's one of the few fields in which, "baked into" the discipline, as part of its methodology and goal, is the shifting of frames of reference, so that you see different understandings of what values are: in historical times, in different cultures, from different perspectives. So take the current kinds of conversation, "What is the most valuable major to choose?". The narrow answer to that is something like, I don't know, "Engineering" or something like that because you get the most "bang for your buck" in income right away, right? But you shift the question slightly, to a different frame of perspective, "what is the most valuable major to have for society?", to a collective frame, then the whole different set of values get, get activated. So, as in the case of ethics, or values, humanities are one of the disciples--not the only ones--in which those kinds of issues are actually part of the field itself. That's why we study novels where people go through different, difficult life crises. That's why we study history, and problems in value clashes arise. That's not to say that the scientists and engineers don't deeply care

about value differences, and different perspectives on value; it's just that it's not quite as "baked into" the profession, as, as such.

**R:**  There's the "required ethics course" [**laughs**]

**AL:**  Yeah...50:29

**A:**  I think this might be a good moment to move on to Part Two, if that's okay? [**noises of affirmation**]. So, we just wanted to build on this discussion that we've been having and to share...I should set this up...um, to share some of our project's thoughts and methods. And to think with you all about how our project might begin to approach some of the questions that we've raised.

**Speaker 7:**  What is the "digital humanities", besides a buzzword? [**laughter**]

**A:**  Ah, so, there are a lot of related terms that you might hear. The "digital humanities", "quantitative literary studies", and "distant reading". These are all related terms. And so, they all share this common rubric. So traditionally, if you were to think about doing research, our immediate thought might be that one person would go--or a small group people would go--to the library, read a book, and try to find the answer to a question. But what if you wanna read this many books [**expansive gesture**]? All at once?  This is where the digital humanities will come into play. So, digital humanities can allow you to ask traditional research questions at a larger scale, aided by computers. So one person can't read a million books, but a computer can do that really easily. And it can also suggest new sets of questions at a big data level. So we can both *amplify* what we might think of as sort of traditional humanistic questions, but we can also enter into *new* territories, of questions that big data might suggest to us. So, our project, the subtitles "the humanities and public discourse" and we have several interrelated project goals...

**[A explains the WE1S project: Keywords, outcomes and advocacy 52:17 -  54:13**

**A:**  [**Calling on participant**] Yes?

**Speaker 2:**    Are you also searching, like, specifically on like "philosophy", "english", "literature"...like, disciplines? Or just like--

**A:**    We thought about that! Yeah, we've done a couple of test pieces.

**R:**    Yeah, we did a number of sample small corpora, where we were "human hand-coding", essentially, to see whether or not that's viable. And I believe that the consensus was, we *did* decide to collect on "English Literature", in certain cases, but for the most part, people throw around the term "philosophy" and "literature", in like, in so many contexts. Like, "my philosophy is..." you know?

**Speaker 7:**    "Let's do a literature review on it" **[noises of affirmation]**

**R**:    Exactly yeah, right.

**A:**    We ran into that a lot. So this is actually a really interesting question of--sometimes the "search" function at the Big Data scale makes it really hard to particularize what you want the word to mean. So this is still kind of a kind of ongoing process for us. So right now, our corpus is about a million articles...**[continues explaining the project** 55:11 - 55:49 **]**

**A:**    So now we're going to be explaining one of our key methods...

**AL:**    Oh! That's my cue **[laughter]** So, [A] showed an image earlier of reading a single book as opposed to a library with a lot of books. So our problem is we have a lot of documents that we want to make sense of, in order to understand public

discourse...**[AL explains topic modeling methodology; "bag of words", etc 56:11 - 59:53 ]**

**AL:**　　Well, that's basically all that I had to say... So, you've separated out your document into 11, 50, 100, 200, 250 themes, or topics. Some of them are nonsense, so you don't look at those. Some of them are too obvious, so you only look at those if you wanna know their relative importance in the document set, compared to others. And then there are some that you kinda half-understand, you have to understand, those are the research sweet spot, right? So then you go read the articles involved in those and find out what people are talking about when they talk about "the humanities *and* science" or the humanities *and* women", or something like that. **[to A]** Do you wanna go now?

**Speaker 5:**　　So [AL], I have a quick question.

**AL:**　　Yes?

**Speaker 5:**　　So it's almost as if the computer is in inadvertently identifying a topic.

**AL:**　　That's right.

**Speaker 5:**　　It's almost creating a topic, and you--the human--are saying "that looks like it makes some sense".

**AL:**　　Yep. Well, also the reverse: "It doesn't look like it makes any sense to me, I don't understand that" so now I need to go figure out what's happening in the corpus to generate that relationship **[J walks in]**

**A:**　　We also just want to welcome [J]...

**J:**       Hi!

**A:**       ...who is part of the project, who is one of our undergraduate Research Assistants. **[murmurs of acknowledgement]**

**Speaker 2:**  How many data points do you need to make this method viable?

**AL:**      Yeah, you mean how many original documents, for example? Or how many words--

**Speaker 2:**  Yeah, or how many comments, or words, or whatever you use...

**AL:**      That's a very good question. Basically, the answer is you need a *lot* to make this value pay off for itself. Because obviously, a human reader is better at looking at 1 to 100 documents. And the computer can read. So what you get out of the method, looking at small scale sets of materials, is not gonna be worth the effort, to do so. This only pays off when you deal with large document sets, or *very* large single documents, when a human reader is not capable of, you know, keeping all that in working memory at one time. I *have* had students, when I teach this method, try to apply it to, like, a single tweet **[laughter]** and I say "I don't think you understand the method, or the philosophy, involved..." So this only applies at a very large level, when you *know* that you're not gonna be able to the method to do anything like close reading, to do really intelligent reading, but you could not have read all these otherwise. So, even "shallow-reading" of this sort, categorizing things, is better than nothing. And if you do it well, that kind of shallow reading--simply by categorizing things and counting the relative importance of the categories and which documents they're most associated with--you can actually deduce a lot from that in a higher interpretive level.1:02:23

**A:**       And then what you can do is, it can guide what you *do* want to close read...

**[Speaker 5:** Right]

**A:**     ...so if you find the topic that's very interesting to you, then you can go and say, "I'm gonna read these articles, and maybe I'll read the top 20", and that's much more manageable than trying to read the million, and trying to come up with that grouping yourself.

**AL:**     It gives us a template, a legitimate reason for reading in a certain order. So, as opposed to pulling things out at random and anecdotally saying, "This is what I'm gonna be basing my case on", now I've got categories, I've got relative weights, and I've got--associated with each topic--the top 20 articles that have the *most* association with that topic. So now, let me go read those 20 articles. And that's a method, that I can rationalize and explain to others, as opposed to a random drawing of articles.

**A:**     So we can give an example here of the live model...**[explains Reddit/UWire model, including different example topics, top articles, etc 1:03:15 - 1:05:24 ]**

**A:**     ...and we've actually reproduced these [topics] on a handout, which I think now we can segway to and explain...

**L:**     Do you need help handing out? The handout? We can just... [**jumbled handing-out, "thank you"s, etc]**

**A:**     So I will just explain briefly what's on here, and then we'll have a few minutes to read through it, and then I hope we can come back together for conversation, and questions as well. So again, one of the key reasons why we are doing human subjects research is to...oh, thanks...is to see how well, or not, our print materials line up with the opinions of people in our own community. So to that end, on the first two pages we've reproduced some excerpts from some of the different sources that we've been using... **[explains handout task, people shuffling papers; working quietly, small clarifications, etc 1:06:21 - 1:20:07 ]**

**A:**     Okay, I think even if you've not gotten to all the questions, we can just start discussing. But *do* make sure to put your name and email if you want to be entered into the raffle. [L] and [J], did you want to orchestrate this discussion?

**L:**     Yeah, sure thing!  Um, so did we wanna start by talking about some of our initial impressions of the article excerpts that we read...? Including the ones related to question one, like, what aspects related or resonated with you, that kind of thing?

**Speaker 6:**     Something that definitely resonated with me, or...sort of this "lack of workability" of humanities majors...and you know, when I'm talking with students about why to major or minor in German, people are like, "Oh I don't have time for that. It's not, you know, it's not useful". Or people will say like, "Why, so I can become a teacher, and keep passing on a skill that nobody actually needs?" **[laughter and disbelief]**

**J:**     People have said that?!

**Speaker 6:**     Yes, people say that! It's like, considered, like it just... everybody learns it, to become a teacher, to teach the next generation of teachers. Which is obviously *not* true-- and ridiculous about something like German, which is, in fact, a skill! **[laughter]** So, um, yeah. I've never understood these things but it comes up in popular discourse, I think.1:21:33

**Speaker 5:**     I was struck by the, um, the comment in the, in Paragraph A, from Dartmouth, at the bottom,  where it says "The two most recent Treasury Secretaries majored in Econ, for example, or Government, or Asian-Am...you know. *This* is the sort of thing I grew up hearing **[noises of affirmation]**, um, both my parents were professors, my father was an English professor, and my mom was the assistant for the Rhodes scholarship trust. So I used... I think of the Rhodes scholars that I would hear about growing up, because it would, [**imitating**] "Ahem, very impressive! Oh yeah, she's an artist, and well, he plays classical piano, but he's a German major", you know, I mean, it was just fabulous composite people that could do so much, or had so many interests, and I

think that's kind of a liberal arts education to me...But anyway, that resonated very much.1:22:26

**AL:** A historical database idea--majors and careers directory sounds like a good idea to me. Just to let students and others know how many different pathways there are. **[noises of affirmation]**

**Speaker 6:** We actually did an alumni survey last week to that effect, and it was...almost all of our students are double majors, and very few students do something directly related to German, but many of them mentioned, like "This is what distinguished me from everybody else". So maybe it's not the selling point in and of itself, but it's, it's what lands you the job in the end effect, so....

**J:** Something that could be useful for majors, like, like a directory like that, is to also show students that a lot of the times people change careers and majors. To show like the path that people take to get to their career. Because, in college, a lot of students tend to think "Oh, if I stick with this major I *have* to go to this job" **[noises of affirmation]** Or, like, "this is only a segment of the career-oriented market that's open to me", but a lot of people change majors and change jobs, and...

**Speaker 5:** And yet, there are some... I mean, it's my understanding that Cal Poly *requires* you to declare a major, and then you're not... you've not given much flexibility. I mean, you declare it as a freshman, and that's it.

**J:** Yeah.

**Speaker 5:** Which would go against--I mean, I agree with *you,* but then our students are being told other things. Like, "Here you are, you made your decision". Or as you **[to Speaker 4]** were describing, you, you know, your...

**L:**   Tracked education.

**Speaker 5:**   Yeah, that's--

**L:**   Which yeah, a lot of different places can start in high school or middle school. Yeah.

**Speaker 5:**   So here we are imposing this on those who might otherwise have chosen.

**AL:**   [**to Speaker 4**] Does this conversation sound very strange from a European perspective? Where so many of the education systems are not liberal arts systems, where you choose what track you go in the moment you apply to college?

**Speaker 4:**   Um, well, I had a different experience myself, because I was in a liberal arts college. So no...And it doesn't sound strange, because many people actually start something and then change, so they'll just drop out and start something new.

**AL:**   So it's similar in result, in other words.

**Speaker 4:**   Yeah.

**Speaker 5:**   Are they penalized for doing that?

**Speaker 4:**   Um, right now they are so used to have this... I was lucky, I studied when we still got, uh, grants without having to prove anything, basically. So you enrolled in university, and you got money from the government to do so **[noises of admiration and disbelief from the Americans]** That is not a reality anymore **[laughter]** So actually

now, people are, um, changing much less because it's just too expensive to stay in, in school for so long.

**Speaker 5:** Ah! Yeah, yeah.

**C:** That's the reality that many UC students face as well. I don't think that there's actually a limit on how many times you can change a major at the UCs. At least there wasn't when I finished by Bachelor's degree at UC Santa Cruz. But many students choose to not switch because they're financially deeply invested. **[noises of affirmation]** Or maybe they don't wanna delay their graduation any further. But I do think that you UCs--once you've passed a certain point in a major, and are maybe only like one or two classes away from graduating--they force you to graduate with that major. You can't switch.

**Speaker 5:** Hm. Didn't know that.

**R:** I know FAFSA will only...Unless you're going with student loans, FAFSA, will only do a maximum of five years of grants for you. So you do get that extra year. Unless they've changed things since my day. Which I doubt. **[laughter]**.

**Speaker 2:** But that wouldn't stop students from minoring or taking courses in humanities, right? Like if they were just... Say yes, they're on the track to the math or something, they could still be like, "Oh, I'm gonna take this sequence...".

**Speaker 7:** Depends on the discipline. Like, when I look at how... and school...Like, at my school, you could be and Engineering...where I went to undergrad, could be, um, an Engineering major and take some liberal arts classes. In fact, it was required. But I don't, I mean, I don't know what the requirements are at UCSB, but when I look at like the sheer number of courses that Engineering majors--

**[AL:** Mm-hmm. Engineering's famous for that]

**Speaker 7:**     --are required to take every year...

**AL:**     Engineering's famous for that.

**Speaker 7:**     Yeah, like you just... It's like they're taking five engineering classes per quarter, every quarter, all four years and it's like, wow. **[laughter]**

**Speaker 6:**     Yeah, there's no way you could double major, or minor

**Speaker 7:**     Yeah! It's insane! Like, I mean, I'm really impressed by like, how much these undergrads know, but...I'm like, I mean, I wouldn't give up my college major writing class for anything. You know?

**L:**     **[to Speaker 3]** Did you have something you were gonna...?

**Speaker 3:**     Yeah, I was, um...I was thinking about how I actually resonated with both sides of the coin, that was sort of suggested on the first page here. It was like, um one where... Yeah, I also kind of--if not growing up, but at least in college--gotten the strong feeling that people who major in humanities and social sciences end up in all kinds of fields, and do all sorts of things, and like often end up the bosses of the engineers, because the engineers never actually got a chance to go out into the world and learn how to be around people as much **[laughter]** And the thing is...and so I see that, but at the same time, the rest of it...You know, the part B, where they talk about, "Oh, um, you know, I could have just gone out and read some books, and gotten the same education". They think they also... well, the student also mentions this in part A here. Um, at some point....Um, maybe it's, maybe it's because of, again, like, trying to spread the humanities, um, to as many people as possible and make it as democratic as possible? Over and over, having taken, you know, a fair number of humanities and social sciences classes as well--in addition to like the computational classes--it seems like the Humanities folks are always trying to simplify and make things less rigorous. Which, um...eEspecially so when you take the general education classes that, you

know, we're talking about... So, they required one or two, you know, English or whatever class that you have to take to graduate. Or the one major writing class that you might enroll in, just because...those classes, it seems, are often made as easy as possible, so that everyone else who's not intimately in familiar with the humanities discipline, gets the picture, or the story, that it's just really easy to get an A, and "humanities" therefore, is just really, really simplistic. Um, which...so...which then results in--It's not just the issue of humanities' portrayal in society as being, you know, as being simplistic, this way. It really has become that friendly. 1:29:34

**L:** Interesting. Yeah...So we only have a couple of minutes left. Um, I'm not sure if, if there's interest in the room in focusing more on the topic model questions, or the kind of sources and materials and advocacy questions? I'm, I'm personally interested in the sources thing, because as you're reminding me with the Reddit example, we do have an opportunity to use some social media sources, um, and you do get a different sense--or at least I did, reading it--that it's much more emotional, it's much more personal than the kinds of things you get in the student papers. Um, so I don't know, but any...

**AL:** Yeah, what should we be collecting? We're collecting campus, student newspaper articles through the University Wire service; we're collecting from Reddit, from Twitter, um... and that's about it, in terms of student-specific--

**A:** ...just for the students...

**AL:** Yeah, specific for the student, yeah.

**A:** At large, we have newspapers, from every state...

**AL:** Yeah

**Speaker 6:**     I don't know if it would be possible to being access to student evaluations, but I think that would be fascinating if you could--

**L:**     Interesting!

**Speaker 6:**     --just to see.

**AL:**     We can get that from that site that's public--

**Speaker 5:**     ...one peek, behind the lines...

**AL:**     -- I mean, proprietary online, um--

**[Participants:** Rate my professor! Right! **[laughter]]**

**AL:**     People Ben Schmidt, who is a digital humanist, have done studies about that, and they're quite revealing, especially the gender bias, it's pretty raw-- **[noises of affirmation]**

**L**:     I can imagine...

**AL:**     **--**so maybe we should try that, actually.

**L:**     And then, it would also be useful to know if there's things that have been useful to you, that maybe aren't "gather-able", but that we should be thinking about in a larger sense. For example, in the subReddit piece that we included, there's a lot about

comparison with your friends. And I was...it made me think like, "Oh, you know, Facebook is actually probably where I get a lot of my professional anxiety from" **[laughs]** because I see people posting about how well they're doing, and they're different career paths, and that kind of thing. So yeah, anything like that as well...

**Speaker 2:** I wonder if there's any like, I don't know, like, a creative outlet that students have where they... where you'd like, implicitly be seeing these distinctions that students... like, I...Like, I would have, like, in my undergrad, there'd be this like--every month or two months--there'd be like the student play, that Drama put on? **[noises of affirmation]** Like a sort of soap opera thing. And they would play off of a lot of the the things that were just, like, going on on campus. And so, I would think like conclusively, there, there would be like jokes. Everyone would be able to laugh about... maybe jokes are...or somehow humor, how humor works--

**[L:** Yeah. yeah, that's a really good thought]

**Speaker 2:** --works here. Like, jokes that are recognizable for people. 'cause that reveals a lot. **[noises of affirmation]**. And just like stories, just... How is like...How's the typical humanities student portrayed? In sort of... maybe in the popular culture, that students...

**[L: Y**eah]

**AL:** In film, for example

**Speaker 2:** Instagram, memes, that sort of stuff

**Speaker 3:** Maybe something like College Humor, that would be a good--

**[Speaker 2:** Yeah, exactly, exactly **[participants agreeing, commenting variously]]**

**AL:** What about mainstream news? For those of you who are undergraduates, or recent undergraduates, to what extent is there any overlap between the student perception of the world and mainstream...Do students still read newspapers, or watch TV news? What kind of overlap is there now?

**Speaker 1:** I mean, there's a Snapchat subscription that tells you, like, America's politics every week **[laughter]**

**[J:** Oh, yeah]

**L:** So you don't need to--

**AL:** So it's all mediated through--

**Speaker 5:** And the source is, what?

**Speaker 1:** It's called, uh, "Good Luck America" but it's like, it has like an anchorman and everything, and it's--

**Speaker 7:** Did you say "Good Luck America"?

**L:** Yeah **[various laughter]**

**AL:** Well...would that be... Is there one place we would look for the way that students get mainstream news?

**Speaker 7:** Facebook **[participants agreeing and discussing]**

**J:** I would say like social...oh, I don't want to interrupt...

**AL:** Go ahead, [J]!

**J:** I was gonna say like, social media sites in general **[participants agreeing].** Like, a lot of fast, really fast, news. Things like Buzzfeed, like, not necessarily just Buzzfeed but news sites like that, where it's just like a big headline. Like, that [Speaker 1]...what [Speaker 1] was mentioning with Snapchat, like, on Snapchat there's a lot of different channels and they're like, all...like, you don't even read the article. You just click and you just see the headline. And then, if you want to swipe on the article, you have to like, swipe up and then read it. But a lot of people just, like, get their news from the headlines **[participants agreeing]** which is why, like, on social media there's a big problem with...I don't wanna say "fake news" 'cause I mean it in a different way. But like, misinformation, because people tend to just read the headlines, and then go straight to the comments.

**Participants:** Yeah. Mm-hmm.

**J:** So that's like another issue **[laughs]**

**Speaker 5:** Yeah, the comments *alone* are another issue! **[laughter]**

**L:** So, I think we're... just about time to wrap up here. Are there any final thoughts anyone would wanna throw out before we head out? Yeah, go for it!

**Speaker 2:** Just, are you looking historically too? Like, how it's developed over time for comparison?

**[L:** Yeah, that's definitely something we're trying--]

**AL:** So this is a problematic issue for us **[laughter].** I'd like to do that. But in...for practical reasons, were limited to when...born-full text, digital text, arose. And the earliest that we can find is around 1980's, when *The New York Times* started to put their articles up visually. Not online, but for internal production reasons. So, 25 years.

**L:** But we can...we can look at more recent history, things like how the Recession might have affected like, public discussion of these things.

**Speaker 2:** So that would be...yeah. Okay, yeah.

**R:** Or the election of a certain President...

**L:** Exactly, yeah **[laughter, participants commenting]**

**AL:** So one thing we want to study is before 2008, and after 2012, so the Great Recession, as a, um, critical factor here.

**Speaker 7:** Wait, how is the Great Recession a factor?

**AL:** Well, in terms of...for example, do we have more incidents of the word "crisis"?

**L:** Yeah. "In the humanities"?

**AL:** In the humanities. After--

**Speaker 7:** Ah

**L:** Are articles more about *money* that you get, that kind of thing

**Speaker 7:** Right. Because people are like "Oh my God! And then I have to get a job!" Yeah.

**R:** And people beginning to see "higher education" as synonymous with "job training" **[participants agreeing]** Which it shouldn't be, necessarily.

**Speaker 2:** Oh, and I know...as somebody who transitioned from high school to college during that period, um, a lot of my peers, you know, their families' financial situation was totally decimated by the Recession. **[noises of affirmation]** So they have to be very calculated in terms of how they approached higher education, things like, you know, not... choosing a major quickly, not dawdling, passing all their classes the first time. So you can get out in like, the most timely manner possible.

**AL:** There's also the collective and national policy dimension of this as well. One of the reasons it would be nice to have full digital text back to the '1960s is that...the Kennedy era is the era in which, for example, the National Endowment for the Humanities was started, the National Endowment for the Arts...and that had to do with broad national policy motivations. It was the Sputnik era, the Cold War era...

**R:** The GI Bill

**AL:** The GI Bill. People have written about the fact that one of the things that the nation needed then was to differentiate itself from the other Cold War power. So... we all have rockets and bombs and so on, but *we* have the *humanities!* So...**[laughter. Participants commenting variously]**

**L:** Well, I think that sounds like as good a... **[more laughter]** as good a goodbye as any! [A], I don't know if you wanna...

**A:** Yeah, please give us your handouts, if you're comfortable with that. And make sure to put your name and email for the raffle if you want to be entered. And thank you all so much for coming!

**AL:** Yes, thank you very much.

**L:** Take food, and thanks...**[various goodbyes and participants shuffling] 1:36:47**