

San José State University
English Department
English 193, Literature of Self Reflection. Fall 2012

Instructor:	Susan Shillinglaw
Office Location:	Faculty Offices 118
Telephone:	408-924-4487
Email:	Susan.shillinglaw@sjsu.edu
Office Hours:	M/W 3:00-4:30
Class Days/Time:	M/W 12:00-1:15
Classroom:	SH 410

Course Description/goals

The first aim of this course is reflective: You will review your years as an English major, rereading essays you've written, reflecting on your development as a writer and a reader, considering the reasons that you chose to be an English major. A portfolio will be assembled that contains papers from your undergraduate literature courses, collected and organized in a way that seems appropriate to you, based on your growth as a writer. Early in the semester, each student will have a conference with me about your portfolio and a reflective essay on your writing. You will also add papers from this semester and, at the end of the term, reflect on your strengths as a writer.

Each student will also reflect on the ways in which reading and class discussions have enriched his or her appreciation of literature. As a class, we shall review the department's list of Student Learning Goals.

The second aim of this course is literary: The class will consider a broad theme, a sense of place, our relationship to nature and to environments impacted by humans. If "you don't know where you are, says Wendel Berry, you don't know *who* you are." "Some are born in their place, some find it, some realize after long searching that the place they left is the one they have been searching for. But whatever their relation to it, it is made a place only by slow accrual, like a coral reef." (Wallace Stegner) We will discuss humans and the environment. What is meant by place, by nature, by environmentalism? What is our responsibility to the wilderness? How can intimacy with a landscape lead to a deeper awareness of the numinous dimensions of that place. How do race/gender/culture/class affect perspectives toward nature? What is nature writing?

The third aim of the class is creative: You will write weekly, both personal and literary reflections/analyses.

The fourth aim of this class is “emergence”: You will soon graduate, and the future may be uncertain. But a couple of things you do know: you’ll keep reading (I hope) and you’ll need a resume. To that end, book groups will be a part of this course, models for post-graduation reading groups. And we’ll discuss what a resume might look like.

Student Learning Objectives [SLO]

In the Department of English and Comparative Literature, students will demonstrate the ability to

1. **read** closely in a variety of forms, styles, structures, and modes, and articulate the value of close reading in the study of literature, creative writing, and/or rhetoric;
2. **show familiarity** with major literary works, genres, periods, and critical approaches to British, American and World Literature;
3. **write** clearly, effectively, and creatively, and adjust writing style appropriately to the content, the context, and the nature of the subject;
4. **develop and carry out** research projects, and locate, evaluate, organize, and incorporate information effectively;
5. **articulate** the relations among culture, history, and texts.

Required Texts/Readings

Anne Fadiman, *At Large and At Small*

Terry Tempest Williams, *Refuge*

Cormac McCarthy, *All the Pretty Horses*

John Steinbeck, *Cannery Row* (Penguin Classics Edition)

Robinson Jeffers, *Robinson Jeffers, Selected Poems* (Vintage. ISBN: 9780394702957)

Strunk & White & Kalman, *The Elements of Style*, Illustrated. (Penguin. ISBN: 978-0-14-311272-3)

Course reader: Maple Press

Recommended reading: *I’m an English Major—Now What?* Tim Lemire

Texts for group work, 3-5 in each group (copies from Amazon or Powells Books, Portland). Groups determined by August 29.

- a. Confronting Wilderness: Bill Bryson, *A Walk in the Woods*; Cheryl Strayed, *Wild*
- b. Encounters in the Wilderness: Barry Lopez, *Arctic Dreams*; Cormac McCarthy, *Blood Meridian*
- c. Pastoral: *Peace Like a River*, Lief Enger; *O Pioneers*, Willa Cather
- d. Memory and reflection: Margaret Atwood, *Surfacing*; Edward Abbey, *Desert Solitaire: A Season in the Wilderness*
- e. Travel: Joe Kane, *Savages*; Gerald Durrell, *My Family and Other Animals*

- f. Travel: Jon Krakauer, *Into Thin Air*; Tony Horwitz, *Blue Latitudes*
- g. Intimacy with place: Norman Maclean, *A River Runs Through It*; James Galvin, *The Meadow*
- h. Intimacy with place: Ivan Doig, *This House of Sky*; N. Scott Momaday, *House Made of Dawn*

Classroom Protocol

Please come to each class prepared; read the assignment for each day carefully and, on Thursdays, have your reading response ready to turn in at the beginning of class. Please hand in hard copies of all essays; I do not accept online submissions unless I give a student specific permission to hand in an essay online. Late papers will receive lower grades; failure to attend class will result in lower participation grades as well. Please do not bring computers to class—this is a seminar, and attentive participation is expected of all.

Dropping and Adding

Students are responsible for understanding the policies and procedures about add/drop, grade forgiveness, etc. Refer to the current semester's [Catalog Policies](http://info.sjsu.edu/static/catalog/policies.html) section at <http://info.sjsu.edu/static/catalog/policies.html>. Add/drop deadlines can be found on the [current academic calendar](http://www.sjsu.edu/academic_programs/calendars/academic_calendar/) web page located at http://www.sjsu.edu/academic_programs/calendars/academic_calendar/. The [Late Drop Policy](http://www.sjsu.edu/aars/policies/latedrops/policy/) is available at <http://www.sjsu.edu/aars/policies/latedrops/policy/>. Students should be aware of the current deadlines and penalties for dropping classes.

Information about the latest changes and news is available at the [Advising Hub](http://www.sjsu.edu/advising/) at <http://www.sjsu.edu/advising/>.

Assignments and grading policy

1. Weekly responses, 20%. Each student will write weekly reading responses that I will collect at the beginning of class on Thursday; entries will be returned the following Tuesday. In 350 words, 1 ½ pages) either relate the week's reading to your own experience **or** write a focused analytical piece, considering a character, image, theme or a theoretical perspective on the reading. Note that these are two different activities: roughly half of your writing responses should be personal; the other half analytical and/or theoretical. Please remember that you cannot possibly discuss broad issues in 2 pages without focusing on a particular scene or character that represents the issue you feel is significant.

When writing your personal entries, please make the connection between your experience and the reading in personal entries by noting specific sections of the text that you found significant to your experience.

Please identify each entry as personal, analytical, theoretical on the upper right corner with your name and the date.

Every reading response, whether personal, analytical, or theoretical, must demonstrate active engagement in the text and in ideas generated by that text. Weekly assignments will be graded on a 1-10 scale, based on the following:

9-10: A superior piece of writing. It is clearly focused, the language is sharp, and the writing is free of grammatical errors. The essay has originality and style, is elegant, thoughtful and persuasive.
topic focused

7-8: A good piece of writing, solid and clear. But it may lack the innovation and sharpness of the top category. The point is clear but could be supported with additional details. There may be minor spelling, typographic, and/or grammatical errors. But it is interesting enough to hold a reader's attention.

5-6: This is an average response, acceptable senior-level work. It meets the requirements of the assignment, but it does not go beyond. The point may be too broad or unsupported. Examples may be general rather than specific. There may be grammatical errors. The central idea may not be fresh. The writing may be wordy and vague.

3-4: These responses are short, general, and lacking in examples. There may be serious grammatical errors.

1-2: Unacceptable work: Lacks insight and clarity.

By the end of the semester, each student will have **at least 10 entries placed in portfolio + 1 page reflection on your favorite entry**. I will collect portfolios and give you a final grade on entries.

No late responses accepted, no responses from those not in class.

2. Essay #1: Self-reflective essay for conference: "What kind of writer am I? What are my strengths and weaknesses?" 10%.

Response to collecting and organizing your papers and then reflecting on your strengths and weaknesses as a writer, 10%: each student will write a **four page essay** that focuses on your strengths and weaknesses as a writer as reflected in the papers you have written as an English major (please consider only papers written for your major, in both lower division and upper division classes). In short, the papers you examine and organize for your portfolio will be your "evidence" and the essay you write will reflect on what those papers tell you about your own writing: what are your strongest characteristics as a writer? What are your challenges? How confident do you feel in grammar? Are your sentences varied? Paragraphs coherent? Evidence strong? Have you developed a personal voice?

Bring this essay with you when you have your portfolio conference (first three weeks of the semester).

3. Essay #2: Reflection on place: Mixed-media project, 15%

After reading several texts about place and discussing ideas about place in class, I would like each of you to consider one place that has meaning to you: garden, cityscape, river, childhood retreat. In preparation for this assignment, I will have you read "Mapping the sacred places," which discusses

the importance of certain places in our lives. I would like you to consider the place that is or has been most significant to you. Part of your assignment will be literary, a **four-page essay**. Integrated into your essay will be photos, drawing, computer graphics, poems, historical research (Fadiman as model here). So the final project may be more than 4 pages total.

4. Essay #3 + presentation: 25%. Working in groups of 4-5, you will select a pair of books or one longer from the additional reading list. After reading groups are selected, each group will spend 15 minutes exchanging email addresses, work schedules, and preference of where to meet.

Group organization and group dynamics: One person will serve as secretary, keeping notes; one as president, organizing presentation and meetings; the other members of the group will circulate as “discussion leader” for each session. When you turn in your group list, please note these “officers.” I have scheduled bookgroup meetings during several class periods; this semester I will not give you questions for groups, but ask that each member of the group come up with two questions he/she wants to discuss for each meeting. You need not write down your responses to the questions— simply discuss them during the meeting--but I would like the group to take 5 minutes at the end of each meeting to write two sentences of what went best in the meeting: best question, best part of book, best passage. Be specific. Only two sentences.

Each group will read two books over the course of the semester. The purpose of this assignment is to demonstrate how book groups can enrich even the busiest lives.

On the day of your presentation, each student will hand in a **four page essay** which will cover the following:

Part I: A central issue related to place, ecology, wilderness, etc. that was most intriguing to you in each book. You may compare treatments in each text or show how similar.

Part II: Relate an issue in the text with one other book read in class.

Part III: Optional. Is biographical/scholarly research helpful? Important? What did you use to prepare your presentation?

Part IV: What was best about your group and/or the books you read? What was the greatest challenge for you or your group?

Your grade for this assignment will be based on the following, each receiving equal weight:

- a. Quality of the team’s group work (questions generated; 2 sentence summary)
- b. Oral presentation based on professor and peer reviews (ie. voice projection, enthusiasm for material, original ideas generated, integrated research, each participant discussing issues in both books)
- c. Originality of the essay: clarity, specificity, lucid examples, etc.

5. Essay #4: Reconsidering your prose/new directions in prose, 25%.

During each student’s conference with the professor about his/her portfolio, the following options will be discussed:

- a. **Substantial revision of one paper.** For this option, the student will read **at least three** additional scholarly essays on the text, the author, or the theoretical approach and revise with

three specific goals in mind. Those goals will be articulated on a cover sheet of the paper. Students will hand in both the original essay and the revised essay.

b. Writing a “Familiar Essay” modeled on Anne Fadiman’s essays. Select a topic that is important to you—it can be a hobby, an academic interest, an author, a summer job—almost anything, as Fadiman’s book suggests. This essay is in part personal and in part factual, based on research. Each “familiar essay” will include **at least 3 sources** and quote more than once from each source.

The final grade will consider of the following:

a. Originality of idea: Due Sept. 24 (but can be narrowed in process of research)

b. Annotated bibliography of 3 sources (+ 2 others for final paper, due with paper): Due Oct. 22.

c. Thesis statement + first paragraph: due Nov. 5

d. Rough draft + Works Cited, 5 sources in MLA format, due November 21. In-class workshop

e. Final essay, due . Please turn in a,b,c, d as well

6. Other: Class participation, resume workshop/final, short and creative final exam: 5%

This is a small but important part of your grade, and I will determine the final piece in the following way, on a 7 point scale:

6-7 points: Someone who has been a reliable and constant positive force in class, who has not missed classes, and who turns in a carefully revised resume and writes a careful and thoughtful and specific exam.

5-6 points: Someone who has been a reliable and constant positive force in class but may have missed one or two classes. Resume is good, exam is good but could be more specific and thoughtful.

3-4 points: A mostly positive force in class but sometimes unprepared. Someone who has missed a few classes. Resume needs more work and exam is brief and/or vague.

1-2 points: Someone who has not contributed because of poor attendance and poor participation and poor preparedness. Resume may be weak, and exam is very general.

Grading: The Department of English reaffirms its commitment to the differential grading scale as defined in the official SJSU *Catalog* (“The Grading System”). Grades issued must represent a full range of student performance: A=excellent; B=above average; C=average; D=below average; F=failure. In this course, as in all English Department courses, I will comment on and grade the quality of writing (grammar, organization, clarity, specificity, etc.) as well as the quality of the ideas being conveyed. All student writing should be distinguished by correct grammar and punctuation, appropriate diction and syntax, and well-organized paragraphs.

University Policies

Academic integrity

Your commitment as a student to learning is evidenced by your enrollment at San Jose State University. The [University's Academic Integrity policy](http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/S07-2.htm), located at <http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/S07-2.htm>, requires you to be honest in all your academic course work. Faculty members are required to report all infractions to the office of Student Conduct and Ethical Development. The [Student Conduct and Ethical Development website](http://www.sjsu.edu/studentconduct/) is available at <http://www.sjsu.edu/studentconduct/>.

Instances of academic dishonesty will not be tolerated. Cheating on exams or plagiarism (presenting the work of another as your own, or the use of another person's ideas without giving proper credit) will result in a failing grade and sanctions by the University. For this class, all assignments are to be completed by the individual student unless otherwise specified. If you would like to include your assignment or any material you have submitted, or plan to submit for another class, please note that SJSU's Academic Policy S07-2 requires approval of instructors.

Campus Policy in Compliance with the American Disabilities Act

If you need course adaptations or accommodations because of a disability, or if you need to make special arrangements in case the building must be evacuated, please make an appointment with me as soon as possible, or see me during office hours. Presidential Directive 97-03 requires that students with disabilities requesting accommodations must register with the [Disability Resource Center \(DRC\)](http://www.drc.sjsu.edu/) at <http://www.drc.sjsu.edu/> to establish a record of their disability.

Schedule

PART I: The Humanities: Reading/Writing

August 22: Introduction: David Brooks, “History for Dollars” (handout) and “The Triumph of Humanities” (attached)

August 27: Reflecting on literary studies: Fadiman: “Preface” and “Procrustes and the Culture Wars,” 75-94. Reader, “Sharing the Mayhem” [SLO: 1,2,5]

Schedule conference, held from September 4 to 20. Bring to your scheduled conference: a. portfolio of essays written for literature classes at SJSU and other universities, with table of contents and 1 paragraph explanation of arrangement; b. Essay #1, a four page reflective essay about your strengths and weaknesses as a writer. c. ideas about rewriting/composing a long essay

August 29: Fadiman, “The Unfuzzy Lamb”; Charles Lamb; “Witches and Other Night Fears” and “A Dissertation on Roast Pig” <http://www.ucs.louisiana.edu/~jer6616/> Reader: “Easy Writers” **Bookgroups** determined by this date; 15 minutes for in-class meeting. [SLO: 1,2,3,5]

September 3: Labor Day, campus closed.

September 5: Fadiman, “Coleridge the Runaway” “Ice Cream” “Night Owl.” Reader: Writing Personal Essays. [SLO 1,2,3,5]

September 10: Fadiman, “Mail” “A Piece of Cotton.” Strunk/White Kalman, Chapter I. [SLO 1,3,5]

September 12: Strunk/White/Kalman, Chapter II. Reader: E.B. White: “Once More to the Lake” Writing Workshop on personal response to one essay read, August 27-12. [SLO 1,3,5]

PART II: Considering place

September 17: Stevens, “13 ways of Looking at a Blackbird”:

<http://boppin.com/poets/stevens.htm>

“Jar in Tennessee”: <http://www.poemhunter.com/poem/anecdote-of-the-jar/>

Lopez, “A Literature of Place” http://arts.envirolink.org/literary_arts/BarryLopez_LitofPlace.html/;

Reader: Steinbeck, Preface, *Sea of Cortez*. Strunk/White/Kalman, Chapter III. [SLO 1,2, 5]

September 19: Fadiman, “Collecting Nature”

Bookgroup meeting, 25 minutes: Finish 1/3 of first book by this point. Steinbeck, *Cannery Row*, Ch 1-5. [SLG 1,5]

September 24: Steinbeck, *Cannery Row*, Ch 6-20 [SLG 1,5] **For Essay #4: Two sentence statement of idea.**

September 26: Steinbeck, *Cannery Row* complete. Reader: “The American Geographies: Losing Our Sense of Place” “Mapping the Sacred Places” [SLO 1,5]

October 1: Reader: Gary Snyder, “The Place, the Region, and the Commons”; sent via email: “Tragedy of the Commons” [SLO 1,5]

October 3: Robinson Jeffers: “Continent’s End” “Tor House” “The Bed by the Window” “The Excesses of God.” **Bookgroup meeting, 25 minutes: Finish 2/3 of first book by this meeting. Ideas/2-sentence summary collected.** [SLO 1,3,5]

October 8: Jeffers, “Roan Stallion” [SLO 1,2,3].

October 10: Jeffers, “Shine, Perishing Republic,” “Night” “Hurt Hawks” “Rock and Hawk” “For Una,” “The House Dog’s Grave” “Their Beauty Has More Meaning” [SLO 1,2,5]

October 15: Jeffers, “Carmel Point” Strunk/White/Kalman, IV. **Essay #2 due, place.** [SLO 1,2,5]

October 17: McCarthy; Strunk/White/Kalman, Chapter V and VI. [SLO 1,2,5]

October 22: McCarthy *For Essay #4: Annotated bibliography of 3 works from historical, scholarly resources. At least 2 not online* [SLO 1,2,4,5];

October 24: Bookgroup meeting, 60 minutes: Finish book 1 by this date. [SLO 1.5]

October 29: McCarthy [SLO 1, 5]

October 31: McCarthy; [SL) 1,5]

November 5: Fadiman, “The Arctic Hedonist,” “Under Water” *For Essay #4: Thesis + opening paragraph.* [SLO 1,3,4,5]

November 7: Bookgroup meeting, 30 minutes. Film, *All the Pretty Horses.* [SLO 2,5]

November 12: No class. Campus closed, Veteran’s Day

November 19: Film: *All the Pretty Horses* [SLO 1,5]

November 21: *For Essay #4: Rough draft + bibliography. In-class workshop, required.* [SLO 3,4, 5]

November 26: *Refuge* [SLG 1,2,5] **Bookgroup meeting, 25 minutes: Finish Book 2 by this date.** [SLO 1,2,5]

November 28: *Refuge* [SLG 1,2]; Resume workshop. [SLO 1,2]

December 3: **Book group presentations** *Refuge*; Reader: “Graduates’ First Job: Marketing Themselves.” [SLO 1,3,4]

December 5: Book group presentations; *Refuge* [SLO1,3,4]

December 10: Book group presentations Reader: “The Medium is the Medium,” [SLO1, 3,4]
<http://well.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/07/02/how-to-make-optimism-work-for-you-2/>

December 18: Final Exam, 9:45-12

June 13, 2011, 8:30 pm

The Triumph of the Humanities

Stanley Fish

Our house in the western Catskills overlooks the Pepacton Reservoir, a 20-mile ribbon of water between Margaretville and Downsville. Maps on the Internet, depending on their scale and detail, will show you where the reservoir is in relation to nearby towns and roads. What they won't show you, although every resident of the area knows about them, are the four towns — Arena, Shavertown, Union Grove and Pepacton — that were flooded in the middle '50s so that the reservoir could be constructed. (Today, after more than 50 years, resentment against New York City remains strong.)

The maps and pictures of the reservoir are determinedly linear; the eye follows the water in its journey down Route 30 toward the city. But for the old-timers, and the new-timers who have been caught up in the romance of the lost towns, the eye stops and looks down to what are now the geological layers of civilizations, one on the surface and claiming a literal, no-nonsense empirical reality (“If you want get from Andes to Downsville, you can travel on either side of the reservoir”), and the other below the surface, where lie subterranean Brigadoons that emerge not every hundred years but whenever the reservoir gets so low that pieces of a drowned culture suddenly and unnervingly come into view. At those moments the eye simply cannot travel the straight line encouraged by visible coherences and road signs; the natural pull of forward progress is forestalled and one begins to ruminate on what lies beneath our every step as we raise our feet to take the next one.

There is now a (relatively) new discipline in which this breaking down of time into spatial units that are read vertically rather than horizontally is the obligatory gesture. It calls itself GeoHumanities and its project is nicely encapsulated in the title of one of the essays in a collection that officially announces the emergence of a field of study. The collection is called [“GeoHumanities: Art, History, Text at the Edge of Place”](#); the essay (by [Edward L. Ayers](#), an historian and president of the University of Richmond) is entitled “Mapping Time.”

Ayers's project is to map the changes that followed upon the emancipation of the slaves after the Civil War. He and his colleagues begin with a simple map and then they locate populations on the landscape and “put down one layer after another: of race, of wealth, of literacy, of water courses, of roads, of railways, of soil type, of voting patterns, of social structure.”

The layered picture that results can then be “read” and a story can be told, the story of complex relationships that are frozen by the analysis but which, of course, are really in motion. The next step is to acknowledge the motion by using cinematic techniques that present the passage of time as spatial units that succeed one another. “By converting time to motion,” says Ayers, “we can visualize the passage of time (as one watches the hands of a clock move).”

Ayers calls this technique of representation “deep contingency,” and he acknowledges its artificiality. The metaphor of a layered reality “is a fiction of course, since the layers continually interact and the ‘top’ layer of humans constantly changes the ‘bottom’ layer of landscape; but it is a useful fiction, since it reminds us of the structural depth of time and experience.” The project is a synthesis of geography (now renamed Geographic Information Science, or GIS) and history: “GIS is about patterns and structures; history is about motion; by integrating the two, we can see layers of events, layers of the consequences of unpredictability.”

That is, we can read events not merely historically, as the product of the events preceding them, but geologically, as the location of sedimented patterns of culture, economics, politics, agriculture. What is being attempted is a reorientation of perception, an alternative way of interpreting the world in which “space is not merely in the service of time, but has a poetics of its own, which reveals itself through a geographical or topological imagination rather than a historical one” (Paul Smethurst, [“The Postmodern Chronotope”](#)).

The interplay in these quotations between a literary and a geographical vocabulary tells us what GeoHumanities is all about; it is the elaboration, by methods derived from the humanities, of “the stratified record upon which we set our feet” (the title of another essay and a quote from Thomas Mann). It is the realization, in a style of analysis, of the “spatial turn,” a “critical shift that divested geography of its largely passive role as history’s ‘stage’ and brought to the fore intersections between the humanities and the earth sciences” (Peta Mitchell in “GeoHumanities”).

“Intersections” is perhaps too weak a word, because it suggests two disciplines that retain their distinctiveness but collaborate occasionally on a specific project. The stronger assertion, made by many in the volume, is that the division between empirical/descriptive disciplines and interpretive disciplines is itself a fiction and one that stands in the way of the production of knowledge.

An apparently empirical project like geography is, and always has been, interpretive through and through. “The map has always been a political agent” (Lize Mogel), has always had a “generative power” (Emily Eliza Scott), and that power can only be released and studied by those who approach their work in the manner of literary critics. Geography “demands a reader who is at once an archeologist, geologist and geographer, a reader who ... is at all times attentive to the stratification of history, memory, language, and landscape and who can read obliquely through their layers” (Peta Mitchell).

If interpretive methods and perspectives are necessary to the practice of geography, they are no less necessary to other projects supposedly separate from the project of the humanities. And that is why, in addition to GeoHumanities, we now have Biohumanities (“the humanities not only comment on the significance or implications of biological knowledge, but add to our understanding of biology itself” — Karola Stotz and Paul E. Griffiths), Disability Studies (of which the X-Men films might be both a representation and an instance), Metahistory (the study of the irreducibly narrative basis of historical “fact”), Law and Literature (the laying bare of the rhetorical and literary strategies giving form to every assertion in the law), Cultural Anthropology (an inquiry into the very possibility of anthropological observation that begins by acknowledging the inescapability of perspective and the ubiquity of interpretation), Cultural Sociology (“the commitment to hermeneutically reconstructing social texts in a rich and persuasive way” — Jeffrey C. Alexander and Philip Smith), and other hybrids already emergent and soon to emerge.

What this all suggests is that while we have been anguishing over the fate of the humanities, the humanities have been busily moving into, and even colonizing, the fields that were supposedly displacing them. In the ‘70s and the ‘80s the humanities exported theory to the social sciences and (with less influence) to the sciences; many disciplines saw a pitched battle between the new watchwords — perspective, contingency, dispersion, multi-vocality, intertextuality — and the traditional techniques of dispassionate observation, the collection of evidence, the drawing of warranted conclusions and the establishing of solid fact. Now the dust has settled and the invaded disciplines have incorporated much of what they resisted. Propositions that once seemed outlandish — all knowledge is mediated, even our certainties are socially constructed — are now routinely asserted in precincts where they were once feared as the harbingers of chaos and corrosive relativism.

One could say then that the humanities are the victors in the theory wars; nearly everyone now dances to their tune. But this conceptual triumph has not brought with it a proportionate share of resources or institutional support. Perhaps administrators still think of the humanities as the province of precious insights that offer little to those who are charged with the task of making sense of the world. Volumes like “GeoHumanities” tell a different story, and it is one that cannot be rehearsed too often.