and extensions of our understanding of these figures, including a heightened understanding of the links among rhetorical theory, economics, and civic responsibility. While some of this work has been published too recently to be reflected in *Rhetoric and the Republic*, incorporation of some of this new scholarship, it seems to me, would have strengthened Longaker’s analysis. A related worry concerns the absence of discussion of George Campbell’s *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, which played a vital role in early American education during the period featured in *Rhetoric and the Republic*.

Beginning with a paradox grants me the liberty to close with a confession. Because I am skeptical of any history that overtly casts theoretical categories and assumptions across cultures, continents, and centuries, I inevitably placed a substantial burden of proof on Longaker, who—it seems to me—must labor to demonstrate the explanatory power of a Gramscian reading of early American rhetorical education. For the most part, I believe he meets this burden admirably. Although at times his repetition of key concepts and terms (“articulation,” “hegemony,” and “suture” quickly come to mind) dulls somewhat the edge of his analysis, Longaker nonetheless provides a powerful and convincing account of rhetoric and rhetorical education in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century America that brings new understanding of the intersections of discourse, economics, politics, and religion in this complex “field of engagement” (217), both then and now. He has begun to convince this skeptic that, whether or not we historians and teachers of rhetoric are in fact all republicans, we ought at least to be all Gramscians.

San Diego, California


Reviewed by Arabella Lyon, SUNY-Buffalo

Discussions of plagiarism have taken on a provocative edge. Once plagiarism was seen as shameful, transparent, and not really worthy of analysis. Now, however, scholars envision plagiarism as a nexus of socio-economic forces, an opportunity for redemption, a point of tension in global values and practices, a site of pedagogical and aesthetic possibilities, and the product of a complex legal and cultural history. New research on plagiarism often reveals relationships and possibilities hitherto unimagined. The field progresses rapidly, and at the front edge, Bill Marsh’s *Plagiarism: Alchemy*
and Remedy in Higher Education asks and answers new questions, engaging recent political events, regulations, and technologies.

Focused on the disciplinary powers of U.S. higher education in the late twentieth and early twenty first century, this intelligent book adds new technological perspectives to a discussion that is often centered on history or students. Engaging many of the familiar features of plagiary in his careful acknowledgements of earlier scholarship, Marsh also analyzes ways in which faculty, administrators, journalists, policy makers, and software entrepreneurs attempt to manage plagiarism through a range of technologies and techniques. In his critique of the apparatus of anti-plagiarism and the media through which plagiarism flows, he would have us see author and plagiarist as a false binary between origin and health, copy and disease. Rather we might understand them better as sides of the same coin, representing different aspects of authoring. While the first two-thirds of the book expose the dualistic traps of plagiarism’s discourse and build a vocabulary and conceptual framework for understanding the tensions surrounding plagiarism and its technologies, the project is at its best in the last two chapters which focus on plagiarism in the age of Internet.

The book begins with the 2002 crimes and scandals involving historians Stephen Ambrose and Doris Kearns Goodwin. Ambrose had copied passages from copyrighted work, and Goodwin had “closely echoed” sentences from other books. While much of popular and professional culture argues that plagiarism is easy to define, the public discussion in these two cases shows that the problems of definition and punishment are far from clear. In chapter 2, building on the insights of Michel de Certeau and Michel Foucault, Marsh historicizes and theorizes definitions of failed authorship and intellectual property, demonstrating the lack of a stable concept of plagiarism through history. The evolution of the rights of original authorship created a dynamic tension between the value of originality and the crime of literary theft, between personal issues of plagiarism and legal issues of copyright infringement. Marsh focuses on plagiarism as an authorial failure of creation that, in turn, interpolates the writer as a “false, fraudulent anti-author” (34). Artists, such as Kathy Acker, may use this position to innovate, but the historical development of intellectual property laws makes it difficult to conceive authorship without property and ownership rights, that is, as other than commodity. Conceiving plagiarism and plagiarism detection as different authoring activities, Marsh characterizes plagiarism detection and remedies as Foucauldian mechanisms which regulate authorship and writing. In the frame of economic and commercial practices, anti-plagiarism technologies control the flow of information. In chapter 3, Marsh connects anti-plagiarism discourse to the emergence of the research paper in the 1920’s, following the enactment of the 1909 Copyright Act. He examines administrative and pedagogical responses to the rise of mass education and the historical trend
to diminish student writing and protect “real authors.” The research paper’s growth following the 1909 law suggests two fundamental contradictions. It offers a solution to inadequate student research, but the nature of the genre encourages cut-and-paste. It values origins, but models the student writer as a mediator.

In pivotal chapter 4, Marsh then uses the metaphor of alchemy to discuss models of what real writers do with borrowing. Conceiving plagiarism as “the failure to transmute borrowed copper into gold or, perhaps worse, the deliberate attempt to pass off the base metal as its precious counterpart” (67), Marsh links the concept of plagiarism as a failure to transform a text, medieval alchemy, to humanist notions of perfecting the spirit and mind. From this historical insight, balanced with the author-centered tradition of intellectual property law, he moves, perhaps too quickly, to arguing that new informational practices will require “new breeds of readers and writers, appropriators and plagiarists, mediators and originators (not to mention humanists and individualists)” (89). In the world of copyright laws, university commitments to the creating of a managerial class, and the disciplinary aspirations of composition, research reading and writing requires complicated procedures and technologies as evidenced in the research handbook, a genre in itself which requires particular disciplined reading strategies. In chapter 5, Marsh argues that the guidelines of handbooks, while pretending to clarity and distinction, hide the socio-literate practices of academic communities, reduce the possibility of student alchemists transforming texts, and fail to promote re-contextualization and the practice of writing. In effect, handbooks seem to support authorship, but substitute opaque rules for generative practice. Through analysis of the personal essay as the model address to modernity’s solitary reader, chapter 6 links progressive writing pedagogy to fundamentalist indoctrination, but more importantly it provides a careful discussion of how we understand the process of learning socio-literate, intertextual practices. Building on Rebecca Moore Howard’s concept of “patchwriting” and her description of the process of writing successful summaries, Marsh interrogates the possibility of mapping “the activity of textual incorporation” (117) or what might be better said as the activities of textual incorporation. While acknowledging the gains of contextual pedagogies of research reading and writing, he argues for increased attention to the readerly aspects of writing following the remedial reading approaches prevalent in composition today.

In the last two chapters, Marsh discusses the nature of plagiarism in the age of Internet, compares contemporary plagiarism to earlier versions, and analyzes how plagiarism debates, especially within higher education, have changed in response to the computer age and its technologies of writing. Here the book shifts the horizons of scholarship. Since some studies suggest there is less Internet plagiarism than we believe, Marsh suggests
that the change is in professorial willingness to report it and institutions' willingness to fight it through assignment reform, rule enforcement, awareness campaigns, focus on academic honesty, education on intellectual property and plagiarism as well as Internet-based solutions. Analyzing four plagiarism detection services, Glatt Plagiarism Services, Essay Verification Engine (EVE2), Plagiarism-finder, and Turnitin.com, the last chapter shows that this new industry attempts to control information flows. Detection services, whether they reduce plagiarism or not, are outsourced education, transferring a teacher's authority and responsibility to commercial enterprise. They offer “idealized technotoxic solution to perennial administrative problems” (145). Internet entrepreneurs, selling papers or selling traps, interpolate students into identities of duplicity or originality and decrease their position as learners in an intertextual literacy. While they situate teachers in role of hunter, using the Internet strategically to find plagiarism, the industry privileges modernism’s conventions of authorship over student writing.

Since new technology raises new questions, Marsh concludes by asking writing instructors to consider what questions about Internet “cheating” and higher education are critical to understanding the deep differences between print and computer literacy. He begins to script answers to several, including “Does Internet plagiarism in the age of post-media composition represent one of the many laudable literacies students with a new ‘communication ability’ bring to the classroom, or is it, as it always has been, a fraudulent or failed venture in the realm of compositional technique, multimodal or otherwise?” (154). While I find that Marsh idealizes the “communication ability” and literacy skills of my “post-media” students and the possibilities of multimodal instruction, the pedagogical dangers of industrial university and the normative assumptions of detection services do call for further investigation and theorization. This book—seemingly focused on plagiarism—takes us to brink of asking and answering questions about intertextuality, the ownership of writing, pedagogy in the industrial university, indeed the ownership of the university. Given the confines of this project, I know it is not fair to ask Marsh to push further, yet that is what I want, what we need as teachers preparing students for new technologies and disciplinary apparatus which we do not yet understand and may have reason to fear. Plagiarism offers an analysis of technologies that is both current and prophetic. I picked up this book to engage in the provocative pleasures of plagiarism, but I come away worried about capitalist forces coming to bear on student writing.

Buffalo, New York
After reading the first of 22 original essays in this weighty tome, I knew at once it wasn’t just another reference to slide onto a dust-collecting shelf. While this volume covers a broad array of praxis useful for both new and veteran directors, and those contemplating future careers, which would be expected, it decidedly serves another aim as well; it provides a clear photograph of the state of the profession in the early twenty-first century. Not a “how-to” guide, The Writing Center Director’s Resource Book instead presents researched scholarship that even beyond creating a sense of what is currently being done as “best work” in writing center spaces, extends to reveal where our theories and goals are headed for future teaching and administrative practices and purposes. To accomplish that end, each essay has its own Works Cited pages, and many have additional resources, including appendices for budgets, surveys, and other artifacts for documenting and promoting intellectual work.

As a teacher of graduate seminars in composition pedagogy, I’m always looking for ways to bring writing center pedagogy into conversation with classroom teaching and reflective teaching practices. As a writing center director, I’m also always looking for essays that speak particularly to graduate students as tutors, ones that I can use in our professional development and orientation workshops. This book delivers on both counts. While The Writing Center Director’s Resource Book’s collection of essays will provide common grounds for ongoing conversations in our field, the book overall also acknowledges the unique experiences that help directors recognize how to make the most of their own institutional identities and opportunities. As the editors explain in the introduction, “this book is structured to respond to diverse institutional settings by providing both current knowledge and case studies that illuminate this knowledge” (xiii), creating not just a content-based resource, but a volume of essays that can also be used as research models for directors and graduate students’ own research agendas. It has both the currency and staying power to make it an excellent choice for required reading lists and permanent library holdings.

The inquiry posed by the editors—“What knowledge do writing center professionals need to have in order to do their best work?” (xi)—drives both the collection as a whole and each individual text. This line of inquiry demonstrates that the necessary knowledge for writing center work is disciplinary and connected to the rhetorical tradition itself. Our body of