

Ad Hoc American Studies: Michigan and the Hidden History of a Movement

Alexander I. Olson and Frank Kelderman

In 1977, K. Anne Teitsworth, a doctoral student in American Culture at the University of Michigan, submitted her dissertation on the literary scholar Howard Mumford Jones and his critical writings.¹ In the manuscript, Teitsworth situated Jones's understanding of culture and literature within a larger genealogy of American humanist thought. By focusing on Jones's published writings, however, Teitsworth ignored his work as an educator and administrator. She never mentioned that, while at Michigan in the 1930s, Jones had played a central role in starting the very program in which Teitsworth was enrolled. In an added twist, the preface reveals that her topic was suggested by Joe Lee Davis, the director of American Culture at Michigan, yet the dissertation itself offers little indication that Davis (or Teitsworth's committee) ever pushed her to think about its connection to the field of American studies in any way, let alone Jones's role in it.² As we shall see, this curious gap speaks volumes about American studies as it evolved at universities like Michigan that were relatively marginal to the historiography of the early years of the field but which housed a significant majority of programs.³

If Howard Mumford Jones appears at all in genealogies of American studies, it is through his connection to Harvard University's American Civilization Program, which largely focused on bridging the fields of U.S. history and literature. Through the work of faculty like Jones, Perry Miller, and F.O. Matthies-

sen, and their students Henry Nash Smith and Leo Marx, Harvard's model came to dominate genealogies of American studies. At Michigan, however, Jones was involved with another iteration of the movement—the American Culture Program—marked by short-term, collaborative projects geared toward public engagement. As a partnership between Jones and faculty from economics, sociology, political science, and other disciplines, Michigan's original curriculum complicates the notion that American studies was simply a way to bridge history and literature. Instead, Michigan's program gave students the tools for examining American culture from multiple disciplinary vantage points. Its grounding in the social sciences underscores the broad appeal of new ideas about culture that were being developed in fields like anthropology and sociology during the 1920s and 1930s.⁴ Among those inspired by the movement was Joe Lee Davis, Teitsworth's mentor, who styled himself “an American Studies man” and called it “a new and revolutionary generalism, removing the old walls built by specialists and chauvinists.”⁵

By the 1970s, this entire early history of the program had been forgotten. For decades thereafter, the program's internal reports and marketing materials listed 1952 as its founding date without confirming this in the archives, thereby failing to recognize the program's roots in the 1930s.⁶ Teitsworth's omission was therefore part of a larger erasure that raises several questions. How did the American Culture Program forget its own history so quickly? What does this hidden history say about the broader institutional struggles of American studies during these years? And how might a recovery of these early years help us make sense of the backlash against American studies activism today? To be sure, some of the reasons for this genesis amnesia are prosaic. As director in the 1950s, Joe Lee Davis was notorious for disorganization and failed to preserve many documents. According to longtime program manager Linda Eggert, Davis ran the program “out of his office out of a file drawer. I don't know if those documents ever were put in the Bentley [Library]. I don't even know if they survived.”⁷ In the absence of record keeping and institutional memory, Davis's colleagues at Michigan gradually came to see the American Culture Program as his creation.

More importantly, however, Teitsworth's dissertation was written at a moment in which the field had begun to eschew its intellectual roots. In an influential critique of the field in 1972, Bruce Kuklick argued that a preoccupation with “myths” and “symbols” characterized early work in American studies, which in his view relied on a retrograde Cartesian dualism that left the relationship between ideas and reality undertheorized. Focusing on two texts produced by graduates of Harvard, Henry Nash Smith's *Virgin Land* (1950) and Leo Marx's *The Machine in the Garden* (1964), Kuklick ascribed to American studies a tendency to make sweeping claims about collective beliefs based on readings of literary texts.⁸ The influence of Kuklick's essay can be seen in the many texts over the next several decades that similarly cast the so-called “myth-and-symbol” school as a metonym for early American studies.⁹ Most of these critiques made the assumption that early scholars of American studies were largely in-

terested in embracing nationalism and burying difference.¹⁰ The vehicle for this impulse, according to the conventional wisdom, was the search for a unified “American character” through the intersection of history and literature.¹¹

Although this line of critique can help explain why so many scholars disavowed the early history of American studies, it is problematic for several reasons. For one, it fails to account for the complexity of figures like Smith and Marx who identified as radicals rather than Cold War accommodationists.¹² Mary Turpie, a professor at University of Minnesota in the 1950s, noted that the program’s faculty (which included both Smith and Marx) were accused “of being not merely critics of American values and American behavior past and present but utterly vicious and destructive debunkers of everything American.”¹³ Second, its approach to intellectual history extrapolated far too much from *Virgin Land*, *Machine in the Garden*, and a handful of other published texts. Like Teitsworth, Kuklick focused on discursive rather than institutional interventions. At places like Michigan, American studies operated through a makeshift series of coalitions, programs, and public engagement initiatives that cut across departments, addressed current events, and took advantage of whatever resources could be cobbled together. In short, it was an *ad hoc* movement that challenged the university to remove, as Davis put it, “the old walls built by specialists and chauvinists.”

Drawing on the American Culture Program (now department) as a case study, this essay casts light on the hidden history of ad hoc American studies. Rather than offering a disciplinary history, we argue that American studies can best be understood as a disparate set of projects bound by shared spaces of political and cross-institutional collaboration. We seek to show that the faculty, students, and community partners of the American Culture Program continually reorganized their intellectual practices to intervene in wider social and political debates. This history suggests that American studies was originally a project of institutional intervention connecting various interdisciplinary movements that shared an interest in critiquing American democracy—especially emerging social science subfields of the 1930s like human ecology, institutional economics, and ethnic studies.¹⁴ The subsequent history of the program further suggests that discipline-centered histories offer only a partial view of the intellectual project of American studies. Instead, recognizing the importance of coalitions and collaborations that were purposefully limited in duration, we decenter publications—particularly those of the so-called myth-and-symbol school at Harvard—and offer an alternative reading of American studies as an ad hoc movement that challenged existing academic structures to support socially relevant and broadly interdisciplinary approaches to the study of culture.

I. Piecing Together a Degree Program

The earliest iteration of Michigan’s program—formally known as the Program in the Development of American Culture—was administered by a

committee of five faculty from across the university: Howard Mumford Jones (English), Roderick McKenzie (sociology), Carl Guthe (anthropology), Dwight Dumond (history), and Max Handman (economics). Its original curriculum was divided into three clusters of courses. The first cluster was characterized by regionally specific requirements in the fields of anthropology, history, and geography, including several specialized courses on the southern and western United States. The second cluster—which included “Courses Designed to Cover the Cultural and Intellectual Development of the United States”—drew from a range of disciplines in the humanities. Specific electives included “American Philosophy,” “Music in America,” and “American Art.” The third cluster focused on the social sciences and was led by McKenzie in sociology and Handman in economics. In a reflection of the importance of logging to the state’s cultural identity at the time (the Michigan Tourist and Resort Association sent a group of thirty lumberjacks as its representatives to the 1934 National Folk Festival), this cluster included an elective in forestry.¹⁵

Several documents suggest that Jones played a leading role in the establishment of the curriculum. Born in Saginaw, Michigan, Jones rose to prominence as a literary critic despite never completing his doctoral studies. After attending the University of Wisconsin, Jones taught at public universities in Texas, Montana, and North Carolina before being offered a job at Michigan in 1930. In a letter to university administrators on February 26, 1935, Jones formally proposed the new program, which was approved for the 1935–1936 academic year. To ensure interdisciplinary breadth and depth, Jones consulted with a wide range of faculty in the humanities and social sciences.¹⁶ Shortly thereafter, the American Culture Committee prepared a proposal for a summer institute that would complement the undergraduate program. As Jones pitched to the administration, “It is a curious fact that in almost no American university is it possible to secure a coherent interpretation of the development of our own civilization.” He granted that relevant course work could be found in “economics, sociology, literature, history, art, or similar fields,” but there were not any prominent institutional spaces where all these fields could come together. In his view, “the first university to recognize the need and to seize the opportunity which it offers will make an extraordinary contribution to educational advance.” Jones went on to argue that momentum was gathering behind such a movement, creating an opportunity for the University of Michigan to step in as a pioneer. He added that “there are already signs that something of this sort has occurred, or is occurring, to alert minds in other university centers.”¹⁷

The program at Michigan fashioned a curriculum that extended well beyond a focus on literary and historical interpretations of the “American mind” to offer studies of regionalism and democratic education. The problem with existing scholarship on American culture, Jones later reflected, was that “most of our historians are based on the East—on Eastern schools, Eastern libraries, Eastern conferences, Eastern foundations, and Eastern value patterns,” and reigning ideas about American culture were disproportionately shaped by “the

ecclesiastical vagaries of New England.”¹⁸ In 1935 Jones argued that a more inclusive notion of American literature in the university would more adequately serve a generation of students from immigrant backgrounds who were now enrolling in public schools and universities in great numbers. Literary scholars, Jones suggested, often forgot that they were teaching primarily non-Anglo students, and the traditional canon proved increasingly “remote from children whose fathers and mothers cared nothing for Great Britain, [and] whose religious traditions are not Anglican.”¹⁹ At Michigan, therefore, the program was to be less concerned with the “American mind” than with addressing a variety of contemporary problems through attention to regional and local contexts.

Jones’s commitment to regionalism echoed a widespread intellectual trend within and outside of the academy during the Great Depression. Other universities had already begun to embrace regionalism in the 1930s, and centers of regional theory had sprung up at public universities like North Carolina, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Nebraska, and Montana.²⁰ At stake in the 1930s debates on regionalism were the very cultural politics of class and the canon—what Michael Denning has called a “literary class war.”²¹ Popular Front intellectuals like Constance Rourke and Benjamin Botkin argued for regionalism as a frame for closing the artificial modernist split between proletarian folk culture and high literature. As such they did not offer “the sentimental invocations of a people without race or ethnicity, nor . . . the ‘politics of patriotism,’ resolving all conflicts in the harmony of ‘Americanism.’ Rather [their works] were attempts to imagine a new culture, a new way of life, a revolution.”²² As Denning has suggested, American studies was a parallel movement to these extra-academic discourses of the 1930s.²³ It would be easy to overstate the extent to which the American Culture Program at Michigan represented an academic arm of the Cultural Front; nevertheless, its focus on regionally specific approaches and its course offerings on labor offer hints of its administrators’ sympathies.²⁴ In effect, the program instituted a strand of American studies that cannot be reduced to either the “American Mind” or the literature-history synthesis, with a curriculum centered on regionalist and social scientific approaches to the study of culture and social problems.

Like Jones, the other coordinators of Michigan’s American Culture Program in the 1930s were all Midwesterners trained at universities outside New England. The central roles of Roderick McKenzie and Max Handman as program administrators indicate that Michigan’s articulation of American studies tapped into new developments in the social sciences. Originally from a small town in Manitoba, McKenzie had studied at the University of Chicago and was a key figure in human ecology, a sociological subfield that was concerned with individuals’ relations to their social environment and institutions.²⁵ McKenzie had been hired away from the University of Washington in 1929, where he had risen to chair of the Sociology Department. During these years, the University of Washington was home to dissident scholars like Vernon Parrington and J. Allen Smith, who shared McKenzie’s interest in labor issues and local politics.²⁶

Handman's network likewise included scholars such as Thorstein Veblen and Albion Small who were challenging disciplinary boundaries. Before coming to Michigan, Handman taught at Chicago, Missouri, and Texas. In Austin, Handman first crossed paths with Howard Mumford Jones as members of the same interdisciplinary faculty workshop.²⁷

The American Culture Program was founded in the same spirit as this workshop as a convergence of disparate intellectual agendas beyond simply American literature and history. Its broadly interdisciplinary orientation was an example of what Joel Isaac has called the "interstitial academy" of the 1920s and 1930s, or the investment by university administrations in "programs and seminars that stood self-consciously outside of conventional departments and professional schools."²⁸ In addition to his role with the American Culture Program, for example, McKenzie also served on Michigan's interdepartmental degree programs in Urban and Rural Community and Oriental Civilization. For Jones, however, the American Culture Program represented not only a space for collaborations across disciplines, but also for partnerships with institutions and publics beyond the university. Even before establishing the American Culture Program, Jones had proposed a sociological literary history of the state of Michigan that would have university professors collaborate with organizations like the Michigan Authors Association, the Schoolmasters Club, and the State Historical Society. The purpose would be to achieve a sociological understanding of "the general quality of the literary taste of a community, judged by its reading matter, in particular decades." Stressing the interdisciplinary character of his proposal, Jones suggested that scholars needed to ask new questions about literary culture:

What categories of books were bought for [public libraries], and how does the history of the circulation of its books reflect the changing reading taste of the community? What is the history of any school or society libraries that may be found, and what relation seems to exist between the contents of that library and the general interest of the community? Was there a literary society, and if there was, what were its programs?²⁹

In short, community-based research on reading practices—particularly those fostered by public institutions like schools and libraries—would help to "better understand ourselves and the problem of American culture."³⁰

For all its ambition, Jones's proposal elicited not a single response from his colleagues at the University of Michigan. Indeed, Jones was becoming increasingly disenchanted with the intellectual milieu of the university, and his contribution to the American Culture Program was part of a flurry of activity to address this problem. Having arrived from Chapel Hill, where "the economic and cultural condition of the state was everybody's problem," Jones was surprised by the apparent lack of such concern in Ann Arbor. At Michigan he found:

too much pride of place, self-assurance, and emphasis on money and rank, too little connection with the problems of a state as complex as Michigan, Detroit excepted, too much looking to the ivy universities with envy, too much looking down on other state universities in the Middle West and the South and of course on those mushroom growths, most of the trans-Mississippi institutions.³¹

A self-professed “progressive of the La Follette persuasion,” Jones saw the connection between region and culture as intertwined with the public mission of the university.³² More than a preoccupation with local character, regionalism represented an approach to the study of culture that promised greater relevance for wider publics and public policy. A profile of Jones in the *Harvard Crimson* later characterized him as a product of “the age of the ‘Wisconsin Idea,’” the collective efforts (supported by the state legislation) to orient the University of Wisconsin toward solving public problems in the early twentieth century.³³ Wisconsin’s education platform emphasized the practicality of the college curriculum, the extension of higher education to a broad array of citizens, and research in service to the interests of the state.³⁴ Jones believed the University of Michigan was lagging behind in recognizing locally responsive scholarship as an organizing principle for academic practice.³⁵

The American Culture Program at Michigan was therefore conceived first and foremost as a project of institutional intervention. It aimed to fashion a curriculum that would be more relevant for the public that the university was intended to serve. The program’s refusal of rigid intellectual boundaries to reorganize academic practice prompts us to consider what is at stake in thinking of the program as a project. Recent texts in social theory and organizational studies have theorized “projects” as short-term, collaborative efforts aimed at institutional change.³⁶ Unlike, say, an individual scholar’s research project, the projects of this theoretical frame are limited in duration and often marked by the differing—or even conflicting—goals of the collaborators. To recognize Michigan’s American Culture Program as a project thus helps to underscore how its founders did not primarily envision it as a fixed location or discourse, but rather as a way to change how the university treated such issues as disciplinary boundaries, the nature of academic inquiry, and the social value of scholarship. Rather than setting an intellectual blueprint for an emergent field, the program and the wider American studies movement were a decentered series of attempts to weave together innovations in different disciplines, largely in order to achieve some measure of social change.

This project-centered approach offers an alternative to positioning the American Culture Program within a genealogy of the field that transposes a singular intellectual objective onto its founding. Jones initially conceived of the program as sustaining “a unified genetic interpretation of civilization in the United States,” but it is only when we decenter Jones and his literary project

that we can approach the American culture initiative as a relational set of projects that challenge the genealogies long privileged by histories of American studies. For the historian Dwight Dumond, for instance, the American Culture Program represented a fitting institutional home, given his scholarly interest in regionalism, social movements, and race relations. Likewise, anthropologist Carl Guthe brought to the program his extensive background in interinstitutional collaboration, public outreach, and educational innovation. Guthe had long cultivated institutional networks of anthropologists and archaeologists in the Midwest. Between 1929 and 1933, he was president of the Michigan-Indiana-Ohio Museums Association and in 1935 cofounded the Society of American Archaeologists, which served both professional and amateur archaeologists and was “strongly supported by Midwestern associates.” In 1935, just as he was helping launch the American Culture Program, Guthe also initiated an “ethnohistorical program on the Indians of the Great Lakes,” which was funded by Rackham Graduate School and based on the Great Lakes division of the Museum of Anthropology.³⁷ In 1938, Guthe developed a program in museum science, which consisted of a series of six graduate courses and was offered until the mid-1940s.

Like Guthe and Dumond, the sociologists Roderick McKenzie and Max Handman were intimately involved in connecting academic work to contemporary social issues through such subfields as urban sociology, human ecology, ethnic studies, and institutional economics. For McKenzie and Handman, the American Culture Program was an interdisciplinary platform for research geared toward social problem solving. McKenzie’s projects were firmly rooted in locality and social analysis. His doctoral project, *The Neighborhood* (1923), had established his reputation with its social analysis of the connections between class, ethnicity, mobility, and institutions in Columbus, Ohio.³⁸ Through McKenzie, the American Culture Program intersected laterally with the emerging field of ethnic studies.³⁹ In 1927, McKenzie had published *Oriental Exclusion*, a critique of anti-Chinese and anti-Japanese immigration policy that came out of a conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations in Honolulu.⁴⁰ At Michigan, McKenzie published *The Metropolitan Community* (1933), a monograph that sought to “throw light on the emerging problems which now confront or which may be expected to later confront the people of the United States.”⁴¹

Handman shared McKenzie’s interest in making academic work relevant to social problems facing American communities and institutions, although he took an interdisciplinary approach that drew from economics, sociology, political science, and history. An advocate of short, timely projects over more sustained scholarly work, Handman had written a dissertation that attempted to understand Karl Marx’s social philosophy through his shorter, occasional writings.⁴² He had himself prepared a book-length manuscript for “a socio-economic study dealing with standards of living and pecuniary valuation,” but deemed it unfit for publication.⁴³ Instead, Handman carried out a range of short-term projects, publishing articles on disparate topics such as the exploitation of

Mexican immigrants, the labor movement, bureaucracy, and the theory of nationalism.⁴⁴ Underlying Handman's various projects was an attempt to examine American institutions as they operated in practice. As a friend and former colleague of the economist and sociologist Thorstein Veblen, Handman connected the American Culture Program to the field of institutional economics.⁴⁵ Rather than employing abstract theoretical models, institutionalists took an interdisciplinary approach to economic problems, linking these to social and cultural factors, and advocated for government regulations to "direct economic activity in a manner consistent with the public interest."⁴⁶ By the time Handman arrived at Michigan, its Economics Department had become "something of a hothouse for young economists seeking a broader institutional or sociological orientation," and Handman's status as trained sociologist appointed in economics and teaching in American Culture underscored its interdisciplinary breadth.⁴⁷

As the American Culture Program straddled emerging social science fields like institutional economics, ethnic studies, and human ecology, its orientation around current economic and social trends—spurred by an attempt at institutional reorganization—responded to the innovations of methods and theories in a range of disciplines. In doing so, the program's interdisciplinary horizon housed a diverse range of projects that happened to coincide at Michigan in 1935: Jones's call for literary studies that recognized the civic mission and demographics of public universities, Guthe's cross-institutional collaborations, Dumond's historical analysis of social movements, McKenzie's analyses of contemporary social problems, and Handman's reflection on American economic and political institutions. From this institutional vantage point, then, the early history of American studies begins to resemble how James Cook and Lawrence Glickman have characterized the "cultural turn" in US history: not as the development of a single method, but as a "weaving together of innovations from a variety of disciplinary locations."⁴⁸ Rather than an attempt to integrate literature and history, or to theorize sweeping generalizations of American life, the program represented an ad hoc movement that channeled cross-disciplinary innovations in both the humanities and social sciences for the purpose of social change.

II. American Studies as Local Networking

The unusual agenda of the American Culture Program may help explain how it forgot about its own founding history. Instead of aggressively seeking the markers of traditional disciplinary status and credentialing, the program's early initiatives prioritized more immediate and topical projects over building a collective and enduring intellectual identity. Shortly after the program's establishment, Jones wrote to university administrators on behalf of his colleagues with a proposal for a four-week summer institute that would be open to graduate students, faculty, and the general public. The institute was to appeal to academic professionals and graduate students interested in American culture,

alumni of the University of Michigan, and “adults generally,” since the committee thought the institute to be “an important contribution to adult education.”⁴⁹ Four months later, the proposal was dealt a blow when Jones was hired away by Harvard University, where he helped establish the American Civilization Program and later served as Henry Nash Smith’s dissertation chair.⁵⁰ The committee was further diminished by the deaths of Handman and McKenzie in 1939 and 1940. Citing low enrollment and lack of faculty, the undergraduate degree program was temporarily removed from the College of Literature, Science and the Arts (LS&A) *Announcement* from 1943 to 1948.⁵¹

Even as the undergraduate program struggled, however, the American Culture Committee made a push to institutionalize graduate studies by reviving the idea for a summer program in 1940 and renaming it the Conference on American Culture and Institutions. The American Culture Committee—which at that point consisted of Guthe, Dumond, and ad hoc members such as English Department chair Louis Bredvold—successfully launched a two-year summer graduate program along the lines of that which Jones had proposed in 1935. According to Guthe, the summer program’s purpose was to offer graduate students from seven departments—Economics, English, Geography, History, Philosophy, Political Science, and Sociology—“an intelligible presentation of fundamental elements of American culture, of the forces which produced them and of present day tendencies toward their preservation or destruction.” Each participating department, Guthe continued, was expected to list a summer course called American Culture that would supplement the roundtables and public lectures, using the example of History 350: American Culture, to be cotaught by Dumond and the historian Dumas Malone.⁵²

The institute was designed to offer a practical plan for connecting the study of American culture to contemporary social issues and to consider the efficacy of existing institutions—educational, religious, and economic. Invited speakers included Associated Press president Stuart Perry, theologian Reinhold Niebuhr, Anti-Imperialist League cofounder Oswald Garrison Villard, and Charles Kettering, the head of research at General Motors and founder of the Kettering Foundation.⁵³ To be sure, such institutes were not unique. The American Culture summer program was modeled after similar events organized by the Far East and Latin American area studies programs, and the following year Dumond also organized a graduate summer session on the topic of “public policy in a world at war.”⁵⁴ Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the American Culture graduate summer institute was envisioned as a recurring, short-term intervention in public discourses rather than a permanent graduate degree program. For the remainder of the 1940s and into the 1950s, graduate students interested in American studies pursued independent interdepartmental degrees through Rackham Graduate School or enrolled in departments like history or English.⁵⁵

After World War II, a new core group of faculty, including Joe Lee Davis, worked to revive the undergraduate degree program, with a greater emphasis on preparing students for graduate study in the burgeoning field.⁵⁶ The 1949 LS&A

Announcement reflected this shift, stating that one of the goals of the program was to prepare students “for admission to recently established graduate programs in American civilization.”⁵⁷ Davis sent a copy of the revised curriculum to his colleague Henry Myers at Cornell University, which was in the process of developing an American studies curriculum of its own and sought to use Michigan’s as a model.⁵⁸ In 1952, Ralph Sawyer, the Dean of Rackham Graduate School, wrote to the American Culture Committee expressing its wishes to establish a graduate course of study leading to an M.A. and Ph.D. in American culture, inviting sociologist Robert Angell to serve as chair of an ad hoc committee for establishing graduate requirements.⁵⁹ Two months and several meetings later, Angell wrote back to Sawyer with the committee’s consensus that a graduate program would not be viable.⁶⁰ The following year, the committee was reorganized as the Committee on the Interdepartmental Program in American Culture, with Angell and Davis as the only two members carried over from the previous incarnation. Davis was appointed director, and four years later, in 1957, the graduate degree program was finally approved.⁶¹

During Davis’s directorship, the program’s organizational changes echoed a wider move toward disciplinary consolidation within American studies programs. Prior to 1956, all courses for the American culture degree were listed under other departments. Recognizing the need for its own course offerings, the program committee petitioned LS&A to approve two courses under a newly created “American studies” heading: Introduction to American Civilization and Senior Conference on American Culture. The former, American Studies 101, was a course open only to international students. In the petition to LS&A, Davis explained:

The American Culture Committee envisages this course as a laboratory experiment for further study of the complex problem of presenting a sound interpretation of the United States to foreign students and proposes to seek aid from the Ford Foundation or the Carnegie Corporation to implement this study during the 1955–1956 academic year or later.⁶²

Such grants were common in American studies programs in the early years of the Cold War. The University of Pennsylvania’s program received major grants from the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations, and the conservative Coe Foundation supported the programs at Yale University and the University of Wyoming.⁶³ These foundations, according to Inderjeet Parmar, were a major force in aligning American studies with the cultural projects of Cold War nationalism.⁶⁴ But since none of these grants came through for Michigan, the program continued to operate on a shoestring budget, and day-to-day management soon shifted from the American Culture Committee to Joe Lee Davis’s office in the English Department.

The dependence on a single director to do most of the administrative work in running the program hampered its effectiveness.⁶⁵ Moreover, with only one of its faculty—John Higham—publishing articles in either *American Quarterly* or *American Studies* prior to 1970, the American Culture Program played only a marginal role in national American studies discourses.⁶⁶ Davis, for one, seems to have relished his campus persona as an American studies man and embraced the work of teaching on a local level. At his death, an obituary in the *Michigan Daily* described Davis as a joyful teacher with a thick white beard who was “Ann Arbor’s Southern-writer-in-residence.”⁶⁷ Other key program faculty, such as Marvin Felheim, were likewise devoted to their students.⁶⁸ But publications and teaching tell only part of the story. For example, faculty affiliated with American culture were among the few to push back against McCarthyism on campus, including economist Kenneth Boulding and philosopher William Frankena. According to David Hollinger, Frankena “took direct and repeated issue with the widespread presumption that Communist Party membership in itself compromised integrity and therefore justified dismissal.”⁶⁹ Other faculty members engaged with the field through cross-institutional initiatives, including Howard Peckham’s directorship of the national American Studies Association’s (ASA’s) microfilm project starting in 1954 and Joseph Kallenbach’s efforts to organize the ASA’s joint meetings with the Political Science Association between 1957 and 1962.⁷⁰ Three years later, Kallenbach shifted his attention to local politics, running as a Democratic candidate for the Ann Arbor City Council in 1965.⁷¹

On a regional level, American studies scholarship continued to include interdisciplinary, project-driven collaborations, but at a relative remove from the University of Michigan. Instead, it was the ASA’s regional chapter—the ASA of Michigan—that acted as a catalyst for local and cross-institutional partnerships, with a striking degree of institutional and disciplinary diversity. For example, its 1955 meeting in East Lansing brought together papers on Walt Whitman by the Detroit book collector Charles Feinberg, the political scientist George Peek from the University of Michigan, and humanities professor Alexander Butler of Michigan State University. The regional chapter’s institutional inclusivity was reflected in the participation of Louis Cantoni, who presented a paper titled “Whitman: Secular Mystic.” A poet, sculptor, and former social worker, Cantoni taught psychology at the General Motors Institute (now Kettering University) in Flint, Michigan, where he also served as community relations coordinator.⁷² The engagement with local institutions and publics seems to have been an important part of the ASA of Michigan’s organizing. Its 1958 meeting in Dearborn was held at Greenfield Village—Ford’s outdoor museum of historic buildings—and included a workshop with papers by executives and public relations directors of Chrysler, General Motors, and the Burroughs Corporation.⁷³ In 1960 the ASA of Michigan organized a meeting at a restaurant in Marshall, Michigan, and its 1968 meeting offered what one attendee called “total immersion” in the city of Detroit.⁷⁴

The ASA of Michigan thus brought together a network of scholars, artists, activists, and business leaders in southeastern Michigan that extended well beyond its flagship university. In the American Culture Program at Michigan, however, there was a renewed push in the 1960s to achieve stability through disciplinary retrenchment, actively recruiting faculty with American studies doctorates, including Robert Sklar and John Raeburn. In a letter to his dean, Davis described them as “two young men who have done their doctorates in perhaps the country’s outstanding American studies programs—Sklar at Harvard and Raeburn at Pennsylvania.”⁷⁵ However, since all professors—Sklar and Raeburn included—were formally appointed in other departments, the program lacked the resources and oversight that traditional departments could count on. Just as importantly, the entire faculty of the program had to be renominated to the executive committee every year.⁷⁶ Although in practice faculty were consistently retained, the symbolic administrative gesture of wiping the slate clean each year reinforced the structural status of Michigan’s American Culture Program as a recurring instantiation of short-term projects rather than part of a coherent field.

Meanwhile, several other universities in the region began expanding and formalizing their American studies programs. In 1957, Bowling Green State University in Ohio developed its program under the direction of Alma Payne and a committee of faculty in the humanities and social sciences.⁷⁷ Bowling Green State University grew into a major site of popular culture studies with the hiring of Ray Browne, who served as the founding editor of the *Journal of Popular Culture* in 1967 and director of the Center for the Study of Popular Culture.⁷⁸ Browne gained notoriety for a class on roller coasters called Coastermania that met at Cedar Point amusement park and, according to the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, included guest lectures by “sociologists, architects, art historians, engineers, and others.”⁷⁹ Michigan State University similarly developed its program around the resources at hand. In 1963, it established an ad hoc committee under the direction of Russell Nye to develop a formal American studies program. According to Don Hausdorff, the “ad hoc American Studies Committee” could rely on some favorable institutional factors: Michigan State University had a justified reputation for experimentation and diversity; campus interest had been demonstrated in a number of ways and for some time; administrative support was present; and, significantly, faculty already existed on campus, scattered through various departments and colleges, with interests and academic training appropriate for an American studies program.⁸⁰

The committee worked closely with an existing program called American Thought and Literature (a required sequence of courses for first-year students) that already offered content that could be considered American studies. The faculty of the American Thought and Literature program agreed to help promote the new major and independently began planning extracurricular American studies events on campus.⁸¹ Two years later, Nye served as president of the national ASA, further establishing Michigan State University’s reputation as a leading program in the field.

At the University of Michigan, perhaps the most significant boost to the program's long-term prospects came with the hiring of administrative assistant Linda Eggert away from the History Department to serve as American Culture's program manager in 1970. Over the next three decades, Eggert created the organizational procedures that maintained continuity through ten different faculty directors.⁸² In a program that continuously had to reinvent itself, Eggert's work at navigating this process was critical to keeping the program afloat, particularly since faculty service time was borrowed from other departments. Indeed, the internal review of 1992 noted that the American Culture Program was "unique among the major programs in that it does *not* possess a core faculty."⁸³ Under such circumstances, Eggert and her staff lent the program both stability and flexibility, creating a space where new kinds of academic partnerships could thrive. As she explained,

American Culture in the 1970s and 1980s attracted students and faculty who wanted to do something different, to take a different angle. I know that too from working in History, American Culture might teach those kind of classes, but they teach it differently. I can't explain it exactly, but I know it's that interdisciplinary approach, it wasn't just History, it wasn't just English, it wasn't just American Literature.⁸⁴

Although departmental support staff are typically invisible in intellectual history, Eggert was indispensable to the practice of American studies at Michigan. Her work mediated between institutional structures and individual agency in a way that greatly helped the program navigate the challenges of faculty turnover and budgetary instability.

III. New Projects for a New Generation

In 1961, the American Culture Program awarded its first doctoral degree to Betty Chmaj, a feminist scholar who had grown up in a conservative Finnish immigrant community in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.⁸⁵ Over the next seven years, Chmaj balanced adjunct teaching positions at multiple institutions across southeast Michigan.⁸⁶ As a scholar committed to reaching nontraditional students in isolated places across the region, Chmaj secured funding to produce a local "lecture-seminar radio series in American studies, in which radio listeners could enroll and thus participate." She produced a revised version of the program *Portrait of the American* through WDET-Detroit that was "broadcast over 116 radio stations during 1965–65" and included interviews with John Dos Passos, Irving Howe, and R.W.B. Lewis.⁸⁷ Shortly thereafter, Bowling Green State University purchased the series for its campus radio station and invited Chmaj to discuss the series on its television station, which it subsequently integrated into introductory American literature classes and publicized through the

campus newspaper.⁸⁸ Chmaj also served as director of the Detroit Jazz Society and in 1967 organized a statewide jazz conference in partnership with Wayne State University and Western Michigan University that was covered by *Billboard*.⁸⁹

During this time, Chmaj prioritized the conference circuit and other short-term projects over the publication of articles and monographs. Chmaj explained later that, despite the economic insecurity, her primary motivation was, as she put it:

to design my own courses and projects. The only way available to do so was to take on combinations of part-time projects—lecture series, radio and television assignments, part-time credit and non-credit courses (especially in adult education, where I found a warm welcome and the freedom to do whatever I wanted), and the conference format.⁹⁰

Chmaj's emphasis on "projects" was central to her understanding of the field. Like several other feminist scholars at the time, Chmaj eschewed monographs in favor of collaborative books with small independent presses such as the Women's Free Press in Pittsburgh. Her commitment to personal and political change was shared by several other young scholars involved with the ASA of Michigan. Although several professors remained active in the chapter, much of its energy came from graduate students, artists, activists, staff members, and contingent faculty like Chmaj at universities and community colleges throughout the region.

The ASA of Michigan's activities were exemplified by a conference it held at Wayne State University in 1966. Chmaj coedited its proceeding into a booklet, *The Protest Papers*, published by Artists Workshop Press. In her introduction, Chmaj explained that "items are taken out of context, edited, and juxtaposed" in order to offer "a sampler, a scrapbook, [and] a selection of statements pertinent to protest in our time."⁹¹ The eclectic program of the conference included a visual exhibit featuring undergraduate and professional artists, a performance on "protest in music," and a Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee filmstrip on Vietnam that, according to Chmaj, "produced the most comment during the symposium." The keynote was given by Robert Sklar, who argued that "American studies had been born in dissent" as a way to break "from the rigid and unyielding structures of traditional departments," but he cautioned that the professionalization of the field was putting this spirit at risk.⁹² If American studies was to retain its energy, it needed to stop putting so much weight on interdisciplinarity—a battle that Sklar argued had largely been won—and instead engage more deeply with contemporary social movements.⁹³ Three years later, Sklar and Chmaj collaborated with activists from several other universities to form the Radical Caucus at the national meeting of the ASA in Toledo. According to Allen Davis, "The radicals within American studies

were not Weathermen nor bomb throwers; they merely wanted to transfer some of the movement for freedom and equality they witnessed all around them to their teaching and learning.”⁹⁴ Indeed, by this point in her career, Chmaj had secured a tenure-track position at Wayne State University, where she directed the American Studies Program.

Perhaps Chmaj’s most influential project involved drawing the field’s attention to the role of gender in American studies hiring and promotion through the ASA’s Commission on the Status of Women. Under Chmaj’s leadership, the commission sent questionnaires on gender, hiring, and workplace climate issues to all members of the national ASA. Her work resulted in the publication of a two-volume report, *American Women and American Studies*, in 1971 and 1972. These findings revealed systematic discrimination in every aspect of American studies professional life and registered “the considerable distance that must be bridged between what ASA members believe to be true or report to be true and what the studies show about university policies and practices.”⁹⁵ Chmaj devoted one chapter to the pain of witnessing gender discrimination on such a major scale, stressing the need for personal testimony in official reports. As Chmaj explained, “The project of putting together this publication has deeply affected me, my other work at the university, my colleagues, my two research assistants, all of our families, our plans, our thinking and our lives, in direct and moving ways—that should be told.”⁹⁶ In the midst of this initiative, Chmaj herself was denied tenure by Wayne State for engaging in precisely the sort of wide-ranging projects that characterized the field at the time. In the second volume of the ASA’s Commission on the Status of Women’s report, Chmaj argued that the rise of interdisciplinary, engagement-oriented movements like American studies required new methods for assessing scholarship, as “standards relevant to traditional areas were not relevant to interdisciplinary areas of teaching and production.”⁹⁷

Chmaj was not alone in merging her scholarly interests with a push for institutional change. Over the 1970s, the American Culture Program at Michigan was building its reputation as a hub of social engagement. In this context, students began to view the push for institutional change as an integral aspect of their graduate careers. Howard Brick, a graduate student in the late 1970s and now a professor at Michigan, explained that American Culture “was a place where we imagined that one could chart one’s own course.”⁹⁸ One focal point of student activism was the push for ethnic studies course offerings. In December 1975, the executive committee heard student complaints about “Euro-centric Cultural Domination” in American culture classes and responded by setting up the Task Force on Oppressed Minorities.⁹⁹ Among the purposes of the task force was “writing a new definition of American culture that would create a more accurate description of the program [that] would include studies about minority groups and women.”¹⁰⁰ According to Marion Marzolf, director of American Culture at the time, the program was viewed in pragmatic terms by university leaders as a place for “people who wanted to create their own niche outside the

existing disciplines.” As a result, demands from students of color for ethnic studies courses were channeled into the program, largely as a way to “take the pressure off the departments.”¹⁰¹ In 1976, graduate student course proposals in Chicano *muralismo* aesthetics, Asian American studies, and Puerto Rican studies were all routed through the American Culture Program.¹⁰²

The shift toward ethnic studies contributed to the departure of scholars such as David Hollinger, who argued that the field had grown “hostile to anyone who was studying anything other than gender and race and imperialism.”¹⁰³ At the same time, the program offered leadership in promoting changes in hiring, curriculum, and campus climate issues through such initiatives as the U-M Network for Cultural Democracy and various public debates and teach-ins.¹⁰⁴ Over the 1980s and 1990s, American Culture helped establish concentrations or minors in Latina/o studies, Native American studies, and Asian/Pacific Islander American studies. Chronically underfunded by the university during its early years, Latina/o studies survived largely through the work of a highly committed group of faculty and students. Its 1989 Review Committee called Latina/o studies a “shoestring operation” that was essentially “a badly underbudgeted program in a poorly supported unit.”¹⁰⁵

The financial and administrative challenges facing American Culture at Michigan in the 1980s echoed larger trends in higher education. As costs shifted from taxpayers to students through neoliberal economic policies, programs came under increasing pressure to demonstrate how their offerings contributed to the employment prospects of their students. In some respects, the orientation of American studies toward public engagement projects would seem to lend itself to the new emphasis on practical outcomes. However, several structural hurdles complicate this impression. For one, tenure and promotion policies have been slow to adapt to the new demands placed on faculty, especially faculty of color who carry out the “invisible labor” of mentoring minority and first-generation students.¹⁰⁶ According to Aimee Carrillo Rowe, many faculty are vexed by the “push-pull, in-out, here-there dance” of pursuing community engagement in an institutional context that rewards “individualistic careerism.”¹⁰⁷ Literary scholar Mary Helen Washington likewise describes the exhilarating but exhausting pressures of intellectual activism involved in operating the Center for Black Studies at the University of Detroit in the 1970s. As she explains, “Besides teaching a full load, fighting to increase the pitifully small number of Black students on campus, negotiating with the traditional departments for their reluctant acceptance, we were under a great deal of pressure, in the Black Power climate of Detroit, to be politically involved.”¹⁰⁸ Although historian Martha Biondi has argued that the greatest impact of Black studies “has come from the production of influential scholarship and the development of new conceptual approaches that have influenced other disciplines,” she also notes that multiple pioneering scholars in the field faced institutional barriers in hiring and publishing, particularly in the 1970s and 1980s.¹⁰⁹ The fact that American studies had an eclectic approach to methodology dating back to at least the 1930s, but did

not face major barriers to publishing until it began engaging with fields like Black studies and Women's studies, suggests that racism and sexism are central to this story.

One influential project that sought to make such work professionally legible was the Imagining America Tenure Team Initiative, codirected by American Culture faculty member Julie Ellison.¹¹⁰ The project's 2008 report, *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University*, proposed best practices for assessing a range of scholarly activities beyond the traditional metrics of research and teaching. As the report argues, "Enlarging the conception of who counts as 'peer' and what counts as 'publication' is part of something bigger: the democratization of knowledge on and off campus."¹¹¹ Such an approach would recognize an array of American studies practices, such as Chmaj's popular radio series, that have been largely illegible to both tenure committees and intellectual historians as a result of the greater weight placed on scholarship published in academic presses. Examples today include El Museo del Norte, a community-based partnership founded by Latina/o studies faculty member María Cotera that utilizes the concept of a "museum without walls" to trace the history of Latina/os in Michigan through "oral history projects, speaker series, art walks, movie nights, musical performances, and 'pop-up museums'" across Detroit and southeast Michigan.¹¹²

A second dissonance between American studies and the neoliberal university hinges on the politics of the national ASA. Like other interdisciplinary fields rooted in social movements, American studies remains committed to the notion that, as Naomi Greyser and Margot Weiss put it, "intellectual labor can spark (and has sparked) social change."¹¹³ In 2013, the ASA voted to endorse an academic boycott of Israeli academic institutions to protest the denial of human rights to Palestinian scholars. The boycott resulted in considerable backlash against American studies programs nationwide, with several universities withdrawing institutional memberships and eight past presidents of ASA writing an open letter calling the boycott "antithetical to the mission of free and open inquiry for which a scholarly organization stands."¹¹⁴ But the actions of the national organization do not tell the full story; a wide range of practices continue to unfold at the local level, beyond the purview of institutional American studies. This includes a renewed wave of student activism—including Being Black at the University of Michigan (#BBUM)—that has already produced striking concessions from institutions around the country, including a pledge by the University of Michigan to build a new, \$10 million multicultural center in the heart of campus where students, staff, faculty, and community members can gather.¹¹⁵

By decentering publications in academic presses, and shifting attention to projects and partnerships like El Museo del Norte or #BBUM, a new kind of intellectual history comes into focus. Far from attempting to create a new discipline, American studies at Michigan emerged as a series of ad hoc projects

that challenged organizational structures for the purpose of social change. Subsequent genealogical narratives emphasizing the rise of the myth-and-symbol school have thus obscured an older history of American studies that is more aptly characterized by what now-retired program manager Linda Eggert called the desire to “do something different, to take a different angle.”¹¹⁶ And for all the flux and backlash experienced by American studies at the national level, it is this impulse that represents the movement’s most enduring thread of community.

Notes

The authors would like to thank Gregory Dowd, June Howard, Philip Deloria, Julie Ellison, Jay Cook, Lisa Jong, Andrew Fearnley, and all who participated in interviews or provided feedback. Portions of this essay are based on Alexander Olson, “The Department of American Culture, 1935–2013,” *University of Michigan Bicentennial History Project*, 2013.

1. K. Anne Teitsworth, “Tarry Awhile: The Humanism of Howard Mumford Jones” (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1977).
2. According to one of Teitsworth’s graduate school classmates in the 1970s, Howard Brick, few students entered the American Culture Program to learn a distinctive American studies methodology or historiography. Howard Brick, interview with Alexander Olson, May 30, 2013.
3. In a study conducted in 1952–53, Edward Grier of the University of Kansas found that very few American studies programs had “power of appointment or promotion or usually any budget except for routine office expenses and library purchases.” He added that most tended “to revolve around the personality of one man and may come to depend upon his actual presence.” Edward Grier, “Programs in American Civilization,” *The Journal of Higher Education* 25, no. 4 (April 1954): 180–81. George Rogers Taylor likewise characterized American studies classes as “little more than window-dressing” in “a rather large number of schools.” George Rogers Taylor, “Undergraduate Programs in American Studies,” *South Atlantic Bulletin* 23, no. 1 (May 1957): 2. For the institutionalization of American studies, see also Tremaine McDowell, *American Studies* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1948); Anthony N.B. Garvan, “The Present State of American Studies,” *Revista de Historia de América* 33 (June 1952): 45–52; and Gene Wise, “Paradigm Dramas” in American Studies: A Cultural and Institutional History of the Movement,” *American Quarterly* 31, no. 3 (1979): 304–306. Sources differ on when the earliest American studies programs were founded. In 1958, Robert Walker identified the earliest as University of Dayton (1921) and Sarah Lawrence College (1928). Robert Walker, *American Studies in the United States: A Survey of College Programs* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958), 74, 95. An earlier survey pointed instead to Sweet Briar College’s major in American Problems, founded in 1930, as the first in the field. Gaynor Pearson, “Nationalism in the College Curriculum,” *School and Society* 65 (January 1947): 21.
4. Leila Zenderland, “Constructing American Studies: Culture, Identity, and the Expansion of the Humanities,” in *The Humanities and the Dynamics of Inclusion Since 1945*, ed. David Hollinger (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 275. See also Kathryn Kuhn and Wynne Walker Moskop, “Free Riders or Front Runners? The Role of Social Scientists in the American Studies Movement,” *American Studies* 40, no. 2 (Summer 1999): 115–36. The social scientific orientation of much of the field well before the 1960s is illustrated by “Articles in American Studies, 1954,” *American Quarterly* 7, no. 2 (Summer 1954): 153–73, which tracked articles in an extremely wide range of journals, including *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *Psychoanalysis*, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *Ethics*, *American Scientist*, *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, *Journal of Economic History*, *Journal of Negro History*, *YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science*, *Nation*, and even *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*.
5. Joe Lee Davis, “Approaches and Encounters in American Studies,” Unpublished manuscript, Box 5, Joe Lee Davis Papers, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
6. The earliest reference to 1952 as the founding date appears in Executive Committee Minutes, November 2, 1971, Box 1, Department of American Culture Records, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan (hereafter *American Culture Records*). This erroneous date was used in multiple documents for the next four decades. In a 2012 memorandum, for example, the program wrote that it was “celebrating its sixtieth anniversary this year”—even though it had actually been founded in 1935. Program in American Culture to Terrence McDonald and Derek Collins, Memo-

randum on Departmental Status, March 12, 2012, American Culture Internal Records, University of Michigan.

7. Linda Eggert, interview with Alexander Olson, May 22, 2013.

8. Bruce Kuklick, "Myth and Symbol in American Studies," *American Quarterly* 24, no. 4 (Fall 1972): 445.

9. James Farrell notes that Kuklick's essay "leaves the unfortunate impression that myth and symbol was the pervasive paradigm of early Americanist researchers." James Farrell, "What Are American Studies For? Some Practical Perspectives," *American Studies* 40, no. 2 (Summer 1999): 185. The flattening of the field's early history is most pervasive among scholars of the "New American Studies" movement, as exemplified by the introduction to John Carlos Rowe, ed., *Post-Nationalist American Studies* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), coauthored by Barbara Brinson Curiel, David Kazanjian, Katherine Kinney, Steven Mailloux, Jay Mechling, John Carlos Rowe, George Sánchez, Shelley Streeby, and Henry Yu, which attacks the unnamed and dubiously extant "defenders of the Myth-and-Symbol school" (p. 25). For influential analyses of the field that echo Kuklick's myth-and-symbol periodization, see R. Gordon Kelly, "Literature and the Historian," *American Quarterly* 26, no. 2 (May 1974): 145; Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 381; George Lipsitz, "Listening to Learn and Learning to Listen: Popular Culture, Cultural Theory, and American Studies," *American Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (December 1990): 623; Alice Kessler-Harris, "Cultural Locations: Positioning American Studies in the Great Debate," *American Quarterly* 44, no. 3 (September 1992): 305; Barry Shank, "The Continuing Embarrassment of Culture: From the Culture Concept to Cultural Studies," *American Studies* 38, no. 2 (Summer 1997): 98–99; and Larry Griffin and Maria Tempens, "Class, Multiculturalism and the *American Quarterly*," *American Quarterly* 54, no. 1 (March 2002): 87.

10. Robyn Wiegman, for example, positions the field's original project as "a protonationalist one, beholden to the ideologies emanating from the security state, and dedicated to forging an entire symbolic vocabulary to accompany the worldwide defense of capitalism that the Cold War spawned." Robyn Wiegman, *Object Lessons* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2012), 229. See also Donald Pease, "Postnational and Postcolonial Reconfigurations of American Studies in the Post-modern Condition," in *A Concise Companion to American Studies*, ed. John Carlos Rowe (Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 263–83; and Janice Radway, "What's in a Name? Presidential Address to the American Studies Association," *American Quarterly* 51, no. 1 (March 1999): 1–32.

11. To be sure, several scholars have complicated this reading of the field's historiography. For example, Michael Denning has challenged the notion that American studies was simply an arm of the Cold War nationalist project, pointing to a strand of "radical culture critique" that emerged as a parallel to British cultural studies. Michael Denning, "'The Special American Conditions': Marxism and American Studies," *American Quarterly* 38, no. 3 (1986): 358. Elaine Tyler May identifies three strands of American studies as Karl Marxism, Leo Marxism, and Groucho Marxism, noting that "most of the myth and symbol practitioners were not writing a celebratory scholarship." Elaine Tyler May, "'The Radical Roots of American Studies': Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, November 9, 1995," *American Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (June 1996): 188. Janice Radway, Kevin Gaines, Barry Shank, and Penny Von Eschen remind readers that "the Cold War itself was not the only political formation to emerge in the postwar world," and that other factors such as "the anticolonial independence projects of the immediate postwar period" in the Global South posed an early challenge to American exceptionalism. Janice Radway, et al., eds., "Introduction," *American Studies: An Anthology* (Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 2. Philip Deloria points out that "American studies had at least four institutional origin flows." Philip Deloria, "Broadway and Main: Crossroads, Ghost Roads, and Paths to an American Studies Future," *American Quarterly* 61, no. 1 (March 2009): 4. The search for a unified "American character" was lampooned as early as 1941 by a scholar who noted: "In the case of practically every trait which one or more authors allege to be characteristically American, an opposing trait is by other authors asserted to be distinctively American, or evidence is advanced in contradiction of the alleged trait." Lee Coleman, "What is American? A Study of Alleged American Traits," *Social Forces* 19, no. 4 (May 1941): 492.

12. In 1932, for example, Smith had been fired from Southern Methodist University for publishing material that the university considered obscenity. Alexander Olson, "'You have rescued me from academicism': Selections from the Correspondence of Henry Nash Smith and Mary Hunter Austin," *Southwest Review* 96, no. 1 (Winter 2011): 51. Likewise Leo Marx located his own intellectual roots in the Popular Front, explaining that he considered himself a socialist and had considered writing proletarian novels in the 1930s. Leo Marx, "Afterword," *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 367–72. Marx noted that the American studies program at the University of Minnesota had been a haven against McCarthyism in the 1950s. Leo Marx, interview with Alexander Olson, June 25, 2010. See also Elaine Tyler May, "The Radical Roots of American Studies," 180. Multiple scholars in the early years of the field explicitly rejected what they variously called chauvinism, jingoism, and nationalism in American studies. See Tremaine McDowell, "American Studies and the New Interdepartmentalism," *School and Society* 68 (September 25, 1948), 196–200; Arthur Bestor, Jr.,

"The Study of American Civilization: Jingoism or Scholarship?" *William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd series, 9 (January 1952): 3-9; and Carl Bode, "The American Studies Movement and the Professor of English," *College English* 16, no. 2 (November 1954): 125-27.

13. Mary Turpie, "American Studies at the University of Minnesota," *American Quarterly* 22, no. 2 (Summer 1970): 520.

14. One scholar listed "the vogue of Veblen" and "the rise of the institutionalist school of economists" as important factors in the rise of American studies in the late 1920s and early 1930s. Taylor, "Undergraduate Programs in American Studies," 1.

15. *Announcement* (1935-36), Box 2, LS&A Publications Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan (hereafter *LS&A Publications*). See also Constance Rourke to Mary Austin, February 1934, Box 108, AU 4469, Mary Austin Papers, Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

16. Howard Mumford Jones to Edward Kraus, February 26, 1935, Box 40, Folder 3, LS&A Records Collection, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan (hereafter *LS&A Records*).

17. "Institute of American Culture," enclosed in Howard Mumford Jones to Edward Kraus and Clarence Yoakum, October 30, 1935, Box 6, Department of English Language and Literature Records, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

18. Howard Mumford Jones, *An Autobiography* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1979), 107.

19. Howard Mumford Jones, "The Orphan Child of the Curriculum," *The English Journal* (College Edition) 25, no. 5 (May 1936): 380. This piece was presented at a conference in late 1935, one of at least two addresses Jones delivered that year arguing against "the lingering prejudice of British over American literature." Kermit Vanderbilt, *American Literature and the Academy: The Roots, Growth, and Maturity of a Profession* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 388. See also Elizabeth Renker, *The Origins of American Literature Studies: An Institutional History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 23.

20. Michael C. Steiner, "Regionalism in the Great Depression," *Geographical Review* 73, no. 4 (Oct. 1983): 430.

21. Michael Denning, *The Cultural Front: The Laboring of American Culture in the Twentieth Century* (London: Verso, 1997), 200.

22. *Ibid.*, 134.

23. *Ibid.*, 135.

24. Margaret Elliott, a professor in Economics and Business Administration, contributed to the American Culture Program with a course on labor that considered "wages, insecurity, strikes, and the growth of the labor movement," as well as "possible remedies by employers, unions, and the government." *Announcement* (1935-36), Box 2, *LS&A Publications Collection*.

25. Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 435-37, and Stow Persons, *Ethnic Studies at Chicago, 1905-1945* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987), 33.

26. Both Vernon Parrington and J. Allen Smith landed at University of Washington after getting fired from conservative institutions. Parrington's three-volume *Main Currents in American Thought* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1927-1930), which interpreted American literature through a sociological and historical approach, has been widely cited as one of the foundational texts in American studies, but the radical political context of the University of Washington in the 1910s and 1920s (which, according to Eric Goldman, was considered "a nest of anarchists") is rarely acknowledged as an important element of his work. For example, Gene Wise asserts: "Parrington is a representative figure for this pre-institutional stage of American studies because he did it almost all alone." Wise, "Paradigm Dramas," 300 (emphasis in original). But in addition to Smith (who "tangled with political bosses, poured cold pacifist water on imperialist flames, and stood with labor on many a touchy issue"), Parrington's colleagues included William Savery, Edward McMahon, and Theresa McMahon (the aforementioned "nest of anarchists"). Eric Goldman, "J. Allen Smith: the Reformer and His Dilemma," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 35, no. 3 (July 1944): 201 and 205. As department chair in sociology, McKenzie fielded requests for advice on course development from several other universities and routinely counseled having students leave the classroom to "make a study of the local community." See Roderick McKenzie to Elmer Miller, November 30, 1927, and Roderick McKenzie to Genevieve Reed, February 28, 1928, Box 1, Folder 31, Department of Sociology Records, University of Washington Special Collections, Seattle. See also Roderick McKenzie, "Community Forces: A Study of the Non-Partisan Municipal Elections in Seattle," *The Journal of Social Forces* 2, no. 3 (March 1924): 415-21.

27. Jones notes that he and Handman met at "a shop club that met monthly for dinner at the Driskill Hotel, and at those meetings I learned the gossip of the university and listened to professional papers by scientists, economists, law professors, and others." See Jones, *Autobiography*, 86.

28. Joel Isaac, *Working Knowledge: Making the Human Sciences from Parsons to Kuhn* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), 32.

29. Howard Mumford Jones, "Local Literature and the State of Michigan," *The Quarterly Review of the Michigan Alumnus* 40, no. 17 (March 1934): 30.

30. *Ibid.*, 30–31.
31. Jones, *Autobiography*, 150.
32. *Ibid.*, 53.
33. “Howard Mumford Jones,” *Harvard Crimson*, March 10, 1943.
34. Lincoln Steffens, “Sending a State to College: What the University of Wisconsin Is Doing for Its People,” *American Magazine* 67 (February 1909): 349–64.
35. As David Hollinger notes, “While Wisconsin prided itself on its special services to its state and region, Michigan looked eastward, and with the extensive support of the legislature in Lansing, fashioned for itself an image more national, more cosmopolitan, and more conservative than that of Wisconsin.” David Hollinger, “Academic Culture at Michigan, 1938–1988: The Apotheosis of Pluralism,” in *Intellectual History and Academic Culture at the University of Michigan: Fresh Explorations*, ed. Margaret Lourie (Ann Arbor: Rackham School of Graduate Studies, 1989), 91.
36. For example, Mustafa Emirbayer and Ann Mische argue that project-centered thinking, which brings to the fore the “purposeful and conflict-driven aspects of organizations,” is central to institutional intervention. Mustafa Emirbayer and Ann Mische, “What is Agency?,” *American Journal of Sociology* 103, no. 4 (Jan. 1998): 993. The organization theorists Ralph Mueller and J. Rodney Turner likewise define a project as a “temporary organization” in which existing resources are mobilized for “a unique, novel, and transient endeavor . . . to deliver beneficial objectives of change.” J. Rodney Turner and Ralf Mueller, “On the Nature of the Project as a Temporary Organization,” *International Journal of Project Management* 21 (2003): 7. See also Ann Mische and Philippa Pattison, “Composing a Civic Arena: Publics, Projects, and Social Settings,” *Poetics* 27 (March 2000): 163–94.
37. James B. Griffin and Volney H. Jones, “Carl Eugen Guthe, 1893–1974,” *American Antiquity* 41, no. 2 (April 1976): 170.
38. Roderick McKenzie, *The Neighborhood: A Study of Local Life in the City of Columbus, Ohio* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923).
39. As Stow Persons explains, during this time “ethnic studies” was a field that was more centrally concerned with the sociology of immigration and processes of assimilation, especially in urban centers. Persons, *Ethnic Studies at Chicago*, 33.
40. Roderick D. McKenzie, *Oriental Exclusion: The Effect of American Immigration Laws, Regulations, and Judicial Decisions upon the Chinese and Japanese on the American Pacific Coast* (New York: American Group Institute of Pacific Relations, 1927). See also Henry Yu, *Thinking Orientals: Migration, Contact, and Exoticism in Modern America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 213.
41. Roderick McKenzie, *The Metropolitan Community* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933), v.
42. Max Handman, “The Beginnings of the Social Philosophy of Karl Marx” (Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1917).
43. “Memorial,” *U-M Faculty History Project*, obituary, accessed December 29, 2015, <http://um2017.org/faculty-history/faculty/max-sylvius-handman/memorial>.
44. Max Handman, “The Sentiment of Nationalism,” *Political Science Quarterly* 36, no. 1 (Mar. 1921): 104–21; Max Handman, “The Mexican Immigrant in Texas,” *Southwestern Political and Social Science Quarterly* 7, no. 1 (Jun. 1926): 33–41; Max Handman, “Scientific Trends in Economics,” *International Journal of Ethics* 39, no. 1 (Oct. 1928): 41–49; Max Handman, “The Bureaucratic Culture Pattern and Political Revolutions,” *American Journal of Sociology* 39, no. 3 (Nov. 1933): 301–13; Max Handman, “Conflicting Ideologies in the Labor Movement,” *American Journal of Sociology* 43, no. 4 (Jan. 1938): 525–38.
45. Malcolm Rutherford, *The Institutional Movement in American Economics, 1918-1947: Science and Social Control* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 15–16.
46. *Ibid.*, 8.
47. *Ibid.*, 153.
48. James W. Cook and Lawrence B. Glickman, “Twelve Propositions for a History of U.S. Cultural History,” in *The Cultural Turn in U.S. History: Past, Present, and Future*, ed. Cook, Glickman, and Michael O’Malley (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2008), 21.
49. Howard Mumford Jones to Edward Kraus and Clarence Yoakum, October 30, 1935, Box 6, Department of English Language and Literature Records, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
50. Jones retained his Midwestern orientation while at Harvard. As he wrote to Smith: “There are times that I’d like to take the entire Harvard administration and move them out to the University of Wyoming in order to make them discover what the rest of the United States is like.” Howard Mumford Jones to Henry Nash Smith, March 14, 1942, Box 3, Folder 3, Henry Nash Smith Papers, Bancroft Library, Berkeley, California.
51. LS&A Executive Committee to Carl Guthe and Dwight Dumond, May 6, 1942, Box 51, *LS&A Records*.
52. Committee on American Culture, Planning Document, January 8, 1940, Box 2, Carl Guthe Papers, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

53. Louis A. Hopkins to Howard Mumford Jones, December 2, 1939, Box 2, Carl Guthe Papers, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
54. Dwight L. Dumond, ed., *Public Policy in a World at War* (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1941).
55. See, for example, Edward Stibitz, "The Treatment of Quakerism in American Historical and Literary Writing" (Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan, 1951). Stibitz's dissertation committee included Louis Bredvold in the English Department, William Frankena in Philosophy, and Verner Crane (chair) in History, all three of whom served in various iterations of the American Culture undergraduate program committee. According to Robert Walker, "There is no regular graduate program or course; instead, the program of the candidate is tailored to his particular interests." Walker, *American Studies in the United States*, 105. A list of dissertations in progress in *American Quarterly* in 1957 included seven interdisciplinary projects at Michigan outside the program. Albert Van Noststrand, "American Studies Dissertations in Progress," *American Quarterly* 9, no. 2 (Summer 1957): 223–30.
56. Robert C. Angell to Ralph A. Sawyer, July 31, 1952, Folder: "American Culture 1952-53," Box 91, *LS&A Records*.
57. *Announcement* (1949–50), Box 2, *LS&A Publications Collection*.
58. Henry Myers to Joe Lee Davis, October 1, 1949, Folder: "1934–50 Correspondence," Box 1, Joe Lee Davis Papers, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.
59. Ralph Sawyer to Robert Angell, et al., May 17, 1952, and Robert Angell to Ralph Sawyer, May 27, 1952, Box 87, Rackham Graduate School Records, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan (hereafter *Rackham Records*).
60. Robert C. Angell to Ralph A. Sawyer, July 31, 1952, Box 91, *LS&A Records*.
61. Rackham Graduate School to Joe Lee Davis, October 4, 1957, Box 87, *Rackham Records*.
62. Joe Lee Davis, "Request for Approval of Course for Which Undergraduate Credit Is Given" (Introduction to American Civilization), October 20, 1954, Folder: "American Culture 54–55," Box 196, *LS&A Records*.
63. Josephine Martin Ober, *History of the American Studies Association* (M.A. thesis, Bryn Mawr College, 1971), 18. The Coe Foundation endowed summer programs in American studies at thirteen institutions in addition to Wyoming and Yale, including Stanford University, Abilene Christian University, Tulane University, and University of South Carolina. Walker, *American Studies in the United States*, 147.
64. Inderjeet Parmar, *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 100–103.
65. See John Higham, "Problems of the American Culture Program," December 4, 1964, Box 87, *Rackham Records*. Higham listed among the challenges facing the director of the program, "the chairman does the work of a departmental chairman and secretary, advising all graduate and undergraduate students, processing degree requirements, administrative forms, and applications for admission and fellowships, maintaining records, and representing the program to the scholarly world."
66. John Higham, "American Intellectual History: A Critical Appraisal," *American Quarterly* 13, no. 2 (Summer 1961): 219–33. Other than book reviews and Higham's article, no American Culture faculty members from the University of Michigan published articles in vols. 1–21 (1949–1969) of *American Quarterly*, or vols. 1–10 (1960–1969) of *American Studies* (previously the *Midcontinent American Studies Journal*).
67. Dan Biddle, "Joe Lee Davis: A farewell," *Michigan Daily*, February 22, 1974.
68. According to Daniel Okrent, an undergraduate in American Culture during these years who later won a Pulitzer Prize and became public editor of *The New York Times*, Marvin Felheim "cherished his relationship with students. If he had to choose between students and faculty, he would choose the students." Daniel Okrent, interview with Alexander Olson, May 27, 2013. See also "Marvin Felheim is Michigan's Prof of Pop," *People Magazine*, March 7, 1977.
69. Hollinger, "Academic Culture at Michigan," 97.
70. The ASA's microfilm project contracted with University Microfilms, Inc., in Ann Arbor, and partnered with the Clements Library, but was not carried out under the auspices of the American Culture Program. "American Calendar," *American Quarterly* 6, no. 4 (Winter 1954): 390.
71. Julie Fitzgerald, "Burns Views Student-City Relationship," *Michigan Daily*, March 2, 1965.
72. Louis D. Rubin, Jr., "American Calendar," *American Quarterly*, 7, no 1 (Spring, 1955): 103.
73. "American Calendar," *American Quarterly* 10, no. 1 (Spring, 1958): 95.
74. "American Calendar," *American Quarterly* 12, no. 4 (Winter, 1960): 533, and "American Calendar," *American Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (Spring 1968): 140.
75. Joe Lee Davis to William L. Hays, May 12, 1969, Director's Files: Higham, Box 1, *American Culture Records*.

76. See the many annual appointment letters to be found in the Director's Files, Box 1, *American Culture Records*. See also Rackham Executive Board to John Eadie, September 10, 1984, Box 87, *Rackham Records*.

77. Alma Payne, "American Studies at Bowling Green State University," *American Quarterly* 22, no. 2 (Summer 1970): 450.

78. Gene Wise, "An American Studies Calendar," *American Quarterly* 31, no. 3 (1979): 429–30; and Ray Browne, "The ASA and Its Friends," *American Quarterly* 31, no. 3 (1979): 356.

79. "Bowling Green Course: Riding Roller Coasters," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, April 14, 1978.

80. Don Hausdorff, "American Studies at Michigan State University," *American Quarterly* 22, no. 2 (Summer 1970): 547.

81. According to Hausdorff, while the American studies program was in development, a group of American Thought and Literature faculty "sat around in a Lebanese restaurant in Detroit one day, in an interim between events at a Fulbright Scholars Conference being held at Wayne State University, and mulled over possibilities for stimulating Michigan State University interest in American studies. To give an idea of the assorted backgrounds represented, they had, or were in process of obtaining, doctoral degrees from New York University, Columbia University, Denver University, Northwestern, the University of Michigan, and the University of Minnesota. They decided to initiate a series of open seminars, on a more or less regular basis, with the original group taking turns to get the operation moving." Hausdorff, 550–51.

82. According to a former program director, the quality of record keeping dramatically improved after Eggert's arrival. Marion Marzolf, interview with Alexander Olson, May 23, 2013.

83. Internal Review of the Program in American Culture, March 12, 1992, Department of American Culture Internal Files, University of Michigan.

84. Linda Eggert, interview with Alexander Olson, May 22, 2013.

85. Betty Chmaj, "The Double Attraction: A History of the National Artistic Will, 1890–1917" (Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan, 1961), and Judith Gustofson, interview with Alexander Olson, June 25, 2010. As a graduate student, Gustofson had collaborated with Chmaj in the preparation of the reports of the ASA Commission on the Status of Women in 1971–72.

86. Between 1961 and 1967, Chmaj held adjunct positions at Wayne State University, Oakland University, Alma College, Detroit Institute of Technology, Detroit Institute of Commerce, and the University Center for Adult Education (a partnership of Eastern Michigan University, Wayne State, and the University of Michigan). Betty Chmaj, CV, Department of American Culture Internal Files, University of Michigan.

87. "American Calendar," *American Quarterly* 17, no. 3 (Autumn 1965): 615. See also Betty Chmaj, CV, Department of American Culture Internal Files, University of Michigan.

88. Payne, "American Studies at Bowling Green State University," 459.

89. Eliot Tiegel, "Jazz Beat," *Billboard Magazine*, April 8, 1967, p. 14.

90. Betty Chmaj, *Image, Myth, and Beyond: American Women and American Studies*, Vol. 2, with Judith Gustofson and Joseph Baunoch (Pittsburgh: Know, 1972), 83.

91. Betty Chmaj and James McEvoy, eds., *The Protest Papers* (Detroit: Artists Workshop Press, 1966), 1. When this volume was produced, McEvoy was a graduate student in American Culture at Michigan.

92. Robert Sklar, "American Studies as a Form of Dissent," in *The Protest Papers*, ed. Chmaj and McEvoy (Detroit: Artists Workshop Press, 1966), xi.

93. *Ibid.*, xii.

94. Allen Davis, "The Politics of American Studies," *American Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (September 1990): 360.

95. Betty Chmaj, *American Women and American Studies*, Vol. 1 (Pittsburgh: Women's Free Press, 1971), 48.

96. *Ibid.*, 121.

97. Chmaj, *Image, Myth, and Beyond*, 94.

98. Howard Brick, interview with Alexander Olson, May 30, 2013.

99. Executive Committee Minutes, December 2, 1975, Box 1, *American Culture Records*, and *Program in American Culture Newsletter*, January 20, 1976.

100. Executive Committee Minutes, February 3, 1976, Box 1, *American Culture Records*.

101. Marion Marzolf, interview with Alexander Olson, May 23, 2013.

102. Course proposals by George Vargas, Bill Wu, and Jose Sanchez can be found in Executive Committee Minutes, February 3, 1976, April 13, 1976, September 21, 1976, and November 30, 1976, Box 1, *American Culture Records*. Wu's proposal was originally voted down in favor of a course on country music, but was approved and taught in 1977. See Bill Wu, "Asian America: A Survey of History and Literature," Box 1, *American Culture Records*.

103. David Hollinger, interview with Alexander Olson, May 24, 2013.

104. June Howard, interview with Alexander Olson, June 5, 2013, and Alan Wald, interview with Alexander Olson, May 28, 2013. See also "American Culture: Only the Open-Minded Need Apply," *University Record* (Ann Arbor, Michigan), September 26, 1977.

105. "Latino Studies Review," October 13, 1989, Box 4, *American Culture Records*. The growth of ethnic studies at Michigan ultimately transformed the program. Over the course of the 1990s, some scholars even began to speak of the program's emphasis on race, ethnicity, and identity as the "Michigan model" for American studies. George Sánchez, "Notes from the Director," *Program in American Culture Newsletter*, Fall 1995.
106. As Audrey Williams June notes, "The hands-on attention that many minority professors willingly provide is an unheralded linchpin in institutional efforts to create an inclusive learning environment and keep students enrolled. That invisible labor reflects what has been described as cultural taxation: the pressure faculty members of color feel to serve as role models, mentors, even surrogate parents to minority students, and to meet every institutional need for ethnic representation." Audrey Williams June, "The Invisible Labor of Minority Professors," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 8, 2015.
107. Aimee Carillo Rowe, "Romancing the Organic Intellectual: On the Queerness of Academic Activism," *American Quarterly* 64, no. 4 (December 2012): 799–800. See also Arjun Appadurai, "Diversity and Disciplinarity as Cultural Artifacts," in *Disciplinary and Dissent in Cultural Studies*, ed. Cary Nelson and Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar (New York: Routledge, 1996), 23–36; and Nicholas De Genova, "Within and Against the Imperial University: Reflections on Crossing the Line," in *The Imperial University: Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent*, ed. Piya Chatterjee and Sunaina Maira (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 301–328.
108. Mary Helen Washington, "'Disturbing the Peace: What Happens to American Studies If You Put African American Studies at the Center?': Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, October 29, 1997," *American Quarterly* 50, no. 1 (March 1998): 2.
109. Martha Biondi, *The Black Revolution on Campus* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 241. See also Deborah Gray White, ed., *Telling Histories: Black Women Historians in the Ivory Tower* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008).
110. Imagining America: Artists and Scholar in Public Life was founded at University of Michigan in 1999 in partnership with the White House Millennium Council and in 2001 became a national consortium devoted to publicly engaged scholarship in the humanities, arts, and design. Ellison served as founding director, and several current and former Michigan faculty members have been involved in its administration, including Kristin Hass, David Scobey, George Sánchez, and Matthew Countryman.
111. Julie Ellison and Timothy Eatman, *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University* (Syracuse: Imagining America, 2008), iv.
112. "Project History," El Museo del Norte, accessed on December 29, 2015, <http://www.elmuseodelnorte.org/about-us.html>. See also "El Museo del Norte: A Latino Museum in Detroit," *Huffington Post*, December 22, 2011, accessed on December 29, 2015, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/10/22/el-museo-del-norte-a-lati_n_1026303.html.
113. Naomi Greyser and Margot Weiss, "Left Intellectuals and the Neoliberal University," *American Quarterly* 64, no. 4 (December 2012): 792.
114. Peter Schmidt, "Backlash Against Israel Boycott Throws Academic Association on Defensive," *The New York Times*, January 5, 2014, and "Backing the Israel Boycott," *Inside Higher Ed*, December 17, 2013, accessed on December 29, 2015, <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/12/17/american-studies-association-backs-boycott-israeli-universities>.
115. Sam Gringlas and Alicia Adamczyk, "#BBUM Goes Viral on Twitter," *The Michigan Daily*, November 19, 2013, and David Jesse, "U-M to Build \$10M Multicultural Center," *Detroit Free Press*, December 17, 2105.
116. Linda Eggert, interview with Alexander Olson, May 22, 2013.

