GENERIC CRITICISM OF EXTRAORDINARY DOCUMENTS: AN INQUIRY INTO

MANIFESTO TEXTS AND GENRE SCHOLARSHIP

by

IAN SUMMERS

JASON EDWARD BLACK, COMMITTEE CHAIR

MEREDITH M. BAGLEY
JEREMY G. BUTLER

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of Communication Studies
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2013

ABSTRACT

While there is no shortage of rhetorical scholarship on social movements, there is

curiously a lack of standalone research on the manifesto texts affiliated with them. At best, they

are subsumed with broader inquiries into a social movement and treated as a secondary text

rather than as a primary discourse, despite the rich insights they provide both rhetorically and

culturally. Additionally, genre criticism as a rhetorical method has also fallen out of mainstream

research in recent times. This study attempts to fill a scholarly gap in both of these areas by

exploring whether movement manifestos constitute their own rhetorical genre through the

examination of the *Declaration of Independence*, the "Declaration of Rights of the Negro

Peoples of the World," "The Southern Manifesto," "The Woman-Identified Woman," and

"Queers Read This."

First, by analyzing these texts through the lenses of war myth, Burkean theory, and

constitutive rhetoric, this study attempts to determine if manifestos do constitute their own genre.

Additionally, it seeks to ascertain whether such a genre provides scholarly benefit beyond

classification. In the conclusions, this study discusses whether the evolution of social protest as

well as the postmodern turn in rhetorical criticism still allows for meaningful generic criticism to

occur. As a result, it is clear that a reconceptualization of genre criticism offers rhetorical

scholars a renewed tool in examining social protest and change.

DEDICATION

       This thesis is dedicated to my wild, weird, and wonderful family, who may be scattered across the country but continue to inspire me every day.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project has always reminded me of how much life can change in the short span of twenty four months. Although there are far too many people to thank for having gotten me here, I will try my best here to acknowledge those whose support not only carried me through this time, but changed my life for the better. First and foremost, I have to recognize my incredible committee for providing me the necessary guidance and support to see this thesis through. I am indebted to Dr. Jeremy Butler, who has truly been invaluable to this process by providing prescient critiques when needed, as well as insight into genre criticism outside of the field of rhetoric. I have to thank Dr. Meredith Bagley, for it was in her class that a small mid-semester assignment blossomed into something far bigger and more beautiful than either of us could have ever imagined. She has not only been a great committee member but also a brilliant colleague and trusted mentor. Lastly, there is nothing I can say to fully express my gratitude to Dr. Jason Edward Black. I can state without hesitation that I would not be writing this were it not for his tireless support. He has not only been my role model as a scholar and educator, but is someone that I can be fortunate enough to also call a dear friend.

Moreover, I have to thank those in the University of Alabama community who helped me and patiently put up with my eccentricities over the years. Dr. Beth Bennett has been an incredibly supportive faculty member and department chair who was always willing to answer any minute question or humor my long discussions when I was taking late-night breaks from writing. Dr. Alexa Chilcutt is the perfect supervisor I always wished I had while in the

workforce, and I will forever remember her as the person that first molded me into becoming a teacher. To the faculty at the University of Alabama, saying thanks is not enough for the insights that you all provided me in starting my long process of becoming a scholar. To my fellow graduate classmates, thank you for being there for me when I was at my lowest and never losing faith in me even when I doubted myself.

Additionally, there are those whose influence earlier in my life got me to where I am today. Thank you to Ms. Naomi Jaeger, who had me for two years as an English teacher at Orono High School. Though we do not stay in touch as often as I would like nowadays, it was in your classes that I first became inspired to better understand human language and fulfill my academic potential. I must also thank Dr. Peter Pober, Director of Forensics at George Mason University, who took a chance on me and let me walk on to the forensics team as a lanky, eighteen year-old freshman. It was through that activity, and our long coaching sessions in Communication Analysis, that I first learned about this field and became introduced to rhetorical scholarship.

Finally, I owe thanks to my family. To my amazing siblings who have all taught me that there is a difference between being brilliant and being educated, that there is such a thing as second chances, and that there are countless ways to live a full life. I would not be the man I am today without your constant, sometimes raucous, but never dull presence. To my father, who has consistently supported me to follow my dreams, even if it meant leaving behind that which is safe and comfortable. And lastly, to my mother, who has taught me to always think critically, to never take anything at face value, and to never to take guff from anyone.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

One of the most explosive dates in the history of both the U.S. Congress as well as the

mainstream Civil Rights Movement occurred on March 11, 1956. Faced with the immediate

aftermath of the landmark *Brown v. Board of Education* decisions, South Carolina Senator Strom

Thurmond, along with ninety eight other Congressional signatories, introduced "The Southern

Manifesto" on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Containing a series of blistering vituperations against

the Supreme Court as well as "outside agitators," the document sought to reframe the debate over

school desegregation as a battle over a Southern way of life needlessly under assault by a

hypocritical, Northern-dominated federal government. The Manifesto is noted by rhetorical

historian Robert Tice Lalka as, "one of the last great publicly vocal stands for school segregation

and white supremacy" (34). In seeking to defend a regressive legal and cultural system, most

would find "The Southern Manifesto" to be the antithesis of liberationist rhetoric – which

advocates breaking down the current dominant social order – that is nominally tied with social

movement manifestos. Yet, perhaps most ironically, the rhetorical tradition "The Southern

Manifesto" draws upon is typically associated with marginalized resistance against hegemonic

cultural oppression. While it most likely was not Thurmond's intention, "The Southern

Manifesto" shares more in common with documents such as the black separatist Universal Negro

Improvement Association's "Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World," and the

radical feminist Lavender Menace's[1] "The Woman-Identified Woman" than at first glance.

---

[1] This organization would be later renamed as "Radicalesbians."

Rationale for Manifesto Studies

Manifesto texts have been inexorably linked to the rhetoric of modern social movements. Mary Ann Caws defines manifestos as, "A public declaration by…an individual or body of individuals whose proceedings are of public importance, making known their past actions and explaining the motives for actions announced as forthcoming" (xix). For social movements, they can be understood as public declarations of principles, intentions, motives, and objectives by a group or other organized entity, typically in response to an internal or external exigency. Manifestos serve an undeniably important role in the formation of social movements and have been identified as a critical stage in their development (Stewart, Smith, and Denton 94). Despite this, there has been a seeming paucity of rhetorical scholarship on manifesto texts or forms. While social movement manifestos are certainly not ignored, it appears that they are often examined within larger analyses on the rhetoric of the social movements that the texts are affiliated with, rather than as stand-alone discourses. For example, Kristan Poirot's discussion of "The Woman-Identified Woman" manifesto is contained within a broader study of the struggle over sexuality in second wave feminism (264). In another instance, Lalka's inquiry into "The Southern Manifesto" is part of a general exploration of pro-segregationist rhetoric during the 1950s. Moreover, Michael Calvin McGee's notion of fragmentation, or using multiple texts to examine a discourse in rhetorical research, has incidentally deemphasized scholarship on singular texts; this trend has also been reflected in how manifestos are studied.

While polysemous, or multiple, textual analyses certainly have benefitted social movement research as a whole, they overlook the significance of manifesto discourses. Rhetorically, manifesto texts form the inventional base upon which social movements draw their justification. Moreover, manifestos as texts constitute a "people" that comprise the movement

(Stewart, Smith, and Denton 94). This was demonstrated in Maurice Charland's discussion of the Peuple Québécois' white paper, where it was shown how a rhetorical text was able to help construct a "rhetorical fiction" of a people as outlined by McGee ("In Search of 'the People'" 341). Likewise, the inherent function of manifestos is rhetorical, for as Caws explains, "The manifesto was from the beginning, and has remained, a deliberate manipulation of the public view" (xix). Materially, social movement manifestos create a set of purposes for which the campaign can organize around and move forward to effect change. Perhaps most importantly, culturally, these texts reveal cyclical patterns of oppression, resistance, and backlash between and among dominant and marginalized communities. They also expose fissures in the larger hegemonic social order and seek to rupture, or recapture, points of privilege and power within society. Lastly, these texts could reveal patterns of cultural myths, which subsequently outline greater social undercurrents across the spectrum of history. Concordantly, it is critical to examine whether social movement manifestos exhibit related rhetorical forms across multiple discourses and periods of time. Such analysis is crucial to understanding these cultural undercurrents and patterns of dominance and resistance.

As such, genre criticism is one of the best available tools for scholars to ascertain if movement manifestos do indeed constitute their own species of text, and if so what that can reveal both rhetorically and culturally about the social movements with which these discourses are affiliated. Moreover, genre criticism has been often overlooked in rhetorical studies in recent times (Gunn 5). Thus, genre analysis can help fill in a current scholarly gap: rhetorical and cultural research on social movement manifestos themselves; the effect they have on social movements; the lens through which they can uniquely provide insight into cyclical patterns of

hegemony in society; and the presence of genre criticism, an increasingly disregarded form of rhetorical scholarship.

Manifesto discourses are appropriate to study as they distill the values and objectives of a social movement into a singular text. Additionally, they often come about as the result of a collaborative process within the said entity or movement that it speaks for; even if the manifesto only claims a singular author, the rhetor was still likely influenced by the dialogue within his or her community. Due to this, movement manifestos are uniquely able to unify multiple voices within diverse communities into a singular text.

Moreover, it should be noted that manifestos exist in multiple fields outside of social movements such as literature, art, philosophy, and theatre (Yanoshevsky 258). In addition, there is much scholarship outside of rhetorical studies; for example, Galia Yanoshevksy notes, "manifestos seem to attract the attention of literary scholars, as is manifested by their significant presence in recent publications— both collections and analytic works — numerous dissertations, and a few conferences. Indeed, the scope of works on manifesto is wide and reflects different tendencies and perspectives" (258-9). Yet, there has been no serious, sustained consideration of such in the field of rhetoric. While rhetorical criticism certainly can have much to offer in the analysis of these other forms of manifestos, and there should be future deliberations as to whether these discourses are part of a rhetorical genre, this study will only examine those affiliated with social movements and protest. By narrowing the scope to discern if one specific sub-group of manifestos constitutes a rhetorical genre, future research can then be broadened to ascertain if these features can or cannot be found in all manifestos.

Justification of Manifesto Texts Examined

To that end, this thesis examines only self-identified manifestos for a particular social movement; more specifically, it explores texts that identify themselves as manifestos and clearly link themselves to a particular group or movement. While there are possibly texts that were appropriated by social movements as a manifesto ad hoc – in other words, after the text was created and was not intended by the author to be one – self-identified manifesto discourses allow for the analysis to be sufficiently narrowed and to fully account for the rhetorical context within which the artifacts were written. Appropriated, ad hoc manifestos would have to account for not only the rhetorical context in which the artifact was originally devised, but also the context surrounding the time in which a particular movement decided to make it their own. Moreover, self-identified manifestos can limit the range of potential intentionality of the author; appropriated texts, on the other hand, often have to grapple with possibly contradictory goals and intentions between the original rhetor and those that later appropriated it. While this could serve as a basis for future research, it would prove problematic in attempting to identify recurring patterns necessary to establish a genre. With that in mind, the artifacts to be examined are: Thomas Jefferson's 1776 *Declaration of Independence*, the Universal Negro Improvement Association's 1920 "Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World," Strom Thurmond's 1956 "The Southern Manifesto," the Lavender Menace's 1970 "The Woman-Identified Woman," and Queer Nation's 1990 "Queers Read This."

Obviously, by selecting these social movement manifestos, many others were left out. This is reflective of any attempt in trying to articulate a genre; as literary critics René Wellek and Austin Warren contend, "The dilemma of genre history is the dilemma of all history: i.e. in order to discover the scheme of reference (in this case, the genre) we must study the history; but we

cannot study the history without having in mind some scheme of selection" (260). For this particular thesis, the "scheme of selection" is by no means intended to canonize the texts or make them the so-called "definition" or exemplars of manifestos against which all other similar texts ought to be contrasted. Rather, their selection justifies how the pattern of forms present in these discourses is not a product of a unique time period, culture, or exigency, but instead is indicative of a rhetorical genre. Each of these manifestos is the product of a distinctive intersection of the aforementioned factors, and subsequently, all employ their rhetorical forms in different ways to achieve different ends, both materially and socially. In short, the forms found in these texts should not be isolated to these texts alone, and to be a genre, could be applied to any number of self-identified social movement manifestos.

Due to this, the rationale behind the selection of these particular manifesto texts is multifaceted. First, while there is a noticeable chronological gap between the *Declaration of Independence* and the remaining texts, which all came out of the twentieth century, Jefferson's document holds such prominence in popular American consciousness that it warrants analysis to determine whether it served as a generative text, or "template," for future American manifestos. Yet, the focus of this thesis is not to examine the evolution of manifestos; as such, the other texts were selected from definite flashpoints in cultural struggles between dominant and marginalized communities, where such times necessitated the existence of such discourses. Moreover, selecting the remaining texts from the twentieth century allows them to be studied within a defined spectrum of hegemony, resistance, and backlash, which will better answer the question as to whether manifestos can provide insight into such tumultuous cultural cycles. Additionally, the time span between these manifestos can determine if rhetorical forms are recurrent. William Benoit claims, "If the rhetorical properties of the discourses in that set differ so radically, they

cannot be identified as a genre. Only if a genre is relatively stable over time is the critic able to identify any common rhetorical properties which constitute the genre" (130-31). As such, even if one were to exclude the *Declaration of Independence*, the seventy-year gap between the 1920 release of the "Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World," the earliest of the twentieth-century texts, and the 1990 publication of "Queers Read This," the most recent, can be used as a means to analyze the genre's rhetorical stability.

Next, each manifesto is not only unique to their respective time period, but for the respective communities they purport to represent and the influence they would later hold for their corresponding social movements. The *Declaration of Independence* is considered a model text for Enlightenment-era political liberalism (Lucas 68); the "Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World" is foundational in establishing a pan-African identity that would form the basis of black nationalism (Grant 160); "The Southern Manifesto" became the basis of the pro-segregationist movement's last gasps at social dominance (Lalka 34); "The Woman-Identified Woman" forged a new identity for both women's liberation as well as political lesbianism (Davis 264-5); and "Queers Read This" marked a new era of AIDS protest and radical queer activism (Rand 289-90).

Research Queries, Critical Framework, and Argument

Although this research project addresses multiple subjects and disciplines, two main research inquiries are brought to bear. First, do manifesto texts contain the "constellation of forms" necessary to be deemed a rhetorical genre for criticism? Second, if manifestos do qualify as a rhetorical genre, does this genre go beyond the purpose of mere classification and provide greater rhetorical and cultural insights, or reveal the "social undercurrents" as discussed by Campbell and Jamieson ("Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism")?

To address this, the primary critical framework for this thesis is genre criticism, as initially outlined in the rhetorical studies field by scholars Campbell and Jamieson ("Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism"). Other scholarly works that have furthered their original framework, such as Joshua Gunn's notion of using genre to illuminate the "unspoken" within culture, are also utilized to give it both a rhetorical as well as cultural framework. Additional scholarship from other fields on genre is discussed as well. Within this greater latticework, other rhetorical elements are also considered to determine if they recur enough to be part of the "constellation of forms" necessary to establish a genre. These elements include: rhetorical myths, in particular the myth of war; constitutive rhetoric; Burke's notions of identification and scapegoating; and lastly, previously established scholarship on manifestos, including from other humanities fields.

This thesis contends that manifestos do constitute their own rhetorical genre. Moreover, this genre reveals a greater window into both the rhetorical invention of manifesto texts as well as the cultural undercurrents out of which they are borne. Subsequently, this has implications for how social movements form a basis of rhetorical invention, how said movements constitute their "ideal auditor" as initially articulated by Edwin Black, as well as how they illuminate the "social undercurrents" as described by Gunn in how marginalized and dominant communities interact and shift in positions of power and resistance.

Outline of Thesis

Chapter One of this thesis provides the topic, justification for study, rationale for the texts, and articulation of research inquiries and possible findings. Chapter Two reviews the relevant literature in genre criticism, myth, constitutive rhetoric, Burkean theory, and previous rhetorical scholarship on manifestos. Chapter Three establishes the rhetorical context for the

aforementioned case studies. Chapter Four analyzes the case studies through the lens of

rhetorical myth, specifically through the myth of war. Chapter Five then examines the

aforementioned texts under the principles of constitutive rhetorical theory. Finally, Chapter Six

concludes by discussing implications, limitations, and possible directions for future scholarship.

.

CHAPTER 2

SURVEYING THE SCHOLARSHIP OF GENRE, MYTH, CONSTITUTIVE
RHETORIC, AND MANIFESTOS

Before delving into the case studies, it is necessary to have an overview of the

scholarship relevant to this thesis. Genre criticism, myth, constitutive rhetoric, Burkean theory,

and prior manifesto research in the field of rhetoric make up the frame for this analysis.

Genre Criticism

In order to determine whether the manifesto is a genre, the key tenets and purposes of

generic criticism must be established. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson are

often credited for formulating our current conceptualization of this method in rhetorical studies.

They argue that genre discerns a recurrent form, and then uses that form as a lens to compare one

rhetorical text to other similar texts ("Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 446). The

purpose of generic criticism is not to merely classify, for Campbell and Jamieson state, "The

justification for a generic claim is the understanding it produces rather than the ordered world it

creates" ("Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 451). What this method provides critics is

insight into how a particular exigency induces and constrains responses, how prior rhetoric

shapes current discourses, and how the relationship between audience and rhetor operates in

specific situations ("Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 450). Hence, Jamieson and

Campbell sum up genre's utility by explaining, "The concept of genre is an economical way of

acknowledging that rhetorical critics have come to recognize interdependence of purpose,

stylistic choices, and requirements arising from the situation and audience" (146). Generic

criticism is founded on the belief that rhetorical forms do not work in isolation but rather in

coordination across particular discourses. In addition, generic criticism can be used for more contemporary cultural analysis. Joshua Gunn argues that the method should be employed in order to help gain an, "understanding of reception and invention as a largely unconscious process" (18). Thus, revealing this process provides understanding into broader social systems. Gunn continues, "The function of the generic critic is to bring social forms into conscious awareness by restoring them to their verbal character – by describing them, in language, as iterations of a recurring social form." Gunn's work focuses on articulating genres that are still within the subconscious. While this study focuses on self-identified movement manifestos, or that which is conscious, Gunn's notions on generic criticism illustrates how genre can provide both rhetorical as well as cultural insights.

Critical to generic scholarship is what exactly constitutes a rhetorical genre. According to Campbell and Jamieson, a genre, "Is a group of acts unified by a constellation of forms that recurs in each of its members" ("Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 452-3). William Benoit expands on this concept, explaining that a "'genre' is a set of discourses which can be isolated by reference to certain identifying characteristics which distinguish it from other sets of discourses" (128). Central to this conceptualization of genre is in the "identifying characteristics," or forms, that comprise them. Forms are defined by Campbell and Jamieson as, "stylistic and substantive responses to perceived situational demands" ("Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 452). The key is to examine forms not in singularity, but how they act in concert with one another; doing this will reveal the internal dynamics that hold them together. Thus, understanding a genre provides, "an angle of vision, a window, that reveals the tension among these elements" ("Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 453). Forms provide the basis of a genre, which can then be used to examine a rhetorical text. Benoit claims that what is

11

necessary for a genre is that "those common rhetorical properties can be expressed in generalizations concerning the rhetorical properties of that set of genre" (120). In short, rhetorical genres have recurring and interlinked features in style, substance, and situational responses.

Additionally, genre criticism exists outside of the field of rhetoric. In literary criticism, genre has been employed to study reoccurrences both in form and in a text's interaction with the audience; manifesto criticism has been studied under the literary lens in this same manner (Yanoshevsky 260). Furthermore, in film studies, Edward Buscombe argues that "A genre is not a mere collection of dead images waiting for a director to animate it, but a tradition with a life of its own" (45). He describes genre as having an "outer" form, one that is tied to visually reoccurring patterns in cinema, and an "inner" form, that reflects interplay between the screen, subject, and audience (36, 39-40). Jeremy Butler elaborates further in the field of television criticism, explaining that "Genre theorists begin from the assumption that television programs resemble one another and that grouping them together provides a context for understanding the meanings of a particular program (and possibly of the society for which it was designed)" (375). He outlines three overlapping criteria for which to study television genre: audience response, stylistic schema, and subject matter (376). First, audience response is predicated on the notion that "Several genres acquire their definitions from how the critic presumes the viewer will respond – usually without any empirical evidence as to how actual viewers responded" (377). Thus, audience interaction can be crucial in determining television genre. Second, stylistic schema is a generic characteristic that "link programs based on how the material is presented. The techniques of sound and image that are used to construct the program – its schema – become critical to distinguishing it from other genres." Third, subject matter is the most common feature

to identify television genre. Butler explains, "Most programs are joined into genres on the basis of their content: the narratives they tell or the non-narrative information they present and the thematic structure that underpins those stories and that information." Thus, television criticism blends form, stylistic patterns, and audience response when formulating a genre.

While genre criticism in other humanities fields can focus on form as a means to understand the individual text and to make better sense of how it will engage its audience, it can also provide cultural understanding. Jane Feuer notes that film criticism treats, "genres themselves as systems and structures[…]Following Claude Lévi-Strauss, [film critics] view genres as cultural problem solving operations" (143). This structuralist approach to genre criticism can be used to identify and examine larger cultural narratives and myths. As summed up by Feuer, "Ultimately, genre criticism is cultural criticism" (143). This overlap between both rhetorical and film criticism illustrates how dominant cultural norms and social structures can be further interrogated by using genre. Furthermore, it highlights the possible utility for rhetorical scholarship to add to the discussion of manifesto texts as a possible genre.

Rhetorical Myths

Related, it is important to explore the possibility of myths as a recurring generic form. Myths have been identified as a component of manifestos, for as Charles J. Stewart, Craig A. Smith, and Robert E. Denton note, "An activist manifesto is considerably more portent and strikes a responsive chord if it identifies with extant myths, beliefs, folk tales, and the like" (95.) First and foremost, it is crucial to understand the difference between myth as defined in the vernacular and myth as it exists in our rhetorical culture. Whereas myth in the colloquial sense is frequently conceptualized as a falsehood, Leroy Dorsey contends, "Far from being a fanciful tale in the most pejorative sense, myths bring reason and a sense of order to a complex, and

sometimes irrational, human society" (44). Janice Hocker Rushing further explains that myths accomplish this because they are, "a communicative narrative that indexes the development of certain portions of history" ("Power, Other, and Spirit in Cultural Texts" 159). This indexing goes beyond mere cataloguing, however, as myths require, "an interdependent set of discourses" that set the collective consciousness towards a particular telos of unity (Hocker Rushing "Mythic Evolution" 268). In other words, how these narratives make collective sense of our history requires an underlying logic that ties them together. Thus, dissecting myths can reveal these cultural logics.

How these narratives within myths are arranged is also of critical import. They are oftentimes organized based on what Michael Osborn calls "archetypal metaphors" (348). These metaphors are social symbols that are not only recurring, but are, "grounded in prominent features of experience, in objects, actions, or conditions which are inescapably salient in human consciousness[…]The appeal of the archetypal metaphor is contingent upon its embodiment of basic human motivations" ("Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric" 348). Thus, myths position cultural narratives based on the social symbols they contain. In addition, myths are inherently rhetorical in nature, as Osborn posits, "[in] myth there is a story, the story must answer some compelling question, the dramatis personae must seem larger-than-life, and the story must convey the sense of the sacred time, place, and symbol" ("In Defense of Broad Mythic Criticism" 121). The way in which myths answer Osborn's "questions" is what gives them such cultural power.

Examining myths is a critical tool for understanding the social formations that privilege particular groups and belief systems over others. This is because the way in which narratives become arranged both reflect and are informed by larger cultural ideologies. Larry Williamson

14

summarizes this idea when he states, "Myth is to ideology what poetry is to reason. They are practically interdependent while theoretically distinct. Unlike ideology, myth, like poetry, is the nonrational medium through which values become incarnate" (217). Therefore, myths are the medium that collectively form disparate narratives into animating forces that shape societal values. Over time, these values become cultural truths that are taken for granted, in turn recursively shaping the telos that guides how myths index cultural narratives. James Oliver Robertson elucidates, "Myths are accretions of many stories and many images which transform themselves in new circumstances and differing realities. In each of them there is a specific core of logic" (21). Myths are a powerful rhetorical tool that helps form, change, and in turn become shaped by cultural values, creating a discursive formation that underpins rhetorical invention.

Due to this, understanding myths can be used to look beyond merely identifying recurring patterns of form across multiple discourses; rather, it can illuminate the discursive processes that construct and perpetuate dominant cultural narratives. This has profound implications for the rhetorical critic; to unveil the formation of myths is to reveal what Barry Brummett calls, "highly adaptive engines for ordering social consciousness in the service of power" (101). Unraveling these myths provides direct insight into the orders that constitute social structures of power and privilege. As such, Richard Hughes correctly underscores the rhetorical power of myths when he observes, "A myth is a story that speaks of meaning and purpose, and for that reason it speaks truth to those who take it seriously" (2). Myths, far from being extraneous appendages to discourse, are rather intrinsically linked to the cultural truths that guide its rhetorical invention.

Myth of War

It is not enough, however, to conclude that texts employ myths. In order to dissect ideological patterns that cut across multiple discourses, it is critical that common myths be

identified. For the purpose of this study, the myth of war – and the cultural logics that buttress it – is examined. There are some reasons for this selection. First, the myth of war and militarism has persistently reappeared across innumerable discourses in American culture. Robertson declares that "The myth of war, with all its analogies, its aggressive and heroic metaphors…its focus on an enemy, its image of supreme effort and efficiency, its appeal[…]of sacrifice[…]has become the most important model of American behavior since World War II" (335). Additionally, given the chaotic context in which manifestos often arise, it is appropriate to determine if such mythology is reflected in these texts as a response to this recurring rhetorical situation.

While certainly not exhaustive, a rough sketching of the recurring elements within the war myth can help better understand the ideological underpinnings that inform such rhetoric. Central to American war mythology is the notion of the "justified war" (Williamson 221), or the idea that war is not only appropriate, but an inevitable course of action. This notion serves as the primary locus from which the war mythology tenets arise. Out of this, three primary elements reappear in the war myth.

First, war mythology employs narrative to portray militarism as an inevitable outcome. Campbell and Jamieson explain that in Presidential war rhetoric, "The justification for military intervention is embodied in a dramatic narrative from which, in turn, an argument is extracted" (*Deeds Done in Words* 107). Narratives do not merely serve as a form of ornamentation, but rather become a critical base of invention in the myth. Campbell and Jamieson continue, "In chronicling the events leading to a decision, Presidents identify a specific adversary whose aims must be thwarted at all cost" (*Deeds Done in Words* 109). Thus, narrative creates a clear enemy and gives the rhetor just cause to engage in war. In addition, narrative in war mythology allows

rhetors to absolve themselves of any responsibility from engaging in the conflict, as Campbell and Jamieson contend, "The chronicle of events demonstrates that the threat has resulted from causes for which the United States bears no responsibility. Despite exhaustive efforts to find other means to resolve conflict, the threat persists; military intervention is unavoidable" (*Deeds Done in Words* 109-110). Thus, narrative shifts agency within a dichotomous conflict; Campbell and Jamieson argue, "The resulting narrative tends to recast the conversation as aggression by the enemy" (*Deeds Done in Words* 107). Narrative, then, helps create a clear enemy, and casts the decision to engage in conflict as the end result of events beyond their control, making war justified.

Second, war mythology, in the words of Dorsey, "contain[s] the transcendent ideal of everlasting peace" (45). While seemingly paradoxical, the mythology of a justified war places peace as one of its central validations. Due to this, the ends for which the conflict is fought are noble in nature, thereby vindicating the contentious means in which they are achieved. Dorsey continues that the pursuit of peace makes one side, in this case the rhetor, its natural champion, while the other as its natural opponent (45). Incidentally, the concept of what defines "peace" is never fully outlined for all situations, although David Klope links the concept of peace within war mythology to creating some semblance of order and stability (343). When peace is not achieved, the rhetor can cast blame on the opponent for preventing it from occurring. Klope states that this occurs in the Burkean sense, whereby the rhetor engages in victimage and transfers guilt to the other party, making them the scapegoat that can be ritually cleansed (346-7). With peace as the ideal, the rhetor can shift guilt whenever order is not achieved, thereby justifying militant action.

Last, war mythology casts a binary between the actors in the conflict: one being righteous, and called into battle only out of necessity, with the other being dishonorable, and needlessly instigating conflict to satiate their own avaricious desires. Williamson explains, "The American variant of just war rhetoric casts us as the reluctant defenders of freedom who make war only as a last resort" (221). When rhetors establish themselves as pulled into a struggle due to circumstances beyond their control, their causes for fighting are just and blameless, motivated solely by self-defense. In the process, war mythology casts the opposite side in the conflict as an Other, dehumanized to the point of where rationally reasoning with them is an impossibility. Robert Ivie contends that war mythology depicts the enemy as a savage, de-civilized to the point of where conflict is the only natural recourse (283-4). Eventually, Ivie concludes, the conflict become a matter of "'us' against 'it'" (285). Moreover, Dorsey states that war mythology personifies the enemy, and by contrast makes the rhetor more virtuous in comparison (50). Thus, the dichotomy justifies conflict, as one side is portrayed as clearly in the "right," whereas the enemy is shown as a savage Other that can only be dealt with through militaristic means.

Moreover, war mythology is not merely limited to rhetoric advocating for military combat. For example, Dorsey explains that American Presidents, from John F. Kennedy's establishment of the Peace Corps (53) to Lyndon Baines Johnson's declared War on Poverty (42), have used war mythology to promote nonmilitary objectives by recharacterizing their issues as a just conflict. Beyond Presidential public address, war mythology has also appeared as a means to justify lifestyles in contrast with larger culture. For example, Michael Hostetler notes that war mythology is recurrent in the rhetoric of Christian ministry and music, which argues that "The Christian life is war" (49). Many members of the Christian faith view secular society as the enemy, and merely being a Christian and living the Christian lifestyle to be a direct act of war

18

against it. In this sense, war mythology is used to reaffirm members of the group the rightness of their existence. As such, analyzing how war mythology pervades nonmilitary rhetoric, particularly within self-identified marginalized communities, can reveal how they ontologically view themselves within the larger world.

Due to this, the rhetorical mythology of war can be extended beyond actual combat. Moreover, the underlying ideology behind the rhetorical myth of war reveals a much more profound cultural belief in justified conflict. Robertson contends, "The use of the metaphor of war, and of images out of the myths and stories of war[…] have given the mythology of war a strong, internal application" (331). Therefore, portraying conflict as an inevitable outcome, using direct confrontation as a means to achieve peace, and casting the enemy as an Other all display a rhetorical means to explain conflict and strife. Even in the absence of explicit war metaphors, war mythology can be reflected in the way in which discourses legitimize aggressive engagement.

Constitutive Rhetoric

Next, this thesis examines whether manifestos attempt to constitute a "people." In other words, if a manifesto has to outline a set of principles or demands, ostensibly a public must also be defined that is making these proclamations. To that end, the theoretical foundations of constitutive rhetoric must be discussed. At its core, constitutive rhetoric challenges basic notions of what establishes an audience for a text. Traditionally, audiences were conceived of in a positivist fashion. That is, for any particular rhetorical situation there was a defined group of rational individuals for whom the text intended to address. Scholars, however, have challenged such beliefs in favor of the view that audiences are constructed through the text itself. Edwin Black argues that rhetorical texts contain a Second Persona, or an "ideal auditor" that is projected

in the discourse of what the rhetor wishes the audience to be (334-5). Rather than merely

targeting a particular physical audience to believe in a certain ideology, the text actually goes a

step further and attempts to convince its recipients to identify with a particular type of person

that is reflective of an ideology.

Michael Calvin McGee also elaborates on this principle, declaring that the concept of

"people," or a group of persons the text addresses, is too often taken as a given by rhetorical

critics when analyzing messages ("In Search of 'the People'" 341). Instead, he proffers that "the

people" in a rhetorical text are, "a fiction dreamed by an advocate and infused with an artificial,

rhetorical reality by the agreement of an audience to participate in a collective fantasy" (343).

This is not to indicate that the audience is a "fiction" as in completely fake, but rather a rhetorical

invention that blends both material and social realities. Due to this, an audience should not be

merely viewed as an immutable presence, but rather a social and material rhetorical creation.

This interplay between the objective realities that face an audience and the social

realities, or "collective fantasies," that an audience buys into is critical, as the latter synthesizes

the aspects of the former in order to form a cohesive unit. Inspired by Marxist philosopher Louis

Althusser's materialist notions of interpellation, Maurice Charland examines this interplay and

the rhetorical creation of "the people" even further (137). He contends that rhetoric is used to

pull the audience to not only identify with the "ideal auditor" as explained by Black, but to

actually become it and thus place themselves within the discourse (138). Moreover, he states that

the participation in a "collective fantasy" as explained by McGee is accomplished through

narrative (143). This not only places the audience in a social reality constructed by the rhetor, but

leaves them in a position to enact the "closure" of said narrative in a material reality. As such,

Charland concludes, constitutive rhetoric is inherently ideological in the Marxian sense. In other

words, constitutive rhetoric shapes how its subjects materially identify themselves in the larger world, which in turn forms their view of it (142-3). Expanding on this, Sarah Stein contends that constitutive rhetoric frames the existing power as inauthentic. Through examining Apple's infamous "1984" Super Bowl advertisement, Stein concludes that the ability to enact closure in the narrative requires delegitimizing a current power structure to give the audience agency (183). In short, constitutive rhetoric seeks to explain how texts create collective fantasies for an audience to participate in so that they can share a common ideology.

Despite this, a rhetor can still "fail" in her or his employment of constitutive rhetoric. Kenneth Zagacki contends that "The emergence of a reconstituted and seemingly autonomous identity is rooted in paradox—becoming a subject is intricately bound up with being subjected to power" (273-4). Thus, constitutive rhetoric seemingly has a contradiction; it attempts to call an autonomous people into being, yet those same people are inherently tied to the rhetor that constitutes their identity. In order to address this, he argues that rhetors must "turn [these paradoxes] into founding opportunities or resources for the establishment of a political telos. They must understand that many audiences exist between and among competing narratives" (288-9). Hence, rather than ignoring these paradoxes, rhetors must use them as the basis for a guiding logic that binds them together. Without this acknowledgment however, a rhetor will fail in successfully creating a reconstituted people as outlined by Charland because the constitutive rhetoric does not incorporate both social and material realities.

Moreover, Helen Tate explains that if a text's constitutive rhetoric employs a narrative that fails to accommodate the material concerns of the majority of its constructed people, it will be unsuccessful in maintaining identity (26-7). Even worse, it may give opponents the rhetorical space to appropriate their constituted people. Using second wave feminism as her case study,

21

Tate concludes that the constituted identity of a feminist was one that separated from the male structure, something that did not account for the everyday objective realities of heterosexual and nonwhite feminists. As a result, opponents were able to claim to be the "true" representative of feminism, disconnecting the constituted "people" from any rhetorical power. Given this, constitutive rhetoric must balance both forming a narrative that creates autonomy yet is mindful of the material reality it seeks to address.

Burkean Theory

Subsequently, some Burkean elements that are tied to constitutive rhetoric as well as manifestos as a whole are discussed here and accessed in the analysis that follows. His notions of dramatism can be utilized as a guiding framework for possibly identifying recurring forms. As previously stated, it is critical to determine whether manifestos must unite a particular audience in order to represent a social movement or aggrieved group. Due to this, Burke's identification is appropriate for this examination. Burke contends, "Two persons may be identified in terms of some principle they share in common, an 'identification' that does not deny their distinctness." (qtd. in Gusfield 180). That is, humans can be united through expressed shared interests while still allowing them to maintain their unique identity. In his book on Kenneth Burke, Joseph R. Gusfield contends, "Identification is the key term in Burke's analysis of rhetoric. Here the analytical tools of the grammar are brought to bear in understanding how texts and performances are seen in relation to an audience" (18). What is crucial in Burke's identification is that common principles are forged in relation to others. Burke states, "Identification is affirmed with earnestness precisely because there is division. Identification is compensatory to division" (qtd. in Gusfield 181-2). Therefore, identification is not merely demonstrating what some have in

common, or who they are, but what they do not share with others, or who they are not. This necessity of contrast underpins identification.

Next, Burke's notions of victimage are crucial for understanding as well. Most notably the scapegoat, which Burke identifies as, "The 'representative' or 'vessel' of certain unwanted evils, the sacrificial animal upon whose back the burden of these evils is ritualistically loaded" (qtd. in Gusfield 294), can be used in social re-identification. Importantly, the process of scapegoating, "Delegates the personal burden to an external bearer, yet the receiver of this burden possesses consubstantiality with the giver" (qtd. in Gusfield 298). These "unwanted evils' could also be viewed as oppressions or marginalization. In summation, scapegoating presents an opportunity for ritual cleansing, for an individual or group to project their problems or ills onto an external vessel, which allows it to be cast out. In doing so, the individual or group can change the principles that underscore their identification. Thus, Burke's notions of scapegoating and ritual cleansing have the possibility in shaping how a group constitutes themselves, both in how they contrast themselves with the scapegoat as well as how they reconstitute their identification after the cleansing process is complete.

Manifesto Scholarship

Next, some forms that have been identified in previous research on manifestos are outlined to provide a framework. Much of this literature guides the analysis in later chapters. Although these works do not establish the "constellation of forms" as previously defined by Campbell and Jamieson ("Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 452-3) on their own, their findings do help inform how manifestos function rhetorically. By synthesizing these, it becomes possible to analyze other manifesto texts in order to determine if such forms recur together across discourses, and to reveal any possible internal dynamics that may hold them together.

Interestingly, there is a seeming scarcity of rhetorical research on manifestos themselves. In light of the fact that manifestos are often examined within larger analyses on the rhetoric of social movements, the essays utilized are ones that specifically studied manifestos. There are three main characteristics of manifestos that can be identified in the research: 1) Objectification (Frye 72-3), 2) Identification (Smith and Smith 458), and 3) Historical Narrative (Pearce 310).

First, manifestos contain a central rhetorical function of objectification. One of the manifesto's primary components is to articulate grievances, perceived or real, that violate the group's principles or right to being. Expanding on this concept in his study of radical black activist James Forman's "Black Manifesto," Jerry Frye cites black movement scholar Arthur L. Smith to explain that objectification is, "the use of language to direct the grievances of a particular group toward another collective body such as an institution, nation, political party, or race" (72-3). Thus, objectification works to not only highlight a group's complaints, but to assign them to a particular body that can be directly addressed. How the grievances are outlined and to whom they are addressed sets the inventional foundation for how the manifesto will call its readers to respond. For example, in her examination of radical feminist manifestos of the 1960s, Kimber Charles Pearce states, "Often, feminist authors stressed one category of oppression over the others, which influenced the proposals for action they set forth in different texts" (310). As such, manifestos not only express a group's grievances, but through objectification create a venue through which its members can have agency and react to the collective body that afflicts them. Through this, objectification critiques the current social order and actively seeks to find ways to rupture it. Also writing on the "Black Manifesto," Maegan Parker claims that Forman's attacks on white religious institutions and subsequent demands for them to pay reparations were intended to both galvanize his black audience to action while compelling his dominant white

audience to reflect on their role in black oppression (323). Objectification, then, is an inductive process that articulates issues, casts them towards an outside collective as the source, and finds ways to disrupt it.

The second characteristic of manifestos, identification, helps to create a particular identity within a specific audience. Building off of Burke's notion that one of the purposes of language is to create a commonality between people, manifestos outline a group based on material and ideological grounds. Craig A. Smith and Kathy B. Smith contend in their study of British political party manifestos that in an election context, such discourses operate to, "maximize a sense of identification between citizens and the party ('we') and to contrast or polarize that identity against the identities of citizens from the various 'thems'" (458). This process leads to, "a convergence around symbols, needs, preferences and reasons." Extending these functions beyond politics, a manifesto forges identification between its audience and the larger group the text represents, forming one of its bases of invention. Due to this, manifestos become the rhetorical extension of its group. In addition, contrasting identity with a "them" expands on Burke's notions of negation. Pearce argues that in past, feminist manifestos created an identity that was, "defined not so much by what it is, as by that to which it is opposed" (310). Contrasting one group as the dialectical opposite from another plays a critical role in identification, as it forges commonality and internal coherence amongst the group's members. Pearce continues that a central rhetorical function of radical feminist manifestos was in framing feminism as a response to an oppressive male-dominated structure, noting that "[they] allowed for the recognition of a hostile worldview against which feminists could unite." Thus, identification works in conjunction with objectification; naming a social order, dominant group, or institution that is responsible for a community's problems allow members to forge a

commonality in shared suffering. Moreover, objectification creates the impetus for which the aggrieved group rallies around and rises up as a response. Due to this, identification is not a rhetorical form that works in isolation.

The last element, historical narrative, plays a critical role in how manifestos construct a worldview. Smith and Smith found that political manifestos use narratives of the past in order to create an historical account that can explain the state of affairs in the present (464). Due to this, these narratives help construct a "discursive world" within the text (469). As manifestos function ideologically, they engage in a process of world-making that places its group identity as well as its grievances within a larger narrative that justifies its positions. Pearce explains that feminist manifestos utilized narrative to establish an anti-masculine historicism that provided the rationale for a radical female liberation movement (309). Moreover, she explains historical narrative allowed feminists to, "assume control of their historical identities, which, heretofore, had been subject to the judgment of men" (310). Historical narrative, therefore, can work in concert with identification as it provides meaning to shared experiences within a group. As Pearce concludes, feminist historical narratives "made it evident that the mere fact of being a woman meant having a particular kind of social and hence historical experience" (310). Historical narrative places a group's identity within a larger world as it makes sense of their experiences. By doing this, the manifesto makes its call to action a logical next step. Writing from a literary perspective, Galia Yanoshevsky contends, "The manifesto has a particular performativity: it does not merely describe a history of rupture, but produces such a history, seeking to create this rupture actively through its own intervention" (266). Indeed, Natalie Alvarez and Jenn Stephenson argue that a manifesto's very existence is a critical act, as, "The manifesto is inherently performative; its aim, through its enunciation, is to bring a future vision into being" (4). As such, a manifesto performs

a critical historiography, inserting itself as the logical next step in its rhetorically constructed historical narrative.

CHAPTER 3

FORGED IN THE FIRES OF SOCIAL TURMOIL:
CONTEXTS OF THE MANIFESTO CASE STUDIES

The rhetorical contexts surrounding these manifestos are discussed in chronological order. Although each rhetorical situation has its own unique characteristics, several patterns do emerge. Each text was borne out of a period of social upheaval, when the power and authority of the dominant social structure was held in question. Additionally, in each context there was a mainstream ideological position that the manifesto would contrast itself against. These recurring situations are later analyzed to determine if they generate unique responses in style and substance, as articulated by the rhetorical genre.

Declaration of Independence

First, the *Declaration of Independence*, though given a lionized history, actually has much more humble beginnings. Stephen E. Lucas, quoting historian Charles Warren, notes that the Declaration, "has been the subject of more incorrect belief, more bad memory on the part of participants, and more false history than any other occurrence in our national life" (69-70). In truth, the Continental Congress voted to approve Delegate Richard Henry Lee's resolution that officially severed ties between the United Colonies and the British Crown on July 2, 1776, and considered the passage of the *Declaration of Independence* a formality that fell low on their list of other priorities during that session (67, 70). Ironically, John Adams presciently predicted that Americans henceforth would throw grand celebrations to commemorate America's independence, but incorrectly thought it would be July 2 (67). Nevertheless, as Lucas explains,

"Because the Declaration was the first official news of that decision, Americans quickly equated it with the decision itself" (68).

The task of writing the Declaration was given to the so-called "Committee of Five" within the Continental Congress, comprised of Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman, John Adams, and Robert Livingston (71). Though Jefferson was at the time a backbencher in the Congress, the Committee voted to make him the primary author due to his prior success in drafting resolutions. Much of the phraseology Jefferson employed was inspired by George Mason's "Declaration of Rights," which was published earlier that year (87). Though Jefferson is the primary writer of the *Declaration of Independence*, the Continental Congress made several edits to the final draft, most notably removing references to slavery (72, 105). As such, though the Declaration was primarily the product of Jefferson, it still came about through a collaborative effort.

The influence of the Continental Congress on the final draft quickly bore itself out. There was much at stake in the publishing of the manifesto; although it was only a formality, Lucas explains that "Every aspect of the Declaration was designed to create a favorable image of Congress and its actions" (73). First, one of the Congress's main goals was to refute the claim made by the British Crown and loyalists at home in America that the desire to form an independent government was the product of a few elites and not held by the majority. Subsequently, the Declaration had to present a unified people that were separate from the British (77). Moreover, as Lucas argues, "Congress needed to justify its decision to its constituents as persuasively as possible […] Above all else the Declaration had to consolidate support for independence among the colonists" (81). This was evident in the Congress's order to have copies sent out to every colony and be read in front of every major town and military unit (80). Also,

while reaction across the colonies was very favorable, from Philadelphia to Boston to New York, revolutionaries in each town coordinated campaigns to pack each reading with as many of those sympathetic to the cause as possible, while also crowding out any loyalists to the Crown (119, 80). Therefore, the Declaration had to reach out to two critical audiences: the British Crown, in demonstrating that there was such a thing as the "American people" who sought independence; and the colonists, in validating their actions for inviting open war with the British and forming a new government.

Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World

Second, the "Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World" was the product of a tumultuous era in American and black civil rights history. The text was the brainchild of Marcus Garvey, a Caribbean-born radical black activist who advocated a bold vision of pan-Africanism (Martin 63, 68). He was best known for founding the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA), in 1917, in Jamaica (59). By 1920, the UNIA had set up operations in Harlem, and within a few years became the largest pan-African organization in the world, with over 1,000 branches in forty different countries. Garvey's establishment of the UNIA dovetailed with his larger rhetorical strategy. Namely, he believed that the path towards creating a vibrant black identity in the United States was to reclaim Africa as the "motherland" of all blacks. Up until that point, most black persons in the United States had, at best, little conceptualization of Africa or, at worst, strictly regarded it in a negative sense, a place oftentimes conjured up by whites to justify their racism (Grant 162). To combat these perceptions, Garvey quickly gained popularity in the United States by capitalizing on black disillusionment after the end of World War I. Despite significant sacrifices from black men who fought for the United States during the War, they came back home to find no recognition of their service from the U.S. government, and

30

most importantly no material gains in equality (Grant 158). Garvey used this disenchantment to

exhort black activists to break away from the accommodationist policies of Booker T.

Washington[2] and adopt a more militant stance, famously declaring, "The time for cowardice is

past. The old-time Negro is gone – buried with Uncle Tom" (Grant 159). The "Declaration of

Rights," naturally, would fill the gap in black civil rights left after the exit of the Old Negro

doctrine.

The "old-time Negro," which at the time was the mainstream stance of the black civil

rights movement, advocated that black communities work within the white-dominated systems of

government and business in order to advance black causes. This position, subsequently, was

noted for avoiding direct confrontation with white dominance and instead accommodating to

black subjugation (Grant 160). Hence, the "Declaration of Rights" was the culmination of two

notable rhetorical shifts in black civil rights rhetoric: reclaiming Africa in order to make it the

locus of a new pan-African identity, and a move towards confrontation with white domination.

The Southern Manifesto

Much of the foundation laid by the "Declaration of Rights" – namely, directly

challenging legally sanctioned white supremacy – fomented the social context out of which "The

Southern Manifesto" was created. In the years following the UNIA, black civil rights gained

momentum as several key laws that enshrined white domination were becoming struck down,

chief among them school segregation in the *Brown v. Board of Education* decisions of 1954 and

1955. The tide was beginning to turn, and white Southerners were all too aware of this. Though

---

[2] Initially outlined in Washington's speech to the Cotton Sales and International Exposition on September 18, 1895 in Atlanta, Georgia, accommodationism meant that black individuals would not challenge white supremacy or segregation in exchange for receiving basic education. This accommodation ostensibly helped to justify the replacement of slavery with substantively similar Black Codes and Jim Crow Laws in the southern states.

the text itself was created specifically in response to these decisions, it also reflected a broader struggle in reasserting Southern states' political influence in both Congress and in Presidential elections (Lalka 35-6). U.S. Senator Strom Thurmond often remarked that the struggle over federally-mandated desegregation was a continuation of the "War for Southern Independence" (34). As such, choosing the floor of the U.S. Senate to deliver this Manifesto served as the ideal venue for white Southerners to reaffirm their political will.

Much of the text was written by Thurmond; indeed, in 1955, the year before "The Southern Manifesto" was released, he delivered a fiery speech at a Virginia Bar Association banquet that used much of the same argumentation and rhetoric that would make its way into the Manifesto (Lalka 32-3). Other signatories to the Manifesto, however, such as U.S. Senators Harry Byrd and Richard Russell, also edited the final text to make it less incendiary (37). This also created a personal political incentive for Thurmond as well, as he used the creation of "The Southern Manifesto" to bolster his standing both among the southern bloc of pro-segregationist Democrats in Congress as well as his constituents in South Carolina (36). Due to this, much was at stake for the creator and signatories of the Manifesto, as their personal careers were directly tied to the perceived success or failure of the document.

Initial reaction to the Manifesto was explosive, as was the intention. News of its release made the front pages of major national newspapers and magazines (Lalka 34-6). Moreover, the arguments presented in the Manifesto were repeated in speeches made by Thurmond and other Southern politicians in the months following (42-4). They sought ultimately to characterize the Supreme Court decisions in particular, and federal attempts at desegregation in general, as a moral struggle where outside groups were hypocritically and maliciously attempting to destroy the Southern way of life. Through its statement of principles and opposition to the Supreme

Court, "The Southern Manifesto" sought to recast segregation and Southern culture in a way to draw sympathy from those from outside the South.

The Woman-Identified Woman

Next, while the inception of "The Woman-Identified Woman" came about only fourteen years after "The Southern Manifesto" was read on the floor of the U.S. Senate, it did so in an American culture that was undergoing a fundamental shift in gender and sexual rights. Even though the women's liberation movement was well underway in the United States, there was turmoil within its ranks. After the Stonewall riots of 1969[3], lesbians began to take a more vocal role in both the gay as well as women's rights movements, but their contributions were not always welcome (Finley and Stringer 25). Early on, lesbian activists were shut out of the largely male-dominated gay rights organizations and took on a more active presence within women's liberation (Davis 264). This infusion created friction. Within the leadership of women's rights organizations, most notably the National Organization for Women (NOW), the concern was that the presence of lesbians would undermine support for the movement in the larger public sphere (Finley and Stringer 26). Flora Davis explains, "For many NOW members, lesbianism was a sensitive subject because they had to defend themselves against accusations that all feminists were gay" (262). To deflect such accusations, NOW leadership refused to accept lesbians openly and attempted to deny them a voice.

---

[3] During the early morning hours of June 28, 1969, New York Police officers attempted to conduct a raid on the Stonewall Inn in Greenwich Village, which was then a common occurrence for gay establishments. The Stonewall's bar area had been raided several times prior to the night in question prompting most to conclude that the Stonewall and its constituents were being viciously profiled. This time however, patrons and residents rioted against the police, forcing them to retreat and launching a new era in gay rights movements. This era ushered in both LGBT material strength and community solidarity.

In 1969, then-President of NOW Betty Freidan referred to lesbians as the "lavender menace" to women's rights and began to purge the organization's leadership of non-heterosexuals (Davis 262-3). The issue came to a head in January of 1970 when Rita Mae Brown, open lesbian and editor of the New York chapter of NOW's newsletter, publicly resigned over the organization's actions (263). The heterosexist backlash against lesbians, as well as the double oppression they faced for both their gender and sexuality, would set the stage – both literally and figuratively – for "The Woman-Identified Woman".

In response to Friedan's remark, a group of lesbians calling themselves the "Lavender Menace" was formed in New York City (Davis 264). Frustrated after years of dealing with heterosexism from leaders within the women's rights movement, they presented their collectively written manifesto at the Second Congress to Unite Women on May 1, 1970 by turning off the lights during the opening ceremony and ambushing the stage (264). Davis claims, "It was one of those rare, pivotal moments in the history of the movement: Afterward, many things would never be quite the same again, for the ideas presented in the paper gripped the imagination of many feminists" (264). Thus, "The Woman-Identified Woman" was a response to not only male hegemony, but also straight privilege. This confluence places the text as a unique site that operates from the margins even within its respective queer as well as women communities.

Queers Read This

Lastly, "Queers Read This" stands as the most recent and possibly most radical of the manifestos examined. During the time in which the text was released in 1990, the gay community faced increasing marginalization in the face of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, a national rise in anti-gay hate crimes, and pressure from conservative politicians to cut federal funding to

queer artists (Cunningham 60-2). Within the ranks of the queer communities, radicals

increasingly began to question whether gay assimilation was the proper course of method for

achieving equality and liberation (Rand 295-6). Within this maelstrom of conflict, the group

Queer Nation, described by one member as, "a peculiar mix of outrage and wackiness"

(Cunningham 63) was formed in April of 1990. Initially, it was a radical gay rights organization

that splintered off from ACT UP[4] in order to deal with the 122% rise of anti-gay hate crimes in

New York City (289). Soon after, its members distributed 15,000 copies of their manifesto as

pamphlets to attendees at the New York City Gay Pride March in June of that year. Within two

years it had chapters in over sixty cities across the United States (Cunningham 63). The title of

the manifesto was borrowed from posters made by ACT UP to publicize the group's 1989

demonstration commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the Stonewall riots (Rand 290).

Thus, Queer Nation was clearly placing its text in the longer historical tradition of gay rights,

particularly in New York City.

Responses from within the queer community were mixed. Reportedly, many attendees at

the March refused copies of the manifesto as its title contained the word "queer," which was still

considered a pejorative term for homosexuals (Kaplan 36). Moreover, the authorship of the text

is unknown, and even some self-identified members of Queer Nation distanced themselves from

it due to its controversial stances (36). Yet, Queer Nation's attempt at articulating queer anger

did engender sympathy even among those who disagreed with its militant stances, as it

highlighted many of the travails facing the community (Cunningham 60). In light of this context,

"Queers Read This" faced a twofold challenge: reclaiming the word queer, and uniting queer

---

[4] The AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power (ACT UP) was founded in 1987 by activist Larry
Kramer in New York City. The organization staged several high-profile protests to raise political
awareness about HIV/AIDS and to demand that the federal government coordinate a national
response to the epidemic.

communities that were facing multiple pressing problems. As such, this informed the text's general stance of aggressive confrontation with straights and fellow queers who do not sympathize with their cause.

Ultimately, the purpose of this study is not only to determine if the manifesto does merit consideration as its own rhetorical genre, but also to establish whether such criticism and analysis reveals deeper undercurrents of form and ideology between seemingly dissimilar texts. Moreover, if such connections do exist, it is crucial to examine the broader rhetorical and cultural implications that arise from this phenomenon. Doing so could demonstrate that genre criticism can still be used for critical evaluation of discourses as well as highlight the importance of manifestos in studying social movements.

CHAPTER 4

MYTH OF WAR WITHIN MANIFESTOS

The possible reoccurring presence of myths could illuminate the tensions that bind forms together across discourses. As articulated by Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, such tension is necessary to construct a rhetorical genre ("Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 453). Myths would go beyond merely unveiling similar forms and instead reveal underlying cultural ideologies that inform manifestos. Additionally, such a dynamic would allow scholars to more readily pinpoint William Benoit's common "identifying characteristics" (128) within a genre. Lastly, recurring rhetorical myths could help determine that manifestos exhibit "stylistic and substantive responses to perceived situational demands" (Campbell and Jamieson "Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 452). If similar exigencies brought forth similar mythic responses, it could help establish the rhetorical genre of social movement manifestos as a whole. As such, rhetorical myth within movement manifestos cannot be ignored.

To reiterate, the analysis is rooted in Leroy Dorsey and Janice Hocker Rushing's conceptualization of myth, not as a falsehood, but rather as a master narrative that organizes and makes sense of human events. More specifically, the rhetorical myth of war as it pertains to justifying an antagonistic approach is the primary lens. While there are possibly numerous other myths that recur across manifesto discourses, the rhetorical mythology of war and conflict is one that must be examined due to the very nature of the texts themselves. Manifestos inherently challenge social systems, or as Galia Yanoshevsky explains, "The manifesto may be viewed as a

programmatic discourse of power because it aspires to change reality with words" (264). Using this notion that manifestos are a "discourse of power," it should be determined if these texts employ myths in similar patterns, in order to justify their attempts to change social reality. Thus, rhetorical myth could reveal a larger ideology operating behind all manifestos, regardless of their outwardly stated purposes or material goals. The key tenets identified in this myth are 1) war as an unavoidable inevitability, 2) war as a noble means to achieve peace, and 3) war used to create a binary that Otherizes the enemy. Each text is studied sequentially within these core elements.

Declaration of Independence: Template for the Ideology of a "Necessary" War

Perhaps no other text in American culture serves as an exemplar for the justified war mythology than the *Declaration of Independence*. Not only does it explicitly call for revolution, but it sets forth a vision of a divinely-ordained democratic government in place of the British monarchy. Although it does not necessary declare war on the British Empire, it proposes no other alternative besides armed conflict. The three core elements outlined in the war mythology – utilizing narrative to present war as an inevitability, using peace as the ultimate goal for conflict, and establishing a binary of good and evil between the rhetor and its enemies – are illustrated throughout the manifesto.

Narrative to Construct War as Inevitable. First, the *Declaration of Independence* constructs a narrative timeline that necessitates armed strife. Narrative serves more than just a cataloguing of events, for as Campbell and Jamieson state, "The chronicle of events demonstrates that the threat has resulted from causes for which the United States bears no responsibility. Despite exhaustive efforts to find other means to resolve conflict, the threat persists; military intervention is unavoidable" (*Deeds Done In Words* 109-110). The declaration

38

initially provides this in the lines directly preceding the list of grievances against King George

III, stating:

> Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. (*Declaration of Independence*)

The grievances then listed all serve to cast a chronicle of events that leave the colonies no choice

but to secede. Directly after this list, the *Declaration* then proclaims:

> In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

The narrative casts the colonies as making every attempt to be reasonable, only to be rebuffed.

Thus, direct engagement – in this case, revolution – is wholly warranted. In this, the ideological

underpinnings of a necessary war can be seen.

The King is not the only enemy in these narratives. Campbell and Jamieson contend that

narratives, "identify a specific adversary whose aims must be thwarted at all cost" (*Deeds Done

in Words* 109). This includes both the King as well as British people in general. In the section

after the grievances against the King, the Declaration has a series of sentences that start with the

phrase "We have" outlining the numerous ways they have appealed for an abeyance in hostilities

from the British people, only to conclude that "They too have been deaf to the voice of justice

and of consanguinity" (*Declaration of Independence*). Subsequently, no other choice is left but

to go to war and revolt.

Divinely Ordained Social Order as Ideal Peace. Next, the *Declaration of Independence*

justifies its revolutionary call by stating it is in service of a divinely-ordained peace. Dorsey

notes the ideal of peace is not some fanciful notion; rather, it is an everlasting ideal, one that

justifies war as it will create permanent resolution (50). The *Declaration* illuminates this in both

its opening and closing sections. In its opening, the manifesto states:

> When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the
> political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the
> powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of
> Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they
> should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

Thus, "peace" as defined here is not merely acquiescence to the powers that be, but rather

serving a divine right to self-governance. This adds an additional layer of ethos to the ideal social

order. The following lines from the *Declaration of Independence* clearly lay this out, when it

contends, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are

endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and

the pursuit of Happiness." Here, the Declaration uses simple inductive logic to establish a new

social system. David Klope contends that the rhetor in war mythology uses peace to create or

maintain a social order (343). In this instance, the Declaration makes a clear case in that citizens

are granted certain rights, and that attainment of these rights is more important than obedience to

a government; thus, overthrowing a tyrannical government that violates these rights is not only

validated, but necessitated. This is summed up in the final line of the Declaration as well, when it

claims, "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine

Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor"

(*Declaration of Independence*). As this social order is sanctioned by God, then going to war to

establish it is perfectly acceptable.

     Americans and British on an Irreconcilable Binary. Lastly, the discourse lays out a clear

binary between the colonists and the British. In order for Larry Williamson's notion that "The

American variant of just war rhetoric casts us as the reluctant defenders of freedom who make

war only as a last resort" (221) to be true, there must be a dialectical opposite of the "defenders of freedom." In the *Declaration of Independence*, it is the British Crown as well as the British people. There are two main areas in the text where this occurs: the grievances against the King, and the indictment of the British people that follows.

In the grievances against the King, the Declaration attempts to both delegitimize his authority as well as well as his very humanity. Initially, the grievances attack his political authority, such as when it complains, "He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only" (*Declaration of Independence*). Throughout the entire text, the king is referred to as a tyrant, one who has no authority to rule the way that he has. Beyond calling him as such, the *Declaration of Independence* further dehumanizes him in the following:

> He [the king] is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to compleat [sic] the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty & perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation. *(Declaration of Independence)*

King George III is no longer royalty, but rather a barbarous brute, unworthy to head any nation. This is reflective of Robert Ivie's notion that binaries serve to turn the enemy into a savage Other, where negotiation with them is impossible (283-4). As King George cannot be reasoned with, he must be fought directly.

Next, the British people are also drawn into this binary. Although it does not reduce their humanity, the *Declaration of Independence* draws a clear distinction between the two. After listing the numerous efforts to reach out to the British to no avail, the text concludes, "We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends" (*Declaration of Independence*). As

41

Dorsey notes, the binary in war mythology personifies the enemy, making the rhetor more virtuous by comparison (50). In this instance, the Declaration makes the British people incompatible with the Americans, ruling out any possibility of a resolution without armed conflict.

Through its narrative that constructs war as an inexorable reality, creating a celestially-ordained social order that can only be accomplished through conflict, and drawing the Americans and British as dialectical opposites, the *Declaration of Independence* exhibits all of the key elements of the war mythology. The methodical, almost sequential manner in which the text lays out these elements not only serves as a strong template for the rhetorical mythology of war, but the underlying ideology that war is necessary. These forms become a recurrent pattern in future manifestos throughout the course of American history.

Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World: Shifting the Savage Other

At first glance, the "Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World" ("Declaration of Rights") does not directly advocate for direct combat with whites, nor is it a call to arms. Yet, by using the notion that black communities have a right to protect themselves and their race, it proffers a broader initiative to ignore or stand up against white-dominated governments. In this sense, the three main elements of war mythology are reflected within the text: conflict as inescapable, achieving peace as the ultimate goal for conflict, and constructing whites as the savage Other.

Conflict with Whites as Inescapable. Initially, the "Declaration of Rights" casts its conflict with white supremacist social systems as completely unavoidable. Campbell and Jamieson contend that narrative is employed to not only define a clear enemy (*Deeds Done in Words* 109), but also to absolve the rhetor of any moral responsibility in starting the conflict by

42

making it an inexorable destiny (110). The "Declaration of Rights" establishes this in the first

subsection, titled "We Complain," that outlines multiple complaints. Although it does not follow

a traditional narrative format, it does clearly identify white governments as the source of their

travails. For example, the manifesto opens with the proclamation:

> That nowhere in the world, with few exceptions, are black men accorded equal treatment with white men, although in the same situation and circumstances, but, on the contrary, are discriminated against and denied the common rights due to human beings for no other reason than their race and color. ("Declaration of Rights")

The complaints that follow are all borne out of this initial statement, highlighting the various

ways in which black people all over the world suffer injustice at the hands of a white system.

This opens up the manifesto to a systemic critique; each of these inequities carries no context

within a vacuum, but taken together represent a broader condemnation of white hegemony.

That same section continues in its critique of white governments, eventually illustrating

Campbell and Jamieson's contention that war mythology portrays intervention as a last resort

that must be taken (*Deeds Done In Words* 109). Complaint number eleven articulates this point,

when it states, "That the many acts of injustices against members of our race before the courts of

law in the respective islands and colonies are of such nature as to create disgust and disrespect

for the white man's sense of justice" ("Declaration of Rights"). These injustices, ranging from

being denied government employment, to being disallowed equal access to medical treatment, to

being forced to pay taxes and face conscription in the armed forces despite not receiving equal

government representation, have created "disgust and disrespect" to the point where white

governments can no longer be taken seriously. Furthermore, the text clearly pardons blacks from

having to follow the system any more, thereby inviting conflict. Black persons are no longer

aggressors, but rather responding to a long line of attacks. This makes conflict as wholly

defensible as it is inescapable.

Racial Equality Being the Ultimate Goal. Next, the "Declaration of Rights" shifts to

establish a new social order that is predicated on racial equality. After listing out the complaints,

the manifesto declares, "In order to encourage our race all over the world and to stimulate it to

overcome the handicaps and difficulties surrounding it, and to push forward to a higher and

grander destiny, we demand and insist on the following Declaration of Rights" and proceeds to

list out the treatment they demand for all blacks everywhere ("Declaration of Rights"). This

"higher and grander destiny" is the social order Klope speaks of (343) when the myth of war is

used as a primary rationalization. The main foundation for this social order is outlined in point

two of these demands, declaring:

> That we believe in the supreme authority of our race in all things racial; that all things are
> created and given to man as a common possession; that there should be an equitable
> distribution and apportionment of all such things, and in consideration of the fact that as a
> race we are now deprived of those things that are morally and legally ours, we believed it
> right that all such things should be acquired and held by whatsoever means possible.
> ("Declaration of Rights")

Essentially, black individuals are now obligated to their race first; anything else is merely

tertiary.

After establishing the ideal social order for which peace can be achieved, the manifesto

then articulates actions and justifications in accomplishing it. This is highlighted in point seven

of this section when it states, "We believe that any law or practice that tends to deprive any

African of his land or the privileges of free citizenship within his country is unjust and immoral,

and no native should respect any such law or practice" ("Declaration of Rights"). Subsequently,

black people are now justified in disobeying laws, for doing so is actually in acquiescence to a

much higher form of peace – social equality for all black communities.

Now that actions are laid out, further justification in the event of conflict is provided,

particularly in point sixteen, "We believe all men should live in peace one with the other, but

when races and nations provoke the ire of other races and nations by attempting to infringe upon their rights, war becomes inevitable, and the attempt in any way to free one's self or protect one's rights or heritage becomes justifiable" ("Declaration of Rights"). In using the belief that protecting their race should be held to the highest standard, the text successfully manages to validate direct confrontation. Moreover, it forestalls any possible moral suasion in casting any culpability towards white aggressors, not black individuals.

Whites Constructed as Savage Other. Lastly, the "Declaration of Rights" illustrates a clear binary between white and black communities. Interestingly, the manifesto inverses traditionally perceived notions of savagery. While savages are typically associated with non-white persons, and has historically been associated with non-Western areas, the "Declaration of Rights" argues that it is ethnically European whites that are the true barbarians. In attempting to remove the savage stigma away from Africa, the manifesto shifts it to whites.

This savage Othering, as described by Ivie, is illustrated in multiple ways. First, the text labels anyone who is not a member of the black communities as an alien race. For example, in point six of the demands section, the "Declaration of Rights" declares, "We declare it unfair and prejudicial to the rights of Negroes in communities where they exist in considerable numbers to be tried by a judge and jury composed entirely of an alien race, but in all such cases members of our race are entitled to representation on the jury." The term "alien" is specifically used again in multiple points, heightening the "'us' against 'them'" mentality that Ivie (284) articulates. This is contrasted with references to the "sacred blood" of the black race in the concluding paragraph. One side is alien, foreign, unable to have harmony with black persons, while the other is righteous, natural, whose very essence is sacred.

Additionally, the "Declaration of Rights" repeatedly places whites and white governance in the category of barbarism. It states in point sixteen of the demands section, "Whereas the lynching, by burning, hanging or any other means, of human beings is a barbarous practice and a shame and disgrace to civilization, we therefore declare any country guilty of such atrocities outside the pale of civilization" ("Declaration of Rights"). In doing so, the text highlights the rhetorical strategy of détournement, or flipping a cultural concept on itself (Debord and Wolman 10). In this case, the role of the savage is shifted from black people, to those that have traditionally used the savage stereotype to discriminate them. Black persons are now portrayed as the virtuous ones, whereas whites are the uncompromising barbarians that necessitate direct confrontation.

Through portraying war as an inevitability, placing racial equality of all black communities over obedience to white governments as the ideal peace, and casting whites as savage barbarians, the "Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World" reflects multiple elements of the justified conflict mythology. While it does not contain traditional narratives, the mythology successfully flips the role of barbarian away from Africa and to their white oppressors. The result is not only a full absolution for blacks to oppose white dominance, but also further buttress Garvey's case to make Africa the new locus for the black diaspora.

The Southern Manifesto: Using the "Myth" of War to Promote the Myth of Desegregation

In attempting to reshape the national dialogue over desegregation, "The Southern Manifesto" reflects several elements of the rhetorical mythology of a just war. Key to this is recasting segregation as a benign way of life that is under assault by avaricious judges. In order to exculpate the conflict the segregationists wish to have with the federal government, they must portray themselves as the respondents rather than the aggressor. Explicit metaphors of combat

46

and war are not overtly present in the text; perhaps this is a product of the segregationists'

sensitivity to the bitter aftereffects of the Civil War. Nonetheless, through constructing a

narrative arc that requires conflict, redefine segregation as a form of racial peace, and portraying

Southerners as virtuous crusaders against a rapacious judiciary, the rhetorical way mythology is

present in many ways.

Narrative Arcs that Necessitate Conflict. First, as discussed by Campbell and Jamieson,

war mythology utilizes narrative to constitute a defined, external enemy and create a set timeline

that portrays the struggle as an inevitable outcome, thereby shifting the role of the aggressor

away from the rhetor and to the enemy (*Deeds Done In Words* 107). Moving Campbell and

Jamieson's original analysis beyond Presidential discourse, the mythology can be seen in "The

Southern Manifesto." Narrative is employed to cast the segregationists, and subsequently their

cause, as being in the moral right.

The timeline within "The Southern Manifesto" is rooted both in immediate, material

concerns – the recent decisions of the federal judiciary to desegregate public schools – as well as

distant, philosophical premises; in this case, the arc of history regarding the role of governmental

checks and balances. The Manifesto synthesizes both of these in its opening statement: "The

unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court in the public school cases is now bearing the fruit

always produced when men substitute naked power for established law" ("The Southern

Manifesto"). The immediate timeline, which revolves around the landmark *Brown v. Board of

Education* decisions, in 1954 and 1955, is used to foreshadow a distant, more ominous threat to

the stability of the republic. The text then outlines the material timeline by depicting the federal

courts as the clear culprits for starting this conflict, noting, "[The decision] climaxes a trend in

the Federal Judiciary undertaking to legislate, in derogation of the authority of Congress, and to

47

encroach upon the reserved rights" ("The Southern Manifesto"). The discourse then illustrates

the many ways in which segregation has been historically established: from noting that "The

original Constitution does not mention education," to pointing out that the Congress that ratified

the 14th Amendment, the legal basis upon which the Supreme Court overturned school

segregation, was, "The very Congress which […] subsequently provided for segregated schools

in the District of Columbia," to stating, "Every one of the twenty six states that had any

substantial race difference among its people, either approved the operation of segregated schools

already in existence or subsequently established such schools" ("The Southern Manifesto").

Through this narrative, "The Southern Manifesto" reflects Campbell and Jamieson's notion that

narrative places the rhetor in the right and as the aggrieved party (107), as the events reflect a

trend that is beyond the segregationist South's control.

 After laying out its narrative retelling, "The Southern Manifesto" replaces the distant,

philosophical concerns of "bearing the fruit always produced" with the immediate, material issue

of superseding Congress and the Constitution in its opening sentence:

> Though there has been no constitutional amendment or act of Congress changing this
> established legal principle almost a century old, the Supreme Court of the United States,
> with no legal basis for such action, undertook to exercise their naked judicial power and
> substitute their personal political and social ideas for the established law of the land.
> ("The Southern Manifesto")

 Due to this, agency has clearly been shifted in the conflict to the federal judiciary, allowing the

text to declare, "We commend the motives of those States which have declared the intention to

resist forced integration by any lawful means" ("The Southern Manifesto"). This is critical, for

as Campbell and Jamieson explain, narrative in war myth can be used to describe the enemy as a

threat to "cherished national values," thereby warranting direct confrontation (*Deeds Done In*

Words 107). With the "cherished values" in this case being the very principles that gird our republic, the text makes conflict not only certain, but needed.

Thus, "The Southern Manifesto" manages to shift the burden of instigating the conflict successfully onto the judiciary, giving them moral authority to challenge the decision of the courts directly. Through these dual timelines, "The Southern Manifesto" portrays the clash between segregationists and the federal courts as an unavoidable outcome, one that is demanded by the aggressive attacks of the enemy. Conflict then becomes justified in the logic of the text, as well as the segregationists that wish to pursue this course of action.

Segregation Recast as a Form of Peace. Next, as previously defined by Dorsey, the justified war myth relies on the ideal of peace as being the ultimate goal of pursuing war (45). On its face, war cannot be justified to merely perpetuate more conflict; if war is depicted as a narrative inevitability according to Campbell and Jamieson (*Deeds Done in Words* 109), then it must be used as a means to end the conflict and achieve concordance. Moreover, the notion of peace within war mythology necessitates the creation of some form of order and stability. Within "The Southern Manifesto", the war myth is validated through the preservation of segregation. An idyllic vision of racial harmony through segregation is laid out in the text and presented as the ideal of peace. It argues that the 1896 Supreme Court case *Plessy v. Ferguson*, which defined the "separate but equal" legal standard that, until Brown, sanctified school segregation, became the basis for cordial race relations. It states, "This interpretation, restated time and again, became a part of the life of the people of many of the States and confirmed their habits, traditions, and way of life. It is founded on elemental humanity and commonsense, for parents should not be deprived of the right to direct the lives and education of their own children" ("The Southern

Manifesto"). By centering routines, established cultural lifestyles, and paternalistic practices as

the ideal for stability, "The Southern Manifesto" roots its war myth on a reactionary ideal.

Although seemingly appalling to most modern audiences, "The Southern Manifesto"

makes this idealized form of segregated race relations central to its war myth. The Manifesto

warns of what has happened because of the Court's decision:

> This unwarranted exercise of power by the Court, contrary to the Constitution, is creating
> chaos and confusion in the States principally affected. It is destroying the amicable
> relations between the white and Negro races that have been created through ninety years
> of patient effort by the good people of both races. ("The Southern Manifesto")

Moreover, if direct confrontation is not taken, the Manifesto cautions that chaos will only

continue, arguing that "outside mediators are threatening immediate and revolutionary changes

in our public school system. If done, this is certain to destroy the system of public education in

some states" ("The Southern Manifesto"). As such, rhetorical war is justified, as the only

outcomes fall on a binary: either the preservation of order or the destruction of any semblance of

stability and, subsequently, any possibility of Dorsey's ideal peace to be achieved.

In addition, the manifesto reflects Burkean victimage, in that it casts blame on the

"outside agitators" of the federal courts and makes them the scapegoat, as they are, "a vessel

strong enough to hold the transgressions" of guilt, as explained by Klope (346). As a result, "The

Southern Manifesto" justifies its combative approach while simultaneously transferring any guilt

in creating this conflict onto an external enemy. The discourse not only rationalizes the use of

conflict, but also the segregated way of life.

Virtuous Southerners versus an Avaricious Judiciary. Lastly, war mythologies operate on

dualities within a conflict: one virtuous, committed to peaceful resolution, and the other

villainous, devoted to chaotic dissolution. The other side is reduced to a savage Other, avaricious

in its own quest for power and incapable of determining the conflict in a civilized manner (Ivie

283-4). In "The Southern Manifesto," the judiciary is portrayed as unable to appeal to reason, thereby forcing the rhetor into a reluctant position of combat in order to achieve some form of closure. Accordingly, segregationists are reaffirmed as the "virtuous" actor in the conflict, creating a circular logic whereby any actions they take, including militant confrontation, are sanctified.

"The Southern Manifesto" reflects this divide in two key ways. First, it does so by targeting the very motives of the federal judiciary. Twice within the text it refers to the federal courts' quest for "naked power," at the expense of following judicial precedent and respecting the powers of Congress. No longer are the courts' decisions on desegregation rooted in jurisprudence, but rather in a rapacious desire for power and control. This, subsequently, reflects Ivie's notions of the savage, turning justices into power hungry tyrants and constructing a struggle over racial discrimination as an "us versus it." Moreover, the Manifesto assumes that this quest for power will be pursued through coercion, as it contends, "We pledge ourselves to use all lawful means to bring about a reversal of this decision which is contrary to the Constitution and to prevent the use of force in its implementation" ("The Southern Manifesto"). In doing so, the de-civilizing of the judiciary is complete, turning them into a power-hungry Other that will destroy segregationists, if not stopped.

Second, the Manifesto portrays the courts as an Other by creating an insider-outsider dichotomy. Initially, the text declares, "Without regard to the consent of the governed, outside mediators are threatening immediate and revolutionary changes in our public schools system" ("The Southern Manifesto"). Although not directly calling them out by name, the manifesto is clearly referring to the Supreme Court and the allegedly deleterious effects it will have wrought on Southern public schools. Moreover, in the final stanza before it declares its statement of

51

principles and opposition to the court decision, the text states, "With the gravest concern for the explosive and dangerous condition created by this decision and inflamed by outside meddlers" ("The Southern Manifesto"). This reflects Williamson's notion of the rhetor being the "reluctant aggressor" (221), only called to action by the actions of agitators. Here, "The Southern Manifesto" heightens this conflict by casting the Supreme Court as troublesome interlopers. This subsequently serves to delegitimize any reasons the Supreme Court may have had in casting its decision on *Brown v. Board of Education*, while making pro-segregationist Southerners reflective of Dorsey's "virtuous champions" of peace against an implacable foe. As a result, conflict becomes authorized in the eyes of the text.

Through portraying conflict as unavoidable, using conflict as a means to reestablish an idealized social order, and portraying the federal judiciary as an Other within a binary context, "The Southern Manifesto" reflects the war mythology in several key ways. Not only does it seek to condone conflict, but also to absolve segregation morally, thereby inverting the role of aggressor away from the proponents of the text. Additionally, "The Southern Manifesto" indicates that the mythology of war can be present in less overt ways and still carry powerful rhetorical meaning. The ideological justification for creating direct strife with the larger social system is still present, even without an explicit call for a second Civil War.

The Woman-Identified Woman: External War as a Means to Gain Internal Peace

The elements of war mythology and justified conflict are reflected throughout "The Woman-Identified Woman." Terms such as "peace," "war," "liberation," and "revolution" indicate a recurrent ideology that emphasizes fighting misogyny as well as heteronormativity. The text seeks to do this by redirecting the struggle away from being between straight and lesbian women to all women versus men. In this way, the main elements of war mythology

previously outlined are all illustrated within the manifesto text. First, the text shifts the necessary

conflict as one between men and women, second it creates a world where peace is achieved

through self-identification, and finally it contends that all men and women fall on a binary of

oppressors and liberators.

An Unavoidable Conflict Recentered. First, the conflict is characterized as one that is

unpreventable. In the case of "The Woman-Identified Woman", this "war" is not between

women, but instead recentered between men and all of womankind. As explained by Campbell

and Jamieson, the justification is drawn from a "dramatic narrative from which, in turn, an

argument is extracted" (*Deeds Done in Words* 107). For in "The Woman-Identified Woman", the

narrative is not a specific chronology of events detailing the past injustices brought upon

lesbians. Instead, the narrative is through the eyes of a nameless lesbian, making it more

detached; it could be applied to any lesbian, or any woman who feels constrained by a male-

dominated social system. The manifesto states:

> She is the woman who, often beginning at an extremely early age, acts in accordance
> with her inner compulsion to be a more complete and freer human being than her society
> – perhaps then, but certainly later – cares to allow her. These needs and actions, over a
> period of years, bring her into painful conflict with people, situations, the accepted ways
> of thinking, feeling and behaving, until she is in a state of continual war with everything
> around her, and usually with her self. ("The Woman-Identified Woman")

The narrative here shows a gradual build and casts lesbians as reluctantly drafted into a war that

they did not start. Much as the *Declaration of Independence* does, this text illustrates a rhetoric

of exhaustion, where the rhetor has no alternative but to engage the conflict. Moreover, it

follows the course of her personal life, lending itself to a micro approach. Through this, it creates

a systemic critique, where the conflict is not between lesbians and straight women but rather

between women and a misogynistic system that socially disciplines them into behaving and

thinking a particular way.

Additionally, inescapability is also constructed in that lesbians are already in direct conflict with the social system, whether they want to be or not. The text notes, "She may not be fully conscious of the political implications of what for her began as personal necessity, but on some level she has not been able to accept the limitations and oppression laid on her by the most basic role of her society--the female role" ("The Woman-Identified Woman"). No other form of recourse is even possible, for just the simple act of being a lesbian brings one into conflict, making this detached narrative a powerful form of justification.

Furthermore, Campbell and Jamieson contend that narrative also functions to identify a clear enemy that must be engaged (*Deeds Done in Words* 109). Here, the manifesto uses the detached narrative to castigate straight women who let the fear of being called a lesbian prevent them from challenging male supremacy. Thus, a clear enemy is delineated: men and women who do as men tell them. "The Woman-Identified Woman" states, "Lesbian is a word, the label, the condition that holds women in line. When a woman hears this word tossed her way, she knows she is stepping out of line […] She recoils, she protests, she reshapes her actions to gain approval." As such, the narrative constructs an argument where the status quo – letting the fear of lesbianism forestall any real efforts at challenging the social order – is simply untenable, and must be addressed. The only logical outcome of this narrative is a direct confrontation with the social system, thereby reflecting the element of inevitability.

Peace Achieved through Self-Identification. Next, the war mythology contends that peace is the final goal of direct conflict. In the case of "The Woman-Identified Woman", this entails creating a new social order that no longer privileges men at the expense of women. To achieve this, however, a new belief system must be established internally within every woman's psyche. The manifesto contends, "On a different political/psychological level, it must be understood that

54

what is crucial is that women begin disengaging from male defined response patterns. In the privacy of our own psyches, we must cut those cords to the core" ("The Woman-Identified Woman"). A different order is subsequently created that begins with a new personal outlook from women. This illustrates the Burkean victimage that shifts guilt on another party in war mythology (Klope 346-7). Through "cutting these chords to the core," "The Woman-Identified Woman" proposes a ritualistic cleansing for women to achieve a new social system. In doing so, Dorsey's contention that war mythology "contain[s] the transcendent ideal of everlasting peace" (45) is reflected within the text. In essence, achieving peace within the mind will lead to peace in society as a whole.

As a result, even though "The Woman-Identified Woman" advocates a forceful overthrow of a system, it is justified in the war mythology as it is done so to realize an idealized peace. The final passage of the manifesto sums up this belief: "It is the primacy of women relating to women, of women creating a new consciousness of and with each other, which is at the heart of women's liberation, and the basis for the cultural revolution" ("The Woman-Identified Woman"). Clearly, peace is used as a means to justify conflict, illustrating a core tenet within the war mythology. Although this peace is more internal, it requires a direct confrontation to the current social order.

Dichotomy of Female Liberators and Male Oppressors. Lastly, "The Woman-Identified Woman" constructs a dialectic that reduces all men to being oppressors. In an effort to find solidarity with their straight feminist counterparts, the lesbian authors of the manifesto create a simple dichotomy: male oppressors, and female liberators. Males are incapable of being sympathetic or allies to the cause of feminism, according to the text: "In exchange for our psychic servicing and for performing society's non-profit-making functions, the man confers on

55

us just one thing: the slave status which makes us legitimate in the eyes of the society in which we live" ("The Woman-Identified Woman"). By using the term "slave" the text reduces men to barbaric savages; only the lowest of brutes hold other people as property. This is indicative of Ivie's notion that war mythology creates a binary of "'us' against 'it'" (285). As a result, this binary is not only between men and women, but between male definitions of women and women:

> He confirms his image of us - of what we have to be in order to be acceptable by him – but not our real selves; he confirms our womanhood – as he defines it, in relation to him – but cannot confirm our personhood, our own selves as absolutes. As long as we are dependent on the male culture for this definition. for this approval, we cannot be free. ("The Woman-Identified Woman")

This slave status, therefore, is not literal, but rather social, controlling women's own states of mind. Men are not to be reasoned with, negotiated with, or accommodated in any way. Rather, they can only be addressed in as direct a revolutionary manner as possible.

As such, the constructed dichotomy in the manifesto forces women also to break away from any male-identified role, as is apparent in the following:

> When you strip off all the packaging, you must finally realize that the essence of being a 'woman' is to get fucked by men [...] It is very difficult to realize and accept that being "feminine" and being a whole person are irreconcilable. Only women can give to each other a new sense of self. ("The Woman-Identified Woman")

As males are savage Others, by extension their definition of women are savage as well. The only logical response to this is to confront directly both men and their constructed societal roles for women, making conflict not only validated, but needed.

In having a detached narrative to establish their unavoidable conflict with the social system, portraying peace as an internal construct that must be attained by any means, and casting males and male-defined roles as dialectically opposite to being a woman, "The Woman-Identified Woman" reflects elements of the rhetorical war mythology throughout. The lesbian authors of the manifesto sought to shift the social tumult away from internal strife between

56

feminists and instead externally against all men. Accordingly, they advocated for a radical new form of social order that not only leads to outward societal changes in social roles, but also to the manner in which women view themselves and the world.

Queers Read This: Inversing the "Other" from Queer to Straight

The mythology of war within "Queers Read This" is a key source of rhetorical invention for the manifesto. Metaphors pertaining to war are prevalent throughout the text. Additionally, in advocating a violent overthrow of the current sexual order in place of a radical, queer-centric one, "Queers Read This" repeatedly attempts to condone its militant approach to straights by characterizing it as the product of a long, vicious conflict that queers were never responsible for starting. Thus, it is apparent that the core tenets of the war myth are reflected in the text. "Queers Read This" does so in three ways: violent confrontation as a logical outcome, queer world making to create a new social order, and queer militarism as the only recourse against savage straights.

Violent Confrontation as Logical Outcome. First, "Queers Read This" recreates the narrative of events that make brutal conflict with straights simply unavoidable. Similar to "The Southern Manifesto", the text also contains dual timelines, one immediate and rooted in material reality, and the other distant and based in a social reality. As that manifesto does, "Queers Read This" also blends these concepts early in its text:

> Queers are under siege […] In 1969, there were 50 "Queer Bashings" in the month of May alone. Violent attacks, 3,720 men, women and children died of AIDS in the same month, caused by a more violent attack --- government inaction, rooted in society's growing homophobia. This is institutionalized violence, perhaps more dangerous to the existence of queers because the attackers are faceless. ("Queers Read This")

Unlike "The Southern Manifesto" however, the causality between these two timelines is seemingly reversed. Whereas "The Southern Manifesto" declares that the philosophical threat to

57

the republic was a result of the material events of the federal courts' decisions, "Queers Read This" contends that the social reality timeline – a homophobic society that has perpetually marginalized queers – has allowed for the immediate, material reality timeline of gay bashings and the AIDS plague to occur. This may be reflective of how pro-segregationist Southerners were fighting to maintain a position of privilege, whereas radical queers were striving to take down a privileged system that oppressed them. It makes sense, then, that "Queers Read This" advocates material changes in the immediate future in order to deal with longstanding social reality issues, as in the following:

> I want there to be a moratorium on straight marriage, on babies, on public displays of affection among the opposite sex and media images that promote heterosexuality. Until I can enjoy the same freedom of movement and sexuality, as straights, their privilege must stop and it must be given over to me and my queer sisters and brothers. ("Queers Read This")

Social reality is what creates the structure that privileges and marginalizes certain communities, but immediate material changes can lead to permanently altering that social reality.

Additionally, the timeline is reflective of the inventive strategies discussed by Campbell and Jamieson (*Deeds Done In Words*), in that a narrative of events forces the rhetor no other recourse but to engage in militarism. In its call to action to fellow queers, the text offers the following: "In 1969, Queers fought back. In 1990, Queers say ok. Next year, will we be here?" ("Queers Read This"). The alternative to action, by the recounting of Queer Nation, is extinction. By invoking Stonewall, the text attempts to create a parallel of historical accounts. Just as how failure to act in 1969 would have resulted in the complete annihilation of queers, so too will this occur in 1990 if queers acquiesce. Though the events are different, the exigency remains the same. Also, through the use of rhetorical memory, the text shames its audience who would consider any other alternative but all-out war to be a viable option.

Moreover, the story set in "Queers Read This" creates a clear external enemy in straights, whose actions clear queers of any responsibility when engaging in militarism:

> The straight world has us so convinced that we are helpless and deserving victims of the violence against us, that queers are immobilized when faced with a threat. BE OUTRAGED! These attacks must not be tolerated. DO SOMETHING. Recognize that any act of aggression against any member of our community is an attack on every member of the community. ("Queers Read This")

By transferring any wrongdoing to any queers done at any time as an act against the entire community, Queer Nation illustrates the narrative function of war mythology laid out by Campbell and Jamieson (*Deeds Done In Words* 109) and vindicates its militant actions

Queer World Making to Create a New Social Order. Next, "Queers Read This" validates its conflict by arguing that it is necessary to establish peace. For this text, the ideal peace within its war mythology is through engaging in queer world making. It proposes a wholly new social order that flips privilege away from straights and towards queers. Charles E. Morris III and John M. Sloop contend that the process of queer world making includes, "queering readings of all forms of intimacy and their public connections" (13). In essence, "Queers Read This" seeks to rupture the heteronormative privileges of the dominant system that come at the expense of queers, in favor of a more just and equitable social structure.

In fulfilling this twofold process, "Queers Read This" argues it will create a world that brings greater order and stability for queers. Initially, it contends that privilege must be taken from straights by any means, stating, "Straight people will not do this voluntarily and so they must be forced into it. Straights must be frightened into it. Terrorized into it. Fear is the most powerful motivation. No one will give us what we deserve. Rights are not given they are taken, by force if necessary" ("Queers Read This"). By using the phrase "what we deserve," "Queers Read This" advocates a new social order, or its utopian version of "peace," which is equal rights

with straights. Due to this, queers are now Dorsey's champions of peace (45), making war

perfectly acceptable.

This is only part of the war mythology within "Queers Read This" however, as it then

proposes a new social system designed specifically for queers. The manifesto then declares,

"Let's make every space a Lesbian and Gay space. Every street a part of our sexual geography. A

city of yearning and then total satisfaction. A city and a country where we can be safe and free

and more" ("Queers Read This"). This is indicative of Klope's ideals of war being used to create

social stability. What marks this new social order, however, is that it is centered on queerness,

rather than straightness, thereby becoming the standard for which Queer Nation can achieve

peace.

Furthermore, "Queers Read This" engages in victimage by blaming straights for all of the

queer community's ills. All straights are cast as the external vessel in the Burkean sense,

responsible for any actions taken against queers simply for being who they are. The manifesto

explains:

> Straight people are your enemy. They are your enemy when they don't acknowledge your
> invisibility and continue to live in and contribute to a culture that kills you. Every day
> one of us is taken by the enemy. Whether it's an AIDS death due to homophobic
> government inaction or a lesbian bashing in an all-night diner (in a supposedly lesbian
> neighborhood). ("Queers Read This")

The manifesto successfully casts blame and shifts guilt onto straights, thereby making them the

enemy of peace and becoming a central component of the war mythology in "Queers Read This".

Recourse against Savage Straights in Queer Militarism. Lastly, Queer Nation creates a

duality between straights and queers. It does so by contrasting the two sides as wholly

incompatible with the other. Primarily, it turns straights into a savage Other in which no form of

equality or concordance could ever possibly be reached. Perhaps "Queers Read This" sums it up

best when it states, "They will beat us, rape us and kill us before they will continue to live with us." The only motive ascribed to straights for their actions is simple bigotry, and subsequently militarism is the only appropriate recourse. Straights become de-civilized and turned into Ivie's savages (284), making peaceful attempts at reconciliation pure folly. Queers are also cast as the "reluctant aggressors" as prescribed by Williamson, as the only alternative to militant confrontation is death. The manifesto highlights this mythical element when it proclaims, "Rights are not given they are taken, by force if necessary[…]The more we allow homophobes to inflict violence, terror and fear on our lives, the more frequently and ferociously we will be the object of their hatred" ("Queers Read This"). As such, queers are now cast as being in the moral right and justified for taking drastic measures, pursuing any other alternative means would not only prove ineffective, but also deleterious to the queer community.

Moreover, the text places all straights within the category of Other, even those who might label themselves as sympathetic to queer issues. Similar to "The Southern Manifesto", the text employs an insider-outsider dialectic to cast straights as simply unable to comprehend queer existence, as in the following:

> I have friends. Some of them are straight. Year after year I continue to realize that the facts of my life are irrelevant to them and that I am only half listened to, that I am an appendage to the doings of a greater world, a world of power and privilege, of the laws of installation, a world of exclusion. ("Queers Read This")

By simply being straight, they are incapable of ever achieving an accord with queers as they are incapable of understanding them. This is indicative of Ivie's "Us versus It" mentality, where all members of the outside are cast as savage and Other (285). Whereas if a few members of the enemy could prove to be allies, thus undercutting the justification for war, portraying all outsiders as savages maintains the binary that underpins war mythology.

In addition, Queer Nation contrasts itself as the righteous counterpart by using moral inheritance, calling on the historical contributions of queers to portray them as an indispensable part of the human condition. While straights are depicted as savage and destructive towards anyone that is different, the manifesto describes queers accordingly:

> Every one of us is a world of infinite possibility. (We have so much to fight for; we are the most precious of endangered species.) And we are an army of lovers because it is we who know what love is. Desire and lust, too. We invented them. ("Queers Read This")

Thus, queer existence is given epistemological precedence over heterosexuality; as those who truly recognize love, desire, and lust, queers have an understanding of both themselves and the world that straights will never attain. On top of this, "Queers Read This" links the struggle for queer liberation with achieving a greater societal good, in the following:

> We must fight for ourselves (no one else is going to do it) and if in that process we bring greater freedom to the world at large then great. (We've given so much to that world: democracy, all the arts, the concepts of love, philosophy and the soul, to name just a few gifts from our ancient Greek Dykes, Fags.) ("Queers Read This").

In doing so, the queers discussed within the manifesto epitomize Dorsey's contrast, as they become the "virtuous champions dedicated to peace against malevolent villains bent on chaos" (45). The war mythology within "Queers Read This" becomes complete, as queers are now reconstituted as the righteous warriors whose militarism is justified against the savage straights.

In portraying its conflict with straights as a foregone conclusion that is necessary to create a new queer order against savage, Otherized straights, "Queers Read This" reflects the key elements of war mythology. Additionally, the myth plays a critical role in its rhetorical invention and argumentation, laying the foundation for a radical, violent queer uprising against a heteronormative system. This illustrates how myths are not merely rhetorical forms for ornamentation, but rather a key ideological undercurrent throughout manifesto texts.

Conclusion: Connecting the Manifestos through Myth

In examining the case studies, there is clearly a reoccurring rhetorical myth of war and justified conflict. Although not every text uses explicit war manifestos or directly advocates for an armed uprising, the presence of narrative inevitability, peace as the ultimate ideal for war, and binaries that construct the enemies as uncompromising demonstrate they contain the same underlying ideology that a direct, confrontational approach to the social system is not only validated, but in many cases necessitated. Thus, they fulfill Leroy Dorsey's contention that myths, "bring reason and a sense of order to a complex, and sometimes irrational, human society" (42). Moreover, Burkean victimage is a noticeable stylistic pattern across these manifestos, as it highlights a new social order that justifies the manifesto's aggressive engagement of conflict. These elements also occur in concert with one another; not only do they appear as a whole unit, but their presence necessarily informs how the others become manifested. Due to this, it seems that the mythology of war is an indispensable component of social movement manifestos. A manifesto necessarily seeks to rupture current cultural logics and social structures. In order to do so, it must justify the socially violent form of war that occurs when systemic overthrow occurs. The elements of war fulfill that need for validation.

In light of this, the case can be made that the myth of war is a prevalent aspect of movement manifestos, and furthers the case that it is a rhetorical genre. It is more than just these elements reoccur; that the manifestos illustrate these elements in different ways only bolsters the argument that myths significantly inform the substantive and stylistic responses to the manifesto's unique rhetorical situations. William Benoit notes that for forms to be considered part of a genre, "those common rhetorical properties can be expressed in generalizations concerning the rhetorical properties of that set of genre" (120). Here, the myth of war clearly

63

serves as a base for rhetorical invention within these texts, making it a necessary component of

the rhetorical genre. Because of this, myths forms one of the tensions that bind multiple forms

together, making it not just a genre for classification, but also for rhetorical and cultural insight.

CHAPTER 5

CONSTITUTIVE RHETORICAL FUNCTION OF MANIFESTOS

It is imperative to ascertain whether patterns of constitutive rhetorical strategies exist within manifestos because genres outline recurring patterns of substance as well as stylistic form across discourses. Therefore, elements of constitutive rhetoric within social movement manifestos are a central component of this analysis. Substantively, constitutive rhetoric helps create a new public that forms the basis of adherents to the movement. Michael Calvin McGee correctly asserts that a "public" is nothing more than a rhetorical fiction that infuses both social and material realities; fiction in the sense of a story or narrative, rather than one that is materially fake. Using this premise, Maurice Charland contends that a "people" cannot be called forth if they do not have the means to participate in the closure of the narrative that underlines the collective fantasy; in other words, if there is no material way to enact closure of a social reality. As such, if the way in which these publics become constructed were similar, constitutive elements would necessarily guide the rhetorical invention of all manifestos, regardless of rhetorical situation or stated ideological outcome. How these texts outline their grievances and set forth means in which to address them could be informed and constrained by the publics which the discourse attempts to create.

Stylistically, constitutive rhetoric is part of a social movement manifesto's attempt to articulate a position of principles, objectives, motives, or grievances to the broader culture. Critical to this is the construction of a public that also believes in the text's declarations so as to gain recognition by a larger audience. The manner in which these publics are fashioned can

reveal cultural undercurrents, for it demonstrates what sort of "ideal auditor" the dominant

culture demands in order to grant recognition. To illustrate these principles more fully,

constitutive elements are individually studied in each of the aforementioned manifestos.

Declaration of Independence*: Creating the American People*

The constitutive rhetoric within the *Declaration of Independence* greatly influences its

invention and style. Stephen Lucas notes, "The Declaration was a rhetorical document. Its

immediate object was to persuade a 'candid world' that the Americans were justified in seeking

to establish themselves as an independent nation" (68-9). Primary among these justifications was

an articulation of an American public that wanted independence, as Lucas explains:

> Yet it was imperative that Congress present a united front to the world, no matter how
> sharply it divided behind closed doors of its meeting hall. British leaders and American
> Tories had long claimed Congress did not represent the true wishes of most colonists, and
> Congress knew its enemies would condemn the quest for independence as a desperate
> measure forced on the majority of Americans by a handful of 'artful, ambitious, and
> wicked men.' (73-4)

Due to this, constitutive rhetoric plays a critical role in the *Declaration*. McGee and Charland's

principles of collective fantasy, interpellation, and Burke's dramatistic notions of identification

are found throughout the text.

Collective Fantasy within Colonial Relations. First, the *Declaration* reveals a collective

fantasy about the characteristics of the Continental Congress's actions as well as the relations

between the colonies and the British Empire. McGee argues that creating a public requires an

"agreement of an audience to participate in a collective fantasy" ("In Search of 'the People'"

343). This is indicative in the way the *Declaration* frames the colonies' clash with the British

Empire. It does so by creating two narrative arcs: one that places the struggle for independence

within humanity's broader quest for equality and liberty that is ordained by God, and one that

addresses the immediate, material concerns of the colonies. Both of these work to address both

66

internal audiences that are sympathetic to the cause of independence, as well as external

audiences that are still skeptical of America's pursuit for independence. Initially, the *Declaration*

proceeds by forming an account that places America's endeavor for independence beyond the

temporal constraints of eighteenth century colonial matters and into the larger spectrum of

human freedom. In the introduction the text proclaims:

> When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation. (*Declaration of Independence*)

This sets the foundation for the collective fantasy from which the *Declaration* draws; Lucas

explains, "The introduction elevates the quarrel with England from a petty political dispute to a

major event in the grand sweep of history" (75). Thus, the foundational narrative of the

collective fantasy is broadened from beyond a current row with the Empire to one that

encapsulates all of human history. Those agitating for American independence are no longer

colonists merely wishing to disentangle themselves of imperial meddling, but rather visionary

fighters engaging in a grand experiment of democratic freedom under the blessing of God.

The collective fantasy of equating American independence with advancing liberty for all

of humanity is reflected in the next section, the preamble, when the *Declaration* continues, "We

hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their

Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of

Happiness" (*Declaration of Independence*). Following this, the *Declaration* contends that the

role of government is to ensure these rights, and that if they fail to do so, the people are entitled

to overthrow them. Lucas argues that the first two listed rights – life and liberty – were reflective

of Enlightenment-era ideals as to what government should ensure for its people, and that

"Happiness was also considered the supreme goal of civil society" (87). Once again, the

Declaration epistemologically elevates the current dispute from one of economic issues to one

over celestially-sanctified political freedoms. As a result, the first two sections of the

Declaration institute a narrative arc that does not directly address the immediate concerns of the

colonies but allows the audience to participate in a collective fantasy of struggling for human

equality. This fantasy also addresses internal audiences, in that elevating the conflict reaffirms

the decision of those who already support revolution and accept the material claims of American

subjugation by the British Empire.

　　After establishing the first narrative arc that addresses philosophical concerns, the

manifesto then proceeds to deal with the material needs of the colonies in its next section, the

indictment of the monarchy as laid out in numerous grievances. In particular, this section speaks

to external audiences who are incredulous to the idea that the colonies are truly suffering under

both Parliament and the British Crown or merely agnostic as to whether revolution is truly

necessary. As explicated by Charland, narrative within collective fantasies infuses the objective

realities the audience faces with the social reality the rhetor is attempting to have the audience

buy into (143). This interplay is reflected in the *Declaration*'s charges against King George III.

There are twenty nine indictments laid against the Crown, divided into four main groups:

abusing executive power, conspiring with Parliament to subject the colonies to unconstitutional

measures, waging war against America, and refusing to address the concerns of the colonies

despite numerous protests (Lucas 96-102). Each group builds off the grievances laid out in the

previous one, summarizing at the end, "In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned

for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by

repeated injury. A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a

Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people" (*Declaration of Independence*). The manner in which the grievances are laid out, however, "Reflect the revolutionaries' view of the conflict and are skillfully written to appear objective while placing George III in the worst possible light […] several of the charges were overstated and, as Thomas Hutchinson complained, 'Most wickedly presented to cast reproach upon the King'" (98). This illustrates the interplay between objective and social realities as McGee and Charland previously explained. By taking real, material complaints against King George III but hyperbolizing them to construct a grander narrative of grave injustice, the *Declaration* successfully constructs a collective fantasy for the audience to engage in, and an identity that can be rooted in repeated marginalization from English monarchy.

Narrative Closure in the Form of Revolution. Moreover, narrative allows for the audience to participate in its "closure," thereby becoming a part of the story itself (Charland 143). Each group of grievances builds off of the previous one, presenting the former as a consequence of the latter. By doing this, the *Declaration* allows for only one logical outcome for closure – revolution and dissolution of all ties from the British Empire. Subsequently, a collective identity rooted in British culture also becomes impossible for the audience, leaving an American public as its only suitable alternative. Charland's interpellation is fully illustrated in the conclusion section of the *Declaration*, which allows for the audience to participate in the closure of both narrative arcs:

> We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved. (*Declaration of Independence*)

Thus, the *Declaration* allows for the audience to participate in the material closure – by breaking away from the colonies – and in the broader, more philosophical closure by appealing to God for their intentions in pursuing liberal democratic ideals. In addition, the philosophical narrative is open-ended, allowing for audiences to continue to interpolate and place themselves in the ideal of making America a cradle for Enlightenment ideals of human freedom and liberty long after the American Revolution.

Burkean Identification by Not Being British. Moreover, the *Declaration* is indicative of Kenneth Burke's dramatistic notions of identification. Burke declares, "Identification is compensatory to division" (182). The text reflects this in both its indictments against the Crown as well as its construction of the American "people." First, the group of objections presents the American people as the dialectical opposite of King George III and British Parliament. Those two entities become synecdochal representatives of the British Empire, thereby creating the rhetorical space for an American identity, free of British influence. The text establishes the American identity as the logical opposite of the King and Parliament, and by extension the British as a whole. Furthermore, this is reflective of the paradox articulated by Kenneth Zagacki, when constitutive rhetoric attempts to call forth, "a reconstituted and seemingly autonomous identity" (274). Making the American people opposite of the British is an attempt to constitute an identity that is independent and autonomous of British culture, even though that is its ostensible origins.

Additionally, the *Declaration* reflects Burke's identification in how it labels the American people in contrast to the British. The text asserts in the opening line the necessity of "one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another" (*Declaration of Independence*). Lucas argues this was done for the purpose of, "Labeling the

Americans 'one people' and the British 'another'[…]the gulf between them was much more than political; it was intellectual, social, moral, and cultural" (77). This illustrates Burke's core argument that identification is not merely what members of one group shares in common with one another, but what they do not with members of other groups. This is also reflected in the second to last section of the *Declaration*, which is a full-throated condemnation of the British people:

> Nor have We been wanting in attentions to our British brethren… We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which, would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends. (*Declaration of Independence*)

Although recognizing their common ties, this section clearly states that "the Americans are a separate people from the British, and that independence is a necessity" (112). Thus, the *Declaration* illuminates Burke's identification and constitutes a new American identity that is contrast to the British crown. Moreover, Burkean identification illustrates another area in which the *Declaration* speaks to both internal and external audiences. For supporters of the cause, this identification serves a consummatory role in creating commonality with fellow revolutionaries. In the case of external audiences, identification reveals a separation between British and American Tories that superseded any shared principles in supporting the British Empire, furthering the case for them to become backers of American independence.

Through collective fantasy, interpellation, and Burkean identification, the *Declaration of Independence* constitutes a new, American-centered collective identity. By doing so, the *Declaration* reveals one of its foundational arguments for independence. As the American identity is the result of English imperial oppression, any possibility of commingling between the

71

two cultures is eradicated. Thus, in the course of making the case for an autonomous nation that is wholly separate and autonomous from the British Empire, the manifesto creates a "rhetorical fiction" as articulated by McGee and forms a new American public to go along with a new American republic.

Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World: Pan-Africanism As Collective Fantasy

Constitutive rhetoric plays a major role in the "Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World" ("Declaration of Rights"). Namely, Marcus Garvey sought to recenter Africa as the space of a new, more assertive black identity. Doing so posed a rhetorical risk; while most black communities in the United States knew little of the African continent at the time, it was almost always portrayed as an uncivilized space, and stereotypes of savagery extended to those who identified with it (Grant 162). Moreover, in order to break away from the "Old Negro" philosophy of Booker T. Washington, Garvey attempted to create a new identity that directly challenged white supremacy (Grant 160). This cleaved the internal and external dynamics of his black audience into two central groups – those who were open to abandoning the Old Negro approach yet were looking for another alternative, and Old Negro proponents who saw no necessity to stray from Washington's course of action. Hence, constitutive rhetoric can be seen within the "Declaration of Rights" in two key areas: creating a racial unity narrative and reclaiming Africa as the locus of a new pan-African identity.

Narrative Uniting a Global Race. First, the Declaration employs a narrative that addresses the material concerns of its internal and external audiences. Resultantly, it constructs a collective fantasy in which they can become participants. While the Declaration is structured more like a series of lists and does not employ narrative in the traditional chronological sense, the complaints section cites common travails experienced by black communities around the

world to create a pan-African audience no longer demarcated by nationality, but rather by the African Diaspora. Charland explains that narratives work through a representational effect; that is, they provide a centerpoint of understanding a particular series of events (139). The opening complaint in the text illustrates the foundation for this focal point: "That nowhere in the world, with few exceptions, are black men accorded equal treatment with white men" ("Declaration of Rights"). Hence, Garvey contends that the audience should no longer interpret their discrimination as merely localized occurrences, but rather as being indicative of a global, systemic subjugation that requires a transnational response. It continues in that first complaint by stating, "We are not willingly accepted as guests in the public hotels and inns of the world for no other reason than our race and color" ("Declaration of Rights"). By explaining that they are excluded from "public" hotels and inns, the text lays out a narrative of black persons being a permanent counterpublic in every corner of the globe. Throughout the rest of the Declaration, the phrase "of the world" is liberally used to remind its audience of injustices occurring everywhere.

Additionally, the list of complaints organizes specific instances so as to be focused on any one particular group. Injustices listed as occurring, "In the southern portion of the United States of America," are couched between other points decrying how the Europeans have colonized Africa to the extent where, "the natives are compelled to surrender their lands to aliens and are treated in most instances like slaves," and how, "nearly everywhere [blacks] are paid smaller wages than white men" ("Declaration of Rights"). Altogether, these complaints paint a picture of black marginalization being a universal problem, allowing black individuals to reconstitute their identity to being one based on race and not on national origin. Therefore, the audience can participate in a collective fantasy where an injustice committed against a black person anywhere is felt everywhere by the African Diaspora. This sentiment is summed up in the

final section declaring their rights when the "Declaration of Rights" argues, "The Negro is entitled to even-handed justice before all courts…when this is denied him on account of his race and color such denial is an insult to the race as a whole." This creates an inventional foundation for the Declaration's solutions; the only logical reaction to such a broad problem is a solution that can match its scope. For internal audiences, this entails becoming part of a new pan-African identity. For external, Old Negro audiences, this narrative makes the case that accomodationism simply cannot work against a global system that works against black communities everywhere.

Likewise, the narrative allows for the internal audience to participate in its closure, thereby reflecting one of constitutive rhetoric's core tenets. The final section of the text opens by saying, "In order to encourage our race all over the world and to stimulate it to a higher and grander destiny, we demand and insist on the following Declaration of Rights" ("Declaration of Rights"). By doing this, the Declaration is not merely stating its positions; it is also inviting its audience to take ownership and fight for these rights around the world. As Charland explicates, "While classical narratives have an ending, constitutive rhetorics leave the task of narrative closure to their constituted subject," thereby empowering the audience to participate in the social and material collective fantasy (143). Each of the complaints is addressed with multiple declarations of rights, with the internal audience that is dissatisfied with the Old Negro approach playing a crucial role in seeing them fulfilled. For example, in answering the complaint of being unable to find lodging while traveling due to discrimination, the Declaration affirms, "The right for the Negro to travel unmolested throughout the world be not abridged by any person or persons, and all Negroes are called upon to give aid to a fellow Negro when thus molested." Through the use of narrative, the text creates a collective fantasy, thereby turning shared

declarations of "we" into individualized directives for each participant. This allows participation in the fantasy, thus reconstituting the black identity from being localized to pan-African.

Africa and the Black Identity Reclaimed. Next, the Declaration operates ideologically, which is another critical component of constitutive rhetoric. Charland explains that constitutive rhetoric becomes ideological when it shapes how the individual view themselves in the larger world through a collective identity (137, 143). It does this most notably in the "Declaration of Rights" section. First, the text declares, "We deprecate the use of the term 'nigger' as applied to Negroes, and demand that the word 'Negro' be written with a capital 'N'" ("Declaration of Rights"). This form of identification is reflective of Burke, as the text seeks to gain power through cleansing and naming. By casting out the term "n*gger" and demanding to be referred to as "Negro," the text transforms the black identity into a Negro one. But it is more than just a mere title, as the text's identification lays out ways that the Negro is defined both explicitly and implicitly. Overtly, the text declares, in adjacent points, "That the colors Red, Black and Green, be the colors of the Negro race […] That the anthem 'Ethiopia, Thou Land of Our Fathers,' etc., shall be the anthem of the Negro race" ("Declaration of Rights"). This lays the new form of identity beyond any one nationality, but a newly formed one that is inherently rooted in Africa. The continent's centrality to the new identity is emphasized when the Declaration proclaims, "We believe in the freedom of Africa for the Negro people of the world […] we also demand Africa for the Africans at home and abroad" ("Declaration of Rights"). Thus, black identity goes from being disunited and local to a transnational Negro with its own flag, anthem, and place. Moreover, this process of self-naming and cleansing creates an identity based in empowerment.

There are also implicit definitions within this new Negro identity. Specifically, Christian elements are found throughout the text, such as when it posits, "With the help of Almighty God,

we declare ourselves the sworn protector of the honor and virtue of our women and children"
("Declaration of Rights"). Moreover, the text opens and closes by referring to the date as "in the
year of our Lord" ("Declaration of Rights"). This identification runs into the paradox as
identified by Zagacki; while the text seeks to constitute an autonomous people, the new identity
is inexorably reliant on the dominant power from which it seeks to break itself away. The
reconstituted identity is intended to be pan-African, but one of its implicit characteristics
inherently reaffirms the Christianizing effect the West has had on Africa. Despite attempting to
create a new Negro, the Declaration reflects an internalized colonization by confirming one of
the very influences that has subjugated blacks and erased its cultural heritage throughout history.

Another area in which the text reflects ideology is by telling its members to function as a
citizen based on race and not on nationality. Although applicable to both internal and external
audiences, in particular it speaks to Old Negro supporters who are accustomed to working within
the political and economic systems. The Declaration states that laws should be interpreted on the
premise that "our race should in no way tolerate any insults that may be interpreted to mean
disrespect to our color" ("Declaration of Rights"). Several consecutive points argue that they
should not obey certain laws, pay taxes, or respect local government institutions if they fail to
serve the interests of the Negro. This is indicative Charland's notion of interpellation, which is
when the subject is transcendent in constitutive rhetoric; thus, in order to become a constructed
"people" as McGee argues, a process of interpellation or "recruitment" must occur ("In Search of
'the People'" 137-8). By telling its audience to ignore local government in favor of serving a
transnational people, the text draws in its audience and makes them an integral part of the
discourse, fusing both subjective and objective realities. This illustrates the epistemological shift

of constitutive rhetoric, as the subjects make sense of their disconnected experiences of discrimination into a new identity that places race above nationality or local rule of law.

Through its narrative and ideological functions, the "Declaration of Rights" reflects elements of constitutive rhetoric in how it re/centers Africa for a new black identity that challenges white domination. This is indicative of Garvey's pursuit to create a new autonomous people separate from white-identified culture. Additionally, the new "people" called forth are both formed and constrained by the ideological goals of the manifesto – directly challenging a hegemonic social system of white privilege and dominance – as well as its material realities, thereby illustrating one of Charland's key notions of constitutive rhetoric. In addition, the manifesto indicates Zagacki's possibility of a "failed" constitutive rhetoric by making it grounded in Christianity, both tethering it to Western culture while alienating black audiences that fall outside dominant religious norms. Ironically, the black audience that is possibly most occluded by this rhetorical move may be Africans themselves, making the pan-African identity unavailable to the blacks that the new public purports to represent.

The Southern Manifesto: Reconstituting the Southern Segregationist Identity

By opposing the then-recent decisions of the federal courts to desegregate schools, "The Southern Manifesto" attempts to recontextualize the issue away from being one of preserving white supremacy to governmental overreach and individual freedom. The text does so by reconstructing the segregationist individual from beyond the literal and metaphorical boundaries of the American South and, in the process, reflects several elements of constitutive rhetoric. The collective fantasies and identification within the Manifesto manage to remove the South as the epicenter of segregation, thereby broadening the constituted public from being merely

77

Southerners to individuals striving for freedom. "The Southern Manifesto" also illustrates

constitutive rhetorical failure, however, in its flawed portrayal of segregation.

The Collective Fantasy of Segregation. Initially, "The Southern Manifesto" constructs a

collective fantasy about segregation and the way of life that revolves around it. As McGee notes,

the collective fantasy is the product of an agreement by the audience to buy into an "artificial,

rhetorical reality" ("In Search of 'the People'" 343). This is none more apparent in the manner in

which segregation is presented within "The Southern Manifesto." Robert Tice Lalka contends,

"The rhetoric of the Southern Manifesto exposed even more about what had ballasted

segregationist ideology and sustained white supremacy throughout the Jim Crow era" (35). The

1896 *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision, which upheld the notion of "separate but equal," is used as the

foundation for the pro-segregation identity in "The Southern Manifesto":

> This interpretation, restated time and again, became a part of the life of the people of
> many of the States and confirmed their habits, traditions, and way of life. It is founded on
> elemental humanity and commonsense, for parents should not be deprived by
> Government of the right to direct the lives and education of their own children. ("The
> Southern Manifesto")

This reflects the interplay between the objective and social realities as discussed by Charland.

Lalka asserts, "The traditions professed in the Manifesto reflected a romanticism and nostalgia

for the way things never were […] 'The Southern Manifesto' relied on the same white

supremacist message found in slaveholders' accounts of their benevolent paternalism towards

blacks; and in telling these lies again, the southern bloc reframed the discussion and calumniated

the courts" (43). Thus, the collective fantasy of segregation reframed those who supported it not

as malicious Southerners, or even whites for that matter, but rather those who believed in a

system of racial amicability. For external audiences that were skeptical of 'separate but equal,'

this reframing made the constituted public of pro-segregationists appear to be less malevolent, while for internal audiences it served as reaffirmation of their chosen identity.

This collective fantasy also plays out in the manner in which the courts are portrayed. "The Southern Manifesto" uses a chronology of an increasingly avaricious federal judiciary that has overstepped its boundaries. The text states, "We regard the decision of the Supreme Court in the school cases as a clear abuse of judicial power. It climaxes a trend in the Federal Judiciary undertaking to legislate, in derogation of the authority of Congress, and to encroach upon the reserved rights of the states and the people" ("The Southern Manifesto"). As such, "The Southern Manifesto" constructs a collective fantasy of a people under siege by a tyrannical court; the decision to desegregate schools becomes decoupled from any discourse surrounding racial equality and recentered around judicial power. The climax of this narrative is the social tumult resulting from desegregation, as "The Southern Manifesto" ominously declares:

> This unwarranted exercise of power by the Court, contrary to the Constitution, is creating chaos and confusion in the States principally affected. It is destroying the amicable relations between the white and Negro races that have been created through 90 years of patient effort by the good people of both races. It has planted hatred and suspicion where there has been heretofore friendship and understanding. ("The Southern Manifesto")

Charland argues that the narrative within constitutive rhetoric allows the audience to place themselves within the story, thus shaping the way they view the world (141-3). Likewise, Lalka contends that "The Southern Manifesto" essentially recreates a new explanation for the racial strife that was occurring in that era in that, "the southerners portrayed the courts as the revolutionaries responsible for this mayhem" (42). Ironically, the Manifesto's collective fantasy casts the pro-segregationist as blameless for racial strife. Lalka concludes, "With this, the writers of 'The Southern Manifesto' connected the current social strife to the recent court cases rather than the long history of white supremacy they fought to preserve" (42). This narrative structure

79

places all of the culpability for racial conflict at the feet of the court, allowing the pro-segregationist public to be constituted as concerned with racial harmony rather than maliciously defending a racially prejudiced system.

This collective fantasy is even more highlighted in how the audience can participate in the narrative's closure. At the end of the text, "The Southern Manifesto" lays out a series of pledges designed as direct responses to the federal court decisions. It allows the audience to participate in these same measures as the Congressmen who presented them on the floor of the Senate. Specifically, it states, "We appeal to the States and people who are not directly affected by these decisions to consider the constitutional principles involved against the time when they too, on issues vital to them may be the victims of judicial encroachment" ("The Southern Manifesto").

This closure is critical to the constitution of the pro-segregationist identity, for it abdicates any moral wrongdoing to those outside of the rhetorically constructed public. Lalka contends, "Through their rhetoric, [the] southern bloc had fought to take the moral high ground by changing the very vocabulary of the desegregation debate. The 'wrong' perpetuated was not immoral Jim Crow, nor was it entrenched racism itself. Rather, it was the judicial decision demanding the desegregation of public schools" (44). Thus, the constituted public is allowed to participate in the "closure" of the narrative by fighting desegregation, and any fallout that ensues is a result of the other side's iniquities, not their own.

Shared Identification Beyond the South. In addition, "The Southern Manifesto" is reflective of Burke's identification. Most interestingly, the shared common principles as outlined by Burke are not limited to the South. "The Southern Manifesto" takes great pains to point out that segregation's roots are in the North. The text states:

80

> This constitutional doctrine [of segregation] began in the North, not in the South, and it was followed not only in Massachusetts, but in Connecticut, New York, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania and other northern states until they, exercising their rights as states through the constitutional processes of local self-government, changed their school systems. ("The Southern Manifesto")

This commonality enables "The Southern Manifesto" to expand its constituted public beyond the borders of the Mason-Dixon Line and to incorporate all Americans. Lalka notes, "This argument allowed the southern bloc to underscore a crucial point: the social history of race issues meant American history, not just Southern history" (41). Consequently, segregation is no longer solely tied to the Southern identity, thereby creating a new rhetorical public that shares similar sentiments towards racial privilege, not regionalism. The Manifesto reflects this near the end of the text when it proclaims, "Even though we constitute a minority in the present Congress, we have full faith that a majority of the American people believe in the dual system of government which has enabled us to achieve our greatness and will in time demand that the reserved rights of the States and of the people be made secure against judicial usurpation" ("The Southern Manifesto"). Thus, the "ideal auditor" is no longer a Southerner, but a segregationist, broadening a public that is now rooted in ideology rather than geography.

Likewise, identification is reflected in the divisions that "The Southern Manifesto" brings to light. Having cast the segregationist as not merely a Southerner, the federal judiciary becomes not just an enemy of the South, but to the broader American public. It gravely warns, "Without regard to the consent of the governed, outside mediators are threatening immediate and revolutionary changes in our public schools systems. If done, this is certain to destroy the system of public education in some of the States" ("The Southern Manifesto"). In figuring them as "outside mediators," the Supreme Court is now the enemy, possibly causing destruction to an idyllic way of life. In this contrast, the constituted public within the Manifesto becomes clear:

while the courts are seeking to fan the flames of revolution, the "people" articulated within the text are simply trying to preserve peace and order.

Segregation Leading to Constitutive Rhetorical Failure. Although it does help constitute a new public, "The Southern Manifesto" runs the risk articulated by Helen Tate. Constitutive rhetoric that fails to account for the material conditions facing its audience and lacks interplay between objective and social realities as required by Charland can "fail" as it loses credence. Lalka astutely indicates this point:

> [T]hese Congressmen obscured the brutal realities of Jim Crow, the unjust and anti-democratic electoral system maintained by poll taxes and literacy tests, and the undeniable inhumanity of lynching throughout the South […] the allure of Jim Crow rhetoric hid its evils. This has become both the legacy and the lesson of "The Southern Manifesto". (42, 54)

In painting a picture of segregation that ignores this harsh objective reality, the collective fantasy within "The Southern Manifesto" limits the interpellation of its audiences. Once an audience understood the true nature of the brutality of racial prejudice and segregation, the ability to enact any sort of "closure" to the narrative becomes circumscribed. The very nature of segregation placed untenable rhetorical constraints on the constitutive rhetoric of the Manifesto itself.

Through collective fantasy and identification "The Southern Manifesto" illustrates constitutive rhetorical elements in expanding a collective identity beyond the South. It manages to combine both social and objective realities to create a narrative of judicial tyranny threatening an idealized – albeit whitewashed – way of segregated life. In the process, those struggling to maintain segregation are constituted as crusaders for constitutionality, rather than racists seeking to sanctify a system of racial privilege. Those who become part of this rhetorically constructed public are thus tethered together on the basis of shared principles, rather than geography or contempt for a marginalized population.

82

The Woman-Identified Woman: Lesbianism as the Quintessentially Constituted Female

The constitutive rhetoric within "The Woman-Identified Woman" reveals a unique response to the challenges facing lesbians within second wave feminist groups of the 1960s. Faced with the double consciousness of being marginalized both for their gender as well as their sexuality, the manifesto seeks to recast lesbianism as a female, rather than a queer, identity. As such, the text attempts to place lesbianism within the larger milieu of womanhood; thus, their identity is constituted not as an entirely separate entity, but rather as part of one already established. This is particularly noteworthy within the ways Burke's identification is illustrated in the discourse, as well as how it seeks to interpolate its audiences into a collective fantasy of a binary gender struggle. In a similar fashion to "The Southern Manifesto" however, "The Woman-Identified Woman" creates an identity that fails to incorporate the material realities of its stated audience, limiting its constitutive effectiveness.

Burkean Identification to Construct Sisterhood. First, Burkean identification can be seen in how the text creates female-exclusive unification. The text opens with a rhetorical question, asking, "What is a lesbian? A lesbian is the rage of all women condensed to the point of explosion" ("The Woman-Identified Woman"). From the outset, the manifesto contends that all of the issues, travails, and prejudices the modern woman faces is distilled within the identity of a lesbian, building upon the shared common principles that Burke notes is necessary in order to build commonality. Tate explains, "In this sense, the lesbian is the first feminist, the woman who recognizes and resists her oppression before all others" (13). Moreover, it establishes that lesbianism as a public is to be primarily constituted on gender, not on sexual orientation, implicitly weakening its ties with one group in order to strengthen its unity with another. The manifesto elaborates on this notion throughout, such as when it asserts, "And yet, in popular

thinking, there is really only one essential difference between a lesbian and other women: that of

sexual orientation – which is to say…you must finally realize that the essence of being a

'woman' is to get fucked by men" ("The Woman-Identified Woman"). Here, lesbianism is used

to highlight the inherent role all women have been placed in within society – to be subservient to

women – further augmenting the ties between straight and non-straight females.

Moreover, the text uses repetition to drive home the commonality with women. Beyond

utilizing plural possessive pronouns throughout the text to build commonality, terms regarding

relation such as, "sister, stranger, binds, cut-off, division, behind a locked window," and

"energies" are employed throughout the manifesto. This conveys lesbians as identified on a basis

of gender. It contends that only through solidarity will women be successful in achieving

liberation from a male-dominated societal structure. Furthermore, the metaphor implies an

almost mystical connection between all women, such as when the manifesto argues, "Our

energies must flow toward our sisters, not backward toward our oppressors" ("The Woman-

Identified Woman"). This creates the rhetorical space for lesbians to argue that they share a

common bond with all women, regardless of class, race, religion, or sexual orientation. Thus,

while the text acknowledges that lesbians are a separate group of people, they still have

inexorable ties to their gender that make them unique, highlighting the marginalized status of all

women.

Additionally, these terms reveal a key source of invention for the text. Male-female is

placed as a binary; a woman either supports her "sisters" or their "oppressors." Lesbians are not

only identified by who they share in common, but who they are not, which is men. The authors

of the discourse argue, "As long as male acceptability is primary – both to individual women and

to the movement as a whole – the term lesbian will be used effectively against women […] It is

very difficult to realize and accept that being 'feminine' and being a whole person are irreconcilable" ("The Woman-Identified Woman"). The manifesto organizes a clear distinction: either you support lesbianism, thereby making you an "authentic" feminist determined to challenge the male dominated system, or you support a male-privileged social structure, making you less than a person. By using authenticity, the manifesto reflects a form of identification that places lesbians as the epistemological maximum of a feminist – one who does not need men in any form to be self-actuated. The text illustrates this when it states:

> As long as woman's liberation tries to free women without facing the basic heterosexual structure that binds us in one-to-one relationship with our oppressors, tremendous energies will continue to flow into trying to straighten up each particular relationship with a man, into finding how to get better sex, how to turn his head around-into trying to make the 'new man' out of him, in the delusion that this will allow us to be the 'new woman.' ("The Woman-Identified Woman")

Thus, identification places lesbians within women's liberation as well as order them as hierarchically superior to straight feminists.

Closure through Breaking Gender Conditioning. Next, the collective fantasy within "The Woman-Identified Woman" takes a micro rather than a macro perspective. While Charland argues that narrative is necessary for the audience to engage in a fused social and material reality as well as place themselves within it to gain "closure," "The Woman-Identified Woman" does not use a traditional narrative timeline, but instead focuses on the present and a hypothetical future. There are no mentions of past injustices or rebellious acts; curiously, neither is the invaluable contribution lesbians had made to the women's rights movement. The historical narrative is more generalized; accordingly, it is experienced by every woman and not particularly tied to any one event, action, or policy:

> But why is it that women have related to and through men? By virtue of having been brought up in a male society, we have internalized the male culture's definition of ourselves. That definition consigns us to sexual and family functions, and excludes us

from defining and shaping the terms of our lives. In exchange for our psychic servicing and for performing society's non-profit-making functions, the man confers on us just one thing: the slave status which makes us legitimate in the eyes of the society in which we live. ("The Woman-Identified Woman")

The narrative, then, purports to represent what every woman goes through in their life: conditioning and consignment to a restricted gender role. It attempts to make sense of their experience for providing a reason why they identify themselves through men. Resultantly, lesbians are placed at the heart of the struggle, for they have had to define themselves outside of a male structure. To accept oneself as a lesbian is to be truly liberated as a woman. The text indicates this sentiment in the following:

Those of us who work that through find ourselves on the other side of a tortuous journey through a night that may have been decades long. The perspective gained from that journey, the liberation of self, the inner peace, the real love of self and of all women, is something to be shared with all women - because we are all women. ("The Woman-Identified Woman")

Due to this, lesbianism is the natural response to the everyday struggles of all women.

After establishing a stream of conscious narrative that places all women in the subjugation of men, the text then turns to reveal the end of this story arc. Women eventually turn to suppress themselves, accepting their marginalized status in society. The manifesto states, "The consequence of internalizing this role is an enormous reservoir of self-hate[…] often beneath the edge of her consciousness, poisoning her existence, keeping her alienated from herself, her own needs, and rendering her a stranger to other women" ("The Woman-Identified Woman"). Reflective of the same rhetorical strategies within the "Declaration of Rights", "The Woman-Identified Woman" points out self-hatred as a product of cultural marginalization, and uses this as an opportunity where the audience can actively engage the narrative and its closure. If staying within the male-dominated hegemony leads to self-internalized hatred, then the only logical response is to sever all ties. The text states, "It must be understood that what is crucial is that

women begin disengaging from male defined response patterns. In the privacy of our own psyches, we must cut those cords to the core" ("The Woman-Identified Woman"). The authors argue that lesbians are attempting to do the same as all liberationist feminists in breaking off their identity as being defined by men.

The vehicle for ending the narrative in this story is to raise critical consciousness. This is indicative when the manifesto proclaims, "Only women can give to each other a new sense of self. That identity we have to develop with reference to ourselves, and not in relation to men. This consciousness is the revolutionary force from which all else will follow, for ours is an organic revolution" ("The Woman-Identified Woman"). Once again, lesbianism becomes the key to this new consciousness, for lesbians truly understand what it means to be free of a male gaze. The text concludes in its final line, "With that real self, with that consciousness, we begin a revolution to end the imposition of all coercive identifications, and to achieve maximum autonomy in human expression" ("The Woman-Identified Woman"). Lesbianism becomes as much of a political choice as a personal one, firmly ensconcing this public within feminism and women's liberation.

Lack of Heterosexual Closure Creating Constitutive Failure. Lastly, while "The Woman-Identified Woman" does reconstruct the lesbian and feminist identity, its constitutive effectiveness is circumscribed. Tate argues, "The constitutive rhetoric of lesbian feminists linked feminism and lesbianism, creating a radical political identity[…] While many white lesbian feminists felt affirmed in the liberator vision of political lesbianism, most heterosexual feminists and lesbians of color did not" (18). For the manifesto, the constitutive rhetoric fails to incorporate a broad enough narrative. Charland contends that the subjects must be interpellated in a story that allows for closure to occur, creating interplay between social and material realities

(143). As Tate states however, "In the case of most heterosexual feminists and lesbians of color, the rhetoric failed […] For refusing to make a complete commitment to women, heterosexual women were made to feel like the movement's backsliders" (20). Thus, by creating a narrative timeline that was too narrow in its scope, many aspects of the constituted identity within "The Woman-Identified Woman" were left out.

Burkean identification and interpellation reflected within "The Woman-Identified Woman" helps create a new rhetorical fiction as outlined by McGee in the form of political lesbianism. Rather than attempt to carve out a wholly autonomous entity however, the manifesto instead identifies an already established public, and then stretches its borders to create the rhetorical space for it to house lesbians as well placing it within the feminist identity. Even though the constitutive rhetoric limits the identity of lesbians – namely, in bypassing any overt associations with larger queer culture – it also expands lesbianism as part of a broader struggle for gender equality. Moreover, the text illustrates the potential pitfalls of when a collective fantasy contains a narrative that demands for a closure outside the material realities of its audience. In this case, heterosexual women unable to perform the interpellation of abandoning all ties with men were subsequently left out of the constituted identity, limiting its effectiveness.

Queers Read This: Appropriating a Homophobic Label Into a Form of Identification

Queer Nation's 1990 manifesto heavily centers on forging a new, queer-based identity to fight back against systemic homophobic oppression. As such, constitutive rhetorical elements can be found throughout the text. Interestingly, instead of creating a new term in which this identity can be housed under, "Queers Read This" instead utilizes a label then considered a homophobic slur – queer. This reflects Burke's notions of identification by expanding the

principal interests that non-straights can share in common. In addition, it paints a clear picture of straight privilege that gives its queer audience a means in which to enact closure.

From a Slur to a Common Identifier. First, the text appropriates the word queer and makes it the key identifier for all non-straight communities. Rather than employ the conventional term "gay," the manifesto attempts to create an identification that is much broader and incorporates all marginalized sexual and gender identities, as is argued in a section titled "WHY QUEER":

> Queer, unlike GAY, doesn't mean MALE. And when spoken to other gays and lesbians it's a way of suggesting we close ranks, and forget (temporarily) our individual differences because we face a more insidious common enemy. Yeah, QUEER can be a rough word but it is also a sly and ironic weapon we can steal from the homophobe's hands and use against him. ("Queers Read This")

Thus, "Queers Read This" reframes an old set of symbols as well as creates convergence on a new one to forge identification. The term gay, which carries connotations of gender, is eschewed in favor of queer, which allows for those who are not gay males to be part of the group. Like the "Declaration of Rights," this also illustrates détournement (DeBord and Wolman 10), where the culturally derogatory label of "queer" is turned on itself, instead becoming a title of honor.

In addition, this form of identification allows the text to place queers as the dialectical opposites of straights. The "insidious enemy" within the manifesto is straights. The text opens with saying, "Everyday you wake up alive, relatively happy, and a functioning human being, you are committing a rebellious act. You as an alive and functioning queer are a revolutionary" ("Queers Read This"). The manifesto argues that queers' very existence is in direct violation of the heteronormative social order. This provides no real possibility of straight allies and presents hostility to the dominant structure as the only logical choice. In essence, the manifesto defines queers by virtue of not being straight and falling outside its system of privilege. This reflects

89

Burke's ideal of identification through negation; we are identified not by who we are, but who we are not.

Buttressing this contrast is the presence of war metaphors. Certain terms portray queers as being "fighters," "revolutionaries," and an "army of lovers" in opposition to straights that "Bash us and stab us and shoot us and bomb us in ever increasing numbers" ("Queers Read This"). There is no possibility for common ground, no opportunity for equality based on sameness with straights. In doing this, the text also creates a rhetorical space to castigate queers who should speak up and be more involved yet do not. Employing the war metaphor once again, the manifesto asserts, "You talk, talk, talk about invisibility and then retreat to your homes to nest with your lovers or carouse in a bar with pals and stumble home in a cab or sit silently and politely by while your family, your boss, your neighbors, your public servants distort and disfigure us, deride us and punish us" ("Queers Read This"). Queers that choose to not fight are merely retreating, allowing straights to attack and destroy the community as a whole. Through these components, the text ties queer identification as direct opposition to straights, whereby radical queers must rise up lest their community be destroyed. After constructing a "we" through shared suffering, the manifesto then moves to contrast queers with a "them" that is directly tied with its call to action.

Queer Collective Fantasy as a Call to Action. Next, this call to action is rooted in the collective fantasy of the text itself. Charland argues that narrative is required to construct a collective fantasy, one that combines both objective and social realities. In "Queers Read This," historical narrative places queers as hierarchically superior to straights, allowing Queer Nation's audience to regain control of their identity. The manifesto asserts, "We've given so much to the world: democracy, all the arts, the concepts of love, philosophy and the soul, to name just a few

90

gifts from our ancient Greek Dykes, Fags" ("Queers Read This"). This provides a moral

inheritance for queers, thereby creating one layer of rationale for why they need to fight back

against heteronormative privilege. It also pushes back against dominant notions that queers have

no past – and subsequently no future – nor that have they ever contributed to society. This

historical narrative also helps make sense of shared queer experiences. Another aspect of this

element places queers within the arts, one of the very areas that is a source of complaint in

"Queers Read This":

> Since time began, the world has been inspired by the work of queer artists. In exchange, there has been suffering, there has been pain, there has been violence. Throughout history, society has struck a bargain with its queer citizens: they may pursue creative careers, if they do it discreetly. ("Queers Read This")

This narrative reinforces the theme that queers have long contributed to larger society yet have

still been negated and rendered voiceless.

Lastly, historical narrative paints modern queers as simply too passive. After outlining

then-recent incidents in New York City where openly gay men were assaulted and murdered, the

manifesto concludes, "In 1969, Queers fought back. In 1990, Queers say ok" ("Queers Read

This"). This places the current predicament queers find themselves within the timeline of radical

activism starting with the Stonewall Inn riots, and provides the basis for drastic queer action;

queers have a proud history of fighting back against the power, and now is the time for them to

take the mantle of radical activism once more. As such, the manifesto inserts itself into the

historical narrative by making a direct plea to its audience to take action. By establishing a

historicism of queer radicalism, direct confrontation with the heteronormative structure becomes

the next logical chapter in queer history.

This leads to the interpellation reflected within the text. Similar to "The Woman-

Identified Woman," "Queers Read This" presents consciousness-raising as its main vehicle for

allowing the audience to enact "closure" in the text. The manifesto exhorts queers in its final paragraph:

> Let yourself feel angry that THERE IS NO PLACE IN THIS COUNTRY WHERE WE ARE SAFE [...] the next time some straight person comes down on you for being angry, tell them that until things change, you don't need any more evidence that the world turns at your expense. ("Queers Read This")

Thus, queers are given a course of action – anger and confrontation with straights – to fight their historical and systematic oppression.

The constitutive rhetoric reflected within "Queers Read This" illustrates a newly constructed public – radical, militant queers – identified under a term that, ironically, was historically used to marginalize that very community. As a result, it constructs a historicism of queer oppression from straights that will never end unless radical action is taken. In addition, straights are places as dialectical opposites of queers where the two will never be the same. Interestingly, "Queers Read This" employs much of the very same constitutive rhetoric in which their opposition, anti-gay activists, uses to justify legal and cultural marginalization of queers. Instead of using difference as means for oppression however, "Queers Read This" uses it as impetus for creation of a new, aggressive identity.

Conclusion: Connecting the Cases through Constitutive Rhetoric

Throughout the analysis, it is apparent that constitutive rhetorical elements recur across numerous social manifestos, irrespective of rhetor, audience, temporality, or current cultural constraints. Aspects of narrative, collective fantasy, and interpellation are prevalent throughout the texts. As such, they reflect McGee's observation that a "people" within a discourse are a rhetorical fiction, one that incorporates both social and material realities. These findings are further bolstered by the presence of Burkean identification, wherein which the manifestos not only defined their people by what they have in common, but also what they do not, using

92

definition by negation as a key rhetorical tactic in constructing a public. Additionally, it is possible that Burkean cleansing is also reflected within some of the texts. By contrasting their people against an enemy as well as casting blame on this same group, the manifestos are defining a group of zealots for the cause, which could essentially purge these groups of those who have anything less than full fealty to the movement.

As such, it appears that a critical aspect of social movement manifestos is that they call a "people" into being. This "people" subsequently informs the rhetorical invention of these texts; for example, a manifesto cannot lay out a series of grievances without indicating who in particular is being aggrieved. Moreover, the "people" are a fusion of both material and social realities: the material observing the actual conditions afflicting an actual group of individuals, whereas the social conjures up an ideal world that audiences can strive to achieve, reflecting the cultural values of the manifesto's authors. Therefore, manifestos reflect both a material people that the text purports to represent, as well as an "ideal auditor" as articulated by Black. The intersection of these two creates McGee's "rhetorical fiction" of a people within social movement manifestos.

Furthermore, the recurrence of constitutive rhetoric establishes that social movement manifesto texts ought to be considered a rhetorical genre. Campbell and Jamieson argue that a rhetorical genre is comprised of forms, which are "stylistic and substantive responses to perceived situational demands" ("Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 452). Clearly, the calling of a people into being as a response to a perceived threat by outsiders would be considered a form, and a critical one at that. As Stewart, Smith, and Denton contend, "The constituting process needs to address the rhetorical functions of social movements" (176). Although constitutive rhetoric alone would not justify establishing social movement manifestos

as a rhetorical genre, it does contribute to the, "constellation of forms that recurs in each of its members" (Campbell and Jamieson "Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 452-3) that is necessary for its creation. Constitutive rhetoric, in conjunction with other forms, institutes the foundation required for a rhetorical genre. Additionally, the presence of constitutive rhetoric reveals how manifestos formulate their ideology through narrative, essentialize their opponents for the purpose of contrasting, and articulate their grievances so as to create closure. In this light, constitutive rhetoric goes beyond classificatory purposes and provides meaningful cultural understandings that might not otherwise be attained.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The examination of the case studies allows the two core research inquiries of this thesis to be revisited. First, do manifesto texts contain the "constellation of forms" necessary to be deemed a rhetorical genre for criticism? Second, if manifestos do qualify as a rhetorical genre, does this genre go beyond the purpose of mere classification and provide greater rhetorical and cultural insights, or reveal the "social undercurrents" as discussed by Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson? Through the analysis of "The *Declaration of Independence*," "The Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World," "The Southern Manifesto," "The Woman-Identified Woman," and "Queers Read This," it is clear that both of those questions can be resoundingly answered in the affirmative.

Results of Study

The reason for these answers can be found in the definition of genre itself. As Jamieson and Campbell contend, "The concept of genre is an economical way of acknowledging that rhetorical critics have come to recognize interdependence of purpose, stylistic choices, and requirements arising from the situation and audience" (146). As a result of this interdependence, a genre "Is a group of acts unified by a constellation of forms that recurs in each of its members" (Campbell and Jamieson "Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 452-3). Through the aforementioned criteria, movement manifestos do constitute their own rhetorical genre. The stylistic and substantive similarities that recur across each of the case studies illustrate an

95

apparent pattern that is rooted in similar responses to perceived situational demands. Within each text there exist elements of both war mythology as well as constitutive rhetoric. Additionally, multiple rhetorical forms – such as the listing of grievances and the presence of narratives – illuminate a constellation that can be tracked across each "member" of self-identified social movement manifestos. In establishing that a rhetorical genre does in fact exist, several implications can be discussed regarding rhetorical and cultural studies, the manifesto texts examined, and possible areas of future research.

Manifesto as a Rhetorical Genre

The most vital implication to explore is the genre of movement manifestos itself. To do this, the tenets that define a movement manifesto genre need to be established so that the patterns of form that recur across all members of this body of discourses will be identified. These tenets are not intended to be viewed as immutable or as the final word on this genre. Moreover, these elements should not be applied to texts to see if they perfectly "fit;" rather, they are intended to be the foundations for future generic criticism of manifestos. In examining the case studies through the lenses of myth and constitutive rhetoric, four primary tenets of movement manifestos can be discerned: framing action as a response to external aggression, articulating an ideal worldview, calling a people into being, and creating an identifiable enemy.

First, movement manifestos contain the common substantive element of framing their rhetorical action as a response to a perceived external threat. The presence of the rhetorical mythology of war and justified conflict highlights this notion. Campbell and Jamieson argue that in Presidential public address, conflict was justified because, "Despite exhaustive efforts to find other means to resolve conflict, the threat persists" (*Deeds Done in Words* 109). Larry Williamson also expounds on this notion by stating that "The American variant of just war

96

rhetoric casts us as the reluctant defenders of freedom who make war only as a last resort" (221). As demonstrated, this ideological foundation is present throughout movement manifestos. The actions outlined in the texts are not done so out of material aggression, but rather as a reaction to an external threat. Subsequently, this absolves the rhetor – the author or authors of the manifesto – from any blame in escalating a conflict.

This element is achieved through the form of narrative, establishing a recurrent stylistic aspect within the genre. As Craig A. Smith and Kathy B. Smith argue, such texts lay out a series of events that create a "discursive world" that makes sense of recent events to fit into their ideological worldview (221). Moreover, Campbell and Jamieson contend that narrative, "tends to recast the conversation as aggression by the enemy" (*Deeds Done in Words* 107). Within manifestos, a specific account lays out a series of grievances. Although not every text explicitly chronicles an arc of events, all lay out perceived injustices perpetuated upon them by an enemy. Implicitly, this builds a narrative of an identified group being perpetually wronged by an outside force; thus, direct action is necessary. Given that forms are defined by Campbell and Jamieson as, "stylistic and substantive responses to perceived situational demands" ("Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 452) the presence of narrative within manifestos certainly qualifies as a pattern of rhetorical form within the genre.

The second recurring tenet of manifestos is articulating an idealistic worldview. Each case study lays out a utopian vision of society that underpins the text's stated goals and plan of action; thus, these worldviews serve as a base for rhetorical invention. In outlining this idealization, manifestos encourage the audience to participate and see it realized, making it a major substantive component to the genre. Natalie Alvarez and Jenn Stephenson concur, arguing, "The manifesto is inherently performative; its aim, through its enunciation, is to bring a future

vision into being" (4). This element reflects both rhetorical myth as well as the collective fantasy within constitutive rhetoric. Williamson contends that rhetorical myth, "is the nonrational medium through which values become incarnate" (217). By using the terminology of myth, it is to not necessarily deem all utopian models within manifestos as inherently false or unrealistic, but rather to illustrate that they serve as a vehicle to embody the ideology contained within the texts. Additionally, within the war mythology in particular, conflict is justified as it "contain[s] the transcendent ideal of everlasting peace" (Dorsey 45). Any turmoil that may arise from the manifesto inciting confrontation is cleared as it strives to install a "better" version of society than what is currently in place.

Furthermore, collective fantasy is also illustrated within this tenet. Michael Calvin McGee notes that collective fantasies are a rhetorical invention that blends both social and material realities ("In Search of 'the People'" 343). The chimerical visions within manifestos are reflective of this, as the texts contrast the material concerns of the current, outlined problems in society with a grandiose ideal of what that society could attain. Maurice Charland expands on this concept, as the audience becomes interpellated into this social and material collective fantasy through narrative to help enact its closure (138, 143). Through this, the stylistic aspect of narrative also plays a recurring role in manifestos. Galia Yanoshevsky argues, "The manifesto has a particular performativity: it does not merely describe a history of rupture, but produces such a history, seeking to create this rupture actively through its own intervention" (266). Blending Charland's and Yanoshevsky's notions, narrative not only explicates a series of grievances, as established in the previous tenet, but can also provide a means to directly address said grievances and create a better future. Using William Benoit's requirement that discourses within a genre contain, "identifying characteristics which distinguish it from other sets of

discourses" (128), it is clear that establishing a vision for a utopian future is an inextricable part of the manifesto genre.

Next, discourses within a manifesto genre contain the substantive element of calling a people into being. In the course of explicating a series of wrongdoings by an external power, manifestos typically need to identify who is being wronged. Additionally, movement manifestos articulate a new "people" that serve as adherents to the cause as outlined by the text. Charles J. Stewart, Craig A. Smith and Robert E. Denton contend that manifestos play a critical role in constituting a new public (94), stating that "The constituting process needs to address the rhetorical functions of social movements" (176). McGee's notion of a rhetorically fashioned public is illustrated in each case study. This extends previous scholarship on manifestos in the area of identification. Smith and Smith offer that a core function of manifestos is to create "a convergence around symbols, needs, preferences and reasons" (458). Beyond just generating convergence however, manifestos help to create a whole new public based on these symbols and preferences. Through doing this, social movement manifestos illustrate Edwin Black's notion of the ideal auditor, or the audience in which the rhetor wishes for them to become (334-5). Assisting in the constitution a new public, then, is a vital rhetorical function of manifestos.

Stylistically, identification through negation is present within this tenet. Most notably, the "publics" within these texts are constituted not just in identifying shared common principles, but also in what they do not share in comparison to another group. Gusfield argues that Kenneth Burke claims this is vital to any group's creation: "Identification is affirmed with earnestness precisely because there is division. Identification is compensatory to division" (181-2). Integral to the creation of a "people" within a manifesto text is to not only state who they are, but who they are not. This is done to ensure that the public constituted in the manifesto is in no way

conflated with the defined enemy. Rather, highlighting the difference between the two only heightens the binary between the two groups. Furthermore, this calling a people into possibly necessitates an internal form of scapegoating and "purging," where only the most loyal zealots to the movements are part of the constituted people. Future Burkean-centric research should ascertain if this is a recurring stylistic element to this tenet. Regardless, it is apparent that calling a people into being can be considered part of the, "stylistic and substantive responses to perceived situational demands" (Campbell and Jamieson "Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 452) necessary for the manifesto rhetorical genre.

Lastly, a major substantive form within movement manifesto texts is the identification of an external enemy. Through constituting a new public and outlining a series of external threats, an enemy must be identified. In creating a narrative that allows the audience to participate in its closure (Charland 143), there necessarily has to be an enemy that can be readily addressed. As such, this tenet plays a major role in the rhetorical invention and ideological undergirding of a manifesto text. Aspects of Jerry Frye's prior manifesto scholarship on objectification can be seen here as well. Citing black movement scholar Arthur L. Smith, Frye notes that objectification is, "the use of language to direct the grievances of a particular group toward another collective body such as an institution, nation, political party, or race" (72-3). Manifestos do more than just merely identify an enemy however. Extending off of this principle, Burkean notions of scapegoating can also be seen. Burke explains that the scapegoat is, "The 'representative' or 'vessel' of certain unwanted evils, the sacrificial animal upon whose back the burden of these evils is ritualistically loaded" (qtd. in Gusfield 294). Thus, having an external enemy gives the rhetor and the text's audience the capability to "cleanse" themselves of the evils pervading them; all that is necessary is to simply eliminate, or in the very least relegate, the scapegoat.

Additionally, the external enemy is also reflected in the war mythology. Robert Ivie argues that in conflict, the other side becomes an Other, framing the strife in terms of an "us versus it" (285). Within each manifesto, the enemy is essentialized to its most reductive, negative qualities, from the British, to whites, to men, to Northerners, to straights. As such, essentialization is a powerful recurring form within the manifesto genre. Having an enemy that is personified as the dialectical opposite of everything the manifesto purports to stand for is a powerful justification to engage in militaristic conflict. The enemy is incapable of being satiated or negotiated with, and is also responsible for the constituted people's ills. Thus, the only logical option is complete elimination of the adversary. In short, the creation of an enemy serves multiple rhetorical functions within manifestos texts, making it an indispensable generic form.

Taken together, these four tenets reflect the recurrent patterns of form within the social movement manifesto genre. All of the previously outlined tenets highlight the interdependence of style and substance that arises from responding to the unique situational demands that generate manifesto texts. In explicating these elements, their interlinking properties become clear. One cannot frame a manifesto as a response to an outside threat or call a public of adherents into being through negation, for example, without also identifying a clear external enemy. The call to fulfill a utopian vision cannot occur without also contrasting it to whatever wrongs the manifesto finds to be so egregious that it necessitates confrontational action. And an enemy does not exist without also establishing an ideal society in which they stand as the dialectical opposite. Altogether, the movement manifesto genre reflects Campbell and Jamieson's ideal that it creates "an angle of vision, a window, that reveals the tension among these elements" ("Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 453). Clearly, not only does the genre contain "a group of acts unified by a constellation of forms that recurs in each of its

members" (452-3), but it goes beyond classification and provides rhetorical critics another tool in understanding manifesto texts by highlighting the tensions that hold these forms together.

Future Research for Myth and Constitutive Rhetoric

In the course of this analysis, some implications also arise in the fields of myth and constitutive rhetoric. Namely, the manner in which these forms were employed within manifestos sets the foundation for some possible directions in future scholarship: First, war mythology and second, possible areas of intersection between myth and constitutive rhetoric.

Initially, what the study of these manifestos reinforced is that a text need not explicitly use war metaphors in order to maintain the key tenets of war mythology. While scholars have identified Presidential public address as an area that has utilized war mythology for non-military purposes (Dorsey 42, 53), and that war mythology is present in the rhetoric of religious discourses (Hostetler 49), the primary focus is still on explicit metaphors of combat. While some of the manifestos did employ these "archetypal metaphors" as articulated by Michael Osborn ("Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric" 348), many did not, but still contained the same underlying ideological assumptions in advocating for aggressive confrontation to a social system. Future research should further explore how war mythology can be used as a lens in other rhetorical texts outside of manifestos, such as in protest music or public address, to ascertain whether the presence of such explicit metaphors are necessary for the myth to still operate ideologically.

Additionally, the absence of overt war language in some of these manifestos should be further examined to determine the constraints presented by the rhetorical situation. For example, perhaps "The Southern Manifesto" lacked such obvious references to war in order to avoid any transparent contextual links to the Civil War and seceding from the Union over disagreements with the federal government, particularly since its authors were federal politicians and it was

delivered on the floor of the U.S. Senate. On the other hand, perhaps a marginalized and disempowered community such as Queer Nation feels no repercussions for employing extreme metaphors of combat and killing, which could subsequently influence the rhetorical invention of their manifesto texts. Articulating the possible constraints of the rhetorical situation in the language used in war mythology could further deepen understanding of the movement manifesto genre.

Furthermore, the element of framing war as inevitable should be explored in the area of rhetorical agency. As Campbell and Jamieson explain from this aspect of the myth, it "tends to recast the conversation as aggression by the enemy" (*Deeds Done in Words* 107). In doing so however, the rhetor essentially cedes any agency over the situation. Thus, a dual rhetorical function is created: the rhetor claims to be powerless in forestalling a conflict from occurring, but still has the ability to realize their idealized vision of a society. Future possible research may analyze whether satisfying both aspects of the war mythology does more to disempower its audience rather than move them to action.

Next, the intersection between constitutive rhetoric and myth should be further examined. As has been noted by McGee, the people within a rhetorical text are "a fiction dreamed by an advocate and infused with an artificial, rhetorical reality by the agreement of an audience to participate in a collective fantasy" ("In Search of 'the People'" 343). The case studies demonstrate that myth provides a powerful basis for the "rhetorical reality" that makes up a collective fantasy. The link between myth and constitutive rhetoric by itself should not be considered extraordinary, given that myths are, "a communicative narrative that indexes the development of certain portions of history" (Hocker Rushing "Power, Other, and Spirit in Cultural Texts" 159), thereby fulfilling many of the duties of a collective fantasy. Yet, the

manner in which a myth could directly influence how a public is constituted merits further

analysis. In each of the case studies, for example, the presence of war mythology shapes each

constituted public as victims of an external enemy, defined just as much by not being an

Otherized adversary as they are by common characteristics. Outside of war and manifestos, the

frontier myth, for example, clearly contains a certain type of rugged, highly autonomous

individual that shapes how the rhetor defines "the people." Myth, in short, could influence the

rhetorical space in which the collective fantasy of constitutive rhetoric exists. Such links should

be identified in scholarship beyond war mythology and manifestos to determine if consistent

patterns of influence between myth and constitutive rhetoric exist.

Implications and Possible Limitations of the Case Studies

Beyond the rhetorical implications within generic analysis, some cultural conclusions can

also be reached regarding the five specific manifestos examined in particular and manifesto texts

in general. Additionally, some areas of possible limitations in the selection of these texts will be

deliberated. First, the presence of common myths within manifestos should be further explored.

This is critical; as Barry Brummett clearly explains, myths are integral in the process of,

"ordering social consciousness in the service of power" (101). Given that myths both are

informed by as well as shape the cultural truths that guide rhetorical invention, the presence of

similar mythological structures across seemingly disparate discourses calls into question whether

texts truly challenge or merely reify the social structures in which they seek to overthrow. This is

especially true for purportedly radical texts such as "Queers Read This." In that instance, the

mythology of war actually could serve to reinforce some of the very cultural truths that have

been used to marginalize queers in the first place. In other words, casting an enemy as a savage,

uncivilized Other, shifting societal blame onto an external vessel, and depicting conflict as a

zero-sum dichotomy in order to justify militant action has been present in rhetorical texts used to marginalize queers. This is not a merely academic exercise either, for as "Queers Read This" so clearly points out, anti-gay violence is the direct result of homophobic attitudes. Yet, by using the war mythology in general and "justified war" in particular, radical texts only continue to privilege that cultural logic that underpins its oppression. Moreover, because Williamson explains that myth is the, "vehicle for which values become incarnate," (217) rhetors such as Queer Nation may be, ironically, supporting the ideology of bigotry.

Yet, the presence of the war mythology within manifestos reveals a dialectical tension facing any social movement. Myths are used precisely because they are rhetorically powerful. Richard Slotkin explains that popular myths – such as war – are effective because they, "appeal to the structures and traditions of storytelling and the clichés of historical memory" (6). For a social movement, this presents a dilemma: how does one challenge Slotkin's "clichés of historical memory" while still finding rhetorical appeal to a broader audience? Further research inquiries into other protest rhetoric and manifesto discourses may be able to gain insight into how radical social movements negotiate this dialectic between seeking to alter social systems of privilege while still appealing to the very cultural narratives that underline them.

In addition, possible limitations in the selection and analysis of these pieces should be acknowledged. First, by utilizing a genre lens these texts were necessarily decontextualized. Some insights that might only be gained from surrounding the unique rhetorical situations surrounding these texts could have been overlooked in the process. Nevertheless, such is a necessary side effect of generic criticism. Benoit explains, "If, on the other hand, the critic's purpose is to clarify the nature of rhetoric as it occurs in certain recurring situations – which is more likely the case in generic criticism – then the specific surrounding circumstances are

reduced (or of no) importance" (130). Of course, this is not to contend that rhetorical context is inconsequential, but merely falls outside the scope of generic analysis, and other methods can more fully account for the rhetorical situation as it affects a text.

Next, while it would be impossible to examine every known social movement manifesto in the present study, the occlusion of some texts does raise some possible issues. First, all of the texts were not only self-identified, but also were chosen in part because the broader hegemony granted them an audience. Consequently, this only serves to reify cultural hegemony's power as a gatekeeper, bypassing potentially powerful manifestos that were given a fate even worse than being condemned or struck down by the dominant society – simply being ignored. There is also the possibility that social movements belonging to groups whose quantitative size simply was not large enough to sustain any impact on the broader culture were also excluded. This is problematic, as it could possibly reaffirm the marginalized status of communities whose size precludes them from having a voice in the dominant social structure. Additionally, while various social groups were identified for this rhetorical research, no manifesto text addressed the issue of intersectionality or of subaltern status. This too could be problematic. Culturally, subaltern groups are denied from public discourse precisely because they refuse to fall within a defined, socially constructed identification, so to occlude any sort of text from this group could add to this form of social muting. Rhetorically, the uniqueness of intersectionality may alter the rhetorical situation and the subsequent substantive and stylistic responses within a genre.

As stated before, the texts used for the case studies are by no means intended to construct a "canon" of manifestos, nor be used as a measuring stick upon which all future manifesto discourses ought to be held against. Local manifesto texts and manifestos belonging to subaltern

groups, such as the "Combahee River Collective Statement[5]," should be welcome for examination in future academic inquiries, not just for the potential insights gained, but for these valuable discourses to be given a forum.

Manifesto Research and Fragmentation

Additionally, serious discussion must occur regarding manifesto scholarship and fragmentation. As this analysis demonstrated, manifestos can be a rich source of insight into social movements, multiple aspects of rhetorical criticism, and the cultural undercurrents that formulate the text's rhetorical situation. Additionally, previous scholarship has identified manifestos as a key element in the formation of a vibrant movement for social change (Stewart, Smith and Denton 94). Yet, there is a noted scarcity of standalone research on these sorts of texts. It could be strongly ascertained that a possible reason for this is that manifestos are typically subsumed within broader examinations of the social movements with which they are affiliated. This is reflective of a turn within rhetorical criticism towards fragmentation and polysemous textual analysis, for as McGee notes in his foundational essay on fragmentation, "Critical rhetoric does not begin with a finished text in need of interpretation; rather, texts are understood to be larger than the apparently finished discourse that presents itself as transparent" ("Text, Context, and the Fragmentation of Contemporary Culture" 70). As such, manifestos are often viewed as only a part of a larger movement discourse, relegating them to being an examined fragment rather than the centerpiece of study.

---

[5] In 1977, a collective of black lesbian feminists, named the "Combahee River Collective," released a manifesto detailing the unique "interlocking oppressions" they faced as a result of society's gender, racial, and heterosexual biases. Active in Boston from 1974 to 1980, the Collective sought to give voice to black women and lesbians that had previously been muted in mainstream society.

The recent evolution of social movements, conversely, may force scholars to revisit this approach. In his groundbreaking work on this field of study, Herbert W. Simons defined social movements as, "An uninstitutionalized collectivity that mobilizes for action to implement a program for the reconstitution of social norms or values" (407). Simons, however, examines movements from a sociological perspective, arguing that movements must have a central leader that can meet a number of rhetorical requirements (408-9). Movements could be understood simply by analyzing the rhetoric of their leaders. But as Ralph R. Smith and Russel R. Windes point out, "Traditional rhetoric, designed to analyze individual speakers and speeches, cannot usefully be employed to analyze innovative movements" (142). Current changes in social movements have supported their notion. The Tea Party protests of 2009 and 2010, as well as Occupy Wall Street from 2011, reflect a new form of decentralized social protest. While members of these campaigns share a broad ideological goal, there is no clear organizational structure, no visible leaders or figureheads, and no unified source calling for rhetorical action. Subsequently, these movements lack the sort of single-text manifestos that have been commonly associated with and movement scholars have deemed as necessary for groups to effect social change. Yet, despite lacking these components, they have had a profound impact on the national discourse in order to push their agenda. Additionally, there is no evidence indicating that these sorts of social movements are an anomaly; rather, they epitomize McGee's observation from over twenty years ago that "We stand now in the middle of a seventy-year movement which has fractured and fragmented American culture. Contemporary discourses reflect this fragmentation" ("Text, Context, and the Fragmentation of Contemporary Culture" 75). This necessitates that scholars reevaluate how manifesto rhetoric can be examined.

It also presents a new opportunity. Fragmentation as a critical rhetorical practice can bridge this gap in manifesto scholarship. Rather than simply find a single, published manifesto discourse that is released from the central leadership of a movement, scholars must now scour press statements from disparate chapters, speeches from ad hoc protests, even social media postings from various individuals and segments who all claim to be operating under the same umbrella. Manifestos no longer can be found in a unified document; they are present in countless pieces strewn across the landscape of the movement itself. McGee asserts, "If by 'text' we mean the sort of finished discourse anticipated in consequence of an essentially homogenized culture, no texts exist today. We have instead fragments of 'information' that constitute our context" ("Text, Context, and the Fragmentation of Contemporary Culture" 76). Using this approach, these fragments can be places together to form a "composite manifesto," which subsequently opens it to genre analysis.

This method could follow a similar model from "composite narrative" analysis. In discussing the collective response from Soviet newspapers to the U.S. accidentally shooting down Iran Air 655, Jim A. Kuypers, Marilyn J. Young and Michael Launer explain:

> Although the content of each editorial is somewhat different, all have the same basic structure. We examine the editorials by conflating them into this basic structure, into one narrative reply to the incident. (311)

Recognizing this unifying structure, scholars can heed Benoit's call that a genre, "is a set of discourses which can be isolated by reference to certain identifying characteristics which distinguish it from other sets of discourses" (128), and together fragments that contain the same connecting forms. While each of these fragments individually would lack the "constellation of forms" to be examined within a genre, as a composite they could be studied under a manifesto generic frame. Using this frame, all of the fragments can be studied in concert with one another.

Even if the beliefs of a movement are not rooted, housed, and articulated within a unified document, their rhetorical invention can still contain the same mythical, constitutive, and ideological functions of a manifesto text. Rather than make manifesto critiques obsolete, fragmentation provides a renewed tool for rhetorical scholars to examine decentralized social movements.

Moreover, "composite manifesto" analysis demonstrates how fragmentation and genre analysis can be employed in unison for rhetorical criticism. Generic examination does not have to be wedded to singular texts in order to be a useful tool for rhetorical critics. Instead, it can fulfill Campbell and Jamieson's call that it provide, "an angle of vision, a window" ("Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism" 453) into texts by operating as a macro frame to study polysemous texts. One critical method does not have to come at the expense of the other, but instead can be mutually symbiotic, informing and further the potential of both practices.

Appropriation as Manifesto Rhetorical Strategy

Another potential area for future manifesto analysis lies in appropriation of other texts. Helene A. Shugart explains appropriation as "the claiming, by an individual or group, of another's meanings, ideas, or experiences to advance the individual's or group's beliefs, ideas, or agenda" (211). Appropriation can be a powerful tool for communities to take back a term that was previously used to marginalize them and rhetorically flip it, using that label for their own advantage. Shugart continues that when this occurs, "the original meaning, which may pose a threat to the appropriator, is deconstructed, distorted, or destroyed so that the perceived threat is undermined and the agenda of the appropriator is advanced instead" (211). In her research it was examined through the lens of feminist appropriation; however, manifestos may also be another site of critical appropriation as well.

A recurrent form across the case studies is that terms are appropriated to suit their own agenda. From the *Declaration of Independence* reframing the notion of loyalty to being that of fellow countrymen instead of the crown, to the "Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World" challenging the usage of the term "n*gger," to "The Southern Manifesto" recasting the notion of segregation, to "The Woman-Identified Woman" confronting lesbianism, to "Queers Read This" embracing the label "queer" and openly declaring that doing so takes the word out of the homophobe's hands, it appears that manifestos recurrently attempt to reclaim key terms or concepts that previously marginalized them and instead reemploy them as tools for identification. It may be that this process is an integral stylistic form for the manifesto genre. Moreover, the standpoint from which the appropriation occurs – be it from a position of cultural dominance or marginalization – may reveal greater ideological foundations to that manifesto. Shugart contends that when dominant groups engage in appropriation, "in such contexts, it tends to function as reinforcement of existing oppression" (211). This certainly could apply to the extremely regressive stances of "The Southern Manifesto." Far from being a discussion over classification, the form of appropriation warrants further study for manifesto texts as it may also influence the rhetorical invention of these texts.

Moreover, appropriation can also be used as a lens to examine the *Declaration of Independence*. While some manifestos, such as the Declaration of Sentiments, explicitly copy the *Declaration of Independence* in their formatting and structure, the question remains whether the *Declaration of Independence* is a generative text that is repeatedly appropriated by other social movement manifestos, or reflects broader cultural beliefs about liberation that transcend temporality. The appropriation of the *Declaration of Independence* is a critical site for examination; such rhetorical tactics may actually constrain future texts from truly challenging

dominant political and social structures. Moreover, it could reify the *Declaration of Independence*'s enshrinement in the civic religion of the United States. Richard Hughes warns of this in the myth of Nature's Nation, where because the U.S.'s founding documents – the *Declaration of Independence* and the Constitution – claim to be directly sanctioned by God, has, "led Americans to believe that the contours of American civilization – the way things actually are – simply reflect 'the way things are meant to be'" (63). It is this exact sort of ideology that has justified colonialism, enslavement, and all other forms of marginalization within American culture (64). Thus, while appropriation of the *Declaration of Independence* can serve as a powerful rhetorical tool in social movement manifestos, it can also reify the same oppressive conceptual underpinnings that necessitate social movements in the first place.

Conclusion: A Call for a Revival of Generic Criticism

Lastly, the analysis within this study makes it apparent that critics should not abandon genre criticism. In recent times, genre as a lens of rhetorical analysis has fallen out of favor with critics. Joshua Gunn notes that beyond genre criticism being dismissed as formulaic or limited, "The poststructuralist turn, in particular, has encouraged moving away from genres and similar 'modern' conceits in favor of genealogical and cartographic modes of criticism" (5). As the emphasis within criticism veers towards cultural critiques and away from closed-text readings and the textual study that does exist becomes more decentralized, too often has genre analysis been discarded as archaic, discredited, and inadequate for rhetorical studies.

Such superciliousness towards genre in the field, however, is not only inaccurate but overlooks its potential value as a tool to study cultural and ideological hegemony. Gunn explains, "Rather than existing in texts, genres are concrete labels for shared patterns or social forms that inhere in the popular imagination […] Once an audience identifies the repetition of an underlying

112

social form within a rhetorical act, it becomes a 'genre'[…] In other words, the generic field is the social field, the collective mental life of the audience" (6). The examination of these case studies illustrates Gunn's notion. While each of the manifestos employed rhetorical forms in a different manner, the underlying social forms among them held together. Studying manifestos under generic criticism reveals an aspect of the "collective mental life" of social movements that would have otherwise not been understood.

Perhaps the call is to not only revisit and expand upon generic criticism, but to also redefine the role of those who use it. While Campbell and Jamieson ("Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism) make it abundantly clear that genre within rhetorical criticism is intended for producing understanding rather than classification, a common critique of the method is that it simply exists to create another level of organization (Benoit 130). In our post-critical turn of rhetorical criticism however, generic critics need to do more than merely avoid categorizing. The understanding that genre critiques can provide should also be clarified. Gunn elaborates, "The function of the generic critic is to bring social forms into conscious awareness by restoring them to their verbal character – by describing them, in language, as iterations of a recurring social form" (18). It is not enough for genre criticism to simply highlight the tensions between rhetorical elements. Rather, it must explicate why these tensions exist between social forms, what cultural understandings can be gained by examining and bringing these tensions to light, and ultimately, ways to rupture these tensions if they privilege hegemonic norms or are used to justify marginalization. In this light, genre is no longer seen as dichotomous to the goals of postmodern rhetorical criticism, but rather can play an integral part. If critics can recognize the potential for critical praxis within this method, it would be of mutual benefit to both the practice as well as the field of rhetoric as a whole.

Recalling that explosive episode on the U.S. Senate floor over fifty five years ago, Strom Thurmond shared more in common with the pan-African nationalist, the lesbian feminist, and the queer radical anarchist than he could have ever fathomed. These inexorable links are exposed, disseminated, and possibly ruptured through genre criticism. It is the role of the critic to wield this tool, not merely for observation, but possibly liberation. For while this method of criticism may be inherently labeled as generic, it is clear that its potential for the future is phenomenal.

WORKS CITED

Alvarez, Natalie and Jenn Stephenson. "A Manifesto for Manifestos." *Canadian Theatre Review* 150 (2012): 3-7. Print.

Benoit, William Lyon. "In Defense of Generic Rhetorical Criticism: John H. Patton's 'Generic Criticism: Typology at an Inflated Price'." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 10.3 (1980): 128-34. Print.

Black, Edwin. "The Second Persona." *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*. Ed. John Louis Lucaites, Celeste Michelle Condit, and Sally Caudill. New York, NY: The Guilford P, 1999. 331-40. Print.

Brummett, Barry. *Rhetorical Homologies: Form, Culture, Experience*. Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P, 2004. Print.

Burke, Kenneth. "Identification." *Kenneth Burke: On Symbols and Society*. Ed. Joseph R. Gusfield. Chicago, IL: U of Chicago P, 1989. 179-91. Print.

---. "Sin and Redemption." *Kenneth Burke: On Symbols and Society*. Ed. Joseph R. Gusfield. Chicago, IL: U of Chicago P, 1989. 294-302. Print.

Buscombe, Edward. "The Idea of Genre in the American Cinema." *Screen* 11.2 (1970): 34-45. Print.

Butler, Jeremy G. *Television: Critical Methods and Applications*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2012. Print.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. *Deeds Done in Words: Presidential Rhetoric and the Genres of Governance*. Chicago, IL: U of Chicago P, 1990. Print.

---. "Form and Genre in Rhetorical Criticism: An Introduction." Readings in Rhetorical Criticism. Ed. Carl R. Burgchardt. Fourth ed. State College, PA: Strata, 2010. 444-462. Print.

Caws, Mary Ann, ed. *Manifesto: A Century of Isms*. Lincoln, NE: U of Nebraska P, 2001. Print.

Charland, Maurice. "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the Peuple Québécois?" *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73.2 (1987): 133-50. Print.

Cunningham, Michael. "If You're Queer and You're Not Angry in 1992, You're Not Paying Attention; If You're Straight It May be Hard to Figure Out What All the Shouting's About." *Mother Jones* May/June 1992: 60-8. Print.

Davis, Flora. *Moving the Mountain: The Women's Movement in America Since 1960*. Urbana Champaign, IL: U of Illinois P, 1999. Print.

Declaration of Independence. Primary Documents in American History**:** Documents from the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention, 1774-1789**.** Web. August 24, 2012**.** *http://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/DeclarInd.html*.

Debord, Guy, and Gil Wolman. "Methods of Detournement." *Situationist International Anthology*. Ed. Ken Knabb. Oakland, CA: AK P, 1989. 8-14. Print.

Dorsey, Leroy G. "The Myth of War and Peace in Presidential Discourse: John Kennedy's 'New Frontier' Myth and the Peace Corps." *Southern Communication Journal* 62.1 (1996): 42-55. Print.

Feuer, Jane. "Genre Study and Television." *Channels of Discourse, Reassembled.* Ed. Robert C. Allen. 2nd ed. Chapel Hill, NC: The U of North Carolina P, 1992. 138-160. Print.

Finley, Laura, and Emily Reynolds Stringer. *Beyond Burning Bras: Feminist Activism for Everyone*. Denver, CO: Praeger, 2010. Print.

Frye, Jerry K. "The 'Black Manifesto' and the Tactic of Objectification." *Journal of Black Studies* 5.1 (1974): 65-76. Print.

Grant, Colin. *Negro with a Hat: The Rise and Fall of Marcus Garvey*. New York, NY: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.

Gunn, Joshua. "The Rhetoric of Exorcism: George W. Bush and the Return of Political Demonology." *Western Journal of Communication* 68.1 (2004): 1-23. Print.

Gusfield, Joseph R., ed. *Kenneth Burke: On Symbols and Society*. Chicago, IL: U of Chicago P, 1989. Print.

Hostetler, Michael J. "Rethinking the War Metaphor in Religious Rhetoric: Burke, Black, and Berrigan's 'Glimmer of Light'." *Journal of Communication & Religion* 20.1 (1997): 49-60. Print.

Hughes, Richard T. *Myths America Lives By*. Urbana, IL: U of Illinois P, 2003. Print.

Ivie, Robert L. "Images of Savagery in American Justifications for War." *Communication Monographs* 47.4 (1980): 279-94. Print.

Jamieson, Kathleen Hall, and Karlyn Kohrs Campbell. "Rhetorical Hybrids: Fusions of Generic Elements." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68.2 (1982): 146-57. Print.

Kaplan, Esther. "A Queer Manifesto." *The Village Voice.* August 14 1990: 36. Print.

Klope, David C. "Defusing a Foreign Policy Crisis: Myth and Victimage in Reagan's 1983 Lebanon/Grenada Address." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50.4 (1986): 336-49. Web.

Kuypers, Jim A., Marilyn J. Young, and Michael K. Launer. "Composite Narrative, Authoritarian Discourse, and the Soviet Response to the Destruction of Iran Air Flight 655." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 87.3 (2001): 305-20. Web.

Lalka, Robert Tice. "I'll Live and Die for Dixie: The Rhetoric of the Southern Manifesto." *Southern Historian* 28(2007): 32-54. Print.

Lucas, Stephen E. "Justifying America: The Declaration of Independence as a Rhetorical Document." *American Rhetoric: Context and Criticism*. Ed. Thomas W. Benson. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1989. 67-130. Print.

Martin, Tony. *The Pan-African Connection: From Slavery to Garvey and Beyond*. Dover, MA: The Majority P, 1983. Print.

McGee, Michael Calvin. "In Search of 'The People': A Rhetorical Alternative." *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*. Ed. John Louis Lucaites, Celeste Michelle Condit, and Sally Caudill. New York, NY: The Guilford P, 1999. 341-56. Print.

---. "Text, Context, and the Fragmentation of Contemporary Culture*." Contemporary Rhetorical Theory*. Ed. John Louis Lucaites, Celeste Michelle Condit, and Sally Caudill. New York, NY: The Guilford P, 1999. 65-78. Print.

Morris III, Charles E., and John M. Sloop. ""What Lips these Lips have Kissed": Refiguring the Politics of Queer Public Kissing." *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 3.1 (2006): 1-26. Print.

Osborn, Michael. "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The Light-Dark Family." *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism*. Ed. Carl R. Burgchardt. 4th ed. State College, PA: Strata Publishing, 2010. 348-59. Print.

---. "In Defense of Broad Mythic Criticism: A Reply to Rowland." *Communication Studies* 41.2 (1990): 121-7. Print.

Parker, Maegan. "Ironic Openings: The Interpretive Challenge of the 'Black Manifesto'." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 94.3 (2008): 320-42. Print.

Pearce, Kimber Charles. "The Radical Feminist Manifesto as Generic Appropriation: Gender, Genre, and Second Wave Resistance." *Southern Communication Journal* 64.4 (2009): 307-15. Print.

Poirot, Kristan. "Domesticating the Liberated Woman: Containment Rhetorics of Second Wave Radical/Lesbian Feminism." *Women's Studies in Communication* 32.3 (2009): 263-92. Print.

Queer Nation. "Queers Read This." 1990. *Queer Resources Directory.org*. Web. http://www.qrd.org/qrd/misc/text/queers.read.this. Accessed March 18, 2013.

Radicalesbians. "The Woman Identified Woman." *David M. Rubenstein Rare Book & Manuscript Library*, Duke University. Web. http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/wlm/womid/. Accessed March 18, 2013.

Rand, Erin J. "A Disunited Nation and a Legacy of Contradiction: Queer Nation's Construction of Identity." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 28.4 (2004): 288-306. Print.

Robertson, James Oliver. *American Myth, American Reality*. New York: Hill & Wang, 1980. Print.

Rushing, Janice Hocker. "Mythic Evolution of 'the New Frontier' in Mass Mediated Rhetoric." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 3.3 (1986): 265-96. Print.

---. "Power, Other, and Spirit in Cultural Texts." *Western Journal of Communication* 57.2 (1993): 159-68. Print.

Shugart, Helene A. "Counterhegemonic Acts: Appropriation as a Feminist Rhetorical Strategy." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83.2 (1997): 210-29. Print.

Simons, Herbert W. "Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion For Social Movements." *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism*. Ed. Carl R. Burgchardt. 4th ed. State College, PA: Strata , 2010. 406-17. Print.

Slotkin, Richard. *Gunfighter Nation: The Myth of the Frontier in Twentieth-Century America*. New York, NY: Maxwell Macmillan, 1992. Print.

Smith, Arthur L. *Rhetoric of Black Revolution*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1969. Print.

Smith, Craig Allen, and Kathy B. Smith. "A Rhetorical Perspective on the 1997 British Party Manifestos." *Political Communication* 17.4 (2000): 457-73. Print.

Smith, Ralph R., and Russel R. Windes. "The Innovational Movement: A Rhetorical Theory." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61.2 (1975): 140-53. Print.

"The Southern Manifesto." *Cong. Rec.* 12 Mar 1956: 4460. *Strom Thurmond Institute*. Clemson University. Web. http://sti.clemson.edu/component/content/article/192-general-info/790-1956-qsouthern-manifestoq. Accessed March 18, 2013.

Stein, Sarah R. "The '1984' Macintosh Ad: Cinematic Icons and Constitutive Rhetoric in the Launch of a New Machine." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88.2 (2002): 169. Print.

Stewart, Charles J., Craig Allen Smith, and Robert E. Denton. *Persuasion and Social Movements*. 6th ed. Long Grove, IL: Waveland , 2012. Print.

Tate, Helen. "The Ideological Effects of a Failed Constitutive Rhetoric: The Co-Option of the Rhetoric of White Lesbian Feminism." *Women's Studies in Communication* 28.1 (2005): 1-31. Print.

Universal Negro Improvement Association. "Declaration of Rights of the Negro Peoples of the World." Public Broadcasting Service *American Experience* Film Series. 2001. Web. http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/garvey/filmmore/ps_rights.html.

Warren, Charles. "Fourth of July Myths." *William and Mary Quarterly* 2.3 (1945): 238-72. Web.

Wellek, René, and Austin Warren. *Theory of Literature*. 3rd ed. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace & World, 1956. Print.

Williamson, Larry A. "Bush's Mythic America: A Critique of the Rhetoric of War." *Southern Communication Journal* 75.3 (2010): 215-31. Print.

Yanoshevsky, Galia. "Three Decades of Writing on Manifesto: The Making of a Genre." *Poetics Today* 30.2 (2009): 257-86. Print.

Zagacki, Kenneth S. "Constitutive Rhetoric Reconsidered: Constitutive Paradoxes in G. W. Bush's Iraq War Speeches." *Western Journal of Communication* 71.4 (2007): 272-93. Print.