In 16th- and 17th-century Europe, there was no clear distinction between libraries and museums or between archives and treasuries. Such places, filled with books, natural oddities, relics, beautiful objects, manuscripts, stones and bones, could resemble junk rooms for the erudite, wunderkammern, landing spots for bequests of all sorts. Books were organized by size or date of arrival or donor, not by content or use.
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In 16th- and 17th-century Europe, there was no clear distinction between libraries and museums or between archives and treasuries. Such institutions, filled with books, old maps, oddities, relics, beautiful objects, manuscripts, stones and bones, could resemble junk rooms but also museum displays, which were the spots for bequests of all sorts. Books were organized by size or date of arrival or donor, not by content or use.

Slowly, systematic discipline and alphabetical catalogs emerged, and “libraries” became places that stored books and manuscripts—and little else. Today, one doesn’t trip over skeletons or jewel boxes. But libraries—or cybraries, as University Librarian Michael Keller likes to call them—contain the world. Absolutely everything is there. The age of the collection has returned.

“Every virtual makes that possible,” said Asunta Pisani, associate university librarian for collections and services. “One of the old limitations of librarianship was space. There were beautiful rooms with displays, which then became larger and more organized, and decisions had to be made about space and efficiency. But now it doesn’t matter.”

In Keller’s view, there’s an old narrative and a new narrative. The old one is the old narrative with interruptions, with high-octane Java, with links and spreadsheets and visualizations, from the point of view of Keller and his colleagues, is that you can dig deep—really recklessly. You can go through a text to the point at which child psychology veers into electrical engineering, the moment of the genesis of scientific argument, by which I mean that you can bump up against chemistry and physics, where relics and stones and texts can be viewed as part of a whole.

Informatics, which posts that everything ultimately is linked to everything else, now can actually link most everything through taxonomic indexing, a highly complex process of assigning semantic categories to chunks of text that can then be summoned in a certain, relevant order, relying on what Keller calls the text’s fingerprints. With that, instead of being in a big space or a specific topic, you can actually look up what a child psychologist would do with a great old building when you have the opportunity to rebuild?”

Curators, or subject specialists, such as Lowood, who have specialized knowledge of both the subjects and the disciplines, are the point at which child psychology veers into electrical engineering, the moment of the genesis of scientific argument, by which I mean that you can bump up against chemistry and physics, where relics and stones and texts can be viewed as part of a whole.

Informatics, which posts that everything ultimately is linked to everything else, now can actually link most everything through taxonomic indexing, a highly complex process of assigning semantic categories to chunks of text that can then be summoned in a certain, relevant order, relying on what Keller calls the text’s fingerprints. With that, instead of being in a big space or a specific topic, you can actually look up what a child psychologist would do with a great old building when you have the opportunity to rebuild?”

“Every virtual makes that possible,” said Asunta Pisani, associate university librarian for collections and services. “One of the old limitations of librarianship was space. There were beautiful rooms with displays, which then became larger and more organized, and decisions had to be made about space and efficiency. But now it doesn’t matter.”

The relationship between hyperlinks and 17th-century collecting practices might not be obvious. But the chief virtue of digitization, from the point of view of Keller and his colleagues, is that you can dig deep—really recklessly. You can go through a text to the point at which child psychology veers into electrical engineering, the moment of the genesis of scientific argument, by which I mean that you can bump up against chemistry and physics, where relics and stones and texts can be viewed as part of a whole.

Informatics, which posts that everything ultimately is linked to everything else, now can actually link most everything through taxonomic indexing, a highly complex process of assigning semantic categories to chunks of text that can then be summoned in a certain, relevant order, relying on what Keller calls the text’s fingerprints. With that, instead of being in a big space or a specific topic, you can actually look up what a child psychologist would do with a great old building when you have the opportunity to rebuild?”
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Informatics, which posts that everything ultimately is linked to everything else, now can actually link most everything through taxonomic indexing, a highly complex process of assigning semantic categories to chunks of text that can then be summoned in a certain, relevant order, relying on what Keller calls the text’s fingerprints. With that, instead of being in a big space or a specific topic, you can actually look up what a child psychologist would do with a great old building when you have the opportunity to rebuild?”

“Every virtual makes that possible,” said Asunta Pisani, associate university librarian for collections and services. “One of the old limitations of librarianship was space. There were beautiful rooms with displays, which then became larger and more organized, and decisions had to be made about space and efficiency. But now it doesn’t matter.”
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Informatics, which posts that everything ultimately is linked to everything else, now can actually link most everything through taxonomic indexing, a highly complex process of assigning semantic categories to chunks of text that can then be summoned in a certain, relevant order, relying on what Keller calls the text’s fingerprints. With that, instead of being in a big space or a specific topic, you can actually look up what a child psychologist would do with a great old building when you have the opportunity to rebuild?”
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We want them to be familiar with primary sources,” Pisani said, “to really actually see a letter by Nathaniel Hawthorne.

New libraries

Among all the buildings going up in the next decade or so at Stanford will be at least two new libraries: engineering and art. The former is expected to be bookless within a decade or so. It will therefore have fewer non-professional staff members but more reference librarians to help with digital resources.

Helen Josephine, head librarian of the Engineering Library, said that traditionally librarians in her field would have purchased materials along departmental lines, asking, for example, what does mechanical engineering need?

“But increasingly, those students and research are crossing disciplines, so they are no longer bound by mechanical engineering.”

Unlike the engineering library, the projected art and architecture library—one of the central pieces of the university’s Arts Initiative—will have plenty of bookshelves. Many arts (and humanities) journals are not available online, and reproduction of images is not always reliable.

“The very nature of research in an object-based discipline is inextricably linked to an object-based learning environment, where the form of the book or magazine as physical object is often imbued with cultural coding as its content,” said Peter Blank, head librarian of the Art and Architecture Library. “There is no substitute for placing such objects in students’ hands. We’re dealing with a different kind of data here.”

But clearly there is a limit to the number of objects an art library can have, and Blank and his staff are also deeply committed to making the online Visual Resources Center (VRC), which houses digital images and slides, accessible, useful and integral to departments across campus.

In 2006 the VRC was transferred from the Art and Art History Department to Stanford University Libraries and Academic Information Resources (SULAIR).

“SULAIR brought considerable technical support to VRC, as well as a different awareness of how visual materials can be used across disciplines,” he said. “We’re refocusing a somewhat inward-looking operation outward to make connections across the campus. Anyone on campus can log on to the ImageBase. We’re upgrading equipment, systemizing backups and cleaning up data. We’ve got an excellent team.”

When Blank says the library was “inward-looking,” he is referring to the old Model of a traditional museum research library. Undergraduates couldn’t get in at all; graduate students could not check out books; and faculty members had limited privileges. That has all changed, and the library now circulates materials to the entire Stanford community.

Six-inch lean

Blank envisions the art library as a “laboratory to support a discovery environment,” a place with that bookshelf to be replaced by rotating exhibits showing off an admirable collection of ephemera and art objects.

“We’re trying to recreate the whole environment to encourage students to visit, personally or virtually, and make it more of a learning space, a place for doing things, where students can see and touch—for example—how art was used as a political tool in the 1960s and ’70s in China,” he said, referring to the library’s collection of Maoist posters, on display last year.

“There’s something I call the ‘6-inch-lean,’ that moment when you’re showing students something and they move in just a bit to see the artifact better. Right then, they’re intellectually and corporally engaged. That’s our job. That’s why students come to Stanford.”

Blank emphasized that many of the objects in the art library that might appear to outsiders to be secondary materials, that is, documents about art objects, are, in fact, primary materials, art objects themselves.

Photography books, for example, are in many cases the object, the first or the only site where a photograph ever appears.

“In the ’60s and ’70s, the art practice site often was the magazine,” Blank said. “So it is essential to preserve that artifact in its original form. Same with Life magazine or posters. Those artifacts project their own media values.

“Most libraries don’t realize they even have ephemera. There were lots of pamphlets published by conceptual artists and contemporary galleries in the 1960s in which pieces would be described or illustrated.” Such was the case with the work of British artist Richard Long, for example, who “makes sculpture by walking,” transforming his wanderings into the artifact itself.

“So pamphlets were released as if they were catalogs, but in fact they were published documentation of the art piece,” Blank said. “They’re here because they appeared as catalogs, when in fact they have multiple purposes. I’m constantly finding stuff like that here and retrieving it.”

Virtual and comfortable

The physical structure and contents of libraries have thus not been overtaken by the virtual. They need each other. The Lane and Bender reading rooms in Green Library, with their overstuffed chairs, the display of student and indoor lighting and the generous wooden tables, are beacons. The grand old spaces (all those grand seminar and study rooms) were retained or revived. Libraries, after all, are meeting places, the most obvious site for cross-disciplinary communities to emerge.

A user survey in spring 2003 showed that students place great value on the library as a place to study and that they rely upon reference librarians to assist them with online resources.

Librarians, in turn, are using the Internet to bring in students and researchers. Branner Library, for example, at the School of Earth Sciences, features an informative and attractive blog with information on books, journals, pollution and earthquake, a Geographic Information System (GIS) and a list of relevant delicious tags, a social-networking system for identifying useful bookmarks. The main Information Center webpage also has tags, blogs, research FAQs and a host of news items, all linked to appropriate resources.

“What’s exciting is seeing the constant evolution and reinvention of the services and information we can provide to people,” Josephine said. “I’m very jazzed; it’s very exciting. We have more of a feel for what students are thinking and what is going on at work, we don’t have to have everything perfect.”

SULAIR brought considerable technical support to VRC, as well as a different awareness of how visual materials can be used across disciplines, he said. “We’re refocusing a somewhat inward-looking operation outward to make connections across the campus. Anyone on campus can log on to the ImageBase. We’re upgrading equipment, systemizing backups and cleaning up data. We’ve got an excellent team.”
An entirely new perspective

The human brain comprises 25 billion neurons that communicate through more or less 25 trillion specialized junctions called synapses. Try taking a picture of that. The explosion of interest in neuroscience over the past decade is due largely to advances in imaging technology, which enables scientists to do their work and unite researchers from different areas who discover they can all profit from the same gadget.

“A vast amount of both invention and research involves being able to see stuff,” said psychologist Brian Wandell, co-director of the Neuroscience Institute at Stanford (NIS) and chair of the Psychology Department. “Visualization is an enormous help. Stanford has been a world leader in this, but now we’re seeing ways that will allow us to be even better.”

After the conversations that led to “Neuro-X” (see accompanying article) showed that imaging was a priority across the board, NIS launched a neuro-modeling lab.

“This lab should function as a crossroads, a watering hole, a place for people to come together casually and share expertise and enjoy coffee and mingling, which we hope will lead to a new curriculum in computational neuroscience,” said Stephen Smith, a professor of molecular and cellular physiology at the School of Medicine who works on the brain’s synaptic circuits.

“Steve Smith and I image things at opposite ends of the size scale,” Wandell said. Smith looks at lab samples; Wandell looks at living humans. “You need to work your way up and down the scale. Using MRI, we’re working hard to link the nano slices used in pathology to the larger images, a few millimeters wide, of whole healthy people, creating an integrative imaging program to teach all those techniques to students.”

Real-time functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) is being applied to a host of neuroscientific problems. Among them: the alleviation of chronic pain and the ability to make good or bad decisions.

SEE YOUR PAIN

Pain is not just a medical condition; Stanford’s online Encyclopedia of Philosophy devotes pages and pages of philosophical analysis to the subject. It is both a biochemical and a profoundly subjective experience. A pain questionnaire widely used by physicians offers patients some 100 adjectives (pulsing, drilling, wrenching, scalding, taut, unbearable, nagging, torturing) to help them describe their condition.

fMRI is finally allowing medical and engineering researchers to get close to this intersection of subjectivity and physicality.

Sean Mackey, co-director of the Pain Working Group at NIS, said, “I knew in grad school (studying electrical engineering) that I was going into medicine.”

“This is a natural meld of medicine and high tech. I did early work in cardio, then anesthesia, then pain management. I looked at what people were doing and I said, wow, we’re in the dark ages. We’re still fusing people’s backs! We’re giving them the same drugs as 20 years ago! So I got into imaging and systems neuroscience and networking.”

Most famously, Mackey’s group has enabled people to literally see their pain as they are experiencing it while inside an MRI scanner.

“I don’t want to sensationalize the clinical applications of this,” he cautioned. “We’re not selling snake oil. There’s lots of work ahead before we can envision a therapeutic tool.”

But that said, who wouldn’t be excited by preliminary results that show that by seeing their pain, people to some extent can control it?

The ethical pitfalls of such work, however, are legion.

“They don’t understand the responsibilities here,”lt,” Mackey said. “People are rewiring their own brains. You could build up soldiers’ capacity to absorb pain. You could improve memory so that
Essential collaboration

But until then, they have to walk from department to department, which has its own advantages, Mobley said, for example, that he has been speaking with researchers at the School of Education and the Graduate School of Business about collaborative projects on Down syndrome, his field of expertise. The groups working on autism and Parkinson’s disease call upon psychologists, biochemists, electrical engineers and physicians to better understand the workings of the brain; one such collaborator was Steve Chu, who won the Nobel Prize in physics in 1997 and is now the director of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

Mobley was instrumental in bringing the Dalai Lama to Stanford in 2005, when the School of Medicine hosted a daylong dialogue among neuroscientists, Buddhist scholars and the community. The point was not to apply Buddhist philosophy to science or vice versa, he told the audience then, but to find those places where they overlapped and to find the common ground between two admittedly different cultures.

“Neuroscientists think in terms of writing papers,” Mobley said, reflecting back on that encounter. “Scientists think they can measure everything; but I have an open mind—literally.”

When he tried to set up what he calls the Compassion Project, inspired by the Dalai Lama’s visit—“talk about collaboration!”—several colleagues brushed him off, he said. But he knew it was the right thing to do, he said, and he is moving ahead.

But along with compassion, some would argue there is also potential trouble; among the most talked-about neuroscientific developments is human enhancement, cloning, genetic tinkering and criminal verdicts without the bother of a trial.

Pain has gotten so complex, it’s impossible for one person to understand it all. Disparate fields are necessary, with everyone thinking outside the box, and remarkable concepts emerge.

One of Mackey’s occasional collaborators is Fumiko Hoeft, a senior research scientist at the Center for Interdisciplinary Brain Sciences Research and the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, who started off working with imaging as a potential clinical tool. But rtfMRI (and fMRI) has limits. For one thing, it relies on what Hoeft called unreal situations. You can’t create images of people with the same goal—to make an impact in clinical settings.

“So the cost has to come down,” she said. “Policy has to change in order for this to be applied.”

At Stanford, there is a good atmosphere here, more so than at the other places I’ve been,” Hoeft said. “At the rtfMRI meetings we have radiologists, psychologists, neuroscientists, anesthesiologists, experts on depression, experts on decision-making ... and all these people have the same goal—to make an impact in clinical settings.

“The big thing is that here everyone seems willing to offer their expertise. It’s easier to get in touch with people you don’t know, to get advice from them. I never thought I’d be working on pain. And now I’m collaborating with Sean.”

RISKY INVESTMENTS

Another of Hoeft’s colleagues is Brian Knutson, assistant professor of psychology. He is part of a new group of researchers called neuroeconomists—psychologists, economists and neurologists who essentially investigate decision-making. The results, they say, can illuminate not only why people make unwise investments but also the origins of mental health disorders, including addiction. It is a field without controversy, with some economists alleging that proponents misunderstand classical economic theory.

“In my work, we deal with people with learning disabilities and developmental problems, which led me to rtfMRI, which gave me an excuse to talk with Brian,” Hoeft said. “I had heard he was interested in rewards and punishment, so I thought, hmmm, this might be useful for studying learning. I thought his work sounded absolutely fascinating. So we’re hoping to collaborate. That was sort of unexpected, and I hope it goes well.”

Knutson began working with fMRI in the mid-1990s, one of very few people doing so then. In fact, it was suggested to the young psychologist that he was working hard at not getting a good job. But he landed at the National Institutes of Health, where he found a mentor who was interested in emotions. How to elicit emotions? the mentor wondered. Money, Knutson replied.

“Technology finally caught up with me,” Knutson said, reflecting from his perch in the country’s top psychology department. Psychologists, of course, are interested primarily in individual human beings, not the aggregate, so Knutson’s collaboration with economists—like Brian Wandell with Steven Smith—is a case of technology helping aligned disciplines answer similar questions. Imaging technology, science and policy can thus intersect; the visible brain reactions of some one choosing a risky investment, deciding to skateboard off a building or shooting heroin may be similar and could help in the search for viable solutions to widespread health-related social problems.

“The imaging is getting better,” Knutson said. “I have faith that the brain is not a processing device; it’s a valuation device, and the molecular level of analysis is not necessarily going to give us the best functional prediction.

“Money influences the brain and vice versa; there’s cross-talk. The issue is which of these links—which are potentially infinite—are most important.”

And those links are finally visible, just as the intensity and shape of our pain is beginning to be visible. If seeing is believing, perhaps too it is the first step toward treating conditions that cost us resources and cause us suffering.
American studies came to life in the 1950s, at a time when one could not be confident about what that meant. America was the United States, whose culture was perceived as both exceptional and homogeneous.

Homogeneity, obviously, is no longer on the table. As for exceptionalism, clearly the United States is not just another country. But if globalization means that goods, services, peoples and cultures refuse to be confined behind national borders, it also means that studying “America” has ceased to be an exercise focused exclusively on the 50 states. Nothing happens here outside a larger, international context.

Thus the transnational turn in American studies—a recognition that the multiple links between “here” and “not-here” are omnipresent and run in both directions. This year’s national meeting of the American Studies Association (ASA), in fact, is titled “América Aquí: Transhemispheric Visions and Community Constructions.”

The old American studies, said English Professor Ramón Saldivar, “meant looking at the hemisphere through U.S. critical paradigms. Today we see the interrelationships, not just the one-way relations.

“For example, immigration is now at the core of the field: What kind of social and structural forces—say, health, or the arts—cut across nations and boundaries and function independently of them? This doesn’t mean that the concept of ‘nation’ has been abandoned, but rather that it’s been supplemented.”

American studies was born in the years following World War II, at the same time as other area studies programs. It was a modest affair, top-heavy with literature and intellectual history and lacking any urgent agenda, with no nationwide meetings or journal to bind it together.

In 1969, a radical caucus appeared at the second national meeting of the ASA demanding that the organization address the critical political issues of the day: civil rights, the war and the women’s movement. (The ASA was, of course, not the only academic association to find its definitions cast asunder by the 1960s.) The field’s framework was thus pushed outward, and a tradition was born of engaging critically with the meanings of “America.” Pluralism rather than universalism became the watchword. Today, the ASA has chapters nationwide and its own journal, American Quarterly. Similar organizations exist worldwide. There is also an active discussion list on H-Net (h-amstdy).
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In 1969, a radical caucus appeared at the second national meeting of the ASA demanding that the organization address the critical political issues of the day: civil rights, the war and the women’s movement. (The ASA was, of course, not the only academic association to find its definitions cast asunder by the 1960s.) The field’s framework was thus pushed outward, and a tradition was born of engaging critically with the meanings of “America.” Pluralism rather than universalism became the watchword. Today, the ASA has chapters nationwide and its own journal, American Quarterly. Similar organizations exist worldwide. There is also an active discussion list on H-Net (h-amstdy).

Watching “The Simpsons”

At Stanford, American studies was first approved in 1975, and the first quarter-century of the program’s existence was fruitful and controversial. But by 2001, some deans and members of the faculty began expressing concerns that the number of majors was declining and that there was not a sufficiently strong intellectual focus to the program, a complaint familiar to other interdisciplinary programs. The program was reauthorized by the Faculty Senate, but for fewer years than in the past. At the same time, it received a mandate to hire a senior director to infuse new direction, and it was given funding for a Humanities Center workshop and postdoctoral fellowships.

The medicine worked, and things were turned around, most noticeably with the hire of Shelley Fisher Fishkin as faculty program director.

Though the program today exudes excitement, “the doubts will never be put to rest, and that’s a good thing,” said Saldivar, the Hoagland Family Professor in the School of Humanities and Sciences. “We must always be self-critical. American studies needed to be examined very closely back then, and the new leadership was crucial.”

Fishkin, an internationally acclaimed scholar of Mark Twain, started things off with a bang as soon as she arrived in the fall of 2003 by organizing conferences on the anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education and, for a change of pace, The Simpsons.

“Students all watched The Simpsons, of course, but they never watched it critically,” she said. “The notion that social criticism happens on TV wasn’t something they had ever really thought of.”

Controversy over the field comes with the territory, she suggested recently.

“Those criticisms [by the Faculty Senate] indicated a lack of consensus concerning American studies’ role in the academy. What is the appropriate place for this program? Do we have a mandate to hire a senior director to infuse new direction, and run in both directions. This year’s national meeting of the American Studies Association (ASA), in fact, is titled “América Aquí: Transhemispheric Visions and Community Constructions.”
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Do America, Do the World

Inherently innovative is a real risk.” Or fetishization of the transnational turn as something United States, an obviously transnational theme. He black American writers.

Colonialism and attitudes in the Soviet Union toward James Baldwin; and spring brought speakers on anti-transnational life and work of W.E.B. Du Bois and in the United States; winter quarter was devoted to the address the interaction of Asian and Latino cultures. Transnational American Studies.” The fall workshop centers and programs in African American, Chicano, Asian American and Native American studies.

In her widely published November 2004 presidential address to the ASA, Fishkin explicitly and powerfully addressed the transnational turn, calling it essential for overcoming the "nationalism, arrogance and Manichean oversimplification" often attributed to Americans.

"When people with power act on visions of America that rest on oversimplification, myth and a blind faith that America is always right—or, for that matter, always wrong—that is a call to us as American studies scholars to do our work," she said.

The work—combating stereotypes and simplifications—leads one quickly to the realization that national boundaries are not the most useful way of assessing cultures. "We are likely to focus less on the United States as a static and stable territory and population ... and more on the nation as a participant in a global flow of people, ideas, texts and products," she went on to say.

Humanities Center workshop

Stanford does not have a PhD program in American studies, but the Program in Modern Thought and Literature (MTL) comes pretty close. MTL students often work as teaching assistants for American studies classes.

They also have been in charge of the occasional "American Cultures" workshop at the Humanities Center. That was the workshop encouraged by the Faculty Senate in 2001.

In 2006-07, it was called "American Cultures/Transnational American Studies." The fall workshop addressed the interaction of Asian and Latino cultures in the United States; winter quarter was devoted to the transnational life and work of W.E.B. Du Bois and James Baldwin; and spring brought speakers on anti-colonialism and attitudes in the Soviet Union toward black American writers.

One of the organizers of that workshop was Steven Lee, an MTL student writing a dissertation comparing multiculturalism in the Soviet Union and the United States, an obviously transnational theme. He cautioned, however, that in general "the celebration or fetishization of the transnational turn as something inherently innovative is a real risk."

"The nation isn’t going anywhere anytime soon," he said. "There are specific contexts and histories that have to be respected.”

Lee was off to St. Petersburg, Russia, in the following day to attend an American studies conference. His colleague and co-organizer of the Humanities Center workshop, Nigel Hatton, had spent the summer at similar meetings in Ireland, Denmark, England and the Czech Republic.

There are some Europeans who are skeptical about U.S. scholars imposing an American studies paradigm on the rest of the world, Hatton admitted, adding that "it will require a constant conversation.”

"Being in all those places certainly broadened my view," he said, and that in large part is the point: to show Americans that the world, including the world of American studies, is larger than they thought.

Undergraduates are figuring that out. To help them along, Fishkin has taught a 2-credit course to prepare students to attend a national ASA meeting. Hatton was the teaching assistant.

"The students were great," he said. "They spent the quarter studying the conference program, figuring out which sessions they wanted to attend and doing research on the speakers. They dressed well; they even made business cards. It was a great way to acclimate them to academia and to American studies. The class really spoke to the vibrancy of Stanford’s program.

"And they danced their heads off at the reception the closing night." Hatton and Lee furthermore are associate managing editors of a brand-new publication, The Journal of Transnational American Studies. It launched in 2008 by Stanford’s American studies program and the University of California-Santa Barbara’s American Cultures and Global Contexts Center. Fishkin is a founding editor of the refereed journal, which will be offered online for free.

Making connections

Lest anyone think that the linkages between U.S. and non-U.S. topics are forced, Fishkin offers examples of how one thing leads to another.

During her presidential address to the ASA, she told her audience about 19th-century Scots oppressed by England who idealized American Indians struggling against the same enemy. One such Scot went by the name of Teyoninhokarawen, as he was half Mohawk and a chief in Canada; he fought the United States in 1812. He also translated the Bible and works by Sir Walter Scott into Mohawk to prepare the Indians for the white society that awaited them.

A story like that, she said, epitomizes a transnational vision that doesn’t hold much store by national boundaries and that can reshape our understanding of North American history and culture.

Even Mark Twain is not off-limits. Several years ago, Fishkin famously uncovered a play by Twain at UC-Berkeley’s Bancroft Library; the play, Is He Dead? opens on Broadway this autumn.

It turns out that Twain wrote it while living in Vienna in the 1890s (his daughter was studying music there), and he set it in 19th-century France. So even Twain, that most American of American authors, had important links to non-U.S. cultures,” she said. Twain also was an early animal-rights advocate, and he shaped the movements both here and in Britain. So, yet another transnational story.

“I tell my students, even though it’s an oxymoron, stalk serendipity and keep an open mind,” Fishkin said. “And students find it exciting to explore all the unexpected places their research can take them.”

A new publication, The Journal of Transnational American Studies, will be a focal point of the growing field.

Graduate students Nigel Hatton, above, and Steven Lee, below, organized a Humanities Center workshop called “American Cultures/Transnational American Studies.”
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By Ann Arvin

breakthroughs in basic science are fundamental to making major advances in human health. This equation sounds simple, but the path from an exciting basic laboratory discovery to a valuable practical application for the prevention or cure of human diseases has many barriers and wrong turns. Nevertheless, the Stanford faculty and their students have made many remarkable contributions in the right direction along this daunting road. The Initiative on Human Health (IHH), a major focus of The Stanford Challenge fundraising campaign, aims to accelerate Stanford’s contributions to improving human health and well-being now and in the years to come.

Success in making fundamental scientific observations and translating these observations into innovations that benefit human health is not new. Lavoisier’s achievement. The spark for the IHH is the recognition that building multidisciplinary research will determine what we can do in helping people to live healthier lives in the 21st century.

In medicine, many important scientific questions opened the mind of the insightful physician at the bedside. At Stanford, the same physician has often returned to the laboratory to find new therapies, some times in collaboration of researchers from other disciplines. Consider the example of Dr. Henry Kaplan and Edward Ginzton at the Hansen Experimental Physics Laboratory who, together in the 1950s, developed an approach to radiation therapy that saved the life of a child with retinoblastoma in its first application.

The goal of the IHH is to make this tradition a cornerstone of health-related research at Stanford. Even more than in past decades, we recognize that major advances in medicine are likely to be the result of multidisciplinary teams. The IHH goal is to offer our faculty and students opportunities to do such work.

Imaging, invention, integration

The IHH has identified three themes that define areas in which new research and training efforts could yield many benefits: imaging, seeing biological processes in ways that yield new therapies; invention, making tools that enhance research and devices that solve health problems; and integration, synthesizing the massive amounts of information emerging from vast databases related to human health.

Imaging. Our modern knowledge about the human body began with the precise anatomical drawings of Leonardo da Vinci and others during the Renaissance. In the next iteration, microscopes were invented that revealed structures too small for the eye to see, laying the foundation for my field, microbiology and infectious diseases. Today, electron microscopes reveal cellular structures at the nanoscale and magnetic resonance imaging has revolutionized clinicians’ ability to diagnose illness and treat patients. We are about to make another leap forward in imaging, equivalent to the change from a still photograph to a movie. The 21st-century ways of “seeing” will involve watching events happen on a cellular level in real time in tissues, organs and entire organisms. Researchers will be able to watch thousands of neurons as they fire in response to a stimulus, rather than being limited to observations about a single cell.

Clinicians will engineer molecules that can hunt down illness and treat patients. We are about to make another leap forward in imaging, equivalent to the change from a still photograph to a movie. The 21st-century ways of “seeing” will involve watching events happen on a cellular level in real time in tissues, organs and entire organisms. Researchers will be able to watch thousands of neurons as they fire in response to a stimulus, rather than being limited to observations about a single cell.

Imaging. Our modern knowledge about the human body began with the precise anatomical drawings of Leonardo da Vinci and others during the Renaissance. In the next iteration, microscopes were invented that revealed structures too small for the eye to see, laying the foundation for my field, microbiology and infectious diseases. Today, electron microscopes reveal cellular structures at the nanoscale and magnetic resonance imaging has revolutionized clinicians’ ability to diagnose illness and treat patients. We are about to make another leap forward in imaging, equivalent to the change from a still photograph to a movie. The 21st-century ways of “seeing” will involve watching events happen on a cellular level in real time in tissues, organs and entire organisms. Researchers will be able to watch thousands of neurons as they fire in response to a stimulus, rather than being limited to observations about a single cell.

Clinicians will engineer molecules that can hunt down disease cells at their earliest stages and literally illuminate them on a computer screen long before current face-to-face interactions between faculty and students with diverse expertise and with the clinical faculty at Stanford Hospital and Clinics and Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital. Through these interactions, we will build upon the remarkable advances in human health that have been achieved by the traditional medical disciplines. The IHH will serve as the catalyst for the next generation of innovators. At Stanford, the new ideas in basic and translational health-related research.
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