This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled

PRACTICE AND THEORY: A NEW APROACH TO
RHETORICAL DELIVERY

presented by

James Ridolfo

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Ph.D. degree in Rhetoric and Writing

Major Professor's Signature

5/11/09

Date

PRACTICE AND THEORY: A NEW APPROACH TO RHETORICAL DELIVERY

By

James Ridolfo

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Rhetoric and Writing
2009

ABSTRACT

PRACTICE AND THEORY: A NEW APPROACH TO RHETORICAL DELIVERY

By

James Ridolfo

This project works to build a new understanding of rhetorical delivery from the experiences, stories, and documents of activists from Ingham County, Michigan. With little money or resources, activist stories of delivery show how rhetorical theory can grow out of a desire or necessity to change more with less. The broad range of experiences discussed by participants represent a wide range of organizations, such as MSU Students for Economic Justice, Movimiento Estudiantil Xicano De Aztlán, MSU Students for Peace & Justice, Lansing Direct Action!, and Amnesty International. Findings show that there are many new ways to expand the theoretical scope and utility of the fifth canon of delivery. Due to arcane Graduate School imaging and formatting standards, the author has chosen to remove all images from the library version of his dissertation.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my partner Janice, my late father, and my mother.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very thankful for the support of many amazing people. My wonderful committee, Julie Lindquist, Bill Hart-Davidson, Ellen Cushman, and Danielle DeVoss, my graduate cohort: Qwo-Li, Stacey Pigg, Angela, Donnie, Kendall, Robyn. Collin, Martine, my family: my mother, late father, and my amazingly supportive partner Janice. I am also extremely grateful for my participants and friends: Maggie C., Maggie R., Triana, Stu, and Todd. Their work helped make this possible. Thanks also to Sayrah for additional research materials and support, as well as Malea Powell, Mike McLeod, and Jeff Grabill for being fantastic colleagues and friends.

PRACTICE AND THEORY: A NEW APPROACH TO RHETORICAL DELIVERY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

What does the little homing pigeon have to do with rhetorical delivery? In short, pigeons have always had very little to do with rhetorical theory, but why? Despite their widespread use as a central communications by the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans, pigeons remain absent from classical Greek and Roman theories of rhetoric[1] (Cornhill Magazine, 285). For thousands of years while orators spoke to crowds of citizens, the pigeons diligently delivered important communications high above cities, trees, and surrounding armies. A magazine article from 1887 mentions how pigeon "correspondence... was conveyed in and out of Paris, during the siege of 1871... and for a time the departure of pigeons-post for Tours (where the letters were enlarged by photography and sent on to Paris) was regularly advertised by the British Post Office" (285). Pigeons helped transmit the news into by means of photographs long before the creation of television or the Internet.

As one of the oldest domesticated animals in the world, pigeons were used to communicate important events and information. In the time of the Greek rhetoricians, they were released to communicate the start of the Olympic games to cities. Perhaps more importantly, the established armies of the world used the pigeon was an important communications tool, with armies investing large sums of money into their military pigeons. Indeed one French pigeon flew twelve combat missions in the First World War, receiving one of the highest of French military honors. According to an article in the

[1] By heritage canon I mean the Greek, Roman, European, and American rhetoric texts which often have been framed as "The History of Rhetoric."

1887 edition of the *National Review,* military pigeons relied on a complex system of training, transmission monitoring, message verification, and distribution:

> The [military pigeon] communication was written on a thin slip of paper and enclosed in a very small gold box, almost as thin as the paper itself, suspended to the neck of the bird. The time of arrival and departure was marked at each successive tower, and, for greater security, a duplicate message was always dispatched a couple of hours after the first (*National Review*, 57-58)

The military pigeon can be considered one of the most prominent and oldest examples of complex systems of delivery as a strategy. As recently as 2002 India maintained a pigeon service for its military. As one of the last governments to maintain a military pigeon service, India opted to replace the signaling technology of the pigeon for newer technologies. However as digital technologies continue to replace mainstream governmental use of a military pigeon service, insurgents engaged in asymmetrical conflict continue to find a strategic use for pigeons ("Indian"). This insurgent pigeon delivery strategy was illustrated in the recent USA-Iraq war, where in 2006 *Time Magazine* reported that insurgents were using pigeons to signal a mortar attack:

> Lately, troops say insurgents have been using a technique called pigeon flipping: while on patrol, the Marines have noticed flocks of pigeons circling above them, leading them to conclude that supporters of the insurgents have somehow trained the birds to signal when troops are in the area. "If it's a game of cat and mouse," says Corporal Richard Bass, "then who's the mouse?" (Time)

How might the insurgents' use of the pigeon be understood as rhetorical, and why have scholars never treated the technology of the pigeon, and other non-oral forms of delivery,

as a strategic use of rhetoric, as a strategic understanding of rhetorical delivery? In this chapter I argue that contemporary scholars should look more toward the pigeon when theorizing a rhetoric of delivery. I suggest that the pigeon is not simply a technology of transmission absent from rhetorical theory: it has a rhetorical potential too, a strategic advantage for a rhetoric of delivery.

GREEK AND ROMAN RHETORIC

From the texts of the Roman orator Cicero scholars of rhetoric receive fragments of an argument for rhetorical delivery by the Greek rhetorician Demosthenes. According to Cicero, when Demosthenes was asked his opinion of what constituted the most important element of [a] rhetoric, he three times repeated, "delivery, delivery, delivery" (Duncan, 84), but Demosthenes' supporting argument has been lost to history. Aristotle's argument for delivery remains most prominent, and relegates delivery to a much lower status.

According to Aristotle, "No systematic treatise upon the rules of delivery has yet been composed; indeed, even the study of language made no progress till late in the day. Besides, delivery is—very properly—not regarded as an elevated subject of inquiry" (120). For Aristotle delivery is worthy of study, but is still not regarded as an elevated subject of inquiry. In this respect Aristotle regards delivery as important, but certainly not as important as the philosophical arts. For individuals concerned with the study of rhetorical delivery, Aristotle says, "It is those who do bear them [the concerns of delivery] in mind who usually win prizes in the dramatic contests; and just as in drama the actors now count for more than the poets, so it is in the contests of public life, owing

to the defects of our political institutions" (119-120). In other words delivery is also pejoratively important in the sense that it owes to the "defects of our political institutions," but it has still not been worthy of a "systematic treatise on delivery." While composing nothing close to a full treatise on delivery, Aristotle does note three factors which may limit the success of an oral delivery. According to Aristotle, there are three things that greatly affect the success of a speech:

> It is plain that delivery has just as much to do with oratory as with poetry. It is, essentially, a matter of the right management of the voice to express the various emotions—of speaking loudly, softly, or between the two; of high, low, or intermediate pitch; of the various rhythms that suit various subjects. These are the three things—volume of sound, modulation of pitch, and rhythm—that a speaker bears in mind. (119)

While Aristotle focuses on the voice, Cicero and Quintilian expand delivery to include corporeality and gesture. According to Quintilian this concern for movement is based on the study of physical eloquence:

> Delivery is often styled action. But the first name is derived from the voice, the second from the gesture. For Cicero in one passage speaks of action as being a form of speech, and in another as being a kind of physical eloquence. None the less, he divides action into two elements, which are the same as the elements of delivery, namely voice and movement. Therefore, it matters not which term we employ. (Butler, 243)

Drawing on Quintilian a millennium later the Italian rhetorician Giambattista Vico also includes the elegance of the corporeal as a key component of delivery. In his work the *Art of Rhetoric,* Vico states that "one's stance, which is a certain eloquence of the body... even though adding happily to delivery, so much that Demosthenes placed it first, is acquired

more by nature and imitation than by any precepts" (Skinner-Linnenberg 207). Vico then becomes one of the foundational texts for the elocutionist movement of the 18th and 19th century. At that point in history the elocutionists emerged in Europe, and they equated the exercise of rhetorical delivery with a form of style.

The meaning of elocution stems from the Latin root *elocutio,* which is equivalent to "the word for style, but it literally means 'speaking out,' and its English derivative, 'elocution,' was adapted as a term for [oral] delivery or reading aloud" (Kennedy, 278). According to Kennedy the 18th century "interest in elocution flourished most in the British Isles, where its leading proponent was the Irishman Thomas Sheridan" (Kennedy, 278). Similar to twentieth century etiquette manuals, eighteenth century elocution books offered a wide variety of advice regarding the conduct of the body:

> textbooks listed tropes and schemes for ornamenting speeches and provided models, often in the form of letters, for addressing various audiences in an elegant, genteel style. Prose and verse passages often were included so that students could practice reading material aloud. (Skinner-Linnenberg, 49)

Sheridan came to *elocutio* through the theatre and acting, the course of study Aristotle says has the most to do with delivery. Kennedy says that in the 18th century the study and promotion of elocution "began to revive with the effort to achieve high standards of delivery in preaching and in theater" (Kennedy 278). Another rhetorician of the same eighteenth and nineteenth century era is Gilbert Austin. According to delivery scholar Virginia Skinner-Linnenberg, Austin focused on the "creation of a marketing method to show proper facial expressions, eye contact, hand or bodily action, and stance" for the purpose of the dramatic. Skinner-Linnenberg explains that Austin wanted to create a

manual for actors and orators, one that could capture the facial expressions and gestures of classical actors in the time of Shakespeare or Milton (194). The study of elocution then in the eighteenth century was widely connected with social class, with speaking and acting to the standard of the ruling bourgeois. According to Nan Johnson, pamphlets such as those penned by Sheridan and Austin circulated widely among the nineteenth century English, American, and Canadian bourgeois:

> Several elocution treatises achieved wide circulation in Canada and the United States between 1800 and the early decades of the twentieth century and were recognized by the academy and the literate public alike as authoritative works on the proper delivery of speeches and public readings and the rules of pronunciation and conversation. Works such as Ebenezer Porter's Analysis of the Principles of Rhetorical Delivery as Applied to Reading and Speaking (1827), William Russell's American Elocutionist (1844), and Alexander Melville Bell Principles of Elocution (1878) provided a course in the rudiments of delivery for the scholar and the "private learner." 20 Influential homiletic treatises such as Daniel P. Kidder Treatise on Homiletics (1864) and Austin Phelps's The Theory of Preaching (1882) offered general principles of delivery as well as particular hints for pulpit elocution. (Johnson 149)

After the elocutionist movement of the nineteenth century little else was written about the canon of delivery until the 1960s and 1970s.[2] After 2400 years, the heritage canon had not moved far beyond the Greek and Roman configuration of rhetorical delivery as

[2] I would argue that the genre of the elocution or code of conduct manual continued in the twentieth century as the etiquette book, and later as books of manners.

equivalent to oral delivery.[3] For the heritage canon the major innovation since the time of Aristotle has been the explicit Roman inclusion of the corporeal, while Aristotle's discussion of rhetorical delivery focuses almost exclusively on orality. Neither the Greek nor Roman traditions leave much room for theorizing delivery in terms of other technologies, such as the carrier pigeon or the epistle-carrying messenger. For Greek and Roman rhetoric the assumption that the location of aural reception would be the same as the location of oral delivery was simply a fact of oral delivery. The conceivable scope of the rhetorical situation as they conceived it is thus synonymous with audience, time, and place. One Greek concept durable enough to survive classical oral delivery's bounded place-time concerns is the concept of *kairos:*

> an ancient Greek word that means "the right moment'" or "the opportune." The two meanings of the word apparently come from two different sources. In archery, it refers to an opening, or "opportunity" or, more precisely, a long tunnel-like aperture through which the archer' s arrow has to pass. Successful passage of a *kairos* requires, therefore, that the archer's arrow be fired not only accurately but with enough power for it to penetrate. (White, 13)

Kairos as a concept for rhetorical delivery necessitates that a rhetorician compose ideas based on a precise understanding of the materiality, time, and place of a future rhetorical situation A concern for *kairos* posits an inventive approach toward issues of delivery. The

---

[3] For a far more comprehensive history of rhetorical delivery and the heritage canon, see the first two chapters in Virginia Skinner-Linnenberg's book, *Dramatizing Writing: Reincorporating Delivery in the Classroom.*

rhetorician must mentally compose the future rhetorical situation as a complex hypothetical scenario laden with many different inductive potentialities, twists, and turns. White explains that *kairos* was also analogous to material practice:

> The second meaning of *kairos* traces to the art of weaving. There it is "the critical time" when the weaver must draw the yarn through a gap that momentarily opens in the warp of the cloth being woven. Putting the two meanings together, one might understand *kairos* to refer to a passing instant when an opening appears which must be driven through with force if success is to be achieved. (White, 13)

White argues that for the Greeks *Kairos* was closely linked with a particular material practice. This work in turn can perhaps tell scholars something about the knowledge of rhetorical practice. As a craft, weaving is complex, and one must anticipate future moves. Each new design poses a unique challenge, and the practice of creation is in turn a form of knowledge. John Trimbur notes that delivery today is generally thought about by compositionists as "a technical issue about physical presentation whether in oral, print, or electronic forms" (Trimbur, *Composition*, 190). Even for contemporary oral delivery, however, it is no longer a given that the time, place, delivery medium, and reception will necessarily be the same for the speaker and the speaker's audience.

RECENT THEORIES OF DELIVERY IN RHETORIC AND COMPOSITION

In the past twenty years there has been a flurry of new scholarship that re-evaluates delivery in light of changes to the available means of persuasion. The massive introduction of electronic delivery has led not only to new forms of digital delivery, but also complex strategic combinations with pre-existing forms of analog delivery. For the field of rhetoric and composition studies this shift in the available means of persuasion

has prompted the re-examination of the Greek and Roman canons. Consequently, in the last fifteen years the majority of field scholarship on rhetorical delivery has articulated the need for new digital conceptualizations of rhetorical delivery. Scholars advocating this digital reconceptualization have also connected their work to broader political, ethical, and legal concerns. One of the first was Sheri Helsley in 1993. She argues that rhetorical delivery has emerged from the confines of classical rhetoric with a new degree of rhetorical importance in the digital era:

> When we interpret delivery as presentation or secondary orality, we do important things for ourselves and our students. We restore the recursiveness and synthesis originally envisioned in the interaction of the five rhetorical canons. We move into important discussions of inevitable technologies and new structures of consciousness in the electronic age. We expose our students to the power of presentation in both encoding and decoding -- an issue that has been largely ignored in contemporary education. (Helsley, 158)

Helsley draws on Walter Ong's terminology of a "secondary orality," and discusses the theorization of digital delivery as a form of canon restoration.[4] The notion of restoring the canon of delivery is common not only to Helsley. Kathleen Welch also has a political motivation for retheorizing the canon of delivery in the era of the digital. In her 1999 book *Electric Rhetoric*: *Classical Rhetoric, Oralism, and a New Literacy,* Welch argues that there are political consequences for the absence of rhetorical delivery from writing textbooks:

[4] Walter Ong's theories of culture have been widely critiqued by cultural scholars.

> In the functions of memory and delivery reside many issues of culture, ideology, society, and the construction of public and private lives, the last of which is routinely and tacitly regarded not as a construction at all but palpably, "obviously" as two separate entities. The elimination of memory and delivery in the majority of student writing textbooks constitutes the removal of student-written language from the larger public arena" (Welch, *Electric*, 145).

Similar to the way the study of delivery as elocution in the eighteenth and nineteenth century was largely the province of bourgeois education, Welch argues that the absence of delivery from composition textbooks has real political consequences.

Only a year after Kathleen Welch's book came out, John Trimbur published his 2000 *College Composition and Communication* (CCC) article "Composition and the Circulation of Writing." Similar to Welch, Trimbur argues for the political significance of delivery in the age of the digital. Trimbur argues that we need to amplify "the students' sense of what constitutes the production of writing by tracing its circulation in order to raise questions about how professional expertise is articulated to the social formation, how it undergoes rhetorical transformations (or 'passages of form')" (Trimbur, *Composition*, 214). In his Marxist-materialist analysis of delivery, Trimbur argues that the boundaries of delivery should be more broadly considered in relationship to the means of economic production and distribution:

> delivery can no longer be thought of simply as a technical aspect of public discourse. It must be seen also as ethical and political—a democratic aspiration to devise delivery systems that circulate ideas, information, opinions and knowledge and thereby expand

the public forums in which people deliberate on the issues of the day. (Trimbur, *Composition*, 190)

He advances that discussions of rhetorical delivery have the potential to explain complex economic formations relating to the means of production and distribution. Trimbur says that the "isolation of writing from the material conditions of production and delivery" should be a critical material concern for compositionists (Trimbur, *Composition,* 189). Trimbur advances a Marxist-materialist notion of delivery; one where the study of delivery can also be synonymous with the study of economics. Trimbur wants the field to think of the economic activity of delivery, and Kathleen Welch wants the field to think about the political significance of delivery in the digital age. Across the recent work of Skinner-Linnenberg, Kathleen Welch, and Trimbur, there is a consistent thread of technological changes alongside a re-examination of delivery in the wake of its movement into the realm of the electronic.

A more recent piece of scholarship by Dànielle Nicole DeVoss and James Porter acutely addresses issues of ethics, file sharing, and delivery. In "Why Napster Matters to Writing" the authors contend that emergent forms of digital delivery have implications for ethics of composing. DeVoss and Porter argue, "the new digital ethic is characterized by drastic changes in delivery, and reminds us of the power of delivery" (36). They posit that changes in the infrastructure and systems of cultural delivery and distribution have a major impact on students' attitudes toward the composition and delivery of writing. DeVoss and Porter supplement their discussion of electronic delivery with a heuristic of what might constitute a rubric for considering digital delivery and distribution. They make use of the Napster controversy as an example to argue for an "expanded notion of

delivery, one that embraces the politics and economics of publishing: the politics of technology development as they impact production and distribution; the politics of information" in an ever-unfolding and ever-present digital landscape (25). In addition, their article provides a highly useful list of criteria to help composition scholars think about digital delivery and contemporary theories of delivery:

> The choice of tools for production and the choice of medium for distribution—a.k.a, publishing practices—that is, the technical and human methods of production, reproduction, and distribution of digital "information" (broadly understood to include audio and video, as well as graphic and textual data);
>
> Knowledge of the systems which govern, constrain, and promote publishing practices—including public policy, copyright laws and other legislation, technology design and development, publishing conventions and economic models (both micro and macro);
>
> Awareness of the ethical and political issues that impact publishing practices—that is, who decides? What policies best serve the interests of society? What constitutes "digital fair use"? How should content producers be credited for their work? (DeVoss and Porter, 26)

With a call for economic analysis complimentary to Trimbur's discussion of delivery, "Why Napster Matters" expands on Trimbur's discussion of economics and adds a specific focus on the ethical dimensions of digital composing and delivery. Similar to Porter and DeVoss, Doug Eyman argues that new digital research methods and methodologies are needed to supplement our existing print methodologies.

Eyman's work is important to the field because it is the first scholarly treatment of rhetorical delivery that asks how researchers can develop "methodologies for research in digital rhetoric" (10). He argues that there is a critical need for humanities scholars to know more about the circulation of digital writing:

> In a knowledge economy, understanding the interactions of texts and contexts can yield a more comprehensive picture of interaction than the traditional approach of rhetorical invention, composition, and delivery; it can also provide a map of the relationships between work and activity that are often hidden because we simply don't have the means to uncover them. (8–9)

Eyman provides a wealth of methodological approaches for scholars interested in studying the overall circulation of a composition, from conference proposals, seminar papers, web texts, e-mail, SMS texts, and more. He proposes what he terms "circulation analysis" as a research tool that can "help trace the movement and use of digital texts" in humanities scholarship (10). Eyman's dissertation work provides methods for studying digital ecologies of circulation is a direct alternative to Trimbur's Marxist-materialist framework for analyzing the production and distribution of texts. While Helsley, Kathleen Welch, Trimbur, DeVoss and Porter, and Eyman have focused on digital delivery, two scholars have also focused on important aspects of contemporary oral delivery, Virginia Skinner-Linnenberg and Beverly Sauer.

Skinner-Linnenberg's 1999 book *Dramatizing Writing* is the first book in composition studies to focus solely on delivery. She argues that in "dramatizing writing, students employ both their physicality and their noetic processes, whether they are the

writers or the audience" (109). Consequently her focus is on making the composition classroom a more oral, physical environment of study and learning:

> Delivery in the classroom through dramatizing writing aids students to use their bodies and minds in their writing. With delivery, students can, with the help of others, study themselves, hear themselves, and see themselves as users of language. (111)

She holds that the dramatic elements of delivery have been lost in the contemporary composition classroom. She argues that a return of oratory to the composition classroom is important because such a focus brings into consideration important considerations of gender in the classroom. Similar to Kathleen Welch and Trimbur, Skinner-Linnenberg argues that rhetorical delivery involves important questions of ethos (110). She points out that delivery and gender have been largely absent from classical rhetoric:

> Some questions that might be asked here are: were there any women rhetoricians who espoused a theory of delivery or who even adhered to Cicero's canon? In what ways did the rhetoric classroom before the separation of speaking and writing differ for women as compared to men?" (110)

Perhaps the first scholar to begin to answer some of these questions of gender, delivery, and the classroom is Nancy Welch. In her 2005 *College Composition and Communication* essay "Living Room: Teaching Public Writing in a Post-Publicity Era," Nancy Welch discusses the context of a rhetoric seminar she taught during the beginning of the US-Iraq war in the spring of 2003. Her article focuses specifically on issues of audience, circulation, and delivery, relating these to what she calls "living room," or the radical decrease in the available room for discussion in public space, coupled with a significant increase in the privatization of everyday space. She says that her work in this

area will "add to the growing body of work that has the potential to reorient us from regarding rhetoric as a specialized *techne* – the property of a small economic and political elite – to understanding and teaching rhetoric as a [sic] *mass, popular art"* (Welch, "Living Room," 474). As an example of "teaching rhetoric as a mass popular art" the article provides a teacher's account of one politically active undergraduate student named Katie.

Welch explains how Katie wrote an anti-war poem as part of an assignment. Katie didn't simply want to write poems for Welch's seminar, she wanted to deliver her poetry to the world beyond the classroom:

> I want these poems to be *out there,* not just in a chapbook where my friends will read them and say, "Oh, Katie wrote a poem. Isn't that nice." (472)

Welch describes her reaction as an instructor when Katie winds up in a police cruiser with an infraction for tacking her flyer up on a metal utility box. She connects this legal issue of delivery with a discussion on the shrinking public sphere. Welch argues that the form of delivery Katie engaged in was legitimate, but "our parks, plazas, shopping malls, and downtown sidewalks have been locked down against the homeless, drug dealers, peddlers, and a student like Katie" (473-476). After her initial detainment by the police Katie decides that in the immediate future she needs to hand-deliver the poem to people. She decides that anonymously taping up copies on city utility boxes is not the most effective form of delivery for her poem (486). Welch's Katie example shows how a rhetorician can learn from past instances of rhetorical delivery. Welch also challenges educators to think about the teaching of rhetorical delivery. In the Katie example she foregrounds a variety of important legal concerns for certain forms of

corporeal delivery, challenging the field to consider a new range of pedagogical responsibilities surrounding delivery and the body.

Beverly Sauer's recent work *The Rhetoric of Risk: Technical Documentation in Hazardous Environments* also connects the episteme of the rhetorician with the potential uncertainty of the argument's transmission, providing a compelling example for how situated knowledge relates to delivery. Sauer's examines about how miners convey abstract yet highly critical safety information to other miners through gestures. The delivery of the miners sharply contrasts with how the managers of the mine communicate:

> When miners describe how to insert a roof bolt, they articulate an ordered sequence of steps: Drill a hole, insert the steel, insert the glue, insert the bolt, and spin the bolt to set the glue. But their gestures depict different aspects of the process: They can depict abstract scientific forces like compression or they can demonstrate how to insert a 15 – or 20-foot cable. They can spread their arms like a wing to show how roof bolts open inside the strata, or they can imitate the rock itself as it falls. (Sauer, *Risk*, 256)

Sauer's focus on the delivery and gesture of miners is a strong example of rhetoric of practice that connects complex conversations of risk and uncertainty with situated acts of rhetorical delivery. Her work provides an important way to think about the form of delivery as a series of situated choices in medium and genre.

The recent conversation on delivery in rhetoric and composition studies includes an early call for a rethinking of delivery for political reasons (Helsley, Kathleen Welch, and Trimbur), a call for the study of specific aspects of digital delivery and research (DeVoss and Porter, Eyman), and also includes a renewed discussion on the body and

delivery (Skinner-Linnenberg, Nancy Welch, Sauer), as well as the legal aspects of delivery (DeVoss and Porter, Nancy Welch). Sauer, Nancy Welch, and Eyman also provide a glimpse into the situated study of rhetorical delivery. Similar to Beverly Sauer and Nancy Welch, the project of this dissertation is to develop a practice-driven approach to the study of rhetorical delivery.

WHY DELIVERY, WHY NOW?

Why begin to rethink delivery at this particular historical moment? According to media theorist Peter Grusin there is a "double logic according to which media (particularly but not exclusively digital media) refashion prior media forms... Video and computer games... remediate film by styling themselves as 'interactive movies,' incorporating standard Hollywood cinematic techniques" (Grusin, 1). Similar to how scholars of rhetorical delivery today are in a unique place to appreciate the range of choice for delivery, Bolter and Grusin argue that scholars can also appreciate trends in remediation "because of the rapid development of new digital media and the nearly as rapid response by traditional media" (Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, 6). Bolter and Grusin also argue that the tension between mediums is found in both Greek and Roman culture:

> The Greeks and Romans conceived of their technology of alphabetic writing on papyrus roll in a dialectic tension with the oral tradition that writing only partly replaced. Ancient prose, even philosophy and history, was often highly rhetorical, as if the writing were still trying to imitate and improve on oral presentation. The shift from

codex to papyrus roll was less problematic, with the result that the codex remediated the roll almost out of existence in a few centuries (Bolter and Grusin, *Writing Space*, 23-4).

When applied to existing notions of rhetorical delivery Bolter and Grusin's ideas help to explain why a theory of delivery for the Greeks remained firmly rooted in oral rhetorics. In Bolter and Grusin's second book *Writing Space: Computers, Hypertext, and the Remediation of Print*, they continue to expand on the specific relationship between remediation and technologies for writing:

> Remediation is not limited to technologies of writing.... [They] have examined the ways in which new visual media, such as computer graphics, virtual reality, and the World Wide Web, define themselves by borrowing from, paying homage to, critiquing, and refashioning their predecessors, principally television, film, photography, and painting (23-24).

The relevance of Bolter and Grusin's main point on this dialectic between mediums is significant, and its importance will become clear for rhetorical delivery in the next section on contemporary theories of delivery.

The work of Bolter and Grusin also challenge scholars of rhetoric to think about historical moments where the gears of remediation didn't immediately translate into a breakthrough in rhetorical theory. Remediation happened before, but why hasn't technological remediation been accompanied by significant changes to how rhetorical theory approaches the topic of delivery? As part of my contribution to the project of rethinking rhetorical theories of delivery for the 21st century, in chapter two I will look at a missed opportunity for rhetorical theory, a historical moment where there was significant potential to rethink rhetorical delivery.

In the next chapter I look at a missed opportunity for a more inclusive theory of rhetorical delivery, a little known 15th century Italian rhetorician and rabbi who wrote the first ever Hebraic treatise on rhetoric, *The Book of Honeycombs Flow*. Judah Messer Leon was the first scholar of rhetoric to synthesize Greek, Roman, and Islamic rhetorics into a Hebraic context. His book of rhetoric was also one of the first three books to ever be published on the Hebrew printing press (Lesley; Bonfil; Rabinowitz).

I use the example of Messer Leon to revisit an important piece of rhetorical scholarship at the time of the early printing press, and ask specific questions about rhetoric, delivery, and changes in technology. Based on the technological milieu of the Leon's time, I theorize that Messer Leon stood a better chance than most for re-theorizing rhetorical delivery. Why didn't Judah Messer Leon respond to the technological innovations of his time in the same excited manner that scholars of rhetoric today are reinterpreting rhetorical theory? How might a 15th century missed opportunity to re-theorize rhetorical delivery benefit rhetoric scholars today? These questions in turn help to inform my study design in chapter three, where I look at what contemporary activist practice can teach scholars of rhetoric about delivery.

As John Trimbur notes "in the modern era... this focus solely on oral rhetoric, absent of other technologies, is not sustainable as a theory of rhetoric. Public forums are diffuse, fragmented, and geographically separated. Speech is both literally and metaphorically broadcast through expanded means of communication" (Trimbur, Composition, 190). I argue that what is needed in the age of digital and analog delivery is a new, flexible canon of delivery based on stories of practice, one not limited to the

narrow confines of the heritage canon or disparate treatises and "who responded to whom" in any sense, but stories of delivery situated in moments of rhetorical practice.

My rationale for theorizing delivery from practice is influenced by previous scholarship in the field of rhetoric and composition, particularly the ways that Malea Powell approaches rhetorical theory by theorizing from instances of practice. Drawing upon her work, I show that it is also productive to theorize rhetorical delivery from instances of practice, rather than attempting to navigate inside the narrow theoretical confines of a particular -- all too often Greek and Roman -- rhetorical tradition. In chapters four and five I am able to theory build several new concepts: rhetorical velocity, rhetorical mystification and reconstruction, and rhetorical valuation. In chapter six I expand on these concepts, and describe a new, comprehensive heuristic for understanding rhetorical delivery as part of a complex, interconnected series of strategies and activities.

CHAPTER TWO: THE RHETORICAL RECONSTRUCTION OF JUDAH MESSER LEON

In 1475 in Mantua, Italy there were two unique moments for the history of rhetoric. Abraham the Dyer, proprietor of the earliest-known Hebrew printing press, published the first Hebraic treatment of rhetoric, the *Sefer Nofet Zuphim* or *The Book of Honeycombs Flow*. The *Nofet Zuphim* was not only the first book of Hebrew to be published during the life of its author, Judah Messer Leon, but it was also one of the first three books ever to be published on the Hebrew printing press. Given the alignment of these unique historical firsts one would assume that Messer Leon's work would have had a more significant impact on the history of rhetoric – and certainly rhetorical delivery --- but this was not the case. Messer Leon's work remains obscure, and the story of the printing of his book exists only in a few Jewish Studies texts or a paragraph's mention in a handful of rhetorical texts.[1]

I examine the significance of a new cultural treatment of rhetoric emerging, for the first time, on a radical new medium of distribution. My purpose is not simply to expand the historical catalogue of accounts on rhetorical delivery, but rather to help inform my own study of delivery in chapters three through five. I show that the story of Messer Leon and his book of rhetoric has generative importance for contemporary rhetorical studies, particularly in terms of how scholars might study rhetorical delivery.

---

[1] Both the story of Messer Leon and the study of rhetorical delivery have existed in only a small number of texts. Perhaps the former would have had more prominence if conversations on rhetorical delivery had proceeded differently.

His example is significant because it hints at the unknown, at unanswerable questions about his relationship to rhetorical delivery, and is thus perfect for helping scholars formulate a rich list of questions for future studies of delivery.

MESSER LEON AND FIFTEENTH CENTURY ITALY

Who was Judah Messer Leon? Mauro Zonta's *Hebrew Scholasticism in the Fifteenth Century: a History and Source Book* provides a lengthy, comprehensive summary of the rabbi, doctor, and teacher:[2]

> Judah ben Yehiel Messer Leon (c. 1425-1498) worked in some of the main cultural centres of fifteenth century Italy as a physician, philosopher and teacher of philosophy. He wrote various works on Hebrew grammar, rhetoric and Biblical exegesis. Possibly born in Montecchio Maggiore (now in the Italian province of Vicenza), tradition has it that he was given the title '*messer*' by the Emperor Fredrich III in 1450, as a reward for his work as a physician. In the years around 1450, he directed a Jewish academy (*yeshivah)* in Ancona. In this academy, which was to follow him in his various places of residence, he lectured on Jewish traditional texts as well as on non-Jewish texts. He taught various subjects – especially Aristotelian logic and physics.[3] (209)

---

[2] I cannot provide a better summary of these biographical facts, so I provide more lengthy quotations when needed.

[3] Zonta also says that Messer Leon moved around several times:

> Between 1456 and 1472 he lived in Padua and Bologna, where it is possible that he attended courses in medicine and philosophy at the local Universities. He is said to have received the title of doctor from the Emperor in Padua in 1469. After a short

Fifteenth century Italy was a time period that featured great academic and cultural change, and these changes are apparent in the life and work of Messer Leon. The second half of the fifteenth century ushered in an Italian intellectual resurgence of Maimonides and Aristotle. In addition, there was large diversity amongst different Jewish immigrant groups. Arthur Lesley describes the decentralized authority of fifteenth-century, Jewish Italy:

> At this time, small, new and unorganized Jewish communities were appearing in many places north of Rome. These communities were created by the granting of short-term contracts by towns or princes to small Jewish loan-bankers and their households. The Jews were heterogeneous, immigrants from France, Provence, Germany, Spain, the Levant, and southern Italy. Each group had its distinctive daily language, communal practices, school traditions, religious and legal authorities, and the competition between claimants for communal and intellectual authority called into the question the legitimacy of all leadership. ("Review," 105-106)

Fifteenth century Italy also faced an influx of new philosophical texts from the scholastics. While texts such as Aristotle's *Rhetoric* had been studied and preserved by the Islamic scholars al-Farabi and Averroes in the tenth and twelfth century, Aristotle's works were not translated into Latin until the fifteenth century (Tirosh-Samuelson,

---

> stay in Venice, he was in Mantua from 1473 to 1475, where Abraham Farissol (perhaps one of his students) worked for him as a scribe. Messer Leon was surely in Naples after 1480 and, according to a conjecture by Israel Rabinowitz, after 1495 he fled to Monastir (now Bitula, in Macedonia), where he died. (209-210)

"Jewish Philosophy," 514). Messer Leon is part of the first generation of Italian scholars to study and engage with the works of Aristotle and the Islamic commentator Averroes.

Scholar of Italian-Jewish history Hava Tirosh-Samuelson says that Messer Leon was the "the person most responsible for the revival of Aristotelianism among Italian Jews," and that Messer Leon wanted Italian Jews to study Aristotelian logic ("Jewish Philosophy," 514). In addition, this mixing of culture in Italy wasn't limited to rhetorical and philosophical texts. The mid-fifteenth century was also a time of greater freedom for Italian Jews. According to Jewish Studies scholars Margolis and Marx, "despite papal bulls and canonical discrimination, Jews in Italy freely associated with Christians" (481). Historian Van Bekkum also argues that the spirit of the Renaissance afforded greater opportunity to Italian Jews:

> In the main cities of Italy we discern a general social rapprochement between Jews and Christians which brought about a gradual loosening of religious observance on the one hand; on the other, however, this rapprochement removed many factors that historically had led Jews to conversion. It was possible for Jews to have social contacts with Italian society at large without abandoning their Jewish tradition and faith totally—a true form of acculturation. Renaissance Italy was therefore a remarkable exception in Jewish existence. (240)

But Historian Gianfranco Miletto explains that this "free association" required significant rhetorical work:

> Rhetoric became a means for advancing the authority of the Rabbis inside the [Italian Jewish] community, and at the same time it facilitated a kind of cultural equality, putting the Rabbis on the same level as Christian scholars.[4] (133)

Messer Leon provides an example of this newfound acculturation and the integration it facilitated. He was the first Italian Jew to receive the honor of being able to confer doctoral status, and was also the first Jew to wear the red hood, the mainstream Italian Medieval dress for medical practitioners, in public. This intercultural engagement was not without its share of personal difficulty, and Messer Leon was accused of assimilation for donning the red hood:

> Many Jews at the time were quick to accuse their Jewish adversaries of behaving like Christians, of having become assimilated, of not being sufficiently orthodox in their behavior, in their cultural interests and so on and so forth. Thus it was that Leonde di Vitale (1420 c. 1495), the medical doctor and learned rabbi usually known as Messer Leon, was accused of assimilation because he adopted the custom of wearing the red "hood," the distinctive dress of medical practitioners. (Bonfil, "Jewish Life," 103)

---

[4] Miletto also says that this is why Messer Leon wrote the *Nofet Zuphim*:

> In the introduction to *Nofet* [sic] *sufim*, Messer Leon claims that he was urged to compose his work at the insistence of Jewish medical students who had requested a rhetorical handbook. The great merit of Messer Leon lies in having recognized the cultural-social function of rhetoric for both intracommunal relations and the external relations with the Christians. (133)

While mid-fifteenth to sixteenth century Mantua was more tolerant of Jews than most places in Europe, it should also be noted that less than twenty years after the publication of the *Nofet Zuphim* the Spanish expelled, forcibly converted, or killed all the Jews from neighboring Sicily and Sardinia.

MESSER LEON AND HIS EDUCATIONAL REFORMS

While Messer Leon engaged with the dominant Catholic culture, a considerable amount of his scholarly effort went into educational reforms, which he focused on Jewish institutions. Jewish and Rhetoric Studies scholar Arthur Lesley explains that Messer Leon's books of logic, rhetoric, and grammar were written for "yeshiva students in the 1450s" ("Sefer," 314). Lesley speculates that the *Nofet Zuphim* was also written to serve this purpose: "My own opinion, as sketched earlier, is that the rhetoric was written for yeshiva students in the 1450s, along with the logic and grammar" (314). Messer Leon's reforms changed the nature of the yeshiva, which in the past had been a place of Talmudic learning:

> Messer Leon did not explain the principles of his teaching system in his theoretical works, but it is evident from his writings that he conceived the tripartite structure of his teaching method in accordance with the medieval *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, and logic)... Ideally, whoever was educated at his school distinguished himself by his encyclopedic knowledge, his skills in oratory, and the stylistic elegance of his writings. (Miletto, 133)

Similar to the *trivium* of Peter Ramus and his French educational reforms of the early sixteenth century, Messer Leon also sought to achieve major curricular reforms. The

purpose of Messer Leon's educational reforms was to prepare his yeshiva students to engage with both Jewish and Christian society.

MESSER LEON AND POLITICAL CONTROVERSIES

Messer Leon's life was not without significant controversy, and in his lifetime he had extensive political ambitions in the Italian Jewish world. According to Robert Bonfil "some fierce and agitated polemics have survived in which Messer Leon tried to impose his rabbinic authority on his fellow Jews in sensitive areas of every-day custom as well as intellectual activity" ("Nofet Suphim" VI). Historian Moses Shulvass also explains some of Messer Leon's most famous controversies, particularly Messer Leon's ambition to become the chief rabbinical authority of Italy:

> The absence of a general organization, coupled with a pressing need for organized religious guidance, especially in view of the heightened Jewish immigration from Germany and France, may have induced Messer Leon to make his single handed attempt at achieving unity.... He failed because of the bitter opposition by a number of prominent Italian rabbis who recoiled from the very idea of rabbinic domination that would limit the authority of local rabbis.[5] (98-99)

Messer Leon tried to achieve this dominance by "promulgating a number of ordinances with a demand that every Italian community obey them under threat of excommunication" (98). Arthur Lesley explains how there were considerable

[5] Messer Leon wanted to create a more rigid rabbinic hierarchy for Italy

philosophical and religious disagreements between the various Jewish communities in fifteenth century Italy:

> Jews from Spain, Provence, and Italy would recognize Maimonidean legal code, Maimonidean or Averroistic scholasticism, and Kabbalah. Jews from Germany and France had a different authoritative legal code and a different pietistic and mystical tradition. Experts on a particular body of texts would not be recognized as authorities by those who came from competing traditions. ("Review," 106)

Messer Leon needed to reach a culturally and geographically diverse audience. This circulation of decrees and ordinances was similar to the rhetorical activities of the Forli Congress, "a fully representative organization that would try to regulate the inner life of Italian Jewry and its relationships with external forces that affected its destiny of the early 14th century," which also "promulgated" its authority by decrees (96). Messer Leon used this strategy of circulation to advocate a new religious legalism in Italy. This new legalism came from the rising religious influence of the Ashkenazim[6] in the north of Italy, where Messer Leon looked for his understanding of religious matters and *halakha*[7]:

> Messer Leon appears to be strongly influenced by Ashkenazi ways of learning and of deciding normative matters, and eager to diffuse these among Italian Jews. Similarly he seems interested in protecting the Ashkenazi Jews then settling in Italy from the pernicious influences of philosophical ideas already common in Italy but hardly known among German Jews. (Bonfil, Nofet Zuphim," VII)

---

[6] Jews descended from traditions traced back to Germanic communities

[7] Jewish religious law

According to Tirosh-Samuelson Messer Leon wanted "to ensure that Jewish philosophers would devote their energies to logic" ("Jewish Philosophy," 515). In the Ashkenazi tradition there was a prohibition against "reading Gersonides' commentary on the Pentateuch," and Messer Leon attempted to extend this prohibition to Italian Jews through a ban on Gersonides' commentary (Bonfil, VII). Messer Leon attacked Gersonides "denial of God's knowledge of particulars," a highly controversial religious argument even today (Tirosh-Samuelson, "Messer Leon," 347) Messer Leon's ban included potentially censoring the very same press that published the *Nofet Zuphim*:

> Of the six books known to have been produced by his press from 1476 to 1480, with care and skill and grace, lads us into the heart of the man, to whom law travel history and exegesis, astronomy and rhetoric were equally dear: [Conat's press published] The legal code 'Path of Life' the traveler's tales of Eldad the Danite, the popular version of Josephus, Rabi Levi ben Gerson's commentary on the Pentateuch, an astronomical table by Mordecai Finzi and "The Droppings of the Honeycomb," by Rabbi Judah ben Yehiel, the first Hebrew book published in the lifetime of its author. (Amram, 31)

At his yeshiva Messer Leon fired a teacher who dared to teach the banned texts of the twelfth century theologian Gersonides, and he also used his extensive rabbinical influence to threaten excommunication to anyone who published or read the book (Tirosh-Samuelson, "Jewish Philosophy," 515; Bonfil, "Jewish Life," 255). Robert Bonfil argues that this censorship shows that Messer Leon was conscious of the power of the printing press:

> The prohibition directed principally towards the Ashkenazi communities, on reading Gersonides' commentary on the Pentateuch. In these struggles Messer Leon appears at

> first sight to be strongly rooted in medieval trends of thought, but at the same time, conscious of the possibilities that printing offered of spreading new ideas and influencing people. ("Nofet Zuphim," VII)

Messer Leon's attempt to influence the philosophic and religious makeup of Jews in Italy was also not a full success. Tirosh-Samuelson posits that the influx of Spanish and Provencal immigrants may have also hampered his efforts (Tirosh-Samuelson, 515).

Arthur Lesley argues that Gersonides' commentary found support among many Italian Jews ("Sefer," 314). Messer Leon tried to promote a number of texts in place of Gersonides, including "the publication of Jacob ben Asher's *Turim,* which Ashkenazi Jews accepted as authoritative" (314). In addition he also wrote a number of commentaries on Yediach Bedersi's *Bechinat Olam* (The Examination of the Universe) and on Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed*" (Tirosh-Samuelson, "Jewish Philosophy," 451). Messer Leon has the distinct honor of not only being the first living author to publish on the Hebrew printing press, but also the first to censor the printing press. He appears not to have been successful in censoring the book on the press of Avraham Conat the Dyer (Amram, 31).

Messer Leon would not be the last to restrict the Hebrew printing of books in Italy. Less than half a century after the death of Messer Leon, the Ferrara Congress of Italy also sought to impose restrictions on the publication of certain Hebrew books:

> A problem of special concern... became central at the last [Ferrara] congress... the question of publication of Hebrew books. The decision of the Ferrara congress of 1554... required rabbinic and communal endorsement of every new book prior to publication. (Shulvass, 98)

Did the Ferrara Congress learn from the political example of Messer Leon? If so, what did they learn, and what might rhetoric scholars of today learn? I argue that this example of censorship should be taken into consideration when evaluating Messer Leon's understanding of rhetorical delivery. While this instance would not fall under the purview of Greek or Roman rhetorics, it is arguably a powerful example for contemporary theories of rhetoric because it hints at a strategic understanding of how a rhetorician in a campaign context understands the persuasive potential of a new form of delivery.

THE *NOFET ZUPHIM:* THE BOOK OF HONEYCOMBS' FLOW

Several scholars (Bonfil; Rabinowitz; Tirosh-Samuelson; Popkin) discuss how the *Nofet Zuphim* is a composite of Greek, Roman, and Islamic rhetorics. Robert Bonfil also speculates that the newness of the medium itself held particular rhetorical importance. Bonfil theorizes that "even if one only considers its physical appearance, one can easily imagine the delighted excitement of contemporaries presented with what seemed to be a codex written simultaneously by 'many *calami* [quills] and not at all miraculously', as the printer enthusiastically boasted in the colophon" (Bonfil, "Nofet Zuphim," V). In addition, Popkin describes the book as "a Hebrew translation of Averroes' Middle Commentary on Aristotle's Rhetoric, together with the Latin writings of Cicero, Quintilian, and others" (109). Robert Bonfil describes the order of the *Nofet Zufim* as a four-part treatise on the subject of rhetoric:

> In the first part Messer Leon deals with the definition of rhetoric, its purpose, importance, the different kinds of speech as regards the different kinds of public, and the characteristics of the ideal orator. In the second part he discusses the different types

> of speeches as regards their content. In the third part the author presents the emotional traits of the orator as these are expressed in the different kinds of speeches, while the past part deals with the rhetorical figures (devices). ("Nofet Zuphim," IX)

In each section Messer Leon largely presents these texts as they are in the classical versions, but he significantly re-contextualizes them through biblical exegesis and pastiche. James Murphy argues that because of this pastiche the book symbolizes "a new combination of secular classical learning and scriptural exegesis for the education of Jewish professionals in Italy" (Murphy, 161). In his use of pastiche Messer Leon is the first known Hebraist to "compose a Hebrew treatise on rhetoric based upon the Bible rather than on Greek and Latin sources" (Frank, 229). In addition, Zinberg discusses how Messer Leon drew from the Hebrew Bible because Messer Leon wanted to "show that in the realm of style and oratory the prophets and Biblical historians must be acknowledged as the supreme masters" (40). The *Nofet Zuphim* is a complex Biblical argument for the study of Greek, Roman, and Islamic rhetorics, Messer Leon argues that rhetorical study has a foundation in the Hebrew bible.

Tirosh-Samuelson explains how these biblical excerpts were remixed with classical rhetoric texts:

> [Quotations] are either cited verbatim or else paraphrased, and their concepts, arguments, and rhetorical vocabulary are rendered in Hebrew for the sake of providing that classical rhetoric, along with the rest of human wisdom, already existed in the divinely revealed Hebrew Bible. ("The Book of the Honeycomb's," 235)

While this remixing and pastiche may not be original to Messer Leon, the *Nofet Zuphim* provides another kind of example for contemporary rhetoric, a complex cultural remix of Quintilian and Averroes. Robert Bonfil posits that the pastiche of texts from different traditions creates a "rather indeterminate flavour, a mélange of late medievalism and of the ingenuous, almost audacious, freshness of a new age hesitantly feeling its way" (V). I would add to Bonfil's reading that perhaps the greatest lasting legacy of the *Nofet Zuphim* is its later circumstance of delivery on the press of Avraham Conat. The publication of the *Nofet Zuphim* itself has the rhetorical potential to question the very rhetorical theory within its pages.

RHETORICAL DELIVERY IN THE *NOFET ZUPHIM*

What does Messer Leon say about delivery? In the *Nofet Zuphim* he devotes chapter twelve to the study of rhetorical delivery. While largely summarizing the theories of rhetorical delivery found in Aristotle, Cicero, Averroes, and Quintilian, his discussion focuses predominantly on the examples of oral delivery found in the Hebrew Bible. Messer Leon says that delivery has been awarded [by God] "**the strong rod** and **the beautiful staff [Jer. 48:17];**" (Rabinowitz, 127). Following the lead of Cicero and Quintilian, Messer Leon concludes that there are two categories of delivery:

> either of physical representations, or of sounds and tones. Of physical representations, some are of the whole body, some are of parts of the body, such as the hands, face, and head, these being the most often used in oratory. (Rabinowitz, 119)

As a restatement of classical rhetoric, this text is not new, however his careful use of pastiche from biblical sources is fascinating. At the end of chapter twelve he provides the following examples to show how the study of rhetorical delivery already existed ---- *a priori* Aristotle and Cicero --- in the text of the Hebrew Bible:

> There can be no doubt that the main rules of delivery are clearly expounded by the Holy Books. As for qualities of voice, the prophet Isaiah, upon whom be peace, says: **Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a horn, and declare unto my people their transgression,"** etc. [Isa. 58:1]. He here points out that the voice, when expressing reproof, should be loud. By the same token, on the other hand, the voice of the unfortunate and of suppliants ought to be subdued, as was said: **And brought down thou shalt speak out of the ground, and thy speech shall be low out of the dust; and thy voice shall be as of a ghost out of the ground,** etc. [Isa. 29:4] Likewise: **"It is not the voice of them that cry for being overcome, neither is it the voice of them that shout for mastery, but the voice of them that sing do I hear"** [Exod. 32:18].[8] (Rabinowitz, 129)

Through his analysis of Isaiah, Messer Leon is able to coax out the rules for control of the voice. The Isaiah example also provides an image of the countenance of the body. Messer Leon is thus able to reason Cicero and Quintilian's rules for oral delivery come from the story of the prophet.

---

[8] The text in bold indicates where Rabinowitz has bolded biblical quotations used by Messer Leon.

On the subject of written delivery Messer Leon only addresses the issue in a single passage, a small but significant clue that he did spend some time considering the relationship of writing to rhetorical delivery:

> The Philosopher also says: "And you should realize that while suggestion-of-countenance is not needed in written rhetorical pieces, it is certainly a necessity in discourses pronounced face-to-face," etc. He further says: "Suggestion-of-countenance is of greatest advantage in controversial speeches, since where there is debate the speaker really needs the help of all the devices which yield persuasion in order to bring off the victory. (Rabinowitz, 121)

Messer Leon's understanding of written rhetorical pieces is that there is less need for self-control. He understands that there is a difference in the written versus oral delivery of a polemical text. For Messer Leon the oral delivery of the polemic requires bodily control, countenance. One wonders what sort of bodily countenance Messer Leon had when the Duke of Mantua banished him for quarrelling with Rabbi Joseph Kolon at approximately the same time that the *Nofet Zuphim* was published:

> Alas, for the author of the [*Nofet Zuphim*] 'Drippings of the Honeycomb.' He attempted to apply to Scripture the rules and terminology of classical rhetoric as found in the writings of Cicero and Quintilian. How could such heresy be countenanced? Rabbi Joseph Kolon, staunch pillar of traditionalism, soon took up the cudgels against the innovator...Hardly was the book finished when a quarrel with Kolon compelled the Duke of Mantua, Lodovico Gonzaga II...to save himself from the importunities of the wrangling theologians by exiling them both. (Amram, 31)

Messer Leon's banishment from Mantua was a significant punishment. Israel Zinberg describes Mantua at the time as "the place where the most brilliant representatives of Italian Renaissance culture assembled" (96). Was Messer Leon still present when his book was published on the press of Avraham Conat the Dyer or was he already in exile? Isaac Rabinowitz argues that he was likely still in Mantua:

> Although the *edito princeps* of the N.S. [*Nofet Zuphim*] does not indicate the year and place of its printing, we know from those of Conat's imprints which do bear such indications that the place was definitely Mantua, and that the year, which cannot be later than early in 1476, was most probably 1475. Thus the probability is very great that JML must still have been residing in Mantua when Conat first began to print the N.S. He undoubtedly knew that Conat had made a manuscript copy of his book, and he may have known of Conat's intention, through the newly available printing process, to issue the work in multiple copies. (Rabinowitz, xxx)

Given that Messer Leon was likely in Mantua at the time when Avraham Conat published the *Nofet Zuphim,* what was Messer Leon's role in its publication? What was his knowledge and potential involvement in the publication of the *Nofet Zuphim*, and what might be the rhetorical significance of his practice for scholars today?

MESSER LEON AND THE PUBLICATION OF THE *NOFET ZUPHIM*

Did Messer Leon have a role in the publication of his work? If so, how might he have considered the role of the printing press in relationship to his own rhetorical theory? As I have already discussed in the previous section, Messer Leon wanted to expand the scope of his religious authority to include a much broader region. In addition he also

sought the suppression of the circulation of Gersonides' commentary on the Pentateuch, perhaps even on the same printing press which first published the *Nofet Zuphim.*

Scholars of Messer Leon have disagreed on the role Messer Leon may have had surrounding the publication of the *Nofet Zuphim.* Robert Bonfil argues that Messer Leon had a role (xxi-xxi), while Isaac Rabinowitz contends that Messer Leon had no known direct knowledge his work was being published by Avraham Conat. Rabinowitz argues that because there were considerable errors made by Conat, Messer Leon would not have allowed such a volume to go to press:

> It is certain, nevertheless, that JML [Judah Messer Leon], for all that he was the original author of the N.S., played no part whatever in its production as a printed book: he neither edited it nor corrected it in proof. Comparison of the text of Menahem De' Rossi's manuscript copy – based, it will be remembered, on the earlier copy made by Conat – with that of the incunabulum edition, shows clearly that Conat, in the course of printing the volume, made many errors both of omission and of commission, errors that JML would never have overlooked or allowed to stand had he anything to do with seeing the work through the press. (Rabinowitz, xxx-xxxi)

Rabinowitz's argument that because there are errors in Conat's printed manuscript means that Messer Leon had zero involvement in its publication role seems possible, but does not appear powerful enough to rule out a lesser degree of involvement. Perhaps Messer Leon did know the *Nofet Zuphim* was being published, but perhaps he could not see the work through to print due in part to the political circumstances that lead to his soon after expulsion from Mantua?

In her review of Isaac Rabinowitz's book Hava Tirosh-Samuelson argues that it is still possible that Messer Leon's politics did have something to do with the publication of the *Nofet Zuphim* on the printing press. While not directly addressing Rabinowitz's argument about manuscript errors, she does imply that Messer Leon may have had some degree of involvement in the publication of his book:

> Little attempt is made to relate Messer Leon's political activities to his decision to publish a manual on rhetoric. No mention is made, for example, of the tension within the Italian Jewish community, of Messer Leon's leaning towards the Ashkenazic legal system, especially rabbinic ordination, or of the impact of the newly-invented printing press on Jewish learning, all of which are relevant to his decision to publish Nophet Suphim. ("The book of the Honeycomb's," 237-238)

On the other hand, Arthur Lesley agrees with Rabinowitz in that it is unlikely Messer Leon had anything to do with the editorial process of the *Nofet Zuphim,* but he says the motives for publishing must be separated from any involvement with the editing of the text:

> Suggestion would be convincing if Rabinowitz had not taken note of a manuscript of *The Book of the Honeycomb's Flow* that is both earlier than and superior to the printed version. He concludes that Messer Leon 'almost certainly had no hand in the editorial operations' that determined the form of the printed text. As a result of this new consideration, the date and motives for the printing of the book must be separated from the date and motives for its composition... Then, when several Latin rhetorics were first printed in the early 1470s, the printer Abraham Conat took advantage of the availability of the text, without authorization, to offer for sale a Hebrew counterpart, by an eminent

local scholar. There is, of course, need for additional evidence on the subject. ("Sefer," 314)

While there is agreement between Bonfil, Lesley, Rabinowitz, and Tirosh-Samuelson that Messer Leon likely knew about the publication of his text, there is no current evidence to determine his degree of involvement beyond Rabinowitz's and Lesley's conclusion that he was likely not involved in the editorial process of the first printed edition. Furthermore, Arthur Lesley also advances that on this matter "the scarcity of documents indicates caution" ("Review," 106). This then leaves scholars of history and rhetorical delivery with a number of unanswered questions. I argue, however, that these unanswered questions may hold the potential to help scholars of rhetoric think about the study of delivery today.

PUTTING THE PIECES TOGETHER

While it is clear that further research is needed to determine what, if any, role Messer Leon had in the printing of his manuscript, it is likely, based on the Gersonides controversy, that he did indeed understand the power of the printing press as a vehicle for distribution. Messer Leon's censorship of Gersonides's commentary and the circulation of decrees show that he was thinking about textual delivery on a broad, regional level. In addition, in the *Nofet Zuphim* itself he considers the Aristotelian relationship of countenance to the delivery of writing. James Murphy argues that, based on his reading of Rabinowitz, Messer Leon may have made strategic choices in terms of how he circulated his various manuscripts:

> Messer Leon completed a Hebrew work on grammar in 1454, The Pavement of Sapphire, and a Hebrew treatise on logic, Perfection of Beauty, in 1455, so that The Honeycomb's Flow (completed by 1471) rounds out a treatment of the traditional trivium. As Rabinowitz points out, Messer Leon circulated all these works publicly while he reserved six of his other writings for private use by smaller circles. (Murphy, 161)

Murphy argues that Messer Leon strategized differently the delivery of texts for specific audiences, but this sort of thinking is not directly reflected in the *Nofet Zuphim.* While today this sort of thinking would indeed be considered rhetorical, at the time of the *Nofet Zuphim* this type of thinking did not fall under the explicit purview of the Greek, Roman, or Islamic thinkers Messer Leon synthesized. How then should historical stories such as these be considered in light of a contemporary theory of rhetorical delivery?

THE USE OF MESSER LEON IN PRESENT DAY SCHOLARSHIP

The story of Messer Leon is ideal for helping contemporary scholars of rhetoric study current rhetorical practice. Specifically, I argue that the very questions Messer Leon's example raises, are the very questions one would want to pose to current practitioners of rhetoric, particularly for those involved in engaging with larger power structures. Similar to the time of Messer Leon, this historical moment is also one of significant technological changes in the means of delivery. I argue that it is precisely the unknown aspects of Messer Leon's story that are the most valuable for contemporary

scholars of delivery. The following unanswered questions provide the ideal base for interviewing practitioners to learn more about rhetorical delivery:

1. What did Messer Leon learn from his own rhetorical practice?
2. How did Messer Leon understand the rhetorical significance of Conat's printing press?
3. How did Messer Leon understand these different rhetorical traditions (Greek, Roman, Islamic) in relationship to his own political practice?
4. What was Messer Leon's involvement in the printing of the Nofet Zuphim?
5. Involvement or no involvement, did he think the publication of his book by "many calami" (many quills) was politically and/or rhetorically significant?
6. What knowledge did he learn from the circulation of decrees and the printing of his book?
7. How did the choice of writing the Nofet Zuphim in Hebrew both restrict and enable the delivery of the text?

From these questions I locate the driving question and rhetorical precedent for my qualitative study: what does a rhetorician learn from her or his rhetorical delivery? I call the rhetorical research involved in answering this question *rhetorical reconstruction.* Rhetorical reconstruction is an attempt to understand another rhetorician's strategy of delivery, to discover what another rhetorician has been strategizing. Unlike much of the heritage canon, the story of Messer Leon provides the field of rhetoric and composition studies the precedent to ask important questions about how the intent, the strategy of the rhetorician impacts our understanding of rhetorical delivery. The question of intent also

allows us to ask additional questions about what a rhetorician may have *learned* about a past instance of rhetorical delivery. The Messer Leon mystery provides a precedent to build a study that focuses on investigating questions of intent *and* knowledge. As I discussed in the first chapter there is little scholarship in rhetorical studies on delivery, and even less that discusses the everyday strategic practice of delivery. Messer Leon and the *Nofet Zuphim* is an ideal place for me to start generating research questions because the book exists at the intersection of cultures, technologies of delivery, and also happens to involve a formidable rhetorician.

CHAPTER THREE: TOWARD A METHODOLOGY FOR THE STUDY OF RHETORICAL DELIVERY

In the first chapter I looked at the historical and current field conversations on rhetorical delivery. In the second chapter I examined the story of a Jewish rhetorician, Judah Messer Leon, a story that yields useful for studying contemporary rhetorical delivery. Judah Messer Leon's historical narrative calls attention to the importance of the relationship between a rhetor's intent for and delivery of a particular text. The dearth of historical evidence seemingly begs contemporary scholars to wonder what he might have reflexively learned from his rhetorical practice. This historical episode has in turn provided me with the exigence to design my qualitative study, a study where I further investigate the ways rhetoricians' intentions relate to their understanding of rhetorical delivery. From the example of Messer Leon, it is clear to me that this can only be accomplished through primary means--by talking with rhetoricians about their intentions and reflections on instances of rhetorical delivery. What I have gathered from these interviews are, at the very least, accounts of how five activists *talk* about the delivery of their work. Of those six interviews, five turned out to be viable for this study. These are individuals who regularly attend protests, hand out flyers, and do other types of direct action around issues of economic, racial and justice. From them, I have collected four hours of oral history as well as hundreds of pages of documents.

As I have discussed in chapter one, there is a need to build rhetorical theories of delivery from stories of practice. This new project is essential for not only theory building with different rhetorics, but also for teaching these different rhetorics. There is a desperate field need for situated examples of rhetorical delivery and practice. In chapter

two I discussed a missed opportunity in historiography to look at and theory-build from the actual rhetorical situation of Judah Messer Leon, not simply a published work of rhetoric. In this chapter I move forward, introducing one possible solution, oral history, to begin theory building rhetorics of delivery from the ground up, introducing new concepts from stories of practice.

It is my intent with this work to address key field questions surrounding rhetorical delivery. Following in the footsteps of Nancy Welch (2005; 2008), I am interested in theory building rhetoric from the experiences of activist practice. In this work I hope to then contribute to the major field conversation of Skinner-Linnenberg 1999; Trimbur 2000; DeVoss & Porter 2005; Welch 2005; 2008; Eyman 2007, not simply by introducing new theoretical concepts, but also presenting examples of activist practice. In turn, I see this work as beneficial to the activists whom I am working with, because it provides a written account of their smart discussions. Therefore, the materials I produce might also be used in future training materials for communities such as these.

For the purpose of this study, however, I have focused on one cluster of individuals/groups, and I chose this group because I had an established peer relationship with them. I found them through shared activist work, and they met me as an activist long before they knew me as a researcher. In this sense they see my research and myself as working toward a common objective, the production of materials that can assist in training other activists. I am not in a position then to judge, and my research is not about criticizing, but rather I attempt to investigate further what I deem to be some of the most

interesting discussion on rhetorical delivery available to me, and from that investigation I hope to produce scholarship that helps them/us in our future work.[1]

In thinking about how I see my dual roles as someone involved with a community, and as someone who later researches a community, I have been very much influenced by the field conversations around Ellen Cushman's 1996 College Composition and Communication article *The Rhetorician as an Agent of Social Change.* In her initial article and later book, *The Struggle and the Tools,* Cushman foregrounds concerns of access to communities, affordances (to both community members and researchers), and the role of the activist-researcher. She discusses the reasons and motivations of the researcher, and argues that there are "other ways in which we [rhetoric and composition teachers and scholars] can affect social change, something more along the lines of civic participation" ("Rhetorician," 7). In Cushman's work I see an imperative to consider a broad range of ethical concerns regarding how academics engage with communities outside their discipline.

In terms of specific groups, my study population includes past and present active members from Michigan State University (MSU) Students for Economic Justice, Lansing

---

[1] Largely campaign and issue driven, these groups generally work to challenge systemic problems through local issues, such as working on university anti-sweatshop campaigns to raise local awareness and promote specific institutional form of larger, often seemingly "abstract" systemic problems (depending on folks positionality). This cluster of groups and people is often focused on issues found under the very broad umbrella of "alternate globalization" activism, and I explain how I became involved with this group of colleagues in the next section.

Direct Action!, MSU Students for Peace and Justice, Movimiento Estudiantil Xicano De Aztlan and Amnesty International. In this study I requested to interview a community of participants about various activist actions, campaigns, and their corresponding written documents in order to learn more about how this particular community of activists discusses and strategizes the delivery of activist material. After several years of working with this community, I solicited participants through Facebook, e-mail, and face-to–face interactions. This solicitation grew out of dozens of conversations from the last several years where the individuals and I involved with this type of activism explicitly discussed the real need for better materials for media training, strategizing, and study. I consider this research then to be well negotiated with interested members of the community in terms of its future use for facilitating the type of workshops my participants think necessary to provide these types of activist communities. I received a positive response back from the twelve potential interviewees. I sent interested participants a list of interview questions and request for documents in advance, and later, at a time and setting of their choosing, sat down with each of them individually. There was no set duration for the interview, and the documented conversations ranged from eighteen minutes to an hour and fifteen minutes long. What follows is a description of who I am in relationship to this community as both an activist and researcher, how I wound up doing this kind of work, what the field rationale is for this sort of study, and an overview of my procedures.

SCHOLAR-ACTIVISM

During most of time as a graduate student at Michigan State University in 2003-2007, I spent most of what would have been my free time working on various campaigns related to the alternate globalization movement. This activist work was a continuation of

my undergraduate work at the University of Rhode Island, where I became deeply involved in the emerging anti-sweatshop campaigns of United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) and movements in opposition to the sharp escalation of the USA military abroad from 2001-2003. This type of activist work, often characterized as "grassroots activism," primarily involved organizing with different student and community groups around the problems of the USA and militarism, which in those years moved quickly year by year from issues of Plan Colombia, sweatshop labor and economic inequality, to Afghanistan and the buildup and subsequent execution of the "second" Iraq war. I became involved in these alternate globalization movements largely for personal and psychological reasons. I do think some of this political activity could be considered doing what I thought was right or correct at the time, but in my later twenties I've come to also think that much of what I did was also a way for me to "work through my own shit." In this sense I do think it is extremely important to say a few things about where my personal motivations for this work have come from, and why exactly I am working with the participant group I have chosen. As will become clear in the interview transcripts I supply in the Appendix, my relationship with my participants as fellow activists is deeply woven into the text of the interviews themselves, where in each interview the six interviewees mention (often hesitantly because of the research context) my role as an activist in particular campaigns, actions, skill sharing workshops, and conferences. I highlighting this interconnectedness because it is important, and its importance will be apparent in chapters three and four as I reference these instances in my transcripts. For now in the pages to come I will explain how I became involved in activism as a participant and later as a researcher.

MY OWN EXPERIENCE

I grew up in a white, middle-class home of an ever-increasing upper middle class suburb of Hartford, Connecticut, the only child of one father and mother. I am privileged in these very facts. In my younger years, around five or six, I started to notice some of the ways in which my family was different. As early as I can remember my father was always sick, and I remember that my mother was, equal to his sickness, always in considerable strain as she too dealt with the day-to-day realities of illnesses. This sickness had a longer history in our family story. My grandfather, my fathers' father, had spent over twenty years of his life after the Second World War in a Veterans Affairs mental hospital. During his childhood my father had grown up in the Frog Hollow housing projects of Hartford. Economic mobility was, he claimed to me, a large part of his decision to join the military and fight in Vietnam. His military service ended in mid-1968 when he was very severely wounded in a large munitions explosion at a base near Cu-Chi, 25 miles south of Saigon. He spent the next year and a half of his life in what he described later as a poorly maintained Veterans Affairs hospital outside Boston, MA as he dealt with and survived the onset of gangrene, skin grafts, sixteen operations, and a body full of shrapnel.

In my own childhood I grew up aware, but normalized, to the psychological effects of these injuries and experiences. He never slept a full night's sleep, and often paced around the hallway or sat alone in the bathroom most nights of the week. When he died in my early adolescence, the VA then classified his death as related to his war injuries. This had a profound impact on my political development. His subsequent absence from my life had an important effect on my political development, one necessary

to account for as part of my methodology, This development later explains part of my motivations and how I've explained my motivations to the activist communities I've worked with, particularly the participants in my study from the Michigan community. This work of tracing my motivations serves as a record for me as a researcher and helps me map out how I wound up where I am now. It's also a rhetoric that is exchanged between participants. This rhetoric binds us to a cause, to a side, and is also a form of ethos construction, pathos, and catharsis.

When I wrote a few paragraphs ago that activism helped me to "work through my shit," I meant that in engaging with politics opposed to militarism, I found a cause into which I could channel my frustrations and energy. This purpose expanded for me into explanations for large global issues, such as militarism. I found explanations for how things could be different in popular antiwar political slogans from February 15, 2003 such as "Another World is Possible," I thought (and still do think) about what life might have been like if I had had brothers and sisters, if my father had never gone to war, and had had a better chance at reaching old age.

My relationship to this type of speculative questioning seems to be settling down as I approach thirty, but I do know that in the years that followed his death I became increasingly focused on the politics of militarism because of these sorts of questions, and my attention began to shift to present USA conflicts. By 1999, between the stream of reminders from VA paperwork and the television images of USA warplanes dropping bombs over the former Yugoslavia, my political convictions drove me to do something more proactive and prompted me to seek out organizations to work with on these types of issues. Although my work in these areas continued for eight years, my involvement in the

alternate globalization movement began at Central Connecticut State University with the Progressive Student Alliance in ____(year?) and I grew even more involved during the millennium at the University of Rhode Island with URI Students for Social Change (URISSC). This involvement included activism around fair trade clothing campaigns, anti-militarism organizing and protests around the Iraq and Afghanistan war, corporate responsibility campaigns, and work with local unions and various left-of-center organizations and causes. This activity transitioned smoothly into my graduate study where for the next four years I became actively involved at Michigan State with MSU Students for Economic Justice, and MSU Students for Peace and Justice. When I began my graduate work at MSU in the fall of 2003, the Iraq war was already entering its sixth month, and I found myself immediately picking up the activism I had been doing in Rhode Island around the war and economic activism. It was between the years 2002 and 2004 that the initial ideas for this dissertation project began to emerge from my activist involvement. In 2002, I recognized that I could be useful for activists in a professional capacity by developing better materials to help train activists with media, but I did not make the connections that this idea could be transformed into a research project in rhetorical theory until my first year of graduate school at Michigan State.

Early on, I became fascinated in how my friends and cohort in alternate globalization activism (some of whom now do media work for large nonprofits) thought about and strategized campaigns along side strategies for the delivery and distribution of compositions. There always seemed to be constant conversations in alternate globalization circles at the University of Rhode Island and at Michigan State University around questions of how, from campaign to campaign and event-to-event, different

groups strategize the delivery, distribution and reception of messages. As an undergraduate, I volunteered often to make different media and document materials for local actions and campaigns. During those years there were a lot of actions and campaigns around militarism for me become involved in (Plan Colombia, School of the Americas, the Afghanistan and second Iraq war), and I got involved. This in turn drew me to rhetorical study.

Between 2000-2002, I became interested in rhetorical studies and took classes with Dr. Libby Miles and Dr. Robert Schwegler. In their courses on rhetorical studies and composition, I was challenged to think about the ways these well-articulated approaches to language and texts could help inform my thinking outside the classroom and seminar room. I looked for ways to help think about my practices as an activist more rhetorically, and in turn I began to look for ways in which the practice of this type of activism might help inform my work as a student of rhetoric. From those two concurrent roles, as a rhetoric seminar attendee and as someone (among many) trying to do his best to advocate against the Iraq war buildup, I began to see in my practice and studies both gaps and intersections between contemporary acts of protests and the rhetorical texts of the Bizzel & Hertzberg *Rhetorical Tradition*. I became interested in how the complex discussions I heard in late night organizing meetings about everything from design and delivery of flyers, leaflets, manifestos, stencils, press advisories, releases, video, as well as the design and delivery of visually intensive protest-events.

My first long-term academic project of developing rhetorical theory from case examples of alternate globalization experience began in my Masters thesis, *Rhetoric, Economy, and the Technologies of Activist Delivery*, and it is one I continue now in this

dissertation project. What motivated me in part is what I perceived as a growing need to document what the activists I came to know (myself included) were learning (often through trial and error) from their instances of practice. I began to think that rhetorical theory could benefit from these new examples of practice, and activists groups in turn could benefit from informed media theory texts, particularly texts grounded in activist case examples. This in turn became a major motivation for my current project, where I wanted to record oral history accounts of various activist experiences with document design and campaign strategy.

The types of activist conversations that have educated, fascinated, innovated, and prompted me to do oral history work as a form of theory building have addressed everything from "how to" questions such as "how do we strategize the delivery of our message," or "how do we learn as a group to write press advisories," to strategic activist dialogues where folks collectively think through, brainstorm, invent, and plan; the design, arrangement, and delivery; of flyers, leaflets, manifestos, chapbooks, short digital films. I think contemporary rhetorical theory can learn some things about delivery from grassroots activism, and many future grassroots activists could benefit from discussions of activist case examples, particularly conversations that include core component issues of strategy and rhetorical theory.

ASSUMPTIONS

Prior to beginning this study I had originally conceived of what I had assumed would be two distinct participant groups. I imagined two different sets of interviews: people who were primary actors in the strategy and delivery of compositions, and folks

with only an ancillary involvement in or partial witness to an extrinsic or 3rd party process and/or strategy of rhetorical delivery. In reflecting on why I thought these two participant groups would be ideal, I imagined that the difference of perspective would be important to document. In other words, I did not set out with the goal of categorizing any participants as only having a certain type of experience based on these interviews, nor have I have ever intended this to be a comprehensive study of how a specific individual thinks or strategizes over a wide set of case examples. What I set out to do is document snapshots of how these activists (and my participants all identify as activists) from this specific Midwestern area *talk through and discuss* issues of delivery and distribution in this particular time and place. I conceived of this study as a first step, an initial study to begin experimenting with ways to learn about how different types of practitioners talk about the rhetorical delivery of texts.

In the case of the first participant group, I went forward eliciting my request for participants to different areas of the progressive activist community in Ingham County. In addition to posting my request for participants on my Facebook profile as a "Note," (meaning that only people I was already friends with would be most likely to see my request), from June, 2007 to November, 2007 I also spoke to people individually in person and at different activist meetings over the course of a four month period. I knew that I wanted to document a type of discussion around particular genres of composing and rhetorical situations. What I didn't realize was that I would be composing an oral history of a community of activists. Before interviews began I conceived of each interview and participant as telling a story between the document and interviewee. I did not anticipate the interconnectedness of each interview, and this began to complicate how I thought of

these interviews. I tried to think about a first group involved in the invention and delivery of texts, and a second group speaking about their understanding of other folk's strategies of delivery. When I began to do interviews, however, I soon realized that this distinction did not make a whole lot of practical sense. I realized that the interviews and textual artifacts I collected were interwoven with each other to such a degree that such a rigid distinction between "groups" no longer made sense for this study. In fact, what I wound up with was an interwoven set of oral history accounts, which comprise the partial historical account of a community in a particular moment in time.

GATHERING THE DOCUMENTS AND INTERVIEWS

I interviewed a total of six local activists in the Lansing/East Lansing area of Ingham County, MI about their experiences with the design, composition, and strategization of compositions for the purpose of delivery. As I have already discussed, I had a deep familiarity with each person I interviewed after having done campaigns with each of them for the last several years. When I decided to do this study I solicited requests by Facebook and e-mail, and received a positive response back from many individuals. I received a favorable response from my participant request, I think, in part due to my explanation for how I think this research will be useful not only for academics in my particular field of study, but also for other activists because it will help to create (what I hope will be) genuinely useful educational materials for the newly involved. I along with my participants imagined that these documented stories would become extremely useful for aiding the future training of activists. There simply isn't enough material specifically designed to help cultivate and facilitate activist discussions of

campaign strategy. When I began procedurally speaking to do interviews I consulted the American Historical Society guide for doing oral history, which has an important list of seven major points of adherence:

1. Interviews should be recorded on tape but only after the person to be interviewed has been informed of the mutual rights and responsibilities involved in oral history, such as editing, confidentiality, disposition, and dissemination of all forms of the record. Interviewers should obtain legal releases and document any agreements with interviewees.

2. The interviewer should strive to prompt informative dialogue through challenging and perceptive inquiry, should be grounded in the background and experiences of the person being interviewed, and, if possible, should review the sources relating to the interviewee before conducting the interview.

3. To the extent practicable, interviewers should extend the inquiry beyond their immediate needs to make each interview as complete as possible for the benefit of others.

4. The interviewer should guard against possible social injury to or exploitation of interviewees and should conduct interviews with respect for human dignity.

5. Interviewers should be responsible for proper citation of oral history sources in creative works, including permanent location.

6. Interviewers should arrange to deposit their interviews in an archival repository that is capable of both preserving the interviews and making them available for general research. Additionally, the interviewer should work with the repository in determining the necessary legal arrangements.

7. As teachers, historians are obligated to inform students of their responsibilities in regard to interviewing and to encourage adherence to the guidelines set forth here. (Ritchie 111-112)

For varying reasons including scheduling, time, fit with the study, I wound up interviewing six participants from the local community. Each interview was scheduled a week in advance. I spoke to each participant and prior to the interview, I told them my intentions for the study, both as a contribution to my field and as a useful document for the activist community. I then asked each individual that agreed to be interviewed for to prepare for the interview by thinking about an instance of composing where they thought about the delivery of their work in significant ways. After explaining this request, I provided an example of the type of story I was interested in hearing more about (the stock example I used was about how I composed press advisories, thinking about the various media outlets and how they might use them). Each participant in my study was familiar

with this example of activist composing, and I think this example helped my participant group to consider and select their example.

Each time I received a positive response back for a possible interview, I e-mailed the consent form and interview questions. I sent the interview questions because I wanted potential participants to have a chance to see the sort of questions I was interested in. In at least two cases this process self-excluded several participants from the study who felt that this study just wasn't of interest to them.

Interviews ranged from eighteen minutes to an hour and fifteen minutes in length, were tape-recorded, and later transcribed. During the interviews I did not address each question point blank to the interviewee, but instead asked each participant to tell the story around a particular instance of composing and delivery they had chosen to discuss with me. I chose to do this because I wanted to understand the decision making processes of my participants better, and I also thought that the story would be more useful for others to read as case examples. After collecting interviews, I transcribed the contents and sent the transcripts to my participants for their approval and/or edit suggestions In sum, I was able to complete six successful interviews around participants' experiences in/around the delivery of compositions. Of these six, five were viable for my study.

ORAL HISTORY

I chose to do oral history and not interviews. I understand that my participants are engaging in historically significant activist work. In thirty years I think that there will be a real need to understand how activists at this specific moment in history have theorized the delivery of their work. For this reason I follow the definition of oral history found in

Dennis Ritchie's (2003) *Doing Oral History: A Practical Guide,* where he defines the work of oral history as collecting:

> ...memories and personal commentaries of historical significance through recorded interviews. An oral history interview generally consists of a well-prepared interviewer questioning an interviewee and recording their exchange in audio or video format. Recordings of the interview are transcribed, summarized, or indexed and then placed in a library or archives. These interviews may be used for research or excerpted in a publication, radio or video documentary, museum exhibition, dramatization or other form of public presentation. Recordings, transcripts, catalogs, photographs and related documentary materials can also be posted on the Internet. Oral history does not include random taping, such as President Richard Nixon's surreptitious recording of his White House conversations, nor does it refer to recorded speeches, wiretapping, personal diaries on tape, or other sound recordings that lack the dialogue between interviewer and interviewee (20).

According to Ritchie an interview becomes an oral history when it has been "recorded, processed in some way, made available in an archive, library, or other repository, or reproduced in relatively verbatim form for publication" (25). I understand my oral history work as providing foremost interview transcripts within a context of documents and stories. And my end result is to provide my interview transcripts as an attached appendix to this project, so that future activists and scholars may study the interviews in as complete form as I am able to provide. In the chapters, I do extensive work to provide interpretations for the interview texts I have gathered in order to provide my interview transcripts within a context of supporting documents (25). As Grele explains in

Envelopes of Sound: The Art of Oral History, it is important to combine oral history with any available supporting documents:

> Where written sources are available, they should be used as background as well as corroboration. Oral data does not exonerate the historian from searching for and using written documents exhaustively. Critical questions about reliability, validity and the representative nature of the data are as essential for oral sources as they are for written material. (Grele et al. 5)

It is not my attempt or aspiration to combine my interview data with supporting evidence in order to do an analysis of my participants' discourse. I am instead interested in learning more about how activists conceived of their strategies of delivery. As I will discuss in the procedures section, I also made efforts to make sure that my participants were able to check over the transcripts and make sure that the transcripts were suitable to them after the interview had been completed. At the request of several participants I also removed instances of "Uhm," "Like," and other types of pauses. In this sense my work does not share any methodological connection with the deep structure oral history studies of McMahan:

> McMahan is interested in three aspects of hermeneutic theory and how they apply to the interview: the performance of the interview within the universe of linguistic possibilities that mark the historicity of the human experience, the fact that the interpretation of historical phenomena is always guided by the biases that an interpreter has at a specific moment of time [ideology], and the contention that the act of interpretation must always be concerned not with the intended meaning, but what the intended meaning is about [deep structure]. (McMahan and Rogers 3)

This means that I am not doing discourse analysis, but I am instead collecting a series of rhetorically situated stories. I am interested not in the specific language moves my participants have chosen to make, but rather a narrative of activist practice.

MY DATA IS RHETORIC, TOO

My approach then to these interviews is that I see these texts as rhetorical. I am not interested in analyzing sentence-level discussions, but the interview text is a co-produced, rhetorically situated document. Each of my participants have read, checked, and agreed to share their transcript for academic use and this study. I have also honored all requests to edit the transcripts as my participants saw fit. The interview text then is not an accurate representation of each interview, but rather something that has been molded by participants to reflect a specific representation. I too have also been a part of this rhetorical construction: as an interviewer I over-determined the topic of the conversation in advance, sending to them my interview questions for their consideration, and during the interview I provided them guiding questions. While I approach the text as rhetorical, a complex series of performances by individuals that have known each other for many years, I also approach the stories of practice that emerge from these texts are valuable.

The information conveyed in such a scene should not simply be considered a capitol-"t" Truth, but should instead be treated as a series of lowercase-t truths, truth in need of rhetorical qualification and some additional explication. In this study on rhetoric, it is unique then that I am not so much interested in how people say what they say, or the rhetoric of how they say these things, but instead want to know something about how

they strategize the delivery of their rhetoric, but as a scholar of rhetoric I cannot ignore how the interview itself functions as a complex rhetorical situation.

Directly informing my thinking on this subject is Julie Lindquist's chapter in *A Place To Stand: Politics and Persuasion in a Working-Class Bar*, where she utilizes ethnography to study the rhetorical landscape of a working-class bar in Chicago called The Smokehouse. In her chapter titled "A Place to Tell It," she includes conversations with her study participants, noting that "the following sections show what Walter, Hoe, Arlen, Maggie, and Perry wanted me to know they knew about themes of class, race and ethnicity, education, language and literacy, and politics" (74). Regarding quotations from her participants, Lindquist notes that her framing is an "attempt to show Smokehousers "'in their own words,'" but the reader should keep in mind that all narratives are mediated, that conclusions about the "meaning" of the following data are inevitably directed by my position as one who participates in, but, in many ways stands apart from, Smokehouse culture" (74). Similar to Lindquist, I also have been a part of the activities I am now interviewing my participants about. I also share a dual position as one who directs the research project and one who also a part of the rhetorical situation, both as a researcher and an activist. Methodologically speaking, I am able to account for my own understanding of how people talk about their work and what people want me to know about their thinking. In this chapter what I am able to frame are three unique examples of how individuals discuss strategies and processes of delivery. For each case example I examine, based on the rubric, how activists are discussing issues of rhetorical delivery. In the next two chapters, I will utilize the following analytic to interpret the data. I present

the story of the particular situation of rhetorical delivery, and then work to understand the issues raised in terms of intentions and objectives.

The focus of the study is on the understanding of the rhetorician in regards to intention: intention toward delivery, strategy, materials, and objectives. The analytic I have created will serve to produce new knowledge about how a distinct group of rhetoricians understand their practices of delivery. I treat the interviews as rhetorical: these are all rhetorical discussions between myself and another activist-researcher. As such, it is difficult to situate the interview materials outside of their rhetorical situation. This is OK. The stories that emerge from these interviews can be examined by the analytic above, and as such they are of considerable use in building a rhetorical theory from practice. In the last chapter, I will interpret the data once more, theory building from the findings to draw conclusions about what a new practice-driven rhetoric of delivery looks like.

While answers to these questions do not emerge from his historical example, the questions his example raises are ideal for informing the study of contemporary instances of practice. While rhetoricians today are limited in their range of study in regards to historical examples of practice and rhetorical delivery, there is more possibility when looking at contemporary instances of practice. As I will discuss in greater depth later, in practice it is extremely difficult to know how someone else theorizes, understands, or reflects a process of rhetorical delivery or distribution. Unlike the historical example of Messer Leon, in contemporary instances of practice I am able to interview activists about their take on rhetorical delivery. But what Messer Leon does provide is a basis for how I should interpret my data. From his case example, I have developed an analytic to

highlight a missing area of research into rhetorical delivery, intentions, actions, and reflections. To this end, the analytic I have developed for chapter four and five explores intentions, actions, and reflections on delivery, strategy, materials, and rhetorical objectives.

1. Intentions and Actions. What are the intentions and actions of the rhetorician? Specifically concerning:

a. Delivery: How is the rhetorician talking about delivery, distribution, and circulation?

b. Strategy: Is there an identifiable strategy in their discussion?

c. Materials: How are they talking about materials? What are these?

d. Goal: How do they discuss the rhetorical goal? What are these?

2. Reflections. How does the rhetorician discuss their reflections?

a. What do they say that they learned?

b. How do they reflect on what they learned?

c. What do they not consider learning, but could be considered as such?

To be more specific, the analytic presents how someone discusses his or her process of rhetorical delivery. It does not however attempt to uncover or interrogate their presentation of ideas more deeply. What I mean by this clause is to say that the situation of the interview itself is a complex rhetorical situation, one that necessarily includes its own particular motivations, intentions, and rhetorical objectives.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

I include here the interview questions for both participant groups, even though these collapsed into non-distinct groups when I began data collection. These questions were sent to participants prior to each oral interview:

1) Could you provide a brief introduction to you and your work?
2) Could you speak generally about the sort of media activism work you do/have done?
3) How long would you say you have been doing this kind of media activist work?
4) What sorts of activist writing do you do/have you done? Who do you generally think of as the audience for your work?
5) What campaigns or causes are you currently working on?
6) Could you talk a bit about the writing/composition you have selected?
7) Were there any other authors of this writing/composition? What role did they play?
8) What was the campaign(s) or action(s) you wrote this document for?
9) Who is/are the audiences for this writing/composition?
10) What was the activist goal for the writing/composition at that particular moment?
11) What was the long-term activist goal?
12) Were these goals realized? Why? Why not?
13) Could you talk about the need for making this? What situation prompted the need to compose this writing/composition?
14) How did you/others distribute the writing/composition?

15) Could you talk a bit more about this? What sort of physical work/labor did you have to do to deliver the writing/composition (printing, carrying, etc)

16) What mediums (print, internet, broadcast) did you consider using when you were still brainstorming the writing/composition? What made you finally decide?

17) How did you think about concerns of delivery early on?

18) How did the delivery meet your expectations? How did it not?

19) Was the writing you did re-used, re-appropriated, re-written by someone else in the future?

20) What would you have done differently?

21) Was the piece of writing/composition re-used, or re-purposed after you delivered it?

22) What will you do in the future when facing a similar task of delivery?

Questions for Participant Group Two:

1) Could you provide a brief introduction to you and your work?

2) Could you speak generally about the sort of media activism work you do/have done?

3) How long would you say you have been doing this kind of media activist work?

4) What sorts of activist writing do you do/have you done? Who do you generally think of as the audience for your work?

5) Could you talk about this particular event/campaign/piece of writing/composition?

6) What sort of delivery/distribution was involved in the campaign?

7) What roles did other folks play in the delivery/distribution?

8) How would you describe this event/campaign/piece of writing/composition?

9) What sort of strategy/strategizing went into this particular event/act of delivery/distribution?

10) What exactly was the purpose of this event/campaign/piece of writing/composition?

11) How did you/others distribute the writing/composition?

12) Could you talk a bit more about this? What sort of physical work/labor did you have to do to deliver the writing/composition (printing, carrying, etc)

13) What mediums (print, internet, broadcast) did you consider using when you were still brainstorming the writing/composition? What made you finally decide?

14) Who were the authors of this event/campaign/piece of writing/composition?

15) What was/were the short-term activist goal/s for this event/campaign/piece of writing/composition?

16) What was/were the long-term activist goals for this event/campaign/piece of writing/composition?

17) Were these activist goals realized? Why? Why not?

18) Was the event/piece of writing/composition re-used, re-purposed, re-composed in some other way after the initial act of delivery?

19) Was this a positive or a negative? Could you talk a bit more about this?

20) What would you do differently in the future, if faced with a comparable instance of delivery?

THE ACTIVISTS

I include below short biographies for each of the five activists in my study:

Maggie Ryan – I met Maggie Ryan in 2005 through MSU Students for Economic Justice. She had worked on the MSU Workers Rights Consortium (WRC) campaign and was involved in Women's Council and other campus activism. She regularly helped to draft fliers, organize actions, petitions, and large-scale protests on a variety of social, economic, and political issues as well as organize the group's internal organization. She's been continuing her activist work as a member of the National Lawyers Guild and as a legal observer.

Maggie Corser – I first met Maggie Corser in 2003, where we worked on planning an anti-Militarism conference with MSU Students for Peace and Justice. She was beginning her first year of university and was (and still remains) someone looking for ways to engage and improve things. Since graduating MSU in 2008, she has begun her graduate work at the New School, where she is working on policy around preventing the sex trafficking of women.

Stuart (Stu) Niles-Kraft – Stuart and I worked together in MSU Students for Economic Justice during 2006. He regularly creates flyers, leaflets, and designs for actions. He is currently working at a local organic farm and is interested in environmental activism.

Triana Sirdenis – I met Triana in 2006 working with MSU Students for Economic Justice. She has worked on numerous campaigns with SEJ, including the Killer Coke campaign, ethical contracting, and Freedom of Information Act stuff. Triana is still active in community activism and regularly works on different actions.

Ernesto Todd Mireles – Todd is a highly experienced Lansing and Detroit Xicano activist with over a dozen years of active campaign history. We met in 2004, working on the WRC campaign with Movimiento Estudiantil Xicano de Aztlan and SEJ. He has extensive expertise organizing campaigns from scratch, from community racial justice to union campaigns. He recently completed his M.S.W and is currently working on his doctorate in American Studies at Michigan State University.

WHY ACTIVISTS?

I chose to interview activists because I hypothesize that activists have interesting stories to tell about delivery. I think that the stories these activists tell about delivery are different from other groups of people, such as professional artist communities. In a future study I plan to focus on the stories of graphic artists, programmers, and lobbyists. I think that each community of practice will have new, interesting stories of strategy and delivery.

CHAPTER FOUR: "MY EXPERIENCE IN DISTRIBUTING FLYERS HAS TAUGHT ME SOMETHING DIFFERENT...": LEARNING A NEW RHETORIC OF DELIVERY FROM PRACTICE

In the first three chapters I have argued that the field of rhetoric and composition studies needs a new approach to studying rhetorical delivery. In this chapter, I provide three activist case examples along with interview data and field documents. In the first example, Maggie Corser talks about her experiences strategizing, delivering, and then observing the distribution and circulation of her manifesto concerning women's role in local activist meetings. Her example provides a rich account for how one can scaffold a strategy of rhetorical delivery, and it also shows how delivery can function both as a type of learning and a form of knowledge making. In the second example, Maggie Ryan talks about a 2005 protest she helped to organize. It was designed to help push Michigan State University into joining the Workers Rights Consortium. While she considers the rhetorical objectives of the protest successful, an image of her at the event was later appropriated by the university and then used for a wide range of university advertising purposes. This appropriation has continued for over four years, with her image appearing on the main MSU web page, on departmental pages, in a photo database, and on university mailings. Her case example provides key insights into how issues of remix and appropriation relate to considerations of rhetorical delivery. In the third and last example of this chapter, Ernesto Todd Mireles talks about a situation in the spring of 2006 where a white supremacist organization, the MSU Young Americans for Freedom (YAF), organized a mock lynching event on the Michigan State University campus. Drawing on his vast experience composing and delivering flyers, Todd talks about moments of

delivery as experiences from which he can learn. In the case example he discusses, Todd talks about students' and local community activists' organizational strategies for countering this hateful event. Specifically, he focuses on the ways that activists strategized the acquisition of press materials from the Spanish and English media. At the end of the chapter, I theorize how these three case examples are useful for a new rhetoric of delivery. These case examples provide examples for how activist practitioners theorize rhetorical delivery as a form of strategy. I advance rhetorical delivery can be understood as a form of strategy, and theory build new rhetorical concepts from each case example.

Case Example: Maggie C. and the Manifesto

In 2006, Maggie Corser, a seasoned activist in the Lansing area, wrote an anti-oppression manifesto after participating in an activist meeting that frustrated her (see figure 4.1, removed by Graduate School). In October 2007 I interviewed her about the delivery of her manifesto:

> Last year, which was 2006 I wrote an anti-oppression piece that I had written after a really frustrating meeting where the dynamics of the meeting had a lot of problems and it was just sort of a last straw kind of a thing... I wrote it in about two hours and then sat on it - went back to it two weeks later and revised it and then brought it to a women's group and got feedback from everyone there... and then after that I circulated it to individuals within the activist community... So I brought it to them. I emailed it out first to our private listserv and then I printed it out and brought it to them in case they hadn't read it on our listserv.

A few weeks later, she e-mailed the piece to a friend of hers at the University of Michigan. Her friend liked the piece so much that she printed out copies and brought it to

an activist meeting in Ann Arbor. Then with Maggie's consent, the editor of a zine in Minneapolis later remixed the piece. Fellow activists began to print off Maggie's work and bring these documents to meetings; they also sent her writing out over various listservs. After distributing her manifesto to friends, a few weeks later her work was republished in a Student Housing Cooperative newspaper in East Lansing:

> One of them [her activist friends] said... thanks for printing it out for me. And I said well, I'm glad you like that. What I'm planning on doing – sorry - So actually somebody asked how are you going to get this out to different people in the activist community that you think need to read this. And I said well, I'd already thought of that a while ago and I want, I told her, I want to print them out, give them to people and then have discussions with that person. In other words, ask them to read it and then call them in a couple days and try to talk about it... And then I emailed it to some friends... A woman from the University of Michigan brought it to her group. There was, I have a friend who is a, she's like a co-editor or something for a queer zine that's in Minneapolis and they took it and used some of my bulleted points in my piece in their zine.... Most of those were either people printing them off and taking them to groups or emailing them out to their group's listservs.

From Maggie's description, it's easy to see that her choice of medium changed depending on the immediate rhetorical situation. When presented with the opportunity to meet with those she identified as likely allies, Maggie concludes that sending the document over a listserv is rhetorically safe, and to augment this initial electronic delivery she brings printed out copies of her manifesto to the women's meeting. When she considers the potential risks and consequences of what she perceives as "higher stakes instances of

delivery" – where her audience is deemed to be less amenable to accepting or understanding the manifesto's content, she talks about the importance of scheduling one-on-one meetings with individuals, as well as hand delivering each document. When she discusses the way she used the analog, printed flyer, Maggie explains that she is able to exert considerably more control over delivery and the rhetorical situation, particularly in comparison to listservs:

> If somebody sends out an e-mail and says um, could somebody, could somebody write, you know, or send this to whatever. Nine times out of ten nobody does it because it's sent out to 300 people and just doesn't seem like it's your responsibility. I think in the same way that if something is sent out that says look there's a problem and we need to talk about it, a lot of times the people that really do need to talk about it um, sort of relinquish all responsibility.

In theorizing the limitations of e-mail, Maggie identifies how e-mail can be used as an excuse to avoid dialogue. In identifying one mode of delivery as less conducive for a particular audience, she only e-mails the manifesto to those she identifies as potential allies. This strategy of delivery is informed by Maggie's study of past examples of what she learned from studying other activists' practice, or what I call the third party study of rhetorical delivery. In other words, Maggie reflects both on the way that she and others have used listserv communication in order to help inform her future practice:

> Something that I took from like my four or five years here was that listservs can be really useful tools to get information out, but certain information will not be heard over a listserv or like digested by people. Just in terms of anti-oppression work I don't think that it can be done over email. If you're talking about interpersonal power dynamics or

broader societal trends, I don't think that can be conveyed, or a dialogue can be started on a listserv that has 500 people that already has really high traffic. Because I don't think that the activists on the listserv can put in the time or really see it as an important dialogue space.

In the above example, Maggie's broad reflections on third person instances of rhetorical delivery reflect a particular kind of knowledge-production, and highlight how the study of a third party's strategy of rhetorical delivery can be epistemic.

When I study the delivery of Maggie C's manifesto, I notice the way she distinguishes among rhetorical delivery, distribution, and circulation. She understands rhetorical delivery as action, and circulation as third party distribution. The image below depicts the recursive way in which these processes interact with and influence one another. Although Maggie highlights the concept of circulation in her discussion, it is not easily discernable from the image above. Maggie explains her understanding of circulation as a complex rhetorical process whose outcome is not entirely predictable but one that she attempts to control and influence in limited ways nonetheless:

I expected it [the manifesto] to be circulated, to be honest, within the activist community by some really supportive people and by some um kinda outraged people that were... I don't know... felt attacked by it or whatever and wanted to sort of discredit it. I expected either like a really positive or negative discussion about it with different circles.

If you return to viewing the diagram above it is difficult to pinpoint the "exact" moment or moments of circulation. In actions two, three, and four, Maggie engages in discrete acts of rhetorical delivery. In actions five, six, and seven, Maggie has less agency, but

through her initial acts of delivery she has been able to determine the timeframe, medium of reception, and content to a limited degree. I argue that any future delivery originating from instances five, six, and seven should be considered what I term "circulation." In this sense, I argue that from her initial acts of rhetorical delivery, Maggie can and does exert important influence over subsequent instances of distribution and circulation. This example demonstrates that Maggie's ability to strategize around the potential for future moments of distribution, recomposition, and appropriation is a critical conceptual component of a 21st century rhetoric of delivery.

According to Maggie, she learned to think about delivery in this way because of a range of past activist experiences. She talks explicitly about the ways materials take on new meanings in different contexts. In her words, texts can become "like a bastardized form... misrepresented... especially among a group of friends... I don't know I've just seen it [misrepresentation] happen with... different things over the last four or five years." From her experiences, she realizes how easily texts can become changed, altered, manipulated by different audiences. This experience informs her current and future practices.

In terms of her rhetorical goals in the manifesto instance, she worked to produce a certain type of conversation around her manifesto. The rhetorical choices in medium and interaction were thus contingent upon the timeframe and audience. In terms of time, the longer her campaign went on, the more broadly she delivered her manifesto. After having achieved specific types of face-to-face discussion around her document, she e-mailed it out and allowed it to be reprinted and reproduced. When discussing her choice of medium, Maggie talks about how a singular mode of delivery might not work:

> My goals were to have a real discussion with a lot of people in the activist community. I thought that the discussion - having a discussion versus just writing and sending it to somebody would sort of um prevent too many discussions like that to come out in terms of just being outraged and you know needing to vent and being like this is ridiculous. I thought that if I was upfront and just went to people and talked about it and let them know where I was coming from that it would prevent that sort of backlash that I think is pretty inevitable, and not really publicized by a lot of more dominant people within the activist community.

In choosing not to simply write and send it to somebody, she emphasizes the way that her ultimate rhetorical goals dictate her means of delivery. Specifically, she highlights the fact that face-to-face interactions are most likely to yield the type of conversations she wants to co-produce. In highlighting this specific approach, however, I'd also like to call attention to the way that Maggie envisions the rhetorical delivery process as multi-tiered, with at least two stages. These two stages in her delivery strategy correspond to two different sets of goals, one more immediate, and the other more long term. Her choices in delivery and her movement from the face-to-face delivery of the manifesto to the second, digital stage emphasize how multimodal and time specific strategies of delivery can correspond to multiple rhetorical goals:

> A goal, a personal goal was just to distribute it and not sort of go along with what was going on and be complicit with silence. I wanted these words distributed at least to sort of let people know where I was coming from. I think in that sense my goal was absolutely realized. The second goal of trying to raise awareness among a lot of people

within the activist community I think was partially realized. There's still a lot of problems that run really deep but people know where I stand on it.

I argue that this change in approach to her preferred method of delivery is time sensitive and goal specific. In the first two sets of acts, the handing out of the printed document corresponded with her personal goal of "letting people know where she was coming from," but it also had the double importance of providing her with useful responses and feedback from a range of voices.

After reflecting on her observations concerning the relative utility of different technologies for particular tasks of rhetorical delivery, she discusses the ways her future rhetorical practices of activist delivery will be informed by the delivery, distribution, and circulation of her manifesto. She reflects on what she says she learned from this strategy:

> So I'd say in the future if I ever did do and write another anti-oppression piece, it would not be put out over a listserv. And if I did have to have meetings with people I think printing it off and talking to people was the most effective because I could have printed it off and given it to them but there's no dialogue afterwards. It might have been read, but I would have no way of knowing if it was really understood.

In the above quotation, Maggie Corser's case example provides several new ways to think about rhetorical delivery. Specifically, I understand the rhetor's discussion as engaged in a type of observational, trial and error learning. This iterative process is also evident in later case examples. Her example is also useful for rethinking rhetorical delivery in terms of strategy. In this example, she talks about understanding how the manifesto's opponents may recirculate or misuse the piece, and she attempts to anticipate and diffuse this possibility in her strategies for delivery and distribution. This type of

strategic thinking about delivery will be revisited toward the end of the chapter, where I will discuss it in terms of "rhetorical velocity," or a type of action where a rhetor explicitly strategizes in a way to anticipate the recomposition of her or his work.

Case Example: Maggie Ryan and the Appropriation of the Image

As part of a national effort by United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS), Movimiento Estudiantil Xicano De Aztlan (MEXA) and Students for Economic Justice (SEJ), a local affiliate of United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS), made up of student activists at Michigan State University (MSU) engaged in a campaign from Fall 2000 to Spring 2005. During this period, they tried to convince the MSU administration to join the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC), a fair labor monitoring body that investigates and certifies college apparel as sweatshop free.

In Spring 2005 the SEJ and MEXA anti-sweatshop campaign at MSU underwent a major shift in tactics and strategy due to a change in university leadership. Prior to Spring 2005, the students attempted to engage with a university president who refused to join the WRC. In that unsupportive atmosphere, the campaign tactics focused largely on event disruption and other forms of direct action which included dressing up as waiters who then surreptiously attended alumni events and handed out "sweatshop menus" to hungry university donors.

Once President Peter McPherson resigned in Spring 2005, however, and a more responsive and progressive leader, Lou Anna K. Simon, assumed the university president position, the SEJ and MEXA student activists drastically revised their strategy to better address the new rhetorical situation. On March 3, one of approximately half a dozen

large, media-centered protests took place. These actions were designed to be what scholar Kevin DeLuca describes as an "image event"— a particular action designed to achieve media coverage through visual display (DeLuca, 1-5). In this case, the SEJ and MEXA activists' primary strategic objective for the March 3rd protest was to attain broadcast coverage and continue their strategy of maintaining a consistent presence in the local news. Consequently, they wanted to use the media to continue to exert public pressure on the MSU administration. Maggie Ryan, one of the activists involved in planning the March 3rd protest, recalls that the action, which took place in front of the MSU Administration building near the John Hannah statue, moved the campaign in a new, more creative direction. She explains:

> we were, you know. ... trying to integrate new ideas because just having a bunch of people gather with signs was getting a little boring and the media wasn't really paying very much attention when there was like fifteen students with a sign–[but] the media started paying more attention when there was like fifteen students doing something way different.

Maggie then explains how the March 3rd actions included a far more creative and visual rhetorical appeal, one that moved way beyond the simple "stand with signs" protest. In the group's attempt to involve more activists as well as more media, they took a new approach--writing with the tools that winter provided, snow itself: "We got dye to write things in the snow and we wrote with our footprints very large in the snow 'W. R. C' so it was visible from very high up – that's Workers Rights Consortium –we basically put signs up...." Arguably both the broader campaign and this specific action were a complete success, and the rhetorical goals Maggie intended to achieve were reached. Due

to a constant and steady stream of protests, media, and publicity, the student activists' objective was achieved on April 8, 2005, when MEXA and SEJ learned that President Lou Anna K. Simon intended to join the WRC. By the end of the summer, President Simon had kept her promise, and the university formally joined the WRC.

But that is not the end of the story, at least not for one participant in the WRC Spring 2005 campaign. In November of 2006, the university used an image of Maggie from the March 2005 protest for advertising purposes (see figures 4.3 and 4.4, removed by Graduate School). According to Maggie, this appropriation wasn't something she had anticipated when the action was initially conceived. She describes how the image was captured during the action:

> I was wearing like a sweatshirt and some other people in Students for Economic Justice were playing in a snowball fight and there was a photographer during the snow fight who was really kind of sketchy scaling up the buildings to take pictures and it was really weird. And then about maybe eight months later the picture appeared on maybe the front page of the Michigan State University and the title of it was "students having fun in the snow."

While the protest itself was far from serious (see figure 4.3, removed by Graduate School), there is no doubt for Maggie that the political intentions of the assembly were. Regardless of the action's relative level of seriousness, the appropriation of Maggie's image (see figures 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, removed by Graduate School) without her consent is indeed a strange and unanticipated occurrence.

Maggie Ryan's image was first used as the main focal point on the MSU website in 2006 (see figures 4.4 and 4.5, removed by Graduate School), but this would not be the last time the university would use Maggie Ryan's image. In figure 4.8, I show a timeline for the appropriation of the Maggie Ryan image, (visible by the blue hat in the images below) for different purposes. Even after I conducted my interview with Maggie Ryan in 2007, an additional example of appropriation took place in February 2008, when the university used her image as part of a major bulk mailing effort (see figure 4.7, removed by Graduate School).

Maggie Ryan's case exemplifies the surprising distance that possible strategies for delivery can travel. While the desired press coverage of the March 3rd action was achieved (see figure 4.3, removed by Graduate School), Maggie R. had no way of anticipating how the university would later use an image of her from the event to promote the Department of Student Life (see figure 4.6, removed by Graduate School), and the University through both its website, (figures 4.3 and 4.4, removed by Graduate School) and the bulk US Post mailing (figure 4.7, removed by Graduate School). But in addition to directly appropriating her image, the university also remixed her image. When comparing figures 4.3 and 4.4, it's clear that not only did the university web team take a picture of Maggie Ryan out of context but they also repurposed it by adding the caption "winter fun learn more" in figures 4.4 and 4.5. Additionally, in figure 4.5 they also cropped Maggie Ryan out of the less scenic background of the MSU administration building, and put her image on the more picturesque and iconic backdrop of the Beaumont tower. When Maggie talked about the action after these first two acts of

appropriation and remixing had taken place, she called attention to the way the university used her image without any attempt to attribute it to her:

> They [the university] didn't contact me. Nobody ever got my name. Nobody ever asked anything. The reporters I don't think even got it but university officials definitely didn't. They didn't get my name or the name of the other person in the picture. And I was like the main person, focal point of the picture.

While Maggie Ryan never consented to or approved of the university using her image for these large-scale advertising purposes, she talked about what she could have done differently to curtail the appropriation of her image. She says that it might have been "a good idea to have more prominent posters or things with you or have things with you so people know what's going on." In doing so, Maggie strategizes how to resist certain forms of appropriation. While the action itself was by her own conclusions not a very serious protest, it did achieve the goals of garnering the requisite amount of broadcast press for the week.

In terms of theorizing delivery, in figure 4.8 I map out the theory of the action. In action one, the activists theorized the image event, and conceived of the sort of coverage they could achieve for that particular week. As Maggie Ryan reflects, these strategic discussions only extended into thinking about the appropriation of the event within the realm of the broadcast and print press, and only within the timeframe of the next few weeks. In these later instances of university appropriation in 2006, 2007, and 2008, the specific misuse of the images was, according to Maggie Ryan, simply beyond the horizon of the activist conversations in early 2005. There was simply no foreseeable or realistic way to predict that this sort of activity would emerge from the event, and specifically that

Maggie Ryan would be utilized in this fashion. As I will discuss toward the end of this chapter, the case example of Maggie Ryan has additional contributions to make toward a theory of rhetorical velocity, which is a term I use to describe how rhetoricians think about the positive, negative, and neutral aspects of composing for recomposition.

Case Example: Todd and the Press Packet

In Fall 2006, a controversial group at MSU called the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) began to publicize an on-campus event called "Catch an Illegal Immigrant." At a time when immigration was front and central in the United States media because of widespread debate over proposed anti-illegal immigration legislation, the YAF chapters at MSU and the University of Michigan announced that they would hold mock lynching-style events on campus. One Michigan State University anti-racist activist, Ernesto Todd Mireles, defined the YAF event in the following way:

> [it was]...a game they actually played at a couple different universities across the country, and basically what happens is some people from the group dress up as an "illegal" immigrant, whatever that looks like, and in most cases it looks like something like a Mexican peon type thing, and then they chase this person around campus until they catch them and then they "deport" them... And so they announced their intention to do this here at Michigan State... And so myself and a few other people began to try to conceive of ways that we could combat this effectively, or if possible stop it.

In order to be able to stop or undermine this event, however, Todd and his colleagues needed to better understand its rhetorical goals. After studying the event's strategy, Todd and his fellow activists concluded that the primary objective of the MSU YAF was to

attract media attention. Given this goal, Todd and his colleagues began to strategize ways to prevent the YAF from achieving their goal.

At the University of Michigan, the September 2006 "Catch an Illegal Immigrant" day event generated a considerable amount of national press coverage, and Todd talks about how the activists in Student Association of Non-Violent Resistance (SA-NVR) made sense of the rhetorical situation:

> I understood their [the YAF] goal as being media exposure. That there's four or five people that are in this group, they have been trained... to use the media through sensationalism.... I think the question is... how do we keep them from getting what it is that they really want.

In studying the strategy of the proposed YAF event in a large group activist meeting, the activists in SA-NVR created an interesting rhetorical strategy in order to counter the YAF's media objectives. Todd describes these discussions:

> I mean they just want that notoriety. They want people to see their name and they want people to know about their organization. And that's what their whole goal is...What we did was, we were like, how do we put these guys [YAF] back on the defensive.... through a process a number of us decided that what we should do is we should give the Young Americans for Freedom an opportunity to demonstrate just how deeply they really believe in all of these things that they are saying.

This "opportunity to demonstrate just how deeply they really believe in all of these things" was the key to the SA-NVR strategy. On the one hand, the whole narrative of the event was to engage in controversial and racist dramatic re-enactments to attract media attention. On the other hand, they seemed to want the media attention for the group as a

whole more than they wanted to be perceived and recognized as an organization specifically designed to foster hate and racism. In taking this into consideration, SA-NVR activists theorized a strategy that directly drew the personal *ethos* of the MSU YAF participants into the spotlight. When the MSU YAF announced that it would hold its event, it did not specify a precise time and location for the event. SA-NVR strategically took advantage of this ambiguity:

> So we said what we're going to do is we are going to make a flyer that invites the entire campus community to come and watch them do their game in front of all of us... So we said, I think it was on October 9th 2006 that at such and such a time "we invite the Young Americans for Freedom to come and demonstrate their game"

In choosing the day October 9th, 2006, the SA-NVR campaign connected the YAF protests with the yearly convergences around Columbus Day, known to many of the activists as Indigenous Peoples Day. By connecting these two issues together, SA-NVR recontextualized the YAF event to be associated with a larger political issue, and in doing so they were able to estimate the number of possible protesters who might attend the October 9th event. Todd explains that the flyer was designed to be provocative and calls attention to the strategic ways the YAF drew upon iconic images of racism that resonate on a very emotional key (see figure 4.9):

> [the flyer] was fairly inflammatory: at the top it had two pictures, it had a picture of the Young Americans for Freedom and it had a picture of a lynching from the South, probably from the fifties I'm thinking, and across the top it said, "Does this look like a game?" And then underneath those two pictures it said, "come watch the Young Americans for Freedom participate in their lynching game they call 'Catch an Illegal

Immigrant'". And then it went on to explain some of the other things, basically equating this group of young white kids who are at Michigan State University with this group of young white kids who are participating in this lynching of these two black men hanging from this picture, and the flyer was shocking. But I think rightfully so.

In making the explicit connection in the flyer between the "Catch an Illegal Immigrant" game and a history of racially charged lynching in the USA, SA-NVR changed the tone of the debate considerably to one of tactic. Is MSU YAF's choice in tactic indicative of a certain form of racism? The debate drew in the MSU President, who condemned the MSU YAF for its tone. In addition to the flyer challenging the YAF to demonstrate its convictions at a certain time and place, the activist group very quickly organized a press conference and produced a range of targeted materials, including a press release in Spanish (see Appendix A):

[They] [c]reated an entire press packet that had the statements from the students, that had a press release concerning the press conference and the invitation to come watch the game, it also included the flyer that I described earlier, and we mailed that out to all the local media and we e-mailed it to all the Spanish language outlets that we could find across the country... And then we held a press conference, and so in the context of this press conference, we had several students that spoke and so myself and a few other people helped these students put together their remarks.

After the SA-NVR press conference, "Students challenge YAF to hold event in public view," on September 25, 2006 (figures 4.10 and 4.11), SA-NVR waited for MSU YAF to respond to their challenge. In a September 26, 2006 article in the MSU student newspaper reporting on the SA-NVR press conference, the chairman of MSU YAF Kyle Bristow

responded to the challenge, and said that the MSU YAF would not hold the event on October 9th, but still planned to hold the event at some point in the future (Machak). In so doing, Bristow and MSU YAF buckled in the face of the SA-NVR challenge. Three days later on September 29, the MSU student paper reported that Kyle Bristow and the MSU YAF had decided to postpone the event indefinitely (Fredricka and Machak); SA-NVR had achieved its goals of preventing the event from taking place. Reflecting on this victory, Todd notes that in the end the MSU YAF buckled under public pressure:

> [they] Cancelled the game, they didn't do it. And they haven't done it here to my knowledge, and if they have done it they did it without telling anybody about it. And I think it is important to know that this is the only university that I am aware of where we didn't just protest the game, we stopped it before it even happened. And I think that's really the key to all of this... In reality we're stopping this game before it ever happens... Because we're diffusing the situation...
>
> Basically we forced them into a position where they had to respond to us. Are you [the YAF] going to come and do this game when *we* say, or are you going to slink away and try to do it undercover, in the dark of night, when nobody is looking and try to pretend like you did something brave and heroic.

Todd's discussion of the strategic elements involved in thinking through the SA-NVR's campaign strategy is useful for field conversations about rhetorical delivery, particularly because he connects strategy with delivery through phrases such as "media exposure." I interpret his mention of the term "media exposure" as a type of delivery strategy where SA-NVR is theorizing about their *opponents'* strategy of delivery. In talking about the "media exposure" of YAF, I understand the SA-NVR as thinking about

how to prevent YAF from effectively succeeding in the delivery of YAF press releases. According to Todd, in the initial SA-NVR strategy meeting the activists discussed ways to keep the YAF from garnering media attention. He explains:

> How we could *deny* them what it was that they really wanted, was this media exposure. And we came to the conclusion really quickly that there was no way to stop it one hundred percent. That they had seized the initiative. That we were, that whatever we did from that point forward in all of the scenarios that we were coming up with, was a reaction to their statement and that until we were somehow able to regain the initiative and make them react to what we were saying, that anything that we said from that point forward would only serve to bolster their claims and to give them exactly what it is that they wanted.

In response to YAF's initial move, SA-NVR needed to strategize a way to seize the event and "turn it around in some way," or as Todd says, "flip it" on them. Todd explains that this "flipping," or turning their own event against them, needed to include strategic thinking on how YAF was making use of different media:

> So what we had to do was, I mean we had to reconceptualize it, you know, and really think about it in terms of, not in terms of what do we do about this but – I don't know it's kind of hard to put it into words actually, now that I think about it. I don't know if I've ever actually said it out loud – It's not about, it's not about reacting to other people, because when you react to them then you're doing something that's predictable based on their actions. What we had to do was do our own thing, you know.... I think that we were able to respond and gain the initiative all at one time. By using the exact same mediums they were hoping to use...

In Todd's discussion of co-opting the YAF strategy and flipping, he said to me that he doesn't know if he had "ever actually said it out loud" before. I understand this search for words as an example of a place where there is an absence of clearly articulated rhetorical concepts. While the knowledge from practice exists, there is still no clear vernacular to convey a sense of what is happening *as* it is happening.

When I asked Todd about his past experiences thinking about delivery, he highlighted part of the art involved with creating and delivering content by means of circulating flyers:

> Well I think that my experience in creating flyers has taught me that there are things that work and do not work on flyers. And you know that may seem simplistic but it is actually true... Now as far as distribution goes... We don't make five hundred flyers, we make five thousand flyers and we put them out all over campus. We put them up underneath people's doors, we put them in the bathrooms, we put them everywhere. We inundate the campus with flyers because it's a form of public communication, you know, and so there's a direct return, the amount of publicity you do will directly impact the amount of people who know and who attend any given event... It is the fundamental tenant of organizing: "I'm going to explain this to you, but I am going to explain this to you really quick – read this", and then *bam*, there you go. It's where it's at – flyering is where it's at.

The way Todd talks about "*bam*" is another instance where a concept is needed to describe an extremely complex situation of delivery. The "*bam*" is more than a successful act of rhetorical delivery, it is an instance when a strategy of rhetorical delivery has succeeded, where a rhetor has accurately assessed and anticipated its audiences' needs,

and consequently, the audience responds in the ways that the rhetors had hoped. In this case example, there are many different elements that made this campaign a success for Todd and SA-NVR. In showcasing the range of materials produced, and in providing some information on how they were used, my analysis of this case illustrates that there is more to this event than the documents themselves. There's the "*bam,*" the strategies still in need of rhetorical description, theories of rhetoric which helped make this strategy a success for SA-NVR. In the next section I will look at some of those theories.

FROM PRACTICE TO THEORY

What can be learned about rhetorical delivery from practice? In each of these instances, activist practitioners talk about how they understand the past and use the knowledge gained from past strategies to remix, redistribute, and recompose images and texts in the future. To review the cases discussed throughout this chapter, Maggie Corser strategically considered how individuals opposed to her writing might in fact redistribute her work. Additionally, her case example reflects how it is possible to study rhetorical delivery not as a single discrete act, but as a series of scaffolding and complimentary acts. In the last example, Todd and the SA-NVR campaign were able to effectively derail the MSU YAF from holding its "Catch an Illegal Immigrant" event. Talking about the ways the group was able to strategize the negation of the YAF event, Todd highlights the complex rhetorical issues surrounding how the SA-NVR group worked to understand and undermine their opponents' campaign. In addition to discussing and strategizing the negation of future texts, Todd also provides an important argument for the development of a new vernacular to discuss strategies of rhetorical delivery, the need to describe the "bam".

In my previous Masters Thesis and 2009 published work with Dànielle DeVoss, I have written about a concept called "rhetorical velocity," or the art of composing for recomposition. In Ridolfo and DeVoss, I define rhetorical velocity as "the strategic theorizing for how a text might be recomposed (and why it might be recomposed) by third parties, and how this recomposing may be useful or not to the short- or long-term rhetorical objectives of the rhetorician" (velocity.html). Each of these three case examples involves, to varying extent, theorizing the future of texts. In Maggie Ryan's example, she worked with other student activists to design a visually intensive protest in order to achieve a particular type of broadcast press coverage. Even though the protest and activist campaign were ultimately successful, in the years that followed, a series of Maggie Ryan's images were used in ways neither Maggie nor the other activists could have plausibly predicted. While the activists succeeded in their rhetorical goal of achieving third-party media coverage for their campaign, Maggie Ryan's *ethos* was undesirably drawn into the spotlight well after the initial events took place. In my previous formulation of rhetorical velocity, I only considered the futures of documents in relation to the original campaign goals, but Maggie Ryan's case complicates this theoretical framework. Maggie Ryan's case example complicates my initial articulation of rhetorical velocity. Now, I have to consider the way the initial actors' individual ethos' may continue to be put in circulation (and thus also reformulated and repurposed) long after the first event has taken place.

As a theory, rhetorical velocity is useful for articulating the positive appropriation of a press release in terms of acquiring additional institutional *ethos.*

For example, when the SA-NVR campaign held their press conference in September 2006, the positive press that originated from the press conference was perhaps worth more in terms of rhetorical weight than a paid advertisement in a newspaper or a commercial break during the evening news. The *ethos* of the news outlet is potentially worth more to the activists than any sum of money they could raise. But this type of ethos is not without its own economy of value and exchange. In the case of Maggie Ryan, she lent her ethos to the WRC campaign, but unbeknownst to her and without her consent ultimately her ethos was appropriated for another purpose. In this sense, in certain instances more weight may need to be given in theories of rhetorical velocity to the framing of the individual *ethos* in relationship to the action. For example, even though an action may be effective in the short term, what are the long-term ramifications on any identifiable individuals involved in the execution of the action?

In the next chapter, I will be building on the issue of knowledge and delivery. Specifically, how do activists understand a third party's strategy of rhetorical delivery, and how researchable is this strategy? In the case of Todd, considerable effort went into understanding the rhetorical strategy of YAF, but how do rhetors learn about and verify this knowledge, and what is its relationship to rhetorical delivery? How is rhetorical delivery epistemic? In the next chapter I look at stories from a Coca-Cola campaign at Michigan State University. From discussions with Stu and Triana, I develop the concepts of rhetorical mystification and reconstruction, concepts I use to describe the work rhetors do to investigate, understand, and plan around a third party's strategy of delivery.

CHAPTER FIVE: "EVERYONE TOOK TURNS SPRAYING AND DRYING": STORIES OF DELIVERY AND COLLABORATION

In chapter four I presented three activist case examples: Maggie Corser, Maggie Ryan, and Ernesto Todd Mireles, and I discussed how these examples might help rhetoricians think about rhetorical delivery within a new framework. I proposed redefining rhetorical delivery as inclusive of strategies for textual delivery, distribution, and circulation, and I began to develop several new concepts in rhetorical delivery. The first idea is a process I term "rhetorical velocity" which involves composing for recomposition, and the second idea is that rhetorical delivery is knowledge producing. In chapter five I analyze two additional activist case examples and develop two more critical concepts: rhetorical mystification and rhetorical reconstruction. In this chapter I continue to frame the analysis in terms of delivery, strategy, material, and goals, but unlike the previous chapter, both of the case examples in this chapter, "Stu and the Stencil" and "Triana and the FOIA request," were drawn from different moments in the same activist campaign. By providing two case examples from the same campaign, my intention is to highlight the ways that different moments within a single activist campaign can exemplify multiple, complimentary strategies for rhetorical delivery.

THE 2006 MSU KILLER COKE CAMPAIGN

Once they successfully completed the Workers Rights Consortium (WRC) campaign in the summer of 2005, in the fall of 2005 MSU Students for Economic Justice (SEJ) and Movimiento Estudiantil Xicano de Aztlan (MEXA) began to channel more of their activist energy into the United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) "Killer Coke"

campaign. The campaign worked similar to the WRC, with individual college USAS chapters working at the local level to cut their university beverage contracts. In 2005 the USAS rationalized participation in the "Why Target Coca-Cola" section of the *Unthinkable! Undrinkable!* USAS Killer Coke Organizing Manual in the following ways:

> Coca-Cola is one of the world's most powerful and profitable corporations. In 2004, Coca-Cola earned $4.85 billion in profits. Yet, despite repeated pleas for help, Coca-Cola has not found the time or resources to insure the most basic safety of the workers who bottle its products or prevent massive environmental devastation in the communities where it does business. Coca-Cola has responded by launching public relations campaigns and denying responsibility- it's time we show them that they need to actually change things on the ground- enough is enough!

The USAS activists cite specific allegations against Coca Cola and its bottling companies: the murder of eight Coca-Cola union organizers from 1989-2005 in addition to environmental crimes in Kala Dera, Rajasthan, Mehdiganj, Plachimada, Kerala, and Uttar Pradesh, India ("Unthinkable! Undrinkable!"). As part of the national USAS "Killer Coke" strategy, local USAS chapters advocated to cut university beverage contracts with Coca-Cola. While the loss in university sales is significant, the damage to Coca Cola's image is more powerful. In the January 26th edition of the 2006 *The Michigan Daily* an anonymous "financial analyst who monitors the beverage industry," commented on the University of Michigan's own January 2006 suspension of its beverage contract, saying that "even with the loss of revenue from the schools, the major victim of the suspensions will be the company's public image" ("Coca-Cola's image"). After the University of Michigan cut its own Coca Cola contract, the rhetorical situation of the MSU campaign

changed. In the spring of 2006, Coca Cola began to pay closer attention to the MSU campaign. What follows are two interrelated stories from the MSU Killer Coke campaign. In the first example Stuart "Stu" Niles-Kraft talks about the strategic appropriation of a Coca-Cola advertisement, and in the second example Triana Sirdenis discusses the campaign strategy of submitting Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests. SEJ and Triana filed the FOIA requests in order to access private communications between the MSU administration and Coca Cola.

STU AND THE STENCIL

By the early spring of 2006, Coca Cola began to actively counter the burgeoning MSU Killer Coke campaign. This included communicating with the MSU administration, as well as paying for newspaper space in the MSU Stu recalls that he had the impression that the campaign was going well:

> [I thought] that it was a really good time for them, like the Coke campaign was really taking off, they were pretty successful and like setting up meetings with university advisors and were getting attention in the school newspaper. Basically making a lot of progress on that campaign and also I think they gained a lot of new membership around that time then.

After the previous success of the WRC campaign, membership and meeting attendance were high in 2006. This is important because one of the short-term campaign goals for SEJ was to increase its membership. Triana Sirdenis, one of the activists involved in the MSU SEJ Killer Coke campaign, explains the long-term goal of the Coke campaign:

> the long term goal was definitely to end our contract with Coke, some schools wait until the contract is up and for us that was four or five years until our contract was up, so it

> wasn't an option for us to wait for the contract to expire, so we're asking for the contract to be ended.

After the University of Michigan cut its contract in January 2006, Coca Cola feared something similar might follow in East Lansing. The company then responded to the student-led protests of January and February 2006 by purchasing a full-page response in the student-run newspaper, *The State News* (see figure 5.1, image removed by the Graduate School). The letter was also published in other student newspapers, and each was signed by Ed Potter, director of Global Labor Relations for Coca-Cola (Davis). Triana, one of the SEJ activists involved with the Killer Coke campaign, talks about some of the ways that Coke tried to change its image at MSU:

> during that year there was also a lot of advertisers in the school newspaper, like full-page ads declaring that Coke was really a [sic] ethically conscious company. And this was happening at other schools too. When their campaigns were really strong Coke would buy thousand dollar page ads, like full-page ads in the newspaper.

As Triana mentions, the SEJ and MEXA activists were acutely conscious of the economic costs of the Coca-Cola letter. On March 3rd, 2006 a SEJ member sent out a message on Facebook to the MSU Killer Coke group, providing SEJ activists with a specific monetary figure (see figure 5.2, image removed by the Graduate School). The sender of the message discussed how he investigated the cost of the letter:

> took the liberty of calling the state news, and found out that the advertisement cost $1524.60.... we [activists] should see this as a small victory. This shows that the heat is on, and we are starting to make an impact to the extent that Coke recognizes it (Coke Advertisement).

Stuart "Stu" Niles-Kraft, one of the recipients of the SEJ Facebook message and an organizer of the 2006 MSU Killer Coke campaign, recalls the sequence of events that followed:

> [that] Coca-Cola bought full page advertisements in the school paper and the State News and uh, we used those advertisements which were a response to our Coke campaign from the company...[the day after the paper came out and]... a few people called each other and we all said we would get the paper from the news stands and so we collected newspapers after that day, mostly straight from news stands, some from recycling centers.

In choosing to not take the papers the day they came out, the activists learned from and avoided the issue of a censorship accusation. In March of 2001 this very issue plagued activists at Brown University when neoconservative David Horowitz paid for the publication of arguments against slave reparations in the university newspaper *The Brown Daily Herald.* In response to the racially charged situation that Horowitz created, a group of student activists chose to prevent the distribution of the argument by taking all 4,000-plus issues of *The Brown Daily* (Rosenbaum). In the resulting controversy that ensued "much of the campus and media turned against these students and accused them of censorship" (Sagrans). In the end and with relatively little effort, Horowitz was able to receive a considerable amount of national media attention, effectively launching the public relations framework for his so-called "Academic Bill of Rights" campaign. In the case of MSU however, after recovering the papers from recycling bins and dumpsters, members of SEJ brought back newspapers to a local cooperative space:

> So we got all these papers and then... I made sets of stencils just using... manila folders... like one was a Coke bottle with a scull and cross bones in it and... I found a font on my computer that looked a lot like the Coke font, had the same kind of curly Q design... So I tried to use Coca-Cola's trademark font or the closest thing we could get to it... kind of like... a jamming sort of idea using their own logo against them.

In figures 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, and 5.6 (images removed by the Graduate School), I show the activists' production process of the stencils. Because the letter covered the full back page of *The State News*, the SEJ activists only needed to perform a single Exacto knife cut to fully detach the advertisement. In choosing to juxtapose the font and colors of Coca-Cola, the activists accomplished a visually powerful remix made possible by the ease with which they were able to appropriate Coca-Cola's public relations materials.

Stu says that as a community activity "everyone took turns spraying and drying and collecting." In addition there "were very few costs involved... The paper was free and... the paint was salvaged from somewhere." The only investment was time. Stu reflects that he thought the appropriation of the letter was like a work of art:

> Thought it was pretty poetic in that we were using a piece of Coca-Cola's propaganda which they bought and paid for, we used those materials to make posters... to use against them and that felt really cool to me. I'm not sure if everybody who saw them realized that it was a Coca-Cola ad that these posters were printed on... But that was the idea we went into it with.

Over the course of the next two months the newly created stencils were delivered across the campus landscape (see figures 5.7 and 5.8, images removed by the Graduate School). They were wheat pasted to walkways, bulletin boards, and trashcans. In the case of Coca-

Cola and the letter, Stu (the originator of the idea) had a long history of repurposing, cut-and-paste, and placement dating back to his early experience producing zines in high school:

> I saw friends of mine make zines that way and the kids from high school who are into kind of making their own little zines and literature it was kind of centered around punk rock culture and that kind of stuff. So that's just how I'd always seen little bits of self made media like that [Jim: Yeah], with scissors and photocopiers. That's just what I was exposed to.

As someone coming from a youth culture of zines, pastiche, and stencils, Stu talks about how the delivery and placement of each poster was an art. For Stu, this type of artistic delivery is what appealed to him about the stenciled over Coke letter. He talks about how the crafting and the delivery are related:

> the idea of making something like that that's kind of a piece of street art that's, you know, putting it on someone else's - on some other piece of public property, I thought placement was really important for like each piece. Especially like when I see stencils where [the place] it is put is almost as important as what the image is... I like to see stencils on campus where it's cleverly placed in accordance with you know whatever that message is... it [the stenciled Coke letter] was mostly specific I think for me anyways that it be on some kind of MSU or university property.

While there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that Coca-Cola did not initially consider how printing their letter as the back full-page section might inadvertently produce useful material for the activists, there is some anecdotal evidence to suggest that Coca-Cola *may* have modified its strategy for future letters, specifically in the case of a letter published at

Smith. Triana received word that in at least one other paper, *The Smith Sophian*, Coca-Cola took out a letter only half a page in size (Sirdenis). In figure 5.9 I compare the half size and full size layouts (image removed by the Graduate School):

I propose that in the case of *The Smith Sophian* the likeliness for Coke of any activist appropriation is considerably less plausible. Unlike the full-page letter, the half page letter requires more activist time for less of an impact. The form of the half page letter significantly reduces the probability of activist appropriation. In comparison to the MSU advertisement, activists at Smith would have needed to do an additional cut to remove the letter from the newspaper. But did Coca-Cola make the strategic choice to publish a half page letter in *The Smith Sophian* based on their prior experiences at MSU? There is no direct proof. It is possible that a half page of newspaper space was all that was available for purchase on that particular day. I argue though that it is indeed rhetorically realistic to consider, just for a moment, the possibility that Coca Cola *could* learn from its past experiences with delivery. I argue that it is also equally important for rhetorical theory to consider how Stu and other activists understand Coca-Cola's strategy of delivery, as it is also equally important to theorize the possible significance of Coke's half page letter at Smith. As part of this argument, I propose that this case example highlights instances for two concepts integral to a new rhetoric of delivery: rhetorical velocity and rhetorical mystification.

In chapter four I introduced rhetorical velocity as a strategy of composing for recomposition. In the example of the stenciled Coca-Cola letter, the delivery of the letter at MSU could be considered a failure for Coca-Cola. If this appropriation was not a desired outcome by Coca-Cola's public relations staff, then Coca-Cola's public relations

staff failed to see the potentiality for a disadvantageous remix of their letter. I have called this form of appropriation "negative appropriation" in chapter four. Specifically, negative appropriation is when one fails to predict and take measures to stop forms of recomposition or remixing which are disadvantageous to specific rhetorical goals. In the case of Coca-Cola, if their rhetorical goal at MSU was to convince the student body that the activist campaign was unfounded, then the stenciled Coca Cola letter may have been a rhetorically damaging recomposition, negative appropriation. This is an example of theorizing for recomposition where the rhetor (Coca-Cola) theorizes how its rhetoric may be appropriated and used against its specific rhetorical campaign objectives. As I have said before in the case of Maggie Ryan, negative appropriation is where someone theorizes how their work may be used against their rhetorical objectives. In the case of Coca Cola and the *Smith Sophian*, this is a real possibility.

The second important concept relevant to this example is rhetorical mystification, or the difficulty of Stu knowing for sure what Coca Cola's strategy of delivery is. Was Coca Cola paying close attention to the campaign at MSU? For Stu, this is a realistic possibility:

> I'd like to think that they did [know about the Coke stencil] I'm not really aware of how closely they pay attention to our university campus but I imagine that it is a concern. The fact that they wanted to print the ads that were used in our papers makes me think that they are paying attention to our Coke campaign here and I know that the University of Michigan success in their Coke Campaign prior that year had been in the news so I do think they pay attention and I'd like to think that they at least did notice that

composition. Maybe that's wishful thinking I'm not sure. I imagine they probably had someone here observing afterwards too.

Rhetorical mystification then is a condition for the rhetorical delivery of texts. As I discussed in chapter four, rhetorical delivery is a knowledge producing activity. For the rhetor, engaging in the delivery of texts, any texts, produces certain types of knowledge. As Stu discusses when he reflects on the delivery of his stencils, there is a particular craft to the delivery and placement of stencils. In actively engaging in this form of delivery, Stu learns his craft and its delivery. But this knowledge is difficult for someone such as Coca Cola to dislodge from the vantage point of the practitioner. In the case of Stu and the other activists in my study, I need to interview them in order to understand some of what they have learned from their particular experiences with delivery. In the case of Messer Leon, these answers are elusive and extremely difficult to uncover. An example of rhetorical mystification then is Stu's theorizing about what Coca Cola knows about his activist campaign at MSU. In light of the Smith Sophian, did Coca Cola learn from their practice at MSU? This question exemplifies a kind of rhetorical mystification --- where it is almost impossible, yet still theorizeable, for Stu to know what Coca Cola knew about the MSU activist campaign.

Another example of rhetorical mystification is when Coca-Cola sends out ten campaign press releases, yet only two media outlets end up publishing a story on the campaign. For a third party such as Stu or Triana, trying to research Coca-Cola's strategy and actions of delivery, the most easily researchable texts are the two published news stories about Coca-Cola's campaign. Any boilerplate text the reporters used from Coca Cola's s press advisory, or any of Coca Cola's first hand knowledge about the other eight

media outlets that did not pick up his story, remains largely close to the knowledge of Coca-Cola. In order to understand more about Coca-Cola's strategy and knowledge of delivery, significant rhetorical reconstruction would be required. In this sense, Coca-Cola's acquired knowledge from various acts of rhetorical delivery, as well as strategy of delivering their documents, remains in a state of mystification to outsiders. In this sense, rhetorical mystification is the difficulty in Stu researching what knowledge and strategy a Coca Cola has in relationship to their strategy of rhetorical delivery.

Triana and the FOIA request

Rhetorical mystification has a counterpart, rhetorical reconstruction. In the case of the MSU SEJ Killer Coke campaign, a striking example of rhetorical reconstruction is the attempt to fill in the gaps of rhetorical mystification, to uncover what someone else knows about rhetorical delivery through the use of a Freedom of Information Act Request (FOIA). Triana explains the SEJ rational for the FOIA:

> SEJ has been working on the Killer Coke campaign for over two years and I think during the first year of the campaign we realized there was a lot of information that we needed to find out about... We saw the vending machines in the Cafeterias, but we didn't know like all the ins and outs and the details. We didn't know how much money we were invested in and how much product we were buying a year and what we were buying... So we needed to find out more.

Rhetorical reconstruction is the attempt by individuals or groups to actively research, learn, and uncover someone else's knowledge and strategy for delivery. This process can include learning about past instances of rhetorical delivery, such as a failed press release,

a series of hidden communications between individuals and institutions, or details about a strategy of rhetorical delivery. Triana also remarks that the FOIA (see figure 5.10, images removed by the Graduate School) "gave us a lot of bargaining power in meetings knowing that we had this information and they didn't have any control over whether we had it or not." Some of this information retrieved from the FOIA requests included documents useful for bargaining with the university.

This includes an "Addendum Letter of Agreement," where in 2002 Coca-Cola sent a letter modifying the existing beverage contract. The letter uses September 11th as the primary reason to not allow labor and human rights monitors to visit factories and inspect plant working conditions in Colombia (see figure 5.11, images removed by the Graduate School). While perhaps in the intense American political climate of 2002 such a request may have seemed reasonable to university administrators, by 2006 this seemed absurd. The likeliness that Al Qaeda would have pretended to be university-sponsored plant inspectors in order to attack Coca Cola bottling plants in Colombia seems highly unlikely. In the eyes of MSU activists, Coca-Cola used September 11t as an excuse to strategically amend the multi-million dollar beverage contract, and MSU officials took Coca Cola at their word (see figure 5.12 and 5.13, images removed by the Graduate School). But the activists received much more useful material from the two FOIA requests, and Triana recalls that they found a wide range of documents. These materials helped the activists understand the level of communications between the university and Coca Cola:

> We [SEJ] found personal e-mails – we found some Coke contact between some of our administrators. And it said specifically like our groups names – SEJ. We also found a

lot of, Coke had sent our school a lot of packets of information showing like the positives about their company and how they're doing strong environmental work and how they have a good human rights record... So we know that they were listening and that it was having a big impact on the campaign.

In the previous example I ended with Stu reflecting on the possibility of whether or not Coke learned from the MSU activist campaign. SEJ had learned through the use of FOIA that Coca Cola and the MSU administration were actively aware of the MSU activist campaign. In addition to learning that they had been noticed; the activists also found examples of the communications between Coca Cola and the administration (see Appendix B), which included Coke's communications strategy. Triana talks about how the FOIA information helped the SEJ campaign:

the company didn't seem as distant as you normally think a corporation is, like when there is actual e-mails from actual contacts from a corporation sending people you know e-mails and like, ah, they definitely have knowledge of our campaign, and you could see I guess how much of an impact it [the campaign] made.

This information had a significant impact on the campaign strategy, and sparked Triana's interest in creating a template for other university activist groups on how to make FOIA request. In Appendix B, I've included the template she created. She later distributed this template to USAS groups at other universities.

Triana talks about how the ability to do a FOIA significantly impacted the overall activist campaign strategy:

I think FOIAs are... with the information that you can get from them they can shed so much more light into your campaign and strategy, because it completely changes your

situation and depending on, with this, the university context, depending on what your relationship is with your administrators, with your decision makers it can change the dynamics of a meeting, it can change a whole campaign...

Stu and Triana's case examples showcase how multiple strategies of rhetorical delivery can scaffold within the same campaign. Their story demonstrates how a new rhetoric of delivery, one conceived of primarily as rhetorical strategies for delivering texts, can involve theorizing the rhetorical potential of texts as future building blocks, as well as the research into someone else's strategy of rhetorical delivery. In the same campaign where Stu theorizes the appropriation of the Coca-Cola letter, Triana and Stu both wonder about Coca-Cola's level of interest in their activist campaign. How is Coca-Cola strategizing the delivery of its texts in order to counter their campaign? Who is Coca Cola sending materials to, and how are they doing so? Through the information gleaned from the FOIA request Triana answers many of these questions. Although these initial processes of delivery were completely obscured, she did manage to uncover some of Coke's strategy of delivery. The material she uncovered was then of particular value in SEJ's conversations with the MSU administration. Although the entire strategy of Coca-Cola was not revealed, Triana and Stu both actively theorize about Coke's methods and knowledge. For Stu and Triana, certain questions remain unanswered: did Coca-Cola learn from the appropriation of the MSU letter and then make corrective changes at Smith? This question continues to remain unanswered, the access to the answers continue to remain in a state of mystification for the activists. In the last chapter I continue to develop the case for rhetorical mystification, as well as rhetorical delivery as episteme, rhetorical velocity, and rhetorical reconstruction.

CHAPTER SIX: THE PIGEON AND THE HONEYCOMB: CONCLUSION

In the first chapter I argued that rhetoric and composition studies needs to turn toward practice in order to build a theory of delivery. I invoke the pigeon as a symbolic reminder that there are other historical forms of delivery worthy of study beyond orality. I argue that from Iraq insurgents to contemporary Brazil, rhetoricians have much to learn from the practice of pigeons:

> Pigeons fly cell phones into Brazilian prison
> By STAN LEHMAN, Associated Press Writer
> Wednesday, April 1, 2009
>
> Inmates have devised an innovative way to smuggle in cell phones into a prison farm in Brazil: carrier pigeons. Guards at the Danilio Pinheiro prison near the southeastern city of Sorocaba noticed a pigeon resting on an electric wire with a small cloth bag tied to one of its legs last week. "The guards nabbed the bird after luring it down with some food and discovered components of a small cell phone inside the bag," police investigator Celso Soramiglio said Tuesday.
>
> One day later, another pigeon was spotted dragging a similar bag inside the prison's exercise yard. Inside the bag was the cell phone's charger, Soramiglio said.
>
> The birds were apparently bred and raised inside the prison, smuggled out, outfitted with the cell phone parts and then released to fly back.
>
> "Pigeons instinctively fly back home, always," the investigator said.

The example of the prison pigeon is an important example for how rhetoric can learn from practice. The Brazilian pigeon highlights an important trend also visible in the Iraqi pigeon example: one instance and medium of delivery increasingly relies on other technologies for success. While used to circumvent the US frequency scanners in Iraq, or the prison guards in Brazil, the pigeon in turn

enables other forms of delivery: the mortar shell or the phone call from a prisoner. However there is an important distinction to be made then between medium theory and rhetorical theory: medium theory focuses less on the rhetorical strategy of the group or individual, and more on the communicative potentialities of the medium itself.[1] On the other hand, rhetorical theory focuses more on the rhetorical objectives, a specific situation, rhetors, and audiences.

There is also an important difference between a technology of delivery and a strategy of delivery.[2] When theorized outside of the rhetorical triangle, the pigeon and the printing press cease to exist as explicitly rhetorical devices and instead exist

---

[1] This includes Innis, McLuhan, and others. Danielle DeVoss also wrote an excellent distinction in our 2009 *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* article:

> We attend not to the work of McLuhan or other communications scholars but instead present a review of work anchored to composition studies, because we think it is necessary to base our understanding of rhetorical delivery on existing field conversations, specifically those that make use of the term. We do not focus on conversations of medium theory, which, although extremely relevant to rhetorical delivery, we view as historically distinct within our discipline from conversations of classical rhetorical delivery. (rhetcomp.html)

[2] I do not use De Certeau's distinction between strategy and tactics. Certeau distinguishes between strategy as an institutional structure for those in power, verses tactics that are used to "manipulate and divert those spaces" (30). Rather, I

as media, a technology of delivery: a pigeon, a press of wood and metal. The two pigeon examples therefore show how old and new technologies of delivery can combine to form new technological combinations for the delivery of texts. This however is not the same as looking at the rhetorical strategy of a technology. In chapters four and five my research with contemporary activists shows how both technologies and strategies of delivery can combine, scaffold, and compliment one another. As Maggie C shows, strategies of delivery are sometimes even more strategic when combined with multiple technologies for delivery.

In figure 6.1 (image removed by the Graduate School) I am visually conveying how rhetorical delivery is increasingly not simply a single action, but a series of supporting, often coordinated actions: Strategies of Textual Placement. The Maggie C case is an excellent example of a rhetor that considers the *placement* of a text across a span of time. This diagram is thus designed to represent delivery as strategic activity, a series of actions that take place not in one discrete moment, but are instead spread out across a span of time.

Increasingly, delivery also involves the *maintenance* of a text: Strategies of Textual Maintenance. The digital file is often uploaded to a server, and the "receiver" must be coerced into downloading the file through other supporting text. Digital delivery is increasingly less mono-directional in this respect, and involves an element of coercion on the part of the uploader, and consent on the part of the

---

understand strategy as a plan for (rhetorical) action, and tactics as specific methods or the use of certain tools to help achieve certain objectives.

downloader. The rhetorician however must also maintain the availability of the text: the server must continue to serve the rhetorical materials; the stencil must remain on the wall. While coercion and consent are certainly not dominant concepts for digital delivery, I invoke them to illustrate how the delivery of a text increasingly involves its placement in a given analog or digital location.

The final point about 6.1 (image removed by the Graduate School) I will make relates to time and research. I argue that complex strategies of delivery highlight the temporal disparity between rhetoricians. Delivery becomes, more clearly, a research problem. When faced with a complex strategy of delivery, the rhetor-researcher is almost always researching the past. Triana's example shows, it is extremely difficult to research and counteract an opponent's strategy of delivery. Not only is there a temporal disadvantage, but specialized, often institutionally specific research knowledge, is required.

In chapters four and five I have introduced and discussed four concepts for a new rhetoric of delivery. Stu and Maggie C show how activists are thinking about composing for recomposition, or what I have termed rhetorical velocity. Maggie R, Todd, and Triana teach how acts of rhetorical delivery can be epistemic or knowledge producing. Stu and Triana both show how researching and uncovering an opponent's strategy and practice of delivery is extremely difficult, but is still *possible.* I call the condition of having only a partial knowledge of an opponents' delivery strategy and practice a form of *rhetorical mystification.* This term rhetorical mystification should not be confused with Kenneth Burke's term "mystify." In *A*

Rhetoric of Motives Burke explains his notion of mystify as "an omission of meaning" that takes place because of systems of writing:

> But expression of the past eras survives in fragments, and often without explicit reference to the situations in which it arose (but of which people were wholly conscious at the time). So the "mystifications" are in part merely a by-product of the written record, and in this sense mystify us as they do not mystify their contemporaries. (111)

Burke argues that hierarchies of power create terms that in turn mystify whole societies (111-120). Power is thus maintained through mysteries of language, and opposition to power structures has the potential to expose mysteries of language.

My definition of rhetorical mystification has no connection to the historical slippage of meaning that Burke discusses. However both Burke and I share a rhetorical interest in systems of writing. While Burke is primarily interested in the significance of the longevity of written texts, I am interested in the rhetoricial significance of strategically placing texts, or what I call Strategies of Textual Placement (STP) (see figure 6.1 (Image Removed by the Graduate School)). Rhetorical velocity is one example of a strategy of textual placement in which the rhetorician theorizes the harm or benefits for the future appropriations of a text.

Another excellent example of a strategy of textual placement can be found in Huatong Sun's 2004 dissertation *Expanding the Scope of Localization: A Cultural Usability Perspective on Mobile Text Messaging Use in American and Chinese Context.* Sun examines the complexities of a multimodal argument between Dirk and Emma (175). During the argument Emma changes the means of delivery several times and

for several different people. She utilizes AOL Instant Messenger, SMS over the web, SMS by phone, cellular walkie-talkie, and cell phone calls:

> Affordances of each technology are used here to arrange a stronger rhetoric. Cell phone conversations allow her to argue with her boyfriend at a distance... Walkie-talkie conversations occurred to counteract the disadvantages of cell phone conversations. Discrete conversation flows with sentence pauses helped them to focus on the content they wanted to convey without being extraordinarily emotional. (183)

This strategic oscillation between different technologies of delivery was part of a rhetorical strategy to mediate the argument. Sun's example demonstrates how the presence of a plurality of technologies of delivery can further complicate strategies of delivery. This oscillation between technologies of rhetorical delivery is also the case in the Maggie Corser example, where Maggie scaffolds her strategy of delivery over the course of several weeks, making strategic use of a broad range of different technologies. In figure 6.1 I call this Practices of Textual Maintenance (PTM), where the rhetorician must do specific *rhetorical* tasks in order to *maintain* a strategy of delivery over a length of time. PTM is concerned with the tools and labor involved in *cultivating* a process of delivery over a span of time.[3]

---

[3] PTM can include a concern for infrastructure, too, but the category differs in that it is not specific to the site of composing, but rather deals with the work required to maintain a strategy of delivery over a stretch of time. See DeVoss, Cushman, and Grabill's 2005 CCC article on the emerging need for a critical understanding of the infrastructure required for new media composing.

Practices of textual management include a new concept called rhetorical valuation, which is the name for a process that identifies the specific acts required to maintain a strategy of delivery over a period of time. In Stu's case, dozens of individual delivery acts were required to maintain the delivery strategy over a long period of time. Stu's case exemplifies rhetorical valuation in action because he accounted for all of the acts required to maintain a complex strategy of delivery, consequently he ends up theorizing the delivery of delivery. Rhetorical valuation can also include tertiary forms of delivery, such as flyering for an event, or sending a link to an activist listserv out to a website.

Rhetorical valuation can be an assessment of the time and resources required to pay the power bill for a server room. However, the rhetorical strategies for the websites are an example of a strategy of textual placement.[4] Rhetorical valuation also applies to classical delivery. The theoretical shift to thinking about rhetorical delivery as not one act, but as a strategy of textual placement means that the traditional concerns of classical delivery (voice, body, gesture) still have an important place in a new rhetoric of delivery. For example, the stump speech is given fifty times on the campaign trail in key cities. The delivery of the speech is

[4] Consider, for example, the difficulty activists have had hosting indymedia.org servers in many countries. Governments in the Americas and Europe have regularly raided server rooms and seized machines. The task of maintaining indymedia.org (which includes hiring attorneys, raising bail money, running the servers, and paying the bills) is a different set of concerns than the rhetorical strategy of indymedia's hosted content. ("Indymedia")

conceived of as an image event, a photo opportunity for the print and broadcast press. The individual speeches are part of a PTM, while the overall rhetorical plan a STP: the delivery of the stump speech in key locales --- with the right press present --- all across the geography of the electorate.

But how does someone else *see* all of a PTM from the moment it has taken place? This question provides the basis for what I've called "rhetorical mystification" in chapter five. I propose that rhetorical mystification then is a *condition* of understanding the strategy practice of delivery as epistemic. Knowledge of delivery becomes increasingly complex because the choices for delivery continue to proliferate. Furthermore, this knowledge of delivery is *unequally* distributed between individuals, groups, and society. Did the reporter write the news story after receiving a press release? Who sent the press release? Who was the press release sent to? How did different news desks react to the press release? I call this research into the rhetorical context of strategies of textual placement and practices of textual maintenance a form of *rhetorical reconstruction.*

Rhetorical reconstruction is the acknowledgement of a researchable problem and procedures for researching it. It is an effort to demystify the strategies of textual placement and practices of textual maintenance of a rhetorical opponent. Triana and Todd are both provide models for rhetoricians engaging in acts of rhetorical reconstruction. Triana utilizes the power of the Freedom of Information Act to learn more about the rhetorical strategy and activities of Coca Cola. Todd studies the Young Americans for Freedom to learn about Kyle Bristow's strategy, and then to formulate a plan to defeat Kyle Bristow's strategy. In relationship to rhetorical

reconstruction, rhetorical mystification will always exist in the past tense. The press release is faxed to a newspaper, but it takes time and resources to uncover the mysteries of the faxers' strategy, practices, and knowledge.

In the *Archaeology of Knowledge* Foucault asks, how can researchers understand the history of ideas and their transmission (21) in relationship to practitioner strategy and practice? How do researchers come to definitively understand this notion of the spirit of the times, or the "community of meanings" that historians find in the study of past conversations (22)? Foucault is concerned with the methodological problem of how scholars reason and re-reason our words, the words of other people, and words from another place and time:

> Aren't you sure of what you're saying? Are you going to change yet again, shift your position according to the questions that are put to you, and say that the objections are not really directed at the place from which you are speaking? Are you going to declare yet again that you have never been what you have been reproached with being. (17)

Foucault's problem poses a challenge for a new rhetoric of delivery, but one that is not insurmountable. While the original meaning and full intention are difficult to discern, in digital environments it is possible to research patterns of activity. These practices can include techniques such as (rhetorical) data mining. Rhetorical data mining may involve comparing digitally archived data, or utilizing digital search techniques and services to compare texts. It may also include examining key phrases from a press release to understand how the texts are recomposed into derivative news articles (Ridolfo and DeVoss, future.html).

It takes a considerable amount of time, effort, and research to uncover a strategy and practices of someone else's strategies of textual placement and practices of textual maintenance. It is impossible that one can ever fully research and know the experiential knowledge of delivery that someone else has attained. This situation however does not mean that uncovering the main points of someone else's strategies of textual placement and practices of textual maintenance is not in itself a significant, rhetorically valuable success. Researching into someone's practices of textual maintenance may yield important breadcrumbs that may help explain their strategy of textual placement. Recognizing rhetorical delivery as epistemic may also mean that an experiential knowledge of rhetorical delivery may in turn help individuals or groups identify other people's rhetorical strategies for delivery. Doug Eyman's work also traces the circulation of texts. In his work on ecologies of writing, Eyman proposes that a circulation analysis, "tracing and mapping the connections between digital texts," can help explain the rhetorical impact of texts:

> although these methods are related to and sometimes derived from methods used in informetrics... circulation analysis is not a "citation study," nor is it a bibliometric analysis... [circulation analysis] uses qualitative, rhetorical evaluation techniques... to discover and outline emergent ecosystems whose contours and boundaries are revealed through the structures made by textual relationships (additionally, circulation analysis looks at all references and links, not just those represented through formal citation). (202)

In this sense Eyman's proposal for circulation analysis can compliment the rhetorical study of practice (by rhetoricians).

The Pigeon and the Honeycomb

Based on my research I propose five implications for the future study of rhetorical delivery:

1) Rhetorical delivery produces a special kind of social, institutional, technological, and strategic form of knowledge;

2) Rhetorical delivery is a strategy of delivery, distribution, but is rarely a strategy of circulation. For example, strategies of delivery are made more interesting and complex through combinations of technologies: the analog and the digital, the digital stencil and the physical brick wall, the pigeon and the phone;

3) Thus, the digital will never fully obsolete the analog stencil, but combined with other technologies, the strategic reach of the stencil can be extended, through combining technologies, as part of a complex strategy of rhetorical delivery

4) Rhetorical delivery is a distinct concept from distribution and circulation: circulation is a term more suited for researchers, as delivery and distribution are for practitioners.

5) Technologies of delivery (the medium theory of McLuhan) should be treated as distinct from rhetorical strategies of delivery. Consider the pigeon as a technology, verses the pigeon as a part of a strategy and a rhetorical situation.

Based on my study I propose that there are three directions for the future study of rhetorical delivery:

1) The continued study of contemporary *rhetorical* practice as a platform for theory-building;
2) The study of how *technologies* of delivery combine and scaffold on top of each other: the pigeon and the cell phone;
3) Archival work that examines different historical practices, the *technology* and *rhetoric* of the Honeycomb;

Through the pursuit of these three areas of study, I propose that rhetorical theories of delivery will continue to expand well beyond the narrow confines of Greek and Roman delivery. While older technologies of delivery may fade into history, the pigeon serves as a reminder that they are never far away. The stories of the pigeon and the Honeycomb remind scholars that beyond the technology and its significance to a particular moment in history, the rhetorical strategy proper has the potential to inform contemporary theories of rhetoric.

WORKS CITED

Amram, David W. The Makers of Hebrew Books in Italy. London: The Holland P Ltd., 1988.

Aristotle. Rhetoric. Trans. W. R. Roberts. Minneapolis: Dover Publications, Incorporated, 2004.

Bagdol, Alese. "MSU YAF labeled hate group." The Michigan Daily 22 Mar. 2007. The University of Michigan. 27 Jan. 2009 <http://www.michigandaily.com/content/msu-yaf-labeled-hate-group>.

Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg, eds. The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001.

Bonfil, Robert. Jewish Life in Renaissance Italy. Trans. Anthony Oldcorn. University of California P, 1994.

---. Nofet Zufim: on Hebrew Rhetoric. Jerusalem: The Magnes P. Hebrew University., 1981.

Burke, Kenneth. A rhetoric of motives. University of California P, 1969.

Butler, Harold Edgeworth. The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian: Books X-XII. New York: G. P. Putnam's sons, 1922.

---. Writing Space: Computers, Hypertext, and the Remediation of Print. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000.

Certeau, Michel De. The Practice of Everyday Life. New York: University of California P, 2002.

Cicero, Marcus T. Cicero Brutus, Orator: Rhetorical Treatises. New York: Harvard UP, 1952.

"Coca-Cola's image main casualty of contract cuts: University only one if 19 schools who have suspended Coke contracts." The Michigan Daily 26 Jan. 2006. University of Michigan. 1 Feb. 2009 <http://www.michigandaily.com/content/coca-colas-image-main-casualty-contract-cuts>.

Cope, William and Mary Kalantzis. Multiliteracies: Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures. London: Routledge, 2000.

Corbett, Edward P. Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student. New York: Oxford UP, 1990.

Cornhill Magazine. "The Pigeon as a War Messenger." The Living Age Sept. 1887: 57-62.

Davidson, Jeremy. "Coke to return to campus: University reinstates contracts with soft-drink giant after Coca-Cola agrees to third-party audits." The Michigan Daily 11 Apr. 2006. University of Michigan. 1 Feb. 2009 <http://www.michigandaily.com/content/coke-return-campus>.

DeLuca, Kevin. Image Politics: The New Rhetoric of Environmental Activism. New York: Guilford, 1999.

DeVoss, Danielle Nicole., Cushman, Ellen., and Grabill, Jeffery. T. Infrastructure and composing: The when of new-media writing. College Composition and Communication, 57(1), 14–44, 2005.

DeVoss, Dànielle Nicole., and Porter, James E. Why Napster matters to writing: Filesharing as a new ethic of digital delivery. Computers and Composition, 23(1) 178–210, 2006.

Domsic, Melissa. "'Catch an immigrant' game fires up debate on campuses." CNN.com 1 Nov. 2006. Cable News Network. 27 Jan. 2009 <http://www.cnn.com/2006/POLITICS/10/23/CNNU.msu.immigrant/index.html>.

---. "A second chance for Coke: Students continue campaign for Coca-Cola ban despite end of U-M boycott." The State News 12 Apr. 2006. Michigan State University. 11 Feb. 2009 <http://www.statenews.com/index.php/article/2006/04/a_second_chance_for_coke>.

Donnelly, Sally B. "Looking out on hostile territory: Why the Iraqi city the Americans conquered a year ago is still a threat." TIme Magazine 6 Nov. 2005. Time/CNN. 12 Jan. 2009 <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1126748,00.html>.

Duncan, Anne. Performance and Identity in the Classical World. New York: Cambridge UP, 2006.

Eyman, Douglas. Digital, rhetoric: Ecologies and economies of circulation. Unpublished dissertation. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 2007.

Frank, Daniel. The Jewish Philosophy Reader. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Harris, Maurice. Medieval Jews: From the Moslem Conquest of Spain to the Discovery of America. 5th ed. Bloch Co., 1929.

Helsley, Sheri L. "11 A Special Afterword to Graduate Students in Rhetoric."

Rhetorical Memory and Delivery: Classical Concepts for Contemporary Composition and Communication. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1993. 157-159.

Herrmann, Klaus. "The Reception of Hekhalot-Literature in Yohanan Alemanno's Autograph MS Paris 849." Studies in Jewish Manuscripts. Ed. Joseph Dan and Klaus Herrmann. Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

Holthouse, David. "Black Hats on Campus: Student Hate Group Roils Michigan State." Southern Poverty Law Center Intelligence Report. Winter 2007. SPLC. 27 Jan. 2009 <http://www.splcenter.org/intel/intelreport/article.jsp?aid=869>

Howard, Rebecca Moore. "Activist Strategies for Textual Multiplicity: Writing Center Leadership on Plagiarism and Authorship." By Rebecca Moore Howard and Tracy Hamler Carrick. The Writing Center Director's Resource Book. Ed. Christina Murphy and Byron L. Stay. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2006. 249-260.

"Indian pigeons lose out to e-mail." BBC News 26 Mar. 2002. British Broadcasting Corporation. 12 Jan. 2009 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/1892085.stm>.

"Indymedia Server Takedown." Electronic Frontier Foundation. Aug. 2005. EFF. 5 Feb. 2009 <www.eff.org>.

Jacobi, Martin. "The Canon of Delivery in Rhetorical Theory: Selections, Commentary, and Advice." Delivering College Composition: The Fifth Canon. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, Inc., a subsidiary of Reed Elsevier Inc., 2006. 17-29.

Johnson, Nan. Nineteenth-Century Rhetoric in North America: Nan Johnson. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991.

Kennedy, George A. Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

---. The Art of Persuasion in Greece. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1963.

Killer Coke. 1 Feb. 2009 <http://www.killercoke.org/>.

Kress, Gunther. and van Leeuwen, Theodore. Multimodal Discourse. London: Arnold, 2001.

Lauer, Janice M. Invention in Rhetoric and Composition. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press and the WAC Clearinghouse, 2004.

Lehman, Stan. "Pigeons fly cell phones into Brazilian prison." SFGate. 1 Apr. 2009. San Francisco Chronicle. 1 Apr. 2009 <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/n/a/2009/03/31/international/i133153D07.DTL&tsp=1>.

Lesley, Arthur M. "Review." Rhetorica 1 (1983): 101-08

---. "Sefer Nofet Tsufim and the Study of Rhetoric." Prooftexts 4 (1984): 312-316.

Lindquist, Julie. A Place to Stand: Politics and Persuasion in a Working-Class Bar. New York: Oxford UP, 2002.

Machak, Lindsay. "Students challenge YAF to host event in public view." The State News 26 Sept. 2006. Michigan State University. 1 May 2008 <http://www.statenews.com/index.php/article/2006/09/students_challenge_yaf>.

Margolis, Max L., and Alexander Marx. A History of the Jewish People. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1927.

McGuire, Michael. "Chapter 6 Materialism: Reductionist Dogma or Critical Rhetoric?." Rhetoric and Philosophy. Ed. Richard A. Cherwitz. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1990. 187-210.

Michel., Foucault,. The Archaeology of Knowledge & The Discourse on Language. New York: Pantheon, 1982.

Miletto, Gianfranco. "The Teaching Program of David Ben Abraham and His Son Abraham Provenzali in Its Historical-Cultural Context." Cultural Intermediaries: Jewish Intellectuals in Early Modern Italy. Comp. David B. Ruderman and Giuseppe Veltri. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania P, 2004. 127-148.
Murphy, James J. A Short History of Writing Instruction. 2nd ed. Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001.

National Review. "Postal Communication, Past and Present." The Living Age Sept. 1887: 284-92.

Nowak, Joey. "Law center lists YAF as 'hate group'" The State News 15 Mar. 2007. Michigan State University. 27 Jan. 2009 <http://www.statenews.com/index.php/article/2007/03/law_center_lists_yaf>.

Paul, Fredricka, and Lindsay Machak. "YAF cancels original event, plans others." The State News 29 Sept. 2006. Michigan State University. 27 Jan. 2009 <http://www.statenews.com/index.php/article/2006/09/yaf_cancels_original>.

--. "Student group protests Coca-Cola Corporation on campus." The State News 29 Sept. 2006. Michigan State University. 1 Feb. 2009

<http://www.statenews.com/index.php/article/2006/09/student_group_protests>
.

Polesnak, Kathleen. "Protesting pop: Students, union worker rally outside Administration Building to remove Coke from campus." The State News 22 Feb. 2006. Michigan State University. 1 Feb. 2009 <http://www.statenews.com/index.php/article/2006/02/Protesting_pop>.

Popkin, Richard H., ed. The Columbia History of Western Philosophy. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999. Questia. 2 May 2008

Quintilian. Institutio Oratoria. Trans. H. E. Butler. Cambridge: Loeb-Harvard UP, 1980.

Rabinowitz, Isaac. The Book of Honeycomb's Flow: Sepher Nophet Suphim. Cornell University Press, 1983.

Ramus, Peter. The Logike of the Moste Excellent Philosopher P. Ramus Martyr. Trans. Roland Macllmaine. Ed. Catherine Dunne. Northridge, CA: San Fernando Valley State College Renaissance Editions, 1969.

Ridolfo, Jim, and Dànielle DeVoss. "Composing for Recomposition: Rhetorical Velocity and Delivery." Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy 13 (2009). 18 Jan. 2009. Kairos. 18 Jan. 2009 <http://www.technorhetoric.net/13.2/topoi/ridolfo_devoss/velocity.html>.

Rosenbaum, Si. "Embattled editors get Herald out at Brown: A day after most copies of the Daily Herald were taken by members of a coalition angered by an ad, the Friday edition is distributed by hand." The Providence Journal 18 Mar. 2001. The Providence Journal. 1 Feb. 2009 <http://www.projo.com/words/brown2.htm>.

Sagrans, Erica. "From margin to center: the rise of intellectual diversity at Brown." The Brown Daily Herald 4 Apr. 2005. Brown University. 1 Feb. 2009 <http://media.www.browndailyherald.com/media/storage/paper472/news/2005/04/08/Columns/From-Margin.To.Center.The.Rise.Of.Intellectual.Diversity.At.Brown-918142.shtml>.

Sauer, Beverly. Living Documents. In Critical Power Tools. Es. Scott, Blake J. Bernadette Longo, and Katherine V. Wells. State University of New York Press, 2006.

--. The Rhetoric of Risk: Technical Documentation in Hazardous Environments. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003.

Shulvass, Moses A. The Jews in the World of the Renaissance. Trans. Elvin I. Kose. Leiden - E.J. Brill and Spertus College of Judaica P, 1973.

Simon, Lou Anna K. "Immigration: Too important an issue for gimmicks." Weblog post. From the President's Desk. 21 Sept. 2006. 1 May 2008 <http://president.msu.edu/desk/index.php?/site/immigration_too_important_an_issue_for_gimmicks/>.

Skinner-Linnenberg, Virginia. Dramatizing Writing: Reincorporating Delivery in the Classroom. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1997.

Sun, Huatong. "Expanding the scope of localization: A cultural usability perspective on mobile text messaging use in American Chinese contexts." Diss. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 2004.

Thonssen, Lester, and A. Craig Baird. Speech Criticism. the Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1948.

Tirosh-Samuelson, Hava. "Jewish Philosophy on the Eve of Modernity." History of Jewish Philosophy. Ed. Daniel H. Frank and Oliver Learman. Routledge, 1997.

--. "The Book of the Honeycomb's Flow: Sepher Nofet Suphim." Renaissance Quarterly Summer 37 (1984): 234-38.

--. "Messer Leon, Judah." Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 1998. 332.

Trimbur, John. "Composition and the Circulation of Writing." College Composition and Communication 52 (2), 188-219, 2000.

---. "Delivering the Message: Typography and the Materiality of Writing." Visual Rhetoric in a Digital World. Ed. Carolyn Handa. Bedford St. Martins, 2004.

"Unthinkable! Undrinkable! A Campus Campaign Overview." United Students Against Sweatshops - Campus Organizing Guide. United Students Against Sweatshops. 10 Feb. 2009 <http://www.studentsagainstsweatshops.org/docs/CokeOrganizingManual.pdf>.

Van Bekkum, Wout Jac. "Jewish Intellectual Culture in Renaissance Context." Medieval and Renaissance Humanism: Rhetoric, Representation, and Reform. Ed. Stephen Gersh and Bert Roest. Boston: Brill, 2003. 227-241.

Welch, Kathleen E. Electric Rhetoric: Classical Rhetoric, Oralism, and a New Literacy. Cambridge: MIT, 1999.

Welch, Nancy. Living room: Teaching public writing in a post-publicity era. College Composition and Communication, 56 (3), 470-92, 2005.

White, Eric Charles. Kaironomia: On the Will-to-Invent. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1987.

Wysocki, Anne Frances. "Chapter 6 The Multiple Media of Texts: How Onscreen and Paper Texts Incorporate Words, Images, and Other Media." What Writing Does and How It Does It: An Introduction to Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices. Ed. Charles Bazerman and Paul Prior. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004. 123-163.

Zinberg, Israel. A History of Jewish Literature: Italian Jewry in the Renaissance Era. Trans. Bernard Martin. KTAV House, Inc., 1974.

Zonta, Mauro. Hebrew Scholasticism in the Fifteenth Century: a History and Source Book. 1st ed. Springer-Verlag New York, LLC, 2006