the changing profession

Global Turns and Cautions in Rhetoric and Composition Studies

WENDY S. HESFORD

IN HER 2003 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS TO THE AMERICAN STUDIES ASSOCIATION, AMY KAPLAN SUGGESTS THAT CURRENT CRISES HAVE "exposed certain limitations of our available tools" (2). Kaplan's address reflects the move beyond the traditionally nationalist concerns of American studies, but her appeal to think more critically about disciplinary identities and methods at this point in our nation's history has wider implications. Alarmed by the "uncanny mirroring" between the lexicon of the champions of empire and that of its critics, Kaplan urges scholars "to do more than expose the imperialistic appropriation of the name America and then turn away from it" (2, 10). Embracing the transnational turn in American studies, Kaplan calls for a comparative historical approach that recognizes the ideological force of "America" and that understands how "America" "changes shape in relation to competing claims to that name and by creating demonic others, drawn in proportions as mythical and monolithic as the idea of America itself" (11).

I invoke the phrase "global turns" in my title not to imply that we live in a postnationalist world but rather to recognize that the source of nationalism's force has shifted. Experiencing a new sense of vulnerability to transnational forces and international terrorism, as Kaplan notes, the United States has embraced a new nationalist discourse, which involves the redefinition and deployment of key terms such as *empire*, *terrorism*, and *homeland*. The atrocities committed at the Abu Ghraib prison, to cite but one chilling example, point toward the power of definition and identification in the name of national security. The Bush administration's refusal to define what has taken place in prisons in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Guantánamo Bay as torture reinforces the United States' image of itself as a victim state, and the administration's reluctance to identify detainees dehumanizes them. When definition and identification fail, violence ensues.[1] Without minimizing the material violence of the current war, I would propose that the conflicts in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Guantánamo Bay are as much definitional battles within political and

WENDY S. HESFORD, associate professor of English at the Ohio State University, Columbus, is the author of *Framing Identities: Autobiography and the Politics of Pedagogy* (U of Minnesota P, 1999) and a coeditor, with Wendy Kozol, of *Haunting Violations: Feminist Criticism and the Crisis of the Real* (U of Illinois P, 2001) and, most recently, *Just Advocacy? Women's Human Rights, Transnational Feminisms, and the Politics of Representation* (Rutgers UP, 2005). She received this year's Florence Howe award for her essay "Kairos and the Geopolitical Rhetorics of Global Sex Work and Video Advocacy," in *Just Advocacy?*

© 2006 BY THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081206X142887 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cultural realms as they are confrontations on warring grounds and in secret prisons.

Scholars in rhetoric and composition studies are meaningfully contributing to conversations about the pressures of globalization and the consequences of the new United States nationalism.[2] The international organization Rhetoricians for Peace, established in 2003 and associated with the National Council of Teachers of English, is dedicated to the critical analysis of public discourses and communications and of "the rhetorical situations in which [they] occur." Focused on fostering peace and social justice through pedagogy and advocacy, Rhetoricians for Peace is a grassroots "media watchdog" with a primary goal of countering misleading or manipulative rhetoric in the public sphere. Among the group's recent projects is "1984 + 20," a worldwide discussion of George Orwell's *1984* that aims to examine how the novel can inform our understanding of current political rhetoric.

An interest in global studies and transnational cultural studies is growing across the intersecting fields of rhetoric and composition.[3] Yet, at the same time, there is evidence of a nostalgic retreat to disciplinary identities and homelands and a resurgent, though not uncritical, localism. My goal in this essay is not to secure a single research paradigm for rhetoric and composition studies or to partake in the policing of disciplinary identities or borders. Rather, I seek to identify the emergent trends in these interlocking fields, paying particular attention to the methodological challenges we face as we turn toward the global. I aim, first, to foster reflection about the possibilities of an imagined global geography in rhetoric and composition studies and, second, to examine the ways in which scholars imperil or safeguard disciplinary identities and methods that take for granted the nation-state and citizen-subject as units of analysis and ignore the global forces shaping individual lives and literate practices. Finally, I argue for greater cross-reading, collaboration, and coalition building across the humanities. We need to consider and to articulate more publicly the role that the humanities can play in providing critical methods and frameworks that work toward more peaceful and just resolutions.

Imagined Geographies

Scholars in rhetoric and composition studies have responded, and importantly so, to the institutional scenes and legacies of globalization, exploring how economic globalization has led to a shift in the university's sense of itself and of its mission. As colleges and universities adopt characteristics of the new global economy, appropriating performance-management strategies, entrepreneurial practices, and corporate multiculturalism, we are also witnessing a renewed nationalism on our campuses and the rising stature of the nation-state as reproducer of culture. Post-9/11 national security policy in the United States has reinvigorated efforts at linguistic and cultural containment, as illustrated by President George W. Bush's 2006 State of the Union address, which called for "orderly and secure borders . . . stronger immigration enforcement and border protection."[4] A citizenry fearful of linguistic and cultural differences and nostalgic for nationalism tends to restrain minority discourses and the viability of alternative cultural citizenship (Young 191).

Morris Young's *Minor Re/Visions: Asian American Literacy Narratives as a Rhetoric of Citizenship*, recipient of this year's CCCC book award, reminds us of the differential conditions and experiences of mobility: travel adventures, immigration, and the restriction of movement because of internment and exclusionary laws.[5] Young, an Asian American born and raised in Hawai'i, draws on personal experiences and artifacts from his youth (report cards, speech-pathology reports) as context for his reading of the literacy history of Hawai'i and public narratives of lit-

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081206X142887 Published online by Cambridge University Press

eracy in the United States. These narratives reify nationalist fantasies of self-reliance and unifying notions of citizenship that draw on a naturalized discourse of Standard English (35). Young seeks not to place identity politics at the center of national politics but to examine how certain identities and literacies define and govern United States citizenship. While autoethnographic methods risk the localism of identity politics and the reification of the researcher as the central subject, Young uses the personal to explicate multiple and often conflicting identity positions, claimed and imposed, and to connect "the individual to political immediacy" (8). Finally, Young's concept of "becoming minor" frames identity and difference as an ongoing process of invention and intervention (13). Despite Young's proposition that becoming minor is "a rhetorical and political act that does not rely on the ostensible categories of difference alone," *Minor Re/Visions* remains grounded in a politics of recognition (192). *Minor Re/Visions* therefore demonstrates our disciplinary and national attachments to identity and suggests how these attachments both encumber and propel national and disciplinary frames of membership and justice.

Post-9/11 nationalism in the United States has reinvigorated ideological critiques of the myth of linguistic homogeneity and the tacit policy of unidirectional English monolingualism (Fox; Matsuda; Trimbur). Pedagogical assumptions about global multiculturalism have come under increased scrutiny, as have tools for addressing diversity in the classroom. For instance, many multicultural first-year writing textbooks and teacher-training materials confirm for the student the intractable otherness of those who differ and position them as objects of cultural consumption (Hesford, Singleton, and García). Similarly, cautious about service-learning initiatives, Nedra Reynolds highlights the dangers of forced volunteerism and "assigned encounters with difference" (134).[6]

Scholars are also looking more closely at the transnational identifications and negotiations of students and teachers (Jarratt, Losh, and Puente; Lam). There is growing interest in multilingual learners (Zamel and Spack) and in multiliteracies and the mediation of cultural practices in a digital age (Selber; Selfe and Hawisher with La Shore and Song; Selfe and Hawisher; Wysocki et al.). Yet concurrent with ideological critique of English monolingualism and with the turn toward the global is a resurgent localism and strategic retreat to disciplinary homelands. In *The End of Composition Studies*, David Smit laments composition's loss of its "center of gravity" in its "turn toward the management of teaching and away from teaching itself" (xi). Critical of English departments' annexation of composition, Susan McLeod calls for a coherently defined research agenda in the field and for disciplinary independence. In his postscript to *Writing on the Margins*, David Bartholomae is apprehensive about the call for writing programs independent of departmental structures (Harris) and of such programs' ability to ensure fair labor practices, intellectual oversight, research support, and good teaching (376).

These imagined geographies for composition are entangled with enrollment-driven management schemes in which departments compete for resources and first-year writing programs help to secure the financial status of departments of English (Farris). Despite composition's ongoing institutional struggles for legitimacy, its capital has mounted, and many have asked at what cost and to what degree its rising status undermines other goals (Crowley; Schell, "Toward"). Marc Bousquet has argued that the success and survival of composition programs and writing program administrators have depended on the continuing failure of the labor struggle—namely, the reduction of the full-time faculty and the increases in adjunct and graduate student labor in the teaching of writing (500). More recently, in *Situating Composition*, Lisa Ede

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081206X142887 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rejects the dichotomized choice that some critics offer between giving up wholly on or relentlessly pursuing efforts to achieve, simultaneously, disciplinary status and academic professionalism (117–18). She argues convincingly that our goal should be not to resurrect a "pure space within which to continue the work of composition" (118) but to identify the contradictory consequences of composition's development as a discipline and the contradictions in which we live and work (75).[7]

In *Geographies of Writing: Inhabiting Places and Encountering Difference*, Nedra Reynolds responds to composition's reliance on imagined geographies in building its empire and in pushing toward disciplinarity (14). Reynolds highlights the preponderance of spatial metaphors in early literature about composition as a discipline, citing Mina Shaughnessy's early use of frontier metaphors in *Errors and Expectations* as exemplary[8] and tracing subsequent scholars' use of geospatial concepts such as "community" (31–32). Despite her critique of composition's imagined geographies, she nevertheless claims that a "geographical rhetoric provides both rich metaphors and particular methodologies for the study of writing, writers, and places" (5). Reynolds proposes the concept of dwelling as a contrast to the traveling theories, border crossings, and other movement metaphors preponderant in postmodernism, which, she argues, do not always account for the importance of inhabitance. Avoiding an uncritical localism and static notions of place, *dwelling* refers to the materiality of "the places we most intimately and frequently occupy" and to the imagined geographies that inform and shape our ways of being in the world (140). Ultimately, Reynolds calls for a spatial methodology that enables writers to account "for their own locatedness" and that recognizes "differences in people's sociospatial worlds and their unequal access to modes of travel" (133, 40). Reynolds therefore holds in productive tension material *localities* and epistemological *locations*.

The contradictory effects of globalization, its polarizing as well as democratizing functions, suggest the need for a critical localism and research methods that recognize the ongoing cultural work of "local" spaces. As we think through the meaning of the global turn for research in rhetoric and composition studies, we must bear in mind that mobility is not an option for many groups and populations and has in fact been forced upon others. As Vorris Nunley reminds us,

> Ethnic enclaves . . . continue to exist in the forgotten purgatories of globalization, which render the local both less important to a privileged few who may choose fluidity at their convenience and more important to disempowered nomads and vagabonds who occupy the local because circumstances dictate that they must. (240–41)

In *African American Rhetoric(s): Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Nunley argues that "[r]hetorical scholarship has undertheorized how spatiality, the politics and poetics of space, mediate rhetorical performances" (222). Nunley focuses on the spatiality of "hush harbor" rhetoric, the rhetoric of covert and quasi-public spaces where "Black folks affirm, share, and negotiate African American epistemologies and resist and subvert hegemonic Whiteness. . . . Enslaved African Americans referred to these spaces as cane breaks, bush arbors, or hush harbors" (222–23). Nunley's goal is not to stabilize romantic or monolithic notions of hush harbors as safe spaces but rather to recognize that as rhetorical spaces, hush harbors are not immune to domination, conflicts, or contradictions. For example, they are not free from "entanglements of power around class, race, and gender" or "traces of hegemonic thinking." As Nunley puts it, "Hush harbor spatialities offer possibilities and containment" (235).

Contemporary hip-hop culture, located in multiple local, national, and transnational spaces, provides "versions of hush harbors

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081206X142887 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where African Americans temporarily escape the disciplining gaze" (234). But like earlier versions, hip-hop culture is a complex, contradictory space that both challenges and mobilizes dominant scripts. In *Check It While I Wreck It: Black Womanhood, Hip-Hop Culture, and the Public Sphere*, Gwendolyn Pough examines how hip-hop culture both "suffers state oppression" and "act[s] as an oppressor" (19, 20). She focuses on how black women's voices in hip-hop "bring wreck" on sexism in hip-hop culture and the misogynistic mainstream. Pough complicates Habermas's concept of spectacle in the public sphere by contrasting blacks' deployment of the spectacle of hip-hop with Habermas's notion of representative publicity—that is, public and prominent self-display by kings and lords, which creates an aura of power and superiority (Pough 21). Pough also acknowledges, however, the limitations of spectacle: "it works only as long as the group attempting to impact the public sphere controls the gaze" (30). Hip-hop culture, including its radical fringe, has been appropriated by an insatiable corporate mainstream and transformed into a tool of the global capitalist market (Tate). Thus, as we move away from the analysis of single, discrete texts to study such transformations, we come to understand that the global turn requires a comparative-historical frame and a broader understanding of culture, text, context, and the public sphere than what traditional rhetorical and ethnographic criticism provides.[9]

Can Ethnography Survive Globality?

Ethnography Unbound, edited by Stephen Gilbert Brown and Sidney I. Dobrin, importantly speaks to the reliance of composition and literacy studies on ethnography as a methodology surviving, though not unchanged by, postmodern theory and questions of authenticity. *Ethnography Unbound* does not address whether ethnographic methods can survive globality, but the collection does set the stage for further consideration of the reciprocity of ethnographic and rhetorical methods and the relation between the local and the global. *Ethnography Unbound* calls for greater sensitivity to power differentials in the research situation, recognition of ethnography as an academic genre and as a mode of genre analysis (Reiff), and the potential value as well as the limits of self-reflexivity and multivocality.

This goal leads Bruce Horner (same volume) to contemplate the professional push in ethnographic studies toward the creation of multivocal research texts, increased collaboration among researchers and their subjects, and greater self-reflexivity by the ethnographer. Horner recognizes the promise of such practices as a contrast to traditional ethnographic methods, but he nevertheless argues that these ideals assume "shared interest among equal partners" and thus "obscure the material social conditions of ethnographic work" (22, 27). Horner therefore suggests that we consider the differential values researchers and their subjects accord to the text as commodity and interpretive labor (25) and the risks self-reflexivity introduces in making the researcher the central subject (29). For instance, Robert Brooke and Charlotte Hogg (same volume) focus on their work with rural communities on the Great Plains and their alignment with their research subjects as "self-identified regionalists" (121). Hogg claims that the regionalist ethos she brings to her ethnographic study of women's literacy in Nebraska enables her to "make sense of the women's literacy through their regional understanding" (123). The regionalist ethos reveals how Brooke and Hogg are implicated in their research process. However, we might ask to what degree the authors, claiming a regionalist ethos and flexible notions of identity, culture, and context, nevertheless reground the ethnographic enterprise in a politics of recognition based on identification. What happens, for instance, when identification reaches its limit, or when identification subsumes important differences?[10]

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081206X142887 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In his contribution to *Ethnography Unbound*, Christopher Keller takes up this question. Keller is critical of ethnographic methods in composition and literacy studies that rely on an "uncomplicated spatialized 'here' and 'there,'" a logic that draws on the oversimplified insider-outsider binary and that binds subjects in naturalized identity categories (209). To work against composition's localism, which, he argues, tends to collapse the "research field" into local sites, Keller advocates ethnographic practices that "trace paths of circulation and travel rather than assume the fixity and rootedness of its subjects" (206). The decentralization of mass politics (through local networks and social actors) requires that we still attend to the local but that we do so in new ways. Crucial to the global turn, therefore, is an understanding of the intertextuality of local and global cultures.

More and more, scholars across the disciplines join rhetorical and ethnographic methods to study the role of persuasion in the formation of transnational publics. These studies warrant our attention precisely because they emphasize the production and deployment of symbolic practices and discursive channels of access. Indeed, turning to these works suggests a closer relation between transnational-social-movement studies and rhetorical studies than we might have initially imagined. Consider, for instance, the award-winning book *Activists beyond Borders*, in which Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, professors of political science, study the emergent communication infrastructure of transnational advocacy networks, especially those responding to human rights abuses in Argentina and Mexico, Third World environmental issues, and violence against women (37–38). *Activists beyond Borders* examines how transnational networks frame human rights issues at particular historical moments and in specific contexts to "persuade, pressure, and gain leverage over much more powerful organizations and governments" (2). Keck and Sikkink's findings suggest that we view transnational civil society as "an arena of struggle . . . in which certain groups emerge and are legitimized (by governments, institutions, and other groups)" (33–34).[11] *Activists beyond Borders* also suggests that as rhetoricians we need to modify our assumptions about collective rhetorical action, developed in the late 1960s and early 1970s as a result of the civil rights, antiwar, and feminist movements (Condit 173). Ultimately, *Activists beyond Borders* provides a promising opening for future studies of the rhetorical dynamics of transnational publics and for imagining transnational ethnographies and new collaborations across the disciplines.

But what, we must ask, prevents transnational ethnography from becoming yet another form of academic cosmopolitanism from above?[12] To forestall this outcome, the contributors to *Global Ethnography*, who are ethnographers in sociology, call for multisited ethnography. Though this approach may shift the focus of study from individual sites to the relations between sites, its practitioners nevertheless argue for grounding ethnography in local histories (Burawoy et al. 5). They advocate a "new cosmopolitanism from below," which combines dwelling with traveling and includes the subjects of study in the making of meaning (Burawoy et al. 349).

Yet greater self-reflexivity does not necessarily alter the different material relations among researchers during fieldwork or the conditions of textual production and distribution (Min-Zhan Lu 296). The global ethnographic turn therefore requires a critical cosmopolitanism (if we are to embrace the term *cosmopolitan* at all) that attends to historical, cultural, and transnational identity categories and transformations. Thus, the crucial question is not so much whether ethnography can survive globality (it has) as how global ethnography can reshape our approach to the rhetorical concepts of identification and difference and broaden our understanding of text, culture, and context. The promise

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081206X142887 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of global ethnography for rhetoric and composition studies lies in the conjoining of ethnographic and rhetorical methods and in our ability to engage the local and the global as traveling signifiers bound by material forces.

Rhetorical History: Unbound and Unbridled

Rather than tracing back the roots . . . to their source . . . show how the roots themselves are in a state of constant flux and change.

—Dick Hebdige (qtd. in Keller 201)

Historical research in rhetorical studies in the United States has been primarily a recovery-and-recognition enterprise. Scholars in rhetorical studies have had to contend with the legacy of omission, and the field is still doing the necessary canon-building work of expanding the rhetorical tradition to include women and minority-group members and of mapping hierarchies of gender, class, race, sexuality, and ability (Brueggemann; Campbell, *Critical Study* and *Key Texts*; Glenn, *Rhetoric*; Logan; Lunsford; Mountford; Powell; Ritchie and Ronald; Royster, among others). Given this emphasis on remapping the rhetorical tradition, it may appear that the field does not yet have the methodological foundation to study transnational rhetorical practices and publics. Canonical membership and disciplinary recognition alone will not provide a methodological basis for better understanding the emergence, history, and rhetorical dynamics of transnational publics. But indispensable tools for thinking through the role of rhetoric in shaping the course of globalization can be derived from critical studies of rhetorical history and from interrogation of why certain rhetors and rhetorical communities were excluded from the canon in the first place (Jarratt, *Rereading*), of the strategic use of silence as a rhetorical method (Glenn, *Unspoken*), of how rhetorical power is trafficked (Johnson), and of recent debates over rhetorical methods among feminist historiographers (Bizzell). For instance, Nan Johnson shifts the feminist project from one of historical recovery toward one that considers the "forces of cultural contestation . . . behind the silences and blank spaces" (11). Nevertheless, feminist scholarship that emphasizes women's rhetoric, as Eileen Schell notes, has focused on North American and European figures, texts, and contexts ("Gender" 9–10). By contrast, several scholars, myself included, have adopted a transnational perspective on feminist rhetoric and the geopolitics of identification (Hesford, "Kairos") and on rhetorical location (Schell, "Gender").

Moreover, and perhaps surprisingly, comparative methods in classical rhetorical studies provide a basis for further contemplating the methodological implications of transnational work. For instance, contributors to the recently published *Rhetoric before and beyond the Greeks* explore the use of rhetoric to promote cross-cultural discourses necessary for commerce and trade (Enos) and expose the limits of analyzing the rhetorical in non-Western traditions primarily through the lens of Greek culture (Lyon).[13]

Similarly, Xing Lu questions the imposition of Western frameworks onto non-Western texts in *Rhetoric of the Chinese Cultural Revolution: The Impact on Chinese Thought, Culture, and Communication*, a study that represents the expanding perimeters of rhetorical scholarship published in the United States and the historically intertextual quality of cultural practices. There is a strong comparative quality to Lu's method, evident in the chapter on post–Cultural Revolution political discourse. She highlights the symbols and symbolic practices used to legitimize the ruling ideology and to persuade over a billion adherents of Confucianism to become devotees of Mao Zedong. Lu also offers a potent analysis of the lingering residue and influence of the rhetoric of the Cultural Revolution in contemporary China. The propaganda may have changed, and Mao may no longer be mystified as a living God,

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081206X142887 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but the rhetorical themes and patterns of the Cultural Revolution (some of which are traceable to classical Chinese rhetoric) persist. These rhetorical strategies include the formalized, moralistic language of official discourse, conspiracy theory and the rhetoric of condemnation, anti-American sentiment, and the objectification and dehumanization of groups deemed a threat to social stability, such as the Falun Gong. While Lu does not explicitly address transnational circuits of exchange or the commodification of China's Cultural Revolution (e.g., the popularity of Cultural Revolution memoirs in the United States marketplace), she notes shifts in Chinese official and popular discourse congruent with globalization and the market economy.

In another example of rhetorical scholarship's global turn, *Peaceful Persuasion: The Geopolitics of Nonviolent Rhetoric*, Ellen W. Gorsevski examines nonviolence as a mode of persuasion and how nonviolent rhetoric plays out in global political conflicts. She focuses on "geopolitical rhetoric that broaches conflict without the use—or threat of use—of violence and weapons" (8). Far too often, she claims, academics and politicians operate under the realpolitik assumption that violence is the only effective way to manage conflicts (7). In contrast to leader-centered rhetorical criticism that focuses on the work of a lone hero—the single-orator paradigm—and to rhetorical theory's emphasis on violent and hierarchical representations of communication, Gorsevski's interest lies in collective rhetorical experiences and the often diffuse and decentralized rhetoric of nonviolent action (121). Gorsevski argues that nonviolent rhetoric "operates on an emotional level to remind the adversary of a shared, universal humanity" (188). Nonviolent rhetoric as action is predicated on mutual identification, an understudied area of inquiry, according to Gorsevski. *Peaceful Persuasion* does not focus on the obstacles to rhetorical identification that pervade international relations and global politics, but its reconfiguration of the concept of rhetorical climate usefully broadens traditional understandings of context. For Gorsevski, rhetorical climate is an intersubjective and interactional phenomenon (154–55): "there is no discrete rhetor and audience or singular material text; all are mutually influential to the point of being indistinguishable" (133).[14]

As rhetorical scholarship reorients itself toward an examination of the global, it will increasingly need to pursue interdisciplinary and collaborative work. The key distinction between the production and the reception of texts has long served as a policing mechanism, source of antagonism, and border division among scholars in rhetoric, composition, and literary studies. Literary studies has traditionally been associated with the reception and interpretation of texts and composition with the production and creation of them. In rhetorical studies, a similar border divides scholars who study production (motive, invention, intention) and those—namely, rhetorical critics—who emphasize reception. In "Re-marking Slave Bodies: Rhetoric as Production and Reception," Steven Mailloux is concerned that these "divisions have resulted in a fragmented disciplinary approach to everything having to do with tropes, arguments, and narratives in culture, including most recently the study of local and global communication networks, old and new literacies, and past and present media revolutions." He therefore calls for the formation of rhetoric as an integrated interdiscipline, and he presents "rhetorical hermeneutics" as an alternative to the "disciplinary fragmentation of rhetoric" (97).

Rhetorical hermeneutics "includes tools both for interpreting texts and for producing them," providing an alternative way to "do" history that counters long-standing relativist perceptions of rhetoric and of historical work as limited to the search for origins. As Mailloux puts it, "Rhetorical hermeneutics is the *use of rhetoric to practice theory by doing history*" (99). Although Mailloux does

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081206X142887 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not use the third term, *circulation*, of the *production-circulation-reception* triad, which is increasingly common in cultural-rhetorical and transnational cultural and literary studies (Schaffer and Smith), he is concerned with how texts "travel"—through time and across cultural and national borders. In his analysis of print and oral texts in the antebellum debate over slavery in the United States, for example, Mailloux "track[s] some rhetorical paths of thought" from ancient Greece and Rome to the biblical era, to Frederick Douglass's embodied performances, and to available rhetorical practices in nineteenth-century America (102). This approach allows Mailloux to consider the overlapping contexts of rhetorical production, circulation, and reception and to situate Douglass's abolitionist rhetoric in a range of historical and cultural traditions and sites.

Likewise, David G. Holmes's critique of voice in *Revisiting Racialized Voice: African American Ethos in Language and Literature* examines how rhetorical hermeneutics can inform the study of history. Holmes employs "race as a cultural hermeneutic"; it becomes a "way of reading culture" rather than an object to be interpreted (25). For Holmes, "American society, instead of race, becomes the text" (45). He is interested in how notions of black identity and voice in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which codified "biological and linguistic boundaries of blackness," informed the racial consciousness of writers of the period and continue to shape assumptions about African American authorship (26). Finally, Holmes takes on the ethnocentric assumptions that have governed the field's approach to teaching African American students. Specifically, he argues that while teachers need to acknowledge the rhetorical power of non-Standard English and affirm black students' creative use of the vernacular, they should not simplistically link racial identity and vernacular rhetoric (101). To frame race as a hermeneutic is not to turn the historical materiality of racism into a trope, as some might fear, but rather to articulate the interdependence of the material and rhetorical.

Turning toward the global, therefore, does not make archival or historical work irrelevant. On the contrary, the global pivot calls for new questions about and new perspectives on the relation between past and present prototypes of globalization, consideration of how symbols and symbolic practices are appropriated, translated, and rehistoricized, and reconsideration of earlier transnational thinkers and international rhetorical figures.[15]

Homeland Security and the Humanities

The Bush administration's encroachment on civil liberties, unlawful surveillance and detentions, silencing of minority voices, feeding of global anxieties, and crushing of dissent remind us of the urgency and critical work of the humanities. In the 2006 State of the Union address, President Bush declared, "There is no peace in retreat. And there is no honor in retreat. . . . The United States will not retreat from the world, and we will never surrender to evil." We need to imagine global citizenship free from the language of fear and from the civilizing mission of providence, a global citizenship that gives substance to human rights and encourages intercultural and transnational dialogue. We need not regret the collisions that will occur, however, as we call for the defense of human rights, on the one hand, and as we deconstruct the categories and terms on which the philosophy of "rights" and the "human" are based, on the other. In fact, we need to consider anew the "relationship between theories of language and the initiative of violence" and, as James Dawes suggests, how international laws of war "reinscribe violence itself within the bounds of language, to make war . . . into a site of unalterable meanings, agreements, and definitions" (200). Toward the end of the 2006 State of the Union address, Bush proclaimed, "We must continue to lead the world in human talent and creativity,"

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081206X142887 Published online by Cambridge University Press

without a single reference to the role of the arts and humanities in building peace and inspiring the conscience of our country.

We also need to consider the links between education and empire, the impact of security policies on the humanities, and the degree to which our colleges and universities, including the humanities, are being co-opted by the global war on terror and national security initiatives.[16] Several universities now offer a bachelor of arts in homeland security (Virginia Commonwealth University, American Military University). The requirements for this degree at the American Military University include six semester hours in English composition and six in literature and humanities. We also see the creation of centers for international and homeland security (the Ohio State University, Stanford University, Rutgers University, and Purdue University, among others). The United States Department of Homeland Security awards scholarships and fellowships to undergraduate and graduate researchers.[17]

How might scholars in the humanities respond to such measures, and what is the role of rhetoric and composition studies in this response? At the Ohio State University—under the leadership of Jacqueline Jones Royster, then associate dean of the College of the Humanities, currently executive dean of arts and sciences, and a renowned scholar in rhetoric, composition, and literacy studies—an interdisciplinary group of humanities faculty members and administrators created "a humanities response to national security." The group analyzed two government security documents, *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America* and *National Strategy for Homeland Security*.[18] The group's report argues that the security documents depict American society as a single, unified entity, lack clear definitions of key terms like terrorism and evil, and provide idealistic and strategically simplistic visions of "freedom," which ignore "histories of conflict, controversy and diversity. The failure to understand these histories," the report continues, "can itself foster the unrest at the root of terrorism." The report claims that humanities methods (critical analysis, self-reflection, and the deliberate creation of interpretive, explanatory contextual frames) can strengthen the national security of the United States. Among the contributions provided by the humanities, the report argues, is an understanding of the language, culture, history, and identity of peoples around the world; of the forces and factors that influence religious or political extremism; and of the threat antiterrorism law poses to civil rights, civil liberties, and intellectual freedom.[19]

At the October 2005 conference Human Rights and the Humanities, cosponsored by the MLA and the Graduate Center, City University of New York, scholars, teachers, and students from across disciplines, along with several human rights activists, came together to explore the connections between human rights and the humanities. Presenters interrogated foundational concepts of the human rights corpus (including notions of the human and dehumanization) and how such concepts inform ethical-political projects (Stanton). Discourse analysis and rhetorical criticism were among the most prominent modes of analysis. Despite the notable absence of scholars associated with rhetoric and composition studies (excepting members of the rhetoric program at the University of California, Berkeley), clearly our work is vital, and unmistakably we have a great deal still to do.

Humanities perspectives broaden the political field, and, likewise, the political field broadens the humanities. The global turn necessitates new collaborations and frameworks, broader notions of composing practices, critical literacies that are linked to global citizenship, a reexamination of existing protocols and divisions, and the formation of new critical frameworks in the light of a changing world. Turning toward the global means supporting scholarly and pedagogical work that challenges the dialectic of recognition (namely,

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081206X142887 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the binary frames of subject/object, self/other, and Western/non-Western) and disciplinary homeland nostalgia that have long dominated the field. The project also involves recognizing historical and cultural intertextuality.[20]

Present crises certainly call for political intervention and sharpened ideological critiques of and attention to national public rhetoric in the United States (Lazere) and its reception by global audiences (Booth). But we should not think about the intellectual and political work of rhetoric and composition studies solely in presentist terms. As Celeste Condit suggested in a pre-9/11 essay, "[W]hile linked to the activism of the moment [we] are also charged with larger time horizons and with the formation (and/or formalization) of new ideologies" (182). Stepping out of the shadow of this "uncanny mirroring" (Kaplan), which contours the terms of and sets the agenda for oppositional arguments, requires critical agility and a broader historical understanding of the work we do. Finally, the global turn demands that we turn away from preoccupations with disciplinary identity. Moreover, to move beyond methods of exposure and to meet current challenges, we may need to "shift the focus of concern from method to the critic's responsibility," as Barbara Warnick suggests, and imagine the "critic as an agent (as opposed to method as agency)" (64). Yet even as we forge these newly imagined geographies and critical roles, we must be apprehensive about idealistic notions of global civil society, skeptical of globalization's bells and whistles, and attentive to its injuries and risks. Cautiously, we turn.

Notes

The author would like to thank Christine Farris, Nan Johnson, Arabella Lyon, and Theresa Kulbaga for reading earlier drafts of this essay.

1. Inverting the common critical maxim "Naming is violence," Dawes makes a similar proposition when he asks, "Is language violent because it names, or is violence released precisely when language fails to name effectively?" (199).

2. *Globalization* is a contested and unstable term that is differentially mobilized. Various spatial characterizations of globalization can be found in Harvey; Sassen; Grewal and Kaplan, *Scattered Hegemonies*; and Appadurai. See also Grewal and Kaplan, "Global Identities," for a discussion of the term *transnational* and Ong on the use of *transnationality*, which captures movements across space, time, and discourses to disrupt totalizing top-down views of globalization.

3. No consensus exists among faculty members about the bipartite descriptor *rhetoric and composition studies*. Indeed, the tripartite *rhetoric, composition, and literacy studies* was recently embraced by the Ohio State University as a new working descriptor for the graduate studies program in these interlocking areas. Faculty members and graduate students in these areas differentially identify their discipline as rhetoric, rhetoric and composition, composition studies with a subspecialty in literacy, and literacy studies. I have chosen, for the purposes of this essay, to use *rhetoric and composition studies*, since the works in literacy studies reviewed here are closely aligned with composition and the teaching of writing.

4. When asked by a news commentator to respond to Bush's position against amnesty for illegal workers, Senator John McCain replied, "I'm against amnesty, too. I mean, that—we tried it in the '80s and failed. But many of us—and I think most Americans—are in favor of an earned citizenship, which would take many years, pay a fine, learn English, and then earn citizenship" ("State of the Union").

5. The major archive for this project consists of the nearly forty books nominated for the 2005 Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) Outstanding Book Award, which I helped judge. The CCCC book award is given annually to the author(s) or editor(s) of a book that "makes an outstanding contribution to composition and communication studies" (www.ncte.org). Additionally, I reference several initiatives that provide critical opportunities for thinking through what the global turn means in terms of research methods, pedagogy, and theory building in rhetoric and composition studies. This self-imposed constraint has made feasible a critical bibliographic essay of this length, which serves as a barometer of the pressures of globalization on the changing profession.

6. See Hesford, "Global/Local," for a discussion of the role of service learning in an increasingly corporate university.

7. Composition scholars have focused on the history and formation of the discipline as a unique phenomenon in the United States; *Historical Studies of Writing Program Administration* and *Practicing Writing: The Postwar Discourse of Freshman English* are among the latest installments (L'Eplatteneir and Mastrangelo;

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081206X142887 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Masters). *Historical Studies* also considers, however, how nineteenth-century Scottish scholars, and their students who later immigrated to the United States, prefigured and influenced North American educational practices and writing instruction (Gaillet 170).

8. "The territory I am calling basic writing," Shaughnessy wrote, "is still very much of a frontier, unmapped, except for . . . a few blazed trails" (qtd. in Reynolds 29). Scholars have read Shaughnessy's characterization of basic writing as a frontier in several ways. Some suggest that it reflects the crowded material conditions at City College, where she worked, and a nostalgia for the expansive lands of her Western past (30). Others read the imagined frontier as dosing composition with missionary zeal (31).

9. Several contributions to the collection *At the Intersections: Cultural Studies and Rhetorical Studies* provide groundwork for thinking through the limitations of traditional understandings of these terms. See esp. Rosteck, "Approaching"; Blair and Michel; Aune; and Condit on context and historicization in traditional rhetorical criticism.

10. Oliver critically reviews seminal works in psychoanalytic theory, postcolonial theory, and feminist theory in which identification and recognition (and misrecognition) play a foundational role. See Jarratt, "Beside Ourselves," for a discussion of feminist and postcolonial critics' alternative rhetorical approaches to a metaphoric understanding of identity by substitution. In "Kairos," I call for the study of the intertextuality of identification and its deployment in particular geopolitical contexts.

11. Keck and Sikkink use the term *transnational civil society* instead of the more common *global civil society*. The latter term is often associated with political cosmopolitanism and the possibility of postnational governance or a postnational morality. Some scholars opt for *global civil society* (Falk) over *transnational civil society*, claiming that *transnational* continues to root the identity of individuals in national consciousness, thereby privileging identities and orientations that arise from the crossing of borders. Others focus on transnational-social-movement organizations (TSMOs), the transnational identities that TSMOs forge, and how they strengthen the global public sphere by widening what constitutes the global public good and enfranchising groups formally excluded from international institutions (Smith). See also McLagan on transnational publicity.

12. C*osmopolitan* itself has contradictory meanings. On the one hand, scholars have used the term negatively to signify liberal self-invention, global tourism, and carnivalesque cosmopolitanism (Buell). On the other hand, the term has been used affirmatively to refer to a new class of transnational cosmopolitans (Hannerz) and to migration and diasporic movements, as in James Clifford's notion of the "discrepant cosmopolitan" (365).

13. In American studies and United States literary studies, a healthy foundation has been established for considering symbolic and rhetorical practices as transnational. Gilroy's *The Black Atlantic*, Lowe's *Immigrant Acts*, and Rowe's edited collection *Post-nationalist American Studies* have established "American" literatures and cultures as always already comparative, defined against others within and without United States borders and by flows of immigration, migration, and forced labor.

14. In *Writing Genres* (nominee for the 2005 CCCC book award), Devitt rejects the separation of context and text as if context were a physical materiality separate from discourse (a container model of meaning), and she highlights the fundamentally interwoven nature and reciprocity of texts and contexts—genre and situation (21–22).

15. See, for example, Sharer, also nominated for the 2005 CCCC book award, for a discussion of the rhetoric of internationalism in the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

16. Moreover, a new nationalism and a security discourse that seeks to curtail dissent have emerged on some of our nation's campuses. For instance, various states have considered adopting legislation based on the "Academic Bill of Rights." The American Civil Liberties Union of Ohio described the measure introduced in that state as a bill that would curtail academic freedom and discourage the discussion of "controversial" topics in college classrooms. See "State Legislation" for a complete list of such bills and their status.

17. The Department of Homeland Security's 130 scholarships and fellowships award students in math, engineering, and science with reimbursement of tuition and fees, a monthly stipend, and—for undergraduate recipients—funds for a summer internship. In addition, a pilot fellowship program, launched in 2004 by the CIA, is designed to train agents in university classrooms; fellows receive $25,000 annually and must accept eighteen months of employment for each year of fellowship. The Department of Defense (DOD) offers Defense Policy Fellowships, worth an annual stipend of between $62,000 and $81,000 and resulting in immediate placement with the DOD on graduation. Finally, the National Security Education Program grooms United States students with language and international expertise for work in the CIA, the DOD, and other federal agencies. Notably, these programs and awards were established during a time when Title VI federal funding for foreign language, area studies, and international studies was under severe attack by Stanley Kurtz, of the *National Review*, and others, who saw these programs and their faculty members as anti-American (Martin).

18. The report was distributed at various national conferences and sent to the Ohio Delegation, the Ohio State University Board of Trustees, campus leadership, and government officials. At the time of this publication, no formal responses had been received.

19. The Ohio State University also hosted a humanities forum in 2004 to address the humanities' response to national and international security (Shuman 27).

20. Indeed, recent dissertations on transnational rhetorics destabilize the binary Western/non-Western and

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081206X142887 Published online by Cambridge University Press

canonical notions of the rhetorical tradition (Chakravarty; Dingo; and Queen).

Works Cited

Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1996.

Aune, James Arnt. "Catching the Third Wave: The Dialectic of Rhetoric and Technology." Rosteck, *At the Intersection* 84–100.

Bartholomae, David. *Writing on the Margins: Essays on Composition and Teaching*. Boston: Bedford, 2004.

Bizzell, Patricia. Preface. *Feminist Historiography in Rhetoric*. Ed. Bizzell. Spec. issue of *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32.1 (2002): 7–10.

Blair, Carol, and Neil Michel. "Commemorating in the Theme Park Zone: Reading the Astronauts Memorial." Rosteck, *At the Intersection* 29–83.

Booth, Wayne. "War Rhetoric, Defensible and Indefensible." *JAC* 25 (2005): 221–44.

Bousquet, Marc. "Composition as a Management Science: Towards a University with a WPA." *JAC* 22 (2002): 493–526.

Brooke, Robert, and Charlotte Hogg. "Open to Change: Ethos, Identification, and Critical Ethnography in Composition Studies." Brown and Dobrin 115–30.

Brown, Stephen Gilbert, and Sidney I. Dobrin, eds. *Ethnography Unbound: From Theory Shock to Critical Praxis*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2004.

Brueggemann, Brenda Jo. *Lend Me Your Ear: Rhetorical Constructions of Deafness*. Washington: Gallaudet UP, 1999.

Buell, Frederick. *National Culture and the New Global System*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1994.

Burawoy, Michael, et al. *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2000.

Bush, George W. "2006 State of the Union Address." US Capitol, Washington. 31 Jan. 2006. *The White House: George W. Bush*. 7 Apr. 2006 <http://www.whitehouse.gov/stateoftheunion/2006/>.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs, ed. *A Critical Study of Early Feminist Rhetoric*. New York: Praeger, 1989. Vol. 1 of *Man Cannot Speak for Her*.

———, ed. *Key Texts of the Early Feminists*. New York: Praeger, 1989. Vol. 2 of *Man Cannot Speak for Her*.

Chakravarty, Subhasree. "Long-Distance Nationalism: Persuasive Invocations of Militant Hinduism in North America." Diss. Ohio State U, 2006.

Clifford, James. "Mixed Feelings." *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation*. Ed. Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1998. 362–69.

Condit, Celeste Michelle. "The Character of 'History' in Rhetoric and Cultural Studies: Recoding Genetics." Rosteck, *At the Intersection* 168–85.

Crowley, Sharon. *Composition in the University: Historical and Polemical Essays*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1998.

Dawes, James. *The Language of War: Literature and Culture in the U.S. from the Civil War through World War II*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2002.

Devitt, Amy J. *Writing Genres*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004.

Dingo, Rebecca. "Anxious Rhetorics: Transnational Policy-Making in Late Twentieth Century U.S. Culture." Diss. Ohio State U, 2005.

Ede, Lisa. *Situating Composition: Composition Studies and the Politics of Location*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004.

Enos, Richard Leo. "The Art of Rhetoric at Rhodes: An Eastern Rival to the Athenian Representation of Classical Rhetoric." Lipson and Binkley 183–96.

Falk, Richard. "Global Civil Society: Perspectives, Initiatives, Movements." *Oxford Development Studies* 26 (1998): 99–111.

Farris, Christine. "No Discipline? Composition's Professional Identity Crisis." *Composition Studies in the New Millennium*. Ed. Lynn Z. Bloom, Donald A. Daiker, and Edward M. White. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2003. 57–61.

Fox, Tom. "Standards and Purity: Understanding Institutional Strategies to Insure Homogeneity." *Interrupting the Program: Critical Questions in Writing Program Administration*. Ed. Jeanne Gunner and Donna Strickland. Forthcoming.

Gaillet, Lynée Lewis. "A Genesis of Writing Program Administration: George Jardine at the University of Glasgow." L'Eplatteneir and Mastrangelo 169–90.

Gilroy, Paul. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1993.

Glenn, Cheryl. *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity through the Renaissance*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1997.

———. *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004.

Gorsevski, Ellen. *Peaceful Persuasion: The Geopolitics of Nonviolent Rhetoric*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2004.

Grewal, Inderpal, and Caren Kaplan. "Global Identities: Theorizing Transnational Studies of Sexuality." *GLQ Archive* 7 (2001): 663–79.

———, eds. *Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1994.

Hannerz, Ulf. "Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture." *Theory, Culture, and Society* 7 (1990): 237–51.

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081206X142887 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Harris, Joseph. "Déjà Vu All Over Again." *CCC* 57 (2006): 535–42.

Harvey, David. *Spaces of Hope*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2000.

Hesford, Wendy S. "Global/Local Labor Politics and the Promise of Service Learning." *Radical Relevance: Essays toward a Scholarship of the "Whole Left."* Ed. Steven Rosendale and Laura Gray-Rosendale. Albany: State U of New York P, 2005. 183–202.

———. "Kairos and the Geopolitical Rhetorics of Global Sex Work and Video Advocacy." *Just Advocacy? Women's Human Rights, Transnational Feminisms, and the Politics of Representation*. Ed. Hesford and Wendy Kozol. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2005. 146–72.

Hesford, Wendy, Eddie Singleton, and Ivonne García. "Laboring to Globalize a First Year Writing Program." *Interrupting the Program: Critical Questions in Writing Program Administration*. Ed. Jeanne Gunner and Donna Strickland. Forthcoming.

Holmes, David. *Revisiting Racialized Voice: African American Ethos in Language and Literature*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004.

Horner, Bruce. "Critical Ethnography, Ethics, and Work: Rearticulating Labor." Brown and Dobrin 13–34.

Jarratt, Susan. "Beside Ourselves: Rhetoric and Representation in Postcolonial Feminist Writing." *The Kinneavy Papers: Theory and the Study of Discourse*. Ed. Lynn Worsham, Sidney I. Dobrin, and Gary A. Olsen. Albany: State U of New York P, 2000. 327–52.

———. *Rereading the Sophists: Classical Rhetoric Refigured*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1991.

Jarratt, Susan, Elizabeth Losh, and David Puente. "Transnational Identifications: Biliterate Writers in a First-Year Humanities Course." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, forthcoming.

Johnson, Nan. *Gender and Rhetorical Space in American Life, 1866–1910*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2002.

Kaplan, Amy. "Violent Belongings and the Question of Empire Today: Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, October 17, 2003." *American Quarterly* 56 (2004): 1–18.

Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1998.

Keller, Christopher. "Unsituating the Subject: 'Locating' Composition and Ethnography in Mobile Worlds." Brown and Dobrin 201–18.

Lam, Wan Shun Eva. "Border Discourses and Identities in Transnational Youth Culture." *What They Don't Learn in School: Literacy in the Lives of Urban Youth*. Ed. Jahari Mahiri. New York: Lang, 2004. 79–98.

Lazere, Donald. "Postmodern Pluralism and the Retreat from Political Literacy." *JAC* 25 (2005): 257–91.

L'Eplatteneir, Barbara, and Lisa Mastrangelo, eds. *Historical Studies of Writing Program Administration: Individuals, Communities, and the Formation of a Discipline*. West Lafayette: Parlor, 2004.

Lipson, Carol S., and Roberta A. Binkley, eds. *Rhetoric before and beyond the Greeks*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2004.

Logan, Shirley. *With Pen and Voice: A Critical Anthology of Nineteenth-Century African American Women*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1995.

Lowe, Lisa. *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Durham: Duke UP, 1996.

Lu, Min-Zhan. "The Ethics of Reading Critical Ethnography." Brown and Dobrin 285–98.

Lu, Xing. *Rhetoric of the Chinese Cultural Revolution: The Impact on Chinese Thought, Culture, and Communication*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 2004.

Lunsford, Andrea, ed. *Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh UP, 1995.

Lyon, Arabella. "Confucian Silence and Remonstration: A Basis for Deliberation?" Lipson and Binkley 131–46.

Mailloux, Steven. "Re-marking Slave Bodies: Rhetoric as Production and Reception." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 35 (2002): 96–119.

Martin, William G. "Manufacturing the Homeland Security Campus and Cadre." *ACAS Bulletin* 70 (2005). 3 Apr. 2006 <http://acas.prairienet.org/bulletin/bull70-07-martin.html>.

Masters, Thomas. *Practicing Writing: The Postwar Discourse of Freshman English*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2004.

Matsuda, Paul Kei. "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition." *Cross Language Relations in Composition*. Ed. Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Matsuda. Spec. issue of *College English* 68 (2006): 637–51.

McLagan, Margaret. "Circuits of Suffering." *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 28 (2005): 223–39.

McLeod, Susan H. "Re-visions: 'Breaking Our Bonds and Reaffirming Our Connections,' Twenty Years Later." *CCC* 57 (2006): 525–34.

Mountford, Roxanne. *The Gendered Pulpit: Preaching in American Protestant Spaces*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2003.

Nunley, Vorris L. "From the Harbor to da Academic Hood: Hush Harbors and an African American Rhetorical Tradition." *African American Rhetoric(s): Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Ed. Elaine B. Richardson and Ronald L. Jackson II. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004. 221–41.

Oliver, Kelly. *Witnessing beyond Recognition*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2001.

Ong, Aihwa. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham: Duke UP, 1999.

Pough, Gwendolyn D. *Check It While I Wreck It: Black Womanhood, Hip-Hop Culture, and the Public Sphere*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 2004.

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081206X142887 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Powell, Malea. "Princess Sarah, the Civilized Indian: The Rhetoric of Cultural Literacies in Sarah Winnemucca Hopkin's *Life among the Piutes*." *Rhetorical Women: Roles and Representations*. Ed. Hildy Miller and Lillian Bridwell-Bowles. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2005. 63–80.

Queen, Mary. "Technologies of Representations: Fields of Rhetorical Action in Transnational Feminism." Diss. Syracuse U, 2005.

Reiff, Mary Jo. "Mediating Materiality and Discursivity: Critical Ethnography as Metageneric Learning." Brown and Dobrin 35–52.

Reynolds, Nedra. *Geographies of Writing: Inhabiting Places and Encountering Difference*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004.

Rhetoricians for Peace. *Rhetoricians for Peace: An International Community of Writers, Teachers, and Activists*. 3 Apr. 2006 <http://www.rhetoriciansforpeace.org>.

Ritchie, Joy, and Kate Ronald, eds. *Available Means: An Anthology of Women's Rhetoric(s)*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2001.

Rosteck, Thomas. "Approaching the Intersection: Issues of Identity, Politics, and Critical Practice." Introduction. Rosteck, *At the Intersection* 1–24.

———, ed. *At the Intersection: Cultural Studies and Rhetorical Studies*. New York: Guilford, 1999.

Rowe, John Carlos, ed. *Post-nationalist American Studies*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2000.

Royster, Jacqueline Jones. *Traces of a Stream: Literacy and Social Change among African American Women*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2000.

Royster, Jacqueline Jones, et al. *Language, Culture, Media, and (Inter)National Security: A Humanities Response to National Security Documents*. Coll. of Humanities, Ohio State U. 3 Apr. 2006 <http://humanities.osu.edu/news/forums/spring04/natlsecdocs/>.

Sassen, Saskia. *The Global City*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.

Schaffer, Kay, and Sidonie Smith. *Human Rights and Narrated Lives: The Ethics of Recognition*. New York: Palgrave, 2004.

Schell, Eileen E. "Gender, Rhetorics, and Globalization: Rethinking the Spaces and Locations of Feminist Rhetorics and Women's Rhetorics in our Field." *Rhetorica Redefines Theory and Practice*. Ed. Joy Ritchie and Kate Ronald. Heinemann, forthcoming 2006.

———."Toward a New Labor Movement in Higher Education: Contingent Labor and Organizing for Change." *Workplace* 4 (2001). 3 Apr. 2006 <http://www.louisville.edu/journal/workplace/issue7/schell.html>.

Selber, Stuart. *Multiliteracies for a Digital Age*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004.

Selfe, Cynthia L., and Gail E. Hawisher. *Literate Lives in the Information Age: Narratives of Literacy from the United States*. Mahwah: Erlbaum, 2004.

Selfe, Cynthia L., and Gail E. Hawisher with Dipo LaShore and Peng Fei Song. "Globalization and Agency: Designing and Re-designing the Literacies of Cyberspace." *Cross Language Relations in Composition*. Ed. Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Matsuda. Spec. issue of *College English* 68 (2006): 619–36.

Sharer, Wendy B. *Vote and Voice: Women's Organizations and Political Literacy, 1915-1930*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004.

Shaughnessy, Mina P. *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing*. New York: Oxford UP, 1977.

Shuman, Amy. "Interrogating Homeland Security: A Humanities Response." *Humanities Exchange* 20 (2004): 27–29.

Smit, David. *The End of Composition Studies*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004.

Smith, Jackie. "Global Civil Society? Transnational Social Movement Organizations and Social Capital." *American Behavioral Scientist* 42.1 (1998): 93–107.

Stanton, Domna C. "Human Rights and the Humanities." *MLA Newsletter* 37.4 (2005): 3–4.

"State Legislation Proposing an 'Academic Bill of Rights.'" *American Association of University Professors: Academic Freedom for a Free Society*. Mar. 2006. Amer. Assn. of U Professors. 4 Apr. 2006 <http://www.aaup.org/Issues/ABOR/statelegislation.htm>.

"State of the Union." *Hardball with Chris Matthews*. MSNBC. 2 Feb. 2006. Transcript. 10 Apr. 2006 <http://msnbc.msn.com/id/11145182/>.

Tate, Greg. "The Color of Money." *Nation* 27 Feb. 2006: 23+.

Trimbur, John. "Linguistic Memory and the Politics of US English." *Cross Language Relations in Composition*. Ed. Bruce Horner, Min-Zhan Lu, and Paul Matsuda. Spec. issue of *College English* 68 (2006): 575–88.

Warnick, Barbara. "The Ethos of Rhetorical Criticism: Enlarging the Dwelling Place of Critical Praxis." *The Ethos of Rhetoric*. Ed. Michael J. Hyde. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 2004. 56–74.

Wysocki, Anne Frances, et al. *Writing New Media: Theory and Applications for Expanding the Teaching of Composition*. Logan: Utah State UP, 2004.

Young, Morris. *Minor Re/Visions: Asian American Literacy Narratives as a Rhetoric of Citizenship*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004.

Zamel, Vivian, and Ruth Spack, eds. *Crossing the Curriculum: Multilingual Learners in College Classrooms*. Mahwah: Erlbaum, 2004.

https://doi.org/10.1632/003081206X142887 Published online by Cambridge University Press