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Abstract

Beyond Disciplinary Drama: Federal Dollars and ESL Instruction for African Americans

Dorell O. Thomas

This dissertation investigated the curious appearance of English as a second language pedagogy for African American freshmen at the University of Wisconsin, Madison in the Fall of 1969 (Scott & Angle, 1970, p. 4). The work explored the researcher’s professional and financial interests in literacy problems that attracted both foundation and National Defense of Education Act funding. Looking beyond disciplinary drama, this dissertation suggested that binaries between marginal researchers and creative ones take away from the complexity of disciplinarity. Oppositions foreclosed on indexing the normative role that sponsors played in our post-World War II and Cold War histories in English instruction.
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INTRODUCTION

This investigation into the appearance of English as a second language (ESL) pedagogy for African Americans was historical, archival, and ethnographic in nature. As the title of my dissertation suggests, I make a connection between federal and foundation funding and the treatment of African Americans as foreign language students. Throughout this work, I focused on a period during the Cold War—largely in the 1950s and 1960s—when linguists were in a position to play leading roles in English instruction. After the Soviets launched Sputnik in 1957, Congress passed the National Defense of Education Act (NDEA) in 1958 and an amendment in 1964 (Park, 2000, p. 71). During this period of curriculum reform, post-Sputnik, Jerome Bruner’s ideas about a new way to organize science curricula had broad appeal, even in English studies (p. 71). Stephen Park (2000) explains that Bruner proposed a new science curriculum that introduced core concepts to students, based on different levels of difficulty (p. 71).

In this context of measurable results and positivism, if English instruction had any claims to being a discipline, the professionals who were represented as most qualified to teach it had to identify English’s core concepts. In the 1950s and 1960s, linguists were in an ideal position to do that. The NDEA (1958) responded to a pervasive sense of deficits in both the sciences and foreign language training. The legislation funded not just math and science instruction and scientific research, but also linguistics (p. 1593). The 1958 version cited specialized training in foreign languages, including knowledge of sensitive geographies, as the basis for funding linguistic research (p. 1594). While the language specialists benefited from federal and foundation money—funding that was both domestic and international in scope (Trimbur, 2008,
Consequently, linguists at intersecting professional organizations in English studies, including the Modern Language Association (MLA), National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), and the American Council of Learned Societies, lobbied Congress successfully to include English instruction in the 1964 amendment to the NDEA (Park, 2000, p. 70). In *Class Politics*, Stephen Park (2000) credited the Princeton linguist Albert Marckwardt with authoring the report that precipitated the 1964 inclusion of English in the NDEA (p. 70). The report is entitled “The National Interest and the Teaching of English” or NITE. Marckwardt also had the distinction of authoring summaries for other documents that have seminal status in English instruction. These include synthesizing the 1964 *Social Dialects and Language Learning Conference* in Bloomington, Indiana, and both editing and prefacing the 1966 *Language and Language Learning* papers at the Dartmouth Conference.

The latter conference at Dartmouth in 1966 focused on defining English instruction for an ideal “native speaker” in the United States and Britain (Trimbur, 2008, p. 143). The conference is commonly referred to as the “Dartmouth Conference,” which is where it happened, but the 1966 publication of *Language and Language Learning* (1968) retains the old name: the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English. During the Bloomington Conference in 1964, on the other hand, linguists debated what to do with the English of marginalized Americans. In one of the papers at Bloomington, entitled “Bilingualism and Bidialectalism,” the Harvard linguist Einar Haugen (1964) suggested: “The discussions at this conference have shown very clearly the need for an interplay of various competences in the solution of the Negroes linguistic problem. In
the initiation of a linguistic slum clearance program, it will be necessary to call on social workers and sociologists to discover the socially relevant dimensions” (p. 124). During the 1950s, the infamous “slum clearance” program in New York City involved establishing a criterion for a slum, targeting low-income urban communities that meet the city’s definition, evicting the low-income residents—especially ones who cannot defend themselves against eminent domain—and then claiming to build better housing or an infrastructure project (Citizens Housing Planning Council, 1951). See Figures 2-4 for a slum clearance program in Harlem.

Haugen suggested that Black speech, like the images below of a Black neighborhood, is less an artifact of culture and more a product of deprivation. The origin of Black speech was an important and contentious question. Normally, I would agree with Michel Foucault that pursuing origins of phenomena is not worth the effort, but this case is an exception. In the *Archeology of Knowledge*, Foucault (1972) mocked this familiar rhetorical move:

> But to seek in the great accumulation of the already-said the text that resembles in advance a later text, to ransack history in order to rediscover the play of anticipations or echoes, to go right back to the first seeds or to go forward to the last traces, to reveal in a work its fidelity to tradition or its irreducible uniqueness, to raise or lower its stock of originality, to say that Port-Royal grammarians invented nothing, or to discover that Cuvier had more predecessors than one thought, these are harmless enough amusements for historians who refuse to grow up. (p. 144)

The unwillingness, on the part of some White linguists, to attribute a heritage to Black speech makes it easier to see Black speech as a problem. According to his New York Times Obituary, the linguist Raven McDavid had a professional association with Albert Marckwardt that went back to the 1930s and 1940s Linguistic Atlas (Blair, 1984, p. 27). At the Bloomington Conference in 1964, McDavid identified a broader category of Americans whose “social dialect” needed correction. In “Social Dialects: Cause or Symptom of Social Maladjustment,” McDavid
(1964) referred to “rural Cajuns,” French-speaking and White, who are “completely deculturized, illiterate in all

Figure 1. Black neighborhood (Citizens Housing Planning Council, 1951)
Figure 2. Aerial view (Citizens Housing Planning Council, 1951)
Figure 3. Lenox Terrace (Citizens Housing Planning Council, 2010)
languages” (p. 5). McDavid concluded with a focus on Black Americans: “the grammatical problems are of such an order that we advance the suggestion—which Mencken had reported before the war [WWII] and which my wife independently derived from her teaching experience—that in our urban slums and other areas where divergent social dialects exist, we might teach Standard English as a foreign language” (p. 7). Both Raven McDavid and Albert Marckwardt, as signatories to the NITE report, played a role in attracting more funding to English studies.

In *Class Politics*, Stephen Park (2000) explained the overall resistance within CCCC’s institutional leadership in the 1960s to affirm unequivocally that Black speech reflected a legitimate regional variety of English. CCCC is a professional organization within NCTE, and since linguists played leadership roles at NCTE in the 1960s, the same linguists were also reflected in CCCC leadership (Trimbur, 2008, p. 143). Using NDEA funds to frame what was at stake, Park’s book tracked the overall efforts by left-leaning groups of researchers, including the New University Conference (NUC), to propose students’ rights to their own language within CCCC in the 1960s.

The eventual *Students Rights* (Students’ Right to Their Own Language [SRTOL]) document, published in 1974, opened with a strong affirmation of students having a right to their “own patterns and varieties” of language (p. 1). The rest of the 1974 document elaborated on the initial statement, using questions and concise responses. Here is a summary of some of the 1974 document.

- A dialect is “the variety of language used by a group whose linguistic habit patterns both reflect and are determined by shared, regional, social, or cultural perspectives (SRTOL, 1974, p. 3).
• Prestige is not inherent in any dialect; both prestige and claims to a standard shift as power relationships between speakers shift (SRTOL, 1974, p. 5).

• The dialect a student speaks is separate from the ability to read and write. Deep structure of all languages is the same, so no dialect puts anyone at a disadvantage in terms of thinking (SRTOL, 1974, p. 6).

• The document affirms at almost every turn that causing students to believe that their language is inferior is wrong and not in keeping with the latest research.

Stephen Park (2000) tracked efforts by the New University Conference (NUC) to engage the institutional leadership of MLA, NCTE, and CCCC to respond to demands for social justice and racial equity in the 1960s; the left-leaning group wanted their activism to be reflected in workshops and panels that these professional organizations offered—especially CCCC and NCTE (p. 55).

Park (2000) cited the institutional obstruction—in part, led by influential linguists—who stood in the way of attributing “regional status” to Black speech (p. 141). Regional dialects of English were reserved for those who Albert Marckwardt described in a 1958 book, *American English*, as European settlers (p. 8) (see Figure 5 below). In *American English*, here is how Marckwardt (1958) described American English:

> In considering the history and development of American English we must remember that the courageous bands who ventured westward into the unknown with Captain John Smith or onboard the Mayflower, as well as those who followed them later in the seventeenth-century, were speaking and writing the English language as it was currently employed in England. (p. 8)

Much of the work in the 1930s Linguistic Atlas mapped where Europeans, especially the British, settled in North America and Canada. McDavid bemoaned the attention that “Black English” was getting, which McDavid felt disrupted the mapping of varieties of English (Park, 2000,
### Figure 4. Settlement of America and English literary history (American English, 1958)
pp. 144-145). It is important to know that Albert Marckwardt, Raven McDavid, and Harold Allen all worked on the Linguistic Atlas project of North America; see Figures 6-8 below for the eventual publication of Atlas research. According to Allen’s obituary in the Linguistic Society of America, Marckwardt and Allen received their doctorates from the University of Michigan and were both Charles Fries’ students (Robinett, 1989, p. 7). For this cohort of linguists at the 1964 Bloomington Conference, what they called a “social dialect” is a product of being excluded from this settler class of Europeans in North America.

When NCTE created the Committee on the English Language (CEL) in 1969, the cohort of linguists who ran the committee had been working together for decades, forming their perceptions of a settler class of White Americans, whose English qualified as a variety of English, and a marginalized “native” class, whose English required correction. The members of the CEL (which was formed within CCCC) included the linguists Harold Allen (CCCC chair in 1952, NCTE president in 1961, and another signatory to the NITE report), “Raven McDavid (who had opposed the connection between Black English and African roots) and Albert Marckwardt (author of NITE)” (p. 141). CEL’s purpose “was to monitor NCTE public statements about linguistics” (Park, 2000, p. 141). The 1958 version of the NDEA identified linguistics as a valuable field in the context of language training and geopolitics. From the perspective of the leadership of the CCCC, NCTE, and MLA in the late 1960s, if Black speech did not need correction, as the 1974 Students Rights to Their Own Language document would later suggest, this would be a significant financial blow to the NITE lobby. These linguists attracted federal money (in the 1964 NDEA amendment) on the condition that improving “substandard English” is relevant to the national defense. (See Figures 9-11 for NITE publications.)
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Figure 9. The signatories (NITE, 1961)
PART I

What Has to Be Done about the National Need to Improve the Teaching of English

- Projects to Assist in Focusing the Teaching of English upon the Study of Language, Literature, and Composition
- Projects to Assist in Educating Teachers to the Developmental and Sequential Nature of English Studies and to Encourage Articulation throughout the School Years
- Projects to Improve Present Preparatory Programs for Teachers of English
- Projects to Improve the Preparation of Practicing Teachers
- Provisions to Obtain Services and Supplies for Teachers of English
- Projects to Assist in Encouraging Research and Scholarship
- Projects to Assist in Recruiting More Teachers of English

Figure 10. NITE objectives (NITE, 1961)
Throughout this dissertation, my questions respond to the professional and financial interests that linguists had in defining literacy problems. I sought input from a retired linguist, Dr. Roger Shuy, whose work I contrast with the University of Wisconsin linguist Charles Scott. Charles Scott is the linguist who used English as a second language pedagogy to teach freshman writing to 12 African American students in 1969 (Scott & Angle, 1970, p. 4). It occurred to me to contrast the two linguists based on dominant assumptions about prominent and marginal researchers in a field. When I started this investigation, as a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin, my peers seemed prepared to dismiss the class as strange. I had nothing much to go on initially, but I sensed that the context around the class was worth exploring.

Early in the investigation, I found out that Charles Scott gave an extensive interview in 1980 to the Wisconsin Writing Center. In different transcript threads, Scott talked about his experience during the turbulent 1960s at UW-Madison. He spoke candidly about the role of federal money in his recruitment into teaching, its influence on his travels all over the world, and even the funds that helped him to finish his Ph.D. (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980). Unlike Scott, when Roger Shuy talked about money during our brief email correspondence, he talked about writing grants that furthered his work (R. Shuy, personal communication, August 8, 2017). Of course, one of the problems with interviews is that the same person might respond differently to the same questions on a different day.

Based on a text-based contrast between the men, I used opposition as a rhetorical device to help my readers follow a fragmented narrative. Very intentionally, this dissertation resisted a teleological climax. Nor did I try to find a singular “origin” for how the 1969 class came to be. Instead, the different sections share a related focus on what tended not to get indexed in writing studies: English as a second language for African Americans. I hardly, if ever, see the topic in
the back of books about curriculum reform in English Education or Composition and Rhetoric. More theoretically, I am motivated to address my research topic’s virtual absence from the indexes of English instruction as a field. I see my modest repository of artifacts as an anti-colonial effort to suggest additions. I provided artifacts with the intent to disrupt the seminal status of other reified texts.

The bulk of the primary documents came from one of the smaller libraries at the University of Wisconsin, Madison (UW-Madison). The other documents came from the Rockefeller Archive in Tarrytown, New York, and from various online archives that are publicly accessible, namely the Brown Center for Digital Scholarship, the University of Wisconsin Writing Center, and the Black Thursday online archive sponsored by UW’s Board of Regents. I also bought the collection of papers for four conferences, downloaded the full text of the NDEA (both versions), and accessed the NITE report online using the Columbia University library system. As for the conferences, these are the 1970 Symposium on Black English at the University of Wisconsin Madison; the 1964 Social Dialects and Language Learning Conference in Bloomington, Indiana; the 1966 Language and Language Learning working groups at the Dartmouth Conference; and the 1979 Pidginization and Creolization of Languages Conference at the University of the West Indies, Mona.

The work I did raised ethical questions about using sensitive information responsibly and methodological ones regarding generalizing from the particular. By today’s standards, I have access to personal information that breaches student privacy. The fact that I have this information, as a researcher, evidences the dominant forces I am trying to counter: archives that house widely cited documents are usually created and maintained by an elite. Setting aside what Dr. Shuy shared with me for now, when the UW-Madison linguist Charles Scott published a
1970 paper entitled “Report on Experimental Program in English for Black Americans,” he included the names of the 12 African American students who took the 1969 class (Scott & Angle, 1970, p. 7). What each of the African American students scored on an English as a second language exam was also published in the paper. I crossed out their names in Figure 12. Any students affiliated with the class, I thought, might want to share their perspective now that they are older. I made unsuccessful attempts to contact some of the students through an alumni association on Facebook.

My concerns over access to these documents might seem like a storm in a teacup. However, a more public, high-profile conflict between Harvard University and an African American woman, Tamara Lanier, covered similar territory. In this case, the stakes in my research became framed more dramatically. I followed Lanier’s story in different New York Times articles while I wrote my own dissertation. The New York Times picked up an Associated Press story on March 20, 2019 about Lanier’s suit, which demanded that Harvard turn over a series of 1850 daguerreotypes, a type of photograph, “and pay [Lanier] an unspecified sum in damages” (Hartocollis, 2008). The suit alleged that two of the slaves in the images are Lanier’s ancestors, Renty and Delia (possibly Renty’s daughter), and that Harvard charged a “hefty” licensing fee to reproduce the images (Hartocollis, 2008). See Figures 13 and 14 for a picture of Renty and the use of Renty’s image for a conference on universities and slavery. I decided not to include the image of Delia because she was depicted topless; her age is unclear.

The March 20 Associated Press article cited that the 1850 daguerreotypes “were commissioned by Harvard biologist Louis Agassiz, whose theories on racial difference were used to support slavery in the US” (Associated Press, 2019). In Lanier’s fight with the
**Figure 11.** Michigan Test (Source: Report on the Special Section, 1970, p. 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>*(35/32/6) 81</td>
<td>*(37/34/14) 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>*(36/32/9) 84</td>
<td>*(38/32/12) 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>*(33/31/6) 78</td>
<td>*(37/31/9) 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>*(37/30/5) 80</td>
<td>*(37/36/10) 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>*(33/35/11) 95</td>
<td>*(32/28/10) 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>*(39/39/14) 94</td>
<td>*(38/35/15) 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>(no score)</td>
<td>(no score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>*(33/30/11) 81</td>
<td>(no score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>*(37/32/10) 85</td>
<td>*(36/33/11) 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>*(30/28/6) 72</td>
<td>*(38/29/7) 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>*(38/34/9) 87</td>
<td>(no score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>*(35/35/9) 85</td>
<td>*(35/33/13) 84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The sequence of sub-scores in parentheses are scores on the grammar, vocabulary, and reading comprehension sub-sections of the Michigan Test respectively. Perfect scores on these sub-sections are 40/40/20. It is clear that the students generally did poorest on the reading comprehension section and best on the grammar section.
Figure 12. Renty (Source: J. T. Zealy, 1850)
powerfully endowed institution, Lanier implicated the university in systemic archival efforts that “erased slaves’ family names, withheld birth and death records, and criminalized literacy” (Associated Press, 2019). The charge made a connection between bureaucratic records and university-based repositories. Different researchers, Archives, and the people who work there are not neutral actors who store and retrieve text in the service of research.

As a graduate student, I rely on the status of primary documents as a representation of events that took place. If documents have no bearing on experience, or when archives systematically reflect the interests of a dominant group, then I have a responsibility to be ethically aware of my role as researcher. I handled documents produced by researchers and ones compiled by researchers about student protesters. Students do not create and maintain documents...
about their protest. In terms of the conference transcripts and student revolts in the 1960s, I have no way of knowing how and who made the decisions about which documents would survive.

In fact, I still have concerns about the “primary-ness” of primary documents—the way these documents circulate with verifiable ease and with their purported closeness to experience, which “primary” suggests. As a researcher, I perhaps perpetuate the fairly exclusive rights of archival institutions to authenticate and attribute “primary” status to documents. The weight of this value, which can be given or taken away from texts, means that archives, in effect, have the power to shape public memory. I will return to this point shortly when discussing book history.

The *Times*’ own reporting by Anemona Hartocollis on March 20, 2019 cited a professor of cultural history, Robin Bernstein, “who declined to take a position in the legal dispute,” but who said, “Frankly, there are other repositories to keep them [the photographs] safe. What I do know is that no ordinary individual, such as myself, could keep them safe in a home” (Hartocollis, 2019). I took the professor’s comment as an invitation to reflect. I thought about my own purported advocacy for vulnerable Black students in my dissertation, and I wondered about how critical I can be of researchers while also trying to become one myself.

As someone who was born on the other side of the capital divide in the Third World, I want to see Ms. Lanier, a Black woman, use the legal system to wrestle away capital from a powerfully endowed university. Maybe she would create a playbook for people who are owed reparations to appropriate capital that is rightfully theirs. On the other hand, I hate to admit it, but I share the professor’s security concerns about “keeping records safe” (Hartocollis, 2019). I worry that when “primary” documents get decentralized and subject to the idiosyncratic access requirements of private citizens, research, as I currently understand it, would change dramatically. It might be harder for everyone to gain access to historical documents.
In addition to the sensitivity of the student documents, I felt a similar privilege that Dr. Shuy opened up so much about his experience as a White linguist researching Black students. I needed his input to better structure my narrative which, without Shuy, I was worried about comparisons to muckraking. Writing an entire dissertation about an ostensible underbelly, which exposes professional academics as mercenaries, seemed one-sided and inflammatory. I wanted to avoid that. In a Foucauldian sense, I want to be taken seriously by the dominant gatekeepers in writing studies. Muckraking indexes a kind of writing that is passé.

In addition, colonial relationships flourish in so many iterations that identifying its more vulgar forms in English studies does not fully appreciate its variety. Some people might experience being dominated as positive. (In the next section, I discuss, in part, nostalgic recollections of growing up in a Kingston inner city within walking distance of a university; the university had been the site of a sugar plantation.) When I sought input from the linguist Roger Shuy, I needed to find an informant who is respected among his peers. Needless to say, a person is not just a tool to further a story. I needed Shuy to stand in as a dominant representation of the traditional researcher by contrast to the UW-Madison linguist Charles Scott.

In terms of what Shuy shared, his sensitivity prompted me to consider the costs when researchers are quick to accuse each other of ethical shortcomings, and not make an attempt to appreciate complexity. Specifically, in instances where colleagues attack one person’s work and elevate others, I wondered about how epistemological dramas foreclose on understanding the role that funding plays in academic research. On August 8, 2017, I wrote to Shuy:

I am interested in whether or not the priorities of funders contributed to the perception that VBE is a foreign language. I am not interested in discrediting the framing of VBE is a foreign language. I am more interested in the context that encouraged some researchers (like Charles Scott) to ask if black students would benefit from ESL pedagogy. (Personal communication, August 8, 2017)
A few minutes later, on August 8, 2017, Shuy responded:

I have no idea about whether funders contributed to the idea that VBE was a foreign language. We at CAL wrote about it as having a logical structure that was different from SE, but we never argued that VBE should be eradicated or that it was a foreign language. You may have seen an NCTE article (College English I think) in which James Sledd took the unusual and unique view that rather than teaching black kids to become bidialectal and speak SE in the appropriate contexts, we should be teaching white kids to speak VBE. As far as I know, Sledd was the only one who argued for that. In that article he clobbered me as a racist for advocating bidialectalism. Another strange man. Back in the days when I was prominent at NCTE, it didn’t give grants. Too poor I guess. I never expected payment or royalties for the several books I published with them. (Personal communication, August 8, 2017)

Prior to sharing the details about Sledd, on August 7, 2019, Shuy said:

I don’t recall having any connection with NDEA [National Defense of Education Act] and I don’t know anything about its effect (if any) on the national conversation about black literacy. The politics of being a white researcher in the fields of VBE and reading became too emotionally difficult for me so I left those areas of study and moved on to other topics. (Personal communication, August 7, 2017)

I wanted to be careful about how I used what Shuy shared with me. I also thought about how his feelings could be instructive. Assuming that academic disciplines index different topics as part of a research agenda, then I have to be sensitive to these dominant preferences when talking about justice. Based on Shuy’s description of how James Sledd “clobbered him,” I strived in this dissertation to better understand a bygone power base of linguists, some of whom were largely disguised from me.

When I started my Ph.D. in 2013 at the University of Wisconsin, the use of animals to make text, for example, was the latest outrage in English departments. I imagine that something else was the target of critical scrutiny only a few years earlier. What goes on in a particular discipline, at a particular time, as reflected in the common language used by researchers, indicated what Michel Foucault called an index. In the *Archeology of Knowledge*, Foucault
(1972) wrote that “the author was the index of the work’s truthfulness” (p. 222), implying that indexes, in the sciences especially, are currently the terms that give a field its identity.

The index for how and when the latest outrage emerges in a field suggests that even justice has a temporal dimension, both for when and how said justice gets indexed. The power relationships that mark a particular moment shape what texts mean and how they mean. For example, the limits placed on reading by different movements, including New Criticism, Reader Response Theory, and post-structuralism, all aim to define reading as a critical activity based on different standards of what qualifies as critical. In each of these turns in reading, writing, and making text, the interpretive procedures do not get stripped of ideology. The Post-Structural antipathy towards binaries and origins do not improve on the New Critical respect for the border and structure of the text. These turns in English studies index different textual attitudes as dominant intellectuals make room for each other in English studies.

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels pointed out in German Ideology that dominant groups have a tendency to frame their local interest as what is best for the group. Marx and Engels (1844) wrote, “in a country where royal power, aristocracy, and bourgeoisie are contending for mastery and where therefore, mastery is shared, the doctrine of separation of powers proves to be the dominant idea and is expressed as eternal law” (p. 65). Marx and Engels wrote further, “during the time that the aristocracy was dominant, the concepts of honor, loyalty, etc. were dominant, during the dominance of the bourgeoisie, the concepts freedom, equality, etc. The ruling class on the whole imagines this to be so” (p. 65). The historians Marx and Engels—whose challenge was similar to mine—wrote that when “some ideas “hold sway,” they “take on the form of universality” (p. 65). Throughout this dissertation, I saw my challenge as being
sensitive to dominant preferences that index how to research the researcher—and specifically, how to understand the relationship that linguists had with funders.

I used a diverse range of sources. The conference papers, largely written by linguists, from the 1970 Symposium on Black English included not just the presentations, but also transcripts of exchanges between audience members. Researchers who were asking questions and making comments, after each presentation, were identified by name. Consequently, it is important to make a distinction between readerly works, such as formal conference papers and seminal texts, and writerly texts, such as memos, protest pamphlets, and transcribed speech. Highly valued texts that weave both messages and devices with skill, or that have prized rhetorical and organizational features, invite readers to appreciate said skill, or—in worst-case scenarios—inexperienced readers get taken in by the author’s design.

I made a distinction between these two types of texts because, in my experience, more formal writing disguises the context that occasions the writing. This is intentional because essays aspire to communicate a message to others while a shopping list is a completely different matter. Roland Barthes responded to this valuing of texts. In S/Z, Barthes (1970) wrote, since “writerly text is not a thing, [and] we would have a hard time finding it in a bookstore” (p. 5), and since writerly texts is “we ourselves” (p. 5), these everyday texts are valued by research institutions in so far as their relevance to dominant narratives. Napoleon’s shopping list might be saved, not mine. The writerly text is often perceived as not worth saving.

By contrast, readerly texts reflects “what can be read, but not written: the readerly. We call any readerly text a classic” (Barthes, 1970, p. 4). At key moments in this dissertation, when I juxtapose writerly memos and pamphlets alongside formal papers, I consciously respond to this ideological distinction between readerly and writerly. By expanding the criteria for which
documents are worth saving, I attempt to validate the legitimacy of otherwise writerly texts, which, I believe, addresses the gaps in dominant readerly research narratives. What more formal documents disguise, the same writers speak more candidly in a writerly document.

Admittedly, gaps in classic or seminal texts are the lifeblood of research-based disciplines. The work of Cheryl Geisler and Linda Flower, for instance, showed a related interest in how dominant literacies in the social sciences tend to establish routine methods of writing one’s own text and resorting to more critical procedures when reading in the same genre. In Academic Literacy and the Nature of Expertise, Geisler (1994) made a distinction between the way researchers design and go about their research, and how they present said work (in writing) differently when publishing. Conducting the research is generally different from how it is presented. Calling attention to how inexperienced readers might not be aware of this discrepancy, Geisler wrote, “Scientists, as writers, appear to strive to produce a virtual experience that they, as readers, strive to resist” (p. 81). Similarly, in “Rhetorical Reading Strategies and Construction of Meaning,” Flower and Hayes (1988) made a distinction between less experienced readers, who are trying to extract messages from texts, and more experienced researchers, as readers, who construct the rhetorical situation that occasioned the text, thus assigning a value to the text (p. 176). My unique point of view required that I legitimate a diverse collection of documents as text and be self-reflexive about my interests in doing so. Relying on any one type of document (readerly or writerly) would be limiting.

Roland Barthes made helpful distinctions that brought the conflict between producers of text and indiscriminate readers closer into focus. In S/Z, Barthes (1970) wrote, “Our literature is characterized by the pitiless divorce which the literary institution maintains between the producer of texts and its user, between its owner and its customer, between its author and its reader” (p. 4).
Reading, Barthes said, is relegated to a mere referendum (p. 4). Not all interpretations of text are equal. In my experience as a Jamaican graduate student, not all responses to revered text get indexed with equal representation. Dominant dispositions towards printed text persist—in particular, how university and private archives curate texts, reproduce the status of a canon, and guard written text against unregulated transmission. The textual practices of the linguists who I was investigating, for example, favored their peers who produced readerly text at the expense of Black subjects, many of whom largely were expected to consume text or serve as topics to be studied. The argument that specialized writing is a function of genre ignores, I think, the disparity between the researcher, as both writer and guardian of standards, and vulnerable students.

One of my assumptions in this dissertation, which Michel Foucault explained in the *Archeology of Knowledge*, is that I am myself a product of archives. As Foucault (1972) stated, the archive enables one to speak (p. 130). I accept this idea of identity-facilitating archives because all of my identities, which include male, researcher, or Jamaican, depend on gender, disciplines, and the imagined community of the nation-state. Each of these sources of identities belongs to an archive that make them understood. In light of influences that are beyond my ability to name, when I discuss my methods in this dissertation, I do my best to name the personal experiences that inform my critical attitude towards research-based academic disciplines. I am also upfront about including personal experiences as part of the repository that I created for this project.

In addition to primary documents and childhood experiences, I am also drawing from a larger bibliography that I put together over the last 7 years as a graduate student. This larger repository might not inform this dissertation directly, in terms of citation, but this deep-
background bibliography reflects my attempt to find a disciplinary identity in the histories of writing. Specifically, when I was a first-year Ph.D. student in the English Department at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, I developed an interest in different questions about printed source materials. I noticed that researchers across different fields were investigating how source materials disguise power. For example, these researchers include Robert Hume in textual criticism, Peter Stallybrass in Early Modern Studies, Robert Darnton in Book History, D. F. McKenzie in bibliographic studies, different post-colonial influences (including Edward Said’s *Culture and Imperialism* and Chinua Achebe’s *Arrow of God*), and post-structural wonderings about the West’s relationship with writing versus speech.

In a bibliography course that I took in 2013, for example, I encountered the work of Joan M. Schwartz, a respected researcher in Art Conservation, and the Historian Terry Cook. In “Archives Records and Power: The Making of Modern Memory,” both Schwartz and Cook (2002) stated that archival institutions are largely sponsored by powerful groups who have an interest in shaping public memory to reflect their interests (p. 3). Similarly, in Early Modern Studies, Peter Stallybrass’ (2007) concise argument in “Against Thinking” really spoke to me as an educator who, prior to starting my Ph.D., taught mostly New York City youth. In “Against Thinking,” Stallybrass commended the decision to make Walt Whitman’s archive publicly available online, insisting that the move “liberate[s] Whitman from the economic and social constraints that govern archival research: the grants, travel money, and time necessary to visit the depositories where the materials are held and the credentials necessary to see the materials” (p. 1580). Inspired by post-structural objections to “the regime of originality,” Stallybrass saw the need for access to documents, and curating stores of one’s own information, as a precursor to creation.
Stallybrass explained that the policing of citation guidelines, which, he contended, is intended to guard against intellectual theft, actually has the effect of limiting creativity. By creativity, Stallybrass appeared to mean the more widely available writerly creativity, which is accessible to anyone who can use language. More broadly, different limits placed on access to archives, who gets to be a “Writer,” or what counts as critical or uncritical interpretation shape the parties who influence public memory. Whose influence gets reflected in an index—that is, what topics get named at the end of a book or how a field identifies its content—shapes whose experience is reflected in a field. A primary concern that is addressed (in the colonialism section) is what happens when some documents become a dominant part of our public memory in English instruction. I am not concerned with proving some “inner colonial workings” of writing studies. Instead, I suggest that the tendency to reify some people and some texts in writing studies has had the effect of limiting how funding gets indexed as a legitimate area of exploration.

I did find articles that discussed linguists, literacy problems (in the 1950s and 1960s), and attracting funding. But the articles typified “calling out” racism and unethical research. Again, confrontation has its place, but an accusatory stance towards some linguists gives the impression that “ethical ones,” whose works were more widely respected, are immune to funding incentives. After Shuy told me that James Sledd “clobbered” him in a College English article, I found two articles that Sledd wrote in 1969 and 1972.

In them, Sledd mocked the influential group of linguists (dialectologist) who used foreign language pedagogy to teach African American students English. In “Double Speak: Dialectology in the Service of Big Brother,” Sledd (1972) mocked Roger Shuy, expressing bafflement that Shuy, previously a “teacher in East Lansing, Michigan,” became a “Director of Urban Language

The government and the foundations began to spray money over the academic landscape like liquid fertilizer, and the professional societies began to bray and paw at the rich new grass. In that proud hour, any teacher who could dream up an expensive scheme to keeping things as they were while pretending to make a change was sure to becoming the director of a project or a center and of flying first class to Washington twice a month. (p. 1308)

The research I did in my dissertation was precisely about this problem. In Sledd’s insightful treatment, he satirized an archetypal “director” (a version of Roger Shuy presumably), who gets to fly “first class to Washington DC” on the condition that the program intended to help Black students actually enforces White supremacy. As part of the history of writing studies, this index of confrontational satire was largely how writing studies responded to ESL for African Americans. It was my intent in this dissertation to build on Sledd’s index. I wanted to broaden how writing studies represent their origin stories. My assumption is that what we punish as “unethical relationships with funding” can tell me something about the more normative role that funding plays in shaping a research agenda in writing studies.
In 2013, during my time as a doctoral student at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (UW-Madison), I started sorting through a box of mostly primary documents. The documents related to a 1969 freshman writing class. It was midway through my Composition and Rhetoric course, and I remember Professor Morris Young talking about introducing us (first-year English Ph.D. students) to what he called other kinds of work. During the previous week, Young modeled what he meant, using David Fleming’s retelling of a 1969 teaching assistant strike. Fleming’s (2011) book contextualized a 1969 graduate assistant revolt at UW-Madison, which precipitated the university’s decision to cease requiring a mandatory freshman writing course (p. 173). After we read Fleming, Young took us to one of the smaller libraries on campus, where he had curated possible research topics in different parts of the room. In the box that I chose, the papers piled up in no particular order inside separate manila folders. More or less, some of the papers signaled what occasioned the box of documents. Two UW-Madison linguists, Charles Scott and Philip Luelsdorff, used foreign language pedagogy to introduce 12 African American students to college-level writing.

As I sorted through the box of documents, I also tried to find articles and interviews that featured the two linguists. I could not place Luelsdorff on the faculty of any university subsequent to Wisconsin. Nor could I find a clear record of publication or university service when I researched his name. On the writing center website, I found a 1980 interview with Charles Scott, in which, among other details about his life, Scott talked about federal and foundation funding. In that interview, Scott (1980) noted:

I don’t think he [Murray Fowler, the Chair of UW-Madison’s Linguistic Department] was particularly creative in leading that department. I think he always had the feeling that linguistics departments through the 1960s, many of which were beginning to expand very, very rapidly, were doing so with federal funds. For instance, through NDEA Title
VI programs. And sometimes various kinds of contractual arrangements with governmental agencies and the government foundations and so forth. And Murray, [the Chair] I think, always felt that there was something tawdry about all that. And I don’t think he wanted any of that to tarnish his department. (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980)

Right after both Scott and Luelsdorff conducted the class, they organized a Symposium on Black English at UW-Madison. Both researchers got a chance to present alongside more high-profile linguists. Taken together, the documents in the box, the 1970 conference on Black English, and the 1980 interview stood out to me as a potentially ethically compromising situation for the two UW-Madison linguists.

I sought input from an informant, the retired linguist Roger Shuy, to help me contextualize this period in English studies when linguists played a featured role in defining English instruction, both in the United States and globally. I chose Shuy for two reasons. Scott used his work on the syllabus of the experimental class, and I could not get my first choice. Ideally, I wanted William Labov. I contacted Labov via email, but I did not get a response. In the context of the Soviet launch of Sputnik in 1957 and the congressional funding that immediately responded to the Soviet threat (Park, 2000, p. 70), different American linguists played pioneering roles in English instruction.

For example, the linguist Harold Allen is credited with calling for the Dartmouth Conference (Trimbur, 2008, p. 143), which brought British and American researchers together to define English instruction. The members of this Anglo-American language alliance (between the United States and Britain) benefited from a sponsorship apparatus, which empowered language experts in the metropole as the one most qualified to package English and teach it. In *Growth Through English*, which is John Dixon’s report on the Dartmouth Conference, John Dixon (1967) called for a literal center that could better position work at Dartmouth as relevant to
teachers (p. 15). The reference that Charles Scott made to his chair being more creative with contractual arrangements also identified the federal government and foundations as the sponsorship apparatus behind these American researchers (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980).

The 1979 Ann Arbor case, which came later than the focus of this dissertation, stands out as a seminal moment for linguists in English instruction. This case was about whether or not Black speech is evidence of developmental concerns in Black children (Labov, 1982, p. 167). In his summary of the Ann Arbor case, William Labov (1982) cited that the children’s parents who brought the case did so because “their children were given all the labels that go with educational failure: learning disabled, behavior problems, and emotionally disturbed” (p. 167). Can teachers simply label students as delayed without having any knowledge of the language that the student speaks? The 1979 Ann Arbor case reflected a more visible contribution by American linguists to English instruction in the United States. In this case, the testimony of William Labov, William Stewart, Roger Shuy, Joey Dillard, and Geneva Smitherman, as expert witnesses, helped to influence Judge Charles Joiner’s decision in favor of the plaintiffs. The ruling established the legal status of Black English as a language and set a precedent that teachers cannot use Black English alone as evidence of student deficit (p. 193).

On the other hand, John Trimbur implicated different British and American linguists in a post-World War II effort to update the older and more vulgar colonial order. Instead of just taking other people’s lands, Winston Churchill said in 1943: “I am very much interested in the question of Basic English. The widespread use of this would be a gain to us far more durable and fruitful that the annexation of great provinces. It would also fit in with my ideas of closer union
with the United States by making it even more worthwhile to belong to the English-speaking club” (Trimbur, 2008, p. 146).

Large movements of capital investment in English studies after World War II had consequences. The researchers deemed useful to government and foundation sponsors benefited from having a sponsorship apparatus behind them. As Churchill suggested, different language experts fanned out from metropoles in England and the United States to advise and teach English in different parts of the world (Trimbur, 2008, p. 143). But, expertise never moved from peripheral geographies in the Third World to the metropole. Black students in the United States became the target of larger efforts to outperform the Soviets globally and to correct perceived deviance in different speakers at home.

This one-way movement of expertise is both colonial and biopolitical. Although the former suggests foreign policy and the latter normally refers to domestic policy, both involve state efforts to control and develop a population. Gayatri Spivak (1988) connected biopolitics to colonization by pointing out the similarity between the phenomena and that Michel Foucault falls short making the connection (p. 86). In The History of Sexuality Volume 1, Foucault (1978) wrote that biopower “exerts a positive influence on life, endeavors to administer, optimize, and multiply it, subjecting it to precise controls and comprehensive regulation” (p. 259). Expanding on the term, he explained, “The biological traits of a population became relevant factors for economic management, and it becomes necessary to organize around them an apparatus which will ensure not only their subjection but the constant increase of their utility” (Foucault, p. 279, 1978). According to Spivak, Foucault focused his attention on schools, hospitals, and prisons to the exclusion of how biopolitics in these spaces closely resembles what the European state did in colonies overseas.
Specifically, in “Can the Subaltern Speak,” Spivak (1988) wrote:

Sometimes it seems as if the very brilliance of Foucault’s analysis of the centuries of European imperialism produces a miniature version of that heterogeneous phenomenon: management of space—but by doctors; development of administrations—but in asylums; considerations of the periphery—but in terms of the insane, prisoners and children. The clinic, the asylum, the prison, the university—all seem to be screen-allegories that foreclose a reading of the broader narratives of imperialism. (p. 86)

What makes phenomena colonial is more difficult to define than biopower since Foucault was explicit about what the latter term meant. In the same essay, Spivak (1988) articulated what a new colonization looked like in terms of its dependence on complex sub-contractual arrangements between the sponsors who supply capital (p. 83), experts who are in a position to benefit from capital investment, and the peripheral people and spaces that are targeted for development. Using his comments as an example, Charles Scott wanted to capitalize on contractual arrangements intended to target a domestic African American population.

Initially, my questions about Scott’s experimental 1969 class in Wisconsin were critical of what I perceived as a self-serving kind of academic ambition. Cold War congressional funding created an incentive for researchers to have ambitions to route money into research projects and set up systems to facilitate the movement of money. In the interest of clarifying what qualifies as “colonial,” here are some of its defining features. The vulnerable population’s language was “discovered” by the dominant group and placed on the research agenda. The language expert (and not the Black speaker) had the resources (in the form of money, journals, and credentials) to assign a status to Black speech. Only the language expert (not Black speakers themselves) could name the features of Black speech, and only the expert can assign an origin to language, contrasting the ways that Black speech is different, deviant, or lacking in relation to a White standard.
In *Culture and Imperialism*, Edward Said (1978) explained what to look for when identifying colonial tropes in a narrative or a story. Following Said’s lead here, I used the words *story* and *narrative* interchangeably, which makes it possible to identify colonial tropes across different types of text. In *Culture and Imperialism*, Said wrote, “Readers of this book will quickly discover that narrative is crucial to my argument here, my basic point being that stories are at the heart of what explorers and novelists say about strange regions of the world” (p. xii).

Elaborating further, Said wrote:

> [Narrative or stories] also become the method colonized people use to assert their own identity and the existence of their own history. The main battle in imperialism is over land, of course; but when it came to who owned the land, who had the right to settle and work on it, who kept it going, who won it back, and who now plans its future—these issues were reflected, contested, and even for a time decided in narrative. (p. xii)

My initial questions were critical of the university’s entrepreneurial role in a larger exploitive apparatus. In large part, I became interested in the experimental freshman writing course because the class raises important questions, questions about the nature of disciplinary research that is intended to have positive effects on research participants.

Specifically, what does it profit Black participants to cooperate with professional researchers? Even though the people who cooperate are not called research subjects anymore, can Black Americans really appreciate their value to the researcher, both professionally and financially? Are there unnamed parties (the state/foundations/publishers) who shape the outcome of what is researched, or whose influence gives invitations to some researchers at the expense of others? These questions were part of my attempts to take a critical look at knowledge production in relation to capital and vulnerable people.

Over the next few years, after I left the University of Wisconsin in 2014, I returned to the documents again and again in different semesters at Columbia. I looked into the linguists who
are named on the 1969 syllabus, and I placed the UW-Madison linguists alongside other linguists. My focus shifted away from exposing something unseemly and more towards understanding research incentives as a norm. I had a few conversations with Professor Janet Miller about the myriad historical, social, and cultural influences, assumptions, and expectations that framed and even perhaps impelled the “kind of story” that I most often verbalized, and about being mindful not to assume to know—that is, to essentialize—“the experience” of Black students. Moreover, my peers and I often say quietly that muckraking stories do not get published. I anticipated that my questions would evolve. In different conversations with Professor Ruth Vinz, she suggested that I consider what an actual student who took the class thought about the experience. “Maybe the students thought the experience was positive,” Professor Vinz said. She asked me to think about academic integrity as a norm and who these linguists are in relation to their peers. These conversations were very helpful.

I can see Janet and Ruth’s influence on how my questions changed. First, does it matter if the two UW-Madison linguists, who organized the foreign language class for Black Americans, are not leaders in their field? How does the binary between distinguished researchers and marginal figures (in the same field) perpetuate misguided representations of academic disciplines as largely textual landscapes, insulated from a funding apparatus? Ultimately, how does the opposition between ethical and unethical relationships with money foreclose on an important discussion about professional and financial incentives, on the part of researchers, to define literacy problems in a manner that attracts funding?

In terms of a framework for this dissertation study, I relied, in large part, on Michel Foucault to think through what binaries obscure from view—specifically, what apparatus (or “field” in Foucault’s [1972] words) might remain disguised when researchers harangue some
colleagues as derivative, unethical, or marginal, and praise others as inventive. I am thinking, in particular, about how the 1966 Dartmouth Conference is often presented to me, as a graduate student, as this moment when James Moffett, John Dixon, and the British “carried the day.” When one or two authors “carry the day” at the expense of others, what does “carry the day” mean exactly? Perhaps the idea of some researchers carrying the day is helpful in developing a common language in a young field. But, it does so at the expense of complexity.

In *The Archeology of Knowledge*, Foucault laid out the basis for his critique of how researchers value some ideas (and the people who write them) at the expense of other ideas. Foucault (1972) wrote:

> One can distinguish therefore between two categories of formulations: those that are highly valued and relatively rare, which appear for the first time, which have no similar antecedent, which may serve as models for others, and which to this extent deserve to be regarded as creations; and those, ordinary, everyday, solid, that are not responsible for themselves, and which derive, sometimes going as far as to repeat it word for word, from what is already being said. (p. 143)

Based on my dissertation research represented throughout this manuscript, I contend that our histories in English education need to accommodate more complex origin stories than easy binaries—at the very least, origin stories more three-dimensional than heroic figures “carrying the day” using only seminal works. Instead of crediting some authors with “inventiveness” and propping up myths about how some authors “started” a field, Foucault (1972) “specifie[d] an effective field of appearance” (p. 144) that makes some statements prized, and by extension, the people who make them.

Thus, what I have decided to include or exclude from this investigation has depended on my interpretations of archives. As Foucault (1972) defined it, an archive is the first law of “what can be said, the system that governs the appearance of statements as unique events” (p. 129). Consequently, my definition of “story” that threads through this dissertation is contingent on
both the intertextual relationships between artifacts and my own personal history with colonization, which informs what stands out to me. I do not see my task as showing a truth to my reader. After all, many possible stories can come from the pile of documents in the box. Instead, as someone who was born on the other side of a capital divide in the Third World, I pay more attention to the impact of large amounts of capital on English instruction.

In “Sponsors of Literacy,” Deborah Brandt (1997) provided the language to reframe how capital is discussed in relation to aesthetic experiences. An “intellectual atmosphere” was “available to young apprentices who worked in the small, decentralized print shops of antebellum America” (p. 1). Subsequent capital investment in industrial printing divided the labor so much that printing only required low-skilled workers. In “Sponsors of Literacy,” Brandt wrote:

Sponsors, as I have come to think of them, are any agents, local or distant, concrete or abstract, who enable, support, teach, or model, as well as recruit, regulate, suppress, or withhold literacy—and gain advantage by it in some way. Just as the ages of radio and television accustom us to having programs brought to us by various commercial sponsors, it is useful to think about who or what underwrites occasions of literacy learning and use. (p. 2)

Capital does not inevitably lead to harmful experiences for vulnerable populations. Throughout this investigation, I have maintained that the inevitability of sponsorship makes easy binaries between researchers untenable. Brandt’s definition suggested a more dynamic interaction between professional academics, who are contracted by research institutions, and sponsors who set often, but not always, useful limits on the purpose of research. Instead of inventive researchers who produce seminal texts and derivative ones who write uninspired work, sponsorship adds complexity by including input from more actors in the field.

For example, in the 2004 Visibility Project, two senior Composition and Rhetoric researchers, Louise Wetherbee Phelps and John M. Ackerman (2010), described an effort to get
writing studies represented in the “information codes and data bases of higher education” (p. 180). Phelps and Ackerman went as far as to equate scholarly success and merit with visibility and funding. The authors wrote:

> It had become evident that the scholarly and programmatic successes we’d celebrated were neither salient to other disciplines nor validated comprehensively in the realm of university politics, government statistics, federal funding and foundations—in short, in the eyes of the academic establishment. (p. 180)

More abstract descriptions of disciplinarity, especially those having German roots, do not pay enough attention to the ways that academic labor often is linked to sponsors.

Ann Markovitch and Terry Shinn’s (2012) characterization, for example, is at odds with how research communities in English studies align themselves with reliable sources of funding. In “Regimes of Science Production and Diffusion,” both authors wrote:

> The disciplinary regime of science production and diffusion is characterized by self-recruitment, the self-selection of research questions, of methodology, self-determination of quality criteria, and it constructs through peer citation and through internal attributions of prizes and other rewards, its own system of compensation. In effect, it forms a relatively autonomous close-economy. (p. 49)

Marcovitch and Shinn acknowledged that “in times of crisis, such as war, disciplinary practitioners historically move beyond their disciplinary referent and become a part of larger ventures” (p. 39). In my own interaction with more experienced faculty, the idea of “outside” influence on their research is unsettling. The conventional wisdom is perhaps that professional researchers who ask questions to attract funding do so at the expense of their academic integrity. But I am also privy to some anecdotal frustration with the terms for getting funding: “You cannot get a grant in Education research without finding something wrong with teachers.” James Gee said this in passing during a presentation at Columbia University in 2017.

Instead of looking to expose bad guys in English studies, who ostensibly took advantage of vulnerable Black freshmen, I wonder if this obscure class at the margins is telling me
something about how financial and professional incentives work as a norm. And if there is a norm, where researchers are expected to pursue financial and professional incentives as part of answering questions, to what extent is this norm colonial in nature? Is it time to start making distinctions between deferent colonial models? Frankly, I came across well-funded research projects that described Black American speech, to my mind, in the same way that colonizers described the unfortunate, savage tendencies of “the native.” In Class Politics, Stephen Park (2000) gave an insightful description of a report that Martin Deutsch wrote in 1968 (p. 100). Deutsch (2000) used public funds from the National Institute of Mental Health and the Office of Economic Opportunity to suggest that Black speech is “a series of unconnected and distracting noise” (p. 100).

It is worth quoting Park’s reference to Deutsch at length here to get a sense of the comparison that I am making between Deutsch, a leading linguist who did government-funded work, and a hypothetical ethnographer, empowered by a colonial administration to research natives. Park (2000) quotes Deutsch,

> While the environment is a noisy one, the noise is not, for the most part, meaningful in relation to the child, and for him most of it is background. In the crowded apartments, with all the daily living stresses, there is a minimum of non-instructional conversation directed toward the child. In actuality, the situation is ideal for the child to learn inattention. Furthermore, he does not get practice from adults correcting his enunciation, pronunciation, and grammar. (p. 100)

A traditional positivist research paper, as a genre, does not provide authors with the self-reflexive space to discuss how findings relate to continued funding or the prospect of funding, let alone colonialism. Consequently, the complex set of conditions, which motivate professional academics to pursue a question, become largely disguised from outsiders who might only have access to curated messages in published works.
Professor Morris Young had suggested that I read Stephen Park. In *Class Politics*, Park (2000) critiqued apolitical representations of professional academics in light of how the federal government responded to the Soviet launch of Sputnik, and how, as Park wrote, “organizations such as the NCTE realized they needed to imagine a new relationship to national politics and the economy if their initiatives were to be funded” (p. 70). Congress passed the National Defense of Education Act (NDEA) in both 1958 and 1964. The first iteration of the NDEA (1958) supported funding for scientific research and education, but English studies were largely excluded from the first version (Park, 2000, p. 70).

Title I of the 1958 “General Provisions” prefaced the motivation behind the legislation: “The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the nation requires the fullest development of mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women” (p. 1581). This preamble (1958) described the political climate as a “present emergency” that “demands additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available” (p. 1581). Title V of the 1958 version singled out “linguistics,” in addition to history, political science, anthropology, and economics, as useful in providing a “full understanding of areas regions and countries” relevant to the war effort (p. 1593). In *Class Politics*, Park (2000) explained that after much lobbying and some contentious opposition to government sponsorship in English studies, English instruction was included in the 1964 version of the NDEA (p. 72), which provides money for “specialized programs of instruction” to help “substantial numbers of culturally, economically, or socially, educationally handicapped” or “disadvantaged youth” (NDEA, 1964, p. 1108).

The national reach of the NDEA had the effect of a call for papers, incentivizing researchers to engage in competitive prospecting for funding. Without the federal and foundation apparatus as a framework, which contextualizes researcher interest in literacy problems, the
linguists whom I investigated would appear to generate research questions on their own terms. In fact, when I first started to look into the unusual UW-Madison class, an otherwise supportive Professor Young reminded me that researchers “ask questions.” Without the contrast between more high-profile linguists, who were attached to the Center of Applied Linguistics, and Charles Scott, the UW-Madison linguist, the interest in Black speech—as a problem—would appear like an isolated incident in English studies. For this dissertation research, then, I decided to expand the scope of my archive, thus creating a larger field in which to discuss that actual university course.

Gayatri Spivak, whose work described systems, margins, and the movement of capital, respectively, helped me to demystify connections between Wisconsin and the more high-profile work in English studies—in particular, how Charles Scott’s indiscrete comments about funding demonstrated something fundamental about Black people’s value as data. The interests of sponsors are part of the calculus that decides which researchers’ work has more value. In fact, the criteria for receiving government funding favor the positivist stance of dialectologists, such as Philip Luelsdorff, Roger Shuy, Raven McDavid, and Albert Markwardt at the expense of linguists, such as the creolist Joey L. Dillard, whose activist scholarship connected Black English to its African heritage.

In “Can the Subaltern Speak?” Gayatri Spivak (1988) framed the movement of capital in colonial terms, making it clear how the seemingly post-colonial can remain colonial through subcontracting relationships. Spivak described the

proliferating phenomena of international subcontracting. Under this strategy, manufacturers based in developed countries subcontract the most labor intensive stages of production, for example, sewing or assembly, to the Third World nations where labor is cheap. Once assembled, the multinational re-imports the goods—under generous tariff exemptions—to the developed country instead of selling them to the local market. Here the link to training in consumerism is almost snapped. While global recession
has markedly slowed trade and investment worldwide since 1979, international subcontracting has boomed. In these cases, multinationals are freer to resist militant workers, revolutionary upheavals, and even economic downturns. (p. 4)

Assuming that some researchers enjoy more favor from sponsors, researching what professional academics themselves find to be ethical or unethical relationships with different sponsors can yield a map of the players in a field. Who is getting published, where, and alongside whom? Which grants from which institutions are most valued? The sponsors’ capital occasions people in different spaces to carry out contractual obligations. Access to sponsors, such as the federal government and foundations, more or less thus often determines the centers and margins of a field.

The queer theorist Leo Bersani created a useful model for how probing these margins has the potential to map a field with greater clarity. In *Is the Rectum a Grave?* Bersani (2010) explained how the threat of AIDS brought out the worst protective instincts in senior medical professionals, whose claims to neutrality and protecting the health of the population became unmasked (p. 4). Bersani’s attention to pornography is not unlike my interest in peripheral Wisconsin linguist Charles Scott. In the same way that dominant genealogies in English education avoid mapping what I perceived, entering into this research, as epistemological dead-ends, such as ESL for Black people, for example, Bersani discussed how pornography gets distanced from normative heterosexual sex as mere escapism (p. 21). Distancing what is disparaged protects the center from being tainted. Bersani wrote:

MacKinnon and Dworkin, on the other hand, rightly assume the immense power of sexual images [in porn] to orient our imagination of how political power can and should be distributed and enjoyed and it seems to me, they just as rightly mistrust a certain intellectual sloppiness in the catharsis argument, a sloppiness that consist in avoiding the question of how a center of presumably wholesome sexuality ever produced those unsavory margins in the first place. Given the public discourse around the center of sexuality, (a discourse obviously not unmotivated by a prescriptive ideology about sex), the margins maybe the only place where the center becomes visible. (p. 21)
Bersani was pointing out how normative sex disguises an exaggerated masculinity, a sort of problematic manliness that is identifiable in porn and is masked in normative heterosexual intercourse.

The drama of different local events at the University of Wisconsin did not require the context of national events to frame what was at stake. On the syllabus for the 1969 “Special Section for Black Americans,” for example, the document informed the Black students that “If the differences between Black English and University English dialects are noticeably great, communication may be impaired” and that “hopefully, by the end of the course, the student should be more bi-dialectical” (Angle & Scott, 1969, p. 4). Yet, in the 1970 conference presentation about the same class, Scott made clear that he was already constructing “a detailed course syllabus for future sections of the Program in English for Black Americans” (Angle & Scott, 1970, p. 5). Since students have access to a syllabus and not necessarily to what happens at an academic conference, students are less likely to know what motivates the researchers’ question.

In Figure 15, the heading of a 1969 English Department memo (at UW-Madison) describes a normative freshman writing program, where the director briefs five faculty members on the state of the department, including department Aims, Placement, Class Size, and so on. In Figure 16, which is page 5 of the same memo, the director, Edna Thomas, pointed out an emerging Black problem that interrupted the normalcy of the department and the memo itself. The memo basically started over on page 5 with the new main heading “Problems,” and two sub-headings that describe the “Problems” as “1) Academic” and “2) Psychological.”
ENGLISH 101

AIMS

The academic aim of English 101 is to prepare the student for English 102. But in addition, the instructor should realize that he has a special obligation here: to inspire confidence in the student and help him, as far as possible, to overcome any psychological barriers which may interfere with his success in his college career. This obligation would presumably be felt by any instructor in a composition course, but it should be felt with particular sensitivity by the instructor in 101.

STRUCTURE

1) Placement

Students are placed in English 101 on the basis of their low performance in the objective testing given all entering students.

This procedure in general is satisfactory. It is felt, however, that a very few students may be incorrectly placed, either in 101 when they are capable of doing well (not just squeaking through) in 102, or in 102 when they are completely incapable of profiting by it and need the foundation to be secured in 101; and that some provision should exist for reviewing such cases. The instructor who suspects that he has a student in this category should at once secure several pieces of writing from the student, and if further reading confirms his suspicion, he should confer with the Director.
PROBLEMS

1) Academic

A distinction must be made here between the black students in the course and the others. For the former, many of the academic problems seem to arise from the fact that they use fluently a special dialect of their own. This is a true dialect which differs from standard English in many respects of pronunciation (which has a marked effect on spelling), vocabulary, and grammar (heavy use of subjectless sentences, for instance). It would be a great help to the staff if any material were available on this dialect so that they might know what problems to look for, and it is thought that some material is being used in the Washington, D. C., public school system. The staff are primarily taking the approach that 101 students need to learn standard English as a second language. Some find the tape recorder helpful, as well as the technique of careful reading aloud in class.

A further division is to be made between black men and black women. The latter (a minority compared to the men) have fewer problems. Though they may lapse into the dialect from time to time, they have already a fairly extensive acquaintance with standard English, and use it predominantly. Many of the men, on the other hand, have very little acquaintance with it.

Figure 15. English 101 Problems (University of Wisconsin English Department, n.d.)
At the same time that the university isolated Black students as separate from the larger university population, Black students themselves also demanded separation on their own terms. Figure 17 and 18, respectively, indicate Black students’ demands for separation within the University of Wisconsin system. My archive of formal writing, such as the papers presented at the different conferences, also includes more writerly texts, such as memos and student demands, which are less conventionalized by contrast to essay writing and invite the reader to reconstruct the message. From this archive, I construct impressions of separation from different perspectives: separation based on the faculty’s stigmatizing Black speech and separation based on students’ demands for institutional representation. I entered into this study believing that a sense of scope, using multiple documents, was not required to make the stakes for Black students and researchers clear.

Paradoxically, the more I expanded my archive to include university memos, student protest literature, conference transcripts, interviews with researchers, national legislation, and foundation memos, the more I perceived that the change in scope had the effect of making the workings of a system in English studies more visible.

Again, different storylines could come from the box. I thus have attempted to make my interpretations of “the stories” surrounding this UW-Madison course understood to a discerning reader by enlisting the help of a knowledgeable informant. I believed that perspectives provided by a linguist with a national reputation, Dr. Roger Shuy, could be useful—not just as a source of insider information, but also as a signpost for the reader. I chose Dr. Shuy with the intention that, as someone whose work dominates the syllabus of the “Special Section,” Shuy qualified as a supposedly more ideal version of typical research norms. I know from talking to Shuy via email that he would not be as ideal as a Noam Chomsky. William Labov’s contribution to linguistics is
Figure 16. “A History of Participation by Black Students in the University Structure” (University of Wisconsin English Department, March 5, 1969)
1. Autonomous Black Students department controlled and organized by Black students and faculty, which would enable students to receive a B.A. in Black Studies.

2. A Black chairman of the Black Studies department, who would be approved by a committee of Black students and faculty.

3. That at least 500 Black students be admitted to U.W. for the semester of September, 1969.

4. That 20 teachers be allocated for the initiation of the Black Studies department with the approval of Black students.

5. That amnesty (defined as no reprisal or chastisement) be given all students who participate in boycotts or other such actions in reference to our demands.

6. That a Black co-director of the Student Financial Aids Office be appointed with the approval of Black students.

7. That Black counselors be hired by the Student Financial Aids Office with the approval of Black students.

8. That scholarships be provided for all athletes up until the time that they receive their degree.

Figure 17. Black students’ demands (University of Wisconsin English Department, March 5, 1969)
likewise cited far more than Shuy. However, I planned to deploy Shuy in the story as the other half of a binary by contrast to Scott. I collapse the binary later when the conceit outlives its usefulness.

If marginal figures in sociolinguistics were positioning Black Americans as nonnative to attract funding, what were more established researchers, who conducted nationally regarded studies, doing? What relationships did they have with funders? I wondered. Dr. Shuy was the only person from among a group of well-respected, high-profile linguists to whom I had access and who is still alive. It occurred to me that, at some point later in the work, Dr. Shuy would outlive his role as a plot device. But I thought it prudent to include him as part of the investigation. The myth that some researchers are leaders in their field reflects a “truth” in terms of academic pedigree. Thus, from my perspective, Shuy’s associations with storied events in English education, such the Ann Arbor Case, made him an ideal informant to help me situate that particular UW-Madison course offering and its participants.
METHODOLOGY AS SITES OF PROHIBITION AND THE FANTASTIC BOX

The moment when I sought an informant, which came later during my doctoral studies at Columbia, responded to concerns that the unusual class and the two men who created it were antithetical to dominant social science research norms. The little that Charles Scott and Luelsdorff published at the time made both men vulnerable to the charge that they were marginal figures with little record of scholarship. As per Foucault’s (1972) point, the heroic researcher who takes intellectual risk is a familiar trope of dominant figures across many disciplines (p. 143); writers with dubious claims to invention, on the other hand, might not have as much reputation to squander by asking strange questions. I entertained the thought that the UW-Madison linguists are marginal figures in so far as I could use this perceived margin as part of my method. In the *Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault discussed sites where prohibitions take place as potentially revealing in terms of systematic norms (p. 193). Leo Bersani (2010) took Foucault further by dramatizing what the AIDS crisis (especially the stigma against gay sex) suggests about sexism in hetero-normative sex (p. 2). In terms of how I use Foucault and Bersani, my primary assumption throughout this study has been as follows: what gets disparaged and cast aside often shares an unsettling affiliation with prescribed standards.

The episodic form in which I created this work was intended not just to guard against repeating my theoretical assumptions at every turn. I intended that this approach, this episodic form, reflect my differing starting points as my research evolved over time. I made recursive movements between the fantastic box of primary documents (either mining, wading, or harvesting from it), following up on leads from said box, and trying to find knowledgeable informants who were willing to talk. This method in fact has a long epistemological tradition. First, it is part detective work, where I revise and pursue questions that come from my own
expanding archive. Second, it is part ethnographic, in terms of the ethical entanglements that come with telling other people’s stories and using informants to do so. Third, it is part bricolage (Derrida, 1974, p. 2) since I rely on available resources to tell my interpretations of these stories that also satisfy the requirements for my Ph.D. One of the sections of this dissertation, for example, meets a certification requirement, which stipulates that I include certain seminal texts from English Education in my work.

As for an informant, the linguist Roger Shuy gave me detailed impressions of a moment in English instruction when Black students became ripe for research. In the emails, I was careful to refer to Shuy as Dr. Shuy, and I solicited his participation under the guise of an outsider who needed guidance. Shuy’s willingness to continue a correspondence with me seemed to be based on his wanting to direct me through unfamiliar terrain. I cannot say I knew from the start that I would need an informant. My decision to solicit one suggests that this work has different points of origin. Instead of seeing these different beginnings as confusing, as though the earlier work meanders toward my current questions, my post-structural stance resists teleological movements towards a climax.

Alternatively, at different moments in my life, while working on the story, I had different priorities. The project evolved as I switched disciplines, traded one part of the country for another, and tried to meet new requirements for graduation. In one of my first conversations with Professor Janet Miller, she encouraged me to think about my first certification exam as “adding to the histories” of English Education. She listened to me tell my version of the class and its connection to federal spending, and she suggested that what I am describing could be considered as part of the nationwide curriculum reform period characterized by U.S. efforts to “catch up
with the Russians,” following their launch of Sputnik in 1957. This was probably the first time that a highly qualified researcher tethered what I was doing to a specific moment in a field.

Speaking of first, my formative experiences are just as much a part of my archive as material artifacts. One of my “first” interactions with any university makes me feel like the unlikely writer of my own dissertation. I grew up in a Kingston ghetto that was within walking distance of the University of the West Indies (UWI). It was common (my mother told me only recently) for mothers to complain that “dem pickney cannot go to dat school.” Inaccessibility aside, UWI was “camp” to us boys. Older teenagers encouraged us to rise early and “go a camp” when the dew was still fresh on the grass. We climbed the high walls, using holes chiseled into the concrete, and jumped onto the university grounds. See Figures 19 and 20 for recent pictures of camp. After the games or before the sun got hot, I abandoned the football to pick plums and stone mango trees. I never went there for one reason. I wandered within a perimeter near the football field, the cricket pitch, the pool, and the student union building.

Looking back now, the university’s concrete walls invited us to climb them. The wall is not a sufficient deterrent. By contrast, we understood that the areas protected by chain-linked fencing and barbed wire were nonnegotiable. The menacing steel makes a clear point. This side of the university is near Mona Heights, the reservoir, and a surviving aqueduct from the colonial period.

Before Mona was the site of a university, the British built Mona Camp during World War II to shelter who were evacuated from near the Rock of Gibraltar (Masis, 2016, p. 17). Mona Camp was also called the Gibraltar Camp (p. 17) during the 4 years that the colonial government hosted the evacuees. Figure 21 is an undated stock photo of the camp being built.
Figure 18. Camp at University of the West Indies (University of the West Indies, n.d.)

Figure 19. Soccer players at UWI (University of West Indies, n.d.)
Figure 22 is a picture that I found in an Israeli newspaper of the Gibraltar Jews in the finished camp.

Figure 20. Mona Camp being built (Mona Camp, n.d.)

Figure 21. Gibraltar Jews in the Mona Camp (Gibraltar Camp, n.d.)
In both pictures, I can see the familiar Long Mountain in the background, which anyone from August Town would recognize. Prior to being the Gibraltar Camp, both Mona and the nearby Papine estates were ideal spaces for sugar plantations. Legend has it that the earliest settlers of my neighborhood, August Town, were slaves who ran away from the Mona and Papine cane fields. These outlaw experiences of slaves are not written down, except for fugitive slave listings in colonial newspapers and other writerly property documents. Here are two of my favorite listings of owners trying to retrieve their slaves in Kingston. Douglas Chambers (2013) edited a group of the listings into a curated publication:

30 July 1718

*Weekly Jamaica Courant*

Run away, from Mrs. Mary Hales in Temple-Lane, Kingston, a creole negro wench, marked on the right shoulder W, called by the name Nanne. She had a white petticoat, an oznaburg jacket, a white handkerchief. Who ever brings her to the aforesaid Mrs. Hales, or to the Printers, shall be well-rewarded, or whoever retains her be it at their peril. (p. 1)

Douglas (2013) gave this slave listing of Kingston runaways:

30 July 1718

*Weekly Jamaica Courant*

Runaway, from the estate of William Pussey Esq., in Vere, a Lusty Ebrow [Eboe] Negro man named Jack, of a pole black complexion, part of his nose cut off; also a lean Calamante [Coromantee] Negro boy named Darby, marked W P that used to conceal himself about the town, they both speak pretty good English. Whoever takes them up and gives notice to Matthias Phillip of Kingston, so as they may be had, shall be reasonably rewarded. (p. 2)

I try to imagine what slaves were like from planter impressions of uncooperative property. Legends about runaway slaves survive as remarks—no details. My uncle’s friend, Nimrod, who used to earn a living from the land, is more qualified to talk about runaway slaves. Admittedly, the fact that I am writing about runaways (and not telling it orally) makes me uncomfortable
about my own privilege. I try to reconcile my excitement at the thought of camp grass—especially the expanse of it—with how fugitive slaves likely experienced the same openness as vulnerability.

A few years ago, someone named Richie (who I knew from primary school) was shot on the other side of Mona campus. From what I heard, he was trying to steal a car. Richie was the kind of 10-year-old boy who told Ms. Heron, the Principal of August Town Primary, “suck yuh maddah.” He was the youngest in a family of boys, and the one most prone to fits of rage. If a momma-joke went too far, his face would turn copper, and he took these deep, panting breaths. Richie and his brothers, including Diego and Azzie (pronounced |Ahzie|), lived at the end of our valley town, where Long Mountain converges. Riche was closer to my age. Diego (who I hope is still alive) is the affable older brother—quick to smile and giving everyone nicknames. Diego included us when the older boys walked to camp on weekend mornings.

Azzie was one of the middle sons. He was big for his age and sweated profusely when we played football. Instead of seeing his big frame as puberty, we teased him for it. “Him have too much oil cake up inna him back.” The cure for this condition is regular sex. One afternoon, Andie Bop stabbed Azzie with a pair of scissors in the schoolyard. Azzie held in his entrails using one hand, stoned Andie Bop with the other, and passed out on the asphalt from blood loss. I was not there when it happened, but the moment survives in our collective retellings. After Azzie, as an adult, found Jesus, he was shot near his house in a case of mistaken identity. Azzie’s name sounds like someone named |Lahzie|, who I heard was the real target. Legend has it that, despite the bullet wounds, Azzie crawled some distance up a dirt hill before he died.

These largely Third World stories provide context for my interests in plural histories. Oral dramas in August Town take place within walking distance of Mona. Yet, they do not benefit
from the more stable transmission that is associated with printed stories. The university’s curated story operates at the level of a dominant history while August Town legends, by contrast, appear like myths or tall tales. I feel a responsibility to add these oral dramas to the more official record of plantation runaways and the Gibraltar Camp.

Henry James advised the unlikely young writer, not unlike myself, to take advantage of available access in whatever form that access comes. In “The Art of Fiction,” James (1884) wrote that it would be “quite unfair (as it seems to me) to declare” that a “damsel shall have nothing to say about the military” (p. 5). “The young lady,” James wrote, “living in the village has only to be a damsel upon who nothing is lost.” The unnamed female writer’s only experience with the military “consisted in her having once, in Paris, as she ascended a staircase, passed an open door, where, in the household of a Pasteur, some of the young Protestants were seated at a table round a finished meal. The glimpse made a picture; it lasted a moment, but that moment was experience” (p. 5). I have had limited access to the people with whom I need to populate this story. Nor does it help that I am directing a critical eye at a community that has good reason not to cooperate.

I noticed that my informant Dr. Shuy was more forthcoming in the emails when I presented myself as less knowledgeable and seeming to want him to play the shepherding role. So, this became a part of our exchanges. “Sure, I’ll try to help. But although I can no longer hear well enough to talk on the telephone, I’m still good at email,” Roger Shuy wrote (personal communication, August 5, 2017). I had sent the retired linguist an email late one Sunday night, and he responded the next day. He copied my follow-up email, made some space for himself between my questions and commentary, and wrote his responses in bold text. He preferred to expand on my questions by interjecting information: “I agree that federal funds have…” or “you
should know that…” I thus sensed Shuy’s generous disposition towards sharing a personal history—and his wanting to do so in the manner that he found comfortable. He was not open to my coming to see him in Missoula, Montana.

During our correspondence in 2017, I needed to make Shuy feel comfortable enough that he would share what he remembered with me. I did not necessarily know what information I wanted. I just wanted to keep him responding. Roger Shuy is one of the last surviving linguists, or the last of the more high-profile ones, whose testimony in the 1979 Ann Arbor case convinced the court to side with the Black plaintiffs in the Ann Arbor school district. Both Joey Dillard and William Stewart are dead now. William Labov is in his 90s and unreachable now. I would also love to talk to Geneva Smitherman, but she really arrived later on the academic scene than these men. I thus focused my dissertation research on the period before the 1968 Mona Conference in Jamaica when Black researchers asserted themselves more in linguistics. Both Dillard and Smitherman belong to what is called the Creolist camp in sociolinguistics. Creolists oppose the position made by dialectologists, such as Labov and Shuy, that Black English deviated from a parent Anglo-tongue years ago, becoming somehow isolated from its parent language and developing subsequent “nonstandard” features.

The testimony of these linguists (especially of Geneva Smitherman) persuaded the Michigan court to recognize Vernacular Black English as having a grammar (Labov, 1982, p. 193). Based on the language in the 1979 ruling, the court required the school district to take appropriate action to teach the Black children “to read in the standard English of the school, the commercial world, the arts, science and professions” (p. 3). I needed Roger Shuy’s input to better understand the treatment of what he called “Vernacular Black English” or VBE. Creolists prefer the term Black English.
While Foucault otherwise disparaged searches for origin, the stakes for African Americans, if Black English did come from a White standard, are quite high. William Labov later admitted that White linguists (mainly dialectologists) were wrong to suggest that Black English came from a White standard. The colonial implication of White origins would then be that Black Americans essentially inherited an ontology from Whites and warped it to their liking. The difference between linguists became especially heated as more Black linguists entered the field.

However, before I was interested in understanding who these players were, I was more concerned with what I was finding in the fantastic box of documents. I paid special attention to the savvy with which the two linguists coordinated with university officials to get permission for the teaching of the course. The linguists succeeded with directing Black students away from Freshman Composition and placing them under the auspices of the linguistics department. At the time, the documents that I pulled into my own archive scrutinized the university’s progressive efforts to recruit Black students, which appeared at odds with the mass expulsion of 94 mostly Black students at UW-Oshkosh.

I have a methodological way of looking at documents that I want to make clear at this point. I have examined and interpreted not just essay communication, where linguists present findings to a more public audience, but also interview transcripts, university memos, and conference records. Relying on just research papers is a problem because the here-and-now often gets lost in an otherwise reasonable goal (in positivist research) to say something that is “true.” This is across space and time. James Moffett (1968) wrote insightfully about the distance between the audience and communicator and the researcher’s responsibility, as writer, to be “less space-time bound” when creating written text (p. 35). The goal to create autonomous messaging
that can resonate with larger numbers of people comes at the expense of errant here-and-now impressions which do not cohere, impressions that real people in real spaces experience.

As I mined through the box of errant documents, and its intertextual relationship with published works, I paid special attention to problems and inconsistencies. I looked for those cases where what the linguists communicate in a writerly way is at odds with what they commit to in print. Again, I am not looking to expose anyone as a liar, nor am I interested in anything unseemly. I am mindful that the complex nature of authorship is as such that published research does not provide a space for the kind of candor that is important for this investigation. I understood, throughout this study, that looking across an archive at different types of printed records had the potential to generate these kinds of problems and inconsistencies.

In “What Is an Author?” Michel Foucault (1979) described hypothetical situations in which errant piles of an author’s writing are made to cohere when authenticating the writer’s body of work. “Even when an individual has been accepted as an author,” Foucault wrote, “we must still ask if everything he wrote, said, or left behind is a part of his work” (p. 223). Foucault used Nietzsche to make his point.

When undertaking the publication of Nietzsche’s work, for example, where should one stop? Surely everything must be published, but what is “everything”? Everything that Nietzsche himself published, certainly. And what about the rough drafts of his works? Obviously. The plans for his aphorisms? Yes. The deleted passages and notes at the bottom of the page? Yes. What if within a workbook filled with aphorisms, one finds a reference, the notation of a meeting or of an address, or a laundry list: is it a work, or not? Why not? (p. 103)

The implication is that some of what an author said and wrote informally can get suppressed in the authenticating process. If I had relied only on what linguists publish in essay form, where researchers have more control over how to represent themselves in formal writing, my archive would be limited. I needed access to the kind of information that is not formatted with text
features intended to control readers. I wanted to eavesdrop on personal notes, memos, and off-the-cuff remarks made in interviews—the everyday writerly stuff, which usually gets discarded as not representative of a discipline. I believe that writerly remarks indeed do share an important kinship with published works.

For example, as a device to start my varied interrogated narrations of the specific UW-Madison course, I put two transcripts from different linguists in conversation with each other. My intent was to make a connection between Roger Shuy’s work, which comes closer to the ideal representations of a researcher, and Charles Scott’s work, which appears problematic by contrast to Shuy. In the transcript from the 1980 interview,¹ this is what Charles Scott said about his own department in the 1960s at the University of Wisconsin, Madison:

I don’t think he [the Chair] was particularly creative in leading that department. I think he always had the feeling that linguistics departments through the 1960s, many of which were beginning to expand very, very rapidly, were doing so with federal funds. For instance, through NDEA Title VI programs. And sometimes various kinds of contractual arrangements with governmental agencies and the government foundations and so forth. And Murray, [the Chair] I think, always felt that there was something tawdry about all that. And I don’t think he wanted any of that to tarnish his department. (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980)

In my email correspondence with Roger Shuy, I wanted to get an impression of his personal interaction with the people who funded his work. In my email, I asked, “How would you describe the priorities of the Carnegie and the Ford Foundation when you were there? Was your work in forensic linguistics very different from foundation-funded work, especially because the funding relationship was different?” Shuy responded:

Foundations develop and change their priorities regularly, often when they get new presidents. When CAL [Center for Applied Linguistics] was founded, Ferguson convinced them to have a focus on America’s need to know and know about the languages of the world. That was its first focus and priority. About the time Ferguson left CAL, one of the Ford divisions took a strong interest in black children and the point person at Ford was Margery Martus, who had helped CAL get a huge grant that Dillard

---

¹ Charles Scott, Oral History Interview (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1981), 00:52:56-00:54:05.
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ran. [William] Stewart worked with Dillard I guess. When it became apparent to Ford that nothing useful was coming out of it, they complained to CAL’s acting director, Hood Roberts, who then fired Dillard and hired me away from Michigan State, where I had received some fame from the Detroit Dialect Study. (R. Shuy, personal communication, August 8, 2017)

In the first transcript, Charles Scott’s willingness to base the direction of his research on available funding puts him at odds with representations of the ideal researcher. Scott’s desire to be creative in attracting funding does not inspire the commonplace integrity that researchers value as a professional community. But, based on the role that the Ford Foundation played in the firing of researchers at the CAL, I wanted to push back against simply dismissing Scott as an unethical, marginal figure. Even the least reproachable relationship between funders and researchers is rooted in a mutually beneficial arrangement. Moreover, the cost of not being transparent about the interests of all parties involved can have real consequences for vulnerable populations.

In addition to juxtaposing transcripts and people, my recursive methods include following up on leads. Shuy mentioned that Ford Foundation officials got Dillard fired from a research project (which is how Shuy got the job at the CAL). I perceive this firing as a Foucauldian moment where punishment might reveal something compelling. I went to the Rockefeller Archive in Tarrytown, where Ford Foundation documents are kept, in the spirit of probing a problem as a site of potential understanding. Shuy told me that he simply reported his findings to the Ford Foundation official Marjorie Martus. But I could not accept this position as a single version of the truth. I am not satisfied with the idea that researchers get money, do contracted work, and then write reports—reports that are filed away by funders who just defer to researchers.
I thus set up binaries with the intent of dismantling them with shared connections. The following comparison, for example, reflects a conceit on my part to use Roger Shuy’s objections to Scott for plot purposes. Shuy said, “As far as I know, Charles Scott never worked with CAL on anything. I knew him vaguely but we had no communication that I can remember. Until you told me, I had no idea that he used DAD [Discovering American Dialect] in his course at UW. But for a few years, DAD was NCTE’s best seller, so I guess that’s possible” (personal communication, August 7, 2017). Roger Shuy put different layers of remove between himself and Charles Scott. Scott “never worked at CAL.” “On anything.” No communication transpired that Shuy remembered well. Nor was Shuy subtle about his relative status (by contrast to Scott) as both a fixture at the CAL and as a bestselling author of an NCTE publication.

Shuy had good reason to distance himself from Scott. Other linguists were careful to say “second dialect instruction” or making Black students “bidialectical,” but Charles Scott took it a step further. In “The Linguistic Basis for the Development of Reading Skills,” Scott (1966) wrote that “foreign language instruction” intended for “speakers of other languages” “will be equally applicable to the teaching of reading skill to native speakers of English” (p. 535). The big names in dialectology, a subfield of linguistics, might not remember this obscure paper or someone like Charles Scott. Scott did not have a sufficiently public genealogy from which to construct a coherent sense of authorship.

In fact, much is at stake for linguists if Shuy’s characterization of Scott has merit. To the extent that Scott’s work was not impactful, or far outside of a mainstream, then Scott’s position on Black English would not matter. He would just be a strange man who had some strange ideas about teaching English. Roger Shuy’s relative proximity to linguists more distinguished than himself gives Shuy some leverage in placing Charles Scott outside of the mainstream. Shuy was
invited to the 1964 Bloomington Conference in Indiana, where some of the nation’s leading language specialists came together to discuss the “language problems of the culturally underprivileged” (Davis, 1964, p. 1). Roger Shuy was there alongside many big names, including Albert H. Marckward and Raven I. McDavid (both distinguished linguists) and Bob Hogan and Harold Allen from NCTE. Allen was CCCC chair in 1952 and NCTE president in 1961. Allen would be president of TESOL 2 years after the Bloomington conference in 1966 (Trimbur, 2008, p. 143). John Gumperz was also there, as were William Stewart from CAL and William Labov, who was an Assistant Professor of Linguistics at Columbia in 1964.

Roger Shuy’s Ph.D. mentor, Raven I. McDavid, Jr., opened the Bloomington conference with a presentation entitled “Social Dialect: Cause or Symptom of Social Maladjustment.” In the paper, McDavid (1964) wrote that

the grammatical problems [of black Americans] are of such an order that we [at Bloomington] advance the suggestion—which Mencken had reported before the war and which my wife independently derived from her teaching experience—that in our urban slums and other areas where divergent social dialects exist, we might teach Standard English as a foreign language. (p. 7)

McDavid’s reference to H. L. Mencken suggested that foreign language instruction for African Americans was not first suggested by Charles Scott.

In Roger Shuy’s own report on Bloomington (he wrote the official report), the Yale linguist W. Nelson Francis (1964) presented work on helping Black freshmen to correct their Vernacular Black English (p. 148). According to another source, Nelson’s project, which was funded with a $200,000 grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, included interviewing successful African Americans to determine the target language, developing “oral exercises in sentence construction” as part of a pilot writing program, and using the oral and written exercises in a “full-scale trial” at Brown; the Brown-Tougaloo Exchange website explains the interaction
between the two universities, including the foundations. The Brown-Tougaloo Exchange credited Francis with respecting Vernacular Black English as a language, but on the condition of its perceived deviance from a standard. What issues from this problematic status is an effort to stop Black speech (or a foreign grammar) from interfering with student performance in the target language. These assumptions undergird the perceived problem that Black students have with “dialect interference,” which dialectologists proposed to remedy with “contrastive analysis.”

This UW-Madison class and the linguists who organized it are more accurately a variation on a common theme: Blackness as nonstandard, different, lacking, deviant, foreign, a mismatch, and in need of correction. At the Dartmouth Seminar in 1966, 2 years after Bloomington, the linguist Joshua Fishman grouped a diversity of language concerns under a generalized umbrella. According to Language and Language Learning, Fishman (1968) praised what he called a “planned language shift” in the United States as a success story. Over the course of the 19th and 20th centuries, the American public education system assimilated the speech communities of multiple immigrant groups into regional varieties of a standard (p. 44). Referring to the phenomenon as “Anglification,” “whether slow or rapid, forced, unforced, or desired,” Fishman explained that government institutions have significant leverage in standardizing the language that is used in the public sphere (p. 44). In this context, Black speech reflects an obstacle to a common language.

Anglification is a version of what Foucault would call positive power, which frames itself as helping people to develop themselves. In addition to Fishman, Charles Ferguson (1968), who cofounded the CAL, described language shifts as a necessary function of a central government. In a paper entitled “Teaching Standard Languages to Dialect Speakers,” which Ferguson presented at the Bloomington Conference, he wrote, “The nation or some part of the nation has
to decide what language it wants to use in its education system and what the relation of that language and the language of the students shall be” (p. 113). Ferguson’s approval of a planned shift in Spain, for example, suggested how the United States would treat its own Black population in the 1950s and 1960s. Ferguson wrote:

Here, to the majority of people in the country [Spain], Spanish is the mother tongue, and the kind of standard Spanish taught in the school is not radically different from the home language, though there are differences. But there are substantial segments of the population in which spoken Spanish, Galician, for example is quite different from the Spanish that is taught in school. It is different enough, in fact, that the children become bidialectical. On the other hand, there are some parts of the Spanish school population which are Catalan speaking or Basque speaking, where the difference is so great that the children must become bilingual. (p. 114)

Both Ferguson and Fishman provided a context for the role that linguists play in the exercise of state power. Linguists have an incentive to make their work relevant in a geopolitical context, where their expertise was critical in shaping the language priorities of the state. The class in Wisconsin might reflect a more vulgar attempt at “Anglification,” which is otherwise disguised in English classes as having what Foucault called positive effects on the population. A portion of the teacher population can talk about invitations to “grow” and have aesthetic experiences without really unpacking the biopolitical and colonial implications of Anglification.
MARJORIE MARTUS

While Marjorie Martus was employed at the Ford Foundation, she wrote to the linguist Joey L. Dillard on November 11, 1966 about becoming “acquainted” with Dillard’s Urban Language Study (ULS) and about her looking “forward to keeping in touch with the progress of the work” (M. Martus, personal communication, November 11, 1966). At the time, Dillard was running a study at the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL). Based on this memo, Martus had gotten a report from Dillard earlier, but she wanted to receive “new items of not too technical content as they are issued” (M. Martus, personal communication, November 29, 1968). Later in the same month, on November 29, another memo to Dillard indicated that Martus was recommending data to Dillard prior to Dillard’s firing. Martus (1966) wrote:

The enclosed brochure concerns a filmed dialogue between two teenage girls from New York City’s lower East Side. I mentioned it to Loren Nussbaum and he thought the ULS [Urban Language Study] staff might be interested in seeing it. The sound track requires the best of equipment which I am sure is no problem for the Center. (M. Martus, personal communication, November 29, 1968)

Martus would have been interacting with different linguists and developing her own point of view by triangulating a range of perspectives on Black students. In the fall of 1966 alone, she was requesting reports from Roger Shuy, Basil Bernstein, and William Labov, respectively. If she was reading the work of these researchers, talking to Center linguists, and making recommendations to some of them, she was doing much more than just filing reports.

The memos invited me to wonder if her role reflected that of a collaborator, and, if so, why might linguists be resistant to thinking about Marjorie Martus as such. Based on an The Almanac obituary (January 31, 2001), Martus graduated from Antioch College in the 1946 and “participated in graduate programs at Columbia University and Bank Street in New York.” Between 1959 and 1982, Martus was Director of Education and Research at the Ford
Foundation, where she was responsible for “grant programs in child development, school innovation and change, literacy studies, and minority scholar development” (The Almanac, January 31, 2001). The Almanac obituary also featured her later move to Stanford University School of Education in 1981, where Martus was “the first distinguished visiting practitioner” (January 31, 2001).

In one memo in particular, Martus used the pronoun “we” to communicate with educators about the work that was being done at CAL. Here she wrote to a superintendent (Dr. L. C. McArthur) in South Carolina on March 30, 1967:

In the course of exploring problems in early language development across a broad front, we have been acquainted with research which indicates that local dialects can serve as an interference in learning to read standard English. The Foundation has supported work at the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington DC aimed at describing the dialects spoken in the district and preparing teaching materials using the linguist’s techniques of contrastive analysis, to aid in the teaching of standard English. (M. Martus, personal communication, March 30, 1967)

The pronoun “we” challenges clear distinctions between researcher and sponsor by placing Martus on a shifting continuum between the two hats. In this March 1967 memo, Martus suggested some claim that she had to the consensus among linguists and was also finding an audience for the researchers’ work at the same time. The dynamic nature of her job meant that she solicited the participation of well-respected researchers, supported them with funding, and kept herself abreast of ongoing work in sociolinguistics, which likely empowered Martus to make suggestions about data.

On the other hand, parsing who owns the data raises vulgar questions about the sponsorship model at CAL, where Martus worked so closely with linguists. I do not know the details of Dillard’s firing, except that when Roger Shuy was hired to replace Dillard, CAL got to merge the data from both Shuy’s Dialect Study in Michigan and the Urban Language Study in
Washington, DC. Was Shuy hired with the prospect of combining a larger pool of data under the control of one researcher? In addition, since the researcher can be fired, what does it mean that the sponsor potentially owned whatever work the researcher did? Martus’ influence suggests that her role in relation to knowledge production defied simple binaries. In the sponsorship model at CAL, she was shaping studies, pooling data, and influencing the direction of what was being studied. Under this sponsorship model, Martus curated work that responded to Ford Foundation priorities.

One fateful memo around the time of Dillard’s firing suggested that Martus was demanding more collaboration across departments at the CAL—and she was willing to terminate funding if the Center did not comply. On April 4, 1968, Martus wrote, “there is little coordination between the Language in Education Program and other center programs affecting the schools.” In the same “Inter-office Memorandum” in 1968, Martus reiterated the conditions to get Ford money: “If the Public Education [Martus’ division at Ford] is to consider a further grant to the Center for Language work relevant to education,” Martus warned, “it should be assured of the commitment of the Center’s leadership to an expanded program in this area and its commitment to providing maximum coordination toward common ends.” Figure 23 below shows a section of the memo.

![Figure 23. Inter-office memorandum (Rockefeller Archive, 1968)](image-url)
The memo suggested Dillard’s departure was due to a failure to satisfy a funding criterion to help Black students in classrooms.

Martus played a key role under the sponsorship model at the Center. She likely had an office there. She had ready access to researchers at the Center who would otherwise be more insulated from engaging with her (too closely) in a university setting. In a February 1967 Center memo, she referred to a role that linguists played in freshman writing. She wrote:

As you can imagine, there is a great deal of controversy in this field and some of the newer work based on actual descriptive studies is not yet accepted by many linguist and English teachers, although I believe it will be in the long run. It would be important also to involve sociolinguists and anthropologists who are interested in language.

If the researcher, as author, included Martus in formal publications, this could have the effect of a warning label that undermined the author’s claim to coming up with his or her own ideas. The problem is not just that formal conference reporting does not provide a space to talk about the role of the sponsors such as Martus, but disciplines also tend to use seminal works and important conferences as the basis to represent the landscape of their fields. The author has to maintain a sovereign claim to an ontological self that is immune from the contractual influence of sponsors.

Throughout this dissertation, I suggest that this ideal ontology of sovereign researchers, who develop and pursue questions, misrepresents the complexity of disciplinarity.

As long as sponsors are hidden from public view, their influence on how linguists thought about Black students does not have to be articulated. In late November of 2018, I tracked down Martus’ memos to the Rockefeller Estate in Tarrytown, New York, and went there to look at them. When I got off the train in Tarrytown, I looked for the bus that the librarian said would take me to the archive. Holding a sign for the archive, woman said, “Rockefeller archive,” so I moved in her direction. The woman had long red hair and what I thought was a smart outfit.
Crew uses “older” models like her, I thought, as cultural influencers to sell fitted jeans and cardigans. “And you are?” she asked. “Dorell Thomas,” I said.

She was not holding a clipboard with a list of names, so I was puzzled by the question. After I collected myself in the van, I wondered why she did not just ask, “Is that where you are going?” Why risk offending someone by asking “And you are?” I was the last person to squeeze into the tight mini-van and I tried not to obsess about it. But when I said my name to the driver (I thought that was her job), she smiled in a way that I perceived as smug—as if the threat of any fallout from our interaction was unlikely. The other researchers on the van were mostly Europeans. One Englishman was wearing a thick tweed blazer and loose slacks. He was talking to a woman who sounded Australian. The Italian who sat next to me also looked the part; he wore close-fitting Levis and a sweater. And his button-down peeked out of a crewneck sweater.

It feels petty to bring up these detailed impressions in print, but I think it is important to document that Marjorie Martus memos are not kept in a public library. I did an “interview” with the librarian after the drive up to the archive, which made me think about how guarded Martus’ story is from public view. The librarian inquired about where I was in the doctoral program, but not with the casual fondness of conversation. It felt as if I was being assessed, so (as best as I could verbally) I approximated an abstract of my work and explained why I should have access to Marjorie Martus’ memos.

The librarian warned me about how to turn the pages, which I thought was fair. She told me about how to cite what I find. And she told me how she preferred that researchers sit. The posture that she found most disagreeable was dangling the papers while slouching in the chair. I have been known to slouch at home or sometimes when I am with family in Kingston (the
Jamaican capital). I also slouch in classrooms when I get too comfortable. But never in spaces where someone like a librarian is trying to place me.

Oddly, I felt like the librarian’s colleague more so when the discussion turned to real estate. The librarian mentioned that, like me, she also lived on Long Island at one point. “In Huntington,” she said. This was when I remember her smiling. The slight moment of intimacy made me wonder what the Italian and the Englishman were told during their interviews, or if they even had interviews.

Roger Shuy and Charles Scott did not talk about money in the same way. In a 1980 interview, Scott described being recruited from a Master’s program to teach ESL in Kabul (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980). In 1958, after a 2-year stint in the military, Scott took his wife and young son with him to the Afghan capital. The family returned to the United States in 1960 after two years overseas when Scott took the initiative to further credential himself in linguistics (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980). Other than a reference to Pauline Rojas, who had referred Scott to the program in Afghanistan, Scott did not talk about mentors or peer groups when he described his doctoral experience. “I was fortunate in Texas to have both a teaching assistantship and then an NDEA Title VI grant for the study of Arabic,” he said, “which was sufficient financial support for me to stay in Texas and finish my PhD” (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980). Charles Scott was poised to benefit from a windfall in public spending after World War II.

“Teachers College Columbia was one of nine different American contract teams in Afghanistan,” he said (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980). English instruction happened alongside a group of infrastructure projects, including irrigation and road
building, which were “under contract” “with what was then called ICA, the International Cooperation Administration (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980). This was “the predecessor to the US Government’s AID…” (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980). Scott and his young family appeared enchanted with the reach of this unnamed and well-funded apparatus. “We were young,” he said (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980). “Twenty-five, twenty-four years of age. I had been overseas prior to this, once in Germany [his stint in the military]. She [his wife] had never been out of New York City. We had, of course, the four month-old baby when we left New York in October of 1958” (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980). He mentioned flying “off to Paris and then on to Rome, then on to Damascus, and Baghdad, and Tehran” (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980). “And we realized when we left Rome on that particular trip that we were truly entering a strange and different world. A world that was very unfamiliar to us,” he said (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980).

The federal government and the grant foundations organized people into both centers and subcontracting relationships, giving the work that is done in these spaces a geopolitical purpose. The word “funder” fails to represent the scope of what was happening because the USAID did not just sign checks. Sponsors, borrowing Brandt’s terms, organized and funded a wide range of activities, including roadwork in Kabul and conferences on curriculum design at home, such as Woods Hole in 1959, the Bloomington Conference in 1964, and the Dartmouth Seminar in 1966. This coordinated sponsorship was intended to better situate the United States geopolitically, using language programs and foreign aid to create closer ties with nations in the developing world.
The work of teachers, researchers, and road builders aspires to create tangible benefits in the lives of real people, which is precisely what biopolitics and Churchill’s new colonialism had in common; Churchill talked about moving away from annexing land, which is colonialism in its most vulgar form, and using English instruction as a more positive way to dominate those who want to join the English club. In Charles Scott’s personal history, the positive effects of biopolitics and the revised colonialism were on full display, with Scott’s Ph.D. funded by the NDEA and his family’s experience overseas as part of a mysterious apparatus. The mistake would be to believe that everyone benefits equally from nation building. How classes of people are located within subcontracting relationships tends to determine who profits more from capital investment.

In “The Dartmouth Conference and the Geohistory of the Native Speaker,” John Trimbur (2008) framed both the CAL and conferences such as Dartmouth and Bloomington in terms of who funded the research and the purpose of the work. Trimbur wrote:

Dartmouth can be seen not just as central to composition history but also in relation to postwar network of Anglo-American collaborations to promote English. Sponsored by government agencies, these included the British Council and the U.S. Information Agency (USIA); the Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie Foundations (Carnegie Sponsored Dartmouth) as well as academic institutions such as The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) at Georgetown University. Their sponsoring of a series of meetings in the 1950s and 1960s helped institutionalize English language teaching (ELT) as an arm of foreign, economic, and cultural policy during the Cold War. (p. 143)

Greater scrutiny of what Trimbur called the “Anglo-American collaboration” can offer insight into unnamed parties who had an interest in shaping English studies. As I studied Trimbur’s analysis, I had to consider deeply that the clear distinction that Shuy tried to make between his work and that of Scott’s did not appear as distinct as Shuy would have liked. In particular, I noted that the theoretical basis for Scott’s would-be ESL class for Black Americans came from linguists who were highly respected, including Shuy’s own mentor, Raven McDavid.
But I primarily surmised that the impact of the sponsors is at the heart of the contrast between Shuy and Scott. Charles Scott’s professional involvement with expanding the reach of ESL yielded more for him than any attempt to use publications to shape the epistemological direction of his field. Scott attributed his getting tenure at the University of Wisconsin in 1968 to “the reasonable amount of publishing that he did at the time” (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980). Yet, when he created the English as a second language class for African Americans in the Fall of 1969, none of the “books” and “various papers” that he talked about writing were on the syllabus. Perhaps that was a personal choice. Considering that English instruction was his area of expertise, Scott did not seem to have any seminal text of his own that compared with his more administrative and organizational work.

Here, Scott described (1980) his own professional milestones:

I was involved very heavily in these years with national committees in the field of English as a Second Language. I was a member of the National Advisory Council for the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language in this country. I was a member of the advisory panel, the English Teaching Advisory Panel for the US Information Services in Washington. And several other committees. I was on the screening committee for the Fulbright Hayes people for linguistics and English as a Second Language. I was doing a lot of travel back and forth between Madison and Washington, and then several of these overseas things. (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980)

Charles Scott seemed to have had a greater impact on his field through his “advisory” work in supporting English-as-a-second-language programs. He did a year of what he called a “consultantship” with the English Language Education Council in Tokyo, Japan between 1965 and 1966, which “was supported by funds from Rockefeller and Ford Foundations” (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980). He mentioned a Thanksgiving call in 1966 from the CAL in Washington, DC, shortly after which he joined “a special study team that the center was putting together under contract with the USAID to study English language teaching of problems in India” (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980). Scott went to India
on Thanksgiving in 1966, did some more “advisory” work for a month, and then flew to Poland the following year to discuss English language instruction at the university level (A. Scott, personal communication, December 22, 1980).

Charles Scott’s candor about how money shaped his work stands in stark contrast to Shuy, who attributed the origin of his interest in literacy to his own work, the *Detroit Dialect Study* (1968). I quote Shuy at length here to demonstrate the marked difference in how the two men looked back on their work.

Before coming to CAL I taught at Michigan State U, where I had just finished a research project in 1966, The Detroit Dialect Study, funded by the USOE. With the help of 11 fieldworkers, we carried out a stratified random sample of 700 tape-recorded Detroit residents that included white and black respondents of three age groups and four socio-economic levels. I suppose CAL knew of this work because in 1967 the acting director of CAL (Ferguson had just left) invited me to come there to be the director a new sociolinguistics research program. I agreed and brought with me two of my former linguistics students that I had taught in my earlier teaching career at Wheaton College, Walt Wolfram and Ralph Fasold. At CAL we continued to analyze parts of the Detroit study (Wolfram in particular) while also doing research in Washington DC (Fasold in particular). I should point out that with Ford Foundation funding some researchers at CAL had begun a study of Washington speech shortly before I was invited there. That work had apparently not satisfied the CAL administration and so they invited me and my team to replace the people who had been working on it. I retained one member of CAL's former project, Irwin Feigenbaum, who worked on developing materials that were geared to teaching black children to become bidialectal. That is, it was not to wipe out VBE but rather to teach them SAE and to become competent enough to use each version in appropriate contexts. Meanwhile I had also become interested in the problems that black children had in learning to read. We all contributed the linguistic information that this task required but I felt the need for a psychologist to contribute to this work, which is when I hired Joan Baratz for that work. As you probably know, CAL had its own publishing department at that time and we produced a number of books through CAL. We received a few new grants from both the Ford and Carnegie of NY foundations to support our work. In 1969 Georgetown University invited me to be a full professor of linguistics there and to head its new PhD degree program in sociolinguistics. Funding for research was becoming more difficult to get then, so I accepted that position, bringing Fasold and Wolfram along with me, although Wolfram stayed at Georgetown for only one year. Wolfram and I continued to work part time at CAL for a few years after that in various capacities before Walt decided to teach at Federal City College (it now goes by a different name) and he also continued part time at CAL. At about that same time, Rudy Troike became the new CAL director and asked me to be the Associate Director of CAL, which I did part time while teaching at Georgetown full time. This enabled me to hire
many of my best Georgetown PhD sociolinguistics students to work at CAL on several projects. Among them was Donna Christian who a few years later was promoted to CAL Director (now called President). Also among them was Joy Kreeft Peyton, who eventually became Donna’s assistant director. When Troike retired, he was replaced by Dick Tucker, who rather abruptly told me that my part time affiliation with CAL was over. Meanwhile I had helped Jana Staton get a research grant at CAL and I helped her informally (and without pay) with it for a year or so. (R. Shuy, personal communication, August 8, 2017)

Shuy had the stronger research-based résumé. He used both the Detroit Dialect Study and the people with whom he collaborated to account for his bidialectical approach to literacy. As per Foucault’s point, the way Shuy located himself in genealogical terms reflected dominant assumptions about where the researcher’s ideas originates, and assumptions about grants that reward researchers for innovation in a field. Shuy was careful to not discuss the pleasure and security that the money provided.

But, considering Marjorie Martus’ influence, the hiring and firing of researchers highlight the role that sponsors have on the eventual questions that researchers ask, even the questions that are valued. Again, in reference to the firing, Shuy said:

I should point out that with Ford Foundation funding some researchers at CAL had begun a study of Washington speech shortly before I was invited there. That work had apparently not satisfied the CAL administration and so they invited me and my team to replace the people who had been working on it. I retained one member of CAL’s former project, Irwin Feigenbaum, who worked on developing materials that were geared to teaching black children to become bidialectal. (R. Shuy, personal communication, August 8, 2017)

Shuy attributed Dilliard’s firing, who was the unnamed researcher, to the CAL administration. But, later in my correspondence with Shuy, when he named Martus as his contact at Ford, he recalled her tendency to encourage “competition” between the researchers whom she handled. Consequently, the thought crossed my mind that Martus’ senior position at Ford would make her the likely person who got Dillard fired.
It is my contention in this dissertation that Marjorie Martus is perhaps not discussed in formal presentations because her influence on the researcher undercuts claims to the researchers’ discovering new phenomena. Instead, not only might the research question not entirely be the researcher’s idea, the internal makeup of the actors in a discipline might inform what the research community prioritizes, more so than any real problem that affects black students. One of the important points that Foucault makes in the Archeology of Knowledge is that researchers are not so much discovering phenomena about the unknown world. To a greater degree, new knowledge, or what Foucault calls fresh propositions, both indexes what came before and indexes what will later add to a discipline. (Foucault, 1974, p. 223) Even the internal landscape of a field, in terms of which texts occupy dominant seminal positions, sets limits on how groups of researchers form consensus about literacy problems.

When Foucault defined a scientific or historical artifact, for example, he saw these texts not as raw material that can reveal something about the actual past for historians or something that scientists can use to reveal nature. Instead, Foucault (1972) wrote, “The document, then, is no longer for history an inert material through which it tries to reconstitute what men have done or said, the events of which only the trace remains; history is now trying to define within the documentary material itself unities, totalities, series, relations” (p. 7). Marjorie Martus’ role at the Ford Foundation, as evidenced in the memos, challenged different assumptions about who decides which texts make up the textual landscape of a field and how research agendas get set. How a question gets taken up internally in sociolinguistics in the 1960s is informed both by the priorities of sponsors and by how texts get legitimimized or excluded from a textual landscape in a field.
THE CLASS, RECRUITMENT, AND MASS EXPULSION

According to the published report, the Program in English Linguistics at the University of Wisconsin (UW) conducted research into helping Black students perform as writers and speakers in the university (Scott & Angle, 1970, p. 4). Charles Scott, a full Professor of Linguistics at the time, assigned the class to Burr Angle, who was a graduate teaching assistant. Angle taught the experimental section to 12 Black students in the Fall of 1969. Angle also taught a more diverse control group of students in the Spring of 1970. The two classes simulated a double-blind study.

The linguists recruited the Black students through a Five-Year Special Scholarship Program run by Ruth B. Doyle, whose efforts brought in 150 “disadvantaged” African American students in 1969 (Scott & Angle, 1970, p. 5). The scholarship program is now called the Center for Academic Excellence, which features the picture below of Ruth Doyle (Figure 24). In Figure 25, the image shows a cafeteria during the general time period of the course “recruitments.” In the report entitled “Experimental Program in English for Black Americans,” both Scott and Angle (1970) cited the increased presence of underprepared Black students as the impetus for this unique freshman section of English 100 (p. 4). Teachers of English 100 had “called attention to an increased number of black students who had performed poorly in the course” and “whose difficulties seemed to be traceable primarily to recurring linguistic features of their spoken and written English” (p. 4).

Of the 150 Black students who entered the university that year, 75 scored poorly enough on the entry exams to warrant remediation. From this initial pool of students, “The Director of the Program in English Linguistics proposed the use of one form of the Michigan Tests of English Language Proficiency [an ESL assessment], partly out of practical necessity and partly out of curiosity” (Scott & Angle, 1970, p. 5). In Figure 36, Scott and Angle’s (1970) report
Figure 23. Ruth Bachhuber Doyle (Ruth Doyle, n.d.)

Figure 24. Recruitments in the cafeteria (UW-Madison, n.d.)
**TABLE I: Michigan Test Scores for Black Students in Special Section of English 101, I Semester 1969-70**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td><em>(35/32/6)</em> 81</td>
<td>(37/34/14) 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>(36/32/9) 74</td>
<td>(38/32/12) 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>(33/31/6) 78</td>
<td>(37/31/9) 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>(37/30/5) 80</td>
<td>(37/36/10) 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>(33/35/11) 85</td>
<td>(32/28/10) 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>(39/39/14) 94</td>
<td>(38/35/15) 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>(no score)</td>
<td>(no score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>(33/30/11) 81</td>
<td>(no score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>(37/32/10) 35</td>
<td>(36/33/11) 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>(30/28/6) 72</td>
<td>(38/29/7) 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>(38/34/9) 87</td>
<td>(no score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>(35/35/9) 85</td>
<td>(35/33/13) 84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The sequence of sub-scores in parentheses are scores on the grammar, vocabulary, and reading comprehension sub-sections of the Michigan Test respectively. Perfect scores on these sub-sections are 40/40/20. It is clear that the students generally did poorest on the reading comprehension section and best on the grammar section.

*Figure 25. Michigan Test (Source: Report on the Special Section, 1970, p. 4)*
indicated the students who took the class and their scores on the test. Note, the report stated that when a foreign student scored 79 or below, “it would be recommended that he pursue no academic course work whatsoever” (p. 6).

The use of the passive voice in reference to student consent to class makes it difficult to tell whose consent really mattered. According to the report, the proposal for the special section “was accepted by the administrators of the Special Scholarship Program after the nature and purpose of the test was explained and after it was pointed out that the test could be administered without the students’ knowing that the test was designed to evaluate the language proficiency of non-native speakers…” (Scott & Angle, 1970, p. 3). The document continued, “It was intended that the 12-15 lowest scorers on this test would be identified as possible enrollees in the special section of English 101” (p. 3). As for whether the students engaged in informed consent, “…the students who actually enrolled in the special section would do so only after the general nature of the work in the special section had been explained to them before hand” (p. 3). The document continued, “Thus, in effect, the students in the special section were volunteers in the ‘experiment’” (p. 3).

I contend that the passive voice here provided limited details at a crucial point in the report. In fact, David Olson’s (1977) description of the academic essay, in “From Utterance to Text,” explained why its pioneers thought that meandering details interfered with messaging (p. 269). By default, this control perpetuates the author’s interests at the expense of telling the reader which subjects performed which active verbs. I submit that disguising information is not sinister. It is a familiar rhetorical strategy in established social sciences genres.

The authors of the report did make some of their assumptions known. First, contrastive analysis, which is the systematic distinction between a target language and a native one, was
proposed as useful in helping the Black students become bidialectical (Scott & Angle, 1970, p. 12). Second, the attempt to make Black students bidialectical assumed that students who spoke Vernacular Black English (a dialectologist term) were unfamiliar with the grammatical rules of standardized English (p. 11). Third, Black English, in Scott and Angle’s own words, was “radically divergent” from Standard English, so much so that this gulf required researchers to treat Black speakers like foreign language learners (p. 11).

The appearance of Scott and Angle’s hypotheses is timely. Their assumptions need to be historicized because they appear at the same time that the National Defense of Education Act (NDEA) was funding foreign language research in 1958 and language training for “disadvantaged youth” in 1964 (Jewett, 1964, p. 580). Title III (1958) of the NDEA funding package stated its overall purpose: “Financial Assistance for Strengthening Science, Mathematics, and Foreign Language Instruction” (p. 1580). Title VI (1958) identified linguistics among other disciplines: “History, political science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography, and anthropology” (p. 1593). The legislation called for specialized instruction in “modern foreign languages” and for the “full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such language is commonly used” (p. 1593). Title VI Part A (1958) anticipated that “through contracts with institutions of higher learning,” researchers with expertise in languages will find “effective methods of teaching such languages and in such other fields, and to develop specialized materials for use in such training” (p. 1594). The amendment also provided funds for a “specialized program of instruction” for the “educationally handicapped” and “disadvantaged youth” (p. 1108).

The 1964 Amendment in Item 2 of Title XI also cited that “no institute may be established under this title for teachers of disadvantaged youth unless such institute will offer a
specialized program of instruction designed to assist such teachers in coping with the unique and peculiar problems involved in the teaching of such youth” (p. 1108). The NDEA made the criteria to receive federal funding explicit. The federal money and the stipulations read like a call for research proposals.

Throughout my dissertation research, I obviously have had to pay special attention to the different documents that provided context for the recruitment of African American students, how the university responded to having more Black students, and how these students reacted to their White benefactors. In a 1968 English Department memo, Edna Thomas provided a local context for the university’s sudden and, perhaps to some, bewildering engagement with an increasing number of Black students. Edna Thomas was the Director of Freshman Writing at the time, and she sent a memo to five members of her staff. The document described the overall state of UW’s recently created remedial English program, and it started with headings that would be expected in a department memo—namely, “Placement,” “Class Size,” “Number of Class Periods,” “Calendar,” “Texts and Materials,” “Staff Relations,” and “Grading.”

The memo essentially started over on the fifth page under the new heading of “problems,” and under “problems,” two additional modifiers described the problems as “academic” and “psychological.” These negative designations referred exclusively to the Black students in English 101. The format of the memo indicated a normative first section—with headings that were commonplace in any memo—but this normalcy was separate from an emerging Black problem at the end of the memo. Thomas’ characterization of the “Black problem” anticipated the physical separation of African American students from normative speakers. The format of the memo itself indicated a ready impulse to isolate Black students as both nonnative speakers and as alien to the university community.
On the other hand, this targeting of Black students for separation happened at the same time that Black students themselves were advocating for an autonomous departmental presence within the UW system. The Black students’ demands complicated the dominant narrative of powerless Black students being marked for separation by enterprising academics. Seven months before the start of the class (February 1969), the Black Peoples Alliance, a student group at UW, demanded that campus institutions that exclusively served Black students be independent within the university structure. An article in the Wisconsin State Journal in December 1968 cited the group’s executive director, Willie Edwards, making the demand. The Journal explained that the Black students were engaged in “mediation” with the university in the Fall of 1968. However, the Madison campus decision to deny readmission to three Black students, who had been expelled as part of the mass expulsion at UW-Oshkosh, eroded any sense of good faith between the Black students and the largely White administration.

The “list of four demands” that the Wisconsin Journal cited in December 1968 grew to 13 in February 1969—just 7 months before the beginnings of the course. Based on primary documents entitled “Blacks Stage UW Demonstration,” “A History of Participation by Black Students in the University Structure,” and “Statement by the University of Wisconsin Administration,” six of the 13 demands were as follows: the transfer of all “Black courses” into a Black Studies Department, a request that was denied on the grounds that faculty cannot be moved without their consent; the creation of an autonomous Black Studies Department, controlled and organized by Black faculty, where students can receive a B.A. in Black Studies; the appointment of a Black person as chair to the Black Studies Department, a chair who is approved by a committee of Black students; the recruitment of 500 Black students for the Fall of 1969, which was the same year as the initiation of the Black course; the representation of Black
leaders in the Student Financial Aid Office and the Special Scholarship Program; and readmitting all of the expelled Oshkosh students who wanted to return to the UW system. In consecutive photographs, these images described what preceded the expulsion of 94 students (mostly Black) from UW-Oshkosh. The photos (Figures 27-31) feature damages to university property, mass arrest in the back of a truck, and students waiting during arraignment.

*Figure 26. Office damage (blackthursday.uwosh.edu, November 21, 1968)*
Figure 27. Henry Brown III (blackthursday.uwosh.edu, November 21, 1968)
Figure 28. Mass arrests (blackthursday.uwosh.edu, November 21, 1968)

Figure 29. Mass arrests at the back of a truck (blackthursday.uwosh.edu, November 21, 1968)
Figure 30. Students waiting during arraignment (blackthursday.uwosh.edu, November 21, 1968)
Both the protest literature and the department memo characterized Black separation differently. But, these competing narratives converge on an important biopolitical distinction between which Black students were preferred at the university. This is a distinction between Black freshmen cooperating with White linguists—that is, ones more amenable to being developed—and Black students demanding that a White leadership be replaced. The difference made the 94 students who were expelled from UW-Oshkosh undesirable, and the 15 compliant freshmen in the experimental class more useful as research subjects.

Federal and foundation sponsorship gave linguists a preferred status among other disciplines, making it easy for the Linguistics Department at UW-Madison to divert the 15 Black students away from the freshman writing program. William Stewart (1975) presented an infamous paper at the 1970 Conference on Black English, which was hosted right after the class ended; the copyright for the collection of papers is 1975. Entitled “Teaching Black Students to Read Against Their Will,” the title suggested that the linguists should overrule the objections of Black detractors who were not in a position to make an informed decision. Stewart was frustrated with Black resistance to Black English in the classroom. He was impatient with what he saw as uninformed pushback against the contrastive treatment of Black English. So he used the UW-Madison Conference as a moment to assert the linguists as being in a better position to help Black people.

According to the conference transcript, (also a part of the 1975 copyright collection of the 1970 conference) Stewart finished presenting his paper and fielded a question from a university administrator about the racial makeup of secondary school staff. According to the transcript that follows Stewart’s paper, John B. Mack III (1975), an African American administrator, cited that there were “600 schools in Chicago and approximately 500 of them in the black community,”
and of the 500, “only 25 principals in all of Chicago” (p. 124). Mack also recalled being a boy in the South and telling his teacher that he wanted to be president one day. The teacher affirmed the wish by writing the words on the board. Mack remembered how “The superintendent came in and really stormed about it[,] the very idea that she [the teacher] would let a black student have such false premised goals [--] this could never happen” (p. 124).

Stewart responded to Mack by insisting on the need for specialized training. Stewart said, “I want to see the evidence that nonsocial scientists, nontrained people in education can solve education problems no matter how much political motivation they have” (p. 127). Stewart spoke with the authority that came with his preferred status as an expert linguist at the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL).

The conference transcript indeed provides context for the paternal responsibility that White academics, such as Stewart, assumed over the welfare of Black students. University governance at UW did not challenge the contrastive treatment of Black English, despite clear evidence that the differences between Black English and the Standard focused on what Black English lacked; for example, in one of the readings on the syllabus (which was written prior to the class and presented later at the 1970 conference) Philip Leulsdorff’s (1975) paper on Black English pointed out absences of third person singular -s and past tense -ed (p. 10).

Geneva Smitherman exposed this difference-deficit phenomenon in *Talkin’ and Testifying*. Smitherman (1977) wrote that “While a few remedial programs spoke of cognitive-linguistic deficiency in black students, most were politer and referred to cognitive-linguistic differences. At the bottom though, both the deficit and the difference models are conceptualized within a framework of black pathology” (p. 202). Based on these insights and perspectives, I thus
argue that the foundation and federally sponsored institutes made White linguists more secure in their condescending posture towards remediating Black students.
EXPANDING THE INDEXES THAT REPRESENT THE FIELD

Figure 31. Cover of The Ugly American (Norton, 1958)
Assumptions and Methods

The special section of English 101 is experimental. It begins with the assumption that Black Americans speak a variety of dialects, some of which very nearly parallel the regional dialects of Standard English, others of which radically differ from them. A speaker of a "Black English" dialect may use a form of the language different in some features of phonology, syntax and diction from the variety of English spoken by most members of the Madison university community. If differences between the "Black English" and the "University English" dialects are noticeably great, communication may be impaired.

Through oral and written practice an attempt will be made to introduce the student to the "University English" dialect. Hopefully, by the end of the course, the student should be more fully bi-dialectal. He will continue to be fluent in his "Black English" dialect, but should also be able to speak the "University English" dialect used by most of his professors and fellow students.

Concurrently, the student will be given instruction in the analysis of written expository prose, and practice in the writing of such prose. Close analysis of selected short essays will at first concentrate upon the rhetorical concept of overall unity. This will give way to the analysis of paragraph structure and the writing of the more useful kinds of paragraphs within exposition. Diction and variety of sentence structure will be treated as they come up, and reading and vocabulary exercises will accompany the largely aural-oral treatment of English syntactic structures.

Figure 32. Course description of 1969 class (UW-Madison Library system, 1969)
The connection between the above novel (*The Ugly American*) and the excerpt from the 1969 syllabus might seem far-fetched. However, this is what I mean about adding to what is already indexed as representative of artifacts in writing studies. *The Ugly American* is a 1958 political novel; Marlon Brando starred in the movie. Unlike the marginally available syllabus in Figure 33, *The Ugly American* was widely read at the time and commonly cited as evidence of America’s failure to close language gaps in Asia; in part, this was owing to chronic monolingualism in the State Department (Thomas, 2016, p. 50). With the departure of the British from the Middle East after World War II, rival European powers perceived a power vacuum in the region. The threat that the Soviets were better trained in Arabic stoked fears that the United States might fall behind in the contest for oil reserves. In *American Arabists in the Cold War Middle East, 1946-75: From Orientalism to Professionalism*, Teresa Fava Thomas (2016) cited the impact of *The Ugly American*, ostensibly a fictional story, on swaying congressional leadership, and how the novel motivated a Senate Foreign Relations Investigation into linguistic gaps in the foreign service (p. 50).

Generally, Thomas’ (2016) book covered the transition between two consecutive periods in the Middle East: a time when, she said, a small group of privileged expatriate Americans translated the Middle East to the West, the orientalist period (p. 7), and a post-World War II emphasis on language training in the foreign service and incentivized promotion (p. 8). Unlike the overtly “orientalist” period, borrowing Edward Said’s term, when claims to expertise in the diplomatic core were largely based on family heritage, the professional period was marked by funding and advancement opportunities for linguists who could teach Americans Arabic. As for tape recorders and speech drills—long before they were used in the 1969 freshman writing
class—linguists used this “audio-lingual method” as a common feature in foreign language training (p. 56).

The American linguist Charles A. Ferguson, for example, who ran an Arabic training program in Beirut, was representative of the funding and professional advancement that were available to American linguists in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. Ferguson was the first president of the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) in 1959. In American Arabist, Thomas (2016) described a 25-year-old Ferguson who directed foreign language instruction as part of the Army Service Training Program (ASTP), teaching Arabic, Japanese, and Bengali to soldiers during World War II (p. 31). He finished his Ph.D. in linguistics in 1945 and was hired by the State Department to run the Beirut division of the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) (p. 34). Prior to the fallout from The Ugly American and the Committee hearing on the linguistic gap, Thomas wrote:

In 1946 the Beirut program began as a six-month crash course focused on speaking skill via rote memorization of simple phrases. Dr. Charles A. Ferguson studied the structure of Arabic and developed the program in the field, using native speakers, whom the FSI called “native informants,” to provide continual, exacting repetition of local dialect forms of speech. (p. 55)

Ferguson coined the term diglossia to describe proficiency with moving between “nonstandard” forms of a language, the “standard,” and a hyper-literary form of a language, which is usually reserved for writing; Ferguson used the way the Egyptian leader, Gamal Abdel Nasser, spoke on the radio to develop the term (Thomas, 2016, p. 68). When professionals such as Ferguson started to work for universities, they took their expertise with them into academia.

It helped me to think about the larger connections between linguists, The Ugly American, and the 1979 freshman writing class using a growth metaphor. While I am not trying to find the origin of the 1969 class at UW-Madison, what preceded or precipitated the class was part of a shared discourse. The appearance of the novel and the 1969 class reflected petals on nearby
branches that extended from a larger tree in a forest. I could have juxtaposed individual leaves related to Wisconsin linguists for this dissertation. But, unpacking colonial relationships required that I pay attention to scale.

The syllabus shared a distant connection with *The Ugly American*. Specifically, in the 1969 excerpt of the syllabus, the authors indicated uncertainty about two terms using quotation marks, both *Black English* and *University English*, terms that were perhaps still being arbitrated. No quotes were put around the terms *bidialectical, oral and written practice*, and *aural-oral treatment of English*. The absence of quotes around these terms indicated, I would say, their more common usage. Aural-oral techniques refer to listening and speaking exercises. To appreciate fully how listening and speaking became a part of freshman writing—in particular, how the justification for listening and speaking drills became assumed—the 1969 syllabus cannot be looked at in isolation.

It is not my intent to essentialize the syllabus for the freshman writing class as having one meaning. However, I agree with Edward Said’s approach to unpacking power relationships in text, which, when looked at in isolation, the scale of power imbalances might go unnoticed. Said’s post-colonialism, as described in *Culture and Imperialism*, shared a methodological similarity with Michel Foucault’s post-structural discourse analysis in *Archeology of Knowledge*. The following quotes, for example, by both authors demand that texts get juxtaposed next to each other, or that a phenomenon get placed in a group of related phenomena to appreciate shared meaning fully.

In *Culture and Imperialism*, Said (1978) referred here to a need to put individual European novels in their appropriate colonial context:

101
In juxtaposing experiences with each other, in letting them play off each other, it is my interpretive political aim (in the broadest sense) to make concurrent those views and experiences that are ideologically and culturally closed to each other and to attempt to distance or suppress other views and experiences. Far from seeking to reduce the significance of ideology the exposure and dramatization of discrepancy highlights it cultural importance; this enables us to appreciate its power and understand its continuing influence. (p. 33)

Said developed his critique in *Culture and Imperialism* largely from fiction and named his version of juxtaposition as reading contrapuntally (p. 18). He famously explained connections between a European claiming land in *Robinson Crusoe* and Jane Austen’s *Mansfield Park*. Austen’s matter-of-fact treatment of the distant colonial plantation in *Mansfield Park* requires the reader to situate how the novel maps European domination of distant spaces (Said, 1978, p. 58). Looked at in isolation, shared representations of imperialist dominance in different texts would likely remain, naturalized and unchallenged.

Foucault (1972) used more obtuse language in *Archeology of Knowledge* to propose a skeptical treatment of the distinction between literature and politics, citing this skepticism as necessary since discourse diffuses itself across these man-made borders. Instead of respecting prescribed unities, Foucault wrote, “It would probably be wrong therefore to seek in the existence of these themes the principle of the individualization of a discourse. Should they not rather be sought in the dispersion of the points of choice that the discourse leaves free?” (p. 36). Here he emphasized the search for organizing principles across texts: “In the different possibilities that it opens of reanimating already existing themes, of arousing opposed strategies, of giving way to irreconcilable interest, of making it possible, with a particular set of concepts, to play different games?” (p. 37). While Foucault was criticized for not naming colonialism by name, he provided a language (the term *discourse*) to name what would otherwise be called juxtaposing. In the same way that Said made connections across colonial tropes in stories,
Foucault encouraged research that disrupts prescribed boundaries in favor of organizing principles.

Throughout this dissertation, my questions reacted to how researchers in writing studies currently experience the field’s origin stories, what epistemological indexes reflect our shared history or points of contention, where our origin stories diverge completely, and how a standardized discourse sets limits on how to discuss money. I experienced this standardized discourse recently when I attended two national conferences in 2019. Based on my experience, at different times when I presented this work, my colleagues sometimes drew on a limited and possibly reified set of shared indexes when trying to contextualize foreign language pedagogy and African Americans. The Dartmouth Conference, with its “growth model” approach for native speakers, is hallowed ground—not to be trampled on by upstart researchers like myself. At times, the challenges to my work felt this way.

English studies is a big tent. Historically, some linguists, such as Albert Marckwardt and Harold Allen, were credentialed as both linguists and English professors. Marckwardt’s publications indicated that a British canon was a part of his training as a pre-World War II linguist (Hill, 1976, p. 675). The faculty that currently operate freshman writing programs (some of whom include contingent faculty who might/might not have a doctorate) are credentialed under different programmatic codes, including Comparative Literature, English, Composition and Rhetoric, and English Education. We are similar and very different at the same time. In fact, the 2010 Visibility Project is Composition and Rhetoric’s successful campaign to get represented separately in the National Research Council’s coding schema; both the federal government and foundations use these codes to distinguish academic disciplines and to make decisions about funding research (Phelps & Ackerman, 2010, p. 180).
When I presented a section of this dissertation at the 2019 American Education Research Association (AERA) in Toronto, another presenter at the roundtable responded that I mentioned “different linguists” and “Black English” without referring to Geneva Smitherman. The problem with this comment was that Black English is just one term that was used to describe Black speech. Creolists, like Geneva Smitherman and Joey Dillard, preferred to say Black English. But dialectologists such as Albert Marckwardt, Raven McDavid, Harold Allen, and William Labov used either Black Vernacular English, Black English Vernacular, social dialect, or non-standard. With me, Shuy used the term VBE. In the 1950s, the linguist Martin Deutsch referred to Black speech as simply noise (Park, 2000, p. 100).

Also, the linguists who played key roles in language instruction, beginning as early as the 1940s and 1950s, preceded “Black Power” discourse relating to English studies. In fact, the irony, to me, is that Geneva Smitherman (1996), before she earned her Ph.D. in English and sociolinguistics, wrote about being forced to take a speech class to “correct” her Southern Black English; this was part of getting her teaching license to work in public school. In “African-American English: From the Hood to the Corner,” Smitherman wrote, “Even though I was writing in the language of wider communication or standard English, I hadn’t learned to code switch in the speech areas, so of course I flunked the test. I went into this speech therapy class because if you failed the test you had to take speech therapy” (p. 8). In the same speech, Smitherman (1996) went on to point out that the speech class also included “Mexicans” and “Appalachian” Whites (p. 8). The latter surprised her initially. The larger discourse that I am constructing actually frames Smitherman’s victimization before she became a force, as a researcher, in the 1970s in linguistics.
At the same 2019 AERA conference in Toronto, we sat closely among other small tables in an open ballroom. The persons who chaired the roundtable from Vanderbilt University framed the discussion using statistical terms for how change happens, either in incremental creeps, the presenter said, or sudden shocks, such as war, natural disaster, or recession. The other pair of presenters talked about the revenue that the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) guarantees to their Texas border town, money that enables local universities to represent and misrepresent their status as research institutions. If I am recalling correctly, the fellow presenter who made the previous comment never heard of a comparison between the Dartmouth Conference and colonialism. Here is the concluding section of my presentations at both the 2019 AERA and the 2019 CCCC.

**Conclusion**

I sought input from an informant, the retired linguist Roger Shuy, to help me contextualize this period in English studies when linguists played a featured role in defining English instruction, both in the United States and globally. I chose Roger Shuy because Scott used his work on the syllabus of the experimental class. In the context of the Cold War and the congressional funding that responded to the Soviet threat, different American linguists played pioneering roles in English instruction. For example, the linguist Harold Allen is credited with calling for the 1966 Dartmouth Conference, which brought British and American researchers together to define English instruction. This Anglo alliance between the United States and England positioned these world powers as the ones most qualified to package English as a commodity and go overseas to teach it. English was slated to play an important role in the new form that colonial domination would take.
The presenter from the Texas border town thought it was interesting that I did not mention Smitherman’s contribution to the 1974 *Students Rights to Their Own Language* document. While I agree with the presenter’s point of view about later efforts to protect students who speak English differently, it struck me how my colleague was valuing the “primary” status of the 1974 *Students’ Rights to Their Own Language* (SRTOL) document. The documents that precede the 1974 version are not a part of the publication circuit, not in the same way that I could google the 1974 document and get a PDF copy right away from the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) (see Figure 34).

I wanted to avoid turning my fellow presenters into straw men as I thought about the differences in how we explained our shared origin stories in writing studies. We were depending on different discourses and emphasizing different archives of primary text—maybe even a different understanding of what is a primary text. The reactions helped me to recognize the more dominant indexes, which shape how our histories get discussed. This dissertation responded to the dearth in indexing sponsorship as a legitimate addition to our collective histories in writing studies.

I received a similar reaction at another national conference this year, where one audience member at the 2019 College Composition and Communication (CCCC) in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, needed more context for foreign language instruction for African Americans (see Figure 35). The audience member wanted to know “where is the New Left” in relation to the unusual freshman writing class. Another audience member appeared to struggle for the words, requesting finally that I contextualize foreign language instruction for African Americans some more. Possibly, she wanted to know about its pervasiveness. Or, maybe a 15-minute presentation is insufficient time to discuss my dissertation.
Figure 33. Cover page Students' Rights (CCCC, 1974)
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Figure 34. Bloomington cover page (Social Dialects and Language Learning, 1964)
Based on the recent reactions to my work, I saw the feedback as an invitation to ask how dominant ideas about a seminal text, including one version of that text, can limit conversation in a field. There are different “primary” reports of the Dartmouth Conference, for example, but John Dixon’s account is cited far more often than the others. I also found that, in my experience, greater attention to bibliographic issues, such as publication history, is relevant in our field. The document that we are discussing has revised versions. Moreover, later versions of a document could reflect compromise that favors the interest of a dominant group.

There are documents that informed and preceded the 1974 *Students Rights* document. Robert Hogan, who was a part of the 1974 *Students Rights* document, had worked with Marckwardt and McDavid earlier to organize the *Social Dialects and Language Learning Conference* in Bloomington, a conference that was organized 10 years before *Students Rights to Their Own Language*, and that was diametrically opposed to the stated aims in the 1974 *Students Rights* document. Here is the cover page that indicates Robert F. Hogan’s affiliation with the 1964 Bloomington Conference. Again, Bloomington was intended to fix the language problems of the “culturally deprived.”

For the sake of clarity, let me repeat some of the points on the 1974 *Students Rights* document that was intended to protect students.

- A dialect is “the variety of language used by a group whose linguistic habit patterns both reflect and are determined by shared, regional, social, or cultural perspectives” (*SRTOL*, 1974, p. 3).
- Prestige is not inherent in any dialect; both prestige and claims to a standard shift as power relationships between speakers shift (*SRTOL*, 1974, p. 5).
The dialect a student speaks is separate from the ability to read and write. Deep structure of all languages is the same, so no dialect puts anyone at a disadvantage in terms of thinking (SRTOL, 1974, p. 6).

The 1974 document has clear strengths, but it reflects a crucial compromise to influential linguists before the 1974 Students Rights resolution would pass. On the question of “origin” of American English, which again is a fraught question since people tend to choose the origin that they want, the 1974 Students Rights document capitulates to the influential group of linguists on Committee on English Language (CEL), Albert Marckwardt, Raven McDavid, and Harold Allen. In section IV of Students Rights, the question read, “Why do some dialects have prestige?” The document responded, “When American settlers arrived on the continent, they brought their British dialects with them” (p. 5). Whatever was said after this, while being an important point, gets undercut by the weight of this statement. If only “settlers” had the exclusive right to bring language with them, then the language that slaves brought with them to the continent was completely disqualified as a contribution to America’s origin story.

In this work, I endorsed a more expansive discourse that can accommodate inquiry into our shared histories. Crucially, the work that I did in this dissertation does not attempt to prove that English instruction has colonial roots. Instead, my efforts indicated that colonialism could flourish in so many iterations that simply naming something as colonial in insufficient. The petal metaphor accommodates the varieties that colonial models could take.

For example, the close ties that Albert Marckwardt had with the Ford Foundation were referenced in an obscure obituary in the same way that Jane Austen’s Mansfield Park devoted a page to the distant, all-important plantation. This slave space, in the Caribbean, supports the
characters’ fortunes in Austen’s novel. In one of Marckwardt’s obituaries, Archibald Hill (1976) cited Melvin Fox from the Ford Foundation:

The influence of Al on the language development work at the Ford Foundation in part directly and in part through the Center for Applied Linguistics, has been continuous since the meeting in Ann Arbor in the summer of 1957 at which the concept and initial plan for the Center was germinated. From then until his contribution as principal consultant in the recent retrospective survey of the Foundation’s work on language problems from 1952 to 1974, Al’s counsel has been regularly sought, given, and used. (p. 670)

If a small cohort of linguists moves between the State Department and academia, and if these same linguists have the ear of Foundation officials and how the federal government dispenses funding, then the system, or sponsorship model, that they create can have colonial implications for vulnerable targets of that funding. How these linguists get other researchers to make epistemological concessions does also reflect another kind of colonial hold over consensus. I want to be careful, however, to make a distinction between students, such as Smitherman, as victims and researchers who have epistemology forced on them. The latter likely were paid.

I recognized, based on my experience, that our histories in writing studies should index the possibility for researchers to draw from a broader discourse when contextualizing English instruction during the post-World War II and Cold War periods. This time witnessed the demise of an older colonial order, shifting away from the vulgar tendency to take armies into countries and take lands. After World War II, in the context of a Cold War struggle for domination, foreign language training in Arabic especially would attract the attention of both Congress and the State Department. As Teresa Fava Thomas explained generally in American Arabists in the Cold War Middle East, 1946-75, both congressional and State Department attention elevated the fortunes of different linguists in the United States.
BEYOND DISCIPLINARY DRAMA

I see an opening in Arthur Applebee’s reporting on curriculum reform in English studies, where I can suggest a fourth leg on the tripod (a possible quadrapod maybe). In addition to language, literature, and composition, linguistics also played a role in the early attempts to define English instruction. Applebee (1974) did not have an index entry for “linguists” in Tradition and Reform. He identified the person who suggested the Dartmouth Conference as Harold B. Allen, someone who was “deeply involved in TESOL” (p. 228). However, John Trimbur, a distinguished professor of writing studies, better contextualized Allen. In “The Dartmouth Conference and the Geohistory of the Native Speaker,” Trimbur (2008) wrote, “It is telling that a proposal for an Anglo-American conference on teaching English to native speakers in the United States and Britain, along the lines of the ELT [English Language Training] meetings, came initially in the 1950s from the linguist Harold B Allen” (p. 143). Allen’s intersecting roles included: “CCCC chair in 1952, NCTE president in 1961, the founder and first president of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) in 1966, and a leading figure in the promotion of TESOL in the United States and internationally during the postwar period” (p. 143). Clearly, Harold Allen and other American linguists were visible at different institutions in English studies.

Despite the presence of linguists across intersecting American institutions in English studies, Applebee (1974) credited the Modern Language Association (MLA) with the “many reforms in foreign language instruction,” reforms that Applebee stated “culminated with the inclusion of funds for foreign language in the National Defense of Education Act (NDEA) of 1958” (p. 192). Applebee’s preference for using “linguistics” as an adjective (pp. 229-230) and not as a noun has consequences for who gets included and excluded from post-World War II
reform histories; as a noun, linguistics would identify both the field and different linguists affiliated with MLA, NCTE, and CCCC. The presence of these researchers at the Dartmouth Seminar invites an accounting of what linguists did during curriculum reform and how their work impacted Black students in particular.

Unlike Applebee’s more sprawling epic, John Dixon (1967) had the time in *Growth Through English* to acknowledge the work of different linguists, some of whom were present at both the Bloomington Conference in 1964 and the Dartmouth Seminar in 1966. Dixon indicated an awareness that these conferences complemented each other. In 1964, linguists used their institutional roles at NCTE and the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) to organize a conference in Bloomington, Indiana, entitled “Social Dialects and Language Learning.” The linguists who presented at Bloomington (at least three of whom were also at Dartmouth—W. Nelson Francis, Joshua Fishman, Albert Marckwardt) focused on what Alva L. Davis called “the language problems of the culturally underprivileged” (Shuy, 1964, p. 1). If Bloomington was billed as the conference on how to use linguistics to help the “linguistically impoverished” (Dixon, 1967, p. 25), the linguists at the Dartmouth Conference tried to define a curriculum for an ideal native speaker. The interests that linguists had in defining native, near native, and nonnative English speakers remains unexplored in English studies.

Dixon was ambivalent about why so many linguists were at the Dartmouth Conference, a conference about defining English. He worried that the English teachers’ need for expertise in language, as a system, could mean linguists wielding considerable influence in the years after the seminar. Dixon (1967) wrote, “The notion of gaining control over what we think by increasing our conceptual awareness of language in general has an obvious appeal to a gathering of intellectuals, not least when many of them are linguists!” (p. 11). The worst-case scenario for
Dixon would be “the folly for teachers of English” to impose “linguistic bodies of knowledge on pupils” (p. 81). At the same time, Dixon also mentioned the important “conceptual” work that linguists do. Citing Albert Marckwardt, Dixon (1967) wrote: “It may be possible to provide sets of ordered language experiences which will work toward the development of the student’s flexibility and agility and general command as a user of his native tongue” (p. 77). Moreover, James Moffett was the one primarily credited with realizing what Marckwardt’s “ordered language experiences” would look like—specifically, in Moffett’s series of questions that reflect different levels of explicitness and abstraction.

However, I am suggesting that instead of telling a heroic narrative of Dartmouth, one that gives a lion’s share of the credit to either John Dixon (for *Growth Through English*) or James Moffett (for *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*), linguists in English studies were also thinking about different invitations for students to perform as readers, writers, and speakers. However, the tangible questions that Moffett offered teachers made it harder to appreciate the less applied contributions of linguists to the seminar. In *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*, Moffett (1968) provided the following questions to help teachers think through invitations for students to engage with texts:

- What is happening—drama—recording
- What happened—narrative—reporting
- What happens—exposition—generalizing
- What may happen—logical argumentation—theorizing (p. 35)

In contrast, the important contributions of Noam Chomsky’s transformational grammar and William Labov’s work in sociolinguistics did not appear as tangible to teachers in classrooms. Yet, these two linguists offered English studies a language to talk about language, a fact that ironically makes it easier to overlook their importance.
Dixon positioned Labov’s qualitative work as critical in changing perceptions about Black speech and deficits. Dixon (1967) wrote, “In a paper too important to be briefly summarized here, Labov has pointed to the major difference of attitude between status groups in New York City” (p. 18). Labov’s work made it harder to claim that vernacular speech reflects some deeper incompetence in Black people, instead describing speech as more reflective of aspirations to belong to a community. Dixon (1967) wrote:

Lower class speakers showed little of no consciousness of external standards of correctness in spoken language: as one said, “How can I speak any other way than I do?” Dixon continues by noting that lower middle-class speakers had the highest group recognition of such external standards “as an inevitable accomplishment of [their] social aspirations and upward social mobility.” (p. 18)

The theorist Paul De Man referred to a critical awareness about language that was similar to what Labov brought to the table. Of course, Labov was not a literary theorist. As a social scientist, his methods were invested in more empirical notions of proof and how diverse samples made results more reliable. But, Labov’s conclusions reflected a way of critiquing existing knowledge about speech—giving everyone in English studies a way of avoiding epistemological missteps, such as deficit theories. By creating a language to critique deficit language, Labov was engaging in what Man (1982) called negative knowledge (p. 10) in “The Resistance to Theory.” This kind of work is valuable as a frame of reference when making judgments about Black English.

In the summer of 2017, I was fortunate to correspond with the linguist Roger Shuy, who helped me to situate mixed feelings about linguists in an expanded context. The biographies of different high-profile linguists indicated that their field had close ties to state power during the postwar period—and that power had both a domestic and an international reach. In American Arabists in the Cold War Middle East, Teresa Fava Thomas (2016) wrote that the scholar Edward Said
viewed the United States as having established a new postcolonial form of oriental dominance, having made the Arab world into an intellectual, political and cultural satellite of the United States. He also pointed out that this extended into the classrooms where Arabic speakers coached students while the program was run by State Department instructors. But for Said those naïve informants did not hold power in the system (in universities, foundations, and the like (which is held almost exclusively by non-Orientals). (p. 6)

Said had good reason to be critical of linguists like Charles Ferguson, whose expertise shaped America’s Middle East policy. Ferguson got his start in the Army Service Training Program, teaching soldiers Arabic during the tail end of World War II (Thomas, 2016, p. 55). After running a foreign language program through the State Department in Beirut in the 1950s, he used federal and foundation resources to cofound the CAL in 1959; Ferguson was CAL’s first president. Later in his career, he joined the faculty at Harvard University’s Center for Middle Eastern Studies.

Domestically, the ambivalence towards linguists is perhaps even more dramatic in relation to African Americans. Shuy told me about a NCTE bestseller entitled Discovering American Dialects that he wrote in 1967, a book that was clearly intended to improve the status of dialects (and by extension, dialectologists). Yet, his work did not shield him from accusations of racism by other researchers in English studies. In one email, Roger Shuy told me that “The politics of being a white researcher in the fields of VBE [Vernacular Black English] and reading became too emotionally difficult for me so I left those areas of study and moved on to other topics.” As I previously noted, Shuy was a part of a small group of linguists whose expert testimony in the Ann Arbor case helped to convince the court that Vernacular Black English was a language. The 1979 court ruling is important to the legacy of linguistics (in English Education) because the court required the school district in Michigan to take appropriate action to teach Black children “to read in the standard English of the school, the commercial world, the arts,
science and professions” (p. 3). I argue, however, that this high point must be weighted against the work that linguists presented at both Bloomington and Dartmouth, work that suggested African Americans speak a foreign language.

At Dartmouth, a working group of linguists (1966) concluded that

a native speaker of Lx [a dialect] is someone who learns Lx as his first language in an unselfconscious L-speaking environment [L being a standard]. Lx is thus preschool language, which is not the same as L. During schooling Lx becomes L, and this situation is no different from teaching a foreign language. (Marckwardt, 1968, p. 59)

At Bloomington, Roger Shuy’s mentor, Ravin McDavid (1964), swore by the legitimacy of foreign language instruction for African Americans (p. 7).

Based on my in-depth researching of the wide variety of perspectives and issues that I have represented here, I thus argue that the coordination between linguists who helped to organize both the Dartmouth and Bloomington Conferences should be more visible in the English Education. By including linguists in our histories, however difficult it is to place them, the respective roles of different sponsors also become more transparent in English Education.

Situating Linguists in Relation to Sponsors and Black Students

English as a Second Language for Africans Americans perhaps reflects the more disruptive addition to the histories of English Education. The phenomenon is difficult to place in the field if Dartmouth is looked at in isolation as purely an epistemological drama. So, let me take the opportunity to establish a timeline that situates linguists in relation to sponsors during the postwar period. The Russians launched Sputnik in October 1957. The first installment of the National Defense of Education Act (NDEA), which was passed in 1958, included money for scientific disciplines, including linguistics (p. 1593), although English was excluded. In 1959, Jerome Bruner provided a model that prioritized students’ study of the structures of disciplines
(especially emphasizing the “scientific” ones) at the Woods Hole Conference; English studies embraced Bruner’s spiral curriculum, which engages students through “structuring principles” that are supposed to be inherent in a field (Applebee, 1974, p. 195). English was included in the 1964 revision of the NDEA after much lobbying (pp. 1103-1108).

This means that both the Bloomington (which took place in 1964) and the Dartmouth Conferences (in 1966) were sponsored at a time when researchers had access to reliable funding and pools of available Black students. The money would have been available to operationalize what Joshua Fishman (1968) proposed as a “planned language shift,” which would assimilate the “culturally deprived” into an American standard (p. 44). In fact, the need to define an English curriculum for “native” and “nonnative” speakers was happening in a financial context during the postwar period.

Joseph Harris reflected on the related programs in English studies that were used to attract federal dollars. In “After Dartmouth: Growth and Conflict in English,” Harris (1991) wrote:

Project English, Basic Issues, the National Interest, Freedom and Discipline. Together they voiced a remarkable consensus over the need both to ‘preserve the humanistic tradition’ and to formalize its study. And so many of the Americans who came to Dartmouth believe that the question ‘What is English?’ could be answered (or ought to be answered) in much the same way one might go about responding to a question like ‘What is chemistry?’—that is, by first defining a subject matter and then pointing to a set of principles for use in its study. (p. 637)

Disciplinary status thus obviously had financial implications for researchers and educators during the postwar period. Even now, the unwillingness to talk about the impact of funding on research comes at a cost to understanding the inevitable role that sponsors play in shaping how researchers think about literacy problems.
The inclusion of linguists in the first iteration of the NDEA demanded an accounting of how sponsors created incentives, the professional and financial incentives to think of Black speech as a problem. How did a focus on epistemology in the two histories make the impact of the federal government and the great foundations less clear? This question is important because neither Applebee nor Dixon interrogated the fact that two separate conferences (Bloomington and Dartmouth) were sponsored primarily with two separate groups of Americans in mind: an ideal “native” and the “nonstandard” dialect speaker. To reiterate in order to be clear, Deborah Brandt (1997) defined sponsors of literacy (in an essay of the same name) as any agents, local or distant, concrete or abstract, who enable, support, teach, or model, as well as recruit, regulate, suppress, or withhold literacy—and gain advantage by it in some way. Just as the ages of radio and television accustom us to having programs brought to us by various commercial sponsors, it is useful to think about who or what underwrites occasions of literacy learning and use. (p. 2)

The prospect of suggesting a more complete history is an uncomfortable experience. As a graduate student, it is intimidating to disrupt the histories of two highly qualified people whose work I respect. Yet, I need to make the case that my own research into federal and foundation sponsors is part of the history of English Education. Citing Steven Mailoux, Louise Wetherbee Phelps and John M. Ackerman (2010) emphasized this same point when he wrote, “Placing one’s self in a specialized field when one speaks, writes, publishes, teaches, hires and engages in other rhetorical practices constitutes perhaps the most powerful condition of academic work” (p. 181). I am trying to make the perception of African Americans as nonnative speakers a more visible moment in English Education. Although I see what I am doing as adding to the history of the field, I can also see where this work interrupts Applebee’s and Dixon’s histories.

Applebee (1974) attributed the origin of Dartmouth to a need for British and American educators to resolve epistemological issues in English instruction. Initially, I found this teleology
helpful as someone who is new to the field. But I am concerned with the cost of that coherent narrative—both in terms of making the role of sponsorship less transparent and the hidden cost to Black students when their speech is perceived as a problem. More broadly, the terms that brought World War II to an end precipitated the Cold War. The subsequent nation building (both at home and abroad) placed a greater responsibility on sponsors to give researchers invitations to contribute to the war; the Russian launch of Sputnik reflected a visible symbol of the urgency to which federal and foundation sponsors were responding.

Applebee’s history does not engage sufficiently with how the Carnegie Corporation, and other sponsors, shaped academic work during the postwar period. Applebee (1974) wrote, “As early as 1957, Harold B. Allen, who had been deeply involved in TESOL programs in Egypt, suggested that a conference on the teaching of English as a native language might be fruitful” (p. 229). Who was funding Allen’s stay in Egypt was not discussed, nor was the reason why Allen was in Egypt. When Applebee mentioned that the Carnegie Corporation “funded” the conference (p. 229), the implication was that the sponsor’s influence was limited to writing checks. Here, Applebee’s summary of Dartmouth suggested a resolution that was arrived at independently of sponsors. Applebee wrote, “What the British offered the Americans was a model for English instruction which focused not on the demands of a ‘discipline’ but on the personal and linguistic growth of the child” (p. 227). The reference to linguistics as an adjective came at a cost to transparency in terms of the number of linguists who were present, and the financial or professional incentives to define English in ways that attracted sponsors. My reading of sponsors’ influence on Black literacy is not easy to integrate into both Applebee’s “curriculum reform” and Dixon’s report on the seminar. The cost that my work suggests (for inclusion) is an
interrogation of what it means to sponsor research—both the impact of funding on the researcher and the consequences for Black students when their speech is perceived as a problem.

I see an opening in what I interpret as Dixon’s more sensitive mapping of what happened at Dartmouth to discuss the impact of sponsors during the postwar period. I want to first acknowledge Dixon’s contributions and then add my work to this history. When Dixon (1967) wrote that “a map is needed on which confusing claims and theories can be plotted,” he charted a landscape of the best that had been said so far in his estimation (p. 1). He rejected the skill-based and cultural heritage models of English in favor of a “growth” approach to defining English.

English teachers, Dixon (1967) believed,

must look again to our human purposes in using language. Recalling experience, getting it clear, giving it shape and making connections, speculating and building theories, celebrating (or exorcizing) particular moments of our lives—these are some of the broad purposes that language serves and enables. For days we may not work much beyond the level of gossip in fulfilling these purposes, but inevitably the time comes when we need to invest a good deal of ourselves and our energy in them. It is the English teacher’s responsibility to prepare for and work towards such times. (p. 7)

Dixon combined this growth approach with a “conceptual awareness” (which linguists bring to the table) to suggest a “tentatively proposed” “literary-linguistic discipline” (p. 11). Dixon complicated the binary perception of the conference that all the Americans wanted to define English as a discipline and the British were more concerned with the needs of students. As a graduate student, I often hear this oversimplification of the conference as follows: “the American position at Dartmouth, then, as an attempt to justify the study of English to other university experts, and the British position as trying to place such work in relation to the needs and concerns of students” (Harris, 1991, p. 635). But simultaneously, Dixon challenged this growth versus discipline divide by being open to positivist orientations, while also insisting that students
receive opportunities to grow. This is a puzzling series of leaps across epistemological and ontological assumptions, to say the least.

But what I believe makes Dixon most problematic for Black students is his suggesting growth through English for the native speaker, and an alternative track for students who speak Vernacular Black English exclusively. The fact that different researchers in sociolinguistics had access to pools of Black students and funding makes it even more likely for linguists to perceive Black speech as a problem. However, Charles Scott’s work while serving in his professorial role as linguist at the University of Wisconsin was perhaps all the more insidious because it resulted in separate “growth” tracks (not some weird aberration). The NDEA incentivized Scott to increase the pool of foreign students by positioning African Americans as ESL students.

From my perspective, Dixon thus endorsed a project that was similar, if not identical, to what Charles Scott proposed at the University of Wisconsin in 1969. In the following, Dixon described the ongoing work that the linguist W. Nelson Francis was doing with the Black students in 1964. Dixon (1967) wrote:

However willing they are, some pupils may find it difficult to pick up standard forms of written and spoken. What to do next is not clear. Can drama help? Should second language drills be used—and if so, with what motivation. Experiments [referring to Francis] will help to clarify our answers here. (p. 21)

Dixon’s footnote indicated that he was referring to a partnership between Brown University (where Francis was a professor of linguistics) and two historically Black colleges, Tougaloo in Mississippi and Southern University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Brown University’s Linguistics Department basically created an ESL “catch-up” program for Black freshmen at the two Black colleges (Francis, 1964, p. 148). The open access online archive at Brown University indicated that Francis worked with the respective chairs of Tougaloo’s English Department and Brown’s Linguistics Department to recruit qualified linguists from all over the nation (Brown Center for
Digital Scholarship). The project’s three phases, which was funded with a $200,000 grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, included interviewing successful African Americans to determine the target language, developing “oral exercises in sentence construction” as part of a pilot writing program, and using the oral and written exercises in a “full-scale trial” at Brown (Brown Center for Digital Scholarship). The Brown Archive credits Francis with respecting Vernacular Black English as a language, but I suspect this was on the condition of its deviance from the standard. What issued from this problematic status as a deviant dialect was an effort to stop Black speech from interfering with the students’ performance in the target language.

**Beyond the Disciplinary Drama at Dartmouth**

By contrast to Scott, the more high-profile linguists who suggested treating African Americans as a nonnative population were better able to situate their claim in the context of nation building. At the Dartmouth Seminar, when the linguist Joshua Fishman (1968) praised the “planned language shift” in the United States, Fishman explained that government institutions have significant leverage in shaping the language that is used in the public sphere (p. 44). The linguist Charles Ferguson located language shifts within the state’s prerogative when he spoke at the Bloomington Conference in 1964. In “Teaching Standard Languages to Dialect Speakers,” Ferguson (1964) wrote, “The nation or some part of the nation has to decide what language it wants to use in its education system and what the relation of that language and the language of the students shall be” (p. 113). Ferguson’s approval of a planned shift in Spain suggested how the United States would treat its own Black population. Ferguson wrote:

> Here, to the majority of people in the country [Spain], Spanish is the mother tongue, and the kind of standard Spanish taught in the school is not radically different from the home language, though there are differences. But there are substantial segments of the population in which spoken Spanish, Galician, for example is quite different from the
Spanish that is taught in school. It is different enough, in fact, that the children become bidialectical. On the other hand, there are some parts of the Spanish school population which are Catalan speaking or Basque speaking, where the difference is so great that the children must become bilingual. (p. 114)

Both Ferguson and Fishman provided a context for the role that linguists play in the exercise of state power. When Fishman suggested the term *Anglification*, this naming legitimized standardization, in general, as the appropriate role of government. The English teacher, in which case who is charged with carrying out the “planned language shift,” is no different from other government employees—including food inspectors and the police—people who reproduce state power through either abstract or fairly clear-cut obligations to a public interest.

Different scholars, such as Joseph Harris and John Trimbur, put the Dartmouth Conference in a larger context of related events that afforded a role for sponsors. In the case of Trimbur’s article, the seminar implicated English instruction in the new world order after World War II. Trimbur (2008) wrote, “In 1943, while the war was still raging, Churchill wrote to Sir Edward Bridges, the Secretary of the War Cabinet” (p. 146). Trimbur pointed out that the commercial potential of English as a unique colonial tool. Here, Trimbur quoted Churchill:

> I am very much interested in the question of Basic English. The widespread use of this would be a gain to us as far more durable and fruitful than the annexation of great provinces. It would also fit in with my ideas of the closer union with the United States by making it even more worthwhile to belong to the English-speaking club. (p. 146)

The way education was funded in the United States by contrast to England meant that American researchers would have an interest in defining English as discipline. The body of knowledge that Dixon feared could be imposed on students had a reliable appeal to some Americans at Dartmouth who wanted to attract federal and foundation money. Harris (1991) wrote that “the reforms suggested at Dartmouth never stood a chance of competing against the federally funded programs of the 1960s Project English” (p. 633). Applebee (1974) talked about funding more in
terms of a marketing campaign to include English in federal and foundation spending. Applebee identified the work that James Squire did as executive secretary at NCTE in using NITE to make the case that English was crucial to America’s welfare (p. 199).

I am adding to Applebee’s history of curriculum reform by saying that the influence of sponsorship is not limited to marketing campaigns in English studies. The language in the National Defense of Education Act (NDEA) made it difficult for American researchers and educators to claim that they were simply making and refuting claims about what is English—somehow without any regard for grant money, professional gains, and political calculation. In *Class Politics*, Stephen Park (2000) wrote that NDEA “moneys were used principally to support projects in the hard sciences, yet the lesson of Sputnik did not go unheeded in other circles. Organizations such as the NCTE realized they needed to imagine a new relationship to national politics and the economy if their initiatives were to be funded” (p. 70). Admittedly, Charles Scott’s work reflected an extreme iteration of how sponsors shaped the questions that researchers asked about Black students. I see the details surrounding Scott’s more predatory class as a heuristic to gauge how transparent other researchers were about how funding influenced their work with Black students.

Both Dixon’s and Applebee’s telling of the Dartmouth Conference, as mostly an epistemological contest, sets up American and British researchers as characters in an academic drama. This epistemological focus displaces questions that would interrogate foundation and NDEA sponsorship. In this moment at Dartmouth, for example, the linguist is cast as a villain, whose influence poses an obstacle to student growth. I want to quote this incident at length because it dramatizes the negative application of Chomsky’s work at Dartmouth. Harris (1991) wrote:
One of the dramatic moments of the conference came during a heated exchange on the teaching of linguistic grammar, which the Americans haltingly and hesitantly defended while the British clucked and deplored. One of the more arrogantly aggressive of the Englishmen rose in all his aristocratic bearing, walked over to a table and plucked off a page of a junior high Project English materials that was covered with strange hieroglyphics, the cabalistic formulae of Chomsky’s transformational or generative grammar. Holding this unreadable and baffling page aloft, the Englishman said in the meticulous accents of his controlled rage. (p. 639)

These were the recollections of James E. Miller, who was an English Professor at the University of Chicago. The moment plays well as a characterization of an epistemological clash; it clearly reinforces the binary between the Americans and the British. Harris (1991) quoted the unnamed Englishman:

‘I would not carry this material into any classroom at any level of the curriculum. It represents an affront to the mind and an insult to the imagination; it is beneath contempt and beyond discussion.’ There followed a stunned silence; present among us Americans were the makers, supporters, or approvers of those materials. But there were none among us willing or able to explain those occult and arcane equations, or to demonstrate how seventh and eighth graders might be lured into curiosity about them, or to show how they benefited once they had mastered the esoterics of their formulation. Silence begat silence, and a shift of focus; and the raw and painful moment was equally soothed over by the steady flow of talk. (p. 640)

The focus on the drama oversimplified Dartmouth. The need to make English reflect an academic discipline had financial and political implications for American researchers in English studies, who were funded on the basis of Cold War criteria for scientific disciplines. As Miller pointed out, the Americans who brought Project English ideas into the Dartmouth Conference could not respond to the Englishman’s objections that the material had nothing to do with the human imagination. The interest in defining English as a discipline more reflected the researcher’s interest to be included in the NDEA.

In conclusion, however difficult it is to place linguistics in relation to English, I argue that linguists deserve a salient position in the histories of our field. Applebee’s use of linguistics as an adjective meant that linguists were excluded from his telling of curriculum reform. Dixon’s
version included linguists, but his telling of Dartmouth reflected an epistemological drama that was isolated from a context of federal and foundation sponsorship. Again, as a graduate student, I found a teleological tale is helpful when introducing the drama of Dartmouth, but on closer inspection, the inclusion of linguist in the first installment of the NDEA would have consequences for how Americans in English studies aspired to define English.

The history that I am adding suggests that American researchers had an interest in defining English in a manner that would attract funding. The linguist Charles Scott went as far as to position African Americans as foreign in order to expand the pool of foreign language students. Charles Scott’s work on the margins of English Education functioned as a heuristic in gauging how transparent researchers were about the role that sponsors played in their work. When Dartmouth was isolated from the context of how curriculum reform was sponsored, the epistemological drama displaced two important histories: the incentive in English studies to define English in more scientific terms and the financial incentive to create two separate tracks—one for an ideal native speaker and one for a nonstandard and foreign Black speaker.
A HIGH SCHOOL IS NOT DISCIPLINE

The appearance of English as a Second Language pedagogy to improve Black literacy indexes where English instruction was in the 1950s and 1960s—specifically, who the dominant actors were, what financial and professional interests motivated them, and through which related institutions these actors performed. As my dissertation suggests, just as the binary between great and peripheral researchers did not hold, especially distinctions between soliciting funding and being immune to sponsorship, any solution to literacy problems (real or perceived) shared a close relationship with institutional power.

As a high school teacher, when I have to interact with supervisors, I witness more vulgar displays of the connection between power and knowledge. This is by contrast to my investigation into disciplines, where I had to work harder to make connections between influential linguists, funding, intersecting institutions, and foreign language pedagogy for African Americans. In *Discipline and Punish*, Michel Foucault (1977) wrote:

> Perhaps, too we should abandon a whole tradition that allows us to imagine that Knowledge can exist only where the power relations are suspended and that knowledge can develop only outside its injunctions, its demands, its interests. Perhaps we should abandon the belief that power makes mad, and that by the same token, the renunciation of power is one of the conditions of knowledge. We should admit rather that power produces knowledge. (p. 27)

There is a dominant tendency, in my experience, to elevate disciplines at the expense of secondary education, the implication being that schooling is dictatorial and university space encourages intellectual freedom. This familiar binary is based on the assumption that public schooling observes stricter chains of command, top-down from principal to teacher to student, whereas epistemology is permitted more space within the university hierarchy. There is some truth to this, but, based on my dissertation, a firm binary between the two spaces and how they treat knowledge does not hold.
One morning, I was sitting across from my assistant principal on the third floor of the public housing building, where my alternative high school is housed. The room showed a view of the buses and cars turning off the Triborough Bridge onto 125th street and First Avenue in upper Manhattan. “John said that students should write do-nows in pencil,” the assistant principal said. “He didn’t mention why. Something about holding a pencil in your hand.” The “John” in question was the superintendent, and he came that day to observe me with a small group of mostly assistant principals and the Manhattan borough principal. I knew that they were coming, and I was forewarned about what John wanted to see. Information moves from top to bottom in my experience as a high school equivalency teacher.

Despite my firm objections, for example, I was charged with teaching English, math, and science with equal competence. What was different about this observation was that I had started my Ph.D. in Wisconsin the previous year in 2013. The difference between schooling and a professional research community was becoming all too clear. About four or five administrators watched me teach for about 20 minutes. Then, the contingent followed the superintendent into another room, where they debriefed for a while and then went to another site. No one invited me to contribute to the discussion. After about an hour, my assistant principal came back to the classroom to let me know what was said. “The superintendent wants to move away from reading out loud to students,” she said. “And good job with the timer.” The assumption that we secondary school educators play a positive role in student learning is an unexamined assumption.

Bureaucratic decision making was on full display that day. Supervisors literally came from a district office, which is a kind of metropole, to my far-flung satellite site in East Harlem. Unlike the beginning of *Discipline and Punish*, where the state goes to great public lengths to punish attempted regicide (Foucault, 1977, p. 3), this exercise of domination felt more routine
and procedural—even cordial. I was never berated by anyone. No metaphoric quartering had to be performed in front of everyone to make sure that I toed the line. Nevertheless, I did feel as if I had experienced a more discrete and equally effective coercive strategy. Information flowed in one direction, and my remove from the person giving the directive made it impossible to hold any supervisor accountable for his or her assumptions.

In the meeting with my assistant principal, the reality of boss and underling suspended any claim that books have to truth. Not surprisingly, when I came back from Wisconsin in 2013, after having started my Ph.D. in an English department, I remember feeling tempted to return to the Midwest. Bibliographies are irrelevant to these people, I thought. I could not decide if I should return to the University of Wisconsin or continue my employment at the alternative school. When people asked me what I did then, I would tell them that I run a GED program inside of a nonprofit in Harlem (which was true). But, on days like this one, when the superintendent visited the site, the real chain of command asserted itself in a vulgar way.

The moment was instructive. Unlike my experience with academic disciplines, secondary schooling has no real firewall between bureaucratic chains of command and research-based epistemology. The centrally administered public school is really a creature of 19th and early-20th-century biopolitics. In The History of Sexuality Volume 1, Foucault (1978) wrote that biopower “exerts a positive influence on life, endeavors to administer, optimize, and multiply it, subjecting it to precise controls and comprehensive regulation” (p. 259). The ideals of public schooling, which is precisely what Foucault meant by “positive power,” disguise a coercive thread that is shared across similar spaces: students in public schools, soldiers in the military, and patients in medicine. The individual, in these spaces, gives up her ontological claim to an independent self. She gets subjected to power relationships that are intended to have positive
effects on individual mortality and at the level of the population (p. 260). Frankly, I was expecting too much from the administrators. Principals and superintendents do not have an incentive—nor really the freedom—to comb through bibliographies about silent reading and pencils. Secondary schools are not disciplines.

Admittedly, John and I have similar views about pencils and silent reading, but he will never know that. Some of my favorite literature on the history of reading (an interest that I developed in Wisconsin) supports silent reading. In the field of *Early Modern Studies*, Paul Saenger perhaps made the best case for it when he explained how 16th-century English readers used devotional text to develop an internal voice (Salter, 2012, p. 51). When these Protestant readers interpreted the bible, according to Saenger, they asserted a self that deferred to no one. In *Popular Reading in English*, Elizabeth Salter (2012) cited Saenger’s position that “private reading” of the *Canterbury Prayer Book* threatened religious authority in England (p. 51). As Salter wrote:

> Within the reading process, this voice is a fictive creation of appropriated authority exterior to the reader. Yet, repeated reading of this book, which are probably fundamental to devotional practice, may have encouraged an internalization of this voice that was potentially subversive to the authority it appropriated. (p. 51)

The bibliography on what Protestant readers did with text is extensive. On one hand, in *Used Books*, William Sherman (2008) cautioned that the emphasis on reading neglects a diverse “book use” during this period (p. xiii). There is no straight line from reading to revolutionary change. In *World on Paper*, on the other hand, David Olson (1994) credited Early Modern Protestants with pioneering the empirical sciences, in large part, by reading scripture differently—namely, treating signs in nature like signs on the page (p. 177).
My high school equivalency students read under circumstances that would be alien to 16th-century readers. In *Social Literacies*, Brian Street (1995) made an overall argument against reanimating print-based dispositions, such as the explicitness of texts during the Reformation, to encourage literacy in the developing world (p. 29). Nevertheless, from my situated perspectives, I argue that open discussions about silent reading, or any practice intended to improve literacy, should happen across school hierarchy. This is probably the best way, I am assuming, to test assumptions about literacy or anything else. Myles Myers (1996), for example, made a connection between the availability of graphite pencils and people being able to conceive of themselves as expressive writers (p. 48). But, who knows what my superintendent meant by pencil use?

Schooling aside, I have concerns about how academic professionals create knowledge, concerns that I have expressed throughout this dissertation. I do appreciate, on the other hand, how disciplines are different from secondary “schooling.” Where a university department chair defers to individual researchers in matters concerning which questions are worth pursuing, the centralized public school, more typically, empowers administrators to make decisions about everything, including staffing, budgets, school supplies, and literacy. The public school administrator thus has the authority to arbitrate what counts as “official” knowledge.

As a public school teacher and a graduate student, I have seen how knowledge cannot be separated from who is exercising power. As a Black person in the United States (or since I am represented as a Black person), I have seen how what counts as knowledge depends on who is saying it and in what space. In different sections of this dissertation, I responded to the ethical demands of knowledge production in a professional research community. I propose that while secondary schools have problems with what counts as knowledge, and how that knowledge is
communicated across school hierarchy, professional researcher communities are less likely to interrogate their own status as authors of knowledge. In particular, through this dissertation research, I pursued my desires to engage in deep examinations of my primary assumption framing this study: the extent to which funders can share credit with researchers for articulating literacy problems as well as supporting certain “solutions” and not others in terms of “solving” those “problems.”

In different sections of this dissertation, I focused on two retired linguists and their interest in Black speech. I used these scholars and their work as guides to get impressions of the role that money plays in academic research. The “Marjorie Martus” section thus contrasted how the two linguists accounted for money in their work. The subsequent sections invited a critical look at how capital has shaped some of our most human aesthetic experiences, including learning as well as ours and others’ constructions of professional identity.

Larger questions now issue from my focus, including how money shapes the identity of the researcher and what both researchers and funders identify as a learning problem based on incentives. Both Deborah Brandt (Composition and Rhetoric) and Gayatri Spivak (Comparative Literature) are already having conversations about money and labor. These researchers made connections between capital investment and its impact (or fallout) when large amounts of money move into a space for a specific purpose.

In Brandt’s case, she wrote that literacy problems that alienate people come about as a consequence of technological shifts and disinvestment in small-scale artisan labor. In “Sponsors of Literacy,” Brandt (1997) talked about the movement towards larger economies of scale in 19th-century America, and how it directly impacted the aesthetic experience of workers in print shops. “As a result,” Brandt wrote, “print jobs were outsourced, the processes of editing and
printing were split, and, in tight competition, print apprentices became low-paid mechanics with no more access to the multi-skilled environment of the craftshop” (p. 1). Brandt called attention to a resistance, on the part of the researcher, to investigating the way that money informs experiences that we have with tools. She wrote, “When economic forces are addressed in our work, they appear primarily as generalities: contexts, determinants, motivators, barriers, touchstones. But rarely are they systematically related to the local conditions and embodied moments of literacy learning that occupy so many of us on a daily basis” (p. 2). The role that money plays in the quest to say something new might be deeper than we are willing to explore. Knowledge production about learning problems, in particular, might be even more freighted with ethical concerns.

Gayatri Spivak reflected on the crucial role of funding in research. In Death of a Discipline, Spivak (2003) diffused the threat that capital investment poses to academic integrity by revisiting an important disciplinary history. As it turned out, Cold War priorities, Spivak cited, gave many researchers direction during the postwar period. Spivak wrote:

Area studies were founded in the wake of the Cold War and funded by federal grants, backed by the great Foundations, especially Ford. To meet the demands of war, scholars of diverse disciplines were forced to pool their knowledge in frantic attempts to advise administrators and policy makers…the war also showed the need for trained personnel in foreign areas. (p. 7)

Spivak was candid about what she perceived as the high quality of the work, despite the politicized context of the funding. Spivak noted:

Area Studies exhibit quality and rigor (those elusive traits), combined with openly conservative or “no” politics. They are tied to the politics of power, and their connections to the power elite in the countries studied are still strong; the quality of the language training is generally excellent, though just as generally confined to the social science framework. (p. 7)
Spivak’s candor about the role of funding invites questions about the relationship between researchers and funders—and what is or is not an ethically compromising position for the researcher.

I want to move away from the idea of bad researchers who put money in front of the work and good ones who claim that funders simply give them money and accept the work that is produced. This binary is not helpful. In *Death of a Discipline*, Spivak (2003) wrote about sites where Comparative Literature, as an older, well-funded, and more conservative field, has an interest in partnering with Cultural Studies, a newer left-leaning field, which Spivak believed could benefit from Comp Lit’s more rigorous methods. In *Death of a Discipline*, Spivak was open about how the work in Comparative Literature is closely tied to or enabled by powerful institutions in the state. When she referred directly to NDEA funding, Spivak insisted that the NDEA funded “excellent training” in foreign languages, work that met “the needs of social science fieldwork” in Area Studies (p. 7). If I read her correctly, I take this to mean that sponsored knowledge does not always mean that the knowledge itself is compromised. After all, what is known about genes, for example, likely grew from earlier motivations to validate White supremacy. The inevitability of power and knowledge complementing each other means that research institutions are now forced to have ethical priorities as part of the work.

On the other hand, in “Can the Subaltern Speak?” Spivak (1985) identified a Third World victim in the global movement of capital. Money spent on education is not isolated from the ambition of sponsors who want to shape world events in a particular way. In her essay, Spivak wrote:

The contemporary international division of labor is a displacement of the divided field of nineteenth-century territorial imperialism. Put simply, a group of countries, generally first-world, are in a position of investing capital; another group, generally, third-world, provide the field for investment…in the interests of maintaining the circulation and
growth of industrial capital, transportation law and standardized education systems were developed—even as local industries were destroyed, and land redistribution rearranged, and raw material was transferred to the colonizing country. (p. 83)

Spivak referred to the Third World in this passage, but the characterization of how capital moves and shapes education resonates with the African American experience, writ large.

Who Brandt called sponsors of literacy played important roles in the movement of capital. As I previously mentioned, Brandt (1997) defined sponsors as “any agents, local or distant, concrete or abstract, who enable, support, teach, or model, as well as recruit, regulate, suppress, or withhold literacy—and gain advantage by it in some way” (p. 2). The implication of this definition raises questions about different conceptions of the “researcher.” Albert Marckwardt and Charles Ferguson influenced the terms of their contract with Melvin Fox at the Ford Foundation. But Dillard’s firing indicated that he was contracted by the Ford Foundation and the Center for Applied Linguistics to conduct research into Black speech.

In examining such implications as well as in pursuing these via further research, I suggested that researchers themselves are a form of capital, especially in cases where a deciding sponsor pays for and terminates the researcher’s employment. The professional researcher’s position is not always clear. Moreover, the inevitability of sponsors provides a language to get past the binary of good relationships with money and bad ones, or between knowledge that circulates freely and knowledge that is uncorrupted by the influence of sponsors. Instead, I want to talk about what different models of sponsorship make possible. All of these future research plans—as well as variations of these that others within the broad field of English Education now might wish to pursue—can variously study, research, and interpret how English and literacy-focused researchers, in particular, solicit money. As well, research projects could focus on how criteria have been decided and delineated in order to examine deeply how decisions about “who
gets the money” inform how linguists as well as English educators thought—and perhaps continue to think—about Vernacular Black English.
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