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Although the grievances and ambitions of distinct social groups have influenced all societies, the recognition and study of these processes as social movements is a result of modern social science. Many rhetoricians, however, reject the idea that new critical approaches, different from those usually applied to political rhetoric, must be developed to apply to social movement rhetoric.

In this thesis I examine the usefulness of the study of the rhetoric of social movements. To accomplish this, I differentiate the rhetoric of movements from other political rhetorics, and I discuss the types of political language often central to it. I also discuss the rhetorical theory used to explain the rhetoric of movements, and I group this theory into three main approaches: Dramatistic/Confrontational, Agitation/Control, and Leader Based.

Showing how these approaches are both used and ignored in practical criticism, I then review critical studies of the rhetoric of three prominent contemporary or recent social movements: Black Power, Women's Liberation, and the Radical Right-Wing. I attempt to isolate and demonstrate the rhetorical and stylistic forms that are unique to each of these movements.

Finally, I explain why I think that the theoretical analysis of social movement rhetoric has not achieved its potential value as a humanistic study.
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Introduction

Social movements stimulate as much controversy and debate as any other single aspect of modern society, and, if the related phenomena of political and social revolutions are considered along with movements, then they can be considered the dominant theme of the last two centuries of world history. While this seems clear and obvious, what social movements actually are and how they differ from other groups or social forces is a more difficult question. The main problem in the definition of movements has always been whether and to what extent they are more than the sum total of the individuals who compose them. The central questions are these: what "moves," how, and why?

In examining both the role of rhetoric in movements and the nature of social movement rhetoric, I cannot, of course, completely answer these questions. I think, however, that we can learn much about what movements are and how they function by studying the rhetorics they produce and the rhetorics that influence them. More than individuals, movements can always be seen as both producers and audiences of rhetoric. Of course, this makes the rhetoric of any movement an extremely complex subject, since at any moment some of the individuals who compose the movement will be making new rhetoric while many others will be reacting as audiences to rhetoric from both within and outside the movement. As either rhetoricians or audiences, movement
members continually change the movement through the interactions of their individual personalities and conflicts about different perceptions of the movement's goals and needs. These complexities make the study of social movement rhetoric difficult, but, when the links between rhetoric and action are found, they provide valuable insights into an important political field.

In the three chapters of this thesis I attempt to define the characteristics by which the rhetoric of social movements may be known, to review the theories that contemporary rhetoricians have created to explain movements and their rhetorics, and to examine how these theories and others can help to criticize the rhetorics of particular movements. Chapter 1 provides background information which I use to locate social movement rhetoric in the broader fields of general rhetoric and political rhetoric. In chapter 2, I identify and explain the major theories which rhetoricians often use for the analysis and explanation of movement rhetoric. Finally, in chapter 3, I review critical studies of rhetoric created in three important contemporary movements. While I discuss most of the critics and theorists of movement rhetoric on their own terms in the body of my thesis, in my conclusion I question the overall value of these rhetorical discussions in relation to their potential value.
Chapter I: Social Movement Rhetoric and General Rhetoric

The rhetoric of social movements is one area of modern political rhetoric, and political rhetoric itself can be seen as just one aspect of political language. The uses of rhetoric in social movements seem to depend especially on three aspects of political language: political metaphor, political humor, and propaganda. These aspects of political language are not limited to movement rhetoric, of course, but they do play a vital role in it. In this chapter, I will attempt to develop a background for the concept of movement rhetoric by examining how these types of political language work.

Before proceeding to these divisions of political language, however, I will discuss the definition of rhetoric itself. Rhetoric, while one of the oldest disciplines, undergoes continual redefinition by scholars who study it. Modern rhetoricians are particularly likely to reject existing definitions and feel the need to create their own. Modern rhetoricians also tend to expand their definitions of rhetoric until they can apply to almost any language use or study. For instance, Richard E. Young, Alton L. Becker, and Kenneth L. Pike claim:

Almost anything related to the act of saying something to someone—in speech or in writing—can conceivably fall within the domain of rhetoric as a field of study: phonetics, grammar, the process of
cognition, language acquisition, perception, penmanship, social relations, persuasive strategies, stylistics, logic and so on. (1)

In another typical modern definition of rhetoric, Lloyd F. Bitzer claims: "Rhetoric is a mode of altering reality...by creation of discourse which changes reality through the mediation of thought and action" ("The Rhetorical Situation" 4). Most modern definitions of rhetoric share the expansiveness of these two examples.

Classical definitions of rhetoric, in contrast, tend to limit their meanings to persuasion but without limitation to any specific activity or discipline. Aristotle's Rhetoric presents the most complete and philosophical classical study of rhetoric. According to W. Ross Winterowd, Aristotle also provides the source from which all subsequent rhetorical study is derived (18). Aristotle defines rhetoric as "the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion" (24). Rhetoric and dialectic both concern all human pursuits; however, rhetoric, which appeals to emotions, can move and persuade more effectively than can the strict logic of dialectic. While modern rhetoricians may criticize Aristotle's definition as too narrow, it has virtues which theirs lack, including clarity, specificity, and familiarity.

Since the use of power, like the use of persuasion, permeates every area of human behavior, it is difficult to differentiate political rhetoric from other uses of rhetoric.
Aristotle, however, defined political rhetoric as rhetoric's use in situations affecting society's civic order. He called it "a nobler business and fitter for a citizen" than the use of rhetoric in civil and legal disputes (25).

Bitzer, in "Political Rhetoric," bases his discussion upon Aristotle, whom he calls the most rigorous and political of all classical rhetoricians (226). Bitzer writes, "Every citizen who deliberates and creates messages about civic affairs...engages in political rhetoric" (228). He reasons that the concept of political rhetoric involves the idea of a public and that "The state and its machinery--laws, courts, offices, and so on--come into existence for the purpose of conducting the public's business" (228).

Within this machinery of the state, Bitzer sees the functions of political rhetoric as resolving conflicts, providing common meaning, and maintaining cooperation. Bitzer follows Aristotle's division of political rhetoric into deliberative, forensic, and epideictic types which correspond to the political virtues of goodness, justice, and nobility. Deliberative political rhetoric "calls for a judgement concerning the public or some part of it" (241). Forensic political rhetoric concerns the finding of public justice. And epideictic political rhetoric attempts to show that an act in the public realm deserves praise or blame. Bitzer also discusses a fourth type, informative political rhetoric, produced by popular mass media (243). Of course, it would
be difficult to separate information from rhetoric in any particular media presentation, whether it be a seemingly objective news program or an obviously rhetorical political ad. Bitzer claims that political rhetoric in our times demands an audience which is neither "a terminal receiver of messages nor a passive object to be manipulated, but an active participating agent in deliberations" (244).

In "Rhetoric and Public Knowledge," Bitzer discusses the sense in which an audience's public concerns and public knowledge can be "authorized by a community with a history and tradition" (90). Bitzer claims that without public knowledge, "there is no genuine public, but only an artificial one held together by such forces as coercive regulations and unchangable boundaries" (90). However, he sees no evidence that modern political rhetoric will really address the public interest or that modern audiences will gain the public knowledge or political competance necessary. Borrowing from Marshall McLuhan's concept of the "Global Village," Bitzer sees modern media and technology as uniting the world's population. But, for this to be a democratic transformation, Bitzer suggests that we:

conceive the whole of mankind as a single massive public whose vital interests are at stake, who require proper representation in assemblies empowered to conduct their business, and who need to acquire an art of judging rightly as citizens of the world. ("Political Rhetoric," 247).
Chaira Perelman, another modern theorist of rhetoric, described political rhetoric and the nature of the public in terms similar to Bitzer's. Perelman and his collaborator, L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, also claim that political rhetoric should address an ideal "universal audience" (13). Further, in "Rhetoric and Politics," Perelman describes rhetoric as the search for common ground and just solutions to resolve political conflicts. He argues that philosophical statements constitute a society's highest political rhetoric since, "being beyond historical communities, they address themselves to all of humanity" (135).

Political rhetoric, in the sense that Bitzer and Perelman discuss it, transcends the everyday political uses of language. But these everyday political uses of language in power relationships color many aspects of all societies. From pre-literate societies to the most technologically advanced and from the most despotic to the most democratic, functions of language enhance power relationships between people and groups. Many different disciplines, including linguistics, political science and sociology, study the nature of political language. These fields can help us to understand the influence of movement rhetoric in our own society by showing the political uses of language in other societies that share functions with movement rhetoric.

In pre-literate societies, according to Paul Corcoran, language itself gave political power to its users. Speaking the names of the gods, for instance, was believed to invoke
the power of the gods; however, this great power was limited and restricted by the creation of specific social roles with sole access to the power of language used in certain ways. Corcoran claims that these social roles exist in technological societies as well. He finds that the medicine man's use of language, for instance, is similar in function to that of the scientist, doctor, or lawyer; and that the function of the "guardian of totems and religions" is similar to that of the academic or curator (5-7).

Corcoran claims that members of early literate cultures, such as classical Greece, no longer believe that language use gives divine power directly. He uses the example of the Greek oracle, however, to show that these societies still see language as the way the gods make their wills known to humans: "It cannot be accidental that the central image of divine wisdom in that period was a voice" (17). Corcoran's argument leads to the speculation that the stronger the oral tradition in a particular culture, the more ritual and theatrical forms will shape its political language.

Essays by Frank E. Mannin and by Gerald Gold provide interesting investigations of this theory. Manning studied the Progressive Labor Party's role in the 1976 Bermuda parliamentary election. He claims that the socialist PLP was finally able to defeat the conservative United Bermuda Party after many unsuccessful attempts only when it turned from theoretical arguments to rhetoric that involved the
social and religious traditions of Bermuda's black majority. In its new successful rhetoric, the PLP emphasized the family, the role of the female, and theatrical, revivalist style—including personal witnessing and testifying. Gold's essay, "Cousin and the Gros Chiens: The Limits of Cajun Political Rhetoric," also shows the influence a strong oral tradition exerts on political language. Examining one candidate's style in an election for Police Juror of a very small Cajun community, Gold finds that this style is very theatrical and exuberant. He claims, however, that the existence of this political tradition is threatened by the constant encroachment of modern American culture.

Harold D. Lasswell and his associates claim that very industrialized societies need specific institutions to regulate the political uses of language. They define political language as "the language of power...the battle cry, verdict and sentence, statute, ordinance and rule, oath of office, controversial news comment and debate" (9). These uses represent the institutions that wield political power in industrial societies: the military, the courts, legislatures, executive offices, and the mass media. Lasswell argues that a particular society's style of political language varies with the degree to which a crisis situation exists. For instance, an urgent and strident style in a political crisis may be replaced with a formal reserved style when the crisis ends (24-28). Also, a crisis tends to emphasize "effect-contrast," the contrast between
a leader's power and an audience's powerlessness. In non-crisis situations, on the other hand, "effect-modelling," the attempt to identify the audience with the leader, predominates (28). Lasswell associates "effect-contrast" with despotism and "effect-modelling" with democracy, but claims that some degree of "effect-modelling" is necessary for any kind of social cohesion. This means that, "even in despotically organized states, the style of public ceremony carried out under threat of great common danger tends towards 'effect-modelling'" (35). Social movement rhetoric, however, poses special problems for this theory since, while a social movement's usual perception of current conditions as a crisis tends to move the movement's rhetoric towards "effect-contrast," the movement's need for mass support demands "effect-modelling."

Doris Graber sees political languages as those used to enforce, sustain and justify power; and she claims that they are important for two reasons: they affect great numbers of people, and they involve powerful elites controlling tremendous resources. She claims that political languages serve five important functions: information dissemination, agenda-setting, linkage and interpretation, projection to past and future, and action stimulation. These functions are all rhetorical as well as political, since persuasion is involved in all of them.

Two special political uses of language, political metaphor and political humor, continually arise from the
types of conflicts which cause social movements. Also important in the rhetoric of social movements, propaganda seems in many ways identical to political language.

Metaphor, the carrying over of meaning from one idea to another, is essential for communication. E. F. Miller claims that political metaphors help communicate abstract political ideas by identifying them with more concrete objects. He argues that political metaphors serve necessary functions, since "the bewildering political universe would be altogether unintelligible if it were not ordered and given meaning by language" (157). If this is true, then to understand the nature of political relationships one must understand how metaphorical speech can make abstract ideas concrete to members of an audience.

In an essay that compares the political uses of metaphor and metonym, Robert L. Paine states that both are analogies speakers use to make audiences share perceptions of political relationships. Paine claims, however, that, for political purposes, the use of metaphor is risky, since while it is high in power and creativity, it is low in predictability and control. He calls metonym a more closed analogy, on the other hand, one that is lower in power but higher in control. To support this idea, Paine argues that elected officials tend to rely on metaphor when they seek to be re-elected in order to create a powerful image. The same officials, he argues, use metonym more in their routine administrative rhetoric which only needs to maintain order.
Paine also claims that, since out-of-power groups always tend to take more risks than in-groups, their rhetorics will usually rely on metaphorical language to a greater extent. Many social movements, for instance, try to create metaphorically powerful rhetoric.

According to Dan F. Hahn, the systematic use of political metaphors eventually creates a framework of political myth. He claims, for instance, that the myth of the state as a living organism which can be sick or healthy developed from social science metaphors. The work of Northrop Frye seems to counter this view, however. Frye sees cultural or literary myths actually predating and giving rise to the social metaphors that attempt to explain them. Both views, however, see these myths as exerting great influence on any rhetoric, such as that of movements, which questions social status.

Humor, like metaphorical speech, a use of language so essential to human nature that it cannot be separated from political language, also functions rhetorically to help an audience identify with the political goals of a speaker or a writer. According to Ronald C. Webb, if humor involving political issues were divided into conservative and radical categories, then conservative humor would reinforce social norms and attempt to identify deviance with social incompetence. Radical political humor, in contrast, would reinforce the courage of rebels against social norms and would give them permission to degrade the sacred symbols.
of the community. Radical humor, Webb claims, leads to identification with the new order that the radical movement struggles to create.

The word, propaganda, another term important to the study of social movement rhetoric, carries negative connotations for most people but is not often clearly defined. Because of this, both sides in a controversy may label the arguments of their opponents as propaganda, meaning only views with which they disagree. Phillip C. Boardman, however, provides a useful approach to a definition of propaganda. Boardman claims that political language must use one of two strategies, active and passive. Active strategies, he says, actively appeal to emotions, while passive strategies use rational dialectic appeals. Boardman also explains that both active and passive strategies can be used either honestly or with attempts to deceive. He represents the use of active-passive strategies and honest-deceptive intentions as the x- and y-axes of a coordinate plane, each of the four quadrants being a type of political language. In this scheme, the use of active strategies with honest goals leads to patriotic or nationalistic rhetoric; the use of passive strategies with honest intentions creates factual information; the use of passive strategies with deceptive aims constitutes misleading or incomplete information. Finally, the more active, emotional strategies are used with an intent to deceive, the more closely the results approach Boardman's definition of propaganda. Boardman does not consider whether skill or
or artistry of presentation can help differentiate propaganda from rhetoric.

This overview of political rhetoric and political language, larger fields in which the rhetoric of social movements exists, and of special aspects of political language that can influence the rhetoric of movements, should provide a perspective from which the rhetoric of movements can be viewed realistically as having the potential to reflect all human concerns. The definition of movement rhetoric itself will be the concern of the next chapter, as will be the development of various theories to explain it.
Chapter II: Theories of the Rhetoric of Movements

Scholars of rhetoric have argued a great deal since the late 1960's about the theory of social movement rhetoric. Numerous articles on the subject have appeared in such speech and communications journals as the Quarterly Journal of Speech, Speech Monographs, and the Central States Speech Journal. No one theoretical approach has become dominant, however, but three perspectives have been useful to critics and influential with other theorists. To present a coherent review of movement rhetorical theory, I will discuss its early development, the three main perspectives developed by theorists to deal with this area of rhetoric, and an example of how these perspectives might be applied to a real movement. I will also discuss some of the recent changes that have taken place in movement rhetorical theory. Each of these topics makes up a separate section of this chapter, the overall goal of which is to explain the ways that scholars of rhetoric approach the complex phenomena called social movements.

The Early Development of Theory about Movement Rhetoric

Leland M. Griffin, in "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," in 1952 made the first influential statement about movement rhetoric. This article and Griffin's subsequent work provided the basis for much criticism and
further development of theory. Before this article was
published, rhetorical studies usually focussed on individuals
and their specific utterances in a traditional and biog-
ographical manner. This biographical approach, also called
neo-Aristotelian by Edwin Black in Rhetorical Criticism, may
have been related to influential sociological theories that
saw agitation and protest as deviant behavior. Griffin
claimed, however, that a biographical approach is inadequate
to deal with the multitude of events, people, and relation-
ships involved when a movement tries to bring about a major
change in society.

In "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," Griffin
defines a movement as happening in the past, although he
and other theorists later expanded this definition to
include on-going movements. Griffin writes that, for a
movement to exist, people must become dissatisfied with
their political environment, must desire change and make
efforts towards change which finally result "in some degree
of success or failure," at which point the historical
movement ends (184). The main task for the rhetorical
scholar, according to Griffin, "is to isolate the rhetorical
movement within the matrix of the historical movement." He
postulates two distinct types of movement. First, "pro-
movements," attempting to create or encourage acceptance
for new institutions, lead to rhetoric that justifies
change. Second, "anti-movements" lead to rhetorics against
"an existing institution or idea" (185). Both of these also lead to the development of producers of opposing rhetoric. "Defendant rhetoricians" from within the establishment attempt to prevent change in "pro-movements" and to defend existing conditions against "anti-movements" (186).

Griffin points to three stages in the development of movements. During a "period of inception," the rhetoric of the movement first comes to the public's notice. In a "period of rhetorical crisis," the society's perceived balance about the movement's issue collapses. Finally, during a "period of consummation...the great proportion of aggressor rhetoricians abandon their efforts" because of success, failure, or other factors. Griffin asserts that a movement is most likely to fail in the inception period but it faces the hardest rhetorical dilemmas in its crisis period. During the crisis, a tremendous amount a rhetorical activity will be needed for success. This tends to exasperate the public's attention and patience, however, so a change must be caused before this alienation occurs (185-87).

Griffin's 1952 essay was influential theoretically but led to few actual studies of movement rhetoric. This lack of impact may only show the influence of sociological theories viewing protest itself as deviant; these continued to have wide acceptance during the 1950's and early 1960's. Griffin's own next work on movement rhetoric, however, "The Rhetorical Structure of the New Left Movement: Part I,"
in 1963 began a prolific period of rhetorical movement criticism. Griffin does not modify his earlier theory in this article except to show that it can apply to on-going movements as well as those in the past. He also begins to use the critical terminology of Kenneth Burke, and he demonstrates his recommended methods in an analysis of the rise of the New Left in the late 1950's and early 1960's. Griffin characterizes the 1958 founding of Dissent magazine as the beginning of the movement's inception period, identifying the New Left as an "anti-movement," concerned with rejecting existing authorities associated with such "devil terms" as "alienation," "conformity," and "absurdity" (117). Because most of its rhetoric is negativistic, Griffin sees the New Left's association with other emerging movements for peace and civil rights as a necessary positive outlet for work associated with such "god terms" as "sanity," "community," and "action" (118). He describes the 1963 March on Washington as a great success for all these movements because it provided a symbol of solidarity, freedom, justice, and peace (122).

Many rhetorical studies of movements followed "The Rhetorical Structure of the New Left Movement." For instance, in an article calling for participant-observation in movement activities, "The Rhetoric of Resistance: Confrontation with the Warmakers," Thomas W. Benson and Bonnie Johnson tell of their action as members of a college speech class in an October, 1967 anti-Vietnam War demon-
As participant-observers they analyzed the nature of the demonstrators, the importance of the speeches, and the nature of the media coverage, which they found to unfavorable and unfair to the protesters. Benson and Johnson conclude that field observation extends the field of rhetoric beyond the classroom and can help clarify "the rhetoric of resistance" (42).

In an interesting 1968 article, Mary G. McEdwards discussed the nature and effects of agitative rhetoric. The style of agitative rhetoric, rhetoric which "evokes extreme movement away from the status quo--usually a complete reversal of existing conditions...," depends, McEdwards claims, upon harshness, highly concrete imagery, and the disruption of moral expectations (37). As examples of agitative rhetoric, she cites Malcolm X in contrast to Martin Luther King and student protesters shouting "Hey, hey LBJ, how many kids did you kill today?" with a college professor's reasoned opposition to the Vietnam War. While McEdwards concedes that agitative rhetoric can be unpleasant, she believes that it is vital to democracy:

We need to be taken from our comfortable ideological pail and be poured into that ideological centrifuge which causes the best ideas in our society to separate from the dross...The agitator must use the jagged word, the snarling word, the insulting word; he cannot clothe his words in euphemistic cotton wool to spare our sensibilities. (43)
Edward P. J. Corbett's 1969 essay, "The Rhetoric of the Open Hand and the Rhetoric of the Closed Fist," also contributed to the development of theory about social movement rhetoric. Using rhetorical examples from civil rights and student protest movements, Corbett claims that contemporary rhetoric can be seen as physical rather than oral, dependent upon groups rather than upon individuals, and more likely to use coercive than persuasive strategies. Although these generalities are questionable, some later theorists followed Corbett in applying them to all movement rhetoric.

These early articles led scholars of rhetoric to begin examining social movements. Griffin's work was certainly the most important in this sense. By about the time that Corbett's and McEdwards's articles appeared in 1969, the three main perspectives on the rhetoric of social movements had begun to form. These perspectives arose from the work of independent theorists. Although representatives of each approach have acknowledged the other perspectives, no one has ever been able to synthesize a completely unified theory from them. These three main perspectives are the Dramatistic/Confrontational Perspective, the Agitation/Control Perspective, and the Leader Based Perspective.

The Dramatistic/Confrontational Perspective

The Dramatistic/Confrontational Perspective on social
movement rhetoric developed because of Leland M. Griffin's increasing enthusiasm for the work of Kenneth Burke. In "A Dramatistic Theory of the Rhetoric of Movements," Griffin distilled and reordered much of Burke's critical writing to form a much more comprehensive life-cycle theory of movements than was presented in Griffin's earlier "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements."

Drawing from all of Burke's works and using his terminology almost exclusively, Griffin claims that the life of a movement illustrates Burke's Pentad. In a movement, Griffin claims, society's transformation is the Act; the scene is history; rhetoric is the agency; movement members are the agents; and morality is the purpose (461).

Griffin claims that, as drama, a movement begins in a time of alienation, when prophets arise and see a new order negating the present one. With their statements of negation, the first act of the movement begins. Next, the "god terms" and "devil terms," the "heaven" and "hell" of the movement are defined. This first stage presents many dangers for the movement. The rhetoric produced then, which may be the movement's most powerful, must fulfill three strategies: it must negate the present order and identify with the one to come; it must provoke conflict and thus create societal reaction and a necessary counter-movement; and it must reach an ever-expanding audience. If a movement survives the initial period, it reaches the
crisis period, when the old order collapses. The public then sees the new order as legitimate and accepts its claims. In the following period of consummation, the new order controls society. The movement's prophets must now become priests, however, and must function under tensions similar to those that had constrained the priests of the old order. Thus consummation brings with it revision, compromise, and self-sacrifice (466-74). Griffin admits the Hegelian and Marxian aspects of his theory, but he emphasizes more the influence of Burke. In a recent essay, "On Studying Movements," Griffin states that the message of his dramatistic approach is to "adopt Burke's comic attitude: delight in the turning wheel, enjoy the task of Sisyphus, find salvation in the act of striving itself" (227).

The metaphor of sacrifice is central in Griffin's theory. He describes the life of a movement as essentially a sacrificial Kill, in which the old order is named the Victim, a "Vile Beast" that must be destroyed. "The collective killing of the Kill," according to Griffin, makes up the crisis of a movement. The Kill can be literal, as in the execution of an overthrown leader, or only symbolic, as in a burning in effigy.

In "The Rhetoric of Confrontation," also published in 1969, Robert L. Scott and Donald K. Smith, like Griffin, use "The Rite of the Kill" as the central metaphor for social movements. They argue that confrontation suggests a radical separation of "haves" from "have nots." In the Manichaeian struggle between them, "those have nots who
confront established power do not seek to share: they demand to supplant...not simply to gain food, land, power, or whatever, but to survive" (3). Scott and Smith call confrontation a "Totalistic Strategy," based upon four claims of the confronters: "a. We are already dead...b. We can be reborn...c. We have the stomach to fight, you don't...d. We are united and understand... (5). Quoting from the rhetoric of Fritz Fanon, Stokely Carmichael, and leaders in the student new left to exemplify these assumptions, they conclude that confrontation is essentially rhetorical action. Scott and Smith explain, however, that, while confrontation always represents total commitment on the part of the confronters, it can be used by their leaders as only a "Non-totalistic Tactic" for reaching a compromise, reform or similar outcome.

These articles of Griffin and of Scott and Smith provide the sources of the Dramatistic/Confrontational Perspective in theory about social movement rhetoric. From this perspective, a movement is defined by its dramatistic form and by its confrontational relationship to the dominant society. Robert S. Cathcart and Charles W. Wilkinson, however, further elaborated and developed this perspective.

Cathcart, in "New Approaches to the Study of Movements: Defining Movements Rhetorically," (1972) and in "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," (1978) attempts to expand the scope of the dramatistic approach. He rejects social science definitions of movements, claiming that
many of the groups included in these definitions are not movements at all, since they do not rhetorically challenge the established order. In his earlier essay, Cathcart finds two ratios from Burke's Pentad, "Agency-Scene" and "Agency-Act," to be essential for a movement's inception. He claims that, since a movement exists rhetorically only in the dialectical tension of a moral conflict, a movement cannot really be significant until the establishment responds hostilely to it. In his view, a movement exists when a new rhetoric proclaims that a moral social order cannot arise through existing change mechanisms; and the present order denounces the new rhetoric. According to Cathcart, this dialectic is the "necessary ingredient which provides the rhetorical form which we have come to recognize as a political or social movement" (88).

In his 1978 article, Cathcart states that a movement "can be recognized by its confrontational form" (234). He also repeats his exclusion of many reform efforts that are included in sociological definitions of movements, finding it necessary "to distinguish between two fundamentally different forms of rhetoric--one of which I shall call managerial and the other I shall call confrontational" (237). As he uses these terms, managerial rhetoric, even when it calls for great social change, reinforces the fundamental legitimacy of the order, while confrontational rhetoric, which is necessarily rare in any society, rejects
the society's basic morals, norms, and values.

Using the terminology of Burke and Griffin, Cathcart explains these two rhetorical forms. Reform efforts using managerial rhetoric work by identification and consubstantiation to reinforce the mysteries and keep the secrets of society. Although they attempt to change society, they use a "rhetoric of piety." The confrontational rhetoric of a movement, on the other hand, "is a rhetoric of reordering rather than reforming" (242). It rejects the legitimacy of the old order and prophesies the new. Cathcart claims, "No movement for radical social change can be taken seriously without confrontation" (243). As an example of confrontational rhetoric, he cites the "Catonsville Nine" incident, the use of napalm by Catholic priests and lay-people to burn draft records in 1968. In this incident and in the rhetoric of Women's Liberation (he refers to Barbara H. Robinson's "Affirmation by Negation in the Women's Liberation Movement,")) Cathcart illustrates how confrontation arises out of guilt about previous acceptance of the now repellent order. Confrontation negates the present order, dramatizes the alienation of the confronter, and identifies the movement as legitimate.

Cathcart also restates his, and Griffin's, earlier idea that confrontation demands an appropriate establishment response: "The establishment, when confronted, must respond not to the particular enactment but to the challenge to its legitimacy" (246). Therefore, establishments respond
to real confrontations with attempts to polarize situations. Treating the confronters as "moral lepers," they "isolate them and pin the anarchist label on them" (246). Polarization may fuel the confrontation until finally "the secret has been revealed--the mystery violated--and the struggle can be seen as a true moral battle for power..." (246).

In "A Rhetorical Definition of Movements," Charles A. Wilkinson tries to correct what he sees as the chief weakness of the Dramatistic/Confrontation Perspective, the limited applicability of its definition to all social movements. Wilkinson reviews the definitions of movements used by Griffin, by Simons, and by Cathcart, but he finds all of them either too limited or too non-rhetorical. To replace them, he offers this definition of movements:

Languaging strategies by which a significantly vocal part of an established society, experiencing together a sustained dialectical tension growing out of a moral (ethical) conflict, agitate to induce cooperation in others, either directly or indirectly, thereby affecting the status quo. (91)

This definition is very broad, including both reform and revolutionary movements, and it retains the dramatistic quality of confrontation theories. To emphasize its dramatistic nature, Wilkinson relates each part of his definition to an element of Burke's Pentad (93-94).
The Agitation/Control Perspective

In *The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control*, John Waite Bowers and Donovan J. Ochs developed a new and influential perspective on movement rhetoric. Bowers and Ochs claim that specific non-traditional rhetorical strategies are unique to agitation and that these strategies are met by establishments with rhetorical strategies of control. In their theory, agitational rhetoric only occurs outside regular channels of "petitioning" the establishment, which includes all normal discursive means of persuasion (17).

These strategies of agitation, in order of their increasing difference from traditional rhetoric, are discussed by Bowers and Ochs: promulgation, solidification, polarization, non-violent resistance, escalation-confrontation, guerilla and Gandhi, guerilla, and revolution. Promulgation refers to "tactics designed to win social support" (17). Solidification strategies reinforce the cohesiveness of the movement group itself. Polarization heightens the contrast between the movement and the establishment. It depends upon "exploitation of flag issues and flag individuals," (vulnerable aspects of establishment rhetoric,) and upon "invention of derogatory jargon for establishment groups" (26-28). Non-violent resistance, the famous strategy of Gandhi and Martin Luther King, gains public support and respect. Escalation-confrontation occurs
when the movement goads "the establishment into disporportionate violence, prompting the larger society to institute reform" (37). Gandhi and guerilla, guerilla, and revolution are increasingly non-rhetorical "involving...a win-lose frame of reference" (37).

Opposed to the rhetoric of agitation, Bowers and Ochs describe the four strategies of the rhetoric of control: avoidance, supression, adjustment, and capitulation. Avoidance, the most desirable strategy from control's point of view, includes counter-persuasion (evasion, "buck-passing" and "the runaround," postponed, "secrecy with a rationale" and denial of physical means, which also must be justified with a rationale (42-44). Supression, which will be used when avoidance tactics fail, includes banishment, harassment, and the purgation of movement leaders. Establishments never see adjustment as a desirable strategy; so an attempt is always made to show that it comes from the strength of the leaders rather than from their weakness. Bowers and Ochs list four possible adjustments: "changing the name of the regulatory agency," "sacrificing personnel" (Lyndon Johnson in 1968, for instance,) "accepting some of the means of agitation," and incorporating either some movement members or some of the movement rhetoric. All of these types of adjustment can be real or only apparent (52-54). The final strategy, capitulation, the "surrender of all decision making power," is never voluntary; "It is not rhetorical. It is complete defeat" (55).
After applying their ideas to three of the major confrontations of the 1960's, the Democratic Convention in Chicago in 1968, the student protest at San Francisco State in 1968 and the civil rights demonstration in Birmingham in 1963, Bowers and Ochs attempt to create "An Interface" between the rhetorics of agitation and control. Using the variables of actual membership, potential membership, and rhetorical sophistication for the movement and level of power, consistency of ideology, and rhetorical sophistication for the establishment, they analyze the probable outcomes of feasible confrontations. Their predictions include:

An establishment high in rhetorical sophistication always adjusts when it perceives that the agitative group is high in potential membership...

An establishment can always successfully avoid or suppress agitative movements when the variables are balanced...

When the agitative group is...low in potential membership and high in rhetorical sophistication, control always successfully uses the strategy of avoidance. (140-41)

Although Bowers and Ochs's Agitation/Control Perspective has been criticized for applying directly only to the movements of the late 1960's, it does provide a unique rhetorical viewpoint from which the interplay of goals and ideas between an agitational movement and a more powerful establishment can be observed. Few subsequent
studies were based upon Bowers and Oohs's entire theoretical framework, but many scholars were influenced by it and can be said to share the Agitation/Control Perspective.

Bruce E. Gronbeck, for instance, in "The Rhetoric of Social-Institutional Change," examines the 1969 Black Action strike at the University of Michigan. Gronbeck claims that movements need effective rhetorics both internally and externally. Internal rhetoric includes "the two great weapons of the agitator—the 'conspiracy appeal' and the 'utopian appeal'" (100). It helps to hold the movement together. External rhetoric, on the other hand, demands the development of a "posture of rational coherence...and the generation of material which allows them to appear rationally driven to change" (100). External rhetoric appeals for the approval of external audiences.

The most influential aspect of the Agitation/Control Perspective has been its emphasis on establishment control factors in the creation of movement rhetoric. From this perspective, a movement rhetorician must take the probabilities of various establishment reactions into account when making rhetorical decisions. In this sense, the Agitation/Control Perspective on movement rhetoric may be the most useful for movement members.

The Leader Based Perspective

The Leader Based Perspective on social movement rhetoric derives primarily from the work of Herbert W. Simons, one
of the most influential of all theorists about movement rhetoric. In his 1970 article, "Requirements, Problems and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," Simons defines a movement as "an unorganized collectivity that mobilizes for action to implement a program for the reconstruction of social norms and values" (3). In Simons's Leader Centered theory, a movement's nature as a collective activity imposes "rhetorical requirements" on leaders, while conflicts among requirements create "rhetorical problems," which, in turn, affect decisions about "rhetorical strategies" (4). Basing his arguments on resource management theory, Simons claims that the rhetorical needs for movement leaders are the same as for leaders in any group:

1. They must attract, maintain and mold workers (i.e., followers) into an efficiently organized unit...
2. They must secure adoption of their product by the larger society...
3. They must react to general resistance by the larger structure... (3-4)

Rhetorical problems for movement leaders, according to Simons, stem from the movement's nature as an anti-establishment organization. This factor insures low internal control and high external resistance. For instance, the need to maintain the movement's thrust while using normal methods of persuasion, attracting support without sacrificing ideology, is a great problem. Simons discusses six others.
First, how should they respond to militancy. Second, to what extent should they tell the members the truth and to what extent should they rely on the movement's mythology. Third, how should they deal with the conflict between organizational efficiency and members' needs for involvement in decision making. Fourth, how should they deal with conflicting role expectations. Fifth, how can they reach all necessary audiences both inside and outside the movement. Sixth, how should they communicate with the many other kinds of leaders found in movements and establishments (4-7).

Simons differentiates three types of rhetorical strategies available to movement leaders: militant, moderate, and intermediate. He also identifies four dilemmas that they face in choosing among them. First, "Militant tactics confer visibility on a movement; moderate tactics gain entry into decision centers" (8). Second, militant tactics often appear unjustified if an establishment responds to them reasonably; moderate tactics appear inadequate if an establishment does not respond. Third, "Militant supporters are easily energized; moderate supporters are more easily controlled" (9). Fourth, while both militant and moderate strategies are effective with some elites, neither is effective with all. Intermediate strategies may appear to solve these four dilemmas, but they also have the potential danger of alienating both supporters and opponents. As an example of a movement leader capable of resolving
these dilemmas, Simons says this about the rhetoric of Martin Luther King: "The great leaders...seem capable of combining these seemingly antithetical strategies without inconsistency by justifying their use with appeals to higher principles" (11).

In a later article, "Persuasion in Social Conflicts," Simons explains that his Leader Based Perspective derives from an actor orientation rather than a system orientation to social conflicts. In other words, it is concerned with the needs of individual movement leaders rather than with the maintenance of social order. Simons argues that conflicts involving social movements are more than just mere disagreements and that they can have positive as well as negative consequences. Simons proposes the Leader Based Perspective to counterbalance what he sees as too great an emphasis on system maintenance in rhetorical theory.

One of the distinguishing characteristics of the Leader Based Perspective is its consideration of movements as analogous to businesses or other kinds of organizations. Leaders of social movements, like business leaders, it claims, must use all available resources in order to attain rational goals. While Simons borrows this idea from the resource management theory of sociology and administration, in his 1976 review of books by Gamson and Oberschall, he warns against the tendency of these resource management theorists to stretch the similarities too far in identifying idealistic movement leaders with hard-headed businessmen.
Simons, along with his co-workers, Elizabeth Mechling and Howard N. Schreier, recently published a revised version of the Leader Based Perspective. In "The Function of Human Communication in Mobilizing for Action from the Bottom Up: The Rhetoric of Social Movements," these authors still advocate the same basic approach. They also try to integrate the other two perspectives into their approach, but only in a limited manner.

Simons, Mechling, and Schreier adopt an "interactionist approach," in which rhetoric, audience, and situation all affect one another. In this context, movement leaders must interact with establishments and with movement members. Leaders' options, however, are determined by the availability of actual material and non-material resources that can be used (812-16). The use of these resources for mobilization and formalization of the movement, which becomes more and more necessary as the movement grows, also raises problems for leaders. They have to make up for the loss of these resources by finding other resources that can be used to achieve the movement's goals.

Simons and his co-authors also deal with the problem of movement militancy, using the basic approach of Simons's earlier work. They claim that militancy can achieve rapid change; however, they warn that militant tactics can also create strong opposition or violent backlash.

Simons, Mechling, and Schreier claim that social movement rhetoric is a distinct form, even though movements
share the same requirements, problems, and strategies as other collectivities. For instance, they refute David Zarefsky's assertion that a federal program can be seen as a social movement. The differences, they write, stem from the movement's relative lack of resources, its lack of incentives for rewarding members. Another difference they point out is a movement's need to create rhetorical appeals at a pace so rapid that it can detract from the movement's progress towards its true goals (841-42).

William E. Jurma's study of the 1969 Vietnam War Moratorium Committee provides an example of the application of the Leader Based Perspective. Jurma was interested in the rhetorical challenges that moderate movement leaders face. He shows that the leaders of the Moratorium Committee tried to maintain its moderate stance and its identification with the majority of the American people. These leaders believed that their moderate opposition would finally affect their target audience, the Nixon Administration. The Committee disbanded after one year, however, because its leaders could not overcome the rhetorical problems posed by inconsistent followers, disinterested media, and competition from more militant and seemingly dramatic protest groups.

The Leader Based Perspective in movement rhetoric, like the other two models, has been influential. The attraction of this approach may be based on the feeling that rhetorical problems and decisions of movement leaders
are easier to isolate and study than is a movement's
dramatistic life cycle or the complex interactions between
an agitational movement and establishment control.

Application of the Perspectives: Anti-Nuclear Movement

To demonstrate how these three main perspectives in
the theory of social movement rhetoric might be applied to
the same actual movement, I will briefly discuss aspects of
the late-1970's Anti-Nuclear Movement that would be investi­
gated if this movement's rhetoric were studied from each
of the perspectives. This may help to demonstrate the
methods of rhetorical research implied by each of the
approaches.

The Anti-Nuclear Movement of the late 1970's was
primarily opposed to nuclear power. Only towards the end
of its existence as a separate movement did it also start
opposing nuclear weapons. This movement's end, in fact,
coincided with the Reagan Administration's military build­
up. At that point, most members of the movement began to
see nuclear war as a much greater threat even than nuclear
power. Most groups identified with opposition to nuclear
power began instead to oppose either nuclear weapons
specifically or militarism in general.

In spite of its short existence and unspectacular
end, however, the Anti-Nuclear Movement can be seen as very
successful rhetorically. Before this movement, general
public opinion about nuclear energy was very favorable, most people probably seeing it as the power source of the future, potentially inexpensive, clean, and safe. Also, the amount of public and private investment in nuclear energy was increasing very rapidly. By the end of the Anti-Nuclear Movement in the early 1980's, however, public doubts about the safety of nuclear energy were extremely common, and even its supporters would only argue for its alleged necessity rather than its desirability. And the amount of investment and planning for new nuclear plants had dropped to almost zero. Of course, the rhetoric of the Anti-Nuclear Movement cannot be credited with all or even most of this change. The Three Mile Island nuclear accident and the persistent financial problems and cost over-runs at existing nuclear facilities would have had very damaging effects on the nuclear industry in any case. Anti-Nuclear Movement rhetoric, however, provided the roots of the conviction that nuclear power itself creates these problems and is essentially dangerous and unreliable as an energy source.

To approach the rhetoric of the Anti-Nuclear Movement from the Dramatistic/Confrontational Perspective, one would look for instances in which the nuclear industry came to be seen by movement members as symbolizing everything evil and corrupt in American society. These instances were quite common, as local groups often saw the building of nuclear plants in their areas as the work of very powerful govern-
ment and business elites with no concern for common people or the natural order. From the Dramatistic/Confrontational Perspective, this claiming of the natural order for the movement and the naming of nuclear energy as the enemy and the symbol of a corrupt social order is the inception of the movement. The confrontation here was basic, since the movement saw the installation of a new reactor not as a temporary defilement of the natural order, but as a practically eternal one.

Two particular aspects of the rhetoric of the Anti-Nuclear Movement might be particularly interesting to study from the Dramatistic/Confrontational Perspective. First, many professionals and technicians from the nuclear industry left it to join the Anti-Nuclear Movement. Second, this movement exploited the rhetorical effects of civil disobedience effectively. These were both important factors in the Anti-Nuclear Movement. For instance, many of the movement's strongest factual arguments against nuclear energy came from scientists and engineers who had previously supported it. Also, many of the movement's most successful events involved extensive civil disobedience resulting in mass arrests. These aspects are central to the Anti-Nuclear Movement from the Dramatistic/Confrontational Perspective because they represent the greatest degree of polarization between the movement and its establishment opposition. Ex-workers from the nuclear industry often felt guilt or disillusionment about their previous partici-
participation, and protesters being arrested for civil disobedience often saw this as one of the most important steps in their lives.

From the Agression/Control Perspective on movement rhetoric, the most important aspect of the Anti-Nuclear Movement is the dialectic tension created by the movement's attempt to stop nuclear power and to publicize its views. The nuclear industry, in the role of establishment control, tried to overcome the movement's interference and to avoid or suppress its public criticism. The tactics used by the movement and by the nuclear industry would be analyzed and classified along the lines of Bowers and Ochs's theory. To study the Anti-Nuclear Movement from the Aggression/Control Perspective would also involve critically analyzing the movement's effort to convert its potential membership, those people with some sympathy for the movement's goals, into actual membership, or active participants in the movement. Of course, the nuclear industry and its supporters tried to prevent this change from potential to actual membership, and the rhetoric of their pro-nuclear efforts would also be of interest from the Aggression/Control Perspective.

Finally, from the Leader Based Perspective on movement rhetoric, the most significant rhetorical aspects of the Anti-Nuclear Movement would be its leaders' decisions in the face of conflicting requirements between more and less activist members and other community and establishment
groups. These might be interesting studies because the roles of leaders in the Anti-Nuclear Movement were rendered highly problematic by the movement's overall commitment to participatory democracy. Most of the movement's activity occurred in small groups where consensus decision making was the rule. When large events or protests were planned, representatives of the small groups met in larger assemblies. This was the form of the east coast Clamshell Alliance and the west coast Abalone Alliance and Alliance for Survival.

Despite this structure, however, identifiable leaders did arise in the Anti-Nuclear Movement and faced the rhetorical problems of representing their members' interests, presenting an appealing and reasonable public ideology, and negotiating the greatest possible cooperation from potential allies in other groups or in the establishment. One interesting subject for a Leader Based study of the Anti-Nuclear Movement might be the organization of rock concert/rallies. The movement leadership organized these concerts, which often featured popular rock musicians and attracted many thousand people. In the rallies, the rhetoric and ideology of the movement were interspersed between songs and celebrity appearances. Many movement activists, however, felt that the party atmosphere of the concerts did not reflect the seriousness of their opposition to nuclear energy. They resented the leaders' roles in promoting them. This problem was made even worse when it
was found that the rallies were not the very successful money making events they had originally appeared to be.

No one of these perspectives on movement rhetoric can be used to analyze all the rhetoric of a particular movement. As in the Anti-Nuclear Movement, different perspectives can help most in studying different aspects of any movement's rhetoric. In critically examining the rhetoric of any movement, however, each of these three perspectives can provide interesting questions to ask and raise important problems to understand.

Recent Ideas in Theory of Social Movement Rhetoric

In the late 1970's and especially since 1980, the concerns of theorists of social movement rhetoric have involved the nature of movements as a force in any society rather than the explanation of current or recent movements. This shift in focus may have resulted from the fact that the period of extensive movement activity of the late 1960's and early 1970's had ended. Therefore, an understanding of the overall effects of movements in society seemed to be needed. Also, many theorists of social movement rhetoric felt the need to refine their ideas in the face of criticism.

In their attempts to extend the applicability of theories of social movement rhetoric, recent theorists have called for two major changes. First, they have advocated
a more historical approach in movement studies. Second, they have urged that theory of movement rhetoric be applied in cultures with different traditions and structures from those of current American society.

Davis Zarefsky, James R. Andrews, and Ralph R. Smith all have recently advocated a more historical approach in studies of social movement rhetoric. Each suggests a different method of integrating historical accuracy with rhetorical understanding.

Zarefsky takes a skeptical view of most theories of movement rhetoric. Citing his own 1977 study of President Johnson's War on Poverty, he argues that since movements are not rhetorically unique, the emphasis in research on movements should be historical rather than theoretical (252). He claims, "theorists have a shaky basis for regarding 'movement' as a rhetorically significant construct" (252).

Andrews also subordinates the theory of movement rhetoric to the study of its history. Unlike Zarefsky, however, he sees value in theory's capacity to "enrich historical investigations by suggesting lines of inquiry and patterns of interpretation" (280). He claims that, while rhetorical theory of movements is strengthened by historical case studies, the historical study of rhetoric should be independent of theoretical constructs (280).

Smith is also concerned with "The Historical Criticism of Social Movements," but he welcomes contributions from all types of rhetorical theory. He finds dramatistic and
sociological approaches especially useful.

Smith also suggests the other recently prominent theme in rhetorical theory about movements: the thought that the study of this rhetoric should "extend past the limits of Anglo-American culture and recent history to which it has confined itself" (290). That the study of movement rhetoric had confined itself to these limits is shown by Suzanne Volmar Riches and Malcolm O. Sillars in "The Status of Movement Criticism." In this review of studies of movement rhetoric, Riches and Sillars conclude that recent American movements provided the subjects for almost all these critical studies, the few exceptions being British.

Stephen E. Lucas also stresses the importance of studying the rhetoric of movements outside Anglo-American culture. In "Coming to Terms with Movement Studies," however, Lucas warns that cross-cultural movement studies will be difficult work:

Rhetoricians who study Continental or Third World social movements will face the formidable task of mastering cultures and languages different from their own. But until such study is undertaken in earnest, our understanding of social movements will be partial and parochial. (256)

These recent concerns of theorists, that theories of movement rhetoric should not violate historical accuracy and should be applicable across cultural boundaries, promise to be beneficial to rhetorical criticism. The new emphasis
on historical integrity may help theorists and critics avoid the tendency to shape facts about a movement's rhetoric to fit the theories. Also, the call for a cross-cultural approach may eventually lead to the discovery of rhetorical factors that accompany social change in all societies. Interest in historical accuracy and inter-cultural constants could probably enhance criticism done any of the three main perspectives of social movement rhetorical theory, and it could also possibly lead to the creation of a more humanistic and inclusive theory that would use the best aspects of all the current models.
Chapter III: Criticism of Social Movement Rhetoric

A great amount of criticism of the rhetoric produced by movements began to appear in the late 1960's. The production of this criticism continued to be strong until the mid-1970's but has declined steadily since. To show both the nature of this criticism and its relationship to the theories discussed in the previous chapter, I will analyze and review selected critical studies of three movements; Black Power, Women's Liberation, and the Radical Right-Wing. I will attempt to isolate the unique rhetorical aspects of each of these movements. Before discussing them, however, I will briefly explain a few theoretical developments that greatly affected rhetorical criticism in the 1970's, when most of the criticism of these movements was written.

Rhetorical Situation, Genre, and Fantasy Analysis

Besides rhetorical theory developed expressly to deal with social movements, theories of the rhetorical situation, generic criticism, and fantasy theme analysis also greatly affected rhetorical criticism of movements. The situational perspective developed from Lloyd Bitzer's 1968 article, "The Rhetorical Situation." The generic approach to rhetorical criticism arose from several sources. And fantasy theme analysis was first discussed by Ernest Bormann

In Bitzer's theory, the three constituents of a rhetorical situation are an exigence, which is a perceived imperfection subject to modification; an audience which "must be capable of serving as mediator of the change;" and constraints, which are "persons, events, objects and relations which are parts of the situation because they have power to constrain decision and action needed to modify the exigence" (8). Bitzer notes that situations change and may even come into and go out of existence without a rhetorical response. According to Bitzer, however, when a rhetorical situation evokes its fitting response, aesthetic and critical satisfaction will be derived (10).

Bitzer's "The Rhetorical Situation" also helped to define what came to be known as generic rhetorical criticism. This still-developing approach has many other theoretical sources as well, including Edwin Black's Rhetorical Criticism, Kathleen Hall Jamieson's "Generic Constraints and the Rhetorical Situation," and Jamieson and Karlyn Kohrs Campbell's Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action.
Generic criticism uses the literary term, "genre," to apply to groupings of rhetorical utterances sharing similar conditions, tactics, or results (Black 132-35). Jamieson, for instance, argues that antecedent rhetorical forms, "genres," exert constraints along with the current rhetorical situation upon the occurrence and appropriateness of a rhetorical response. Jamieson reasons that members of a rhetorical genre will share important similarities:

If there is an apologetic genre then the Apology of Socrates and the Checkers speech of Richard Nison...should be similar in significant respects. ...When one knows what makes an inaugural an inaugural and not an apology, one has isolated generic characteristics (163).

The generic approach has been specifically applied to social movement rhetoric more often than has the situational approach.

A third major influence on rhetorical criticism in the 1970's and 1980's, fantasy theme analysis, derives mainly from one source, Bormann's 1972 essay "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality." The direct application of this approach to social movement rhetoric may be one of its most important potential uses. Bormann himself mentioned the fantasy theme approach to social movements in his original article, and Sillars claimed, in 1980, that any application of fantasy theme
analysis may be considered a movement study (31).

Structurally, fantasy theme analysis may be seen as a form of dramatism that is independent of Burke's framework, based instead on fantasized self-images that can arise spontaneously in small group interactions. Imagined plots and roles of any type can extend from small group settings to affect and, in some cases, ultimately define social reality. Bormann claims that this occurs when the group fantasy "chains out" to larger publics and finally reaches the rhetorical contexts of "speaker-audience fantasizing and the dream merchants of the mass media" (396). The results of this process, a composite drama of related fantasy themes, is called a "rhetorical vision." Bormann defines a movement as "small group fantasy chains, public fantasy events and a rhetorical vision in a complex and reciprocal set of relationships" (399).

Not all criticism of Black Power rhetoric, Women's Liberation rhetoric, or Right-Wing rhetoric was influenced by situational, generic, or fantasy theme approaches. A great deal of it was, however, the situational approach having its greatest influence in the early 1970's and fantasy theme analysis being most influential in the late 1970's and 1980's. Criticism of Women's Liberation rhetoric was even more affected by these theoretical developments than was that of Black Power rhetoric or Right-Wing rhetoric.
The rhetoric of the Black Power movement developed from the initial use of "Black Power" in 1965-66 as an alternative to the "Freedom Now" slogan of the 1960's civil rights movement. Its early proponents included Floyd McKissick, director of CORE (Congress of Racial Equality) and Stokely Carmichael, leader of SNCC (Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee.) They advocated the use of the Black Power slogan against the wishes of Martin Luther King, who was the recognized leader of the entire civil rights movement. King opposed Black Power on many grounds, but Carmichael, especially, developed the aggressive rhetorical style that came to be linked with Black Power, and he helped to define the movement's goals and demands.

As the Black Power movement gained momentum and strength in the late 1960's, it claimed Malcolm X posthumously as one of its major influences. Stokely Carmichael continued to be the movement's main spokesman through 1969. His successor at SNCC, H. Rap Brown, also attained prominence, reaching large audiences. Other rhetoricians of Black Power, such as Eldridge Cleaver, Huey Newton, and Bobby Seale, produced powerful and influential statements in the late 1960's.

Leadership disputes, competition with more moderate organizations, and official suppression, however, caused the Black Power movement's influence to peak quickly and then...
decline. By the mid-1970's, the rhetoric of Black Power seems to have faded from public consciousness to a great degree. Its demands and passionate oratory had either been forgotten or twisted into such caricatures as those seen in the black exploitation films of that time.

Black Power had very specific time limits as a movement and easily identifiable spokesmen. While it failed to achieve many of its goals, elements that were central to the rhetoric of Black Power continue to appeal to millions of blacks in this country and to give them cultural identification with the continent of Africa and with the entire Third World. Black Power began as a counter-movement to the civil rights movement, but both Black Power's opponents, like King, and its supporters, like Carmichael, realized that they were parts of a larger continuing struggle to create real racial equality. The degree to which the rhetoric of Black Power has influenced this struggle, or will influence it in the future, will determine its real significance.

Much rhetorical criticism of the Black Power movement appeared between 1968 and 1973. Two influential books on Black Power rhetoric, Arthur L. Smith's The Rhetoric of Black Revolution and Scott and Brockriede's The Rhetoric of Black Power, presented important speeches and essays by movement leaders along with rhetorical analyses of their significance. The large amount of rhetorical criticism
generated by Black Power was probably due both to threats of widespread violence inherent in its rhetoric and to the vehement eloquence of such speakers as Carmichael, Brown, and Malcolm X. The conscious attempt of sympathetic scholars to open the curriculum for minority voices may also have contributed to this profusion of rhetorical criticism.

In *The Rhetoric of Black Revolution*, Smith analyzes the topics and strategies of the rhetoric associated with Black Power. He discusses the nature of its intended audience, and he traces its development through a history of black protest that began when "the first slave was chained and sold on the auction block" (72). Smith finds the themes of black revolution to be black unity and community in the face of a common enemy and the recognition of hypocrisy and conspiracy in the rhetoric of white American leaders (43-61). To express these themes, Smith claims that black agitators rely on strategies of vilifying their oppressors, objectifying their enemy as a specific person or institution, mythifying their positions through reliance on black assimilation of the biblical themes of oppression and redemption, and legitimizing their aggressive actions to counter oppression (25-42). Smith describes black audiences as expressionistic and active; he attributes this to its African heritage and its experience of evangelistic Christianity during the time of slavery. He
also claims that these aspects of black audience help shape the style of black revolution rhetoric (63-70).

Smith shows that the revolutionary themes of Black Power have been present but largely ignored in black rhetoric from, at least, the late eighteenth century. He describes some of the more important writers and speakers who expressed these themes. He also analyzes their ideas. Among those whom Smith discusses in detail are David Walker, author of *Appeal to the Colored Citizens of the World* (1830); Charles Lenox Remond, "the first black man to appear regularly on the platform in protest against slavery" (88); and Frederick Douglass, an escaped slave whose anti-slavery oratory "ranks among the highest in the annals of the English speaking world" (96). Among post-slavery black rhetoricians who helped develop revolutionary themes, Smith discusses Marcus Garvey, who called for complete separation of the races and for African nationalism, and W. E. B. DuBois, who rejected Garvey's ideas and was an "intellectual giant of the American black man" (101). Smith claims that themes from all these sources can be found in the rhetoric of Black Power leaders (71-104).

Smith sees the Black Power theme superseding the brotherhood theme of civil rights leaders as a result of the lack of progress in civil rights, its hostile reception from whites, and the belief that brotherhood cannot work when power is unequally divided. In this sense, Black Power is
essential to self-respect for blacks. Smith cites examples of these ideas in the "manhood speeches" of Malcolm X and in the rhetoric of Carmichael, Brown and others (47-50).

Scott and Brockriede's *Rhetoric of Black Power* contains a speech and an autobiographical piece by Martin Luther King, Jr., in which King explains his sympathy with some Black Power leaders but also his opposition to their program. Scott and Brockriede's book also contains speeches by Carmichael, essays on Black Power by James P. Comer and by Charles V. Hamilton and the authors' analysis of various aspects of Black Power rhetoric.

In Chapter Eight of *The Rhetoric of Black Power*, "Stokely Carmichael: Two Speeches on Black Power," Scott and Brockriede analyze speeches given by Carmichael to a black audience in Detroit in July, 1967 and to a white audience in Wisconsin in February, 1967. The two speeches contain the same argument, but their styles are very different. Carmichael is much more animated and dramatic with the black audience. Carmichael defines Black Power as "personal pride in being black, responsibility to other blacks and power as a group to deal with outsiders" (116).

Scott and Brockriede claim that, because of the need to move blacks towards power and self-respect, Carmichael and all Black Power rhetoricians only are really concerned with the black audience.

They also note that the white liberal response to Carmichael and to ideas of Black Power was overwhelmingly
negative due to misrepresentation and misunderstanding of the basic premises involved. They claim that whites could have responded differently by seeing that the need for Black Power does not necessarily mean the rejection of white cooperation. According to Scott and Brockriede, Carmichael's attack on the liberal "god-word," integration, was a result of his commitment to all blacks: "His opposition was to individualized integration which, he argues convincingly, was not an effective antidote to institutionalized racism" (128). Finally, Scott and Brockriede argue that white liberals could have found more positive and peaceful meanings for the term, power, than to assume "with the press and Establishment spokesmen that power means violence" (129).

In Chapter Nine of *The Rhetoric of Black Power,* "Justifying Violence: The Rhetoric of Militant Black Power," Scott continues to examine Black Power rhetoric. He advances three propositions about its approach to violence: first, its threat of violence is real; second, it claims that black violence is justified by white violence; third, it claims that whites need to see the reality of this justification (134). Scott illustrates that violence in Black Power rhetoric appears in contexts of self-defense or unity with anti-imperialist struggles. To emphasize this unity, Black Power advocates often used the metaphor of the black ghetto as a third world colony of the United States.

Scott argues that Black Power rhetoric, with its image
of white society as a unified enemy, while overly simplistic, does have a basis in reality. Scott writes:

I believe we must assume that their rhetoric makes clear the world as it is for many, perhaps most, Black Americans: The ghetto is a colony; the White is the enemy; a racist society is violent. (143)

While Scott concluded that only revolutionary changes could resolve the problems raised by Black Power rhetoric, this rhetoric has passed away without revolutionary changes and, in some instances, without any improvement in ghetto conditions at all. Perhaps the reasons for the failure of the Black Power movement can be seen in Martin Luther King's criticism of Black Power rhetoric.

King opposed Black Power's rejection of white assistance in the civil rights movement, but he was reluctant to take a public stand on Black Power since he sympathized with the frustration and anger of those favoring it. Since King was committed to passive resistance, however, he also abhorred Black Power's willingness to use violence. In his 1967 address to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference Tenth Anniversary Convention, King explicitly rejects the violent stance of Black Power, arguing that the black cause in America would be lost if it lost all white support (Scott and Brockriede, 146-65). In this great speech, however, King does recognize the need for black pride and black self-respect, the needs that motivate Black Power advocates. King's solution was to weld love to power:
Power without love is reckless and abusive, and love without power is sentimental and anemic. Power at its best is love implementing the demands of justice, and justice at its best is power correcting everything that stands against love. 157

For Black Power proponents, however, the themes of power and pride were most important and produced the rhetoric that white society found threatening. Parke G. Burgess, in "The Rhetoric of Black Power: A Moral Demand," analyzes the tensions between freedom and order raised by Black Power rhetoric. Burgess sees American society as naturally partial to order, but claims that it must also be committed to freedom in order to remain democratic. In white America, however, the force of white racism was so strong, according to Burgess, that the civil rights movement's claims to freedom were thwarted or mocked with token changes. Therefore, Burgess claims, Black Power arose to challenge white racism and even to use some of the rhetoric of racism in defense of blacks. He argues that American society should see Black Power as a rhetorical demand that it face the white racism at its heart. Perhaps a more understanding approach to Black Power did arise over time, as white leaders became familiar with its style and learned to feel less threatened.

To examine the effect of Black Power rhetoric upon one of its most important intended audiences, young urban blacks, was the purpose of a study by Richard B. Gregg,
A. Jackson McCormack and Douglas J. Pederson. These authors analyze the interactions during ten lessons of a Black History class taught by a dynamic black teacher to poor black youths and based on the ideology of Black Power. The authors also analyze the youths' interactions with white teachers and with each other. They argue that Black Power rhetoric belongs to the genre, exhortation, since it tells blacks: "You have accepted white perceptions for so long that you believe you are incapable. But your heritage asserts the opposite" (157). Gregg et. al. claim that this rhetoric taught the black students to address their peers more often than before, while it led to their ignoring whites. They also claim that Black Power taught the youths pessimism about white motives but did not lead them to withdraw from discussion about these motives. Gregg et. al. conclude that the white response to the realistic Black Power approach should be a "rhetoric of coexistence," which means "to refrain from acting in kind to the rhetoric of the black man, who is intent on calling his brothers to rally to the objectives of black culture" (160).

In "Socio-Historical Perspectives of Black Oratory," Arthur L. Smith claims that African oral traditions are central to all black rhetoric. He also calls slavery the essential frame in American black history. Smith writes therefore that any public discussion by American blacks on themes, such as "white racism, black pride, freedom, crime, or poverty," deals really with the issue of what can be
made of the slavery experience. Smith claims that, also, religious and musical patterns in black rhetoric reflect both anti-slavery and African oral traditions. These influences are strong in the rhetoric of many Black Power leaders, such as Carmichael and Malcolm X.

Since, even before Marcus Garvey's early twentieth century "Back to Africa" movement, pan-Africanism has been a part of black revolutionary rhetoric. Its importance increased during the years of the Black Power movement, however. Stokely Carmichael emphasized this trend in his 1971 speech at Florida A & M University, where he "insisted blacks must unify worldwide in common cause and all go back to Africa psychologically...because she is rising and America is dying" (Art Pollock, 93). The style and content of this speech by Carmichael may show, however, that the Black Power movement in the United States was already declining, since one of its main spokesmen had turned away from advocating direct action at home.

Arguing that the chief purpose of Black Power rhetoric was to change the self-image of black Americans, Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, in "The Rhetoric of Radical Black Nationalism," discusses how this rhetoric defined terms. The right to use language creatively, she claims, is more important than is the formal logic of arguments. As an example of this importance in Black Power rhetoric, Campbell discusses rejection of the term, "Negro," in favor of the term, "Black:"

"Negro" is the name given them by whites, "Black" is
the name they choose for themselves, "Negroes" are the descendents of the house Negroes of the plantation who loved their masters..."Blacks" are the descendents of field Negroes who were beaten and abused, hated their masters, and were in turn hated and feared by them. (156)

The same demand for the right to define terms can be seen in Malcolm X's rejection of the idea of black racism. Campbell gives Malcolm's argument that black violence in response to white violence should not be called racism, but that white violence to blacks because of hatred of their color must not be called anything else (157). Campbell claims that the goal of Black Power rhetoric is a situation of language "in which a confrontation between equals can occur" (156).

Using a functional approach, Marilyn Van Graber lists nine argumentative principles which, she claims, are vital in Black Power rhetoric. First, "Probably the most obvious characteristic of Black Power is its 'now' quality," in that it rejects promises of future actions. Second, Black Power demands rights but rejects integration. Third, the sense of building a community permeates its rhetoric. A fourth principle is that "Black is beautiful." Fifth, the white man is characteristically a hypocrite in Black Power rhetoric. The sixth basic principle claims black independence: "White help is not needed; white interference is not tolerated" (216). Seventh, personal relationships with
leaders are not desired because, eighth, the white establishment is not seen as represented by real persons. Ninth, and finally, Van Graber claims the Black Power rhetoricians "make it a practice never to ask, to request, to entreat. They demand" (217). Van Graber's principles do seem essential to most rhetoric of the Black Power movement. They represent, however, both its strength, in their giving identity and self-respect to black advocates, and its weakness, in their disregard for the really overwhelming disparity in power between blacks and whites in America.

In a 1981 essay, "Black Power and Ego-Defensiveness: A Study in the Rhetoric of Despair," Diane C. Mader looks back on the era of the Black Power movement. Examining the rhetoric of Carmichael, H. Rap Brown, Eldridge Cleaver, and Malcolm X, Mader finds these leaders to express ego-defensiveness and fear more than power and action. She claims also, probably rightly, that the Black Power movement failed to improve the conditions of blacks. While Martin Luther King had predicted the ultimate failure of Black Power, he had also recognized the needs of black Americans for self-respect, identity and the power of love. His own rhetoric, up until his murder, stressed these topics to an ever greater degree. Self-respect and pride continue today as central themes in the rhetoric of black equality in America. But the present leaders of the black movement no longer use Black Power rhetoric to a great extent because of its inherent weaknesses, such as those identified by
Mader, passivity and defensiveness under the cloak of aggressiveness and power.

Women's Liberation

In contrast to Black Power, the Women's Liberation movement that began in the late 1960's worked to achieve many different rhetorical goals and used a variety of rhetorical styles. Woman's Liberation also covers a larger time period and continues into the present. In the late 1960's and early 1970's, however, this movement produced its most distinctive and famous rhetoric. Rhetorical criticism of the modern Women's Liberation movement began appearing around 1970 and continues still.

Two branches or strands originally composed the Women's Liberation movement. The first branch was made up mostly of older, professional women, who became concerned about the lack of progress in women's status resulting from the creation of presidential and state commissions in the early 1960's. When this branch formed the National Organization for Women in 1966, they made the first new national feminist group in fifty years. NOW, and the similar organizations which soon formed, worked hard for legislative action to bring women equality under the law. The second branch of the Women's movement, composed mostly of younger college women, met together in small, non-sexist, creative groups and used the technique of consciousness-raising.
in their attempt to achieve the powerful experience called sisterhood (Freeman, 543-56).

Although the two strands of Women's Liberation remained separate, they depended upon each other a great deal. The younger strand, which expanded rapidly through the use of organizational experience gained from its members' new left backgrounds, was creative and broadly based. Compared to NOW, however, it was politically impotent. This lack of political power was due partly to the rejection by many members of the small groups of ideas of formal structure and, especially, leadership. On the other hand, NOW and other large groups in the older branch of the movement recruited many new members in the early 1970's, when some of their programs began showing success. They continued to depend upon the experimental and critical approach of the younger branch to give them new ideas and a sense of identity, however (Freeman, 543-56).

While the term, Women's Liberation, is used much less frequently today, many groups still represent both branches of the movement. NOW has become a politically influential organization, for instance, and radical women groups still function on college campuses and in communities. Over the years, however, both branches have dealt with challenging internal problems and have faced strong external opposition. Internally, controversies about lesbianism, pornography, reproductive rights, and racism have tested the movement's strength. The "gay-straight split" was especially damaging,
many lesbians claiming that heterosexual women could not really be feminists (Ferree and Hess, 104-111). This was a form of "trashing" the darker side of consciousness-raising, which was also often turned against women who seemed to be leaders, intellectuals, or "media stars" (Freeman, 550-56). Externally, the movement had to face increasingly strong right-wing opposition, which finally succeeded in stopping the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment, in spite of NOW's total effort in its support. Nevertheless, the Women's Liberation movement brought about many important changes in American society. Ferree and Hess claim that some of these changes are so profound that, like the idea that men and women should be paid equally for doing the same job, they now seem natural, but, paradoxically, the Women's movement is not given credit for them (183).

I will discuss criticism concerning two phases of rhetoric stimulated by the Women's Liberation movement. First, I will examine criticism evoked by the distinctive rhetoric of the movement's beginnings and attempt to define its unique qualities. Second, and more briefly, I will discuss the rhetoric of STOP ERA and other groups composing the rightist backlash to Women's Liberation.

Margaret B. McDowell, in "The New Rhetoric of Woman's Power," attempts to answer the question: "What types of rhetoric...can currently be defined or categorized in the Women's Movement" (188)? In this 1971 article, she lists
four groups advocating improvement in women's status: militant and non-militant liberationists, members of large formal groups (such as NOW) and women in public and private bureaucracies working for change from within. Militant liberationists, according to McDowell, make radical demands for socialism, change in family structure, and, occasionally, communal or lesbian life-styles. McDowell claims also that they use the most vehement and colorful rhetoric of the four groups. As examples, she quotes Ti-Grace Atkinson's response when asked to define marriage, "'Rape and slavery,'" and tells of the Women's International Terrorist Conspiracy from Hell (WITCH) chanting at a New York bridal fair, "'Here come the slaves/ Off to their graves'" (192-93). McDowell finds that non-militant liberationists, however, are much more reluctant to engage in public controversy. Instead, they define and spread their views through the consciousness-raising process. Secrecy also comes from this process, however, since members use it to disclose personal feelings trusting in group protection. McDowell calls this a "contradictory aspect which makes... rhetoric particularly difficult to study" (194). Members of large groups, such as NOW, are more likely, according to McDowell, to use newspaper articles or formal interviews for rhetorical purposes. In these they usually stress the harmful effects of discriminatory laws and regulations. Finally, McDowell claims that women in bureaucracies have similar concerns to those of NOW women. They try to affect the organizations they
have entered and to open the way for more women (196).

The younger, loosely organized strand of the movement was sometimes called the Women's Liberation Front. Louise McPherson contrasts the WLF's opposition to sex role stereotypes with NOW's concern for legislation. She calls the WLF "an amorphous organization" with many small cells with no officers or member lists (34). She also analyzes both the internal and external rhetorics of these groups.

As internal communication, according to McPherson, the WLF used consciousness-raising to help women improve their images of themselves and to question the validity of common sex roles. She claims that consciousness-raising, carried out in leaderless encounter groups, limited the comments of the most vocal women and encouraged the contribution of the least talkative. In this atmosphere, self-disclosure eventually taught women "to see the common problems of their sex—a general system of oppression of women" (34). Internal communication of the WLF also involved the study of current feminist theory and literature.

McPherson claims that external rhetoric from the WLF began when a group developed enough solidarity and confidence to reach out to other groups and to pick an issue on which to work. She mentions four specific types of issues on which these groups could challenge sex role stereotypes: change in the definition of women as sex objects, change in the concept of the nuclear family, repeal of restrictions on abortion and establishment of public child care. While the
WLF would not work on these issues through the established mass media because of the belief that they depict distorted sex roles, it did favor direct communication through the creation of alternative media. McPherson claims that, except for a few large monthly magazines, such as Ms., these voices of Women's Liberation were "without leaders and staffed in the same structureless manner as the cells that establish them" (36). As an exception to the rule against rhetorical use of mass media, McPherson mentions the use of "flashy actions...violating the reality structure" to parody sex roles (36).

McPherson concludes, however, that efforts to change social attitudes are not usually successful unless changes in the social structure precede them. She implies, therefore, that the legislative efforts of NOW were more effective than was the social criticism of WLF rhetoric. One cannot really separate the two strands of the movement, however.

"The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron" by Karlyn Kohrs Campbell was an important article both for its insights into Liberation rhetoric and for its use of generic criticism. In it, Campbell argues that the style and substance of Women's Liberation, being unique, constitute an independent rhetorical genre. She writes that the substance of this rhetoric is distinctive because its seemingly moderate demands (legal, economic, and sexual equality for women), being intimately related to the structure of society,
are really very radical. In this sense, "the option to be moderate and reformist is simply not available to women's liberation advocates" (77). Campbell claims that its stylistic features also make Women's Liberation rhetoric unique. This rhetoric, she writes, rejects ideas of group persuasion by expert individuals and speaker conformance to audience norms, claiming that these models reflect aspects of the sexist system. Instead, Campbell claims, Liberation rhetoric embraces the leaderless consciousness-raising model and a self-conscious, self-critical approach which permeates all its speeches, articles, and books (81). Campbell argues also that, since Women's Liberation must challenge socially defined reality, its rhetoric relies upon "attack metaphors," such as the actions of WITCH and SCUM (Society for Cutting Up Men) or such assertions as that the lesbian or the prostitute is the prototype of the liberated woman. Campbell calls this strategy "transforming devil terms into god terms" (82). Considering rhetorical theories, Campbell concludes that the Dramatistic/Confrontational approach may be most helpful in explaining Women's Liberation rhetoric (83).

Also using Griffin's Dramatistic approach, Barbara R. Hancock, in "Affirmation by Negation in the Women's Liberation Movement," gives a compelling explanation of Women's Liberation rhetoric. Hancock traces the radical elements in the movement back to the mid-1960's, when women in the new left began to find it "male-dominated" with traditional
expectations for women "to cook, type and have sexual relations on demand" (264). Hancock identifies saying "No" to this sexist order as the central fact of liberation rhetoric. The first step in this negation, she claims, involves "Naming the Enemy," and naming occurred when these began to identify men as oppressors rather than to identify capitalism as their main enemy (266). In naming their enemy, liberationists released great anger, of which groups like SCUM and WITCH are examples. Anger was followed, however, by catharsis and guilt about their former participation in the sexist system. In turn, Hancock claims, a new positive identity began to emerge: "Naming the enemy is important not only in isolating the movement's victim, but also in giving women identity as the antithesis of men" (268).

Hancock calls the rhetoric that emerged from this formation of a new identity "the pro-woman line" (268). It claims that women are centrally vital in the effort to achieve a just and humane society. The pro-woman line also rejects power relationships and all negativism about women. In its "negation of 'masculine' characteristics," the pro-woman line also worked to limit the emergence of "stars" in the movement (270).

While both naming the enemy and the pro-woman line met with extremely hostile reactions, especially from men of the new left and Black Power movements, Hancock mentions Griffin's rule that the strength of the reaction helps to define a movement. She concludes that much of the rhetoric
of Women's Liberation, while seeming only man-hating and negative, served the positive functions of asserting women's identities and raising their self-image. She sees a conflict, however, between the negation of men and the egalitarian humanism of the new self-image created by the pro-woman line (271).

Also examining the rhetorical origins of Women's Liberation, Marie J. Rosenwasser, in "Rhetoric and Progress of the Women's Liberation Movement," claims that images of anger, commitment, and solidarity dominate the movement's early rhetoric. She gives examples of these images from the writings of Ti-Grace Atkinson and Robin Morgan and claims that such books as Shulamith Firestone's The Dialectic of Sex, Germaine Greer's The Female Eunuch, and Kate Millit's Sexual Politics give "the Movement increased rhetorical substance" (50).

Rosenwasser maintained that in 1972 the Women's movement had brought about real changes and that rapid conversion of new members was taking place. She noted such things as equal employment, modification of sexist language usage, the founding of Ms. magazine and the organization of the National Women's Political Caucus as examples of changes produced by the movement. Rosenwasser concluded, however, that the movement still had a long way to go before it could attain complete acceptance of its goals. Using the Agitation/Control theory of Bowers and Ochs, she wrote: "The 'establishment' remains high in rhetorical sophis-
tication and actual and potential members; it will not acquiesce easily to the demands of the Movement" (53).

Ti-Grace Atkinson's rhetoric helped to define the radical branch of the Women's Liberation movement. In a 1973 interview with Beatrice Reynolds, Atkinson discusses her approach to audiences inside and outside of the movement. Explaining a series of speeches and papers written from 1967 to 1969 on such subjects as abortion, "Vaginal Orgasm as a Mass Hysterical Survival Response," "The Institution of Sexual Intercourse," "Radical Feminism and Love," prostitution and pornography, and "Lesbianism and Feminism," Atkinson describes her method as always being very personal with an audience. She claims, however, always to decide rhetorical strategies, such as whether or not to answer questions after a speech, based upon the political situation involved. Atkinson claims also that she always tries to reach an audience's most vulnerable spot. For instance, when she wrote "Radical Feminism and Love" for a women's college newspaper, she "chose to write about love because I tried to figure out the one thing...that young girls are hanging onto. They are either in love or are looking to fall in love. So that was their jugular..." (6). In her delivery of the "Vaginal Orgasm" speech as another example, Atkinson attempted to politicize sex:

the language was designed to have that effect—the violence of the language. I used sexual language. People said to me, "You used obscen-
ities," and I said, "No, I just used terminology adequate to describe the conditions." (5)

Diane Schaich Hope, in her 1975 comparison of Women's Liberation and Black Power rhetorics, attempts to show the rhetorical similarities and differences between the two. Hope finds the most important similarity to be that both movements try to change their self-definitions through rhetoric, to cast off their social definitions as "non-persons" or "outsiders" and to define themselves (18). She notes, however, three basic rhetorical differences between the two movements: first, their central metaphors about each other; second, the nature of their audiences; and, third, the counter-rhetorics they stimulated.

Hope sees the recurrent "Woman as Nigger" metaphor in Women's rhetoric as an attempt to ignore white women's racism, but also as an attempt to overcome it and identify with another oppressed group (19). She finds a "Woman as Property" metaphor, denying women's identities, however, inherent in much rhetoric of Black Power. As examples of this, she cites the non-entity status of the women murder victims in Richard Wright's novel, Native Son, and Eldridge Cleaver's unrepentent confession, in Soul on Ice, that he had raped both black and white women. Hope sees this example as especially significant since Cleaver's book appeared when he was a kind of "culture hero," "but his rapist history evidently involved little risk of alienation from his audience" (20).
Hope also claims that the lack of a pre-existing audience is a significant difference between Women's Liberation and Black Power rhetorics. While blacks may be separated by geographical, sociological, and physical barriers, she argues that they at least know themselves to be a specific group with distinctive needs and problems. Women's Liberation rhetoricians, she claims, did not have this power base. In addition to all the other barriers, they also had to deal with the fact that most women live in intimate relationships with husbands, fathers, or male employers, who are conscious or unconscious representatives of the class that oppresses women. Therefore, Hope claims, Liberation rhetoricians faced great obstacles to the development of a group identity for women.

Finally, Hope argues that no real counter-rhetoric to Women's Liberation was created as it had been in opposition to Black Power. She differentiates mere sexist backlash, such as Abbie Hoffman's statement, "The only alliance I would make with Women's Liberation is in bed;" or Stokely Carmichael's, "The only position for women in SNCC is prone," from a real counter-rhetoric (22). She argues that the establishment really met Women's Liberation with silence, which could be taken as a threatening sign of anger or as a mark of respect (23).

The real strength of the counter movement to Women's Liberation, however, became apparent in the late 1970's, when large groups of women, claiming to be both traditional
and happy, united in opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment. This opposition appeared to be towards what fantasy theme critics would call the entire rhetorical vision of Women's Liberation. Martha Solomon and Sonja K. Foss separately analyzed the rhetoric of these women opponents of Women's Liberation.

In one of the few applications of literary criticism to movement rhetoric, "The Positive Woman's Journey: A Mythic Analysis of the Rhetoric of STOP ERA," Solomon uses Northrop Frye's mythos of the romantic quest to compare Phyllis Schafly's STOP ERA rhetoric with John Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress. She contends that STOP ERA pictures "the Positive Woman" as one on a journey toward fulfillment, one who suffers willingly on her way and is wise enough to reject the deceptive appeals of ideas like Women's Liberation. The "Woman as Hero" in this myth is also the pillar of society, a privileged and protected person with a nurturing power over the future. Against this image, ERA supporters are seen in this myth as of two types: idle middle-class women out for psychological kicks in defiance of natural order and freeloaders who fail to do their duty to provide for women (268-70). The ERA itself is not seen as "a straightforward guarantee of basic rights for females, but, instead, an octopus-like encroachment into the lives of everyone" (271).

Solomon finds the rhetorical power of this myth to be great since it fulfills mystical, cosmological, sociological,
and psychological functions for those women who accept it. Psychologically, in particular, the myth reaffirms women's own self-images as nurturing and loving. It relieves self-doubt caused by Women's Liberation's creation of potentially expanded self-hood. It also allows clear identification of heroes (themselves) and villains (feminists). Solomon claims that the inability of ERA supporters "to create such a compelling vision may be the source of much of their political frustration" (274).

In a later article, "Stopping ERA: A Pyrrhic Victory," (published in 1983 after the deadline for ERA ratification had passed), Solomon further analyzes the rhetoric of the anti-ERA movement. She claims that STOP ERA leaders portray themselves as divinely ordained to create a movement that "highlights an order in the universe, mandated by God, manifested in nature and sanctioned by tradition" (110). STOP ERA rhetoric claims that woman is designed by God to be a mother. Therefore, her family roles are essential to insuring the social order and should be maintained by law. STOP ERA rhetoric links religion with science by stressing the divine origin of biological differences between the sexes, Solomon claims; and "From this perspective, dissatisfaction or deviation from stereotypical roles becomes very difficult to rationalize" (114). Also STOP ERA gives its followers a sense of community, "a vision of stability and structure, ...The foundation of an order in religion and biology creates a continuity across time" (114). It allows its
followers to feel unity with women of all times and places.

In spite of the tremendous support it gives its members, however, Solomon finds STOP ERA and its leaders to be "dangerous anomalies in society" (110). Their rhetoric she calls "unnecessarily personalized and vitriolic," picturing ERA proponents as exclusively "government employees... homosexuals and lesbians... and radical groups," and claiming that ERA passage would be "a chaotic perversion of the normal order" (112-13). Solomon claims that, among other harmful effects, ERA rhetoric:

- contributed to devisiveness, suspicion and bitterness... polarized and alienated large groups of women from each other... overemphasized the differences between women and men... (and) encouraged a vision of narrowness and intolerance. (116)

Foss also analyzes the rhetoric of ERA opponents from a perspective similar to that of Solomon. Foss argues that ERA's proponents and opponents operate from different world views generated by their rhetoric and transcending the specific issues that ERA raises. Foss sees these world views as created in the fantasy theme chaining described by Bormann. In this process, "the concept of rhetorical vision... extends the fantasy theme to the level of social movements" (277).

Foss shows stark contrast between the two world views. ERA supporters see themselves as part of a large majority, working for women, representing them and helping them share
the benefits of democracy. They perceive the opponents of ERA as missocialized, sexist men and brainwashed women of the far right (280). Foss argues that, on the other hand, opponents of ERA see woman's natural place to be in the home. They see ERA as threatening natural social roles and causing change much too rapidly. ERA opponents also see themselves as representing true women, but, according to Foss, they see its supporters as deviant and communistic (284-86). Foss concludes that the emergence of opposing world views limits the possibility of common ground between the two groups: "Each side's rhetoric is not only a threat to the other's way of making sense of the world, but also a reason to defend strongly their particular world" (288).

Two recent critical articles about Women's Liberation rhetoric help to place the movement's early controversies in the perspective of its overall aims and effects. These essays, one by Becky Swanson Kroll and the other by Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, also help to understand the changes in this rhetoric, as some of the movement's goals were achieved and, on the other hand, as stronger opposition to the movement and social entrenchment against it developed.

Kroll, in "From Small Group to Public View: Mainstreaming the Women's Movement," analyzes, also using the fantasy theme approach, the rhetoric produced by the women's movement of Minnesota's Twin Cities between 1967 and 1977. She examines the use of rhetorical roles, such as "hero/ine" and villian, to apply to social groups, activists, estab-
lishments and establishment figures, and particular events in fantasy created plots. Kroll finds that a shift took place in the early 1970's from the pro-woman line of small group consciousness-raising to a more activist "main-streaming" rhetoric (146). She claims that the early rhetoric of the small groups defined roles narrowly, making heroes/heroines, villians and plots very clear, but also limiting the field of possible action. Main-streaming rhetoric, however, defines roles and plots more broadly. Therefore, it allows such activities as coalition-forming, compromise, support for establishment politicians, and the use of mass media. Kroll claims that the new rhetoric, while allowing the movement "to overcome the weaknesses of the original rhetoric..., dilutes the potency and power of the earlier pro-woman line" (146).

In "Feminism and Feminity: To Be or Not To Be a Woman," Campbell argues that the goal of every movement is to eliminate the conditions that created it. She says that a conflict between the concepts, "womanhood" and "personhood," was the real cause of both the nineteenth-century women's movement and modern Women's Liberation. Campbell claims that these two women's movements are rhetorically identical, and, therefore, the modern movement can learn from the mistakes of the earlier one. In particular, while both movements used consciousness-raising to resolve the conflicts between "personhood" and "womanhood," Campbell claims that the earlier movement finally made the error of
defining "womanhood" as a "nobler state" than that of men, which led to the racism and classism inherent in nineteenth-century feminism (101-103).

In modern Women's Liberation, however, Campbell sees the opposite kind of rhetorical mistake. While the modern movement correctly recognized true "personhood" as its ultimate goal, it rejected the concept, "womanhood," too vehemently and with too little rhetorical justification. Campbell claims that the movement thereby alienated traditional women and left itself open to right-wing attacks (107).

The rhetoric of the Women's Liberation movement continues to play an important role in American society. Its vitality as a rhetorical form seems to be based upon two somewhat contradictory facts. First, it has proved to be an effective rhetoric, since many of its goals have been reached resulting in important social changes. Second, the conditions that provided the arguments, audiences, and purposes of Women's Liberation rhetoric still exist to a degree great enough that it remains a powerful form.

The Radical Right

The Radical Right-Wing in America is too fragmented to be truly described as a social movement. The rhetoric of the Right-Wing can be criticized as movement rhetoric, however, since many of the groups composing the Right have similar basic characteristics to movement groups. For
instance, they need to recruit and organize new members and to promote the perception of themselves as oppressed by the larger social system.

Most Right-Wing groups employ a rhetoric expressing what Richard Hofstadter called "The Paranoid Style in American Politics," which he discussed in an essay with that title. The paranoid style can be found in any extremist rhetoric, but, according to Hofstadter, it is historically most closely identified with that of the Right. Hofstadter lists four elements of the paranoid style: first, a vast conspiracy moves history; second, the enemy is a perfect model of evil; third, only a life-and-death effort could possibly overcome this enemy; and, fourth, the political paranoid is prepared to wage this war (25-39). The style of political paranoia seems essential to Right-Wing rhetoric. In fact, while the Right itself is diverse and amorphous as a movement, its rhetoric seems very simple, little more than variations on the paranoid theme. The style of political paranoia most often expresses itself in religious contexts. Some conspiracy theories, in fact, even claim to be able to trace the sources of current political conflicts back to Lucifer's original rebellion against God (Lipset and Raab, 281).

While Right-Wing groups, to maintain their thrust and momentum, must see themselves as oppressed victims of a hostile society corrupted by a communistic conspiracy, in fact they are not oppressed. Seymour M. Lipset and Earl
Raab, in *The Politics of Unreason: Right-Wing Extremism in America, 1790-1977*, provide comprehensive evidence that these groups have usually been popular and influential in the U. S. They also show that the members and leaders of these organizations have not been drawn from the poorest and least educated sectors of society, but usually from the well-off and highly educated. Business executives, physicians, military officers and police, for instance, made up a large part of the John Birch Society. Especially interesting is the fact that Lipset and Raab found advancement in military rank to be positively correlated with the adherence to right-wing views (306-25).

While Right-Wing rhetoric may claim that the Right is the only part of society that stands for its true principles, it still identifies itself with the preservation of the current society. This contrasts with other movement rhetoric, in which the present society is seen as oppressive and a new just order is the goal. In other words, Right-Wing rhetoric does not attempt to bring about a new society, but to remove the new unwanted elements that have infiltrated the old one. In this sense, all Right-Wing rhetoric can be seen as counter-rhetoric to social movements and social change.

The rhetoric of the Right appears in many forms, contexts, and levels of intensity. I will first try to isolate some of its main themes, which can be most clearly seen in extremist rhetoric. Then I will discuss its expression in
more moderate forms in specific movements or other social contexts.

Illustrating some of the politically paranoid aspects of Right-Wing rhetoric, Barnet Baskerville, in "The Cross and the Flag: Evangelists of the Far Right," analyzes the rhetoric of three prominent Rightist preachers of the early 1960's, Billy James Hargis, Carl McIntire, and Dr. Charles Woodbury. He finds that Communism is personified and identified with all evil in their rhetoric. These evangelists "admit of no middle ground" (203). To them, those not fighting against Communism must be actively supporting it. They consistently link their fundamentalist religion and anti-Communism, citing Biblical authority and prophecy to claim that their ideas are ordained by God. Baskerville notes, "There is present always in the exhortations of these right-wing evangelists...a terrible urgency" (204). Baskerville found that the rhetoric of the religious Right lacked specific programs or hopes of final victory. Right-Wing rhetoric seems to have changed on these issues, however, and definite political action agendas, supported by apocalyptic visions of absolute triumph, have become common.

In "The Second Persona," Edwin Black analyzes the use of the "Communism as Cancer" metaphor in the rhetoric of the Radical Right. Black claims that the cancer metaphor is very pervasive in this rhetoric but almost absent in the rhetoric of liberals or of the left. Using examples from
Robert Welch's *Blue Book of the John Birch Society*, Black tries to show that cancer is metaphorically "a homicidal extension of one's own body" (116). Also, since many people see cancer as essentially incurable and as "probably the most terrifying affliction commonly known," its use as a metaphor powerfully envisions "an organismic view of the state" threatened by mortal illness (116-17). Black also claims that our society irrationally and unconsciously blames cancer on "a morally responsible agent" and associates it with guilt (117-18).

From these characteristics of the cancer metaphor, Black infers that the ideal audience for the Radical Right, the people their rhetoric really addresses, have personality traits that respond to the metaphor's appeal. He describes a member of this audience as someone who is ambivalent about his own body, fearing it will turn against him, and careless about the future, feeling that he is already doomed. Black also claims that this person will be intensely individualistic in economics and ideology, but conformist in behavior and style. Finally, Black claims, this ideal audience member will be driven by unconscious guilt to embrace irrational, destructive religions (118-19).

In "The Psycho-Pathology of Style: The Case of Right-Wing Rhetoric," J. Halverson also analyzes Welch's *Blue Book of the John Birch Society*. He finds that Right-Wing rhetoric uses two central metaphors for Communism, its main enemy. Halverson, like Black, finds the cancer metaphor to
be pervasive, but he finds that Communism is also metaphorically identified as an inhuman beast, usually an octopus with arms reaching everywhere. In either case, however, cancer or beast, Right-Wing rhetoric pictures Communism as a single terribly threatening organism (102).

From this metaphorical singularity and threat, Halverson speculates that under the fear of Communism in Right-Wing rhetoric lies the fear of what is really the single unconquerable controller of our lives: death. Therefore, Right-Wing rhetoric represents "the primitive wish to destroy death" (104). Halverson uses the history of Nazi Germany to show how this fear influenced Nazi rhetoric:

It was not sufficient to liquidate the Communists, for somehow the threat persisted; the Jews had to be destroyed also, and then all "inferior races," and then--The process has no logical termination, except in universal death, for only then can there be no death (105).

Halverson argues that the message of Right-Wing rhetoric may not cause such violence as lynchings or police riots, but that the latent fantasy of its style, "fed by the unconscious logic of killing death," can cause these events (106).

Halverson's approach to the John Birch Society, to analyze its style for psycho-pathological origins, seems to identify the Society's basic motives. This approach might also be useful for understanding other groups that identify themselves with opposition to an ideology or other group of
people. I agree with Halverson's assertion that death is the ultimate enemy which these movements attempt to overcome. To closed minds, death may represent all that is unknown. They unconsciously try to distance death by eliminating the unknown and foreign. The sickness of this effort lies in its disregard for the unity between life and death and between the familiar and the unknown.

Phillip C. Wander, in "The John Birch and Martin Luther King Symbols in the Radical Right," ignores who Birch and King really were, examining instead their symbolic meanings in Right-Wing rhetoric. Birch, for instance, whose life was so obscure that only Welch among the twelve founders of the John Birch Society had previously heard of him, came to be seen in examples of Right-Wing rhetoric as the first victim in a war with Communism or, as Wander puts it, "a fallen martyr in the war between the forces of darkness and the forces of light." While Wander is satirizing this rhetoric, he provides many examples from Birch Society literature to show that Birch's death, in Rightist rhetoric, drew the lines of conflict "in the great political-religious drama of our time" (6-7).

While the John Birch symbol was used chiefly by the John Birch Society, Wander claims, King was vilified by the entire Right. Analyzing Radical-Right rhetoric from both before and after King's assassination, Wander concludes that, as a Right-Wing symbol, King was a tool of the Communist conspiracy. His goal was violence and revolution,
and his apparent non-violence was only a clever form of provocation. This rhetoric claims that King was really killed by his Communist bosses when he began to lose his effectiveness. It claims they killed him because his death would be blamed on "anti-Communists," thereby creating an apparent martyr and aiding in the progress of "Communist (civil rights) legislation" (6-8). As for the civil rights movement itself: "It was obviously about revolution. It was, in fact, about Communist revolution. But it didn't begin in Selma. It began in Moscow" (Scott Stanley Jr., quoted in Wander, 9).

Wander concludes that the Right's rhetorical appeal lies in its simplistic world view. It resolves complex social problems by recasting them in the light of Good against Evil, clearly defining Evil as Communism. Wander sees this rhetoric as anti-intellectual and dangerous, completely lacking self-examination, qualification, or reinterpretation of positions. In these respects, Right-Wing rhetoric is the polar opposite of the rhetoric of Women's Liberation.

Dale C. Leathers argues that the persuasive appeals of American Rightist rhetoric can best be understood in relation to the beliefs and disbeliefs of those who foster it. He claims, in fact, that the belief-disbelief system of the Radical Right creates a "communicative vacuum," since it will not allow those who possess it to listen to the arguments of the other side. Believing it to be wrong
to learn about systems which are dangerous or incorrect, the reactionary argues and "feels most strongly about what he knows least" (129). Leathers also claims that, unable to learn about what he or she opposes, the reactionary cannot distinguish among other systems either and tends to see them all together as a monolithic and consistently predictable enemy. By believing his own position to be unassailable, and even that it is evil to doubt it, "Almost invariably the reactionary attacks the beliefs of others rather than supporting his own" (131).

In "The Rhetoric of Conservative Resistance," Barbara Warnick identifies a genre of movement rhetoric which shares some, but not all, of the Right-Wing themes. The conservative resistance movement, according to Warnick, arises as a counter-movement to some proposed change or reform, which is seen as a threat to personal identity or status. Conservative resistance rhetoric, she claims, quickly adopts a moralistic stance that rejects rational argument or compromise (257).

As an example of a conservative resistance movement, Warnick analyzes the rhetoric involved in the 1974 West Virginia textbook protest. This issue received national attention for its violence and bitterness, as the majority of adults in Kanawha County unified in opposition to the adoption of an elementary school textbook series, which they felt undermined their own traditional values and social perceptions. In this struggle, which they finally lost,
the protest rhetoric rejected efforts towards reconciliation or compromise and projected an image of the protesters as defenders of traditional Western morals and social identities (265-72).

Also analyzing the rhetoric of a single-issue conservative resistance movement, Randall Lake, in "Order and Disorder in Anti-Abortion Rhetoric," finds anti-abortion rhetoric to manifest Kenneth Burke's dramatistic cycle. In Burke's theory, a Fall or descent into disorder made necessary by Guilt is followed by Redemption, the return ascent to order. Only the sacrifice of another in a Victimage can make Redemption possible, however. In anti-abortion rhetoric, according to Lake, the Guilt is sexual guilt; disorder is abortion itself; and the victims are women, whose sacrifice through forced childbearing can redeem society and men. Lake reasons that it is this mythical form which creates the complete rejection of compromise found in some anti-abortion rhetoric. For instance, many anti-abortionists refuse to make exceptions for rape victims or cases in which childbirth could endanger the mother's life. According to Lake, these exceptions are unallowable because they would let women escape their Victimage and make Redemption impossible. While Lake uses a Burkean dramatistic approach, he concentrates on complex psychological factors rather than the dialectic between movement and society, which is the focus of the Dramatistic/Confrontational Perspective that I discussed earlier.
While the rhetoric of single-issue conservative resistance movements, such as anti-abortion, exhibits only a few of the Radical Right-Wing themes, such as a Manichaean moral vision and a distrust of rational discussion, the recently prominent types of politicized fundamentalist religion use many more. Charles Conrad argues that the appeal of these religions, in particular Jerry Falwell's Moral Majority, lies in their romantic form, which invites their audiences to participate in a world of simplified moral constructs, thus being lifted out of the dangerous and morally ambiguous real world. Using Northrop Frye's description of romantic form (*The Secular Scripture*, 50-53), Conrad discusses the merging in Moral Majority rhetoric of Right-Wing ideology with the Protestant ethic. In the mythology that emerges, America is seen as heroically attempting to regain lost values "in a quest for political freedom and moral principle" (169). Unfortunately, however, democracy is not essential in this myth:

In the idyllic world envisioned by Moral Majority rhetoric, all "moral" citizens will be allowed free and open access to government. Since the values they hold are inherently good and since humanistic values are inherently evil, the advocates of righteousness will always have a fair and justifiable advantage. (165)

To claim that official U. S. government policies may exhibit the same rhetorical themes as Right-Wing
movements may seem extreme, but Phillip C. Wander, in "The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy," argues strongly that some do. If one considers Lipset and Raab's analysis of Right-Wing influence in post-World War II America, especially among the military, however, the conclusion that the Right shaped American foreign policy should not be too surprising. Lipset and Raab, in fact, give examples of the Right-Wing origins of some aspects of this policy (The Politics of Unreason, Chapters 3, 4, and 5).

Wander explains two argumentative forms which he claims dominate American foreign policy rhetoric. The first, which he calls "prophetic dualism," closely resembles Hofstadter's idea of "political paranoia," in that it completely divides the world into two camps, our side representing law and the other Communistic disorder (341-42). From the viewpoint of "prophetic dualism," for instance, "Korea was not a war, but a 'police action' designed to uphold the law" (344). Wander argues that prophetic dualism was the central rhetorical feature of American foreign policy until the early 1960's.

At that time, however, according to Wander, the Kennedy Administration tried to replace prophetic dualism with an ideal of technical efficiency, which became the second major policy form, "technocratic realism" (350). "Technocratic realism" relies on the assumption that experts possessing the technical knowledge to accomplish policy objectives obviously should also define what those objectives are to
be. From the perspective of "technocratic realism," for instance, those affected by foreign policy decisions need not be consulted because "ordinary people...are not equipped to grasp the demands made on American foreign policy...are not in the position to make informed decisions" (352).

While "prophetic dualism" and "technocratic realism" may seem logically and politically incompatable, Wander argues that they have been able to co-exist and even reinforce each other on the common ground of nationalism, so that they now both play central roles in American foreign policy rhetoric. In the nationalism that fosters this rhetoric, the Right-Wing idea of complete duality, with our side representing enlightenment and order, is taken for granted. Also, methods for punishing or changing parts of the world that represent disorder may not be questioned, because no one but the experts who create policies is considered able to understand them. Wander argues that these rhetorical themes threaten both democracy in America and peace in the world. Wander concludes his essay with his ideas about the purpose of rhetorical criticism:

The task of criticism in our time is to raise real issues and to assist in the creation of publics able to and, in the interests of human survival, willing to rise above parochial concerns. Criticism confronting technique with purpose, euphemism with reality, and silence—the threatened silence of future generations—
with speech will not alter the predicament in which we find ourselves, but it will keep the task clearly before us. (357)

While taking this realistic and humanistic stance may not be the only necessary of current rhetorical criticism, I agree with Wander that it may be the most historically important.
Dissatisfied Conclusion

The overall value of rhetorical discussions of social movements seems to have fallen far short of its potential. Social movements have rhetorically challenged the legitimacy of our social and political order, and they continue to do so. I think it is also apparent that our society has never really met the challenge of social movements, since the problems from which movements arise continue to exist. Rhetorical analysis of movements, however, with few exceptions, seems never to have realized the seriousness of the problems causing social movements, on the one hand, or the vitality of movement rhetoric, on the other.

In considering the overall value of rhetorical approaches to social movements, however, theory should probably be separated from practical criticism, since the theorists and the critics seem to have very different concerns. The theorists of social movement rhetoric, in general, seem compelled to explain, even to explain away, the force of movement rhetoric. Most critics of movement rhetoric, on the other hand, seem more interested in specific examples of the rhetoric itself and in the use of criticism to illuminate them and relate them to other aspects of modern culture. In general, I find criticism of social movement rhetoric to be much more valuable than its theory.

The central problem for rhetorical theorists of move-
ments does not seem to be one of distance or commitment, since theorists who appear to have strong commitments to movement ideology produce work with the same alienating quality as do theorists who appear either indifferent to or hostile to movement ideology. Instead, their problem seems to be their tendency to generate ever higher levels of abstraction in the attempt to explain facts that are intellectually very simple but emotionally complex. Thus, they quickly elevate their theories away from the interesting, emotional aspects of movement rhetoric until these theories can only be of interest to people who have followed the same circular path. This generation of pointless, continuous abstraction, as I said, seems to proceed regardless of the theorist's original commitment or indifference; and commitment is probably much more common than indifference, since the indifferent would not be likely to involve themselves with these problems in the first place. Also, while this obfuscating abstraction seems to be a hazzard in advanced study in any field, there are probably few areas in which it is greater than in movement rhetoric, where the most ethereal aspects of the humanities and the social sciences meet.

Critics of movement rhetoric produce more readable, lively and illuminating work than do the theorists because they deal with immediate situations in which people actually meet and use rhetoric to deal with one another. Because of the concreteness of these situations, critics cannot turn
so easily to abstraction but must face the emotional complexities of confrontation and conflict. They can, however, and really must try to relate these complexities to their own concerns and to those of other people. I think that the greater humanity and accessibility of critical studies over theoretical ones can be seen in many of the articles I discussed in this thesis.

If there is any hope for really interesting theory about movement rhetoric, I think it comes from the dramatic and myth-oriented theorists. They do not attempt so much as the others to reduce the conflicts and tensions found in movement rhetoric by the method of classification. Instead, they try to relate them to motivations and passions which may exist on deeper human levels. Their ideas, therefore, do not provide so easy an abstract way out of the immediacy of social conflict. The recent concern of social movement rhetoricians with historical integrity and cross-cultural consistency may also help to improve rhetorical theory. This concern seems to show both these theorists' own frustration with the emptiness of their theories and their interest in creating theory with more human content.
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