



## Literacy after the Revolution

Lester Faigley

*College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 48, No. 1. (Feb., 1997), pp. 30-43.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0010-096X%28199702%2948%3A1%3C30%3ALATR%3E2.0.CO%3B2-D>

*College Composition and Communication* is currently published by National Council of Teachers of English.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ncte.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*Lester Faigley*

## Literacy After the Revolution

One of the traditions of the CCCC Chair's address is to narrate an anxiety dream. Andrea Lunsford still has the best one, when she dreamed about beginning her address, turning the first page, and finding only the word *linguine* on the next page, and on the page after that, and on the page after that, and on all the rest of the pages. My dream was somewhat less fantastic. I dreamed that I met many of my friends walking out of the auditorium as I was walking in to speak. I wanted desperately to ask them why they were leaving, but then I thought that I probably didn't want to know.

When faced last August with a deadline for supplying a title for this talk, I began reading the addresses of past chairs printed in *CCC*. They comprise a distinguished collection of essays on the values placed on literacy and on what it means to be a college teacher of writing. The tradition of the chair delivering an address at the opening general session began with Richard Lloyd-Jones in 1977, the first year I attended the convention. Reading the addresses I had heard over my years at the annual convention was like reading a personal history of the field, a history I had witnessed.

Together the chairs' addresses also caused me to reflect on how I came to be before you today. The condition of living in a highly urbanized, mobile, and transient society allows remarkable sets of circumstances to direct the paths of particular lives, and my life is no exception. When I graduated from high school, I never planned to be an English major, never planned to get a PhD, never planned to be a college teacher, and certainly never planned to be chair of CCCC. In each case I could narrate a series of minor events that were pivotal in shaping years of my life. I'm sure each of you can think of at least one small event where if a particular person were ab-

*Lester Faigley* directs the Division of Rhetoric and Composition at the University of Texas at Austin. This essay is a revised version of his 1996 CCCC Chair's address delivered in Milwaukee in March 1996.

sent or if your presence at a particular location had been just few minutes earlier or later, the subsequent course of your life would have been very different.

But if the particular paths that our lives take are very influenced by seemingly chance events, the broader tracks show a great deal more regularity. After all, there are over 3,000 of us at this convention. Evidently some common forces brought us here. I only gradually became aware of these forces. Like most other college writing teachers of my generation, I was not trained specifically in rhetoric and composition. I taught writing in graduate school as a teaching assistant, but at the universities where I did my graduate work, there was no specialization in rhetoric and composition at that time. Teaching writing was something you did for a living but not something you thought about very much. For those of us who found our way into rhetoric and composition, somewhere along the way we began thinking about teaching writing other than as a drudgery from which we wished deliverance. We realized that likely we would be teaching writing in some form if we were to have a professional career, but more immediate were the positive experiences that we were teaching something quite valuable for our students' lives.

It is not coincidental that early experiences of teaching basic writers figure so prominently among the past chairs of my generation—Jacqueline Jones Royster, Lillian Bridwell-Bowles, Anne Ruggles Gere, Bill Cook, Don McQuade, Jane Peterson, Andrea Lunsford, David Bartholomae, Miriam Chaplin, Lee Odell, Rosentene Purnell, Jim Hill, and Lynn Quitman Troyka—and among many other of my contemporaries. We came of age when the great social issues of the Civil Rights movement and the Vietnam War were being debated publicly and when education was widely believed to be the chief means of ending social inequality. Early experiences of teaching basic writers exposed for these teachers the role and power of institutions in maintaining social divisions. But these teachers also found spaces where institutional power could be challenged and where students who had been labeled as deficient could succeed.

That the good classroom could help produce the good society seemed self-evident when I began teaching college writing courses. The students I taught were becoming more diverse, and I believed composition teachers were better situated than anyone to adapt to their needs. We were the faculty who were exploring anti-authoritarian ways of teaching and who were encouraging our students to use literacy to participate in democratic community life, to engage civic issues, and to promote social justice. Even though, like nearly everyone else teaching composition, I experienced the second-class status of a writing teacher in an English department, I felt that composition was going to do fine in the long run. We were in step

with the new mission of colleges and universities to provide education for all who wanted it. History seemed to be on our side.

Now that we are more than halfway through the 1990s and closing quickly on both the end of the millennium and the fiftieth anniversary of CCCC, it no longer seems like we are riding the wave of history but instead are caught in a rip tide carrying us away from where we want to go. Part of this frustration is linked to the growth of rhetoric and composition as a discipline. Had not the members of CCCC been so successful in creating an expansive discipline, in fostering important research and scholarship, and in broadening the ways in which writing is taught, perhaps visions of restoring rhetoric to the central place in the American college curriculum might have remained nostalgic images of the past. At the same time, however, writing teachers who have been at the forefront of initiating change have run up against a multitude of institutional barriers and attitudes that would limit writing instruction to teaching students to replicate the traditional forms of academic and professional discourses. Most disappointing, the discipline's success has not influenced institutions to improve the working conditions for many teachers of writing. A huge percentage of college writing courses are taught by part-time faculty who endure uncertain employment, heavy workloads, poor pay, nonexistent benefits, and often the lack of the most meager support services such as a desk and a mailbox.

A decade ago, Maxine Hairston in her Chair's address blamed the literature faculty for the problems writing teachers face. Now the situation for writing teachers might seem rosy if the problems could be resolved within English departments, no matter how petty and vicious the politics. I'm going to talk today about how larger forces of change affect how we see ourselves and what we do. These changes are of such magnitude that they have been labeled revolutions—one a technological transformation called the *digital revolution* and the other an economic, social and political transformation called the *revolution of the rich*. These revolutions have been described as having very different impacts—the digital revolution as expanding access and the revolution of the rich as contracting it—but we may eventually come to see them as different aspects of an even larger scale change.

I want to begin with the revolution of the rich. What no one, including writing teachers, foresaw 20 years ago was the extent to which the creation of wealth would be divorced from labor and redistributed, leaving the United States the most economically polarized among industrialized nations, with the divide between rich and poor continuing to widen. The most recent Federal Reserve figures available, from 1989, indicate that the wealthiest 1% of the population, living in households with a net worth of at least \$2.3 million each, own almost 40% of America's wealth. The top

20% of U.S. households, worth \$180,000 or more, own nearly all of its wealth—more than 80% (Bradsher).

Those in the middle have increasingly struggled to maintain their position. The workweek in America has increased and leisure time has decreased since 1970. Juliet Schor found that the average working American in 1989 put in 163 more hours a year than he or she did 20 years earlier—the equivalent of an extra month of work. Those who work harder for lower real wages and reduced benefits have found life precarious. Business executives take great credit for increasing corporate profits through downsizing, but these profits have come out of the pockets of the workers. During the 1970s and 1980s, corporations succeeded in busting unions and in rolling back government social programs.

But the most important strategy to increase profits has been to seek greater flexibility in hiring workers. Between 1979 and 1995, the *New York Times* estimates from Department of Labor statistics that 43 million jobs were eliminated in the United States (Uchitelle and Kleinfield). The layoffs in the 1990s read like casualty totals from World War I battles: 123,000 gone from AT&T, 50,000 fired by Sears, 18,800 pink slips at Delta Airlines, 16,800 cut from Eastman Kodak. Four companies out of five in America laid off workers in 1995. These reductions came not at a time of economic depression but when the economy was booming and the stock market was setting record highs. While unemployment is currently low in the United States and millions of new jobs have been created, there has not been such job instability since the Great Depression and never before have highly paid, highly educated workers been so vulnerable. Only 35% of currently laid-off full-time workers find jobs comparable to the ones they held.

Workers have not shared in the prosperity of the last 15 years. The median wage in 1994 adjusted for inflation is nearly 3% below what it was in 1979. Household income climbed 10% during the same period, but the richest 20% received 97% of that gain (Uchitelle and Kleinfield). The accumulation of wealth at the top is staggering even when compared to the robber barons of the nineteenth century. On November 29, 1995, Steven Jobs, the co-founder of Apple Computers, made \$1.2 billion on paper on the first day of the public issue of his company Pixar Animation Studios, when the stock price jumped from 22 to 39. In August, 1995, Jim Clark, the co-founder of Netscape, made \$1.3 billion when it went public. To give some perspective, these sums are over double the annual gross domestic product of a small nation like Belize (CIA). That's what I call empowerment.

What is different today from the era of monopoly capitalism in the 19th and early 20th centuries is that people in the last century looked to government to regulate the monopolies of industries, railroads, and banks.

For example, San Francisco newspaper editor Henry George attacked speculators who reaped huge profits from the rising price of land that they did not improve. He proposed a tax on this “unearned increment” that the government would use to address the misery caused by industrialization. Today no one is calling for taxes to ameliorate poverty on money earned by speculation. Instead government is identified with bureaucracy, inefficiency, and waste. Current defenders of the free market go even further than Andrew Carnegie, who justified laissez-faire economics by appealing to Social Darwinism, but nonetheless saw the need for public schools and libraries.

Today the invisible hand of the unregulated market is trusted to do nearly everything, and publicly supported higher education is becoming an institution of the past. Tax dollar support for higher education is being reduced so rapidly that huge tuition and fee increases cannot keep pace. From 1991 to 1995, the California State Legislature slashed the budget of the University of California at Berkeley by \$70 million, or about 19%, and over the same period the City University of New York has been cut \$200 million, or 20% (Honan).

More and more, colleges and universities are being ordered to make sweeping changes by politicians who are unfamiliar with higher education. They see colleges and universities as bloated and want to “re-engineer” higher education on the market-driven principles of “downsizing” by imposing heavier workloads, getting rid of tenure, and converting full-time jobs into “permanent temp” positions. In the corporate world, these changes are called “planned staffing.” Arizona Regent John Munger, an opponent of tenure, puts it bluntly: “There’s plenty of faculty out there who want to teach and are willing to teach without tenure, and frankly who we might be able to obtain at a cheaper price and with more hiring flexibility” (Mayes). Munger and his allies are already far along in these “reforms.” According to the Education Department’s National Center for Education Statistics, the percentage of part-time faculty in institutions of higher education rose between 1970 to 1991 from 22% to 35%. These jobs are also disproportionately held by women.<sup>1</sup> In this respect writing programs have been pioneers in the new employment structure of higher education.

Given the magnitude of these forces, continuing to argue for a vision of literacy for participation in democratic community life, civic engagement, and social justice feels like swimming against the current. But as in the case of rip tides where there are often complex cross currents, so too are the social and economic forces influencing higher education. The revolution of the rich has been facilitated by another related revolution—the digital revolution of electronic communications technologies. These tech-

nologies have grown up along with CCCC. It is very difficult to imagine from the perspective of 1949, the year of the first meeting of CCCC, the development of computer and information technologies and the impacts they would have on the industrialized world. Computers in 1949 were comparable to automobiles in 1899. Computers, like early cars, were bulky, slow, expensive, and difficult to use. Their utility was confined largely to replicating certain functions of mechanical calculators. Even though the transistor had been invented in 1947, the big advances that allowed the rapid increase in computing power and decrease in cost were yet to come, especially the development of the integrated circuit in 1957 and the microprocessor in 1971 (Braun and MacDonald). We can now describe the history of computers in terms of household objects. A throw-away greeting card that sings "Happy Birthday" has more computing processing power than existed in 1951; a home video camera has more than a 1976 IBM 360, the standard mainframe machine that I used as an assistant professor (Huey 37).

Personal computers invaded the academy in large numbers beginning in the early 1980s, and where they were available in composition classrooms, they enhanced process pedagogy by making it easier for students to revise their papers. But as personal computers became enormously more powerful in memory and speed, they began to challenge the unproblematic relationship between familiar pedagogy and new technology. When personal computers became linked to other computers in local-area networks, writing teachers were forced to devise new pedagogies because the traditional lines of authority had to be renegotiated. With the coming of the Internet and the World Wide Web, another major renegotiation of pedagogy and authority is now in progress.

I direct a large college writing program that aims to give every student opportunities to practice the new electronic literacies unless they prefer to be in a traditional classroom. We are committed to teaching the great majority of our writing courses in networked classrooms by 1998. The Division of Rhetoric and Composition and the University of Texas administration believe that college students should be able to use the media of literacy that they will likely use in their later lives. The Division of Rhetoric and Composition also has as one of its central goals to encourage students to read and write about significant public issues.

Discourse on significant public issues abounds on the Internet, and giving students access to participate in these discussions at first seemed like a wish come true. Our instructors quickly explored the potential of connecting students with ongoing world-wide discussions of political and social issues. For example, at the time of the elections in South Africa that brought Nelson Mandela to power, a graduate instructor, Noel Stahle, directed his

students to the on-line newsgroup, *soc.culture.southafrica*, where they were able to obtain first-hand accounts of the elections and to contact people in South Africa. Other instructors have involved students in on-line discussion groups concerning domestic and international issues.

But as talk radio so vividly demonstrates, providing venues for the discussion of public issues does not necessarily lead to a more informed public, increased civic engagement, or enhanced democracy. The problems our instructors have encountered in introducing students to newsgroups reflect larger debates over the impacts of the Internet. In the wake of the exponential growth of the Internet—from 213 host computers in 1981 to over 9,000,000 in early 1996—and sweeping pronouncements on the scale of John Perry Barlow's that (forget Gutenberg!) the coming of the Internet is the most transformative event in human history since the capture of fire, others have begun asking into what changed state are people being transformed.<sup>2</sup> One of the most strident critics of the Internet, Mark Slouka, sees the appeal of life in virtual worlds motivated by the degradation of our physical environment. Slouka blames technology for our present lack of civic engagement, arguing that when our own communities have become unsafe, uncertain, unpleasant, and ugly, we seek artificial ones.

The stampede to get on-line has prompted much hype and horror about the Internet, but before we pronounce it good or bad for our discipline, we should pause to examine how the Internet developed over several decades and what actually is new about its widespread use. The Internet has its origins in a Cold War project in the 1960s that addressed how the military would maintain communications in the aftermath of a nuclear war, when presumably many if not most lines of communication and most major communications centers would be destroyed. The ingenious solution was to flatten the communications hierarchy, making every node equivalent so that the loss of any one node would not collapse the system. Each node would have the capability to originate, pass, and receive individually addressed messages bundled in packets. The routing of messages became relatively unimportant. Messages would bounce from host to host like a beach ball batted around in the crowd at a free concert until it finally reached its destination.

In 1969 the Pentagon began connecting researchers at military and university sites on the ARPANET, enabling them to transmit data at high speeds and access each other's computers. The ARPANET grew rapidly in the 1970s because its utility was obvious and its structure accommodated different kinds of machines, overcoming the problem of incompatibility. Because the demand for high-speed communications was so great at the time the National Science Foundation took on the expansion of the Internet in 1986, the NSF decided to build a network capable of connecting

most of the nation's researchers. By 1990 the Internet had outgrown the community of scientists as corporations and individuals began to take advantage of the Internet's speed and low cost, and by 1993 the growth of the Internet became explosive.

It is not surprising that the Internet would become so widely used so quickly. The Internet became available at a time when other new low-cost, high-speed communications technologies—FAX machines, cellular telephones, and cable television—were also growing in popularity. But what is surprising is how the Internet came to be used. Soon after the introduction of the original ARPANET in 1969, researchers began to do more than access and transfer data at remote sites. Those researchers who had personal accounts soon exploited the net for person-to-person communication that ranged from project collaboration to schmoozing to the first hobby bulletin boards. Just as was the case for older technologies, researchers on the ARPANET quickly discovered new uses that hadn't been imagined by the designers.

A decade later, between 1979 and 1983, programmers wrote the software that led eventually to thousands of newsgroups created on USENET and on other networks.<sup>3</sup> The number of words posted each day on these newsgroups may now exceed the number of words printed each day—a fact that enthusiasts like Barlow celebrate as the overcoming of barriers to communication and that skeptics like Slouka decry as a morass of babel in which reflective thought disappears. Overlooked in these pronouncements is that a significant new medium of literacy has come into existence with the Internet.

In 1982, Thomas Miller and I conducted a survey of 200 college-educated people writing on the job, stratified according to type of employer and type of occupation. We found that everyone in an occupation that requires a college education wrote on the job and wrote frequently. Nearly three-fourths of the people sampled claimed to devote 10% or more of their work time to writing, but very few reported writing much off the job. For many people who have access to the Internet, that situation has changed. They may be using work time for personal writing, but they are nonetheless writing for purposes other than work. For many people on-line newsgroups and chat rooms have become something close to an addiction.

The Internet will soon be as ubiquitous as cable television as the costs of computers and connections continue to drop. At least ten million people today in the United States are connected either directly to the Internet or to commercial on-line services. Even more phenomenal has been the growth of the World Wide Web, which in months became a major medium of publishing. By August 1994, just two years after its introduction by the European Nuclear Research Center, Internet traffic on the World Wide

Web was greater than the volume of electronic mail. If this growth pattern continues, traffic on the Web will surpass the total world voice communication traffic by 1998 (Rutkowski).

When the NSF backbone was turned off on April 30, 1995, the Internet became privatized, and with the signing into law of the Telecommunications Reform Act in February 1996, the land rush is on for the control of Cyberspace. Initially, the part of the telecommunications bill that has been most controversial is the Communications Decency Act, which is a truly benighted piece of legislation but which also is likely to be struck down in numerous court challenges.<sup>4</sup> The major long-term impacts, however, will come from removing regulations from corporations involved in computing, communications, publishing, and entertainment. The new media megaliths created by the mergers of Time Warner/CNN, Westinghouse/CBS, and Disney/ABC are only the beginnings of consolidation of power as the giants buy up the technology to control how we work, how we get information, how we shop, how we relax, and how we communicate with other people.

AT&T, which we used to think of as a telephone company, has been fast out of the starting blocks following the Telecommunications Act to reach out and crush someone—notably Prodigy, CompuServe, and America Online along with MCI—by offering five hours of free Internet service monthly to all of its 80 million long-distance customers beginning on March 14, 1996. This move points the way of the future because it not only gives AT&T an advantage in its telephone business but greatly expands its share of telecommunication and financial services. Soon AT&T is going to launch its WorldNet Internet service that will insure credit card transactions for users of its Universal Card, creating a world-wide Home Shopping Network with massive possibilities for cross-marketing with other partners,

As much as I resist AT&T's "you will" advertisements that offer scenes of technological determinism, I do not foresee colleges and universities remaining unaffected by these developments for long. AT&T and the other telecommunication giants are committed to put every household with a computer and disposable income on-line in the very near future, and soon the majority of students we teach are going to come from these households. Many colleges are already responding by giving students easy high-speed access to the Internet. By December 1996, my university will have installed ethernet connections in every dormitory room, boasting "a port for every pillow." Student traffic on the Internet at the University of Texas doubled from spring to fall semester in 1995.

When students enter one of our networked classrooms, they quickly dispel any assumptions of their teachers that they do little writing on their own. Most use email, and many already have personal home pages on the

World Wide Web. While many of these personal home pages are little more than self-advertisements, the students who made them have experience producing and publishing multimedia forms of literacy.

Some have made quite remarkable use of this new literacy. Even though Generation X often gets bashed for its political apathy, many students have used their digital literacy to engage social and political issues. For example, the Web site of an undergraduate student at Swarthmore, Justin Paulson, became an important distribution point for the publications of the Zapatista rebels in the Mexican state of Chiapas. Many thousands of people have connected to Paulson's Web site and have read essays, communiqués, and articles about the Zapatistas. The Web site itself has become much publicized through articles in many magazines and newspapers including *The Guardian* (UK) and *Reforma* (Mexico). In April 1995, the Mexican Foreign Minister, José Angel Gurría, declared that the uprising in Chiapas is a "Guerra de Tinta y de Internet" ("a war of ink and of the Internet"). The role of the Internet in the Zapatista uprising becomes evident when Chiapas is contrasted to the Shining Path rebellion in Peru. The Zapatistas have been able to historicize the context of their rebellion and convey the complexity of a peasant society without resorting to ongoing violence.

While I am much encouraged by the creativity and commitment students like Justin Paulson, their Web sites need to be placed in a larger perspective. Pointing to their work as proof that digital literacy necessarily leads to democratic participation and civic engagement is another version of the good classroom leading to the good society. We as teachers have little control over who gains access to higher education and even less control of access to the Internet. Very simply, the Internet is not the world. Use of the Internet is even more skewed than consumption of the world's energy resources, where less than 5% of the world's population who live in the United States annually consumes nearly 25% of its energy resources (*Economist Book*). In January 1995, nearly 98% of Internet hosts were located in the United States, Western Europe, Canada, Australia, and Japan. The presence on the Internet of much of Africa, Asia, and Latin America is nonexistent (In Africa, there were only 90 hosts outside of South Africa).

Even within the United States, Internet users are far from being equally distributed across the population. A major Internet publisher, O'Reilly and Associates, conducted a survey of United States residents over 18 years of age, which used random telephone dialing to obtain interviews with a statistically representative sample of nearly 30,000 people. This survey, released in October 1995, confirmed findings of other surveys that younger people are the most frequent users of the Internet.<sup>5</sup> Over half the users are between the ages of 18 and 34 (57%) and only 4% are 55 or older. They are

also well-off financially. Median annual income in 1994 is reported as between \$50,000 and \$75,000. And they are mostly white. There is no doubt that African-Americans are severely underrepresented because their percentage of ownership of computers is far lower than that of white Americans. A 1989 U.S. Census Bureau report estimated that nearly 27 million whites but only 1.5 million African-Americans used computers at home (Stuart).

The O'Reilly survey found that a third of Internet users are women, a higher percentage than earlier surveys that gave estimates that 80–90% of Internet users are men. Nonetheless, even the O'Reilly figures have the gender skew at 2 to 1. The disparity of men and women on the Internet indicates that factors beyond merely owning a computer with a connection to the Internet and being literate in English determine access. People must have time to keep up with the abundant discourse if they are to be active participants, and the people who have this time are most likely to be young, affluent-white men.

Up to now the debate over the Internet within the humanities has been conducted in terms of the printed book. In *The Gutenberg Elegies*, Sven Birkerts asks "What is the place of reading . . . in our culture?" (15) and he answers that it is increasingly shrinking, with the attendant effects of the loss of deep thinking, the erosion of language, and the flattening of historical perspective. Birkerts calls on us to resist the tide of electronic media; his last words in the book are "refuse it." It's disappointing for someone as thoughtful as Birkerts to allow his book to derail by collapsing all electronic media into a single form and then offering an either/or vision of the future. Anyone who has used email knows that it bears little similarity to television beyond light appearing on a screen, and we haven't thrown away pencils, legal pads, or the good books that Birkerts loves to curl up with.

The more misleading either/or that Birkerts posits, however, is that reflective thinking can occur only in acts of reading. I would like to let him in on a little secret that writing teachers know: college students often become more careful, critical, and appreciative readers after a semester in a writing course. I'm learning that little secret again. This semester for the first time I am devoting a significant part of a writing course to graphic design, and I am discovering that after years of attempting to teach students to analyze images, they learn much more quickly when they create images on their own. Active learners can think reflectively about any human symbolic activity whatever the medium.

If we come back to our annual convention a decade from now and find that the essay is no longer on center stage, it will not mean the end of our discipline. I expect that we will be teaching an increasingly fluid, multi-

media literacy, and that we will be quite happy that attempts in the past failed to drop our fourth “C,” “Communication,”—a term David Bartholomae noted in his 1988 Chair’s address that “keeps us from ever completely knowing our subject” (45).

What concerns me much more is whether we as a professional organization can sustain a shared sense of values when in many respects history is not on our side. Benjamin Barber summarizes our condition when he writes that the more hollow values of the Enlightenment: “materialism, solipsism, and radical individualism [have triumphed] over certain of its nobler aspirations: civic virtue, just community, social equality, and the lifting of the economic yoke from what were once known as the laboring classes” (222). These nobler aspirations were developed and spread primarily through the practices of literacy. We know that literacy education has often not lived up to these ideals and has functioned instead to label individuals and groups as deficient, inferior, and unworthy. Nevertheless, these ideals have provided the means of critique for educational practices that uphold illegitimate hierarchies of power.

When I first came to the annual convention in 1977, I needed CCCC for the intellectual community it provided. Over the years I have come to appreciate more the values we share in common. In a culture that is increasingly cynical about the belief that schools should offer equal opportunity to education, we have remained steadfast to the goal of literacy for equality. Even if many of us occupy less powerful positions in less powerful departments, we still have many strengths. We are not tied to narrow disciplinary turf. We can cut across traditional disciplinary boundaries. We can be confident that the need for what we teach will only increase. And as part of a much larger professional organization, we have many possibilities for working with teachers in the schools and with colleagues in the other college organizations of NCTE.

But we also have some hard questions before us. Can we do anything to stop the decline in publicly supported education? Can we promote a literacy that challenges monopolies of knowledge and information? Can we use technology to lessen rather than widen social divisions? The overriding question facing us as a professional organization is: What do you do when the tide seems to be running against you? I don’t think there is any big answer but there are some little ones. You have to look outward. You have to be smarter and more aware. You have to look for opportunities to inform people about what you do. You have to practice what you preach and engage in public discourse. You have to form alliances. You have to be more tolerant of your friends and look for common ground. You have to organize.

Our charge is in the last two sentences from *Rhetorics, Poetics, and Cultures*, the recently published final book from Jim Berlin, who sustained me through his work and his friendship. He writes: "It is time all reading and writing teachers situate their activities within the contexts of the larger profession as well as the contexts of economic and political concerns. We have much to gain working together and much to lose working alone" (180). May Jim Berlin remain present among us.

## Notes

1. These numbers come from the National Center for Education Statistics (230, 234). The statistics on full-time higher education faculty count full-time adjuncts; thus the percentage of non-tenure-track faculty is actually much higher than 35%. In 1991, the percentages of full-time women and men faculty were nearly equal, but the percentage of women in part-time positions was over two-thirds (66.8%).
2. This debate is enacted in "What Are We Doing On-Line?"
3. See Salus, chapters 15 and 18.
4. A panel of federal judges ruled the Communications Decency Act unconstitutional in June 1996.
5. A January 1994 survey found that 62% of respondents were under age 35; 73% under age 45 (Quarterman).

## Works Cited

- Barber, Benjamin R. *Jihad vs. McWorld*. New York: Times Books, 1995.
- Bartholomae, David. "Freshman English, Composition, and CCCC." *CCC* 40 (1989): 38-50.
- Berlin, James A. *Rhetorics, Poetics, and Cultures*. Urbana: NCTE, 1996.
- Birkerts, Sven. *The Gutenberg Elegies: The Fate of Reading in an Electronic Age*. Boston: Faber and Faber, 1994.
- Bradsher, Keith. "Gap in Wealth in U.S. Called Widest in West." *New York Times* 17 Apr. 1995: A1+.
- Braun, Ernest, and Stuart MacDonald. *Revolution in Miniature: The History and Impact of Semiconductor Electronics Re-explored*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.
- Central Intelligence Agency. *The World Factbook, 1995*. Washington, DC: CIA, 1995.
- The Economist Book of Vital World Statistics*. 1990. New York: Times Books, 1990.
- Faigley, Lester, and Thomas P. Miller. "What We Learn from Writing on the Job." *College English* 44 (1982): 557-69.
- George, Henry. *Progress and Poverty: An Inquiry into the Cause of Industrial Depressions and of Increase of Want with Increase of Wealth*. San Francisco: Hilton, 1879.
- Hairston, Maxine C. "Breaking Our Bonds and Reaffirming Our Connections." *CCC* 36 (1985): 272-82.
- Honan, William H. "New Pressures on the University" *New York Times* 9 Jan. 1994, sec.4A: 16.
- Huey, John. "Waking Up to the New Economy." *Fortune* 17 June 1994: 36-46.
- Mayes, Kris. "Tenure Debate Worries Faculty" *Phoenix Gazette* 28 Sept. 1995, B1.
- National Center for Education Statistics. *Digest of Education Statistics 1995*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, 1995.
- O'Reilly and Associates. "Defining the Internet Opportunity." <http://www.ora.com/survey> (31 Oct. 1995).
- Paulson, Justin. "Ya Basta!" <http://www.peak.org/~justin/ezln/ezln.html> (31 Oct. 1995).
- Quarterman, John S. "The Internet Demographic Survey." *Matrix News* 4 (January 1994): 2-6.
- Rutkowski, Anthony-Michael. "Bottom-Up Information Infrastructure and the Internet." <http://info.isoc.org:80/speeches/upitt-foundersday.html> (31 Oct. 1995).
- Salus, Peter H. *Casting the Net: From ARPANET to Internet and Beyond*. Reading, MA: Addison, 1995.

- Schor, Juliet B. *The Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure*. New York: Basic 1992.
- Slouka, Mark. *War of the Worlds: Cyberspace and the High-Tech Assault on Reality*. New York: Basic, 1995.
- Stuart, Reginald. "High-Tech Redlining." *Utne Reader* 68 (March-April 1995): 73.
- Uchitelle, Louis, and N. R. Kleinfield. "On the Battlefields of Business, Millions of Casualties" *New York Times* 3 March 1996, sec.1: 1.
- "What Are We Doing On-Line?" *Harper's* August 1995: 35-46.

## LINKED CITATIONS

- Page 1 of 1 -



You have printed the following article:

### **Literacy after the Revolution**

Lester Faigley

*College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 48, No. 1. (Feb., 1997), pp. 30-43.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0010-096X%28199702%2948%3A1%3C30%3ALATR%3E2.0.CO%3B2-D>

---

*This article references the following linked citations. If you are trying to access articles from an off-campus location, you may be required to first logon via your library web site to access JSTOR. Please visit your library's website or contact a librarian to learn about options for remote access to JSTOR.*

## **Works Cited**

### **Freshman English, Composition, and CCCC**

David Bartholomae

*College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 40, No. 1. (Feb., 1989), pp. 38-50.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0010-096X%28198902%2940%3A1%3C38%3AFECAC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-C>

### **What We Learn from Writing on the Job**

Lester Faigley; Thomas P. Miller

*College English*, Vol. 44, No. 6. (Oct., 1982), pp. 557-569.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0010-0994%28198210%2944%3A6%3C557%3AWWLFWO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-5>

### **Breaking Our Bonds and Reaffirming Our Connections**

Maxine Hairston

*College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 36, No. 3. (Oct., 1985), pp. 272-282.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0010-096X%28198510%2936%3A3%3C272%3ABOBARO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-K>