sub-disciplines and specialized idioms. As such, it can no longer claim to be marginalized in any but a self-serving sense. If the publication of this book finally puts to rest the myth of marginalization, then it will have performed a much needed service for the discipline.

In claiming both the intellectual and the professional as categories for describing the work we do, this book makes an effort to see that work in its proper political and economic context in U.S. society. Indeed, much of the energy of this book arises from an oscillation between the politics of professionalism and the politics of a critique of professionalism. But the question of who does and does not publish—of who survives and who advances to the highest ranks of the professoriate—is, of course, a complex one, more complex than any single article or book can adequately address. If I were to put my own "oar/or" in, as Kenneth Burke would have it in his own development of the metaphor of conversation, I would extend the effort of this volume by directing greater attention to the racial and gendered subtext that attends issues in scholarly publishing. These issues are more or less present in Jasper Neel's essay, which by itself repays the purchase price of the volume and which offers a racial and gendered allegory of the views of scholarship as intellectual and business activity; in Janice Lauer's essay on mentoring which, serving as counterpoint to this volume, discourages graduate students (the majority of whom are women) from publishing; in Richard Gebhardt's essay on the teacher-researcher which, in effect, tells teachers (most of whom, again, are women) that they can publish despite their working conditions and family responsibilities if they would simply find the time and try harder; and in Robert Boice's essay on writer's block which ignores the possibility that writing difficulties may be a function of social factors rather than individual psychology. What I would want to highlight, in short, are the systems of constraints in which we must operate as productive scholars.

_Publishing in Rhetoric and Composition_ may well mark a distinct stage in the professionalization of the discipline, as Hillis Miller suggests in his foreword. Or it may just be an excellent idea finally materialized in print. In any event, the field owes a debt of gratitude to the editors and contributors for making available what otherwise would remain the exclusive address of a privileged few.


Reviewed by Nedra Reynolds, University of Rhode Island

Joseph Harris's new book is an engaging and refreshing account of "how teaching practices are formed and argued for" in composition studies (x), interpreted through several compelling keywords and through four "interchapters," short essays about the micro-politics of teaching that feature student texts. To keep the emphasis on a teaching subject, this book traces how research has "influenced
the work of writing teachers," rather than how it has "shaped theories of composing" (x). Flatly not interested in illustrating composition's legitimacy as a discipline, Harris writes about teaching writing—and the difference is notable in both content and organization. Equally disinterested in writing a tidy, coherent progress narrative, where composition started small and grew large, or had humble beginnings before huge success, Harris concentrates on conflict and tension rather than harmony and agreement.

The book opens with Foreword(s) on "Research and Teaching" and ends with Afterword(s) on "Contact and Negotiation"; in between it explores five significant keywords: growth, voice, process, error, community. These keywords situate composition's place within English studies and how composition has been "theorized and imagined" since the 1966 Dartmouth Seminar (ix). Composition is defined as "a kind of style of doing English" and as "the only part of English studies . . . commonly defined not in relation to a subject outside of the academy . . . but by its position within the curriculum" (x-xi). The keywords represent enormously influential areas for composition's interests that, while they have worked to make composition legitimate or lively, have failed to make composition as a serious intellectual enterprise for either teachers or students. The problem with growth, voice, process, error, and community is that they have promoted methods, procedures, or boundaries over messier sorts of "wringling" with ideas, and have more served composition's academic ambitions than its intellectual pursuits.

Though he doesn't elaborate fully enough, this distinction between "academic" and "intellectual" may be one of Harris's most important points. He sees our task as preparing students to be critics and intellectuals, which "is not the same at all as preparing them to become academics" (89). In its pursuit of academic legitimacy and its investment in teaching academic discourse, composition may be sacrificing opportunities "to help . . . students imagine themselves as intellectuals" (19). To do so might invigorate a number of common teaching practices that do not imagine students as intellectual anything.

The theme of composition's anti-intellectual tendencies appears in each chapter. Each keyword has some element or association that works against intellectual engagement. For example, the growth theories of Dartmouth, informed by exciting ideas about language development, did not translate into asking students to write about their intellectual experiences but about their personal ones (14-15). After Dartmouth, the image of the writer became that of the artist—the poet or novelist—who writes about experience rather than the image of the critic or theorist who writes about ideas or books. As advocates of voice shaped a conception of a writer's self, "writing thus begins to be valued more as a form of self-discovery or self-expression than as a way of communicating with others" (29). And in his harshest comment about this tendency, Harris claims that "Voice serves as a key term in what thus becomes an anti-intellectual project" (31). The keyword process focused attention on how texts get made, but also allowed teachers to avoid dealing with ideas and content, and therefore to sidestep sticky moral and political problems (42). Neither was a groundbreaking study of error a project with intellectual outcomes: "Errors and Expectations thus argues for a new sort of student but not a new sort of intellectual practice" (79). Finally, even ideas with the most popular currency concern Harris: "I worry about the view of public intellectual life that the metaphor of the contact zone promotes" (123).

Harris doesn't quite answer what composition studies has at stake in remaining so intellectually "deficient." Why would a field that has created so many new graduate programs, journals, and book series sidestep or avoid intellectualism? Why would it be more of a guarantee of "success," for a new field, to train students in self-expression or canned academic discourse than to train them to be cultural critics and public intellectuals? I wish Harris had pursued this line of argument further, but the keyword organization doesn't really invite a point-by-point argument—both its strength and its weakness.

Harris begins with the 1966 Dartmouth conference but does not treat it nostalgically. He finds the tensions present at the conference, especially between British and American participants, as far more significant than any outcomes. In fact, he claims that actual recommendations from Dartmouth were vague, with little impact overall and no practical effect on teaching. Dartmouth, in short, was not a scene of heroic shift (3).

There are no scenes of heroic shift in this account—not even in the places where teaching practices changed quite dramatically from the influence of the process movement. Refreshingly, Harris points out that writing as process has become a banal idea by now (57). Harris charges that we shifted attention from the final product to the steps of getting one, but that the real problem still remains: content is ignored; ideas are not prominent; intellectual engagement is sacrificed to method. Process writing ignores content and ideas as much as the current-traditional rhetoric ever did. Students are not asked to write about their intellectual experiences (14), and teachers have been composing coaches instead of being readers (56).

And who doesn't teach writing as a process? I remember the shock wave that a presentation by Jim Berlin sent through a conference in the late 1980s—one of the first trenchant critiques of the writing-process movement that most of the participants had heard. Many of the process teachers in the audience were quite dismayed by his argument, which seemed disloyal and "went too far." Then someone asked Berlin how exactly he taught writing—how did he organize or conduct a writing class? Sure enough, the writing process was at the center of Berlin's classes, with attention to invention, drafting, peer response, revision, and so on. Who doesn't teach process? Berlin admitted, as I recall, that he didn't know of a better way and that he had no interest in returning to the old paradigm. That's where writing instruction has been stuck for a number of years: theoretical or social-political critiques of process have multiplied in number and sophistication, but no one has come up with anything better for the practical, everyday teaching of writing.
Debates have centered, instead, on the issue of error and response to error (usually in the larger context of "academic discourse") because that is the dominant public perception of writing and writing instruction. Fans of Mina Shaughnessy and her basic writing pedagogy will need to prepare themselves for Harris's public perception of writing and writing instruction. Fans of Mina Shaughnessy, in short, is politically liberal but intellectually conservative (78). Over a hugely successful program, surrounded by supporters and awards. Those who loved Maher's book will squirm at Harris's pages on Shaughnessy because "The House That Mina Built" (Maher's chapter title) is, according to Harris, a house built on a foundation of correctness—not on a new paradigm at all. Errors and Expectations, in short, is politically liberal but intellectually conservative (78). While he admits that Shaughnessy "brought a sense of urgency to the problem of teaching underprepared writers," Harris points out that she was not the first to identify or address the problem (79-80). Of more serious concern was "her nearly complete lack of interest in revision" (81). Cultivating proofreading habits is about the extent of Shaughnessy's challenge to students' intellects. Instead of just giving Shaughnessy a hit and run, however, Harris identifies another, far more neglected, 1970s text that does urge teachers to respond to what students have to say: Geneva Smitherman's Talkin' and Testifyin'. It is curious why this book, along with the 1974 CCC statement "Students' Right to Their Own Language," has not achieved nearly the same status as Errors and Expectations, but Harris might say that their move away from correctness was too uncomfortable for teachers and too risky for a new field; it was not an approach that could be collapsed easily into pedagogical steps or stages.

In the Shaughnessy discussion and elsewhere, Harris does not simply marshal a critique—pointing out problems and flaws—and then move on to the next target; he routinely offers substantial suggestions or models. For example, instead of reviewing verbs and adverbs, he writes, "[w]hat struggling students need... is not more of the basics but a sense of what others find most exciting and useful about books, writing, and ideas" (83). The interchapters offer solutions or possibilities in ways that most academic books do not: a written exchange between a student (Heather), writing about Mike Rose's Lives on the Boundary, and Harris's colleague and co-teacher (Rashmi Bhatnagar), offers a superb example of how teachers might respond to a competent but flat, safe, student essay—the type we see every day—in ways that really push students to think and to see again (see 46-52). This exchange between student and teacher serves well to illustrate "what Harris wants" when he insists that our teaching could be more intellectual and more challenging to students. He wants more wrangling; the goal is not to get outside constraints but to strain against them (38).

Teacher-readers will also find this book refreshing because in places where he could turn to postmodern theorists, Harris turns instead to a teaching tradition. "[I]n a different context I would be glad to call on the likes of Barthes, Bakhtin, or Derrida in stating my case. But what I have to say here really draws less on their work than on an approach to teaching writing that can be traced back to Amherst College in the 1930s to Theodore Baird and his colleagues" (34).

For me, the boldest, best argument in the book occurs in the Afterword(s) on "Contact and Negotiation," which demonstrates that even the most inviting metaphors can wear thin or prove problematic (also see his discussion of "frontier," 79-80), perhaps as the field outgrows its own keywords. As composition studies has committed itself to social theories and political approaches to writing, while trying to maintain its commitment to diverse, marginalized, or underrepresented writers, Mary Louise Pratt's image of the contact zone has become hugely appealing and has offered an alternative to the warm fuzziness of "community." Harris worries that too many treatments of the contact zone represent it as a "multicultural bazaar" where all are welcome but no one is ever challenged. Harris points out some of the usually overlooked elements of the contact zone: that it is "a space to which [no one] owes much allegiance" (119), and that it simply reproduces little utopias ("safe houses") where all can retreat when threatened by difference and where "expressing dissent gets romanticized" (120). Harris shows the serious limits of such a zone and encourages us to do what Pratt fails to do: "to get students to articulate or negotiate the differences among themselves" (118). Harris prefers the keyword "public": "a more urban and less utopian view of social life [that] might help us rethink the kinds of work that can go on in our classrooms" (108). Without idealizing such a space, Harris wants to promote tolerance and civility, "a willingness to live with difference" (109).

As Harris's readers wrangle with the keyword "public," they will need to come to terms with the burden of professionalism and to clarify the differences between being a professional (or an academic) and being a public intellectual. I like the way that Harris openly admits his own investment in composition's professional status (for example, as editor of College Composition and Communication), which co-exists uneasily with his worry that professionalization has loosened ties to the classroom (xi). With more books like this one, however, we can strengthen those ties through more "wrangling" and with greater intellectual integrity.
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In his influential article, "Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class," James Berlin held up Ira Shor as a shining example of the "New Rhetorician," applauding and promoting Shor's concern with student agency and lauding his efforts to counter the "arbitrary authority" to which students are often subjected.