

## RCC Blog Prospectus

### Aim

The RCC blog aims to demonstrate the relevance and importance of instilling a humanistic perspective into discussions about today's environmental challenges. It aims to showcase innovative research and provocative commentary from experts in fields such as history, eco-criticism, anthropology, and philosophy (to name a few) with the overall goals of forging a connection between humanistic scholarship and public discourse and uncovering the human and historical dimensions of environmental problems.

### What the blog is

The blog is a repository for ideas, commentaries and profiles that, from a big-picture perspective, address the question, Why are the humanities integral to confronting today's environmental challenges? It should be seen as a public resource for understanding the environmental humanities and their value to environmental discussions. As such, it also creates a space for more informal and creative writing.

We are open to the following types of posts:

- responses to current events (e.g., unwrapping a current event from a humanistic perspective)
- responses to provocative questions about the human dimensions of environmental issues
- profiles of Carson Fellows that showcase their research and why they think it is important (and also that might include more light-hearted questions)
- tying RCC events (e.g., conferences) and publications into the bigger picture
- glimpses into innovative research in the environmental humanities
- interviews with non-RCC experts and/or "movers and shakers" in the environmental humanities
- multi-media showcases including recorded interviews, videos, or photographic reports

### What the blog is *not*

- a diary of the RCC
- an outlet for polished academic research
- a venue for formal conference reports
- a place for formal, jargon-y writing

### Audience and voice

The primary audience for the blog is the interested public and academics of all types.

Since a primary goal of the blog is public outreach, posts should be accessibly written in a more journalistic tone, using "plain English" (i.e., no academic jargon!) and an active voice. A first year college student should be able to understand all posts.

As our blog has a global audience, authors should attempt to make their posts understandable to people unfamiliar with the particulars of any one region.

All posts must be written in English.

### **Additional guidelines for contributors**

#### *Submission process*

If a staff member, fellow, or outside contributor has an idea for a blog post, he or she must send a concise paragraph presenting this idea to the editors. The editors will review the idea and get back to the potential contributor within two weeks.

If the editors accept the blog proposal, they will negotiate with the potential contributor a deadline for the final piece. If the potential contributor does not meet the deadline, he or she will run the risk of losing the opportunity to publish his/her post (unless they discuss their inability to meet the deadline with the editors ahead of time and have a reasonable excuse).

Once the final post is submitted, the editors will review it once again. They reserve the right to not accept the post if it does not meet the criteria and mission of the blog. If they accept the final post, it will be copyedited and put into an appropriate place within the production queue.

#### *Writing your piece*

Maximum word count per post: approx. **1500 words**

Remember to avoid academic jargon and passive voice. Posts are to be written for an educated but non-academic audience.

All posts must be submitted in a polished, final form. Posts will be edited primarily for content and copyedited for major spelling and grammatical mistakes.

If English is not the first language of the author, we expect that he or she has written the post to the best of their language ability and that it is clear and well-formulated. We do not provide language editing services for blog posts.

If the piece is opinionated, it will be made clear that it reflects only the opinion of the author and not that of the RCC.