Russell’s named task is “to examine the ways writing has been taught—directly or indirectly—in the wider curriculum... of secondary and higher education in modern America” (3). As such, his study traces the history of writing instruction outside general composition courses from the 1870s (when writing was taught as ancillary to speaking) through the 1980s (with the expansion of the writing across the curriculum movement). Along with surveying curricula and educational theories of the last century, *Writing in the Academic Disciplines* tacitly explores those factors contributing to the marginalization of writing.

Part I, “The Triumph of Specialization,” points to the latent entrenchment of nineteenth-century myths within the modern university system: namely, the myth of “transience”—that writing is simply a form of talking rather than a mode of learning (6)—and the myth of “transparency”—that students often learn a discipline’s written conventions as a part of their socialization into that community, and thus never acquire a conscious knowledge of the rhetorical convention which they use (16). In this section, Russell also reviews those changes that most affected nineteenth-century based writing instruction in a period of post-Civil War industrialization: the shift toward an elective curriculum based on specialized departments and an elective curriculum based on specialized departments and an embracing of the ideals of research and utilitarian service.

Part II, “The Search for Community,” details the encroaching philosophical conflict prompted by twentieth-century urbanization and industrialization: the need for specialized knowledge versus the desire for social cohesiveness. Drawing examples from writing programs at various institutions (Harvard, MIT, Beaver College, etc.), Russell shows how administrative progressives advanced the idea of cost-effective language instruction, primarily through remediation, in opposition to Deweyan progressive education. Part III concludes with a look at “The Postwar Era,” including the writing across the curriculum movement, and synthesizes information presented in earlier sections. Russell’s discussions of the theoretical bases of WAC (especially the work of James Britton), of the growth of WAC in the 70s and the 80s, and of the political climate shift of the 90s are cogent and informative.

Though repetitive and confusing at times (especially in its employment of dates), *Writing in the Academic Disciplines* fills a void in writing instruction scholarship and will be a valuable tool for student and
researcher alike. Sections such as that on technical writing can function apart from the curriculum discussion as well as within it. Also, a twenty-three page works cited section proves an excellent bibliographic resource. Furthermore, as Russell documents the myths and theories of curricula, he also dispels general misconceptions fostered by concepts of "liberal culture" or the "back to basics movement." In so doing, he provides an interesting counterperspective to works such as Dinesh D'Souza's Illiberal Education.

—Colleen Tremonte
Texas Christian University

The Craft of Revision—Donald Murray; Holt; 1991; 185 pp. ISBN 0-03-070692-0

In this informal, practical guide to writing, Murray returns to the process approach of teaching writing, which is also the foundation of two of his other books—A Writer Teaches Writing (1968; 1985) and Write to Learn (1984; 1990). Persuaded that "writing is rewriting," he builds his new text on the idea that revision is a flexible, sequential decision-making process. He says it is the satisfactions of revision, especially problem solving, discovery, and exploration, that motivate the writer to revise and to communicate.

Written in a personal manner, the text brings the reader in close to "see how the printed text is made and learn the craft of revision that precedes publication" (10). One step at a time, the book "shows the student how to create a discovery draft and then how to read the draft to see what has been discovered. Then the text takes the student through the decisions of revision: focus, audience, form, information, structure, and language. They are dealt with in an orderly, sequential manner that the student can adapt to a variety of writing tasks" (viii-ix).

Murray talks enthusiastically about writing and everywhere illustrates the process with suggestions and works in progress, including one candid paragraph about his unhappy childhood and his being a high school "dropout and, finally, flunkout" (21). He coaches—"first create a text to revise...experience writing as an act of discovery" (23); he counsels—"I go from despair to panic" (49); he advises—"I have had to teach myself to read fragments, and so should you" (52); he instructs—"outline after writing" (104).

The author holds a positive attitude, like "the explorer [who] has expectations but seeks the unexpected" (26), and he frequently experiments, "an act of seeking that may very well fail" (26). In the end, Murray