Editor's Introduction

Jo-Ann Wallace

f LHe new look of this and subsequent issues of ESC: English Studies in Canada marks its move—or, more properly, its return—to the University of Alberta. We intend the redesign of the journal to signal some new directions but also to provide visual confirmation of the journal's ongoing commitment to publish work that represents the full variety of research that takes place in English departments. This means that ESC publishes articles on topics ranging from Old Norse to Bollywood, Shakespeare to Hardt and Negri. The mandate of ESC is (as it has always been) to reflect the discipline of English studies back to itself, in all its diversity and shifting contours. Our designers, Tim Hoffpauir and James Shrimpton, have given us a visual style that emblematizes this mandate. At Tim's suggestion our cover photographs play with the theme of reflection and reflective surfaces. Tim also provided a four-season palette of rich, bold, saturated colours that signal *ESC*'s confidence—even *swagger*—as the journal enters its twenty-ninth year of publication. James created a logo for us that plays with ESC's acronym and brings it into the age of cyberculture. Harvey Quamen, ESC's new Electronics and Design Editor, came up with the journal's new, larger format with expanded margins that allow for design features like pull quotes and brief author biographies. The pull quotes,

like the generous use of white space and some of the other more playful elements of the design, are intended to pull the reader in. When you pick the journal up and flip through it, we want you to feel compelled to read something before you put it down again. Harvey is also responsible for the colophon that will conclude each issue of *ESC*, a gesture that reaches back through the corridors of book history but also (as Harvey indicates in this issue's colophon) outward to connect with mass-market speciality magazines like *Wired*. The colophon signals the journal's *in the worldness* by pointing to its conditions of production, both personal and institutional, and by acknowledging the degree to which the circulation of knowledge still depends upon the skill of largely unacknowledged artisans.

Along with changes in design, we are introducing several new features in this issue. These include an expanded use of the Readers' Forum as a place for meditating on the state of our discipline. For this issue we invited contributions from several early- and mid-career colleagues. We asked them to write brief, polemical pieces addressing the question "What's left of English studies?" Many of you will recognize this as a twist on the title question of a 2000 volume of essays edited by Judith Butler, John Guillory, and Kendall Thomas, What's Left of Theory? Our new Submissions Editor, Mike O'Driscoll, drafted the wording of the email we sent to potential contributors, inviting them to consider questions like the following: What is the relationship of literary studies and progressive politics or social advocacy today? Has English studies passed beyond its encounter with literature, and/or what are the remainders of our critical encounters with literature? How have literary studies changed in the wake of the turn to cultural studies? Do we, should we, can we, must we still work in institutions that call themselves English Departments?

Our contributors responded with imagination, passion, wit, and a sense of deep commitment to whatever it is we do. Some, like Clara Joseph, put pressure on our current and reactive tendency to defend our discipline on the basis of the *skills* (critical reading, writing, thinking) we impart to students, calling instead for a Gandhian faith in the transformative potential of art. Others, like Patricia Badir and Sandra Tomc, argue that, contrary to the implication of several documents released by our granting council, the humanities *have* had a profound impact on civil society in the last couple of decades. Eric Savoy defends close reading; Daniel Heath Justice defends all reading. Steven Bruhm "queeries" smug pedagogues who use the classroom as a place to enforce ethical platitudes. Like Nicholas Brown and Imre Szeman, he argues the need for continued theorizing. Trevor Ross reminds us that one of the answers to the question

"what's left" is: fewer of us. Julia Wright and Chris Keep note, respectively, the uses and institutional histories of the sense of crisis that seems always to have defined our discipline.

For this issue we have primed the Readers' Forum pump, so to speak, by inviting contributions. We will continue to do this periodically, just as we will invite several responses to the pieces that appear in this issue. But we also hope to publish a number of unsolicited responses or position papers, and we invite any interested reader or potential contributor to the Forum to contact us.

Long time readers of *ESC* will note one other change: the inclusion of review articles as a supplement to our book reviews section. While our editorial policy on book reviews has not changed—that is, we will continue to review as many books published by Canadian scholars as possible—we will also invite longer essays. These will be devoted to Canadian books of broad interest (as in Brian Edwards's review of Tilottama Rajan's and Michael O'Driscoll's edited volume, After Poststructuralism: Writing the Intellectual History of Theory), to books published by non-Canadians which are important to our discipline (as in Stephen Slemon's review of Gayatri Spivak's new book, Death of a Discipline), and to interesting groupings of books (as in Anna-Lize Berry's review of Martha C. Nussbaum's Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions and Robert Rawdon Wilson's The Hydra's Tale: Imagining Disgust).

The appearance of the words "Canadian" and "non-Canadian" in the preceding paragraph points to one more change of direction for ESC: the journal is now open to submissions from all English studies scholars anywhere in the world. This venture—discussed with members of the Editorial Advisory Board at our 2003 annual meeting, and then ratified by the ACCUTE Executive and Membership—was not taken lightly. We were all mindful of the history of ESC, which was born out of a meeting more than thirty years ago at which Clara Thomas (York University), Janet Lewis (York University), Paul Fleck (University of Western Ontario), Ronald Bates (University of Western Ontario), and George Johnson (University of Alberta) "tossed about the idea of a journal" (Thomas 16) and agreed to put it on the agenda of the next annual ACCUTE meeting. Two years later Lauriat Lane (University of New Brunswick) agreed to serve as the inaugural editor of English Studies in Canada and brought out its first issue in 1975. As the next editor, Rowland McMaster, points out in a 1989 editorial, the ACCUTE committee examining the need for a journal noted, first, that "there was not a single Canadian journal of studies in English" and, second, that the market was flooded with international, especially

American, journals "at a time when Canada was worried about American cultural domination" (quoted in McMaster 4). McMaster goes on to support ACCUTE's original desire to limit publication in ESC to Canadians and members of the association. His argument represents the strongest possible case for this more limited mandate, and so it is worth quoting at some length:

When Canadian scholars submit their papers to specialized journals abroad, as is natural for specialists in various fields, and as most of us do, the papers are dispersed and diffused among others. English Studies in Canada, on the other hand, provides a forum where the Canadian scholarly community working in English can be identified, can become conscious of itself, recognize its newcomers, stars, trends, and compartments, and therefore develop its own collegial discourse. The Canadian scholarly community in this field becomes visible and can therefore consult, co-operate, debate, and carry on a Canadian intellectual life.... If the journal were open to all contributors, whomever, however excellent they might be, it would become another literary journal among, and like, a great many such journals and could not assist Canadian scholars, from graduate students to seasoned professors, as it does now very effectively. (McMaster 7)

As a child of the quiet revolution in Quebec and Trudeauesque politics nationally—in other words, as the child of an era of nationalisms in this part of the continent—I feel torn. On the one hand, I like the notion of Canadian literary scholars congregating on a field (an image of the old Learneds beer tent comes to mind); on the other hand, I have to recognize that when it comes to journals that limit their appeal and circulation, lots of scholars are walking off the field, ball in hand. It is also the case that what was good for one generation doesn't necessarily serve the next as well. Earlier I referred to the *in the worldness* of journals which are the product of both visible and invisible forms of labour. But journals, like the work of the scholars they publish, are obviously in the world in other ways too. ESC will continue to serve its community of Canadian scholars and ACCUTE members but it will do so by taking our work into the broad world of intellectual exchange. We have begun that exchange by inviting Brian Edwards, an Australian scholar, to review the Rajan and O'Driscoll volume. We have added three international members to our Editorial Advisory Board: Scott McCracken of Sheffield Hallam University (UK), Gillian Whitlock of the University of Queensland (Australia), and Craig Womack of the University

of Oklahoma (us). And we will invite responses to our Readers' Forum from English studies scholars in Canada and abroad.

Two happy tasks will conclude this Editor's Introduction. The first is to thank a number of colleagues: the members of the Editorial Advisory Board for their hard work and for the advice and support of those members who were able to attend the annual meeting in Halifax; Neil Besner and other members of the ACCUTE Executive for their support and encouragement; the Office of the Vice-President (Research) at the University of Alberta for a grant which enabled us to cover the cost of redesigning the journal; the Department of English at the University of Alberta for supplying graduate research assistance; and Len Findlay for giving us "swagger." The second is to congratulate the 2002 F.E.L. Priestley Prize winners. Inaugurated in 1989 and offered jointly by ACCUTE and ESC, this annual prize recognizes the best essay published in ESC. This year we have two winners: Kevin McNeilly (University of British Columbia) for his essay "All Poets Are Not Jews: Transgression and Satire in A.M. Klein" and Eric Savoy (Université de Montréal) for his essay "Necro-filia, or Hawthorne's Melancholia." Congratulations to you both and all best wishes for your continuing and future research.

Works Cited

Butler, Judith, John Guillory, and Kendall Thomas, eds. What's Left of Theory? New Work on the Politics of Literary Theory. New York and London: Routledge, 2000.

McMaster, Rowland. "ESC and its Ways." English Studies in Canada 15.1 (March 1989): 3-11.

Thomas, Clara. "The Beginning of English Studies in Canada." English Studies in Canada 25 (March 1999): 15-17.