As Shumway notes, my insistence on retaining my teacherly authority implies my acceptance of some kinds of hierarchies, and I do not think all competition is unhealthy. But for Shumway, "that authority presumes that not all opinions are equal and that the intellectual world is structured by differences in the legitimacy of arguments" (431.) Differences, for him, imply and justify hierarchy: differences and a diversity of opinions mean that some arguments are necessarily and *a priori* better, stronger, more acceptable than others. And this assumes that there is an objective authority or standard by which to judge these arguments. Of course, all teaching includes the evaluation of student work, and feminists, as Shumway points out, must argue their positions like anyone else. But none of this means that we must accept the proposition that "intellectual competition is thus the rule." Just because competition "rules" in most traditional spaces in the academy or the "real world" does not mean that feminist and progressive pedagogies and politics should not try to imagine and model alternative means of intellectual engagement which are not an adversarial, zero sum game (if I win, you must lose, and that lesson of competition is "good" for you).

Shumway implies that alternatives to competition do not provide the intellectual engagement students deserve, and goes so far as to say that the "nurturing" Women's Studies classroom (nurturing because it seeks to empower all student voices, not the traditional vocal majority) puts students at a disadvantage in the real world where they will inevitably face cut-throat, individualistic (read: American) competition. But to "test" students' ideas in order to strengthen them or evaluate them does not require that we pit them against each other, or against an illusory, apolitical, objective, standard that determines winners and losers. The truly "nurturing" classroom is one that privileges all students—that supports and encourages as wide a range of learning styles as there are student learners—and if some aspects of web technology help us to realize this "utopian" goal, then I support appropriating those aspects for our use.

is that the former are tried and true and have the imprimatur of "tradition," while web sites are seemingly "new," relatively untried, the product of a technology whose aims are not necessarily humanizing or democratic. I believe, as Shumway implies, that we should resist the seductions of mere "newness," but I am intrigued by the possibilities web technology offers for exploring the interstices between traditional disciplines and traditional methods where interdisciplinary fields like Women's Studies and American Studies emerge. I believe, as Shumway clearly does not, that this technology offers possibilities for producing new kinds of knowledge, for allowing students to create interdisciplinary and interactive presentations that would challenge the traditional definition not only of "text' and "assignment," but of learning as well. Even in these possibilities, web technology is a means to an end, but a means that can powerfully shape that end.

Feminist pedagogies, when successful, are also always a means to an end—but that end may look more processional, contingent and activist than Shumway's approved dispensing of "concepts, information, skills," a mode which sounds dangerously close to the "banking model" of education criticized by Paulo Freire and labeled by Shumway as "inadequate." One of my "overtly" political ends is to encourage students to develop critical skills they can take beyond the classroom and the particular discipline and knowledge formation, into the wider world, and to familiarize them, especially women students, with a masculine-dominated technology so that they can become discerning, resisting, critical users and shapers of technology in the future. These ends are also broadly consistent with the mandates of American Studies and with a long tradition of progressive and radical teaching.

Finally, Shumway misconstrues the meaning of the term "masculine ethos," and asserts a monolithic standard and style of intellectual engagement and classroom atmosphere. What I mean by "masculine ethos" is not "hierarchy and competition" as Shumway suspects, but the acceptance and enactment of unearned and often invisible entitlement of boys and men, and the ways they have learned to behave and have been rewarded for behaving. This ethos, which is open to, but often problematic for some girls and women, some people of color and members of the working class, produces an unfair but nevertheless "naturalized" form of domination by those bigger, louder, more aggressive and assertive than others, those who have learned to play the academic game and feel comfortable at the center, in the spotlight, on the spot, those who feel what they have to say at any given moment is important. While a feminist consciousness encourages teachers to be aware of this invisible standard, and work against it, some web technology which does not privilege physical aspects of classroom performance remedies this unfairness for less "entitled" students and thus actually and measurably increases their intellectual engagement in the material, as Gregory Jay recounts in his experiences of teaching with web technology.

On key points, Shumway's critique targets aspects of my course that do not exist. Perhaps he has a preconceived notion of Women's Studies courses, especially at elite institutions like Dartmouth. It is worth asking why he imagines these are key features my course, and why he sets my aims up in opposition to Tracey Weis' course on activism when, for all I know, she and I might well share much the same pedagogical agenda. But here, I will address three major assumptions of Shumway's that allow him to seriously misread my claims.

First, Shumway brands my introductory Women's Studies course "undisciplinary" because of its alleged "lack of emphasis on the production of knowledge." By contrast, he praises Tracey Weis' course, which encourages students to use the Web to produce historically based narratives of women's activism, and applauds her goal of helping students develop "the ability to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize historical evidence," despite the fact that she too, obviously, "has a political agenda." This contrast arises because Shumway either does not recognize, or does not value the kinds of knowledge we attempted to produce in our WS 10 course. After the sentence he quotes in which I point out that "students, like teachers, have to unlearn" the false dichotomy between the personal and the political, (an assertion which amplifies historian Robert J. Bezucha's position), I assert that "students have to learn a critical approach towards the personal and private; they need to be able to filter their own as well as others' experiences through analytical lenses, often clarified by theoretical constructs, and distinguish that from the merely confessional or emotive." In other words, the knowledges we encouraged our students to produce were highly critical, evaluative understandings of the workings of sex and gender in (mostly) contemporary US culture.

Although this course had a traditionally "historical" component, we also asked students to reflect, slowly, deeply, and narratively, on their own experiences or what they saw around them. I understand this goal to be firmly within the tradition of American Studies which, as Sherry Lee Linkon points out in her response, has had a long commitment to turning its critical gaze on the popular and quotidian, as well as raising "alternative political and social consciousness."

Shumway's second point is that my essay illustrates an extreme form of prioritizing "a particular kind of pedagogy" over the teaching of "any particular content" which results in making "pedagogy not a means but an end, and . . . the Web as tool for reaching that end." He uses Weis again to illustrate the contrasting, positive use of the Web "as a means to teach students something else: concepts, information, skills." This criticism assumes an opposition of form and content, means and ends, that I find disturbing and also limiting. Many of us discovered in using the Web to teach not that the medium is the message, but that the medium shapes the message in ways we must recognize and, as Mark Sample recommends in his response, reconsider—and that this is as true for the lecture or discussion format, the textbook, novel, or the web site. The difference

is true for the Hitler links, which could perhaps have been explained and justified discursively. As they stand, they simply seem to express the student's ignorance." In the context of her hyperlinked, visual argument—using format, style, and images as rhetoric—Wendy's project engages in critical thinking inside the logic of stereotypes, albeit without the form and appearance of a traditional, discursive argument. The issue here is not about the judgement of a single student project, in or out of context, but about exploring *alternative* ways to help novice students understand and express complex ideas.

Finally, we reject Shumway's *ex cathedra* argument that students shouldn't publish on the Web. The public nature of the Web plays all kinds of strategic roles in the kind of teaching approaches we discuss in our essay. Furthermore, a course in "Race, Gender, and Justice," functions largely in the complex interplay between public and private, and individual and social meaning. When students conduct their work in the public spaces of the Internet—both dangerous and validating—they experience not only the empowerment that helps them take their own ideas seriously (something they don't necessarily do after years of writing private discursive papers to their teachers), but engages them in the very matrix of public and private knowledge we seek to convey.

Response to Crossroads Collection Comments

Ivy Schweitzer

There is much to discuss in all of the comments written in response to the Crossroads collection. I direct this response particularly to David Shumway, who considers my Women's Studies course "among the most overtly political," that is, the polar opposite of "traditional," "disciplinary," and thus "useful." Shumway ends his response where I begin, vigorously rejecting a claim he lifts out of context from the opening of my essay, that "the web has the capacity not merely to challenge, but to change the structures of power in classroom, and perhaps the world at large. I did not make this claim without emphasizing several "important caveats," elaborated at some length later in the essay, that for me limit "the potential of web technology to actualize some of the basic goals of feminism and feminist pedagogy." Although I share many of his qualms about information technology, I don't agree that "the web reflects perfectly the social status quo." I do believe it reflects it enough to require radical interventions. Yes, it is a technology unevenly distributed, underanalyzed and, in his words, "deployed mainly in the service of the market [whose] overall impact is to encourage consumption and passivity," but that deployment is inevitable. Like others, I believe we can resist and reshape it with the critical analyses we bring to it.

Beware of Geeks Fearing Shifts

Ron Buckmire, Gabrielle Foreman, and Donna Maeda

In David Shumway's response, he targets for critique one of the student projects we discuss at some length. Specifically he addresses the student's (Wendy's) use of hyperlinking to create connections, as he puts it, that "equate both men and whites with Hitler." He goes on to say that this "is not critical thinking; indeed, it is only by courtesy that we can call it thinking at all. Imagine if a student with a right-wing political agenda had constructed a site in which the word 'black' was linked to an image of Sambo, or the word 'woman' to the image of a prostitute. Such links would surely be criticized (correctly) by these teachers as racist and sexist, yet they don't seem to be able to see that this site commits the same kind of intellectual error of gross stereotyping" (435). But, in fact, Wendy's student paper was not a commission of "gross stereotyping;" rather, as we said in the essay, she uses "visual links to call attention to semiotics, the relationship between language and the meanings we assign to it."

One of our assumptions in "Race, Gender and Justice" as illustrated in the final paper which called for an analysis of Barbara Kruger's art piece "Love for Sale" using the legal theory of Patricia Williams' is that inter-disciplinary, multimedia work provides students with multiple ways to develop their analytical skills. We believe that multi-linear, multi-media modes of writing can be effective ways to introduce students to sophisticated ideas about social and cultural meaning. It seems that Shumway needs an accompanying discursive explanation for our student's choice of, and choice to use, images. Without it, he seems stuck in a strikingly literal, rather than conceptual, framework. Subtlety is not the only manner in which one can forward critical thinking.

Indeed, artists and musicians often use intentional hyperbole to engage their audiences. Clearly, the images the student, Wendy, uses are shocking and stereotypical, intentionally so; this doesn't make them unsuccessful. Among the many critical questions we asked students to consider for the final project was "In what ways do intersecting scripts of race, gender, and sexuality shape your reading of the work?"

Our point is that a medium that incorporates both narrative and iconographic expression allows students who are not conventionally strong writers to improve their narrative skills as they also express themselves conceptually (in this case visually) at a high level. We felt Wendy's essay was successful because, as we said, she "purposefully scrambles the meanings we attach to language—calling the meaning of 'resistance' into question, and reassigning the word savage to connect it to white male exclusionary power and the fascism that she has already aligned with the symbol of Hitler."

Shumway says of Wendy's project, that she "did not present an argument, something which web sites, unlike papers, do not typically feature. The same

Course Objectives: HUM 256

Apply specific and defensible criteria, appropriate to the cultural context, to analyze, interpret, and evaluate African-American texts.

Analyze the role of orality in this literature, including the continuing effects of "street language."

Explain the broad features of African-American literary history and situate individual texts within that history.

Examine the effects of individual and culturally-determined factors (such as race, gender, class, region, biases of information sources, prior cross-cultural experiences) in one's own and others' responses to African American texts and culture.

Evaluate the role which music (such as spirituals, jazz, blues, rap) plays within African-American culture and literature and analyze selected works in relation to an appropriate musical tradition.

Analyze the effects of education, gender roles, printing and publication practices, segregation, and race identity on the development and reputation of these authors.

Use formal and informal writing to develop and express interpretations and analyses, distinguishing between personal and critical responses.

Use evidence from the texts and bring multiple viewpoints and perspectives to bear in developing one's interpretations, evaluations, and comparative analyses of these literary works.

Explain the relationships within these selections, among audience, purpose, organization, form, voice, diction, style, and use of literary conventions.

Though Shumway prefers community which occurs within a confined physical space to community which occurs in cyberspace, it was precisely to overcome the ethnic confinements of our physical space that I turned to cyberspace. I tend to agree with Shumway's apparent assumption that we should ask whether technology is added to a course for its own sake (bells and whistles, a sense of being "on the cutting edge," maybe a way to impress or engage students) or whether it represents the best way to provide necessary instruction. For my students, the opportunity to connect with students with very different cultural experiences was a very direct way to achieve an important objective of our course.

too came improved finding aids such as the index. As O'Donnell notes, hypermedia are to print what the codex was to the scroll: an immensely more powerful means toward accomplishing a familiar end.

Further, just as writing is as much a way of learning as it is of storing information, so too with hypermedia. They make it easier to challenge students to hear those other voices they now too frequently screen out when they read. When one puts a course on a web page, for example, with the sorts of links indicated above for "Dulce et Decorum Est," students can no longer pretend the poem is simply a graphic depiction of a gas attack.

They can, that is, more clearly hear Owen's "NO!" because those saying "YES" are also within earshot. And we can ask more challenging questions—those which push students to consider the significance of a particular way of phrasing that "NO!" in the context of the history of the conversation, for example—because the resources for answering are at hand.

Works Cited

Burke, Kenneth. *The Philosophy of Literary Form*. Berkeley, CA: U of California P 1941.

Knoles, Lucia and John McClymer, "Ersatz Learning, Inauthentic Teaching," *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching* 3 (1992): 33-50.

O'Donnell, James J. "St. Augustine to NREN: The tree of knowledgeand how it grows." Plenary paper given at the North American Serials Interest Group 7th Annual Conference, June 1992.

Response

Kathy Walsh

David Shumway rightly points out that a mere demonstration of the fact of cultural diversity would be inadequate as the sole justification for a college-level course. My own course, he particularly questions in this regard, did indeed address an entire range of student learning outcomes (see below). Enabling my students to better understand "the fact of cultural diversity," and, especially, the particular challenge such diversity presents to interpreters of literature, was indeed the prime learning outcome which the project described in my case study was designed to promote, though not the sole objective of the course. Here are all the course objectives for HUM 256:

> Stefan Zweig attempted to explain the terrible attraction war held for countless millions in August of 1914. He attributed this in part to heroic ideas (fantasies?) that they had absorbed in the long decades of peace. In part he attributed it to the sense of importance war gave ordinary people. And he also credited Freud for having uncovered some of the deepest psychological satisfactions war affords. Use the other primary materials to annotate Zweig's arguments. That is, cite specific passages from Brooke, Owen, and Freud that support, illustrate, or complicate Zweig's analysis. If you really want to impress, go back to the site on French poster art and choose one or two posters that literally illustrate Zweig's argument that artists and intellectuals eagerly supported the war.

Hypertext and multimedia—because they combine characteristics of library, archive, laboratory, gallery and darkroom, recording studio and stereo system, TV studio and editing board, graphics and statistical package—bring together text (in whatever form) and context in uniquely powerful ways.

Using text to illumine context and context to explore text is exactly what expert learners have always done. The potential for a revolution in teaching and learning lies in the fact that the new technology permits novice learners to do the same. It allows them, that is, to hear other speakers in the "unending conversation" in a more nuanced way and it allows them to share their understanding of what those speakers are saying with an exceptional range of other listeners.

Ah, yes, one can hear the skeptic saying, but will they do it? Since Shumway makes a single student product bear much of the weight of his argument that the Web will allow bad discourse to drive out good, perhaps I can be permitted to cite another student's work, Emmanuelle Vuillermoz's essay written in response to the assignment quoted above. I have, I should add, posted this essay/web page, with the student's permission, as a model for other students. As a result, the reader will find my running commentary in a parallel frame alongside her essay.

http://www.assumption.edu/HTML/Academic/history/HI14Net/Ellie.html

The possibilities opened up by the Web and other new technologies are analogous to those we associate with the invention and elaboration of writing. To paraphrase classicist James J. O'Donnell, in an oral culture, something is known only if some person actually has committed it to memory.

However, once it is transcribed, that same item is "known" even if no actual living person commands it because people know where it is stored, "and that is a very great revolution indeed." The development of the codex, O'Donnell points out, enormously improved access to stored knowledge. No longer did one have to proceed in a linear fashion through a scroll until one came upon the object sought. One could turn directly to the correct page. With the codex

standing students must develop in order to, in Burke's phrase, "catch the tenor of the argument." One is informational.

There is a body of fact speakers in the conversation take for granted. Owen assumed, for example, that his readers knew Horace's "Dulce et Decorum Est." Another sort of understanding presumed in the conversation is a familiarity with the set of standard questions around which the conversation organizes itself. If a historian were to suggest that many of the changes attributed to the impact of World War I had really begun before the "guns of August" sounded, she would take it for granted that her listeners understood that specialists in many disciplines use World War I as a watershed event and therefore would recognize immediately that she was challenging conventional wisdom. Further, she would assume a third kind of familiarity, namely with the canons of evidence and argument in the humanities. She would know, that is, what sorts of proof her listeners would demand before taking her contribution to the conversation seriously. "Catching the tenor" of such an argument is a formidable task.

So it is not surprising that students tend not to behave as Kenneth Burke would have them. They do initially sit quietly, aware that they understand little of what is being said around them. But too often they do not try to figure out the larger contexts in which the statements they hear take their meaning. Instead they focus narrowly upon a single voice. They summarize the content of what they hear. They do not, that is, attempt to become participants in the conversation. They do not seek to connect; they compartmentalize. They cope rather than learn.

Most typically, they transpose questions about interpreting events or texts into questions about information. They construct lists of the causes of World War I, for example, which they treat in the same fashion as they would Wilson's "Fourteen Points." And we too often collaborate in this "erstaz" knowing by the way we construct our courses, assignments, and exams.

Our first challenge is to enable students to hear some of the other voices in the conversation rather than to focus exclusively upon the surface meaning of the single text before them. It is precisely this which hypermedia so powerfully facilitate. Consider a Web Page using Owen's poem. I have designed one for use in an introductory-level course on Modern European and U.S. History in a unit that deals with World War I. It pulls together key texts, some pictures of trench warfare, poster art, a link to a sound file of Stravinski's "The Rite of Spring" along with a description of its initial reception, statistical tables about casualty figures, and much else: **http://www.assumption.edu/HTML/-Academic/history/HI14Net/Unit_6.html**

Students also read a narrative account of the war in their textbook, excerpts from Stephan Zweig's autobiography, Owen's "Dulce Et Decorum Est," Rupert Brooke's "The Soldier," and excerpts from Freud's *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Their task was to write an essay addressing the following question:

Machiavelli described how he put on the robes he would have worn to attend upon royalty before entering his library where he would engage "noble" minds in discussions about the ways of rulers and the possibility of virtue. Four centuries later, W.E.B. DuBois sounded the same note when he wrote that color was no bar to interrogating the great sages of all times and countries. All bade him welcome, listened respectfully to his questions, and weighed the merits of his ideas.

In this conversation that stretches out across centuries and continents, each statement, to quote Albert Murray's recently published *The Blue Devils of Nada*, "is a reference or allusion to another . . . , to which in effect it either says yes and also and also and perhaps also; or it says no or not necessarily or on the other hand or not so far as I for one am concerned." Students rarely read with this sense of context.

As an example, consider a work routinely assigned in introductory history and literature courses at Assumption College, Wilfred Owen's "Dulce et Decorum Est." When Owen wrote his bitter denunciation of World War One, he took for granted that his audience would share his own base of knowledge. So, having described in gory detail the death of a soldier from mustard gas, he ended the poem:

> If in some smothering dream you too could pace
> Behind the wagon that we flung him in . .
> My friend, you would not tell with such high zest
> To children ardent for some desperate glory,
> The old Lie: Dulce et decorum est
> Pro patria mori.

Owen's deep bitterness is itself an indication of the importance he attached to cultural traditions. Having concluded that the poets and thinkers in whom he had believed had been peddling an "old Lie," he entered the conversation by flinging a dramatic "NO" back towards Horace, Shakespeare, Tennyson, and all those who had extolled the nobility of dying in a worthy cause. But his "NO" loses much of its sting for students who, unlike Owen and his fellow "Lost Poets," did not read Horace in the sixth form and who have no knowledge of Latin at all. Nor do they share Owen's assumption that he had a right to enter into the conversation.

Most faculty will immediately recognize their own experience in this example: students all too often lack the contextual knowledge necessary for understanding the events and/or works of a given period. As faculty we find ourselves, Little Dutch Boy-like, trying to plug holes in the dike by providing students on a day-by-day basis with missing background. Taking part in the "unending conversation" requires, in short, an appreciation of the ongoing interplay of texts and contexts. More exactly, there are several sorts of under-

> this limited use of written language has an effect on what is communicated; While pictures can communicate a great of deal of information in an instant, they are typically unable to present the subtle discriminations that are substance of most academic work. The discipline of art history depends on slides and other reproductions, but the knowledge it produces is discursive. And if such a heavily visual field has required discourse, it is hard to imagine that the much more textual fields of history and literature will not continue to do so. By depending heavily on web for teaching, you deprive students of access to that discourse and to the kind of intellectual work it enables. (433-34)

Is this so? There is no question that web pages are typically more graphics intensive than print. So too with audio and video. That indeed is one of the meanings of hypertext. It does not follow, however, that "those elements are privileged over text." That is simply an assertion, albeit a very common one. Those of us who think differently could simply assert the contrary and be done with it. Or we could note that there are NO technical limits whatsoever to the amount of text one can include in a web page. "You want more words?" We could say, "put them in. It is up to you." But the notion that hypermedia "privilege" the visual (and/or the aural) over print is an exceedingly mischievous one. Not only does it lead Shumway astray, it also distorts the work of many using the Web in their teaching. So, at the risk of belaboring the obvious, I will try to respond more fully.

Let us return to a characteristic of the new media Shumway quotes and then ignores, that the Internet, CD-ROMs, and related technologies are "layered in linked pages." They are about links. It is this feature, quite as much as the ease with which one can include graphics or sound or video, which makes the Web "far from being just another style of presentation."

Learning, to use Kenneth Burke's felicitous phrase, entails joining in a "unending conversation" about the central questions of human experience. Imagine that you enter a parlor. You come late. When you arrive, others have long preceded you, and they are engaged in a heated discussion, a discussion too heated for them to pause and tell you exactly what it is about. In fact, the discussion had already begun long before any of them got there, so that no one present is qualified to retrace for you all the steps that had gone before. You listen for a while, until you decide that you have caught the tenor of the argument; then put in your oar. Someone answers; you answer him; another comes to your defense; another aligns himself against you . . . .

However, the discussion is interminable. The hour grows late, you must depart. And you do depart, with the discussion still vigorously in progress. It is an idea of learning with an ancient pedigree. In the early sixteenth century,

The Trajectory of a Dialogue: Responses to David Shumway

Editors' Note: What follows here is the beginning of a broader dialogue that the entire volume is intended to foster. It was in the spirit of this dialogue that we asked respondents to read the essays and comment—both generally and specifically—on what was, in their opinion, the larger meaning of these classroom cases. In other words, we wanted to create a trajectory for what is sure to be a very complex dialogue as it is taken up across these fields. As we had hoped, the responses took cautious and balanced approaches, being appropriately both appreciative and critical. David Shumway's response most directly critiqued the core findings of the project and some of the cases. And his concerns also represent the most prevalent general prejudices against new media technologies. Therefore, we felt it was appropriate to invite counter responses from the faculty contributors. Here are four responses to David Shumway.

We hope that a broad dialogue can continue well beyond the boundaries of this volume, in ways we suggest in the **Afterword** and in the volume overall.

Text in Hypertext: Is Chicken Little Right This Time?

John McClymer

David Shumway gets to what many concerned about the use of the Internet in the classroom regard as the heart of the matter when he quotes a contributor that "'web sites are intended to be more graphics (and audio) intensive, as well as layered in linked pages'" and then adds that "those elements are privileged over text." How so? "Far from being just another style of presentation," he explains,