

University of Massachusetts Amherst

From the Selected Works of David Fleming

2009

Rhetoric Revival or Process Revolution? Revisiting the Emergence of Composition- Rhetoric as a Discipline

David Fleming, *University of Massachusetts Amherst*



Available at: <https://works.bepress.com/david-fleming/23/>

Renewing Rhetoric's Relation to Composition: Essays in Honor of Theresa Jarnagin Enos. Ed. Shane Borrowman, Stuart C. Brown, and Thomas P. Miller. New York: Routledge, 2009.

2

RHETORIC REVIVAL OR PROCESS REVOLUTION?

Revisiting the Emergence
of Composition-Rhetoric as a Discipline

David Fleming
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Introduction

Given that it is still, as a field, relatively young, still (in many places) intellectually and professionally marginalized, and still mostly presentist in orientation, it is surprising that composition-rhetoric has become, over the last generation, so self-conscious about its own history.¹ Nonetheless, the evidence is unmistakable: for every graduate seminar on theory, research, or pedagogy offered in our doctoral programs, there's one on history. Scholarly articles and monographs on historical topics proliferate. And historical methodologies are increasingly deployed in increasingly sophisticated ways by scholars in the field, often in the interest of better understanding the discipline itself. Compositionists are now some of the best institutional archivists and oral historians in the academy, and their work has provided us with an incomparably rich understanding of our own past. "Without quite setting out to do so," John Brereton wrote over a decade ago, "historians of composition have created the single most impressive body of knowledge about any discipline in higher education" (xiv).

✓ But if, as a discipline, we display extraordinarily avid interest in and knowledge about our history, the actual narratives we relate often differ radically from one another, so much so that they sometimes seem to leave us in different fields altogether. The divergence is especially acute, I believe, in how we account for the twentieth-century rise of

composition-rhetoric as an academic field and, in particular, the historical status we grant—or refuse to grant—to the “process revolution” of the 1970s.

Concerning earlier periods, there are fewer discrepancies in the stories we tell. Our professional narratives almost always include, for example, some link to the rhetorics of Greek and Roman antiquity, though they differ markedly in how interesting or useful they find that link. And nearly all recognize the last quarter of the nineteenth century as a key moment in the rise of composition in the North American academy, especially in terms of first-year writing. They may highlight different factors in that rise, but they almost all agree that, by the beginning of the twentieth century, a universally-required freshman course in written composition was in place across U.S. higher education. Unfortunately, according to this narrative, no discipline emerged to intellectually and professionally support the course: there were few or no undergraduate majors in composition; few or no graduate degrees for advanced study or certification; no real scholarly apparatus in terms of academic journals, research monographs, or professional meetings; no widely-shared research questions or methods of inquiry; and little or no intellectual respect from peers inside the academy or the public outside. As Robert Connors once put it, “Writing was the most often taught of college subjects and by a great measure the least examined” (*Composition-Rhetoric* 15). This asymmetrical situation—a central, foundational, universally-required course unaccompanied by a discipline of study—persisted, according to the stories we generally tell ourselves, for more than half a century.

Until, that is, the end of World War II. Sometime between then and 1990, a host of graduate programs, scholarly journals, and professional organizations dedicated to composition-rhetoric studies emerged in North American higher education.² Despite the continued complaints raised against it, the freshman course itself persisted and grew during this period; but now undergirding it was a bona fide academic discipline, increasingly autonomous from other fields and capable not only of supervising, growing, and questioning that course but of sponsoring full and independent curricula at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, rich and seemingly limitless research projects, and dedicated academic careers of every rank and tenure.³ By the end of this period, “comp-rhet” boasted book series, endowed chairs, grant programs, research centers, and radically enhanced intellectual and professional self-confidence. Most crucially of all, it had become epistemically self-regulating, no longer beholden to either “social fiat” (Connors, *Composition-Rhetoric* 7) or classroom “lore” (North 23). It could now ground its projects in open-ended research, using its own theories, methodologies, and debates, propagated by scholar-practitioners whose work in the field was their life’s vocation.⁴

Perhaps the key historical development in all this was the rise of the “comp-rhet” Ph.D. The field granted no advanced degrees—in fact sponsored no real curricular presence apart from the freshman course—during the entire period from 1865 to 1945, with the exception of twenty-three doctorates produced under Fred Newton Scott at Michigan early in the twentieth century (Connors, “Composition History” 411). Yet by the early 1990s, there were more than 1,200 comp-rhet doctoral students in the United States, studying in seventy-two different graduate programs, together granting more than a hundred PhDs a year (Connors, “Composition History” 418).⁵ And even that number was apparently insufficient to meet the demands of the academic job market. According to Connors, one out of every seven jobs advertised in the 1989 MLA Job Information List (JIL) was an entry-level, tenure-track position in comp-rhet (“Composition History” 419). Other estimates have put the proportion even higher: Gail Stygall has claimed that more than one-fourth of MLA jobs in recent years have been in composition-rhetoric (380). And the MLA itself reports that as many as a third of the 1,500 postsecondary English Language and Literature positions advertised every year in the United States use “composition and rhetoric” as a search term, more than for any other term, including both “British” and “American literature” (Laurence, Lusin, and Olsen table 6). Given these numbers, Stygall claims that the field is still in fact *underproducing* PhDs (382).

By the end of the twentieth century, in other words, using the doctorate as the key marker of academic status, a discipline had been born. It’s easy, of course, to overstate the importance of this development—not everyone has benefited from the “rise” of the discipline, and even if they had, no discipline can claim to be an unqualified good, given the role that universities continue to play in socioeconomic stratification, for example. And there’s still disparagement, ignorance, and marginalization of composition-rhetoric by others. But it’s hard to deny that there has been, over the past half century, a rise in our professional status, growth in the academic resources available to us, and an increase in our intellectual depth, breadth, and rigor. The change in fortunes is remarkable and, in many ways, still quite recent.

What happened? Exactly when, how, and why did composition-rhetoric emerge as a discipline in the postwar North American academy? How did it get from 1945, when “the field” was essentially a single course—textbook-driven, disparaged by its own professors, subordinate to the content areas, and unattached to a scholarly enterprise—to the 1980s and 1990s when hundreds of new comp-rhet PhDs every year had their pick of tenure-track academic jobs in North American colleges and universities?

Most stories that try to answer that question begin in 1949 with the creation of the Conference on College Composition and Communication

(CCCC), the first national academic organization dedicated to the post-secondary teaching of writing. "4Cs" is key here: for all our fragmentation, our multiple allegiances, our diverse professional and intellectual identities, it makes us a field as nothing else does. Now more than 6,000 members strong, it is, in many ways, the discipline of composition-rhetoric; and its founding was a crucial episode in our emergence.⁶

But if composition was finally professionalized during the 1940s and '50s, if CCCC made possible for the first time a national network of meetings and journals for postsecondary teachers of writing, by the late 1950s, an autonomous scholarly community had yet to emerge behind the freshman course, grounding its methods, testing its theories, and supplying it with dedicated scholars and researchers. As Maureen Daly Goggin has put it, 4Cs in the 1950s was growing but still not disciplinary ("Disciplinary Instability" 36-7). Robert Connors has described the 1950s similarly as the field's second "failed attempt at disciplinarity" (the first being the 1890s) ("Composition History" 409; "Introduction" xv-xvi). After all, most compositionists at that time were still first and foremost something else—professors of literature, for example, who identified themselves primarily with other intellectual projects, however much time and energy they devoted to the course. And those faculty had still not, by the late 1950s, dislodged the prewar model of composition pedagogy, what we usually refer to now as the "current-traditional" paradigm. Clearly, CCCC was necessary but not sufficient to alter this situation. Something else had to happen between 1945 and 1990 for a discipline to emerge. And here the stories we tell ourselves diverge, I believe, in an interesting way.

In one story, the key event in the field's emergence occurred "around 1963," when composition teachers finally adopted a theoretical rather than a pedagogical attitude towards written discourse, attaching themselves to an international, interdisciplinary "turn" in the humanities and social sciences towards the validation and study of ordinary human language, informal practical reasoning, and everyday socio-cultural activity, in part as a reaction to the academy's search for certainty and disparagement of "common sense," both of which had been dramatically invalidated by the global events of the 1930s and '40s. In English Departments, the turn re-awakened compositionists to their ancient roots in rhetoric, providing them with a powerful and attractive alternative to "current-traditionalism" and, more importantly, a compelling intellectual vision capable of transcending the freshman course, generating research projects of wide scope and manifest value, and motivating full academic careers that were as rich and rewarding as those in any other field.

In the other story, the rhetoric revival of the late 1950s and early 1960s may have been noteworthy, but it didn't create a discipline. It failed to

supplant the old pedagogical paradigm, and it wasn't flexible enough conceptually to sponsor an autonomous research field and motivate careers dedicated to composition-rhetoric itself. For that, the profession would have to wait until "around 1971," when the "process revolution" provided teachers with a new focus on individual students and their actual composing processes, and new kinds of writing classrooms promised personal growth, intellectual discovery, and social change. The process revolution also supplied the young profession with a new, seemingly limitless research agenda, focused on writing as both noun and verb, for both adult and developmental contexts, and an exciting new public identity, centered on literacy as individual and social goal.

Now, at first glance, it might seem like these stories simply constitute successive chapters in a single narrative about comp-rhet's twentieth-century emergence in the North American university. Any discrepancy between them, on this view, would come from their occurrence in different (but contiguous) historical periods or their separate (but commensurate) intellectual lineages or their distinct (but compatible) professional emphases. I will myself argue below for connecting the rhetoric revival and the process revolution more deeply than we usually do. But given how the two stories have actually been used over the last generation, I can't help but read them as conflicting explanations of how we came to be as a discipline in the late twentieth century. Why, for example, have the two narratives so rarely intersected when deployed by leading figures in the field? Why did celebrants of the rhetoric revival of the 1950s and '60s often fail to even mention the rhetoric revival of the 1950s and '60s? And why did champions of the "new rhetoric" in the 1990s seem to go out of their way to ignore the process revolution, sometimes skipping the 1970s altogether in their histories and anthologies? If the two stories are consecutive chapters in a single narrative, why have they so often appeared as ships passing in the night? Is it possible that they offer not just distinct but competing accounts of the origin, purpose, status, and scope of modern composition-rhetoric? What can we learn about ourselves by interrogating these stories and their role in our disciplinary formation?

In trying to answer those questions, I'll begin with the process revolution of the 1970s because its narrative, I believe, settled first in our self-consciousness.

Around 1971: The Process Revolution

While composition-rhetoric was profoundly changed during the postwar years by the GI Bill, the General Education movement, the founding of CCCC, and the professional growth of the 1950s and 1960s, it was the 1970s when the field really came into its own intellectually, epistemologically, and pedagogically—at least according to our single most

widely shared disciplinary narrative. That emergence, we tell ourselves, was the result of a dramatic turn, in both our teaching and our research, away from written products and toward writing processes. The turn was famously announced in a 1982 article by Maxine Hairston, who called it a "paradigm shift." She argued that the shift began in the mid-1950s with Chomsky's Syntactic Structures and picked up steam in the 1960s with the work of Francis Christensen and the 1966 Dartmouth Conference. But the immediate cause for the change, Hairston argued, was a crisis in the old product-oriented paradigm of composition pedagogy, a crisis that was felt most acutely in U.S. higher education only after 1970, with the advent of "open admissions policies, the return to school of veterans and other groups of older students who are less docile and rule-bound than traditional freshmen, the national decline in conventional verbal skills, and the ever larger number of high school graduates going on to college as our society demands more and more credentials for economic citizenship" (82). Throw into that mix the untrained teachers who were still teaching compositions at most institutions, in programs still administered by untrained faculty members, and you had the makings of a genuine educational crisis.

The flashpoint for all this, wrote Hairston, was the institution of open enrollment at City College in New York City in 1970 and the impetus this provided scholar-teacher Mina Shaughnessy to publicly register for the field the "shock" of the new non-traditional students and their writing (83). Instead of despairing or merely repeating the old pieties, Shaughnessy looked at how those students actually wrote, with all the "errors" this entailed, and attempted thereby to understand the logic involved in that activity. Other researchers, such as Janet Emig, James Britton, Linda Flower, and John R. Hayes, also began to shine a newly descriptive light onto students' actual writing processes, according to Hairston.

In addition to new research on students' composing processes, new pedagogies oriented to the process of writing arose and spread quickly—encouraged by the work of Donald Murray, Peter Elbow, the teachers of the Bay Area Writing Project, and others. By the end of the decade, wrote Hairston, a new paradigm had been established, whose principal features were as follows:

1. It focuses on the writing process, and instructors are to intervene in that process.
2. It teaches strategies for invention and discovery, and instructors help students to generate content and discover purpose.
3. It is rhetorically based, with audience, purpose, and occasion figuring prominently in the writing assignment.

4. Instructors evaluate the written product by how well it fulfills the writer's intention and meets the audience's needs.
5. It views writing as a recursive rather than a linear process, with pre-writing, writing, and revision seen to be activities that overlap and intertwine.
6. It is holistic, viewing writing as an activity that involves the intuitive and non-rational as well as the rational faculties.
7. It emphasizes that writing is a way of learning and developing as well as a communication skill.
8. It includes a variety of writing modes, expressive as well as expository.
9. It is informed by other disciplines, especially cognitive psychology, linguistics, and related research into the composing process.
10. It stresses the principle that writing teachers should be people who write. (86)

The story of the triumph of this paradigm over current-traditionalism is still, for many teachers and scholars, the founding myth of our discipline.

If Hairston gave the "process revolution" its most memorable articulation, it has shown up in other accounts as well. Perhaps the most historically self-conscious has come from Martin Nystrand and his colleagues at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Nystrand's version of the process myth puts less emphasis than Hairston's does on changes in the population of student writers and the development of new teaching practices and more on transformations in institutional contexts and intellectual foci, especially as regards the interdisciplinary, federally-funded research culture of mid-twentieth-century North American educational psychology and psycholinguistics. From this point of view, the main impetus for the new writing studies was the Cambridge Cognitive Revolution of the 1950s and '60s.

Despite this key difference with Hairston, Nystrand also ends up in the early 1970s with the shift towards process that occurred in the study and teaching of language. Instead of looking to the institution of open enrollment at CUNY and the effect that it had on Mina Shaughnessy, however, he focuses on the 1971 publication of two ground-breaking research monographs, both coming out of the Harvard-MIT axis of the 1950s and '60s: Janet Emig's *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders* and Frank Smith's *Understanding Reading*. The two studies were alike founded on the assumption that individual language users are active and creative meaning makers; and the two authors were equally adept at applying that insight to education: "[E]ach argued that effective reform required neither new curricula nor novel instructional tech-

niques, but rather a fundamentally new conceptualization of the nature of literacy instruction, emphasizing learning rather than teaching" (Nystrand 124). The combined efforts of Emig and Smith in the early 1970s, according to Nystrand, amounted to nothing less than a redefinition of reading and writing for North American schooling.

In Emig's case, however, that redefinition depended on the existence of a community of writing scholars and researchers who could take up her challenge, something which did not fully emerge in this country until the 1970s, after government support for education had grown as it did in the 1960s—after funding increased, the number and diversity of students skyrocketed, and educational research itself expanded. Process also needed, according to Nystrand, the ideological shift provided by the anti-war and civil rights movements, on the one hand, and the new educational philosophy (critical of convention, oriented to individual freedom and personal growth), on the other.

Sharon Crowley also identified the early 1970s as the key period in composition's disciplinary formation. In a frequently-cited paper from 1993, the same year that Nystrand, Greene, and Wiemelt published their influential article on the history of writing studies, she rejected Hairston's talk of a "paradigm shift" in the field, arguing that current-traditionalism remained dominant in our teaching, at least as evidenced in the textbooks still so central to writing instruction. However, Crowley acknowledged that there had been a significant change in the field, which she dated, as did Hairston and Nystrand, to "around 1971." It was then, says Crowley, that compositionists really began, as a group, to focus on students and, in particular, to pay attention to their invention processes rather than their finished products (70). These new foci were associated with new classroom strategies—pre-writing, free-writing, drafting, collaborative writing, peer review, deferred grading, and portfolios—that changed the way writing was taught in this country. But more was going on than pedagogical reform. According to Crowley, around 1971 writing teachers began to see themselves as members of a discipline organized around a subject matter—the composing process—that was rich and important enough to sustain full and rewarding scholarly careers in research, instruction, and program development.

One aspect of these stories needs to be stressed: from the point of view of both its advocates and its chroniclers, the 1970s-era "process" movement was never just a teaching method and never just applicable to a single course. Evident in the summaries of Hairston, Nystrand, and Crowley above, the process revolution was about the establishment of a new educational dispensation in U.S. schools; but it was also about the arrival of a whole new field of academic inquiry and a completely new professional identity for writing experts and teachers. As Nystrand,

Greene, and Wiemelt put it, compositionists during this time fundamentally reconceptualized reading and writing, turning them into "dynamic processes of constructing meaning," in which "language orders and gives shape and thus meaning to experience" (285). For Crowley, too, process created a whole new research field. Even Hairston, who is in some senses the most teacherly of the bunch, casts the new paradigm in primarily theoretical terms; most of the features in her list above are about the ways the field views writing, how we think about it, not just how we teach it.

To dramatic changes in teaching, then, we need to add significant developments in research and theory. And we also need to consider changes in the third leg of the disciplinary stool, service: how compositionists sustained and publicized a picture of themselves as useful to others and worthy of their resources. From this point of view, the "revolution" gave composition a whole new social mission, a professional project more ambitious and attractive than any it had assumed before. Nothing prior to 1971, nothing since the decline of rhetorical education in the early modern era, comes close to the power and ubiquity of that new self-image. No longer would we be merely paper markers, experts in finished prose, assigners and arbiters of the pseudo-transactional writing of the classroom (Petraglia). We would now be sponsors of written meaning-making, concerned above all else with our students' discovery of themselves and the world around them through literacy, of individual growth and social betterment via written composition. Process not only changed the way we think about and teach our "subject," it made our work a vocation worthy of full-time, lifelong, academic careers.

The process revolution of the 1970s, in other words, supplied Freshman Composition with a powerful new teaching method; but, more importantly, it created the discipline of composition-rhetoric itself, taking what was a community of teachers organized around a single course and providing it with a whole new way of thinking about language and literacy that was

1. focused insistently on the writer,
2. relentlessly oriented to the discovery and creation of meaning,
3. concerned primarily with development and thus with schooling, and
4. adamantly non-conventional, democratic, even utopian, in its politics.

By the early 1980s, the sense that a discipline-forming change had occurred in the field was widespread, and it was manifest in a common narrative about when the change began: the early 1970s; what caused

the change: a shift in focus from writing products to writing processes; and what that shift meant for teaching, research, and service: full-scale disciplinarity.

Around 1963: The Rhetoric Revival

It always struck me as odd, then, that when I was in graduate school in the early 1990s, many of us in that generation of scholar-teachers found ourselves running away from process and the disciplinary narratives that featured it. From our point of view, the paradigm that Hairston described in 1982 was just the latest iteration in the modern truncation of rhetoric from an ancient, technically precise, and conceptually rich discipline, concerned broadly with the symbolic underpinnings of human society itself, to composition, a mere school subject (Goggin, "Disciplinary Instability"). Even more curious, we didn't just belittle the intellectual status of "process"; we denied it a role in the history of the field. If a discipline of writing studies had emerged in the North American academy during the second half of the twentieth century, we told ourselves, it wasn't because of a pedagogical shift during the 1970s from product to process; it was because the field had finally reconnected during the 1950s and '60s with the wider, deeper, more attractive, and more interesting path of rhetoric, a reconnection that had been temporarily obscured by "process" but was now (in the 1980s and '90s) being reasserted.

Some of my own dissatisfaction with 1970s-era composition may have been a function of the particular PhD program I was in, Carnegie Mellon, the particular time I was a student there, the early 1990s, and the constellation of theory and methodology which we imbibed in that time and place. That constellation always seemed to leave pedagogical matters subsequent, secondary, and subordinate to the creation and testing of general, abstract, disciplinary knowledge. But, in fact, I believe that, by the late 1980s and early 1990s, a concerted effort was underway across the field to replace the myth of process with a myth about rhetoric. If the field wanted to be taken seriously in the modern academy, this thinking went, it needed to reject classroom method as its professional basis. In Maureen Daly Goggin's groundbreaking work on the post-World War II history of the discipline, conducted mostly in the 1990s, for example, "composition" was figured as a pedagogical enterprise, and "rhetoric," the more "interconnected system," incorporating theory, practice, and product, as well as pedagogy, and thus better able to sponsor an autonomous intellectual discipline ("Disciplinary Instability").

To drive this point home, a canon of great thinkers and foundational texts was formed to encapsulate rhetorical theory for the young field. First on the list, of course, were the old masters—Plato, Cicero, and,

above all, Aristotle. But more important for twentieth-century composition were the "new" rhetoricians of the mid-twentieth-century rhetoric revival, who were seen as having updated ancient theory for modern use. The late 1980s and early 1990s, in fact, can be seen as the moment when these "new rhetorics" were formally enlisted by scholars in the field to tell a story about the rebirth of rhetoric in the U.S. academy. In the early 1990s, for example, three anthologies appeared which offered tangible proof that an alternative history of the field's emergence was now available, a history that had nothing to do with writing processes or pedagogies. These were Bizzell and Herzberg's *The Rhetorical Tradition* (especially its Part Five: Twentieth-Century Rhetoric), Foss, Foss, and Trapp's *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric*, and Enos and Brown's *Professing the New Rhetorics: A Sourcebook*. These works overlap significantly in how they portray the rhetoric revival. Although nine authors show up in only one of the anthologies (Roland Barthes, Wayne Booth, Helene Cixous, Jacques Derrida, Henry Louis Gates, Jr., Julia Kristeva, Richard McKeon, Michael Polanyi, and Ferdinand de Saussure), three show up in two (Mikhail Bakhtin, Ernesto Grassi, and Jürgen Habermas), and six show up in all three: Kenneth Burke, Michel Foucault, Chaim Perelman, I.A. Richards, Stephen Toulmin, and Richard Weaver. We might take these six, in fact, as the theoretical heart of the mid-century rhetoric revival.

It is a very different canon from that championed by Hairston, Nystrand, and Crowley, whose heroes were Janet Emig, Mina Shaughnessy, Donald Murray, Peter Elbow, Kenneth Bruffee, and a host of others. If we take the full list of 18 "new rhetoricians" from above, we can see immediately that they are far more international than the "new compositionists" (only 5 of 18 are American). They're decidedly more male (16 of 18 compared to many more women among the new compositionists), and they represent a different interdisciplinary configuration (including literature, speech, philosophy, politics, and law, rather than education, psychology, and linguistics). Finally, they're less focused on writing per se, and they're less interested in developmental and pedagogical projects.

Most obvious of all, they come from a different era, the 1950s and '60s, rather than the 1970s (seemingly contiguous periods divided in fact by the gulf of the late 1960s). Most of the new rhetoricians listed above are, in fact, now dead (13 of 18), while most of the new compositionists are still active. And if, as we saw above, the process revolution can be dated with some consensus to "around 1971," dates for the rhetoric revival cluster around the late 1950s and early 1960s. The key year for Toulmin and Perelman, for example, at least in terms of their most influential work for composition-rhetoric, was 1958, when Toulmin's *The Uses of Argument* and Perelman's *La Nouvelle Rhétorique*

(co-authored with Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca) were published. The timing is significant here because Toulmin and Perelman were both part of a post-war intellectual reaction to the ideological extremism of the first half of the twentieth century, with its deadly search for order. Both advocated a re-casting of human reason in juridical rather than mathematical terms, that is, as an ordinary, practical, situated, discursive activity. And both proposed a neo-Aristotelian art of everyday argument for use where logics of the necessary, compelling, and certain were inapplicable: a new rhetoric (or dialectic), "founded on opinion," as Perelman put it, "concerned with contingent realities" (154), addressed by an "orator" to an "audience of listeners or readers," and aimed "at obtaining or reinforcing the adherence of the audience" to his or her thesis (154). Like Burke, who thought that the answer to social conflict was to edify, not deny, humans' competitive impulses, Perelman and Toulmin sought ways to channel social conflict through argument so that it wouldn't spill over into violence.

If the international turn to rhetoric was in full swing by 1958, the revival of rhetoric in North American English Departments is usually dated to around 1963, "the fulcrum year" Connors calls it (*Composition-Rhetoric* 202), when a memorable session on "the new rhetoric" was held at 4Cs (see also Connors, "Introduction" xvii; Connors, Ede, and Lunsford 10; Corbett, "Teaching"; Nelms and Goggin 15; Rice; Smit 3; and Young and Goggin 22). That was also a big year, according to James Berlin, for research and scholarship in English Studies, which surged after Sputnik. Published in 1963, for example, were Richard Braddock, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer's groundbreaking *Research on Written Composition* and Albert Kitzhaber's empirical study of freshman writing at Dartmouth, *Themes, Theories, and Therapy*, which together announced a research, rather than pedagogical, basis for the composition course (North 15). But it's rhetoric, not research, that seems to have really captured the imagination of compositionists during this period, from Dan Fogerty's *Roots of a New Rhetoric* in 1959 and Wayne Booth's influential *Rhetoric of Fiction* in 1961 to Edward P. J. Corbett's equally influential *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student* in 1965. "Rhetoric is the word" Robert Gorrell wrote in 1965 (qtd. in Connors, *Composition-Rhetoric* 207). In fact, for some scholars, 1965 is the year when composition-rhetoric finally emerged as a discipline (see, for example, Goggin, *Authoring a Discipline* 75, where it is a key historical boundary for the field).

Regardless of whether we date the change to 1958, 1963, or 1965, it's clear that something happened in English Departments at mid-century, and happened rather quickly (on the suddenness of rhetoric's triumph, see Connors, "Introduction" xvi-xviii). This something looked, for a time at least, like it might finally liberate composition from current-

traditionalism and win respect from other academics. Why was rhetoric so attractive to so many at this time? Because it gave the field a theoretical system rather than just formal mechanics and pedagogical lore on which to base its projects. In fact, the word "system" shows up often in accounts of the mid-century rhetoric revival. Nelms and Goggin, for example, write that classical rhetoric provided compositionists with a "comprehensive ... system," "a practical system," informed by theory and "immediately applicable to the teaching of writing" (18). Such assessments echo Corbett, who had written in 1967 that rhetoric gave the field "a unified, coherent, completed system" ("A New Look" 64) and James McCrimmon, who argued two years later that "the first thing the new rhetorics can do for us is to encourage a more systematic approach to the teaching of composition" (124). Rhetoric was key for mid-century compositionists, and their later chroniclers, because of its intellectual pedigree, its technical specificity, and its conceptual richness, all of which current-traditionalism seemed to lack.⁷

Alas, as I'll argue below, the rhetoric revival was apparently over rather quickly. The late 1960s constituted a cultural, intellectual, and institutional divide which the new rhetorics could not get over, and what emerged on the other side, the process paradigm, seemed to come out of an entirely different world from that which produced Wayne Booth and Edward Corbett. In fact, when the mid-century "new rhetorics" were finally canonized in the late 1980s and 1990s, they no longer looked like they did in the 1950s and 1960s. The figures most anthologized in our sample of early 1990s readers—Burke, Foucault, Perelman, Richards, Toulmin, and Weaver—represented only one part of the actual rhetoric revival. McCrimmon claimed in 1969, for example, that the most important documents of the "new rhetoric" were the works of Richards and Burke (he doesn't even mention the other four); but he also celebrates developments, like Kenneth Pike's tagmemics and Francis Christensen's generative rhetoric of the sentence, which were nowhere to be seen in the 1990s version of the rhetoric revival. Between 1969 and 1989, the "new rhetoric" lost its linguistic and psychological "content."⁸

Also unfaithful to the 1950s and 1960s, when rhetoric had a pronounced educational orientation, was the apparent pedagogical innocence of 1990s rhetorical theory. As Jeff Rice has shown, Corbett's classical rhetoric was all about giving students "careful, systematized guidance at every step in the writing process" (58), and Booth's rhetorical stance was "a plea for classical rhetorical instruction: know all available arguments, know one's audience, construct proper voice, and establish speaker ethos" (58). In fact, the achievement of 1963, for Rice, was precisely this installation of "a specific kind of educational apparatus through the reinstatement of classical rhetoric" (58).⁹

However unfaithful to the original "rhetoric revival," scholars in the 1980s and 1990s were clearly trying to supply composition with an alternative history to the process revolution. The field was encouraged to move beyond its "narrow presentism" (Connors, "Composition History" 409) and expand its purview beyond Freshman Composition in order to see itself as a bona fide intellectual discipline. At the heart of this enterprise would be rhetoric, a new (old) way of thinking about human symbolic action that was

1. focused on audience and context, and thus inescapably sociological,
2. oriented to the justification and establishment of meaning,
3. concerned with politics and law and thus with persuasion and oratory, and
4. imbued with a conventional republican, even tragic politics.

Although very different from the process revolution, the rhetoric revival was thought by its celebrants to have had the same practical effect on the field. It supplanted current-traditionalism, put Freshman Composition in its place, motivated a rich research enterprise, and offered the field an attractive social mission: to help develop in the general public an insistently critical, linguistically self-conscious, inherently rhetorical sensibility about social life.

Competing Narratives

We have before us, then, two very different stories concerning the disciplinary emergence of composition-rhetoric in the modern North American university, two answers to the questions, when and how did we arrive as a bona fide academic field? Now, one explanation for this discrepancy is that composition-rhetoric is really two disciplines—one of which we should call "composition," the other "rhetoric"—with distinct origins, methods, and goals. Their union, from this point of view, is superficial, an accident of U.S. academic history; and the negative effects of that accident—the tensions arising from our divergent interests, ideologies, and projects—suggest that we should stop trying to paper over our intellectual and professional differences with a hyphen and go our separate ways.

The problem with this argument is that so many of us are involved without apparent schizophrenia in both projects. We move back and forth between the paradigms (if we even recognize them as separate) and are able to map the key terms of one onto the other without undue cognitive dissonance (composition's "process," for example, slides easily into rhetoric's "invention").¹⁰ From this point of view, the new rhetorics of

the 1950s and 1960s and the process revolution of the 1970s were simply different stops on the same journey, successive chapters in the same narrative. Conceptually speaking, they represent two sides of the same coin, distinct but overlapping areas within a single discipline.

But why then have the two histories intersected so rarely when we talk about our field? Why have apologists of one seemed to go out of their way to ignore the other? Why did Maxine Hairston and Martin Nystrand in their histories of "process" ignore so utterly the new rhetorics of the 1950s and '60s? And why did Patricia Bizzell, Bruce Herzberg, Theresa Enos, and Stuart Brown in their "new rhetorics" of the 1990s exclude so extravagantly the process revolution of the 1970s? All four anthologists, after all, were working in English Departments and professionally connected in one way or another with first-year writing. Perhaps they had simply learned to compartmentalize the field as it grew larger and more internally differentiated? But why, then, in *The Rhetorical Tradition*, did Bizzell and Herzberg include an entire section on "the rhetoric of composition," with Alexander Bain and Adams Sherman Hill, but then completely exclude the single most important development in the entire history of composition studies—the process revolution—from their chapter on the twentieth century?

Is it possible that the silence about 1970s-era "process" among celebrants of the "new rhetorics" reflects a profound anxiety about that movement within the field? Rather than simply offering "rhetoric" as another theoretical model for composition, is it possible that they were trying to supplant process as the central paradigm of the field, attempting, in effect, to re-write history so that process would be seen as a minor pedagogical movement of the 1970s and the new rhetorics of the 1950s and '60s, the real intellectual basis of the field? However we answer those questions, we clearly need something more nuanced between saying that the two stories mark an unbridgeable divide and arguing that the differences between them are trivial. The first position fails to acknowledge the genuinely hyphenated nature of our discipline and the sense among so many of us that we remain a single field no matter how variegated our parts or pronounced our disagreements. The second fails to acknowledge the definitive rupture in our history that occurred between the rhetoric revival and the process revolution, a rupture that can be dated, I believe to "around 1969."

Learning to Love the 1970s

Anxiety about process is understandable when we consider, first, massive and continuing influence on the field and, second, its continuing contribution to our anomalous status within the academy. talk about the first of these here and the second in the next section

As I argued above, whatever gains composition-rhetoric made as a discipline during the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s through professionalization, the expansion of educational research, and the revival of rhetorical theory, they were insufficient to carry it across the cultural, economic, and social divide of the late 1960s and early 1970s. First-year composition itself survived that divide, though not without turmoil. Afterwards, a very different paradigm emerged beneath it, focused on students' writing processes, and it was that paradigm which carried the field into full disciplinarity in the late 1970s and early 1980s. It was process that finally revolutionized our teaching, making our work something more attractive and valuable than error-hunting; it was process that finally motivated a bona fide and open-ended research enterprise, with tenure-track jobs and a full scholarly apparatus; and it was process, ironically, that gave compositionists in the 1980s and 1990s the confidence to look back to the rhetoric revival of the 1950s and 1960s and see there the "real" intellectual origins of the discipline.

Like it or not, composition-rhetoric remains primarily an educational discipline, focused on the teaching of writing; and the teaching of writing in this country is nearly everywhere officially, if not actually, process-based. This is not to deny that scholar-practitioners in the field do many things that aren't on their surface about the teaching of writing, or that in our teaching many of us work in theoretical domains distinct from, even opposed to, process. But I believe that our identity as a discipline is still, twenty-five years after Hairston and thirty-five years after Emig and Shaughnessy, based on the central tenets of process: the focus on writers and their writing, the interest in meaning-making, the concern with students' development over time, and the democratic, even utopian, politics that all this implies. Theoretical projects since the 1970s, including critiques of this very paradigm, have not, I believe, dislodged it as our basic professional posture. Rather, they perch on top of process, modifying, interrogating, and supplementing it, but never really supplanting it. Whatever our theoretical allegiances, in our dealings with students and the new teachers facing them, we remain through and through process-based.

Nor is this to deny that when one looks at actual schooling, pre-K-16 and beyond, one finds there the stubborn persistence of current-traditionalism, gross distortions of process, and other signs of a gap between "paradigm" and "practice." Rich Lane has marshaled evidence to show, for example, that contemporary secondary English education is still mired, half a century after the rhetorical, pragmatic, and postmodern "turns," in chronological, nationalistic, and literary-aesthetic content. The influence of the discipline has clearly been uneven.

But I am talking here, after all, about the discipline, its constitutive values and beliefs, and its official positions. From that point of view,

process is king. And it is a "process" that, in its overall outlines and most of its particulars, is virtually indistinguishable from the "new composition" of the early- and mid-1970s. Notice, for example, the way both editions of Victor Villanueva's influential anthology *Cross Talk in Comp Theory* (the first in 1997, the second in 2003) begin with Donald Murray's 1972 article "Teach Writing as a Process not Product." On re-reading that short piece, it's obvious why Villanueva chose to open his volume (and, by extension, the discipline itself) with it: because Murray's plea for process articulates better than anything else could "The 'Given' in Our Conversations," as Villanueva calls the first section of his anthology. In effect, it announces composition-rhetoric as a moral project; and it still provides, 35 years later, a compelling image of who we are and what we do. In fact, in many ways, Murray is more radical here than we are, despite our historical distance from him and our greater theoretical and ideological sophistication:

1. The text of the writing course is the student's own writing.
2. The student finds his own subject.
3. The student uses his own language.
4. The student should have the opportunity to write all the drafts necessary for him to discover what he has to say on this particular subject.
5. The student is encouraged to attempt any form of writing which may help him discover and communicate what he has to say.
6. Mechanics come last.
7. There must be time for the writing process to take place and time for it to end.
8. Papers are examined to see what other choices the writer might make... The student writer is graded on what he has produced at the end of the writing process.
9. The students are individuals who must explore the writing process in their own way.
10. There are no rules, no absolutes, just alternatives... All writing is experimental. (5-6)

We might quibble with one or another of these implications; we might ignore, discard, modify, or add an item or two; we might interrogate the ideology behind the whole group. But it's a humane and honorable list; and, like it or not, the assumptions it reflects remain the starting point for nearly everything we do as a profession. A quick glance at NCTE's "Beliefs about the Teaching of Writing," disseminated in 2004, shows how little we have changed in our core beliefs since Murray. If, as John Trimbur noted in 2003, "the main vehicle and symbol of the process movement" is the writing workshop, "with its repertoire of collaborative

learning, drafting and revising, freewriting, peer response, and so on," then process "remains a defining feature of contemporary writing instruction, even in an era we are starting to call post-process" (17-18).

In fact, Trimbur's solution to one of the professional problems created by process—that it is more difficult now to imagine writing as a subject of study, the focus of an undergraduate major, for example—is not to abandon or "abolish" freshman composition or the process paradigm on which it is based, but to add new and different kinds of educational projects, based on new and different kinds of intellectual paradigms, to it. The very success of process, in other words, makes possible the critiques of process that largely constitute the field today:

[I]t has been precisely the historical and theoretical construction of the first-year course, with all of its debates about literacy, rhetoric, culture, and technology, that has laid the groundwork for a curriculum devoted to the study of writing. The achievements of the first-year course have made an advanced writing curriculum thinkable precisely to the extent that our knowledges of writing are too much for a single course to contain. Quantity turns into quality, and in many respects the work of theorizing and enacting the study of writing is to make transparent and teachable the social relations and bodies of knowledge that now silently underwrite the first-year course—to organize the study of writing as an intellectual resource for undergraduates. (23)

From this point of view, as I suggested above, theoretical and pedagogical developments in the discipline since the 1970s perch on top of the process revolution, dependent on it even as they explicitly and implicitly critique it. To put this another way: process gave compositionists the intellectual, material, and moral resources, ironically, to belittle it, enabling us to fashion a new origin myth for the discipline centered on the rhetoric revival of the 1950s and 1960s.

As it turns out, the actual effects of that revival pale compared to the influence of the process revolution. In a study of freshman composition at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (UW) during the late 1960s, I and my fellow researchers were struck by how little evidence we found for a revival of rhetorical theory in English studies at that time. We combed through minutes from three years of UW English Department committee meetings, dozens of intra-departmental memos, university and departmental reports, and correspondence to and from the department chair and the Freshman English program director. We reviewed twenty-seven articles, many by Freshman English instructors, of the UW Teaching Assistant Association's groundbreaking journal *Critical Teaching*, as well as TA newsletters and reports, course syllabi, dozens of campus and

local newspaper articles, and student petitions. We listened to taped oral history interviews with faculty from the time and conducted our own interviews with former TAs. In none of these manifold sources did we ever come across a single instance of the phrase "new rhetoric." In fact, we encountered very few uses of the word "rhetoric" at all, and those we did find were mostly pejorative, associated with textbook phenomena such as paragraphing techniques and methods of exposition. It's as if compositionists in the late 1960s at this land-grant institution in the Midwestern heartland of comp-rhet were completely innocent of rhetoric, old or new. In fact, current-traditionalism seems to have held sway at UW all the way up to late 1969, when freshman composition there was abruptly abolished. The only alternative ever offered was a critical humanist pedagogy developed by radical TAs that had little in common with either the "new rhetorics" that had supposedly revolutionized composition during the preceding decade or the process paradigm that would sweep the field in just a few years.

Clearly, as we saw above, there were at this time sessions at 4Cs about rhetoric and journal articles touting the new (old) theories. Corbett's textbook, first published in 1965, was enough of a hit, in terms of sales, to warrant a second edition in 1971. However, Crowley's biting comment about the actual influence of classical rhetoric on the field during this period should give us pause: "ancient rhetorics were never a serious competitor to current-traditionalism" (72). Is it possible that we have exaggerated the influence of the rhetoric revival even as we have underestimated the effects of the process revolution?

Take, for example, the field's reception of Stephen Toulmin and Chaïm Perelman, two of the "big six" new rhetoricians of the late 1980s and early 1990s. As we saw earlier, both published groundbreaking "new rhetorics" in 1958. As it turns out, neither *The Uses of Argument* or *The New Rhetoric* had any appreciable influence in comp-rhet until the late 1970s, twenty years after their publication. McCrimmon's 1969 survey of "new rhetorics" in CCC doesn't even mention them. Toulmin's work was essentially unknown in English Departments until 1978, when Charles Kneupper's introduction appeared in CCC. And Chaïm Perelman's *New Rhetoric* was largely unknown among compositionists until 1979, when E. F. Kaelin published an appreciation in *RSQ*. Interestingly, the late 1970s is also when the very concept of "current-traditional rhetoric" was invented by Richard Young (in a 1978 essay), to be used from that point on as the foil against which the new rhetorics would shine, the problem to which they were the theoretical (and disciplinary) solution.¹¹

Given all that, one can't help but wonder if the "rhetoric revival" of the late 1950s and early 1960s was a more modest intellectual movement, at the time, than we have been led to believe. And one can't help but ask: what happened to account for the sudden interest in rhetorical

theory among compositionists that began in the late 1970s and early 1980s? The answer: the process revolution! And here, I think, we need to reverse our usual historical impulse to always push our origins back further and further—from 1979 to 1971 to 1963 to 1958 to 1949. Perhaps we should be looking for our origins a little closer. Why? Because the discipline doesn't really establish itself as a discipline until after the process revolution of the early 1970s had taken root, the key consolidations, expansions, and professionalizations occurring in the mid-to-late 1970s. Obviously, I don't mean by this that composition-rhetoric emerged *ex nihilo* in 1978 or '79. I'm suggesting that we may have overestimated intellectual and professional developments before 1970 and underestimated the momentous changes that occurred after.

We've already seen, for example, that the 1970s witnessed the birth of the very idea of "current-traditionalism," as well as the beginnings of the real influence of new rhetoricians like Toulmin and Perelman. The decade also marks a revival in first-year composition itself, as it enters what must be considered its third great period of expansion in the North American academy, the first two occurring in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the years immediately after the end of World War II. Interestingly, Connors finds no evidence of abolitionist sentiments regarding freshman composition from 1975 all the way to 1990, suggesting a kind of "golden age" for the course ("New Abolitionism" 19). And when Carol Hartzog, in 1984, asked administrators of 44 post-secondary writing programs in the United States the questions "Within the past ten years, have there been major changes in your program?" and, if so, "When did these changes occur?" the peak years reported were, by far, 1978 and 1979 (6).

The 1970s saw changes in other parts of the discipline as well. As Connors shows, this was when the first composition PhDs appeared in America since the 1920s ("Composition History" 411), with the end of the decade witnessing an especially vigorous expansion in graduate programs in composition-rhetoric. This was also the period when a scholarly apparatus for the field finally reached a kind of critical mass: according to Maureen Daly Goggin, of 23 composition-rhetoric journals founded between 1950 and 1990, 14 (or 61%) were founded between 1972 and 1982, 9 of those (40% of the total) between 1975-1980 alone (Authoring a Discipline 36).

What all this suggests to me is that, despite the professional growth of the field during the 1950s, despite the sophistication and importance of the theoretical developments of the early 1960s, despite the early hints of process during those years—the big decade for the field was the 1970s, and the impetus for that was the dramatic changes in teaching, research, and professional identity that we have been indexing with the word "process." I believe in fact that the turbulent years 1967-1970

constituted a kind of wall over which the earlier developments of that decade, including the new rhetorics, could not surmount; it was then that current-traditionalism was invalidated once and for all (at least officially), but there was nothing pedagogically and institutionally powerful enough to take its place. On the other side of that wall, in or around 1971, a new professional paradigm emerged, took root, and within a few years revolutionized—no, created—the field.

By the end of the 1970s, everything was in place for a bona fide academic discipline: an attractive and effective teaching paradigm, a compelling social (even moral) purpose, a community of dedicated intellectuals engaged full-time in that work, shared research problems and methodologies, peer-reviewed journals and books, master's and doctoral programs of study, tenure-track jobs, and expansion beyond freshman composition into writing centers, writing-across-the-curriculum, advanced composition, community literacy, and writing majors. In fact, the changes in the discipline in the three decades since 1979, however striking they might appear, pale compared to the changes that took place in the single decade before 1979. It was during those years, I would argue, that the field came to be; and the impetus for that emergence can be summed up in a single word: process.

Embarrassed

Why, then, did advocates of the new rhetoric in the late 1980s and early 1990s seem to go out of their way to deny the process revolution a place in the discipline's story? Was it because of the directions process seemed to be heading by the early 1980s: toward neo-romantic expressivism, on the one hand, and empirically-driven cognitivism, on the other? Did the combination of the social turn in writing studies, the theory craze in English Departments, and the ideological battles of the Reagan years make process intellectually unattractive at the very time that Hairston was announcing its arrival?

Certainly, it's possible that advocates of the new rhetoric opposed the process paradigm on theoretical grounds. But such opposition fails to account, I believe, for the anxiety that process generated among its detractors, an anxiety that manifest itself not so much in argument as in dismissal, even silence. No, I think many comp-rhet scholars in the 1980s and '90s—I was one of them—saw process as an embarrassment. They saw it as beneath theoretical debate, non-intellectual, a teachers' movement, a wrong turn for the field which, far from announcing and motivating a discipline, actually delayed that discipline's asserting itself in the academy as a bona fide intellectual project.

I have since come to believe that this attitude represents a triple misreading of process. First, it refuses to see process as a genuine theory

of language activity and acquisition, casting it instead as a teaching method tied to a single course, though, as we saw above, process was for its first advocates and remains for its more thoughtful supporters a scholarly and moral as well as a pedagogical project. Second, it fails to acknowledge that the success of the process revolution in the 1970s laid the professional groundwork for the very critique that comp-rhet scholars with PhDs and tenure-track jobs leveled against it in the 1980s and '90s. Third, it fails to see how an intellectual project dedicated not, primarily, to the discovery, testing, and dissemination of knowledge but to the moral, linguistic, and sociocognitive development of children and young adults could be a bona fide academic discipline.

Process suffers, that is, from what Marjorie Curry Woods has called our "academic self-hatred" ("Among Men" 18), our tendency to belittle those parts of our work that take place in classrooms and that involve children and young adults. The disparagement is pervasive and longstanding: Woods shows, for example, how effective the denigration of pedagogy has been in histories of rhetoric such as George Kennedy's, where political speech—oral, persuasive, and civic—is "primary rhetoric"; literature—written, narrative, and personal—is "secondary"; and the historical drift from the first to the second—called by Kennedy *letteraturizzazione*—is always figured as a loss ("Teaching of Writing" 78–80). But disparagement here concerns not just the forms, media, and functions of discourse; it concerns the classroom itself, since the main cause of *letteraturizzazione* for Kennedy is the role that rhetoric has historically played in school, where it is invariably transformed from a virile, outdoorsy practice to an aestheticized, effete simulation. Kennedy participates here in what Woods calls the "post-romantic 'unteachability' topos, which assumes that what is most important about education is what least resembles the classroom" ("Among Men" 18). But he's also perpetuating traditional rhetorical theory's sexism and ageism, since, as Woods shows, his story of disciplinary decline privileges the civic rhetoric of men and demeans the school-bound rhetorics of women and children.

From this point of view, the 1970s process revolution created anxiety in subsequent generations of comp-rhet scholar-practitioners because, for them, it was too closely associated with the classroom and with children and young adults. By contrast, the new rhetoricians were innocent of pedagogy. That's not to say their work hasn't been useful for all kinds of educational projects: clearly, you can read Burke, Perelman, and Toulmin and derive classroom implications from them. But the texts themselves, I would argue, are devoid of developmental insights or even interest. Instead, what you get is theory with a capital T, meant to describe and explain human phenomena—the situated, "real world," authentic practices of adult speakers and writers—that are prior to, independent of,

and superior to the classroom. For many scholars in the 1980s and '90s, that was the kind of project the field needed.

As I've been arguing, though, process was not just a classroom method but a whole new way of thinking about language, human development, and schooling. From the beginning, it was as much an intellectual, theoretical, and moral project as a pedagogical one, and it quickly spread far beyond a single postsecondary writing course. It is true, though, that process, for all its success, has left comp-rhet with a "thinner" intellectual base than most disciplines, and this has probably contributed to its anomalous status in the academy. But that thinness may also be the source of composition's surprising longevity and even potency in North American education, supplying first year writing, for example, with a flexibility that has allowed it to connect with very different kinds of students in very different kinds of spatiotemporal situations. In fact, the "unbearable lightness" of process may be what has allowed us to coalesce professionally, at least to the extent that we do so.

Ironically, in its anti-disciplinary disciplinarity, process may be the real "new rhetoric." After all, classical rhetoric, like "process," was at heart an educational project: it had rich theories, but they were meant primarily to be internalized by children and young adults as part of their linguistic, political, and personal development. Process helps us see more clearly, I believe, the educational bias of the rhetorical tradition. But the new rhetorics have much to teach us as well. From them, we learn to more effectively and responsibly embed process in situation, context, and community, deepening our understanding of our students' places in the world and thinking more productively and responsibly about the purposes and effects of their writing.

When we talk about the emergence of "comp-rhet" as a discipline, however, we need to put rhetoric in its place. And we should recall the abiding lesson of 1970s process, which is to treat each student as a unique and whole person who needs time and support to find his or her voice. It is the lesson that made us who we are.

Notes

1. I take the term "composition-rhetoric" from Connors (*Composition-Rhetoric* 1–22). As a name for the field, it carries liabilities, but I like the inclusion of both words, in that order, with the hyphen connecting them.
2. I've chosen 1990 as a culmination point here: that's when the rhetoric anthologies discussed below began to appear; it's also when, according to Connors, the "new abolitionism" began to rear its head, suggesting that the field was confident enough by that point to openly criticize its central educational project, the first-year writing course ("New Abolitionism" 19).

3. I make no attempt here to formally define "discipline"—a fraught concept, especially after Foucault. But one can readily imagine by that word a community of scholarly-practitioners, located in institutions of higher education, and united by a three-part professional project, including 1) knowledge production and testing, 2) public service, and 3) teaching and certification. This corresponds to Goggin's depiction of disciplines as centered on the "creation, use, and preservation of knowledge" (*Authoring* 8).
4. I use the term "open-ended" both because the lack of prior constraints on inquiry is a key principle in all academic disciplines and because the autonomy implied by the phrase contrasts markedly with the "myth of transience" that has historically hobbled freshman composition: the idea that the course is merely a temporary stopgap until the primary and secondary schools do a better job of teaching writing (Rose; Russell).
5. The data come from Brown, Meyer, and Enos. As for the number of graduate programs, the Consortium of Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition currently has 71 members (June 9, 2008 <http://www.rhetoric.msu.edu/rc_consortium/>).
6. By comparison, both the MLA (with around 30,000 members) and NCTE (with around 60,000) are much larger. We should remember, though, that CCCC is the central professional organization for the most required course in U.S. higher education (Adelman) and, in effect, the international home for the advanced study of writing and writing instruction.
7. As Nelms and Goggin put it, rhetoric provided composition with "a theoretical framework for exploring a wide range of issues ... a set of practical tools for analyzing the consumption and production of various kinds of discourse ... useful heuristics ... for teaching reading and composing of all kinds of writing ... a rich, multilayered resource to mine for a series of intersecting purposes" (19).
8. Connors, for example, defines the "new rhetoric" historically as the "rebirth of classical rhetoric, the development of tagmemic rhetoric, the prewriting movement, sentence combining, the writing-process movement, Christensen rhetoric, and the entire new seriousness of the research strand in composition" ("Composition History" 409). Only the first of these fits comfortably with the later version.
9. In fact, the whole attitude towards classical rhetoric changed between the rhetoric revival of the late 1950s and early 1960s and its later redaction in the 1980s and 1990s. By the later dates, the field seemed much more accepting of an unreconstructed classical tradition. In 1964, Richard Ohmann was writing about the need to *update* classical rhetoric: to make it more about cooperation, mutuality, and harmony. And, as late as 1975, Michael Halloran was still emphasizing the needs for a *new* rhetoric and castigating the limits of the old. But by the 1980s, the focus was more on the compatibility between classical and modern rhetorics: see, for example, Lunsford and Ede.
10. After all, process-oriented scholars like Chris Burnham and Linda Flower have often referred to what they do as a kind of "rhetoric"; and new rheto-

rician Stephen Toulmin is perhaps the most-often cited theorist in contemporary composition textbooks.

11. As has often been reported, Dan Fogerty first used the phrase "current traditional" in his 1959 *Roots of a New Rhetoric*, but it was Young in the late 1970s who "invented" current-traditional rhetoric as that against which the new discipline would define itself intellectually, socially, and pedagogically (see also Matsuda).

References

- Adelman, Clifford. *The New College Course Map and Transcript Files: Changes in Course-Taking and Achievement, 1972–1993*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Education, 1995.
- Berlin, James A. *Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900–1985*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1987.
- Bizzell, Patricia and Bruce Herzberg, eds. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. Boston: Bedford Books, 1990.
- Braddock, Richard, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer. *Research on Written Composition*. Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.
- Brereton, John C. *The Origins of Composition Studies in the American College, 1875–1925: A Documentary History*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1995.
- Brown, Stuart C., Paul R. Meyer, and Theresa Enos, eds. "Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition." *Rhetoric Review* 12.2 (Spring 1994): 237–412.
- Burnham, Christopher. "New Rhetorics." *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition*. Ed. Theresa Enos. New York: Garland, 1996. 461–64.
- Connors, Robert J. "Composition History and Disciplinarity." *History, Reflection, and Narrative: The Professionalization of Composition, 1963–1983*. Eds. Mary Rosner, Beth Boehm, and Debra Journet. Stamford, CT: Ablex, 2000. 3–21. Rept. in *Selected Essays of Robert J. Connors*. Eds. Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin, 2003. 405–422.
- . *Composition-Rhetoric: Backgrounds, Theory, and Pedagogy*. Pittsburgh, PA: U of Pittsburgh, P, 1997.
- . "Introduction." *Selected Essays of Edward P. J. Corbett*. Ed. Robert J. Connors. Dallas, TX: Southern Methodist UP, 1989. xi–xxii.
- . "The New Abolitionism." *Reconceiving Writing, Rethinking Writing Instruction*. Ed. Joseph Petraglia. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1995. 3–26.
- Connors, Robert J., Lisa S. Ede, and Andrea A. Lunsford. "The Revival of Rhetoric in America." *Essays on Classical Rhetoric and Modern Discourse*. Eds. Robert J. Connors, Lisa S. Ede, and Andrea A. Lunsford. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1984. 1–15.
- Corbett, Edward P. J. "A New Look at Old Rhetoric." *Rhetoric: Theories for Application*. Ed. Robert M. Gorrell. NCTE, 1967. Rept. in *Selected Essays of Edward P. J. Corbett*. Ed. Robert J. Connors. Dallas, TX: Southern Methodist UP, 1989. 61–72.

- . "Teaching Composition: Where We've Been and Where We're Going." *CCC* 38 (1977): 444-52.
- Crowley, Sharon. "Around 1971: Current-Traditional Rhetoric and Process Models of Composing." *Composition in the Twenty-First Century: Crisis and Change*. Ed. Lynn Z. Bloom, Donald A. Daiker, and Edward M. White. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1996. 64-74.
- Emig, Janet. *The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders*. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1971.
- Enos, Theresa and Stuart C. Brown, eds. *Defining the New Rhetorics*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1993.
- . *Professing the New Rhetorics: A Sourcebook*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1994.
- Flower, Linda. "Cognitive Rhetoric: Inquiry into the Art of Inquiry." *Defining the New Rhetorics*. Eds. Theresa Enos and Stuart C. Brown. Newbury Park: Sage, 1993. 171-90.
- Foss, Sonja K., Karen A. Foss, and Robert Trapp. *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric*, 2nd ed. Prospect Heights: Waveland P, 1991.
- Goggin, Maureen Daly. *Authoring a Discipline: Scholarly Journals and the Post-World War II Emergence of Rhetoric and Composition*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2000.
- . "The Disciplinary Instability of Composition." *Reconceiving Writing, Rethinking Writing Instruction*. Ed. Joseph Petraglia. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1995. 27-48.
- Hairston, Maxine. "The Winds of Change: Thomas Kuhn and the Revolution in the Teaching of Writing." *CCC* 33.1 (1982): 76-88.
- Halloran, S. Michael. "On the End of Rhetoric, Classical and Modern." *College English* (Feb. 1975). Rpt. in *Professing the New Rhetorics: A Sourcebook*. Eds. Theresa Enos and Stuart C. Brown. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1994. 331-343.
- Hartzog, Carol P. *Composition and the Academy: A Study of Writing Program Administration*. New York: Modern Language Association, 1986.
- Kaelin, E. F. "Perelman and the New Rhetoric." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 9 (1979): 2-6.
- Kitzhaber, Albert. *Themes, Theories, and Therapy: Teaching of Writing in College*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- Kneupper, Charles W. "Teaching Argument: An Introduction to the Toulmin Model." *CCC* 29.3 (1978): 237-41.
- Lane, Rich. "A 'Forgotten' Location: A Rhetorical Curriculum in English Education." *Rhetorical Education in America*. Eds. Cheryl Glenn, Margaret M. Lyday, and Wendy B. Sharer. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2004.
- Laurence, David, Natalia Lusin, and Stephen Olsen. "Report on Trends in the MLA Job Information List, September 2007." New York: Modern Language Association, 2007. June 9, 2008 <http://www.mla.org/pdf/report_on_trends_in_jil_se.pdf> (text of report) and <http://www.mla.org/pdf/tables_and_figures_for_jil.pdf> (tables and figures).
- Lunsford, Andrea A., and Lisa S. Ede. "On Distinctions between Classical and Modern Rhetoric." *Essays on Classical Rhetoric and Modern Discourse*. Eds. Robert J. Connors, Lisa S. Ede, and Andrea A. Lunsford. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1984. Rpt. in *Professing the New Rhetorics: A Sourcebook*. Ed. Theresa Enos and Stuart C. Brown. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1994. 397-411.
- Matsuda, Paul Kei. "Process and Post-Process: A Discursive History." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 12 (2003): 65-83.
- McCrimmon, James M. "Will the New Rhetorics Produce New Emphases in the Composition Class?" *CCC* 20.2 (1969): 124-30.
- Murray, Donald. "Teach Writing as Process not Product." *The Leaflet* (Nov. 1972): 11-14. Rpt. in *Cross Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*. Ed. Victor Villanueva, Jr. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1997. 3-6.
- "NCTE Beliefs about the Teaching of Writing." National Council of the Teachers of English. The Writing Study Group of the NCTE Executive Committee. Nov., 2004. May 25, 2008. <<http://www.ncte.org/about/over/positions/category/write/118876.htm?source=gs>>.
- Nelms, Gerald, and Maureen Daly Goggin. "The Revival of Classical Rhetoric for Modern Composition Studies: A Survey." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 23.3/4 (1993): 11-26.
- North, Stephen N. *The Making of Knowledge in Composition: Portrait of an Emerging Field*. Upper Montclair: Boynton/Cook, 1987.
- Nystrand, Martin. "Janet Emig, Frank Smith, and the New Discourse about Writing and Reading: Or, How Writing and Reading Came to Be Cognitive Processes in 1971." *Towards a Rhetoric of Everyday Life: New Directions in Research on Writing, Text, and Discourse*. Eds. Martin Nystrand and John Duffy. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2003. 121-144.
- Nystrand, Martin, Stuart Greene, and Joseph Wiemelt. "Where Did Composition Studies Come From? An Intellectual History." *Written Communication* 10 (1993): 267-333.
- Ohmann, Richard. "In Lieu of a New Rhetoric." *College English*, October 1964. Rpt. in *Professing the New Rhetorics: A Sourcebook*. Eds. Theresa Enos and Stuart C. Brown. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1994. 298-306.
- Perelman, Chaïm. "The New Rhetoric: A Theory of Practical Reasoning." *Great Ideas Today*. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1970. Rpt. in *Professing the New Rhetorics: A Sourcebook*. Eds. Theresa Enos and Stuart C. Brown. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1994. 145-177.
- Perelman, Chaïm, and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Trans. J. Wilkinson and P. Weaver. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 1969.
- Petraglia, Joseph. "Spinning Like a Kite: A Closer Look at the Pseudotransactional Function of Writing." *Journal of Advanced Composition* 15.1 (1995): 19-33.
- Rice, Jeff. "The 1963 Composition Revolution Will Not Be Televised, Computed, or Demonstrated by Any Other Means of Technology." *Composition Studies* 33.1 (Spring 2005): 55-73.
- Rose, Mike. "The Language of Exclusion: Writing Instruction at the University." *College English* 47.4 (Apr. 1985): 341-359.
- Russell, David R. *Writing in the Academic Disciplines*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1991.

- Smit, David W. *The End of Composition Studies*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004.
- Stygall, Gail. "At the Century's End: The Job Market in Rhetoric and Composition." *Rhetoric Review* 18.2 (Spring 2000): 375-389.
- Trimbur, John. "Changing the Question: Should Writing Be Studied?" *Composition Studies* 31.1 (Spring 2003): 15-24.
- Villanueva, Victor, Jr. *Cross Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*. 2nd ed. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2003.
- . *Cross Talk in Comp Theory: A Reader*. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1997.
- Woods, Marjorie C. "Among Men — Not Boys: Histories of Rhetoric and the Exclusion of Pedagogy." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 22.1 (1992): 18-26.
- . "The Teaching of Writing in Medieval Europe." *A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to Twentieth-Century America*. Ed. James J. Murphy. Davis: Hermagoras P, 1990. 77-94.
- Young, Richard. "Paradigms and Problems: Needed Research in Rhetorical Invention." *Research on Composing: Points of Departure*. Eds. Charles Cooper and Lee Odell. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 1978. 29-47.
- Young, Richard and Maureen Daly Goggin. "Some Issues in Dating the Birth of the New Rhetoric in Departments of English: A Contribution to a Developing Historiography." *Defining the New Rhetorics*. Eds. Theresa Enos and Stuart C. Brown. Newbury Park: Sage, 1993. 22-43.