Recently, several works and conferences have focused on the origins of rhetoric and composition as a third discipline in English departments mainly concerned with teaching writing and paralleling the literature and linguistic segments of English. That focus has properly emphasized scholarship and publications, but certain other aspects have been neglected, for example, administrative changes in the partitioning of the concerns of English departments for literature and the teaching of writing to beginners and advanced students. Curricular innovations have become important, but some do not usually merit being called scholarship. Other changes include the initiation of programs for training teachers to teach writing at all levels, from elementary school through graduate school, and a restructuring of the graduate programs in English to make room for rhetoric majors in English and for interdisciplinary rhetoric programs. There has been the rise of organizations like the Rhetoric Society of America and the International Society for the History of Rhetoric. There has been the admission of rhetoric into the divisions of the Modern Language Association (MLA) and into its annual bibliography. And there has been a fairly important number of rhetoricians who have begun to write college and school textbooks for rhetoric. But most of these movements have not received the attention they deserve in any history of the renaissance of rhetoric in English departments in the last forty years. All of these have been pioneering efforts, and many of them have involved conflicts with English departments, or university administrations, or textbook publishers, or dominant structures such as the MLA. In this paper I intend to look at some of these innovations and some of these conflicts in which Ross Winterowd has been involved.

Ross Winterowd is an important name. But there are also others in many other institutions who have done similar work. Ross has been a leader of these colleagues, and so this chapter is not only about him but is also about many other pioneers and warriors in the past forty years across the country who have helped to make rhetoric the important discipline it now is.

More specifically, Ross has been an important innovator in the establishment of graduate rhetoric programs in this country and in the world. He has also been in the vanguard of academics in English departments who have worked to improve the teaching of writing in secondary schools. To achieve this he has been a major figure in establishing programs in English departments to train future teachers of writing, either in the school or college venue. Paralleling and supplementing this effort has
been Ross's incorporating rhetoric into textbooks for the middle and secondary school classes—a major innovation. Finally, he is one of the four or five people who initiated and established the Rhetoric Society of America.

Nearly all of these pioneering efforts have involved conflicts and strife. But three areas in particular have distinguished Ross as a warrior. At the departmental level, he has been at loggerheads with some administrators and colleagues in his own English department for over twenty-five years. Second, at a national level, he has had an ongoing series of spats with the MLA, the major national community of scholars in English, linguistics, and foreign languages. Third, also at a national level, Ross has crossed swords with one of the major publishing giants in the country, the publisher who put out his series of texts on writing for middle and secondary schools. All three of these battles have been colorful and dramatic.

Somewhat less spectacular and sensational have been the five major pioneering projects of which I mentioned above. But, in the long run, they are probably more important even than his rhetorical military engagements. And, of course, most of his innovations also involved a measure of warfare.

I might add as a footnote to these introductory remarks that I do not mean to imply that Ross is not important from a scholarly point of view. His vita is as impressive from this point of view, both qualitatively and quantitatively, as that of any of his colleagues at other institutions, and I am certain that many of the essays in this festschrift will address this dimension of his work. He has probably published more books and written more articles and chapters of books than any other contemporary rhetorician. In addition he has done his fair share of reviews of other books. Finally, he has few equals in the number of speeches on rhetoric which he has given all over the country for the last thirty-one years. I will advert to some of Ross's scholarship which is relevant to the innovations and battles which I hope to chronicle.

Winterowd the Pioneer: The First Graduate Rhetoric Program in English

Let us first take a look at the five major rhetorical projects in which Ross was either the first or one of the first to initiate a program which the situational context of the time demanded.

Probably the most significant innovation for which Ross will be remembered is his initiation of a graduate program in rhetoric in the University of Southern California English department. As far as I am aware, the graduate rhetoric program which he established in 1972 was the first program of its type in the country—and also in the world.

This statement calls for a short historical commentary. Rhetoric, the study of composition and the teaching of composition, has been a part of the liberal arts tradition in the Western world from the fourth century B.C. to the present century. In the past century, rhetoric was the major factor in the founding of English department in Scottish and English universities. These departments also took up the study of English literature, as opposed to classical literature.

In the first part of this century, a rift developed between the rhetorical emphasis on speech and debating in the new English departments and the emphases on
composition and literature. In 1914, at the meeting of the National Council of the Teachers of English (NCTE), the speech and debate people made a dramatic departure from the English departments and started their own departments. The major anomaly of the situation was that English departments were still left with the responsibility of teaching freshman writing courses, but the theoretical rhetorical interests had departed to the new speech departments. For some forty years this anomaly persisted.

Eventually, however, some people in English departments realized that there were historical and theoretical bases for the rhetoric on which freshman higher level writing courses were based and set about offering graduate courses in these areas, mainly for purposes of training the incoming teaching assistants, who were actually teaching most of the writing courses in large state and regional universities. Ross was one of the leaders in this resurrection of rhetoric in English departments, and it was such an interest that eventually led to the formation of the first graduate program in rhetoric at USC in 1972.

For years Ross himself taught the main teacher-training graduate course. But he realized that one course was not really adequate to cover the theoretical and historical issues which were relevant to training future teachers of writing. Eventually such a realization brought about the creation of the graduate program in Rhetoric, Linguistics, and Literature (RLL as it was referred to for many years). The title of the program is indicative of several theoretical forces. First, it asserts a program that is primarily rhetorical—that is, concerned about writing. Second, it asserts that linguistics is an important auxiliary discipline in the teaching of writing. This position, as we will see, consistently accompanies nearly all of the administrative and practical decisions which Ross made about composition, both at the college and secondary school situations. Third, Ross does not at all deny the validity of literary scholarship—unlike the position of many of the literary scholars opposing him who denied the validity of rhetorical scholarship. In fact, nearly all of the major graduate programs in rhetoric have a heavy component of literary courses.

In addition to these disciplines—rhetoric, linguistics, literature—Ross also emphasizes three others. Consistently listed in his faculty for the RLL were colleagues from the speech communications department at USC, colleagues from the philosophy department, and colleagues from education. In other words, Ross viewed rhetoric as an interdisciplinary project involving rhetoric, linguistics, literary scholarship, speech communication, philosophy, and education. His position on this issue has been followed by many of the subsequent graduate programs in rhetoric: they are interdisciplinary and they usually involve the disciplines which he incorporated into his program.

Notice that Ross's decision about the extent of the rhetoric program had to do with scholarship—what scholars in different disciplines had to offer to training a future teacher of writing. But the decision itself was not an act recorded in scholarly publications. As I remarked earlier, some of the major decisions in recent rhetorical history are scholarly but are not recorded as scholarly publications.

Besides the early interdisciplinary emphasis, the program later took on a historical emphasis with an attempt to cover the history of rhetoric through
antiquity, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance through the nineteenth century, and
the contemporary period.

Once the graduate program was initiated in 1972, it rapidly expanded. By 1991
the faculty numbered twelve members, five from English, four from linguistics, and
one each from philosophy, education, and speech communications. As Ross remarked
in a letter in 1991, "Among us, I think we represent a broader perspective than can
be found in any other program in composition/rhetoric." From its beginnings in
1972 till the dissolution of the program in 1996, fifty-nine doctorates were awarded.
Of these, Ross directed thirty-two dissertations. These fifty-nine graduates are now
spread across the country in seventeen states and many from the USC program now
are the heads of major rhetoric programs.

Work with Secondary Schools
One of the functions which rhetoric programs have largely taken over is the training
of future teachers for writing courses at the secondary level. Most of the time this
training is also shared by colleagues in colleges of education who teach the general
psychological, curriculum, and methods courses. But rhetoricians in English
departments have largely taken over the specific content preparation for the future
teachers of writing. This usually involves an undergraduate course in rhetoric and
sometimes also the supervision of student teachers in high school writing classes.

Clearly this involves some rapprochement with the schools in which the
student teachers carry out their apprenticeships. It also can heavily involve an
outreach of the rhetoricians in English departments with the school districts.
Ross has been exemplary and quite innovative in this regard.

Since 1966 when he gave his first talk on "Modern Rhetoric" to high school
teachers in Austin, Texas, Ross has given such talks in over thirty states and in several
Canadian provinces. Naturally, he has done more of this work in California than in
other states. In particular he has worked with state-wide conferences sponsored by
the California Department of Education. He has worked with regional conferences
in the state. And especially he has worked for several years with eight different school
districts. He has also given talks to many individual school faculties in California.

In sustained work with the Huntington Beach Union High School District,
Ross set up a literacy project, involving reading, writing, and frequent exercises
involving both linguistics and composition, exercises systematically teaching
students how to combine phrases and clauses into complex and compound
sentences. He has written a fair number of articles and given a number of talks
on sentence combining. He has also incorporated sentence combining into his
high school textbooks, as we will see shortly.

But the work with secondary schools does not involve simply writing articles
and textbooks. It is a very hands-on task, requiring consultants to go to schools,
assess students' abilities, work with administrators, and train teachers in the
rhetorical skills involved.

This kind of outreach is new to many departments of English, which have
often left contact with schools and school teachers up to colleges of education.
The kind of outreach practiced by Ross at USC has been imitated by many departments of English across the country. Like the graduate programs in rhetoric, working with secondary schools has given another dimension to departments of English as well as another dimension to the modus operandi of many secondary schools and districts in almost all of the states of the country.

**English Writing and Language Skills: Winterowd’s High School Textbook**

The renaissance of rhetoric in English departments in the 1960s and subsequent decades after its departure from English in the second decade of this century took a certain amount of time to influence the college scene as far as textbooks were concerned. In fact, college textbooks departing from the so-called “current traditional” system—the system emphasizing paragraph structure, style, and the modes of discourse—did not begin to hit the market until the late sixties and early seventies. But the emphasis on classical rhetorical proofs, on different purposes in writing (as exemplified by the liberal arts tradition), and on modern linguistics did not hit the secondary market until the 1980s with publications like *English Writing and Language Skills*, published by Holt, Rinehart, and Winston in 1985, written by Ross Winterowd and Patricia Y. Murray. This six-volume series for the seventh through the twelfth grade was also accompanied by a teacher’s edition for each grade. The first edition appeared in 1985 and the second in 1988. Thus, although the text is listed as only two books in Ross’s bibliography, it is actually two sets of six volumes—twelve books in all for each separate edition.

Unlike many other texts at the secondary level, the six volumes in the series were actually written by Winterowd and Murray, his co-author. In my series, for example, I wrote the scope and sequence plan and seven or eight paradigm chapters for the text, but free lance authors wrote the remainder of the chapters.

The title of the series is immediately interesting. The first edition was called *English Writing and Language Skills*. The word “language” in the title signals an emphasis to which I have called attention before—a close coordination of rhetorical and linguistic skills. The twelfth grade text, called the *Complete Course*, is divided into four sections: writing (pages 1-311), grammar and usage (312-547), mechanics (548-595), and language resources (596-675). With the last three sections it is clear that there is a heavy emphasis on language. Even in the writing section there is a major linguistic dimension, since each of the nine chapters of this section features a “Sentence Combining” section which applies sentence combining to the particular issue of that section.

Ross is not tied down to any particular theory of linguistics, but uses traditional, structural, and transformational grammar as each suits his purpose. After Paul Roberts, *The Roberts English Series* (1967), Ross was one of the first to use modern grammars in high school texts.

Another feature of Ross’s high school and college texts, and a feature which is derivative of modern views of language, is the dialectal pluralism which pervades the texts. By *dialectal pluralism* I mean the tolerance for more than just a rigid standard English written dialect. Ross was one of thirteen members of a Conference on College
Composition and Communication (CCCC) committee which worked for several years on a statement of that organization’s position on this issue. The committee was headed by Melvin A. Butler of Southern University, who, unfortunately, died before the final report was published. It also included Richard Lloyd-Jones, Geneva Smitherman, Jenefer Giannasi, and seven other illustrious scholars and administrators.

The committee’s assignment was to explain a resolution adopted by the Executive Committee of the CCCC in 1972, which reads as follows:

We affirm the students’ right to their own patterns and varieties of language—the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own identity and style. Language scholars long ago denied that the myth of a standard American dialect has any validity. The claim that any one dialect is unacceptable amounts to an attempt of one social group to exert its dominance over another. Such a claim leads to false advice for speakers and writers and immoral advice for humans. A nation proud of its diverse heritage and its cultural and racial variety will preserve its heritage of dialects. We affirm strongly that teachers must have the experiences and training that will enable them to respect diversity and uphold the right of students to their own language.

This statement was a resolution founded on the application of the studies of modern linguistics applied to the teaching of composition. As has been pointed out before, Ross was very interested in modern linguistic studies—and dialects were no exception to his interest—so it is not surprising that he worked on a committee having to do with the application of modern linguistic theories of dialect to the teaching of writing.

In writing textbooks, such a dialectal tolerance usually boiled down to another issue which, we will see in the next section, is also characteristic of modern rhetoric. This has to do with the emphasis on the purpose of the discourse. It is usually now accepted that in personal writing, use of the person’s original dialect is quite acceptable, whereas in public discourse, addressed to a very general audience, especially in expository writing, the use of the more standard dialect is preferred, mainly for purposes of communication.

This general principle runs throughout Ross’s textbooks. It was another facet of the use of modern linguistics in the text. But the use of modern grammars was not the major rhetorical innovation in Ross’s high school series. Two other features characterized the new series. First was the introduction of the process emphasis in composition. During the period of the domination of the “current traditional” composition programs, from the early part of the century till about 1980, the emphasis had been on the product. The teacher assigned a composition: Write a theme on the importance of the gold imagery in Yeats’ “Sailing to Byzantium”—it will be due next Monday. The students were expected to turn in the product on Monday, without much help in the intervening week. This was the so-called product emphasis. But research by Janet Emig, Linda Flower, and John Hayes in rhetoric in the seventies and eighties focussed attention on the importance of the intervening process, emphasizing preplanning, early drafts, revisions, and final drafts. What they did not give was a formula for preplanning and early drafts; in a word, they did not have a heuristic, a method for exploration.
Ross combined two heuristics in a felicitous manner. He related the six basic questions that journalists use for news stories (who, what, where, when, why, and how) with the five elements of the pentad heuristic of Kenneth Burke (agent, act, scene, purpose, and agency). Who is the agent? What is the act? Where and when are the scene? Why is the purpose? And, how is the agency? By using Burke’s more complex formula, Ross came up with a very workable heuristic which he used as the first chapter in all of his high school textbooks and which applied to all of the subsequent chapters of the writing section of those books.

The writing section also uses another important element of modern rhetoric. It consists of ten chapters: Using the writing process, personal writing, writing paragraphs, writing exposition, imaginative writing, critical writing, writing the research paper, logic and writing, persuasive writing, business letters and forms. Anyone who looks at a text structure like this and compares it to the usual texts of the “current traditional” period realizes that there has been a major sea change. Missing from this list of chapters are several of the usual modes or forms of discourse, as they were also called. Since the time of Alexander Bain in the last century, the modes had dominated the structure of school and college texts, with chapters devoted to narration, description, argumentation, persuasion, and exposition. The first three are missing in Ross’s structure (although logic does overlap with argumentation). Instead, however, there are chapters devoted to the personal, imaginative, critical, research paper, and business writing. Most of these are purposes or aims of writing, as distinct from the modes or means of writing. Ross has also taken advantage of several important figures in modern rhetoric who have re-emphasized what the long liberal arts tradition had emphasized—the importance of purpose or aims in writing. People like James Britton, Ed Corbett, Robert Conners and I have made this a major break with “current traditional” rhetoric. And Ross’s text embodies this principle in each of his six volumes.

These various features characterize both the first and the second edition of English Writing and Language Skills. But the second edition poses an interesting coda to the story of Ross’s high school series—a coda which we will examine when we talk about his fights with his publishers.

Undergraduate Teacher Training Program

It should be fairly obvious, after a consideration of Ross’s work with the schools and after examining the complexities and innovations in his school textbooks, that a teacher training program was called for to introduce teachers to the new materials in rhetoric and linguistics and their pedagogical corollaries.

In fact, before the resurrection of rhetoric in English departments, there had not been a course preparing future teachers of English in both elementary and secondary schools to teach writing. Curiously enough, there has also not usually been a course training the same people to teach literature. Occasionally there have been special courses in children’s and adolescent literature acquainting future teachers with the canons in these areas, but the courses did not usually carry a pedagogical dimension.
However, with the advent of the resurrected rhetoric and with the reshaping of the writing courses that was taking place in English departments, the need for a particular course training future teachers of writing was articulated. Eventually, the undergraduate curriculum preparing secondary teachers of English in nearly all colleges and universities included a mandatory course in the teaching of writing, which usually combines some writing with some pedagogy. It is often accompanied by one or two courses in writing, by three or four courses in literature, by one or several courses in linguistics, by a course in literary criticism, and by several courses in education, including a course in student teaching.

The Rhetoric Society of America

Another of Ross's pioneering efforts remains to be examined before we move on to his military exploits. This has to do with the nurturing and bringing to a mature state a new society and a new journal. The Rhetoric Society of America and its journal, The Rhetoric Society Quarterly, both are creations of the new interest in rhetoric engendered by the revitalized programs in composition in English departments, by the new graduate programs in English departments and by the cooperation of the faculty of those programs with the older programs in rhetoric housed in speech and communications departments and colleges in many universities.

Toward the end of the 1960s, a group of rhetoricians from these various departments began to meet annually, usually at a conference sponsored either by the Conference on College, Composition, and Communication (CCCC) or by the Speech Communications Association. Probably the earliest of such informal meetings was the encounter between Ross and Nelson Smith at the CCCC meeting in St. Louis in 1965. Smith talked to Ross about the possibility of a rhetoric society including people from both English and speech communications and about a newsletter addressing their mutual concerns. Smith began the newsletter; but after he removed himself from the scene, Richard Larson took over his list of members and published several of the newsletters. After these initial newsletters, George Yoos of St. Cloud, Minnesota, took over the newsletter and eventually became the editor of the new journal, The Rhetoric Society Quarterly. Yoos edited the journal for many years, bringing it from infancy to maturity.

In Miami in 1969, at the annual meeting of CCCC, Chris Jennison of Wadsworth Publishing Company financed a meeting of the future society. Henry Johnstone, founder of the journal Philosophy and Rhetoric, was the principal speaker. And the author of the lead article in the first issue was Lloyd Bitzer, author of "The Rhetorical Situation." His article was discussed by Ed Corbett, John Ahsmead, Janice Lauer, and others. This may have been the first formal meeting of the Rhetoric Society of America.

One of the more memorable of the earliest meetings was at Ross's own house in Huntington Beach when the CCCC met at Anaheim in 1974. It was a very informal meeting, with many of us sitting on the floor of Ross's living room.
Unlike the other three pioneering attempts, the establishment of the Rhetoric Society of American and its journal, the *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, was not a pugnacious affair. But Ross’s innovations have usually been fraught with conflict and contention. Let us briefly survey three of these battles.

Winterowd the Warrior: Winterowd Versus the English Department

Undoubtedly the most persistent, the most disagreeable, and at once the most successful and yet the least satisfying battle in which Ross engaged had to do with the relationship of the new rhetoric program—graduate and undergraduate—to his home department of English.

At the outset, a veritable obstacle course had to be negotiated in order to establish the two-level program. One of the most critical obstacles had to do with the availability of graduate students for the literature and the rhetoric programs, drawn from the same pool. The graduate students were critical to both the graduate and the undergraduate program. If students majored in Rhetoric, Linguistics, and Literature (RLL), they were, in effect, siphoned off from those who majored in literature. Thus, a rivalry developed between graduate students. Before the RLL program, all graduates were literature majors.

The second facet of this problem had to do with the teaching functions of the graduate students. Nearly all graduate students had to teach writing courses, though some got to teach literature courses. In other words, the graduate students were essential to the rhetoric undergraduate program but only accidental to the literature program.

As the years went by, one determining factor turned out to be the job market. Graduate students were very interested in where the jobs were, which, more and more, were in rhetoric, not in literature. As a result, over the years after the RLL program started in 1972, the job market persuaded many graduate students to move into the rhetoric graduate program. Subsequently, in 1983-84, eleven years after the program was established, half of the graduate students had opted for the RLL program. Almost a decade later, the English department issued a list of the forty-eight graduate student placements which the department had made in the past several years. As Ross pointed out in a letter to the English department, all forty-eight of these placements had been in RLL.

The choices of these graduate students were based on a number of factors, but among them were issues which Ross had addressed to the English department. In these letters he frequently pointed out the deficiencies of an English literature graduate major.

In a particularly compelling letter to the graduate students in the English department in 1994 he pointed out five illusions under which English graduate majors operate:

*You are being prepared to teach; many of you and your mentors are doing cultural studies; literature makes people more tolerant, sensitive, and caring; you are being prepared to enter a profession; you will spend your years in a major research university. The reality response to each of these illusions bears the same message: you are being prepared to write literary term papers to get tenure in an institution that either has no graduate program or has one that is minimal.*

\(^6\)
Such an acerbic assessment of the function of graduate programs in English literature obviously did not endear him to the literary members of his own department. But the graduate students increasingly came to accept Ross's assessments of many facets of graduate study, both at USC and throughout the country.

One particular facet of the graduate program at USC increasingly irritated the rhetoric graduate students and faculty. The screening examination for graduate majors in English heavily emphasized literature. To pass the examination, the graduate students had to take a large proportion of their courses in literature and, as a corollary, to neglect their rhetoric courses. The graduate rhetoric majors (and also those in linguistics and film and literature, etc.) wanted to be allowed a mix of these several disciplines, and they wanted the screening examination to reflect such a mix. Unfortunately, such a tolerance was not allowed, and the screening examination played a partial role in the final dissolution of the program. In fact, instead of relaxing the literature emphasis, further literary emphases were added. Eventually this forced graduate students to take literature courses to prepare for the screening examination.

The success of the RLL majors in getting jobs and the failure of the majority of the literature majors to get jobs was an additional matter of concern between Ross and the English department. All of the RLL majors got jobs, many in quite prestigious institutions (Universities of Wisconsin, Illinois, California, Michigan, North Carolina, Alabama, De Paul, Texas, Oregon State, Syracuse, Ohio State, etc.) In contrast, as Ross pointed out in one of his memos to the department, "Over the last decade, one in five of our PhD's specializing in literature, film and literature, and cultural criticism has landed a tenure-track job." The major reason for this was the fact that 70 percent of the jobs advertised in the Chronicle of Higher Education and in the October issues of Publications of the Modern Language Association of America (PMLA) for a good number of years have been composition jobs. Ross repeatedly called the attention of the department to this ominous fact.

The contrast of the success in placements of the two programs was clearly a further aspect of the battle of the rhetoric program with the literature teachers in the department. Eventually it turned the literature teachers to view the issue as an either-or and not a both-and: this will be either a department of literature or rhetoric, and it will not be both a literature and a rhetoric department.

Another bone of contention between the two factions had to do with the failure of some of the members of the rhetoric graduate faculty to receive tenure. Three of the most flagrant cases occurred in 1984, when the department met to consider Louise Phelps, Marilyn Cooper, and Michael Holzman. All three were denied tenure. The department faulted Louise Phelps for a lack of scholarship; yet her book on rhetoric was accepted by Oxford University Press in a month following the departmental decision. And the department refused an appeal. She accepted a full professorship (not just an associate professorship) at Syracuse University, where she now directs the writing program. Cooper went from USC to Michigan Tech, where she is flourishing. Holzman left academia. In the previous year, the department had turned down Betty Bamberg for tenure. So the trend was clear; the rhetoric department could be held back by denying tenure to its members. Thus, another of the telling reasons for the dissolution of the program.
Another procedure of the English department to discourage rhetoric majors had to do with the establishment of an advising mentor for each incoming graduate student. The majority of the mentors were obviously literary scholars; they represented a large force recommending that future majors not concentrate in rhetoric.

In 1997, most of these trends converged. Although the graduate rhetoric program had flourished between 1985 and 1994, the negative effect of the convergence of the trends which I have outlined above came to a dramatic conclusion. Fewer and fewer of the rhetoric graduate students were screened to admittance to the doctoral program; the rhetoric faculty was being decimated by denials of tenure; and the literature members of the department, dismayed by the movement of the graduate students to the rhetoric major, as graduate advisors steered students away from rhetoric. The result of the convergence of these three movements was the rather quick decline of students admitted to the rhetoric concentration program. By 1997, there were none. In effect, from being half of the graduate student majors in the department, the rhetoric majors in a few years had been reduced to none.

In a very real sense, the rhetoric program had killed itself by being too successful. It was unfortunate that this situation occurred at the very place at which the rhetoric graduate program in English had originated. By contrast, there are now more than seventy other graduate rhetoric programs in English departments in which the literateurs, the linguists, and the rhetoricians have been able to co-exist, though rarely without rancor.

Winterowd Versus the Modern Language Association
A second clearly controversial issue in which Ross has also moved some waves has to do with rhetoric and the MLA. This very large association of over 30,000 members in 1997 states its purpose succinctly in its constitution: "The object of the association shall be to promote study, criticism, and research in the more and less commonly taught modern languages and their literatures and to further the common interests of teachers of these subjects." Obviously a broad range of members can qualify under these criteria. The association has been in existence since 1883, and because of its historical importance and wide range of interests, it is one of the most influential scholarly organizations in America.

The organization's journal, *Publications of the Modern Language Association* (*PMLA*), its *MLA International Bibliography*, a very thorough bibliographic study for the areas which it investigates, and its annual convention, at which more than 10,000 members usually appear, testify to its influence. Both the journal and the convention go beyond the usual connotations of "modern," since both accept contributions about literature from Old and Medieval English (and other literature of current modern languages—Italian, French, German, Hispanic, African, and Asian languages). The journal and the convention accept articles and presentations about genre studies (about literature), interdisciplinary approaches to literature (thirteen different approaches in 1997), and language and "teaching" studies. The 1997 issue lists four "teaching" issues: language, literature, writing, and "teaching as a profession."
Of these eight divisions with eighty-one discussion groups listed in the September, 1997 *Directory*, only one, “The Teaching of Writing,” is devoted to rhetoric, and that has been relegated to the pedagogical division under teaching—the last division listed, it might be pointed out. There is still no recognition that rhetoric has a content of its own, although seventy-seven other discussion groups in language and literature have recognizable content areas.

This is fundamentally the basis for Ross’s objection to the MLA. “The Teaching of Writing” is a fairly recent addition to the discussion groups. In other words, for over 100 of its 107 years, the MLA has not even recognized rhetoric as a field of “language and literary study.” And when it finally allowed one discussion group, it gave it only pedagogical, not content area justification. This is despite the long and rich history of rhetoric in western and other civilizations from the earliest documents of these cultures. Indeed, it is impossible to find a culture in which persuasion has not existed alongside literature as a cultural phenomenon. In fact, persuasion in many cultures is quantitatively much more dominant than literature; religion, politics, and advertising, for example, are much more dominant in our culture than literature.

At a literacy conference in Pittsburgh, sponsored by the MLA, Ross challenged the supposed superiority of literature. Catherine Stimson, then president of MLA, according to Ross:

... flew in to give us the word and then flew out immediately. Her word was quite wonderful: Literacy is the sea on which sails the ship of literature. I responded thus (and I’m VERY proud of this moment): Professor Stimson, your metaphor is askew. Your stately ship of literature is actually a trireme, and the people attending this meeting are the galley slaves.”

At one time during this period, Ross even resigned from the MLA, as a protest against its policies.

Eventually, especially under the leadership of Phyllis Franklin, MLA did make some moves to expand its concept of literacy. In 1982, the MLA’s Commission on the Future of the Profession recommended that “composition teaching, theory, and practice be accorded the same institutional recognition and rewards as the pedagogy and practice associated with literary studies.” A later Commission of Writing and Literature, of which I was a member, elaborated these suggestions. In its report it recommended that the MLA include two specialists in the PMLA Advisory Committee, that the MLA bibliography expand its categories for classifying research in composition and writing, that the MLA Program Committee include in its members a specialist in composition and rhetoric, and that the MLA sponsor some literacy conferences aimed at incorporating rhetoric and composition more into the organization. All of these recommendations were eventually accepted and acted upon.

In practice, though, it will still take decades before English departments treat rhetoric and composition teachers with the same respect given to teachers of literature. But at least the efforts of some rhetoricians, including Ross, have made some differences in official policy.
Winterowd Versus the Publishers

One of Ross's major military campaigns has to do with differences with publishers. As he pointed out in an article in CCC in 1989, "Over the last twenty-five years, I have worked as a referee and consultant for perhaps two dozen publishers and have done books for seven of these." In this Ross is typical of other authors who have had relationships with publishers that were cordial and congenial at times, but controversial and unpleasant at other times.

Ross raises some major issues with regard to publishers. Initially, he found that publishers of composition textbooks in the 1970s were not aware of current thinking among rhetoricians that was at strong variance with the "current-traditional" assumptions upon which then-current textbooks were based. Publishers needed to be re-educated and made aware of the new rhetorics which were coming into vogue. This re-education took time; differences of opinion about textbook content, ensuing contracts, unwritten agreements among publishers and authors, and a host of other problems arose. Ross faced these problems in publishing both his college textbooks and his high school texts, because, as we have already seen, he insisted on incorporating the new rhetorics into his textbooks at all levels.

The distinct possibility existed that publishers could take new ideas submitted by prospective textbook authors, pass them on to in-staff writers, and publish new texts without giving authors credit for the new ideas. Especially at the level of school publishing, this publishing gamut resulted in generic, authorless textbooks, put "together by in-house staffs after editors and publishers have scoured the profession for ideas." Of course, if the authors are recognized, then there is the usual routine of contracts to be agreed upon and signed. As Ross properly points out, these contracts are all constructed by the lawyers of the publishers and protect the publishers, not the authors. In addition, many of these contracts are "boilerplate" contracts, generic to many publishing houses.

In particular, Ross warns against several clauses which these generic contracts include. As he says, in the 1989 article,

A contract designed to get the most from an author: while giving the least might work in the following way. First, through the contract the author grants, conveys, and assigns to the Publisher all his right, title, and interest in and to any material of the Author in the Work, insofar as said material is original with him. Now the publisher owns what the author has produced. Second, the author agrees that the Publisher is under no obligation to use the Author's ... services in any subsequent revisions or editions of the Work and the Publisher may use any and all of the Author's ... contribution to the said work in any such revision and/or editions, the extent of revision or determination of new editions to be solely in the discretion of the publisher. And now the publisher has the legal right to use the author's ideas and words in any way or context and to exclude the author from further participation in the development of the work.

Ross asks why an author would sign such a contract. The unfortunate fact is that many authors do sign such contracts and are stuck with the consequences. One common sequence is that second editions of textbooks are written without authorial
consent by in-staff writers. Then the author’s royalties are severely cut and the 
author has no legal recourse because he or she has signed the contract with 
clauses like those cited above. But the major ideas and the whole sequence and 
development of the series remain the same. In other words, the second edition 
does not pay the authors for their work or their ideas.

What does the author do? Sit back, take reduced royalties, and ignore the 
affront to authorship? Or can the author write furiously around the country, 
discouraging people from adopting the bastardized edition, but in the process 
cut his or her own royalties?

These are issues which Ross has raised, resulting from actual experiences. 
As Ross frequently points out, such issues have not been adequately discussed, 
yet they are major.

Given his important pioneering innovations and given his militant campa­
igns, Ross Winterowd emerges as one of the major figures in contemporary 
rhetoric and composition. Few people can equal his scholarly innovations, and 
few have gone to battle for principles as Ross has. Ultimately, Ross is a pleasant 
and agreeable colleague and in classical terms, a gentleman and a scholar—and 
a good deal more besides.
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