

Carolinas Communication Annual

Volume XXXI

Published by the Carolinas Communication Association

FORUM: LETTING SOUTHERN ARCHIVES SPEAK

Introduction

Melody Lehn

Listening for the Dissonant Voice: The Southern Archive as Cacophonous Song

Sean Patrick O'Rourke

In Defense of Crap Archives: Archival Possibilities for Researching First Ladies

Melody Lehn

A is for Archive: The Politics of Research in the Southern Archive

Camille Kaminski Lewis

Pedagogical Reflections: Teaching, Texts, and Southern Archival Spaces

Cynthia King

Local Intervention and the Archival Trap

Brandon Inabinet & Luke Christie

ESSAYS

Edward Snowden: Rhetorical Reasoning and Proposing Self-Names and Other-Names

Susan Opt

No Girls Allowed: A Textual Analysis of Newspaper Coverage of the National Council of Women's Organization's Protest of the 2003 Masters Tournament

Mary Tucker-McLaughlin & Cindy Elmore

GIFTS INC (GREAT IDEAS FOR TEACHING STUDENTS IN THE CAROLINAS)

Engaging Appalachia: Digital Literacies, Mobile Media, and a Sense of Place

Mark Nunes

Assessing Conflict Management through Self-Authored Student Mediation Role-Plays in the Basic Course

Andrew W. Cole

INVITED GIFTS INC

The Opportunity to Choose Courage,... What Will You Do?

Tamara Burk, Kayla L. Mallett, & Kiosha Gregg Boyles

Carolinas Communication Association Officers (2014-2015)

<u>President:</u>	Jason Black, University of Alabama
<u>1st Vice President:</u>	Robert Westerfelhaus, College of Charleston
<u>2nd Vice President:</u>	Jennifer Brubaker, University of North Carolina Wilmington
<u>Secretary:</u>	Melody Lynn, University of South Carolina, Extended University
<u>Treasurer:</u>	Lynn Gregory, Appalachian State University
<u>Annual Editor:</u>	Jason Brian Munsell, Columbia College
<u>Web Manager:</u>	Elena Martínez-Vidal, Midlands Technical College

Carolinas Communication Association Life Members

Ray Camp, North Carolina State University

Lynn Cherry, College of Charleston

Jean DeHart, Appalachian State University

Carol Drowota, Charleston Southern University

Carol Dykers, Salem College

Keith Griffin, Southern Illinois University Charleston

Brandon Inabinet, Furman University

Spoma Jovanovic, University of North Carolina Greensboro

Dolores Jones, Charleston Southern University

Steve Madden, Coastal Carolina University

Elena Martínez-Vidal, Midlands Technical College

Jason Brian Munsell, Columbia College

Jody Natalle, University of North Carolina Greensboro

Sean O'Rourke, Furman University

Roy Schwartzman, University of North Carolina Greensboro

Nancy Snow, North Carolina State University

Charmaine Wilson, University of South Carolina Aiken

Carolinas Communication Annual, Volume XXXI

Editor

Jason Brian Munsell
Columbia College

2015 Editorial Board

Katie Anthony
University of Southern Mississippi

Jason Black
University of Alabama

Jean DeHart
Appalachian State University

Lisa Flanagan
Xavier University of Louisiana

Wes Fondren
Coastal Carolina University

Daniel Grano
University of North Carolina Charlotte

Ariel Gratch
Georgia College & State University

Jade C. Huell
Columbia College

Richard Leeman
University of North Carolina Charlotte

Anita Mixon
University of Illinois

Gretchen Stein Rhodes
Louisiana State University

Roy Schwartzman
University of North Carolina Greensboro

Jillian Tullis
University of North Carolina Charlotte

Robert Westerfelhaus
College of Charleston

Donata Worrell
Rockingham Community College

Carolinas Communication Annual

FORUM: LETTING SOUTHERN ARCHIVES SPEAK

Introduction <i>Melody Lehn</i>	1
Listening for the Dissonant Voice: The Southern Archive as Cacophonous Song <i>Sean Patrick O'Rourke</i>	4
In Defense of Crap Archives: Archival Possibilities for Researching First Ladies <i>Melody Lehn</i>	10
A is for Archive: The Politics of Research in the Southern Archive <i>Camille Kaminski Lewis</i>	15
Pedagogical Reflections: Teaching, Texts, and Southern Archival Spaces <i>Cynthia King</i>	19
Local Intervention and the Archival Trap <i>Brandon Inabinet & Luke Christie</i>	24

ESSAYS

Edward Snowden: Rhetorical Reasoning and Proposing Self-Names and Other-Names <i>Susan Opt</i>	30
No Girls Allowed: A Textual Analysis of Newspaper Coverage of the National Council of Women's Organization's Protest of the 2003 Masters Tournament <i>Mary Tucker-McLaughlin & Cindy Elmore</i>	45

GIFTS INC (GREAT IDEAS FOR TEACHING STUDENTS IN THE CAROLINAS)

Engaging Appalachia: Digital Literacies, Mobile Media, and a Sense of Place <i>Mark Nunes</i>	65
Assessing Conflict Management through Self-Authored Student Mediation Role-Plays in the Basic Course <i>Andrew W. Cole</i>	70

INVITED GIFTS INC

The Opportunity to Choose Courage,... What Will You Do? <i>Tamara Burk, Kayla L. Mallett, & Kiosha Gregg Boyles</i>	77
--	----

Editorial Policy (2016)

The *Carolinas Communication Annual*, the peer-reviewed, state/regional journal published by the Carolinas Communication Association (representing both North Carolina and South Carolina), accepts the submission of scholarly articles (both critical essays and research reports) on an ongoing basis. While articles by authors in the Carolinas and about topics relevant to the Carolinas and the surrounding region are particularly relevant for this journal, the call is open to authors from around the country, and to a wide range of topics from multiple methodologies and perspectives within the larger Communication Studies disciplines. Furthermore, the journal is interested in submissions regarding pedagogical ideas for our GIFTS INC (Great Ideas for Teaching Students in the Carolinas) area. Those submissions should generally be modeled after activity essays published in *Communication Teacher*.

Critical essays and research reports should generally be no longer than 6000-7000 words in length and should follow the latest editions of MLA, Chicago, or APA style manuals. GIFTS INC essays should generally be no longer than 2000 words also utilizing a specific citation style. Authors should submit their essays electronically (in Word format) to the editor by May 14, 2016. Please include abstract, author identification information and correspondence information in a separate cover sheet or cover letter to ensure blind review. Authors should only submit one work per year to the Annual and the work should not be under review with any other journal. Authors should also note in the cover letter the history of the submitted essay as well as indications that, when necessary, the research meets ethical standards of research (ex., IRB approval if relevant). The editor reserves the right to reject any submission that does not meet the basic standards above or seems to indicate a lack of ethical work.

The *Annual* became contracted with EBSCO in 2014. The journal is searchable on EBSCO through its *Communication Source* database as of August, 2015. The journal's acceptance rate is appropriately 25%.

As of the writing of this call, the new editor for the 2016-2018 Volumes of the *Carolinas Communication Annual* has not yet been elected by the association's membership (editors serve a three year term). A full call with editor information will be available October, 2015 on the association's webpage:

<http://carolinascommunication.org/>

Editor's Letter

Dear Members and Readers,

I am pleased to present the 2015 volume of the *Carolinas Communication Annual*. We have a bit different and expanded editorial board and I'm so very thankful for their service; a couple of which volunteered their work during crunch time when I needed additional readers. Thus, I am truly and sincerely (yes, both!) indebted to the reviewers for their substantial service to the Carolinas Communication Association. Each essay submitted goes through a rigorous blind review process; and our rejection rate this year was approximately 27%. I admit I did assert my role as editor to invite a brief work in light of the Charleston massacre. Readers might also note the continued new look of the journal. I reformatted the journal with my first volume in 2013 to make it look much more like other academic journals.

And so I fear this is the final year of my three year term as editor of our journal. I'm heartbroken. As I type this letter, I weep uncontrollably. This is the end of my glory days. Twenty or thirty years from now, if I'm still alive, I'll be at some academic conference, drinking at the hotel bar, intoxicated with nostalgia, relaying to every passerby, "You know, I was editor of the *Carolinas Communication Annual* from 2013-2015, Volumes 29-31." Oh, I can see it. I will be lauded. I will be lauded. Word will spread throughout the bar. A mass of graduate students will gather around me and ask for autographs. "No, no, young one. I'm very sorry. That would be inappropriate. I'll only sign on a piece of paper..." But I digress...

After contracting with EBSCO in 2014, we are now, as of August 2015, searchable on the *Communication Source* database. I had hoped that such a process of contracting with EBSCO and getting on a database would be a pretty simple task. I was wrong. It has taken two years to make this happen. Moreover, I had hoped to get back issues (Volumes 1-28) up as well; but this seems a near impossibility in light of what EBSCO has told me about their policies. I'm hoping the next editor can inspire EBSCO to make that happen.

I want to also thank publically Jesika Brooks, Educational Technology Coordinator at Columbia College. When I had technical formatting woes with this issue she magically fixed everything. I could not have put this volume together without her help!

I like this volume very much. You'll notice that we start with a forum. That forum took place (live!) at our conference last year in Greenville, SC. I think it's an invaluable piece for those of us who do archival research; and, well everyone. I think, too, that the two essays are exemplar ones. In light of the space I had, I wanted one that was "big" and one that focused on the local; granted Augusta isn't in the Carolinas, but I'm so mighty that I'm able to throw a stone across the Savannah River. The GIFTS INC pieces are novel. One local and sort of cutting-edge in light of tech issues and the other very timely in light of the many conflicts we've been dealing with this past summer.

And that, perhaps, (the tone of the summer) is why I invited a piece by one of my colleagues. This summer, in many ways, has been the best of times and the worst of times. Personally, I have been dealing with my mother's health as she deals with late stage breast cancer. But I was able to fly home to Tulsa and spend a lot of time with her and my family. She fights on. And we can't help but acknowledge the wisdom of the Supreme Court in regards to equality, but also the horror of the shootings in Charleston (and elsewhere... as ever it seems...). The way the family members of those murdered in Charleston and Charlestonians generally responded to the massacre are lessons of hope; and that damn flag is finally down! As teachers and scholars of Communication Studies we must embrace such incredibly messy and horrendous events as teachable moments; thus, the final short, invited piece. Indeed, all of us have a duty to muster up the courage to do what we can to fight for the justice and the dignity of all people.

I dedicate this final volume under my editorship to my mother, Barbara Lee Munsell, and the Emmanuel Nine.

Sincerely,
Jason Brian Munsell
Columbia, South Carolina
September 2015

Forum: Letting Southern Archives Speak

Introduction

Melody Lehn

In the introduction to a 2006 forum on archives for *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, Charles E. Morris III announced an “archival turn” in the field of rhetorical studies. This turn, Morris explained, had less to do with any new innovation in how rhetorical critics engage archives in their teaching and scholarship and more to do with rethinking how critics increasingly regard archives as “inventional sites of rhetorical pasts” that warrant “sustained critical-rhetorical reflection by scholars in this discipline.”¹ The authors in this forum gathered at the October 2014 meeting of the Carolinas Communication Association in Greenville, South Carolina with the express purpose of engaging archives, particularly Southern archives, in the way that Morris suggests: as inventional sites of rhetorical pasts constituted in complex ways by regional histories, special investments, political challenges, and public memories that do not always reflect what Southern archives and their keepers have to say.

What the authors in this forum could not have anticipated was a gunman entering the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina and shooting nine parishioners meeting for a prayer service on the evening of June 17, 2015. As a direct consequence of this unspeakable tragedy and its implications for race relations in America, the Confederate flag was lowered across the South and eventually removed from the grounds of the South Carolina State House. The governor of Alabama soon followed suit and ordered the flag be removed from a Confederate memorial at the state capitol. As retailers across the nation reassessed the sale of Confederate-inspired merchandise, concurrent conversations about civility, tradition, symbolism, commemoration, and regional pride made their way into the national public discourse. The moment is opportune to let Southern archives speak and to reconsider how the preservation of selective Southern pasts might empower or hold power over rhetorical critics.

To this end, Sean Patrick O’Rourke’s essay forecasts the core questions that concern the authors of this forum: “How should scholars engage Southern archives? What obstacles do we face? What posture should we adopt? And for what should we be looking and listening?” For O’Rourke, a productive way to address these questions is by examining the tensions surrounding “dissonant voices” housed and hidden in the archives. Voices marked as “dissonant” not only include voices that have been lost or forgotten, but also those that have – sometimes purposefully – been marginalized because they call into question popular local histories. O’Rourke’s timely articulation of the tensions surrounding Civil Rights rhetoric in the conference city, Greenville, serves as a cogent call for critics to listen for dissonant voices in and beyond the archives.

Melody Lehn is assistant professor of speech communication at the University of South Carolina, Extended University in Columbia, South Carolina. She expresses her gratitude to each member of this forum, to the anonymous reviewers who offered detailed feedback that considerably strengthened these papers, and to Jason Munsell for his editorial guidance to publication. Correspondence to: Melody Lehn, University of South Carolina, 901 Sumter Street, Byrnes 620, Columbia, South Carolina, 29208, USA. Email: MelodyL@mailbox.sc.edu

Melody Lehn examines one such dissonant voice from the archives, when she recalls a chance encounter with a segregationist's fiery pamphlet that denounced Eleanor Roosevelt for her observations on Southern poverty. Letting such dissonant voices and texts remain untouched by critical reflection, Lehn asserts, can perpetuate a parallel marginalization and gendering of both Southern archives and U.S. first ladies. Having located the pamphlet in what one writer terms a "crap archive," Lehn argues for the merits of such archives as supplemental resources that can account for contested aspects of a first lady's rhetorical performance, in ways that what is preserved and highlighted in more prominent archives and narratives cannot. The low status of alternative and regional archives, Lehn insists, connects to the resistance first ladies face when they use their unelected and uncompensated role as a platform for public argument.

Camille Lewis's essay illuminates the political challenges entrenched in archives, particularly when the gatekeepers of those archives are invested in both protecting and projecting an image of harmony. Accessing archives and their holdings is made all the more difficult, Lewis shows, when the critic is banned from the archives because she seeks to reveal and publicize intolerant voices. As she explains, Lewis is forbidden to enter the archives on the campus of Bob Jones University in upstate South Carolina. Her essay offers an example of Davis Houck's claim that archives are sites of "preferred memory" in which archivists can exercise control over holdings and the interpretations of those holdings.² Lewis shows the ways that questions of access both hinder and inform the efforts of critics who are uncovering histories that some might prefer remain unspoken.

In her essay, Cynthia King crafts a bridge between Southern archival research and rhetoric classrooms. After reflecting on the risks and pedagogical openings involved in entering local archives, King offers concrete examples and assignments to show how she and her students reconcile difficult questions of regionalism within the critical work of rhetoric. What is at stake for King is the way critics facilitate a broader understanding of how "individuals in their humanity precipitate civility even toward those whose character and actions offend us." Following Edwin Black, King advocates for a perspective of rhetorical criticism that compels the critic to temporarily suspend judgment and prejudice to interpret its "object on the object's own terms."³ The role of both the teacher and the critic, in King's view, is to empower students to engage those difficult questions with both a critical toolbox and a conscience.

Modeling King's charge to teachers to empower and support students in their expeditions into the archives, Brandon Inabinet and Luke Christie conclude the forum by recounting their experiences working with a generally unknown speech of John C. Calhoun for Inabinet's course in Early American Public Address. Inabinet and Christie discuss the urge of Southern students to walk into archives that go beyond basic course knowledge to explain more local and particular histories of how rhetoric functions to cultivate power. In the unfortunate case of Southern white males studying local eighteenth and nineteenth century speech, even respect for eloquent argument can appear as undue praise – in this case, for John C. Calhoun, for Southern slaveholders, or even for the system for slavery they perpetuated. By collapsing barriers between teacher and student, this reflective dialogue models how to nuance these archival pressures without condemning the original impulse to let local archives speak.

Notes

¹ Charles E. Morris III, "The Archival Turn in Rhetorical Studies: Or, the Archive's Rhetorical (Re)Turn," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 9, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 113-15, quotation on 113.

² Davis W. Houck, "On or About June 1988," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 9, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 132-37.

³ Edwin Black, "A Note on Theory and Practice in Rhetorical Criticism," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 44, no. 4 (Fall 1980): 331-36, quotation on 334.

Listening for the Dissonant Voice: The Southern Archive as Cacophonous Song

Sean Patrick O'Rourke

In her now classic rendition of the trial of those charged in 1947 with Greenville, South Carolina's last lynching, British-born and New York-based writer Rebecca West wrote of a Southern town dripping with humidity and moving to the "coloratura hymns" sung "with hope and vehemence" on Sunday evenings at the First Baptist Church.¹ Taking her cue from the music, West saw the trial of the 31 accused as an opera sung in a "rhetorical" note, a melodramatic yet persuasive farce designed to distract residents from "the cloying, clinging heat" and to convince them that it wasn't really that hot after all. The heat, of course, was both literal and figurative, for the Willie Earle murder trial was held in late May and involved all of the theatrics of a Southern courtroom in which race was an issue: segregated seating, appeals to community, friendship, and heritage; the specter of black brutality looming, however improbably, over a gang of whites who mutilated and murdered a black man; and the sense that "we all know" what ought to happen in cases like this. All of the accused were found not guilty, though everyone knew they had lynched Willie Earle because they admitted it out of court.²

The dominant white response to the verdict, sung in different keys throughout the civil rights era and after, was to downplay racial conflict and instead give voice to a chorus of racial harmony in a tolerant, modern city. Even those appalled by the case were concerned that the coverage of it would have a negative effect "on Greenville's image as a progressive, cultural, growing city of the New South"³ and therefore on economic development. As late as 1956, Mayor Kenneth Cass stressed, in an interview for *Life* magazine, that "there's always been a good feeling in the race situation" in Greenville, noting that there would be "no trouble here unless an agitator comes in and stirs things up."⁴ Guardians of Greenville's image have since promoted what my colleague Steve O'Neill has called a tone of "self-congratulation." O'Neill notes that "the historical memory of the civil rights years in Greenville . . . recalls desegregation of public facilities and schools undertaken voluntarily on the part of the establishment, 'integration with dignity,' integration carried out with 'grace and style'."⁵

However, as O'Neill, several of our colleagues and students, and I have sought to point out for some time now, resistance to the civil rights movement was strong, often vitriolic, and occasionally violent,⁶ and the public memory of the period is in constant need of adjustment and correction. We have found evidence for these claims in various archives in the region, including the Carolina Room of the Greenville County Library, Furman University's Special Collections, and the South Carolina Historical Archives, to name a few.

Sean Patrick O'Rourke is the Brown Foundation Fellow and Distinguished Visiting Professor of Rhetoric at Sewanee: The University of the South and professor of rhetoric at Furman University. He would like to thank the participants in the 2014 Carolinas Communication Association panel on "Southern Archives" for their comments on an earlier draft of this essay. Special thanks to Furman alums Kira Kaplan, Luke Christie, Melody Lehn, and Brandon Inabinet for their help. Correspondence to: Sean Patrick O'Rourke, 135 Furman Hall, Furman University, 3300 Poinsett Highway, Greenville, SC 29613, USA. Email: sean.orourke@furman.edu

How should scholars of this period's rhetoric, on civil rights issues, engage Southern archives? What obstacles do we face? What posture should we adopt? And for what should we be looking and listening?⁷ In the brief space available in this forum, I want to suggest five tensions archival researchers might acknowledge, embrace, and engage.

The first of these, suggested above, is the tension between history and memory. Historians tend to think that:

history is what trained historians do, a reasoned reconstruction of the past rooted in research; it tends to be critical and skeptical of human motive and action, and therefore more secular than what people commonly call memory. History can be read by or belong to everyone; it is more relative, and contingent on place, chronology, and scale. If history is shared and secular, memory is often treated as a sacred set of absolute meanings and stories, possessed as the heritage or identity of a community. Memory is often owned, history interpreted. Memory is passed down through generations; history is revised. Memory often coalesces in objects, sites, and monuments; history seeks to understand contexts in all their complexity. History asserts the authority of academic training and canons of evidence; memory carries the often more immediate authority of community membership and experience.⁸

Rhetoricians, however, can and should complicate this dichotomy and engage it as an opportunity. Rhetoricians tend to see history and public memory as two species of rhetoric: two spheres of recollection and interpretation, scholarly and public, which overlap in interesting and suggestive ways. The differences are in the penumbra, the shadows cast by each on the other, but at all times the activities of invention – of constructing claims and supporting evidence and persuading an audience – are very similar.⁹

Public memory is best when it functions more like good history – that is, when it is critiqued and revised – and history is best when it is conducted as a species of rhetoric – as an activity of engaged invention and argumentation that operates controversially – through research, interpretation, and thesis and case building, of course, but also through refutation and rebuttal, cross examination, and ongoing argument. History in this sense is fluid, the lifeblood of civic culture, and rhetoric is its method. With a posture appropriately balanced, archival researchers can help history nourish and correct public memory and make rhetoric the means by which a culture keeps history and memory in productive tension and conversation. The overlap between history and civic memory provides space in our classrooms for rhetorical education, and Southern archives offer fertile sites of historical, and therefore rhetorical, invention.¹⁰

A second, related tension is between viewing the archive as a kind of sacristy and the equally alluring notion that the Southern archive is only another of the dominant culture's tools of authoritative (and perhaps authoritarian) propaganda. Neither view is helpful because no true archive is wholly sacred or profane.

To approach the archive as sacred is to make it a site of cultural adoration, worship, and veneration. When researchers adopt this posture, they engage in what LaCapra years ago called the “archive as fetish”: the seductive notion that the archive provides something more than “traces of the past” and can therefore serve not only as proof of the past but also (to use Biesecker's terms) as an “ultimate arbiter” of history and cultural identity.¹¹ This perspective encourages a view of the past as definitive, immutable, and uncontested – as “heritage,” – promotes a research strategy designed to find evidence that supports a pre-existing or predetermined claim or position, and fosters a desire to purify the past by ridding it of messy counterclaims.¹²

But approaching the archive as profane, as a font of propaganda from a dominant culture, can be an equally troublesome stance. From this perspective the researcher enters with an intent to undermine – or to desecrate, violate, defile, and plunder – and adversarial intent colors the research, sometimes in unproductive ways. Of course, interventionist critics often view archives through critiques of domination and power and have produced excellent, often wonderful studies that undermine existing hagiographies. And yet, negotiating the sacred/profane tension is not easy. The balanced stance will vary from one archive to another – moving from the Museum of the Confederacy to the South Carolina Historical Archives requires a distinct shift of posture – because each archive offers a different purpose and level of advocacy. Negotiating this tension entails, at the very least, holding a hermeneutics of suspicion in productive tension with a hermeneutics of faith.

Such considerations almost inevitably raise a third tension: between intervention – the scholar’s active, enthusiastic engagement of the materials – and detachment – the requirement of distance from the archival materials so that they can be assessed, to the extent possible, on their own terms.¹³ The traditional articulation of this tension stresses the importance of both poles: Intervention constitutes the scholarly passion necessary to carry an investigation through to its end and detachment prevents that passion from overpowering the study.

For scholars approaching the Southern archive, however, intervention takes on added meaning and responsibility. Archives contain only what has been collected and all too often that has meant, from the civil rights years, too few dissonant voices. The leading media are routinely represented in Southern archives, as are the personal and public papers of white political, commercial, and religious leaders. Black voices, however, are not. In the archives of upcountry South Carolina, Black newspapers and radio stations are underrepresented, as are the personal papers of civil rights leaders. Even photographs of civil rights protests have mysteriously fallen from circulation.¹⁴

Intervention, in such cases, requires scholars of the period to see that archives are not only constituted for them by others, but also can be reconstituted by them for others. If voices are missing, they need to be found, recorded, transcribed, and archived. In Greenville, for example, scholars have joined forces with the Upcountry History Museum to identify key figures from the civil rights years, and several oral history projects have added considerably to the museum’s growing archive.¹⁵

A fourth tension is rooted in Pike’s distinction, adapted by Black and Leff to rhetoric, between emic and etic criticism.¹⁶ As they see it, emic criticism emerges from within a culture’s beliefs, values, rituals, and texts and critiques them on their own terms. Conversely, etic criticism approaches the subject from the outside, often using terms and standards external to the culture.

The distinction is not only a tension but also a challenge for researchers in Southern archives. In few places is the insider/outsider distinction so fraught with interpretive peril and so frequently invoked. Of even deeper concern is that the tension itself is misleading: Southerner/Non-Southerner elides distinctions within the South (South Carolina is not Mississippi and certainly not Louisiana; South Carolina’s upcountry and lowcountry differ considerably) and conceals the many layers of culture at play in the South (consider the imbrications of white/brown/black, rich/middle class/poor, Christian/Non-Christian, Protestant/Catholic, propertied/non-propertied and the conceit that there is even something that can fairly be called a “black community” or a “white community”).

Even the researcher's identity resists stable or constant definitions over time: If I was a "Yankee" when I moved to the South in 1992, I may still be a Yankee now – but certainly not the same Yankee.¹⁷

And that brings us to the final and concluding tension, which requires an act of resistance. The natural tendency of non-scholars, I suspect, is to harmonize the world in which they live. If my experience in Southern archives is any indication, the tendency to harmonize influenced many Southern archivists as well, for their holdings seem to reflect the image they had of themselves and their Southern communities. The results are Southern archives in which we now hear a song too long sung in monotonous consonance. If we allow the harmonizing tendency to dominate our scholarly efforts in Southern archives, however, we will surely miss what may be most telling – the dissonant voice. Our effort should always be to realize that Southern voices, like voices everywhere, are surely more often raised in cacophonous song than in harmonious choir, to listen for those dissonant voices, and to allow our minds to dance, as dance they should, "in the writing/reading world we live in."¹⁸

Notes

¹ The church, located at 101 W. McBee Avenue in Greenville, is now called Downtown Baptist and is the home of Grace Church.

² Rebecca West, "A Reporter at Large: Opera in Greenville," *The New Yorker*, June 14, 1947, 31-36, 39-42, 44-46, 48-50, 52-56, 58-63, quotations on 31. See also Sean Patrick O'Rourke, "Racism's Lessons Learned in Upstate: A 60-Year Retrospective," *Greenville [SC] News*, June 14, 2007, 1B, 4B.

³ Schaefer Kendrick, "What Kind of Place Was Greenville in 1947?" *Carologue: Bulletin of the South Carolina Historical Society* 8 (1992): 14.

⁴ "No Trouble Here Unless . . .," *Life*, September 17, 1956, 109-10.

⁵ Steve O'Neill, "Memory, History, and the Desegregation of Greenville, South Carolina," in *Toward the Meeting of the Waters: Currents in the Civil Rights Movement of South Carolina during the Twentieth Century*, ed. Winfred B. Moore, Jr. and Orville Vernon Burton (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2008), 286-99, quotation on 286.

⁶ See, for example, Jennifer E. M. Hill, "Reframing the Victim: Rhetoric for Segregation in *The Greenville News*," *Young Scholars in Writing: Undergraduate Research in Writing and Rhetoric* 9 (2012): 45-57.

⁷ On these questions, see Charles E. Morris, "The Archival Turn in Rhetorical Studies; Or, the Archive's Rhetorical (Re)turn," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 9 (2006): 113-15.

⁸ David Blight, "Historians and 'Memory'," *Common-Place* 2, no. 3 (2002), <http://www.common-place.org/vol-02/no-03/author/> (accessed April 19, 2015).

⁹ See, for example, Pierre Nora, "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire," *Representations* 26 (1989): 7-25; Allan Megill and Donald N. McCloskey, "The Rhetoric of History," in *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences: Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs*, ed. John S. Nelson, Allan Megill, and Donald N. McCloskey (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987), 221-38; Nancy S. Struever, "Historical Discourse," in *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Volume I: Disciplines of Discourse*, ed. Treun A. van Dijk (London: Academic Press, 1985), 249-71; J. H. Hexter, "The Rhetoric of History," *History & Theory* 6 (1967): 3-13.

¹⁰ One might also consider the problem to be, as Brad Vivian has recently suggested, a social process of remembering and forgetting. From this perspective, idioms of remembering and forgetting are both important, not least for their use in determining and reimagining standards and procedures of public judgment in the on-going conversation with and about our collective past – as well as our responsibilities to and for it. See Bradford Vivian, *Public Forgetting: The Rhetoric and Politics of Beginning Again* (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2010); Bradford Vivian, “The Paradox of Regret: Remembering and Forgetting the History of Slavery in George W. Bush’s Gorée Island Address,” *History and Memory* 24 (2012): 5-38.

¹¹ Dominick LaCapra, *History and Criticism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), 92 n.17; Barbara A. Biesecker, “Of Historicity, Rhetoric: The Archive as Scene of Invention,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 9 (2006): 124-31. See also Helen Freshwater, “The Allure of the Archive,” *Poetics Today* 24 (2003): 729-58.

¹² In a recent series of articles, Brian Ott, Eric Aoki, and Greg Dickinson demonstrate quite convincingly how detrimental the archive-as-sacred approach can be. In their studies of the Buffalo Bill Museum, Plains Indian Museum, and Cody Firearms Museum, Ott, Aoki, and Dickinson argue that the museums “privilege images of masculinity and Whiteness” to “carnivalize the violent conflicts between Anglo Americans and Native Americans,” “absolve Anglo-visitors of the social guilt regarding Western conquest through a rhetoric of reverence,” and transform “guns into inert objects of visual pleasure” that “cannot fully erase the history of violence and colonial conquering in which guns played a starring role.” See Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki, “Memory and Myth at the Buffalo Bill Museum,” *Western Journal of Communication* 69 (2005): 85-108; Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki, “Spaces of Remembering and Forgetting: The Reverent Eye/I at the Plains Indian Museum,” *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 3 (2006): 27-47; Brian L. Ott, Eric Aoki, and Greg Dickinson, “Ways of (Not) Seeing Guns: Presence and Absence at the Cody Firearms Museum,” *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 8 (2011): 215-239. For the period from the early Civil Rights Movement to today, James W. Loewen documents a prolonged, proactive attempt to make sacred the symbols and shibboleths of the Confederacy in his “Why Do People Believe the Myths about the Confederacy? Because Our Textbooks and Monuments are Wrong,” *Washington Post*, July 1, 2015, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2015/07/01/why-do-people-believe-myths-about-the-confederacy-because-our-textbooks-and-monuments-are-wrong/> (accessed August 31, 2015).

¹³ On intervention and detachment as historian’s tension, see G. Edward White, *Intervention and Detachment: Essays in Legal History and Jurisprudence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994). For more recent discussions of this tension as it applies to rhetorical criticism, see Edwin Black, “On Objectivity and Politics in Criticism” and Jason Edward Black, “Paddling the Rhetorical River, Revisiting the Social Actor: Rhetorical Criticism as Both Appreciation and Intervention,” in *Purpose, Practice, and Pedagogy in Rhetorical Criticism*, ed. Jim A. Kuypers (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2014), 1-5; 7-21.

¹⁴ Sean Patrick O’Rourke, “Circulation and Noncirculation of Photographic Texts in the Civil Rights Movement: A Case Study of the Rhetoric of Control,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 15 (2012): 685-94. See also Cara A. Finnegan, “What Is This a Picture Of? Some Thoughts on Images and Archives,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 9 (2006): 116-23.

¹⁵ Heather Yenco, Curator of Collections and Exhibitions, reports that the museum now holds complete oral histories for 12 civil rights-era activists (email to author, 26 March 2015) and one of my Furman colleagues and I have several more soon to be deposited.

¹⁶ Kenneth L. Pike, "Emic and Etic Standpoints for the Description of Behavior," Chapter Two of Pike, *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior* (Glendale, CA: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1954), 8-28; Edwin Black, "A Note on Theory and Practice in Rhetorical Criticism," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 44 (1980): 331-36; Michael Leff, "Interpretation and the Art of the Rhetorical Critic," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 44 (1980): 337-49. As is typical of scholars outside the field of linguistics, Black and Leff modify and adapt Pike's original ideas to their own purposes.

¹⁷ I am not speaking here of the well known and much discussed notion that (as one reviewer put it) "scholars' subjectivities and subject positions (intersectionalities, really) ought to be right there on the table." My point does not concern being forthcoming about one's position. It concerns instead the difficulty of determining a fixed position or identity as one immerses oneself, perhaps over decades, in a given culture into which one was not born. Identities are always in flux over time. To ignore the time issue and write as if one's subject positions are stable over time or, if not, can be readily and clearly identified at any one point in time is nearly, I think, as troublesome as pretending they do not exist at all.

¹⁸ Toni Morrison, *The Dancing Mind* (New York: Knopf, 1996), 7.

In Defense of Crap Archives: Archival Possibilities for Researching First Ladies

Melody Lehn

Not long ago, I unexpectedly came across a historical text in a local antique shop in Columbia, South Carolina. The text is a sixty-two page pamphlet written in 1950 titled *Weep No More, My Lady: A Southerner Addresses Mrs. Roosevelt's Report on the "Poor and Unhappy" South*. The author of the pamphlet is North Carolina radio personality Waldemar Eros "W.E." Debnam, a newspaperman and conservative commentator for WPTF radio who gained notoriety for authoring a refutation to Eleanor Roosevelt's syndicated newspaper column "My Day." The indictment, which originated as a two-day broadcast on Debnam's radio show, eventually circulated in published form. In May 1950, Graphic Press of Raleigh printed ten thousand copies of Debnam's argument to be sold at fifty cents apiece. By September, seventy thousand copies had been printed and were in circulation.¹

Debnam's concern stemmed from Roosevelt's recollection of a recent trip she had taken to Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Roosevelt wrote:

There is a charm about the South. The smell of magnolias, the lavender-and-old-lace feeling, still exists there. People are less hurried; they have more opportunity perhaps for the grace of living. But underneath it all I am not so sure that there are not some signs of poverty and unhappiness that will gradually have to disappear if that part of our nation is going to prosper and keep pace with the rest of it.²

After tracing the roots of her Georgia-born grandmother as a motivation for her special interest in the South, Roosevelt wrote that she could "never go into that part of the country and come away without a certain sense of sadness." "One can enjoy oneself superficially," she explained further to her readers, "but one must shut one's eyes."³

In his radio broadcast and later the pamphlet, Debnam questioned Roosevelt's ability to offer a fair and accurate picture of the South because of her Northern roots which, Debnam charged, damned her report as having been "written in the vein of a traveler returning from some foreign country." Among other things, Debnam chastised Roosevelt for noting signs of poverty and unhappiness in the South when, he pointed out, she and anyone else could have looked just about anywhere in America to see these same signs of poverty and unhappiness.

Melody Lehn is assistant professor of speech communication at the University of South Carolina, Extended University in Columbia, South Carolina. Correspondence to: Melody Lehn, University of South Carolina, 901 Sumter Street, Byrnes 620, Columbia, South Carolina, 29208, USA. Email: MelodyL@mailbox.sc.edu

In his most sharply worded passage, he wrote:

Almost from the window of her hotel apartment in New York, she can look out and see what is possibly the greatest cesspool of heaped-up-and-pressed-down-and-running-over poverty and crime and spiritual and moral and economic unhappiness on the face of the earth. We are speaking, of course, of that great Negro ghetto in the heart of New York that is Harlem.”⁴

Piling insult onto racial insult, Debnam used his pamphlet to deny a “Southern problem,” to assign the South the role of delicate woman in need of protection, and to assume the role of chief defender of this delicate woman’s honor from the unwelcome attention of Roosevelt, an interloping Northern aggressor. Meanwhile, Debnam signaled that Roosevelt’s femininity was removed with her pen, not unlike a Union soldier brandishing a rapier when pillaging through the spoils of war.

As was to be expected, the pamphlet flourished with those white Southern audiences already inclined to be uneasy about the former first lady, who to them represented an increased liberalization taking hold of parts of the Democratic party.⁵ In a letter to James Dombrowski of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Juliette Hampton Morgan, a librarian and Civil Rights activist from Montgomery, Alabama, lamented that the bookstore where she was working had to keep the pamphlet on “permanent back order” because they were selling so fast.⁶ Mrs. Ned Griffin, a reader from Florida, ordered no fewer than fifty copies to distribute to friends, one of whom wrote to *The Miami Daily News* to endorse the pamphlet as “good reading.”⁷ *Weep No More, My Lady* also found a sympathetic reader in the longtime Speaker of the Mississippi House of Representatives, Walter Sillers, Jr., who was so infuriated and persuaded by Debnam’s attack on Roosevelt that he eventually had to stop reading halfway through. “Every time I read about her and think about what she and F.D.R. have [d]one to the South it almost gives me apoplexy,” Sillers wrote in dismay to a friend.⁸

As was to be expected, Roosevelt’s critics also found value in the pamphlet, demonstrating sympathy to Debnam’s argument even when they were not Southerners. In an August 1951 editorial, anti-Roosevelt columnist Westbrook Pegler praised the cover design of the pamphlet, which featured an over-the-top caricature of Roosevelt weeping dramatically into a handkerchief against the backdrop of, as Pegler put it, a “subtle combination of stars and bars which artfully suggests the flag of the grand rebellion against northern mischief which ended with the South writhing under the heel of a despotic force.”⁹ That an “amateur” like Debnam could self-publish a pamphlet going into its tenth printing little more than a year after its initial publication, the argument went, was testament enough to its apt characterization of the despotic “old woman” trampling, rather than smelling, the magnolias on her Southern tour.

For her part, Roosevelt barely paid the charges any mind, dismissing the pamphlet when asked about it in an appearance at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill three years after the first printing. In a February 7, 1953 “My Day” column, Roosevelt recalled her recent appearance in Chapel Hill and wrote:

I was asked on one or two occasions, in view of Mr. Debnam’s booklet, “Weep No More, My Lady,” and now that I had returned to the South, if I had changed the opinions that had brought about the booklet. I was obliged to answer that, with an itinerary such as I had had, what I had been able to observe was somewhat hurried and casual.¹⁰

Much like the way Roosevelt dismissed Debnam's critique in her newspaper column, her biographers and historians have not given *Weep No More, My Lady* much attention either, mentioning it in passing or ignoring it altogether. As just one example, the otherwise excellent edited collection *The Eleanor Roosevelt Encyclopedia* fails entirely to mention Debnam or his pamphlet in entries about Roosevelt's "My Day" column, her "Civil Rights" positions on segregation, or anywhere else.¹¹ Perhaps the reasons for this dismissal are best captured by Alan Scherstuhl, whose discovery of the pamphlet echoes my own experience. Scherstuhl discovered a copy of the pamphlet in a thrift store and subsequently penned a satirical column about it in 2009 for *The Village Voice*. In a feature section of "From the Crap Archives," a tongue-in-cheek effort to uncover and expose "the finest in forgotten and bewildering crap culled from basements, thrift stores, estate sales and flea markets," Scherstuhl comically boosts Debnam in his contest with that "uppity widow" Eleanor Roosevelt while listing, more seriously, Debnam's most off-putting and fallacious quotations to further make the point that this pamphlet has more than earned its status in the "crap archive."¹²

These brief highlights of the development, circulation, and reception of W.E. Debnam's pamphlet culminate in several important and related questions: what are rhetorical critics to do with regional texts that find their way into "crap archives" like junk shops and dusty basements? Does this "crappy" status suggest that we should – as Eleanor Roosevelt, some of her biographers, and others have – discount these texts as mere instruments of propaganda that found a hospitable audience in only the most militant and prejudiced of readers? Are these "crap archives" even archives at all and if so, how valuable are they in assessing the performances of first ladies like Eleanor Roosevelt and others?

When untangling these questions, rhetoricians would be remiss to ignore a polysemous text like *Weep No More, My Lady*, for as much as it is an attack on Eleanor Roosevelt's observations of the South and of the Northern liberalism informing her positions, the pamphlet is also a critique of how Roosevelt was granted the right to speak in the first place, of her status as a former first lady, and of the first lady position itself. Her arguments, as well as her gendered pulpit, were on trial. On the very first page of the pamphlet is the premise from which all other arguments proceed: "There are some, we know, who contend Mrs. Roosevelt would have never gotten where she is if she hadn't been married to a man who was President of the United States and one of the outstanding world leaders – a lot of people insist *the* outstanding world leader – of this century."¹³ That Roosevelt was no longer the sitting first lady was irrelevant: she was still intimately connected to her former role by Debnam's approximation and made ordinary by the comparison to her extraordinary (and elected) husband. Read as a gendered critique of a first lady's authority to speak and advocate, *Weep No More* also stands as proof of the complexities facing presidential spouses who dare to pursue their own political agendas.

Archival researchers must understand, particularly when dealing with unflattering depictions like *Weep No More, My Lady*, that texts critical of a first lady's performance will not always factor prominently into how their materials or materials related to them are preserved, organized, and exhibited in the archives and museums where they are most likely to be found. Like Debnam's impulse to valorize the South and

deflect attention away from that which is not charming and graceful, the places where the papers and materials of first ladies are kept and displayed (the presidential library system, to name just one example) often have their own vested interest in how first ladies are presented in narratives of U.S. and presidential history. By their very definition, Shawn Parry-Giles reminds us, presidential libraries cannot help but to “magnify the self-interestedness of presidential administrations and [as a consequence can] provide inevitably partial and politicized views of their actions.”¹⁴ When seeking first ladies in the archives, rhetoricians must be careful not to fall into the trap of seeking out the good and neglecting the bad and the ugly. Like Eleanor Roosevelt, we too must look past the magnolias, the lavender, and the lace – the inaugural gowns, the hairdos, the White House china collections – to reach their more substantial activities and contributions to history, as well as the disapproval and indifference these activities and contributions have inspired.

Archives are not always announced as such and are often located in the most unexpected of places. Sometimes, in fact, the discovery of the text precedes the recognition – or the invention¹⁵ – of the archive. “Crap archives” and their “crappy” holdings, when taken seriously, can reflect and call into the question ways that speech genres, materials, regions, and women are gendered and discredited by their critics. Without the “crap,” rhetoricians cannot fully account for how texts circulate, resonate, and become a part of the “inflammatory” (male) and “inconsequential” (female) histories that often make up places like the South.

Notes

¹ W. E. Debnam, *Weep No More, My Lady: A Southerner Answers Mrs. Roosevelt's Report on the "Poor and Unhappy" South* (Raleigh, North Carolina: The Graphic Press, Inc., 1950). The copy I found and quote herein is the sixth printing edition, which was published on September 10, 1950; Tom Eamon, *The Making of a Southern Democracy: North Carolina Politics from Kerr Scott to Pat McCrory* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014), 33-34.

² Eleanor Roosevelt, “My Day,” *The Eleanor Roosevelt Papers Project*, February 4, 1950, http://www.gwu.edu/~erpapers/myday/displaydoc.cfm?_y=1950&_f=md001507 (accessed March 21, 2015).

³ Roosevelt, “My Day,” February 4, 1950.

⁴ Debnam, *Weep No More*, 9.

⁵ Mary Stanton, *Journey toward Justice: Juliette Hampton Morgan and the Montgomery Bus Boycott* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2006), 130-31; Eamon, *The Making of a Southern Democracy*, 33-34.

⁶ Stanton, *Journey toward Justice*, 131.

⁷ Martha Lummus, “Social Scenes: *Weep No More, My Lady*,” *The Miami Daily News*, August 10, 1950, 11-A.

⁸ Walter Sillers, Jr. to Mr. W.C. Trotter, letter, 16 October, 1950,” Mississippi Digital Library, <http://collections.msdl.org/cdm/compoundobject/collection/dsu/id/168/rec/1> (accessed August 29, 2015).

⁹ Westbrook Pegler, “Fair Enough,” *Reading Eagle*, August 1, 1951, 10.

¹⁰ Eleanor Roosevelt, “My Day,” *The Eleanor Roosevelt Papers Project*, February 7, 1953, http://www.gwu.edu/~erpapers/myday/displaydoc.cfm?_y=1953&_f=md002452 (accessed March 21, 2015).

¹¹ See Maurine H. Beasley, Holly C. Shulman, and Henry R. Beasley, eds., *The Eleanor Roosevelt Encyclopedia* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2001).

¹² Alan Scherstuhl, “From the Crap Archives: *Weep No More, My Lady*,” *Village Voice*, January 15, 2009, <http://www.villagevoice.com/news/from-the-crap-archives-weep-no-more-my-lady-6718622> (accessed August 29, 2015).

¹³ Debnam, *Weep No More*, 7. Despite being the seventh page, this is the first page of the actual text.

¹⁴ Shawn J. Parry-Giles, “Archival Research and the American Presidency: The Political and Rhetorical Complexities of Presidential Records,” in *The Handbook of Rhetoric and Public Address*, eds. Shawn J. Parry-Giles and J. Michael Hogan (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 157-83, quotation on 163. On the special pressures and constraints facing presidential libraries, which further affects access and representation, see also Mary E. Stuckey, “Presidential Secrecy: Keeping Archives Open,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 9, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 138-44.

¹⁵ See Barbara A. Biesecker, “Of Historicity, Rhetoric: The Archive as Scene of Invention,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 9, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 124-31.

A is for Archive: The Politics of Research in the Southern Archive

Camille Kaminski Lewis

When Stephen Stein, my History of American Religion Professor at Indiana University, took us graduate students to the Special Collections of the Lilly Library, we were dazzled. It was the perfect representation of the Ivory Tower. Period furniture, a room named “Lincoln,” soft lighting, book-lined walls, the giant walnut conference table, and manuscripts barely legible made us all feel like real historians. We were protected and isolated, just book nerds who loved the smell of mildewed paper and the feel of mechanical pencils. We sat and talked about the French Catholics. The present was two centuries away.

Most of the time, however, we graduate students were relegated to the basement of the Main Library, squinting at dimming microfilm machines, and the only smell in the air was the old Chick-Fil-A grease sneaking in from next door.

It was still bliss. Both experiences in archival research seem somewhat idyllic now. Both are still Ivory Towers.

I am a Northerner, having lived long enough in Greenville, South Carolina that my friends say I am allowed to consider myself a native. Yet, I am still trying to understand this New South¹ Greenville.

Elsewhere, I have explained Southern civic life like this: the rules are like a rhetorical *code duello*, with sparring partners of equal power facing-off under vigilante justice and with maintaining good form as the supreme virtue.² The critic is assigned a role in that Burkean drama as an invisible scenic element, a “second,” simply documenting the players and events with photographic details alone. No interpretation or intervention is expected or permitted. Any critical action is met with threats, both coded and overt, because that action may threaten the secrecy and the sanctity of the duel.

If that critic happens to be a Northern-born woman, those threats can get nasty. If she dares to act outside of the Southern silence, the female scholar is branded a kind of Hester Prynne. Wearing a Scarlet “A” for her archival research, she is marked as impious and promiscuous.

As an independent scholar, I am researching the intersection of conservative politics, revivalism, and white supremacy in Southern higher education. I have now been to archives in Tennessee, Missouri, Illinois, Florida, Alabama, and South Carolina, of course. I have received thousands of pages from FBI files and even a rather gruesome local fifty-year-old police report. This project in the Southern archives has resulted in my getting banned from one local collection, my university job threatened, and my family targeted at our church and at my sons’ public elementary school. I have even received death threats. When I went to report this intimidation to local law enforcement, the police officer called these tactics “perfectly respectable.”

So what am I uncovering that is so threatening? How could presumably dead documents, buried in dusty archives, threaten the living?

Camille Kaminski Lewis is an independent scholar researching the intersection of revivalism and conservative politics in the twentieth century, specifically in the American South. Correspondence to: Cklewis@alumni.indiana.edu

Here is just one example. On Easter Sunday morning in 1960, Greenville's own Bob Jones Sr. broadcast what would become his most infamous sermon in our lifetime, "Is Segregation Scriptural?"³ So important was this statement to Jones that he had his staff transcribe the sermon and distribute it to every student enrolled in his school until 1986. So from 1960 through 1986, this sermon was Bob Jones University's official statement defending its racism.

This text is important for Greenville history and for Southern scholars as a glimpse into how religion and politics combine into one powerful cudgel. This is important to religious historians because Jones was offering a counter-statement to Billy Graham's 1960 Good Friday appeal to Evangelicals: "'Jim Crow' must go. It is absolutely ridiculous to refuse food or a night's lodging to a man on the basis of skin color. . . . I am also concerned about some clergymen of both races that have made the 'race issue' their Gospel. This is not the Gospel!"⁴ Jones read Graham's plea for racial understanding as throwing down the gauntlet, and Jones accepted the perceived challenge two days later on Easter Sunday morning – on the High Holy Day of Christianity – presenting his gospel of segregation.

As important as Jones' statement is, no library in the world catalogs it. In 2010, if you visited BJU's archives and asked for a copy of the sermon, the archivists would have told you that it is "restricted access," and you would not be permitted to copy its pages. You could transcribe the words in pencil, but no photocopies or photographs could leave the archives. The document that was so important to their racist *apologia* and to their framing of racial segregation as ecclesiastical separation, they wanted it to remain hidden. It must, it seems to me, reveal their duel with Billy Graham.

In May 2011, I scrounged. I begged. And among three people, who joked that I was "a holy troublemaker," I was able to quilt together a complete copy of that 1960 sermon. I have uploaded the text and a pdf of the pamphlet on my website,⁵ so now it is fully public. This past summer, the *Washington Post* cited my website in their exposé on religious bigotry in Arizona.⁶ And thanks to Indiana Governor Mike Pence, the text has become even more relevant for those comparing the history of religion as a political weapon in America.

Through 2014, if you visited those same BJU archives and asked for the sermon, the staff would shrug and actually admit, "Well, Camille Lewis has it on her website. You can just go there and see it." That changed, however, after I presented at the Carolinas Communication Association Conference in October 2014. Since then, the Bob Jones University archives no longer restrict access to this infamous sermon text. Anyone with an appointment can pull out a smart phone and document the text for herself.

I exposed the duel.

In 2012, I received my letter banning me from Bob Jones University which, of course, includes the official archives. In February 2014, the BJU Public Relations director – not the archivist, not a historian, not any academic officer, but their ad man – called the administration of my employer, North Greenville University (NGU), to tell them to silence my critical academic voice. In my disciplinary interview, one of the pieces of evidence against me was a peer-reviewed publication in the *Kenneth Burke Journal*.⁷ My husband was a full professor of music at NGU. If we still worked at NGU, my conference presentation and this short article would be forbidden under threat of termination. As of May 5, 2014, both of us resigned from that institution.

I am far from sequestered in the Ivory Tower here in Greenville, South Carolina.

If I am going to use my theory of the rhetorical *code duello*, the actors want me to be invisible – they want Hester Prynne away in exile. They cannot imagine me as their equal or even as a human being. For their myth to stand, I must disappear so that their vigilante justice can go undetected. As long as their duel is secret, their “good form” is maintained and their virtue and power is secure.

So when I stand over a library table, wearing my scarlet “A for Archive,” holding a hand-scrawled document from 1924 signed by “a few white men,” I realize that it sounds very much like emails I have received. For my research in the Southern archives at least, I am not really researching the past. These texts are not dead and buried. As long as my subject sees their Cause as not lost, I am documenting the present with living texts. So I do what I can. I expose the duel.

Notes

¹ The “New South” is a term coined by Henry W. Grady to describe the burgeoning modernization and industrialization in the post-bellum South. Still genteel, still white-supremacist, but with the rising middle-class competing against the moneyed patrician class, the New South was the glittering image to woo Northern investors. For further reading, see Raymond B. Nixon, *Henry W. Grady: Spokesman of the New South* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1943); Harold E. Davis, *Henry Grady’s New South: Atlanta, a Brave and Beautiful City* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2002).

² Camille Kaminski Lewis, “‘Jim Crow Must Go!’ Dueling Revivalists, Holy Week 1960,” (presentation at the Southeastern Commission for the Study of Religion Conference, Greenville, SC, March 17, 2013), https://www.academia.edu/2997072/_Jim_Crow_Must_Go_Dueling_Revivalists_Holy_Week_1960_; Camille Kaminski Lewis, “He Said, They Said: Dueling Bob Jones University in the Public Sphere,” (presentation at the Kenneth Burke Conference, St. Louis, July 18, 2014), https://www.academia.edu/7673495/He_Said_They_Said_Dueling_Bob_Jones_University_in_the_Public_Sphere.

³ “Is Segregation Scriptural?” Bob Jones, Sr., April 17, 1960, transcript, <http://www.drslewis.org/camille/2013/03/15/is-segregation-scriptural-by-bob-jones-sr-1960/> (accessed March 23, 2015).

⁴ Billy Graham, “Billy Graham Speaks Out On Segregation,” *St. Petersburg Times*, April 16, 1960, 4-D.

⁵ “Is Segregation Scriptural?”

⁶ Harold Meyerson, “Harold Meyerson: Arizona Uses Religion as a Shield for Gay Bigotry,” *Washington Post*, February 25, 2014, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/harold-meyerson-arizona-uses-religion-as-a-shield-for-gay-bigotry/2014/02/25/c431a2a6-9e56-11e3-9ba6-800d1192d08b_story.html?hpid=z2 (accessed April 13, 2015).

⁷ Camille K. Lewis, "Publish and Perish?: My Fundamentalist Education from the Inside Out." *Kenneth Burke Journal* 4, no. 2 (Spring 2008). Online text for this article can be found at: <http://kbjournal.org/lewis>.

Pedagogical Reflections: Teaching, Texts, and Southern Archival Spaces

Cynthia King

When I walked into the six-room house that serves as the Museum and Library of Confederate History (MLCH), I couldn't say who was more stunned: me, an African American professor there to finalize plans for her class tour, or the handful of elderly white gentlemen sitting around a table in the library. My reaction to the scene was visceral. Though overrun with relics from the cause that bears its name, most jarring were the oversized Confederate flags hanging from the ceiling. In that moment, I realized that I had never been so close to *the* preeminent symbol of racial terrorism for African Americans. The men in the museum seemed just as surprised to see me in their space. Perhaps they surmised my discomfort with the surroundings and with their deeply personal but "cultural" and "educational" mission to depict an "accurate portrayal" of the "War for Southern Independence," and "honor those who served the cause of the Confederate States of America."¹ A visit paid by the ancestor of slaves to an archival space dedicated to valorizing the fight to sustain the institution embodies the "odd position" that Lehn contends "Southern texts and the archives that house them" place rhetorical critics.² The reasons that drew me to the Confederate Museum are the same reasons that prompted me to arrange a tour of the Upcountry History Museum (UHM) and a field trip to the Reedy River Baptist Church Cemetery. Those reasons structure this brief reflection.

First, pedagogical restlessness fueled an urge to introduce localism into U.S. Public Address courses at Furman University, where I teach. As I use it here, localism denotes moving the classroom off campus and into historical, cultural, and government sites in the community. Local museums were the change of scenery I sought for my teaching, but more importantly they gave tangible form to the past. Tangibility is an instrument of teaching. Moreover, visiting these sites is inherently interdisciplinary. American history, Southern history, rhetoric, public address, museum studies, and religion coalesce in narratives that hold multiple and conflicting meanings derived from the disciplines and facets of history they index; more than that however, engaging local material culture invites students to take a more complex view of where and how a community's past is presented to its members and the factors informing these presentations.

But moving into local spaces also risks providing their guardians a platform to frame students' understanding of their meaning and significance. This is especially true for museums. Intentionally, museums weave the raw materials of the past into intelligible narratives constrained by institutional priorities and practices. Even supplemental backstories supplied by museum tour guides have a hand in shaping these narratives and can signify guides' personal investment in the impact and perceived veracity of those narratives. For example, against a backdrop of Confederate

Cynthia P. King (Ph.D. 2002, University of Maryland) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at Furman University. Correspondence to: Cynthia King, Furman Hall, Furman University, 3300 Poinsett Highway, Greenville, SC 29613. Email: cynthia.king1205@furman.edu

artillery and weaponry of every ilk, the guides at the MLCH painted the South as victors in character if not in fact of the Civil War. Likewise, the guide in the Upcountry History Museum was a native South Carolinian who clearly took pride in the proclivity of his independent-minded, Scotch-Irish ancestors to revolt against centralized authority.

Exhibits are also subject to logistical constraints such as space; therefore, curators must be judicious about which events of the past are selected to foreground. But selectivity is compelled by other reasons. For example, exhibits of slavery are conspicuously absent or underrepresented in both the MLCH and UHM. During the tour, the MLCH alluded to slavery only once, to dispel the “myth” it was the central reason why Southerners fought the Civil War. The motives for omitting slavery from the MLCH are less puzzling than those of the UHM. Much larger and more contemporary, the UHM’s most prominent nods to the institution include a few bales of cotton and a mannequin of a young slave. Instead of focusing on the institution that was the economic engine of South Carolina, the museum foregrounds exhibits which fit neatly into Greenville’s contemporary and aspirational image as a “political and economic hub.”³ For example, the city’s status for many years as the “textile capital of the world” is showcased in a large exhibit, and the life of textile workers is explained in some detail on the tour. After the tour, I probe students about which stories were told and which were omitted. Inevitably, some students assert the absence of slavery. I use the omission to urge students to think critically about what these representations tell us about how communities remember the past and the implications these remembrances hold for the present.

These considerations lead to the second reason archival spaces serve my pedagogy: to engage course concepts and principles for my rhetoric courses. Museums are identifiably rhetorical spaces. This fact comes into clearer focus when a curator at the Upcountry History Museum explains the intensive, multi-step process for developing an exhibit: thoroughly researching the historical context, selecting the most effective tools of storytelling, and finally, allotting and arranging museum space to tell accessible, “accurate,” and engaging narratives of the past. This undertaking is akin to the activities of rhetorical invention, which acts as an “intentional, created, polished attempt to overcome the obstacles in a given situation with a specific audience on a given issue to achieve a particular end.”⁴ The suitability for the study of museums in rhetoric courses becomes clear when viewed through these terms.

As historical spaces with rhetorical intent, museums serve as vivid reference points for explaining the central critical concept in which rhetoric and history intersect: public memory. Browne explains that public memory is a “shared sense of the past fashioned from the symbolic resources of community and subject to its particular history, hierarchies, and aspirations.”⁵ While Browne’s definition calls attention to the communal work performed in museums, DeLaure’s definition that, “public memory is material, embodied, and connected to sites”⁶ highlights the tangibility museums afford the past. Students move through synthetic historical landscapes, allowing them to experience particular semblances of past eras predicated on sensibilities and ideologies of the present. The dialectical twin of public memory is collective forgetting which is understood as “what is unregistered in . . . monuments, relics, statues, and ritual observances [,] . . . a failure to transmit information about the past.”⁷ Collective forgetting, one scholar reminds us, “does not mean every member of a society forgets the same thing; it means that remembering and forgetting are distributed unevenly among different communities, groups, and individuals.”⁸

Forgetting is dictated, in part, by practicality. Out of necessity, museums paint pictures of the past with broad strokes. But as Vivian has asserted even “unintentional episodes of . . . excision or loss in regard to the past . . . signify ethical failings when imperatives to archive . . . and preserve hold the moral high ground.”⁹ Moreover, broad strokes can diminish human qualities that connect individuals across time and culture, which leads to my final pedagogical reason

for visiting museums and for looking at primary texts in Southern archival sites: engaging the human elements of history and rhetoric. This inclination is undergirded by the central idea of my personal and pedagogical philosophies: everyone deserves to be understood. Understanding individuals in their humanity precipitates civility even toward those whose character and actions offend us. In discussions of the antebellum South, this perspective applies equally to slave and slave master. Though clearly the experiences were not equivalent, the point is to understand human mindsets and motivations, which requires temporarily suspending judgment. Two examples illustrate how to push past a predominant historical group identifier, slave owners, to ascertain transcendent human qualities of one or more individual members of the group.

The first is the inclusion of Confederate soldier William Erin Phillips (1841-1862), whose casket-sized tomb sits in the Reedy River Baptist Church Cemetery, a mile from Furman University. Mundane and aspirational details of Phillips' life can be gleaned from letters he wrote to family members archived in the Phillips and Hudson Families Papers.¹⁰ Phillips is an especially good subject for my courses because of the life experiences he shares with my students. He attended Furman, incurred debt for tuition, room, board, and books, and like many of my students, he inclined toward a spiritual vocation, but put those plans on hold when he volunteered for military duty at the start of Civil War.¹¹ Phillips died of fever before his traveling parents could reach his military camp. His remains were transported back to Greenville to be interred in his home church, the Reedy River Baptist Church.¹² Highlighting facets of Phillips' life shared in common with my students shade slightly the blurred image of whites in the antebellum South, and also establishes a connection that complicates their understanding of that society.

The second, related course component requires the examination of documents from the Plantation Collection Letters, included among the readings in my U.S. Public Address course. The letters glimpse the complex motives and mindsets of slave owners. For example, in a letter dated October 22, 1846, plantation owner Thomas B. Bennehan mused obliquely that he "wished that his northern friends could see the joy and gratitude expressed by my slaves... on my return home. They would think better of our Southern Institutions."¹³ Bennehan seems oblivious to the contradiction in his concession that while "slavery may be oppressive it is often attended with much comfort and enjoyment."¹⁴ I ask my students to reconcile Bennehan's rosy description with the well-documented constant paranoia of slave rebellions among planters. I counterbalance the privileged position of whites in a slave society based on race with the wretched day-to-day existence of slaves. Advertisements for runaway slaves and slave narratives like those by Frederick Douglass, Harriet Jacobs, Ellen Craft, and Solomon Northup convey the human realities and individual experiences under an economic institution sustained by degradation and violence.

I impress upon students the oppressive conditions under which slaves lived: they were underfed, underdressed, and lived constantly under the threat of being whipped, mutilated or killed.¹⁵ Black women were raped routinely by masters and overseers and the bi-racial children who resulted from these violations were paradoxically open secrets and served alternatively as visible contradictions and confirmations in the reasoning for those violations.¹⁶ The discussion culminates with my questioning what kind of circumstances might cause Southerners, who are not evil human beings, to ignore the human suffering in their immediate vicinity. War, history, self-preservation, and cultural sensibilities are frequent answers. Students cannot conceive of seeing people as less than human. But I quickly point out how contemporary discourses entailed in the debate over undocumented immigrants or racially tinged discourses of "law and order" invite insensitivity, if not obliviousness, to the misfortunes of others.

Students' reaction to museum visits range from indifference to outrage. Those in the latter category are usually disturbed by the pro-Confederate (read: proslavery) narrative of the past woven around relics in the MLCH. However, I try to tamp down and channel these emotions by asking student to assume the critical distance necessary to complete the culminating assignment of the visits and the class.

The final paper for my Introduction to Rhetoric class requires students to analyze how the MLCH and UHM represent an aspect of Southern history. I try to preempt their inclination to assume the role of editorialist and emphasize their role as a critic. For example, a student whose reaction to the MLCH had been as visceral as my own initial reaction wondered how she could be unbiased about an ideology she found offensive and dangerous. I reminded her of Edwin Black's mandate for "critics to suspend their repugnance *temporarily*" (emphasis mine); he then continues that "acts of objectivity are only intermittent and never an end in themselves."¹⁷ I also encouraged her to assert the negative and dangerous implications she sees in the Confederate narrative, but cautioned that scholarly conventions and the assignment require that she provide ample textual evidence, strong secondary foundations, clear explanations, and a restrained tone: all of which serve to establish the strength of her argument and the integrity of her conclusions. She did so, and concluded in her paper that in "a modern American society still teeming with racial inequalities, with partisan strife over events such as [those of] Ferguson, Missouri," narratives like those in MLCH are "disruptive and disturbing."¹⁸

My foray into Southern archival spaces serves my pedagogical goal, which is to expand my classroom and appropriate tools to make course concepts more tangible. But it also reminds me that some Southern archival spaces are "odder" than others. This was my experience with the MLCH, and perhaps theirs with me. I have visited the site three times, and while I am now less shocked by its content, I am still apprehensive, in part because students' reactions are uncertain. The raw materials of the past reside in these spaces, but it is up to the teacher-critic to use them credibly by the standards of his or her scholarly communities and more importantly principled by the critic's own conscience.

Notes

¹ "Welcome," *Museum and Library of Confederate History*, <http://confederatemuseumandlibrary.org/> (accessed March 20, 2015).

² Our panel organizer, Melody Lehn, used this language in her cogent description of the panel which gave rise to this forum. Panel: "Reconciling Ourselves to Southern Archives," Carolinas Communication Association Conference, October 3, 2014, Greenville, South Carolina.

³ "Upcountry History Museum: Furman University," <http://www.upcountryhistory.org/welcome/about/> (accessed April 1, 2015).

⁴ Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Susan Schultz Huxman, *The Rhetorical Act: Thinking, Speaking, and Writing Critically*, 3rd ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2003), 7.

⁵ Stephen H. Browne, "Reading, Rhetoric, and the Texture of Public Memory," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 81, no. 2 (1995): 237-50, quotation on 248.

⁶ Marilyn Bordwell DeLaure, "Remembering the Sit-Ins: Performing Public Memory at Greensboro's International Civil Rights Center and Museum," *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* 7, no. 2 (2011): 1-28, quotation on 7.

⁷ Barry Schwartz, "Collective Forgetting and the Symbolic Power of Oneness: The Strange Apotheosis of Rosa Parks," *Social Psychology Quarterly* 72 no. 2 (2009): 123-42, quotation on 123.

⁸ Schwartz, "Collective Forgetting and the Symbolic," 123.

⁹ Bradford Vivian, *Public Forgetting: The Rhetoric and Politics of Beginning Again* (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2010), 6.

¹⁰ "Papers, 1790-1983, of the Phillips and Hudson Families," South Carolina Library, University of South Carolina, <http://library.sc.edu/socar/uscs/2009/philhud09.html> (accessed May 9, 2015).

¹¹ Phillips and Hudson Papers.

¹² Phillips and Hudson Papers.

¹³ Thomas Bennehan to Hon. Duncan Cameron, 22 October 1846, series 1.3.3, box, 42, folder: 995 in *The Plantation Letters: Interpreting Antebellum Plantation Life*.

¹⁴ Thomas Bennehan to Hon. Duncan Cameron.

¹⁵ Calvin Schermerhorn, "The Everyday Life of Enslaved People in the Antebellum South," *OAH Magazine of History* 23 no. 2 (2009): 31-36.

¹⁶ Faye A. Yarbrough, "Power, Perception, and Interracial Sex: Former Slaves Recall a Multiracial South," *The Journal of Southern History* 71 no. 3 (2005): 563-68.

¹⁷ Edwin Black, "On Objectivity and Politics in Criticism," in *The Art of Rhetorical Criticism*, ed. Jim Kuypers (Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon, 2005): 29-32, quotation on 29.

¹⁸ Selimah Harmon, "Museum Paper" (student paper, Furman University, 2014), 6.

Local Intervention and the Archival Trap

Brandon Inabinet and Luke Christie

Educational institutions with a concern for their local community or region need to enhance the opportunities for archive-based rhetorical criticism for student critics. Studies of texts outside dominant research paradigms can trap scholars who are under institutional demands and time limits. Students are best situated to do this work on local and regional texts and seek out the alternative publication venues that crave such work. Any archival traps students encounter can form great moments for learning. Through our dialogue and conclusions, we hope to elevate this mode of engagement and pedagogy in the field of rhetorical studies.

Dialogue

Brandon Inabinet: As a student in U.S. Public Address, I was fascinated by the way speech formed an eloquent historical index of political thought.¹ The professor assigned the final paper for the course, offering extra credit for those who chose texts from a local archive. I searched the tiny archive in my hometown and then the South Carolina Historical Society. I found only one speech by Laurence Massillon Keitt, a minor figure of rhetorical infamy: a Southern Fire-Eater—a radical defender of slavery and secession; the only man in U.S. history to take part in two acts of legislative violence (assisted in the caning of Charles Sumner and two years later tried to choke a Pennsylvania Republican); and a Romantic idealist who rode into enemy fire at The Battle of Cold Spring rather than succumb to Union defeat. The speech was a thirty-five page handwritten manuscript of an antebellum Fourth of July Oration and Eulogy for John C. Calhoun. After days of transcribing, it provided a unique understanding of spread-eagle oratory, hailing John C. Calhoun as a gifted statesman, philosopher, and orator.²

Luke Christie: Ten years later, I sat in a nearly identical classroom (Early U.S. Public Address), listening to my professor, Dr. Inabinet, discuss the excitement of finding local texts and the possibility of saying something new about them. Immediately, I started researching an important political figure born just a few miles from my hometown: John C. Calhoun. I found an overlooked nineteenth century speech in which Calhoun had shut down Henry Clay's amendments to abolish the presidential veto power.³ In my analysis, I claimed that Calhoun eloquently protected Constitutional checks-and-balances, as the early U.S. shifted from elite republican rule to the whims of democratic majority rule.⁴ Archival work with microfiche, university archives, and obscure early twentieth-century books on Southern statesmen all came to aid my research.

Brandon Inabinet is Associate Professor of Communication Studies at Furman University. Luke Christie (B.A. 2015, Communication Studies and Humanities) intends to pursue a graduate degree in Communication Studies. We would especially like to thank Sean O'Rourke for his mentorship of this work and feedback on this essay, as well as Melody Lehn, other forum contributors, and reviewers for their feedback on this unusual scholarly format. Correspondence to: Brandon Inabinet and Luke Christie, Communication Studies, Furman University, 3300 Poinsett Highway, Greenville, SC 29613, USA. Email: brandon.inabinet@furman.edu

Brandon Inabinet: We both felt we had followed the prompt of the professor.

Luke Christie: And yet in both cases, before the final draft, we felt trapped, interpreted by others as unapologetically defending John C. Calhoun, the Old South, or even, by extension, slavery.

Brandon Inabinet: Neither paper said anything of the sort, of course, but critics and respondents might see these archival selections as a strategic choice to bolster white male dominance, unaware of the assignment or the archive's limits in regard to early U.S. oratory.⁵

Luke Christie: I even went so far as to offer praise of the speaker. After all, Dr. Inabinet asked us to offer an “appreciative” or “charitable” reading of the text in its context. My veto speech analysis praised the constrained argumentative form that protected checks-and-balances against Congressional power.⁶ Naturally, it extended that praise to the orator, Calhoun, and to the era that tolerated such sophisticated eloquence in the halls of Congress.

Brandon Inabinet: I did a version of that, too. The eulogy analysis praised the wild Romantic imagery and the complex archetypal metaphors it evoked. It praised the era, too, that allowed such unconstrained, public *epideixis*.⁷

Luke Christie: Limited within the bounds of novice critics, the brevity of the semester, and perhaps even the unconscious impulses of local pride, we did not delve far into what the authors of our texts were *not* saying—textual exclusions made legible only through context.

Brandon Inabinet: So as I read Luke's draft, I knew I needed to say something, beyond what would appear in written feedback. The quality of the paper was strong in terms of analysis. But not many in a field as broad as Communication Studies have the patience for the nuanced unpacking of obscure nineteenth-century argumentation and style on Constitutional interpretation. Even in his sophomore year, I could tell Luke might be headed to graduate school. Would his first journal reviewer or Director of Graduate Studies see the careful analysis of a text on nineteenth-century veto powers as worthwhile, or would they instead expect bold claims about slave rhetoric? I needed to advise Luke to seek out claims more scholars would find significant about a figure like Calhoun.

Luke Christie: That my analysis might be seen as irrelevant or insignificant would have been hard to hear. I was excited to find this speech, and I felt I could reveal something new about Calhoun's rhetoric other than his defense of slavery.

Brandon Inabinet: Exactly. So luckily I could share my personal story. My eulogy criticism went to a conference alongside interpretations of Civil Rights speeches—studies using almost identical analytical tools. A respondent panned my local criticism alone as a mere “Neo-Aristotelian” analysis.⁸ It was a well-known problem in the history of rhetorical criticism, but one not at all clear to a twenty-year-old in his first criticism class. Later, I came to understand it as a thinly veiled prejudice against a Southern white male student using concepts from Greco-Roman theory to analyze archived texts.

Luke Christie: After our conversation, and fearing that kind of response, I realized that my essay concluded with a strong *accumulatio*: adding the virtues of the style and argument together to praise the great speech, the

great speaker, and the eloquence of the era. I reexamined the larger political context in which the speech was given and began to see how Calhoun could have used the veto speech, with its piety toward the founders, to defend slavery. Calhoun favored the presidential veto at least in part because the sitting president, John Tyler, would likely have vetoed bills harmful to Southern economic interests.⁹ The revised paper better responded to the ideological questions of its audiences today, regarding race and slavery in the nineteenth century, while also not abandoning the detail present in the original analysis. These changes strengthened the analysis enough for it to be published in an undergraduate journal.

Brandon Inabinet: The criticism of the eulogy for Calhoun did not fare as well. Scholars outside the field found more interest in it than those inside. English scholars in Romantic literature collaborated, and historians recommended sending the critique to the home of the original text, the South Carolina Historical Society. With tenure-track appointment, I had the luxury to seek out these more relevant audiences, in history, literature, and the broader public.

Conclusions

Somewhere between local forgetting (of race politics), archival scarcity (in the prescribed era and genre of oratory), and a simple lack of critical awareness and agency (among critics in their first courses), the classroom archive opportunity became a trap. As pointed out by Jason Edward Black, the act of criticism incurs politics, and as Charles E. Morris III says, the archive functions as a site of power that can be fairly determinative of what we can say.¹⁰ We hold that all those dynamics get politicized once again in teaching local or regional criticism.

In this case, Southern regional criticism bound the authors in an additional particular way. What counts as “Southern” in the field of rhetorical studies has been highly influenced by Reconstruction and Lost Cause rhetoric, the Agrarian Movement, and the work by early critics such as Dallas Dickey and Waldo Braden.¹¹ The category was exclusive to white male demagogues and focused heavily on the defense of slavery and Agrarian culture. Attempts to expand that definition and study the region in more complex terms, given the larger national suspicions of the South as backward and illiberal, mostly failed. Intellectual bigotry against the South (especially in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century) led to resentment of Northern elitism by Southerners. This, in turn, resulted in defensive criticism of speech as *the* Southern “art form,” which created marginalization and containment of Southern speech criticism in particular journals and institutions. At the same time, other Southerners, such as minority activists, were read as national (rather than global or regional), in a field privileging the nation as the site of civic activity. Debates about tokenism and canons neglected their regional accents, and Southern anthologies were late to the game in adding Civil Rights speakers or forms beyond oral speeches that would bring in a broader set of rhetorical practitioners. Studying the South as a site of rhetoric became antiquated.

Regions or locales with complex inferiority themes, like the South, also lend themselves to archival and interpretive traps.¹² In an area like South Carolina, which first preached secession and defended slavery as a necessary economic and religious system, it becomes almost inescapable. The state continues to this day to carry antagonistic and resistive politics. The basic tools of a field so devoted toward the elevation of texts and speakers must be adapted to such a place. First, our sense of place and social identity calls us to push against the “appreciative attitude” toward texts as a general guide.¹³ Second, it calls for the limits and exclusions of archival sources to be

made more explicit. Third, complexity of texts and elevation of eloquence must be weighted against this history of regional bias. The very tools that make criticism of progressive or minority speech fantastic might be the absolute wrong tools for texts that come to us with a different cultural resonance.

The unique challenge, especially in the South, is not to mirror and redeploy defensiveness, but to instead make the analysis richer. It is a dangerous proposition that faculty can direct students into that mode, despite the supportive evidence in the dialogue above. Students may not react positively to an indictment of their analysis on general cultural or political terms, especially when the assignment may seem determined by archival depth and course assignments. Criticism's liberal politics, for individual autonomy, social equality, and civic pluralism, may backfire. Liberal education is indeed a paradox, being intolerant of intolerance.¹⁴ The local or regional archive introduces a politics close to the student's own upbringing, with potential intolerances that the student holds but never had to speak for. Amidst all the other subjugations of the classroom (the power imbalance between professor and student, the weight of the entire field of rhetorical criticism against a student's first analysis, and the need to promote a respectful environment for all students), is it really fair to introduce this additional trap? And should such archival texts be engaged if they invite another trap?¹⁵

These are, in the experience of the authors, conversations that are fundamental to the field and will go well in the context of individual discussion, once the student is invested in the work and invested in the audience of the field. We should be cognizant that classrooms structure teachers in positions of control.¹⁶ We should find and teach sympathetic texts that go against our field's predilections. We should be wary of laying out the terms of criticism in advance. Graduate schools should be open to students who study minor local works, and the field in general could revive spaces for regional and resistive study, knowing that assimilative tendencies are strong.¹⁷ In the introduction to *Rhetoric, Religion and the Civil Rights Movement, 1954–1965*, Davis W. Houck and David E. Dixon argue that regional and local voices in their anthology often helped to “contextualize the national movement for a local audience.”¹⁸ Thus, faculty should design courses in a way that prioritizes local archives and calls out to discuss the politics of criticism in individual mentorship, reclaiming local archival texts as tools for understanding students' unique local reception within national or global movements.

Students have special abilities to find unique texts in local archives, renegotiate and contest the borders of our current field, and innovate with whatever resources they have—abilities scholars often lose or temper after entering academe professionally. Students show that rhetorical critics have not only a liberal and liberalizing mission to maintain and enhance, but also agency to sustain the interrogation of local voices, even when the emancipatory political potential is low. The reading of such voices reinvigorates traditions outside of our field's major paradigms. Exercising this kind of agency, critics can do a much better job in speaking to their communities—communities that still hold people like John C. Calhoun as a great statesman and philosopher.

Notes

¹ My ambitions were very similar to the approach put forward in Ernest J. Wraga, “Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 33, no. 4 (1947): 451-57.

² The paper was commended and published by an undergraduate conference as Brandon Inabinet, “Thematic Archetypal Metaphor and Dialectical Questions in ‘Eulogy on Mr. Calhoun,’ A Fourth of July Oration by Fire-Eater Laurence Keitt,” *Journal from the 38th Conference in Rhetorical Criticism in Hayward, California* (2004). The author then republished the ideas in popular media as “The Long Farewell: Laurence M. Keitt’s Eulogy on John C. Calhoun.” *Carologue – South Carolina Historical Society Magazine* (Winter 2012): 17-22.

³ John C. Calhoun, “Speech on the Veto Power, February 28, 1842,” in *Union and Liberty: The Political Philosophy of John C. Calhoun*, ed. Ross M. Lence, (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1992), 487-511.

⁴ Luke Christie, “It’s Not About the Bank: Religious Republicanism in John C. Calhoun’s Speech on the Veto Power, February 28, 1842,” *Papers and Publications: Interdisciplinary Journal of Undergraduate Research* 3, no. 8 (2014): 1-14.

⁵ Any local texts from St. Matthews are small remnants of antebellum culture in an area that was mostly burned to the ground during William Sherman’s March and occupation through the state. The eulogy, for example, comes from a city (Orangeburg, S.C.) whose entire courthouse, archives, and records were destroyed in 1865.

⁶ The distrust of the Presidential veto came from a Jacksonian-Whig conflict, voting reforms that suggested universal suffrage, and the eloquent sectional propaganda of the Great Triumvirate: Clary, Calhoun, and Daniel Webster.

⁷ Michael Osborn, “The Function and Significance of Metaphor in Rhetorical Discourse” (Ph.D. diss., University of Florida, 1963), 212.

⁸ The term dates to Edwin Black’s critique and a response contained in G. P. Mohrmann and Michael C. Leff, “Lincoln at Cooper Union: A Rationale for Neo-Classical Criticism,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60, no. 4 (December 1974): 459 - 467. Even scholars who clung to classical terminology and focused on famous speech texts (by elite male orators in the early U.S.) abandoned continuity with earlier scholarship because of these associations.

⁹ Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun: Sectionalist, 1840-1850* (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1951).

¹⁰ See especially the chapters by Jason Edward Black and Charles E. Morris, III, from Jim A. Kuypers, ed., *Purpose, Practice, and Pedagogy in Rhetorical Criticism* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2014).

¹¹ Christina L. Moss, “The Re-Conceptualization of Southern Rhetoric: A Meta-Critical Perspective” (Ph.D. diss., Louisiana State University, 2005). Available online at http://etd.lsu.edu/docs/available/etd-11102005-121031/unrestricted/Moss_dis.pdf (accessed August 3, 2013). Also see “Twelve Southerners,” *I’ll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 2006; 75th Anniversary Edition).

¹² Angie Maxwell, *The Indicted South: Public Criticism, Southern Inferiority and the Politics of Whiteness* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014).

¹³ Jim A. Kuypers, “Must We All Be Political Activists?” *American Communication Journal*, 4, no. 1 (2000), <http://ac-journal.org/journal/vol4/iss1/special/kuypers.htm>, (accessed July 25, 2015).

¹⁴ Nomi Maya Stolzenberg, “He Drew a Circle That Shut Me out”: Assimilation, Indoctrination, and the Paradox of a Liberal Education,” *Harvard Law Review* 106, no. 3 (1993): 581-667.

¹⁵ Like Kenneth Burke's study of Hitler's rhetoric in the 1930s, this comes with the danger of further exposure to voices some might deem better left dead and lifeless in the archive. Kenneth Burke, "The Rhetoric of Hitler's Battle." *The Southern Review* 5 (1939): 1-21.

¹⁶ The metaphor of control and subjugation comes from Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1984).

¹⁷ Jenny Rice, "From Architectonic to Tectonics: Introducing Regional Rhetorics," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (2012): 201-213.

¹⁸ Davis W. Houck and David E. Dixon, *Rhetoric, Religion and the Civil Rights Movement, 1954-1965* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 9.

Edward Snowden: Rhetorical Reasoning and Proposing Self-Names and Other-Names

Susan K. Opt

This study analyzes Edward Snowden’s rhetorical reasoning process in the PR battle to name his and the NSA’s actions in the year since the revelation of his identity. It finds that Snowden de-emphasized self-naming and emphasized other-naming in his interventional attempt to define the conversation to his advantage. By avoiding self-naming, Snowden attempted to direct the conversation away from his actions and toward the NSA by naming it specifically as a “threat.” Side effects of his reasoning strategy, such as increased public choice and increased public uncertainty, and short-term and long-term outcomes are discussed. In all, the essay argues that certain rhetorical reasoning emphases may be more advantageous than others for those doing “battle” to define the conversation in their terms. In Snowden’s case, his approach both succeeded and failed in influencing public opinion about his and the NSA’s actions.

Keywords: Edward Snowden, NSA, rhetorical reasoning, naming, intervention

Within hours of Edward Snowden’s revelation that he was the source of classified National Security Agency documents published in early June 2013 by the UK newspaper *The Guardian*, politicians, commentators, and news media were attempting to make sense of his actions (e.g., Baldwin, 2013; Bolling, 2013; Ellsberg, 2013; Liptak, 2013; Rushkoff, 2013; Toobin, 2013). Yet, in the year since his identity disclosure, news and online polls indicate ongoing public uncertainty about whether to support Snowden’s actions, name him a “hero,” or prosecute him. Blake (2013) comments that these poll differences “suggest that there is a very real PR battle underway when it comes to Snowden” (para. 9). Blake (2013) describes this battle as between Snowden, who is attempting to construct an image of himself as a “do-gooder,” and the U.S. government, which is attempting to portray him as a “criminal.” In all, Blake (2013) contends, “Whoever can define the conversation in their terms (and words) will have a big advantage” (para. 11). However, as this essay argues, certain approaches to defining the conversation may be more advantageous than others.

Snowden’s discourse provides an opportunity to explore how we attempt to “define a conversation” and the potential side effects from the approach used. Specifically, this essay finds that, for most of the first year after his identity revelation, Snowden refused to propose a specific name for himself, such as “hero” or “traitor.” Instead, Snowden discursively emphasized particular aspects of his actions and behaviors and relied on the public to constitute a name for him based on the qualities he highlighted. In so doing, Snowden circumvented direct

Susan K. Opt is associate professor in the School of Communication Studies at James Madison University. A previous version of this essay won the Ray Camp Award at the 2014 Carolinas Communication Association’s annual conference in Greenville, SC. Correspondence to: Susan K. Opt, School of Communication Studies, James Madison University, MSC 2106, Harrisonburg, VA 22807, USA. Email: optsk@jmu.edu

engagement with those, such as the U.S. government, who were trying to name him as a potential traitor or terrorist “threat.” Instead, he attempted to define the conversation as one about the NSA “threat” to freedom and privacy. Not until about 10 months after the initial disclosure did Snowden (2014b) finally propose a self-name—an “American.”

However, public opinion polls in 2014 reveal a continued lack of public consensus regarding how to name Snowden and consequently how to treat his actions, which suggests that this aspect of Snowden’s approach has not worked to his advantage (e.g., Dutton, DePinto, Salvanto, & Backus, 2014; Jagel, 2014; “NBC National,” 2014; “NBC News/Wall Street Journal,” 2014; “Obama’s NSA Speech,” 2014; Shonfeld, 2014; Swanson, 2014). Yet, the polls also indicate that the public has maintained its opposition to or become less supportive of the U.S. government’s surveillance actions, suggesting that Snowden’s approach to defining this aspect of conversation has been more influential (e.g., Dutton et al., 2014; Jagel, 2014; “Obama’s NSA Speech,” 2014). Analyzing Snowden’s rhetorical reasoning processes can provide clues as to why Snowden appears to be both failing and succeeding at defining the conversation to his advantage and offer insights for other change agents attempting to influence conversations.

The essay opens with a brief background on the rhetorical reasoning process and the methodological approach. Next it presents an analysis of Snowden’s rhetorical reasoning process in his PR battle to define the public conversation about the meaning of “threat.” Then it concludes by discussing factors that may be influencing Snowden’s apparent failure and success in shaping the conversation and implications of Snowden’s rhetorical reasoning approach.

The Process of Rhetorical Reasoning

The concept of “naming” is one that has attracted the attention of communication researchers in a variety of ways. In the past decade alone, researchers have analyzed the framing and metaphoric aspects of naming (e.g., Fitzsimmons, 2010; Temmerman, 2010; Trioen & Temmerman, 2009) and examined how nature and color naming shifts have influenced human behavior (Kates, 2010; Milstein, 2011; Skorinko, Kemmer, Hebl, & Lane, 2006). Others have focused on the social aspects of naming and its relationship to promoting change in stakeholder positions, among social groups, and in social spaces (e.g., Aden, Pearson & Sell, 2010; Atkins-Sayre, 2005; Chang & Holt, 2011; Engels, 2009; Galasiński & Skowronek, 2001; Levinson, 2011). More recently Bricker (2014) has explored how anti-environmental organizations named themselves to persuade the public that they support environmental sustainability and attempted to define conversations related to environmental regulations and policy. Despite the variety of naming studies, Aden et al. (2010) have noted that “relatively little attention . . . has been given to a systemic study of naming,” which they find “especially unusual within a field in which foundational works emphasize the centrality of naming” (p. 280). In addition, Bricker (2014) has pointed out the importance of analyzing the act of naming and argument by definition to reveal interveners’ attempts to influence the public’s understanding of experience through clarification or deception. This essay analyzes Snowden’s discourse using a rhetorical model that emphasizes the centrality and systemic nature of naming in attempting to influence conversations. Unlike studies that focus on the validity and ethics of naming (e.g., Bricker, 2014), this essay highlights the constitutive process of naming, or the ongoing process of transforming experience into symbols

(Langer, 1980). Via a process of rhetorical reasoning, we propose names for experience and argue for their appropriateness in concert with others (Brown, 1972).

To highlight this process, this essay draws upon Brown's (1978) rhetoric of social intervention (RSI) model. Although most research using the RSI model has focused on the macro-level process by which ideology, conceived of as a superordinate "name," is constituted, maintained, and changed rhetorically (e.g., DeBord, 2009; Gring 1998; Huang, 1996; Keith, 2006; Opt, 2012; Opt, 2013; Oyelarkin, 2009; Phillips & Gring, 2009; Snyder, 2005; Snyder, 2009), this study is based on the model's micro-level assumption that naming is the fundamental human activity (Brown, 1978). The same communication process by which we create and negotiate ideology to create a meaningful life also underlies the symbolic process by which we generate names to give meaning to specific experiences, behaviors, and entities.

The rhetorical reasoning process involves "the statement of a name," "a statement of its appropriateness," and "a statement of the expected or appropriate response" (Brown, 1972, p. 377). In essence, a communicator constitutes a name by stating a particular symbolic categorization for sensed and non-sensed experience, provides support for its "appropriateness" for sense-making by explaining how the entity, experience, or action being named embodies the defining or "criterial" attributes associated with the symbolic category, and concludes by indicating the "appropriate," or expected, response or action to be taken toward the named entity (Brown, 1972; Bruner, Goodnow, & Austin, 1965). A communicator also can reason rhetorically for the "inappropriateness" of a current or proposed name for sense-making by demonstrating how an entity, experience, or action does not embody the criterial attributes associated with the name (Brown, 1972).

Via the rhetorical reasoning process, a communicator attempts to "define the conversation" by proposing a "new" name for an unnamed experience, by maintaining a currently accepted name for experience, or by shifting from an accepted name to an alternative name (Opt & Gring, 2009). Brown (1972) has observed that "as *names* for an entity shift, so to some extent do the perceptions of it" (p. 371). Shifts in specific names for experience come about via a discursive pattern known as an "attention switch," which is promoted and impeded through anomaly featuring and masking communication (Brown, 1982). When communicators rhetorically highlight attention to "gaps" in the rhetorical reasoning process for a current or proposed name's "appropriateness" for interpreting experience, they feature attention to anomalies. They try to show how the expectancies created by the current or proposed name's criterial attributes are not being met (Opt & Gring, 2009). Attention switches also occur when communicators propose that attention to the criterial attributes that constitute a name be redirected (Opt & Gring, 2009). In all, with an attention shift, experience itself does not change; rather a person's definition of the experience changes (Brown, 1982).

Via the rhetorical reasoning process of constituting and shifting names, communicators attempt to influence a social system's symbolic "reality" by defining its conversation. In general, names function rhetorically to bring a sense of clarity or order to apparent unknown, chaotic, or uncertain experience (Brown, 1972). Communicators also use names rhetorically to create transcendence by directing attention to apparent similarities among experiences or division by emphasizing apparent differences among experiences (Brown, 1972). Finally, communicators may emphasize particular names to suggest "approach" and "avoidance" responses toward experience, implying that an

action or behavior should be accepted or rejected in line with apparent societal expectancies or values (Brown, 1972).

To explore Snowden's approach to naming, only his first-person discourse was analyzed to capture his own words and not summaries of his words. Key data sources included *The Guardian* web site, which posted videos and statements by Snowden; the *Free Snowden* web site, which offered links to numerous Snowden press interviews and statements; the *TED* web site, which featured Snowden's TED talk presentation; *YouTube*, which had a video of Snowden's panel participation at the SXSW conference; *NBC News*, which broadcast a television interview with Snowden; and articles acquired from an "Edward Snowden" key word search in the Newsbank database, which pointed to additional Snowden first-person discourse. In all, 23 video, audio, and print interview sources posted or published between June 9, 2013, and June 8, 2014, were analyzed.

As the following narrative demonstrates, for the most part, Snowden avoided promoting a particular naming of himself or his actions. Instead, Snowden reasoned rhetorically by directing attention to specific actions and behaviors, or criterial attributes, he had enacted to suggest the "inappropriateness" of the "avoidance" names (e.g., "traitor," "criminal") attributed to him by the U.S. government. However, Snowden seems to assume that the public would follow his reasoning and conclude that his actions demonstrated criterial attributes of names with "approach" value (e.g., "hero" or "patriot"). In addition, Snowden proposed a specific name, "threat," and reasoned rhetorically to show that the NSA/government's actions "fit" this symbolic category because of its apparent violations of freedom and privacy. Not until almost 10 months after Snowden's identity was revealed did he constitute a specific self-name—"an American"—perhaps in response to the NSA/government's attempts to define Snowden's behavior as the "threat" by suggesting he was a "traitor" or "criminal."

Snowden's Rhetorical Reasoning Patterns

Snowden's identity as the source of classified NSA documents was revealed in a print article and a video interview posted June 9, 2013, on *The Guardian's* web site. The print article features excerpts from a note Snowden had written to accompany the NSA documents he gave to *The Guardian* (Greenwald, MacAskill, & Poitras, 2013). In the video interview, reporter Glenn Greenwald attributes to Snowden the name "whistleblower" in a question (Greenwald & Poitras, 2013a). Although Snowden fails to reject that proposed name in his reply, he never specifically calls himself a "whistleblower." Similarly, in a few later interviews or statements, Snowden hints at a specific name for categorizing his actions, such as "whistleblower" (Snowden, 2014a; "Snowden Interview," 2013), "U.S. government spy" (Williams, 2014), and "patriot" (Williams, 2014), by mentioning these names and their criterial attributes. Additionally, a few times he indicates specifically what he is not—for example, "hero," (Greenwald, et al., 2013), "Chinese spy," (Snowden, 2013a), "traitor" ("ARD," 2014; Snowden, 2013a), and "low-level analyst" (Williams, 2014)—in the form of stating "I don't consider myself to be [a hero]" or "if I were [a traitor]" and highlighting how his actions do not embody the criterial attributes associated with those names. However, overall, rather than proposing a specific self-name and demonstrating its "appropriateness," Snowden invokes a rhetorical reasoning pattern that requires the public to draw its own conclusions about the "appropriate" name to use to clarify the meaning of Snowden's actions.

Snowden's Self-Name Rhetorical Reasoning

In the initial identity-disclosing note and interview, Snowden directs attention to two key aspects of his actions and behaviors—his motivation for releasing the documents and his sacrifice as a result of releasing the documents—to which he would repeatedly refer in future interviews and statements. Snowden's description of these particular actions and behaviors can be viewed as criterial attributes associated with “approach” value names such as “whistleblower,” “patriot,” and “defender of democracy and freedom.” At the same time, by directing attention to these criterial attributes, Snowden rhetorically features attention to gaps in other interveners' reasoning that “avoidance” names, such as “traitor,” “defector,” and “betrayor,” are “appropriate” for making sense of his activities. Thus, Snowden attempts to shift the audience's attention to criterial attributes that he apparently expects the public to associate with names that promote support for his actions.

In describing his motivations for releasing the NSA documents, Snowden frequently begins by describing his own attention shift that occurred as he became aware of anomalies in his own name for the NSA (Greenwald & Poitras, 2013a, 2013b). In essence, he had categorized the agency symbolically as “a collector and analyzer of communications of potential foreign threats to U.S. democracy and freedom.” However, during his time working for the agency, he says he became aware that the agency apparently also monitored and stored non-threatening domestic communications and lied about its actions, resulting in his initial name for agency no longer making sense of experience (Williams, 2014). “I saw a lot of things that had disturbed me. We do a lot of good things in the intelligence community. . . . But there are also things that go too far” (Snowden, 2014b). As an outcome of his attention shift, Snowden says he approached others in the agency and sent emails to superiors in an attempt to direct their attention to these apparent anomalies (“Edward Snowden Responds,” 2014; Williams, 2014). When the others failed to meet his expectancy of taking action, he took on the task. “You can't wait around for someone else to act. I had been looking for leaders, but I realised that leadership is about being the first to act” (Greenwald, et al., 2013, para. 36). Thus, in his discourse, Snowden suggests his decision to release the NSA documents was motivated by the criterial attribute of “wrongness.” He also implies that his actions embody criterial attributes associated with a “leader.” Both an awareness of “wrongness” and “leadership” in correcting the apparent “wrong” could be considered criterial attributes of “approach” names such as “whistleblower” and “patriot,” if the public makes the connection in the way Snowden apparently hopes that it will.

Furthermore, to encourage the public to conclude that proposed names such as “traitor” and “defector” are “inappropriate” symbolic categorizations of his actions, Snowden highlights how he did not enact behaviors that serve as criterial attributes of those names. For example, he received no compensation for releasing the documents. “If I were motivated by money, I could have sold these documents to any number of countries and gotten very rich,” he states (Greenwald et al., 2013, para 40). In a statement to human rights groups, Snowden (2013c) emphasizes, “I did not seek to enrich myself. I did not seek to sell U.S. secrets. I did not partner with any foreign government to guarantee my safety” (para. 5). Furthermore, he points out that his goal was not to harm individuals by releasing the documents. “I carefully evaluated every single document I disclosed to ensue that each was legitimately in the public interest” (Greenwald et al., 2013, para. 50). Thus, Snowden attempts to impede the audience's potentiality

for reasoning that names such as “traitor” or “villain” “appropriately” fit his actions by featuring attention to the ways in which his actions fail to fulfill criterial attributes associated with those symbolic categorizations.

Besides motivation, another aspect of his behavior that Snowden frequently highlights in his discourse involves “sacrifice.” To reason rhetorically that he is enacting the criterial attributes associated with the symbolic category “sacrifice,” Snowden directs attention to his apparent losses as a result of disclosing the NSA documents. For example, in a statement given while Snowden was staying at Moscow’s Sheremetyevo airport, he points out, “A little over one month ago, I had a family, a home in paradise, and I lived in great comfort” (Snowden, 2013c, para. 1). In essence, he has given up what the public might consider to be the American dream to do what is “right” (Snowden, 2013c). In addition, Snowden suggests that the sacrifice might also involve his life, which he says he knew he was risking by disclosing NSA secrets (Greenwald & Poitras, 2013a; Snowden, 2013b; Snowden, 2013d). In a January 2014 interview broadcast on Germany’s *ARD* channel, Snowden notes that several U.S. government officials “told the [*Buzzfeed*] reporter . . . that they wanted to murder me. . . . to put a bullet in my head, to poison me as I was returning from the grocery store (“ARD,” 2014, paras. 3-4). By directing attention to his apparent sacrifices, Snowden appears to be encouraging the public to conclude that “approach” names such as “hero” and “whistleblower,” which embody “sacrifice” as a criterial attribute, are “appropriate” for clarifying his actions.

Snowden also highlights attention to the apparent reasons for his willingness to disclose information to reinforce the sacrificial nature of his actions. For example, in the note accompanying the NSA documents, Snowden writes, “I’m willing to sacrifice all of that because I can’t in good conscience allow the U.S. government to destroy privacy, internet freedom and basic liberties for people around the world with this massive surveillance machine they’re secretly building” (Greenwald et al., 2013, para. 8). In this statement and others similar to it, Snowden directs attention to how he is enacting behaviors expected of a “patriot” or “defender of freedom and democracy” without actually stating those names.

Finally, Snowden frequently emphasizes how the needs of the public outweigh his own needs, again foregrounding rhetorically criterial attributes associated with the “sacrifice” expected of a “patriot” or “whistleblower.” For example, in a September 2013 statement to the European Parliamentary Committee, Snowden explains, “[P]ublic debate is not possible without public knowledge, and in my country the cost for one in my position of returning public knowledge to public hands has been persecution and exile” (Gosztola, 2013, para. 9). Later, in a December 2013 letter to the people of Brazil, Snowden (2013d) writes, “The price for my speech was my passport, but I would pay it again: I will not be the one to ignore criminality for the sake of political comfort. I would rather be without a state than without a voice” (para. 24). In these kinds of statements, then, Snowden attempts to focus the public’s attention on how his apparent sacrifice was motivated by the need to protect freedom and democracy, to encourage the public to attend to his actions as criterial attributes that constitute “approach” names. His actions and behaviors do not constitute the “threat,” rather, those of the NSA and government do.

Snowden’s Other-Name Rhetorical Reasoning

In the identity-revealing interview, Snowden proposes the name “existential threat to democracy” for interpreting the NSA’s actions, and, by extension, the U.S. government’s actions. He features attention to criterial attributes of the NSA/government’s actions to demonstrate how the name appropriately makes sense of their actions

(Greenwald et al., 2013, para. 39). Thus, although Snowden avoids proposing and reasoning for a self-name, he specifically categorizes the NSA/government's actions symbolically. In interviews and statements, Snowden focuses attention on three expectancies or criterial attributes of a "democratic government operating with the consent of the people"—oversight, authority, and privacy. To encourage the public to agree with his reasoning that the NSA/government should be named a "threat," Snowden directs attention to how the NSA/government's actions fail to embody the three defining attributes of a "democracy."

To make real the apparent lack of public oversight, Snowden frequently refers to his own abilities as an NSA contractor to demonstrate the types of information the NSA can gather without the public's consent, thus constituting a "threat" to democracy. He "had the capability without any warrant to search for, seize, and read your communications. Anyone's communications at any time. That is the power to change people's fates" (Snowden, 2013c, para. 1). In an *NBC News* interview, Snowden describes the kinds of data that the NSA can obtain and store from people's cell phones and computers without their knowledge or agreement (Williams, 2014). "The government has granted itself power it is not entitled to. There is no public oversight. The result is people like myself have the latitude to go further than they are allowed to," Snowden writes in the note that accompanied the NSA documents (Greenwald et al., 2013, para. 41). By emphasizing the NSA's apparently wide-ranging data collection, use, and storage capabilities, Snowden attempts to feature attention to ways in which the government fails to enact the public oversight criterial attribute that constitutes the symbolic category "democracy." In so doing, Snowden reasons rhetorically that the "appropriate" name for the NSA's actions is "threat."

Similarly, Snowden directs attention to the ways in which the NSA's actions apparently exemplify criterial attributes associated with the symbolic category "illegal," to further support his reasoning that the appropriate name for the NSA is "threat" because it is ignoring the limits of its publicly granted authority. In a statement to human rights groups, Snowden (2013c) notes, "While the U.S. Constitution marks these programs as illegal, my government argues that secret court rulings, which the world is not permitted to see, somehow legitimize an illegal affair" (para. 2). In a Twitter interview, Snowden (2013a) names the NSA's monitoring of domestic institutions such as hospitals, universities, and businesses as "nakedly, aggressively criminal acts" because such actions go beyond the NSA's authorization to monitor foreign communication only. By emphasizing how the NSA's actions reflect criterial attributes associated with "criminal" or "non-authorized," Snowden attempts to reason rhetorically that the NSA's actions are a "threat" and encourage the public to reject the NSA's domestic surveillance actions.

Besides describing how the NSA's domestic actions fit the symbolic category of "criminal," Snowden also highlights the ways in which the agency has committed "illegal" foreign acts, such as monitoring the German chancellor's communications after claiming it did not (Gellman, 2013). "Congress hasn't declared war on the countries—the majority of them are our allies—but without asking for public permission, NSA is running network operations against them that affect millions of innocent people," Snowden (2013a) posts in a Twitter interview. By directing attention to the ways in which the NSA has operated outside the limits of its publicly granted authority to monitor foreign communication, Snowden attempts to support his naming proposal that "threat" is an "appropriate" way to categorize the NSA's actions symbolically.

In addition, Snowden tries to foreground how the NSA's actions fail to enact criterial attributes associated

with “privacy,” a taken-for-granted expectancy of citizens in a social system organized by democracy. Snowden emphasizes how the apparent violation of that expectancy “threatens” the future of the social system by reducing creativity and freedom. In the note accompanying the NSA documents, Snowden writes that without privacy, “intellectual exploration and creativity” will be limited (Greenwald et al., 2013, para. 38). He links the apparent need for privacy to the apparent need for creativity to promote individual and social system success. In a statement to a European parliamentary committee on civil liberties, justice, and home affairs, Snowden claims, “The success of economies in developing nations relies increasingly on their creative output and if that success is to continue we must remember that creativity is the product of curiosity, which in turn is the product of privacy” (Gosztola, 2013, para. 7). Thus, Snowden reasons rhetorically that his stated name “threat” is an “appropriate” way for making sense of the NSA’s activities because its apparent wide-ranging information monitoring actions may hinder activities necessary to a social system’s growth and survival.

Finally, Snowden attempts to categorize “privacy” symbolically as a criterial attribute of “freedom,” which is a constitutive tenet of “democracy.” In a Christmas video broadcast in the United Kingdom, Snowden (2013e) points out how “a child born today will grow up with no conception of privacy at all.” He attempts to reason rhetorically that the lack of privacy is a “problem” because “privacy is what allows us to determine who we are and who we want to be” (Snowden, 2013e). To support this categorization of “freedom,” Snowden refers to studies that appear to indicate “human behavior changes when we know we’re being watched. Under observation, we act less free, which means we effectively are less free” (Snowden, 2014a, para. 13). In essence, he reasons that by failing to give U.S. citizens privacy, the NSA is enacting behaviors that constitute a “threat” to “freedom” and “democracy.”

Snowden’s Transcendent Self-Name Rhetorical Reasoning

For about 10 months after the disclosure of his identity, Snowden reasons rhetorically in a way that avoids proposing a specific name for his actions. Only once in the discourse analyzed did Snowden propose a specific name for himself. In a March 2014 TED talk, Snowden (2014b) says, “If I had to describe myself, I wouldn’t use words like ‘hero.’ I wouldn’t use ‘patriot,’ and I wouldn’t use ‘traitor.’ I’d say I’m an American and I’m a citizen, just like everyone else.” In so doing, he offers a self-name that transcends “hero” and “patriot” and simultaneously incorporates criterial attributes associated with those symbolic categories.

However, in the remainder of the speech, Snowden fails to develop his reasoning and provide evidence that supports the “appropriateness” of the “American” and “citizen like everyone else” names for making sense of his actions. Instead, in his speech, Snowden describes actions and behaviors associated with the defining attributes of names like “hero” and “patriot” that he had foregrounded previously in speeches and interviews. Furthermore, the content of his presentation, which focused on his knowledge of the NSA’s actions and his own technological expertise, could be perceived as violating the expectancies of the symbolic category of “citizen like everyone else.” Rather than emphasizing his “sameness” with the name, his discourse may have emphasized his “differences.”

Discussion/Conclusion

Like others in the past who have chosen to disclose government secrets, Snowden faced the rhetorical PR battle of how to garner public support for his actions and attempt to avoid public sanctioning. In essence, the battle has revolved around whom to name as “threat”—Snowden as a potential “traitor” or “terrorist” or the NSA because of its apparent violation of privacy and freedom expectancies. As the analysis indicates, Snowden’s rhetorical reasoning approach has been to de-emphasize self-naming and emphasize other-naming. In the March 2014 TED talk, Snowden offers a clue as to why he primarily has enacted this approach. “Who I am really doesn’t matter at all,” he says. “What really matters here are the issues. What really matters here is the kind of government we want, the kind of Internet we want, the kind of relationship between people and societies” (Snowden, 2014b). By not proposing a self-name, Snowden attempts to define the conversation as being about the “threat” to freedom and privacy in contrast to the NSA’s naming Snowden’s actions as a “threat” because of their apparent “traitor” or “terrorist” nature. In essence, he argues that the conversation should not be about the name of the messenger but about the message itself. Hence, his lack of self-naming may be an attempt to separate his self from the message.

Furthermore, Snowden’s approach may reflect his belief in public choices, which he argues the NSA does not respect. As he frequently indicates in his interviews and statements, he released the NSA documents to give the public a choice about whether the NSA should conduct wide-ranging information-collecting activities. In not proposing a self-name, he may be attempting to offer the public a choice about naming his actions. A side effect of this approach and perhaps an advantage is that Snowden avoids getting bogged down in confrontations with other interveners, such as the U.S. government, regarding how he should be named, which would direct the conversation toward him and away from the issues.

However, because other interveners, such as government officials, commentators, and the media, play a role in defining the conversation, Snowden must contend with their symbolic categorizations of him, which potentially influence the public’s naming of him and its acceptance of his message. Narrative research suggests that how the public names a messenger potentially influences its acceptance of the message, with the public more likely to attend to and like a message promoted by a person it has categorized as “hero” (Jones, 2014a, 2014b). Thus, on the one hand, by discursively featuring attention to his actions as criterial attributes rather than stating a name, Snowden gives the appearance of not naming himself (in line with his “who I am really doesn’t matter” statement) and of offering the public choices. On the other hand, by highlighting rhetorically certain kinds of actions as criterial attributes, Snowden indirectly proposes a self-name by prompting the public to conclude that he is a “hero,” “whistleblower” or “patriot” to encourage support for his decision to disclose the documents. In essence, he responds to the others’ interventions to categorize his actions as the “threat” by both not naming and indirectly naming.

A potential side effect and disadvantage of Snowden’s both/and reasoning approach may be increased public uncertainty about how to make sense of his actions. In addition, by attempting to focus attention on the message, Snowden may be backgrounding his own attention to a potential self-naming opportunity that might enhance the public’s acceptance of his message. The lack of consensus in news and online polls measuring the

public's support for and response to Snowden's actions indicates that public opinion might not be moving in the direction he might have hoped (e.g., Dutton et al., 2014; Jagel, 2014; "NBC National," 2014; "NBC News/Wall Street Journal," 2014; "Obama's NSA Speech," 2014; Shonfeld, 2014; Swanson, 2014). Thus, Snowden's reasoning strategy may not be directing the conversation but hindering it, for without agreement on how to name Snowden, no future for him can be chosen. Although in the short term, this might seem advantageous for Snowden as the lack of a name means he avoids possible outcomes such as prosecution, in the long term, from the view of the RSI model, the U.S. public might compensate for the lack of naming agreement by either "forgetting" about Snowden to background its inability to make sense of Snowden's actions or by Snowden supporters and opponents more ardently advocating their communication of their naming choices, or both. A May 2014 NBC national news survey reported that 27% of those surveyed said they did not know about Snowden or the leaks, suggesting that the public may be moving toward backgrounding attention to Snowden, which would limit his ability to direct the conversation if the public is failing to attend to him. Snowden's downplaying of attention to the messenger may paradoxically be downplaying attention to his message.

Snowden's failure to propose a self-name may also have the side effect of violating the public's expectancies of how names typically are constituted and negotiated, as viewed from the RSI perspective (Brown, 1972, 1978). In an era in which the media, politicians, and commentators constantly propose and reason for specific names to interpret experience, the public might be unaccustomed to attending to criterial attributes and connecting the dots to constitute its own names, thus working to Snowden's disadvantage. Snowden's rhetorical reasoning approach also has the side effect of limiting the public's ability to compare others' naming proposals to his, which might also violate naming expectancies and contribute to the public's apparent inability to negotiate a name for him. Furthermore, Snowden's decision to briefly self-name as "American" and "average citizen" may have the side effect of increasing the public's confusion because he failed to reason for the "appropriateness" of the names, and the public may have interpreted his speech content as contradicting expectancies associated with the names.

Snowden's choice to define "threat" as the NSA's actions suggests that he is attempting to shape the conversation in a way that encourages the public to reject the NSA's actions and accept his. A potential side effect and advantage of Snowden's approach may be a shift in the public's attention away from who Snowden is as a person and toward the issues of freedom and privacy. Another side effect of Snowden's stating directly a name for the NSA's deeds is that he also may mask attention to the potential "illegality" and "criminality" of his own actions. Furthermore, the public may perceive this rhetorical reasoning approach as more effectively meeting its expectations of how conversations are defined in that Snowden provides the public with a specific name that fits an apparent cultural emphasis on "either/or" naming. Polls suggest that Snowden's approach to reasoning rhetorically about the NSA and related issues has been working to his advantage, with the public either maintaining or increasing its disapproval of the NSA's surveillance activities (Dutton et al., 2014; Jagel, 2014; "Obama's NSA Speech," 2014). Furthermore, the June 2015 passage of the USA Freedom Act, which limited the NSA's ability to mass collect and store phone records of U.S. citizens, also indicates that the public has increased awareness of the NSA as a "threat" (Siddiqui, 2015).

Overall, the analysis of Snowden’s discourse suggests that certain rhetorical reasoning emphases may be more advantageous than others for those doing “battle” to define the conversation in their terms. But to confirm this, instances similar to Snowden’s need to be examined to see if the naming patterns and outcomes detected in this study recur. Moreover, cases in which the person at the center of public attention proposes a self-name need to be compared to this study’s findings to see how public uncertainty might be influenced. Furthermore, because of time and length limitations, this study focused only on Snowden’s first person discourse to highlight attention to the rhetorical reasoning process. Future studies should broaden the examination to see how that reasoning process is influenced in interactions among Snowden, the government, media, and other stakeholders. In addition, the findings point to another aspect of defining the conversation that needs attention—whether the rhetorical reasoning process leads to or is reflective of (or both) a social system focused on “either/or” naming as opposed to “both/and” naming. How might the conversation have been different if Snowden had proposed that he is both “hero” and “traitor?” How might attention have switched if the NSA’s activities were named as both “threatening” and “protecting” freedom and privacy? How might the PR battle be “won” if “threat” were defined as both Snowden’s and the NSA’s actions?

References

- Aden, R.C., Pearson, P., & Sell, L. (2010). Placing townies: The symbolic work of naming. *Communication Quarterly*, 58(3), 279-296. doi:10.1080/01463373.2010.503157
- ARD interview with Edward Snowden (2014, January 26). *Free Snowden*. Retrieved from <http://www.freesnowden.is/2014/01/27/video-ard-interview-with-edward-snowden/index.html>
- Atkins-Sayre, W. (2005). Naming women: The emergence of “Ms.” as a liberatory title. *Women and Language*, 28(1), 8-16. Retrieved from <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-133864710.html>
- Baldwin, B. (2013, June 10). *NSA leaker on the run: Hero or traitor* [CNN Newsroom]. Atlanta, GA: CNN. Retrieved from Newsbank database.
- Blake, A. (2013, June 17). The PR battle over Edward Snowden—in two polls. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/06/17/the-pr-battle-over-edward-snowden-in-two-polls/>
- Bolling, E. (2013, June 10). *NSA leader: Hero or traitor* [The Five]. New York: Fox News. Retrieved from Newsbank database.
- Bricker, B. J. (2014). Feigning environmentalism: Antienvironmental organizations, strategic naming, and definitional argument. *Western Journal of Communication*, 78(5), 636-652. doi:10.1080/10570314.2013.835065
- Brown, W. R. (1972). Language and strategy. In J. Makay & W. Brown (Eds.), *The rhetorical dialogue: Contemporary concepts and cases* (pp. 365-433). Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Brown, W. R. (1978). Ideology as communication process. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 64, 123-140. doi:10.1080/00335637809383420.
- Brown, W. R. (1982). Attention and the rhetoric of social intervention. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 68, 17-27. doi:10.1080/00335638209383588.
- Bruner, J. S., Goodnow, J. J., & Austin, G. A. (1965). *A study of thinking*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Chang, H. C., & Holt, R. (2011). Naming China: Taiwan's National Day speeches as identity politics. *Journal of Language & Politics*, 10(3), 396-415. doi:10.1075/jlp.10.3.05cha
- DeBord, S. (2009). From count them out to *Count Us In*. In S. K. Opt & M. A. Gring (Eds.), *The rhetoric of social intervention: An introduction* (pp. 169-184). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dutton, S., DePinto, J., Salvanto, A., & Backus, F. (2014, January 22). Poll: Most think Edward Snowden should stand trial in U.S. *CBS News*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/poll-most-think-edward-snowden-should-stand-trial-in-us/>
- Edward Snowden responds to release of e-mail by U.S. officials. (2014, May 29). *Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/edward-snowden-responds-to-release-of-e-mail-by-us-officials/2014/05/29/95137e1c-e781-11e3-afc6-a1dd9407abcf_story.html
- Ellsberg, D. (2013, June 10). Daniel Ellsberg: Edward Snowden is a hero and we need more whistleblowers. *The Daily Beast*. Retrieved from Newsbank database.
- Engels, J. (2009). Friend or foe?: Naming the enemy. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 12(1), 37-64. doi:10.1353/rap.0.0096
- Fitzsimmons, P. (2010). Little white lies: 9/11 and the recasting of evil through metaphor. In N. Billas (Ed.) *At the interface: Probing the boundaries* (pp. 3-17). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Ropodi B.V.
- Galasiński, D., & Skowronek, K. (2001). Naming the nation: A critical analysis of names in Polish political discourse. *Political Communication*, 18, 51-66. doi:10.1080/10584600150217659
- Gellman, B. (2013, December 23). Edward Snowden, after months of NSA revelations, says his mission's accomplished. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/edward-snowden-after-months-of-nsa-revelations-says-his-missions-accomplished/2013/12/23/49fc36de-6c1c-11e3-a523-fe73f0ff6b8d_story.html#
- Gosztola, K. (2013, September 30). Snowden's statement to European Parliamentary Committee on 'greatest human rights challenge of our time.' Retrieved from <http://dissenter.firedoglake.com/2013/09/30/snowdens-statement-to-european-parliamentary-committee-on-greatest-human-rights-challenge-of-our-time/>
- Greenwald, G., MacAskill, E., & Poitras, L. (2013, June 9). Edward Snowden: The whistleblower behind the NSA surveillance revelations. *The Guardian*, p. 2. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jun/09/edward-snowden-nsa-whistleblower-surveillance>
- Greenwald, G., & Poitras, L. (2013a, June 9). *Prism whistleblower* [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/world/video/2013/jun/09/nsa-whistleblower-edward-snowden-interview-video>
- Greenwald, G. & Poitras, L. (2013b, July 8). *Snowden interview part 2* [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/world/video/2013/jul/08/edward-snowden-video-interview>
- Gring, M. A. (1998). Attention, power, and need: The rhetoric of religion and revolution in Nicaragua. *World Communication Journal*, 27(4), 27-37. Retrieved from Communication & Mass Media Complete database.
- Huang, S. (1996). *To rebel is justified: A rhetorical study of China's cultural revolution movement, 1966-1969*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

- Jagel, K. (2014, January 22). Poll results: Snowden. *YouGov*. Retrieved from <http://today.yougov.com/news/2014/01/22/poll-results-snowden/>
- Jones, M. D. (2014a). Communicating climate change: Are stories better than “just the facts?” *Policy Studies Journal*, 42(4), 644-673. doi:10.1111/psj.12072
- Jones, M. D. (2014b). Cultural characters and climate change: How heroes shape our perception of climate science. *Social Science Quarterly*, 95(1), 1-39. doi:10.1111/ssqu.12043
- Kates, J. (2010). Naming the forest fire: Journalists define the “Red Demon,” 1871-1933. *Media History Monographs*, 12(2), 2-18. Retrieved from <http://facstaff.elon.edu/dcopeland/mhm/volume12.htm>
- Keith, S. (2006). Abigail Scott Duniway: The rhetoric of intervention and the new northwest. *Texas Speech Communication Journal*, 30(2), 146-157. Retrieved from Communication & Mass Media Complete database.
- Langer, S. (1980). *Philosophy in a new key: A study in the symbolism of reason, rite, and art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Levinson, M. H. (2011, July) Mapping the Persian Gulf naming dispute. *ETC*, 279-287. Retrieved from <http://www.generalsemantics.org/etc>
- Liptak, K. (2013, June 10). King: ‘Defector’ Snowden is a danger to national security. *CNN Wire*. Retrieved from Newsbank database.
- Milstein, T. (2011). Nature identification: The power of pointing and naming. *Environmental Communication*, 5(1), 3-24. doi:10.1080/17524032.2010.535836
- NBC national news survey (2014, May). *NBC News*. Retrieved from http://msnbcmedia.msn.com/i/MSNBC/Sections/A_Politics/14353%20May%20NBC%20News%20National%20Survey%20Interview%20Schedule.pdf
- NBC News/Wall Street Journal survey (2014, January). *MSNBC*. Retrieved from http://msnbcmedia.msn.com/i/MSNBC/Sections/A_Politics/_Today_Stories_Teases/14039%20NBC-WSJ%20JANUARY%20POLL%20%281-28%20RELEASE%29.pdf
- Obama’s NSA speech has little impact on skeptical public (2014, January 20). *Pew Research Center for the People & the Press*. Retrieved from <http://www.people-press.org/2014/01/20/obamas-nsa-speech-has-little-impact-on-skeptical-public/>
- Opt, S. (2012). Mammogram-screening policy as need intervention. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 40(1), 1-19. doi:10.1080/00909882.2011.636375.
- Opt, S. (2013). Apology as power intervention: The case of News of the World. *Western Journal of Communication*, 77(4), 424-443. doi:10.1080/10570314.2013.767471
- Opt, S., & Gring, M. (2009). *The rhetoric of social intervention: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Oyelakin, O. (2009). *The Butterflies’ rhetorical challenge: The choices of social interveners*. In S. K. Opt & M. A. Gring (Eds.), *The rhetoric of social intervention: An introduction* (pp. 199-212). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Phillips, S., & Gring, M. (2009). "The lady's not for turning:" Margaret Thatcher's attention intervention. In S. K. Opt & M. A. Gring (Eds.), *The rhetoric of social intervention: An introduction* (pp. 185-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rushkoff, D. (2013, June 9). Edward Snowden is a hero. *CNN Wire*. Retrieved from Newsbank database.
- Shonfeld, Z. (2014, June 3). Most Americans think Snowden did the right thing, poll says. *Newsweek*. Retrieved from <http://www.newsweek.com/most-americans-think-snowden-did-right-thing-poll-says-253163>
- Siddiqui, S. (2015, June 3). Congress passes NSA surveillance reform in vindication for Snowden, *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/jun/02/congress-surveillance-reform-edward-snowden>
- Skorinko, J. L., Kemmer, S., Hebl, M. R., & Lane, D. M. (2006). A rose by any other name...: Color-naming influences on decision making. *Psychology & Marketing*, 23(12), 975-993. doi: 10.1002/mar.20142
- Snowden, E. (2013a, June 17). Edward Snowden: NSA whistleblower answers reader questions. *theguardian.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jun/17/edward-snowden-nsa-files-whistleblower>
- Snowden, E. (2013b, July 1). Statement for Edward Snowden in Moscow. *Wikileaks.org*. Retrieved from <http://wikileaks.org/Statement-from-Edward-Snowden-in.html?snow>
- Snowden, E. (2013c, July 12). Statement by Edward Snowden to human rights groups at Moscow's Sheremetyevo airport. *Wikileaks.org*, Retrieved from <http://wikileaks.org/Statement-by-Edward-Snowden-to.html>
- Snowden, E. (2013d, December 16). An open letter to the people of Brazil. *Folha de S.Paolo*. Retrieved from <http://www1.folha.uol.com.br/internacional/en/world/2013/12/1386296-an-open-letter-to-the-people-of-brazil.shtml>
- Snowden, E. (2013e, December 25). *Edward Snowden warms about loss of privacy in Christmas message* [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/world/video/2013/dec/25/edward-snowden-christmas-message-video>
- Snowden, E. (2014a, January 23). Live Q&A with Edward Snowden. *Free Snowden: In Support of Edward Snowden*. Retrieved from <http://www.freesnowden.is/asksnowden/>
- Snowden, E. (2014b, March). Here's how we take back the Internet. *Ted2014*. Retrieved from http://www.ted.com/talks/edward_snowden_here_s_how_we_take_back_the_internet
- Snowden interview with Fantástico (2013, December 22). *Free Snowden*. Retrieved from <http://www.freesnowden.is/2013/12/29/video-snowden-interview-with-fantastico/index.html#more-2127>
- Snyder, L. (2005, Fall). Argument as intervention in the Revelation of John: A rhetorical analysis. *Stone-Campbell Journal*, 8, 245-259. Available from http://www.stone-campbelljournal.com/the_journal/research/volume_8_issue_2/80206/
- Snyder, L. (2009). Born to power: Influence in the rhetoric of the posse comitatus. In S. K. Opt & M. A. Gring (Eds.), *The rhetoric of social intervention: An introduction* (pp. 213-228). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Swanson, E. (2014, April 1). Americans might not support Edward Snowden, but they support disclosing programs. *Huffington Post*, Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/04/01/edward-snowden-support_n_5071938.html
- Temmerman, M. (2010). Naming and framing in Belgian politics: An analysis of the representation of politicians and the political state of affairs during the 2007 government formation period in the Belgian press. *Belgian Journal of Linguistic*, 24, 120-138. doi:10.1075/bjl.24.06tem
- Toobin, J. (2013, June 10). Edward Snowden is no hero. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from Newsbank database.
- Trioen, M., & Temmerman, M. (2009). Patterns of inconsistency: Naming and transitivity in the coverage of the World Youth Day 2005 in the Flemish press. In H. Geybels, S. Mels, and M. Walrave (Eds.), *Analysis of faith and media: Representation and communication* (pp. 71-102). Brussels: P.I.E. Peter Lang.
- Williams, B. (2014, May 28). *Inside the mind of Edward Snowden* [NBC News]. New York: NBC. Retrieved from <http://www.nbcnews.com/feature/edward-snowden-interview>

No Girls Allowed: A Textual Analysis of Newspaper Coverage of the National Council of Women’s Organization’s Protest of the 2003 Masters Tournament

Mary Tucker-McLaughlin & Cindy Elmore

The National Council of Women’s Organization’s president, Martha Burk, made headlines in 2003 when she exposed the Augusta National to the global media spotlight. The famous golf club, and host of the internationally known Masters tournament, had never admitted a female member to its golf club. Using a textual analysis and frames analysis, this paper compares the local, regional, and national newspaper coverage of the National Council of Women’s Organizations’ protest at The Augusta National’s 2003 Masters Tournament. The coverage was analyzed according to four variables: location of the newspaper, Op/Ed letters and columns, the gender of the reporter covering the story, and the general discursive construction of the event. The analysis found that male reporters and the close-proximity newspaper were more likely to negatively construct the event in the articles. Ninety-four articles were analyzed in the study. Drawing on other scholarship that has explored media coverage of feminist topics, the paper discusses the implications of this negative, and patriarchal, news coverage.

Keywords: golf, feminism, sports, Augusta National, Masters, protest

In 2012, after decades of requests by women and women’s organizations, the Augusta National Golf Club, host of “The Masters,” finally admitted its first female members. As sportswriter Christine Brennan wrote (Brennan, 2012), the opening is important for women because it “allow[s] women into the place where the old boys’ network works its million-dollar magic . . . Ask any golf-playing businessman where he has crafted a deal or two or 10, and he’ll undoubtedly say: ‘the golf course.’” Yet, this breakthrough did not come about without a long struggle by women and their equal rights supporters. In recognition of this effort, this study first describes a well-known 2003 protest against the Augusta National’s all-male policy.¹ As with many public protests, this one received significant media interest.

Mary Tucker-McLaughlin is an associate professor in the School of Communication at East Carolina University. Cindy Elmore is also an associate professor in the School of Communication at East Carolina University. A previous version of this paper was presented at the AEJMC, Commission on the Status of Women in Washington, DC, 2013. Correspondence to: Mary Tucker-McLaughlin, East Carolina University, School of Communication, 122 Joyner East, Greenville, NC, 27858, USA. Email: tuckermclaughlinm@ecu.edu.

¹The Augusta National Golf Club did not have a membership policy that specifically excluded participants on the basis of gender or race. Instead, members are personally invited. There is no application process. However, the club, up until 2012, had never invited a woman to become a member (Anderson, 2002).

In this paper, the protest background is described, followed by a review of the literature about the coverage of women and feminist issues in the news. Next, we describe our study, which drew upon textual and framing analysis in the examination of newspaper content about the protest. Lastly, we critique the newspapers' discourse and discuss the consequences of these socially constructed ways of describing one of the last major U.S. protests for equal access for women. These findings will help to extend the understanding about how the struggle for equal opportunities for women is characterized by the news media and provide new insights into the ways journalists discursively construct this locally contentious issue with national implications.

The Protest

Dr. Martha Burk, former president of the National Council of Women's Organizations (NCWO), took on the golf world in 2003 after reading an article in *USA Today* about the continued all-male members' policy at the Augusta National Golf Club. The club is renowned for hosting what some call the most widely publicized sporting event in the world, The Masters golf tournament (Lenkiewicz, 2011; Markiewicz, 2003).

Burk spoke to the executive committee at NCWO and they agreed that a letter should be written to the Augusta National concerning its exclusion of women as members. More than 200 women's organizations, and millions of women, belong to the NCWO, the most familiar of which is NOW or the National Organization for Women.

The Augusta National's Masters Tournament draws thousands of reporters annually, not to mention hundreds of thousands of spectators, and TV viewers in the millions. As a world renowned private club, The Augusta National maintains a reputation for its pristine golf course and long heritage dating back to the early 1930s. It was also one of the last American golf clubs to exclude women members, despite some negative repercussions (Lenkiewicz, 2011; Shipnuck, 2004).

This paper examines the coverage of this 2003 protest by three newspapers: *The Augusta Chronicle*, the local paper; *The Atlanta Journal Constitution*, a regional newspaper; and *The New York Times*, a nationally distributed newspaper. This case study examines the coverage according to four variables: the geographic location of the newspaper, the published Op/Ed letters, editorials, and columns; the gender of reporters covering the story, and the discursive framing of the published pieces. Based upon our textual analysis, we sought to determine whether—and if so, how—the proximity of the newspaper to the event resulted in different editorial treatment of the NCWO protest. Secondly, we gauged whether or not male and female reporters seemed to cover this feminist protest differently. Third, we analyzed the written responses from the community, from columnists, and at times the opinion of the newspapers themselves in the Op/Ed section of each newspaper; and lastly, we analyzed the general article texts to determine if the coverage reinforced dominant gender ideologies. This analysis adds to scholarship about media coverage of political and civil rights causes that are gender focused (Terkilsden & Schnell, 1997; & Husting, 1999). Because the Augusta National Golf Club protest was led by a feminist organization, and

because the news media, especially sports departments,² are dominated by males, this analysis was particularly focused on whether or not patriarchal or feminist ideologies were reinforced in the reporting.

News Discourse about Feminists, Feminist Issues

Feminist scholars continue to challenge news media concerning their coverage of both feminist issues and female leaders (Bradley, 2003; Douglas, 1994; Lawless, 2009; Mendes, 2011a; Pingree & Hawkins, 1978; Sheridan, Magarey & Lilburn, 2007; Tuchman, 1978; Tuchman, 1979; van Zoonen, E.A., 1992). When feminist leaders intersect with the sports world, a primarily male venue, the resulting news coverage can underscore what is a continuing patriarchal bias in the news. Scholars have established that feminists and feminist issues have been either “symbolically annihilated” by their absence in the media or been covered in the media in such a way as to present them as inferior or the “other” (Bradley, 2003; Tuchman, 1979; see also Husting, 1999; Lind & Salo, 2002; and Ross & Carter, 2011). The “other” signifies “outsiders” who do not fall within mainstream, predominantly white, male society or support the dominant hegemony. One form of such “othering” has been with media portrayals of feminists as “man-hating radicals out of touch with the concerns of average American women” (Bronstein, 2005, p. 783; see also van Zoonen, 1992), with a clear discursive “demarcation between ‘legitimate’ and ‘de-legitimate’ feminists, the latter being anyone who deviates from traditional feminine norms,” (Mendes, 2011c, p. 483). In her analysis of news coverage of second wave feminism, Bradley (2003) found feminists portrayed with sometimes bizarre stereotypes, with a complex feminist agenda reduced to the single issue of workplace equity. On the whole, she found the media simultaneously supported, distorted, and ignored the feminist movement (see also Mendes, 2011c). Others find feminist causes positioned as ineffective (Mendes, 2011c), feminist activism marginalized (Husting, 1999), and some of the most newsworthy women in America—the presidential first ladies—ignored, or belittled as an example of a narrow, anti-feminist and stereotypical media discourse (Beasley, 2005). Many scholars find the media has trivialized feminist messages (Chambers, Steiner, & Fleming, 2004; Lind & Salo, 2002; Rhode, 1997). Mendes (2012) writes that media narratives about Third Wave feminism, “largely serve to undercut feminism’s progress and seek to instill a sense that women have already made it, and thus further activism is unnecessary” (p. 557), or, as Bronstein (2005) terms it, feminism is portrayed as a less substantive, apolitical “Feminism Lite” (p. 788) that represents no threat to the status quo. Feminism and feminists have even been ridiculed outright (Mendes, 2011c). For example, a 1993 *Newsweek* column covering anti-rape activists on a college campus bore the title “Stop Whining” (Pozner, 2003). Popular conservative radio host Rush Limbaugh unabashedly refers to feminists as “FemiNazis” and even called the National Organization of Women a terrorist group (Pozner, 2003). The examples illustrate a widespread margin

Many scholars find there is a patriarchal culture in the newsroom (Beasley & Gibbons, 2003; Chambers, et al. 2004; Elmore, 2007; Robinson, 2005) that is internalized by women as embodying the

² The 2010-11 Associated Press Sports Editors’ Racial and Gender Report found that 94 percent of sports editors were men, 90 percent of assistant sports editors were men, 90 percent of columnists were men, 89 percent of reporters were men, and 84 percent of copy editors/designers were men (Mitsu Klos, D., 2013).

neutral professional norm of journalism. This culture is particularly prevalent at the sports desk, where as few as 6 percent of women occupy sports reporting positions (Mastro, Seate, Blecha, & Gallegos, 2012). Sports reporting remains a domain of white males (Mastro et al., 2012; Skirstad, 2009) where female staffers constantly face the tensions of identifying both as women and as professional journalists (Hardin & Shain, 2006). In such a location, advocating for women and women's issues often serves only to marginalize the status of female sports journalists (Hardin & Shain, 2005).

Female journalists have long been socialized to believe that they have to adopt masculine newsroom norms if they want to get ahead (Mills, 1988, p. 238; see also, Beasley & Gibbons, 2003; Chambers, et al., 2004; Creedon, 1993; de Bruin & Ross, 2004; Gist, 1993; Hardin & Whiteside, 2009; Mills, 1997), "which may obviate any differences based on journalist gender" (Meeks, 2013, p. 59). Female sports journalists often practice "gender passivity," hoping to assimilate in a male dominated workforce that frowns upon femininity (Claringbould & Knoppers, 2012, p. 412). In fact, Hardin posits that female sports journalists may be more career conflicted than female journalists in other departments and that "over" identification with male work ethos, or making every effort to blend in, were means of avoiding gender tensions (Hardin & Whiteside, 2009, p. 630).

At the same time, however, considerable scholarship also asserts that female journalists carry out the selection, reporting, sourcing, writing, and/or editing of news differently from their male counterparts (see, for example, Armstrong, 2004; Beasley, 1993; Bradley, 2003; Bradley, 2005; Chambers, et al., 2004; Elmore, 2008; Kahn & Goldenberg, 1991; Liebler & Smith, 1997; Meeks, 2013; Mills, 1988; Peiser, 2000; van Zoonen, 1998; Zoch & Turk, 1998). Bradley (2003), for example, writes that the increase in the number of female reporters and media executives between 1965 and 1975 seemed to be in direct correlation with increased supportive coverage of women's issues. However, she wrote, in later years the nature of the representations of women began to reflect a growing conservatism in the U.S., and female journalists "seemed to have adopted stereotypical views of other women" (Bradley, 2003, p. 218).

Results from this study vary little from previous scholarship on feminist portrayals in the media. This is significant in that the data is from 2003, yet the analysis shows little advancement from studies done in the 1970s and 1980s. Symbolic annihilation in this instance not only appears in the representations by the newspapers of feminist discourse, but additionally seems to spread to the culture of the sports page affecting the local female journalists' ability to fairly represent the protest in their coverage of the event, symbolically annihilating their gender as reporters (Tuchman, 1979).

Nontraditional Media Content: Letters to the Editor

Social protests and problems are often the topic of newspaper editorials and of "Letters to the Editor" from community members. While newspaper editors widely support the idea that their letters to the editor sections are a public forum for an all-sides debate of ideas and issues (Reader, Stempel, & Daniel, 2004; Richardson & Franklin, 2004; Wahl-Jorgensen, 2001; 2002; 2004), in reality, the section may not be the pure "public opinion barometer" (Wahl-Jorgensen, 2002, p. 122) that editors say they support. This is because the writers of such letters are more likely to be male, older, and of a higher socio-economic status

than the general public they are purported to represent (Reader, Stempel, & Daniel, 2004; Sigelman & Walkosz, 1992; Singletary & Cowling, 1979). In addition, the editors of those sections engage in a form of gatekeeping bias in their selection of which letters to publish and which to discard (Grey & Brown, 1970; Reader & Moist, 2008; Renfro, 1979). In explaining his subjective selection criteria, one letters editor tellingly told researcher David Hill, “We publish most [letters], certainly all *appropriate* ones” (emphasis added) (Hill, 1981, p. 389). Editors are often partial to letters “that show [the writers’] authority through their professional or public status or by their knowledge about a certain subject, or readers that represent an institution or organization” (da Silva, 2012, p. 253). Yet, by their very selection, newspapers are signaling that the letters chosen are important. Their very publication helps to “legitimate their contents” (da Silva, 2012, p. 259). Researchers find that most letters selected for publication are about “current, controversial local issues” (Renfro, 1979, p. 825), and that most are negative or reflect views that are more extreme than that of the population at large (Kerr & Moy, 2002). Editors, in fact, acknowledge that they are disinclined to reject a letter even if it is “sexist, racist, homophobic, or generally intolerant” (Wahl-Jorgensen, 2004, p. 89). And in fact, they view “provocative letters ... [as] instrumental in engendering public debate” (Wahl-Jorgensen, 2004, p. 98). After all, the letters to the editor sections are generally popular among readers (Reader & Moist, 2008; Hynds, 1991; Pounds, 2006), and influential among readers (Wahl-Jorgensen, 2004).

Newspaper Proximity as a Factor in Coverage

This study also examines news coverage of the Augusta National protest in accordance with the proximity of the newspaper to the event and how that proximity may or may not affect the stories written about the event. Journalists are routinely taught that “proximity” is one of the hallmark determinants of the newsworthiness of an event. Events that are closest in proximity to a news outlet are often more likely to be covered than far-away events. Moreover, nearby events demand fewer resources in terms of costs and time. Oliver and Maney (2000) found support for this effect in previous newspaper coverage of protests. In a separate study, Oliver and Myers (1999) noted that close proximity may predispose journalists and news organizations to handle the news in a certain way. The authors observed that protest movements that have “an organizational sponsor with positive ties to the news media” can “fare rather well in local news coverage” (Oliver & Myers, 1999, p. 77). In his 2010 study, Castello explored “conditioning factors” that have implications for the coverage of events and organizations within close proximity to media outlets (Castello, 2010, p. 475). Castello found that proximity had a direct relationship with the positive framing of stories about local organizations. Qualitative interviews with the journalists identified a common fear about negative reporting on those organizations with considerable community influence. Journalists expressed that they were “careful” in reporting negative stories because of the economic repercussions to the communities that depend on these organizations. The Augusta National and its Masters tournament represent a considerable economic influence in the local Augusta, Georgia community. Local journalists may have experienced similar concerns about negatively reporting issues in regards to the golf club (Castello, 2010).

In the present study, the owner of the local *Augusta Chronicle* newspaper was at the time of the protests a member of the Augusta National Golf Club, a powerful affiliation that may mean coverage in the local paper is different from that of less-affiliated regional and national papers. Martha Burk and her organizational supporters, however, were not local to Augusta. Oliver and Myers (1999) point out that “independent tabulations of protest events against which to compare the media record are extraordinarily rare” (p. 39). By studying the Augusta National protest, this case study can help to shed light on the proximity effect of newspapers with regard to the coverage of a feminist issue.

Method and Analysis

This study looked at the coverage of the NCWO protest by three separate newspapers: *The Augusta Chronicle*, a local newspaper; *The Atlanta Journal Constitution*, a regional newspaper; and *The New York Times*, a national newspaper. Articles were located using a keyword search in the Lexus-Nexus academic database, using the terms “Augusta National” and “Martha Burk” together. All articles about the NCWO protest published in the newspapers between March 1, 2003 and May 30, 2003, the two-month time period surrounding the protest, were examined. This particular period was chosen for analysis because of the concentration of news coverage by all publications during the two month time frame. The sample size was limited to 94 pieces, because of the demanding process of qualitative textual analysis.

All 94 pieces, including news stories, sports stories, guest columns, editorials, letters to the editor, and “rants”³ published during that time frame were examined. Using an index of questions to determine bias, the published pieces were coded on the basis of location, reporter gender, support or non-support for the protest, and type of published piece, and then were analyzed using basic descriptive statistics. After close readings, pieces were determined to have a negative tone if they manifestly contained language that supported the Augusta National or contained language that disparaged Burk, her organization, the protest, or the notion that the Augusta National should admit women. Pieces were deemed as neutral if they included a fair number of statements from both parties and the language in the article was of a neutral and not negative or supportive nature. Articles that appeared to support the NCWO contained language supportive of the organization’s stance on the membership policy or contained negative language towards the Augusta National. Simple frequencies were tabulated to illustrate patterns.

³ Rants are similar to the letters to the editors section but are limited in word count and are anonymous. These sections offer the opportunity for community members to submit opinions about issues with which they disagree. Some publishers consider these sections in conjunction with “letters to the editor” as a “safety valve” for upset community members (Hynds, 1992).

Table 1: Types and Number of Published Items

Comparison	NYT	NYT%	AJC	AJC%	Chronicle	Chronicle%	Total
News Stories	2	10%	7	17.9%	10	28.57%	
Op/Ed including “Letters to the Editor”, Guest Columns, Editorials, Sports Editorial and Rants and Raves	5	25%	2	5%	20	57.14%	
Sports pieces	13	65%	30	77%	5	14.28%	
Total	20		39		35		94

*NYT refers to *The New York Times*; AJC refers to the *Atlanta Journal Constitution*; and Chronicle is an abbreviation for *The Augusta Chronicle*.

Table 1 details the three newspapers’ coverage in general terms. Of all the newspapers, *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution* (AJC) had the highest number of pieces covering the event, 39 in all. That’s four more pieces than appeared in *The Augusta Chronicle* (*the Chronicle*), which ran 35 pieces, over 57% of which were letters to the editor, editorials, rants, and guest columns. As expected, *The New York Times*, as a national newspaper far distant from the event, published far fewer than the others, 20 pieces. Even so, 20 articles or letters about a single far-off issue within a two-month time frame in *The New York Times* indicated a relatively high level of interest in the NWCO protest.

Table 2: Support/non-support of Protest Reflected in Published Items

Tone of Pieces	NYT	%	AJC	%	Chronicle	%	Total publications	%
Supported Augusta National	3	15%	23	58.9%	25	71%	51	54.2%
Supported Martha Burk	6	30%	2	5%	2	5%	10	10.6%

Neutral articles	11	55%	14	35.8%	8	22%	33	35.1%
Total	20		39		35		94	

Among the three newspapers overall, only 10% of *all* pieces expressed clear support for the feminists in their protest against the Augusta National (see *Table 2*). *The Augusta Chronicle* news and sports coverage was much less supportive, with 60% of the articles supporting the Augusta National in its male-only membership, while 40% appeared to be neutral and none of the articles expressed clear support for Burk and the NCWO. More than 54% of the pieces published among the three papers overtly supported the antifeminist policies at the Augusta National.

Table 2 A: Analysis of Tone of News and Sports Coverage, *The Augusta Chronicle*

Augusta Chronicle	pos	neg	neu	Total articles
sports/news				15
male	0	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	10
female	0	3 (60%)	2(40%)	5
Total		9 (60%)	6 (40%)	

One way that the media marginalizes feminists and other civil rights causes is to discredit them either through emotive language or by underrepresentation, according to Tuchman (1979). Emotional language or personal put-downs can be found throughout the text of all the articles that were critical of the protest. For example, the *Chronicle*'s Scott Michaux uses both demanding and sarcastic language to reaffirm the dominant power of male club leaders and to discredit the feminist protesters as a bothersome distraction:

The sooner Burk and her cronies withdraw from the debate, the sooner the club might consider change. As for Johnson's prospects for longevity as the club's chairman, the 72-year old isn't backing down. "You're not going to get rid of me anytime soon," he said. Let's hope the same *can't* be said of Burk's crusade. (Michaux, 2003)

An article in the sports section of *The Atlanta Journal Constitution* began this way: "From Martha Burk and Jesse Jackson to the Ku Klux Klan and Insanely Queer, everybody wants to be heard at this year's Masters Tournament in April..." (Markiewicz, 2003, 6C). This lead rhetorically attaches feminist and minority organizations together with the Ku Klux Klan, implying they are equivalent and similarly motivated. If indeed "everybody" wanted to be heard, why are the comparison entities mostly out of the mainstream? Perhaps because all three of the entities mentioned as being at one with Martha Burk are references to "others" – an African-American civil rights leader, a delegitimized white racist group, and, presumably, a gay rights group, although the article never defines "Insanely Queer" -- all are positioned as being outside of the mainstream.

According to Tuchman, the content of quotes can bias the reader (Tuchman, 1972), and reporters always have the choice of whose and which quotes to include and whose to leave out of their articles. As a result, for instance, if two-thirds of the quotes selected for inclusion in an article represent the NCWO's cause, then the reader may be influenced to disapprove of the Augusta National. However, according to the accepted standards of journalistic fairness, prickly quotes that make interesting reading need to be balanced with quotes supporting the other side of an issue. Oftentimes, however, the quotes from the NCWO were professional in nature, while those opposing Dr. Burk took on an *ad hominem* style of argumentation, tossing barbs at the protesters and not addressing the issues they were there to draw attention to. Although some barbs were tossed at the Augusta National for its membership rules, the majority were aimed at the NCWO and its opposition to the all-male membership policy. The public relations director for Augusta National was quoted by the Sports Editor of *The Augusta Chronicle* at the end of an article saying, "The fact is that Ms. Burk has waged her dubious campaign from the start with threats and insults and mockery," Greenspan said. "She has persisted for months now, though the public clearly believes that this is not among the serious, pressing issues facing the country" (Boyette, 2003).

Some passages, such as this one from the April 13, 2003, Sunday edition of *The New York Times* sports page, positioned Burk as weak and unprepared to face the Augusta National's publicity machine. Defying the AP Style conventions of newspapers, the female columnist refers to Ms. Burk as Martha, instead of referring to her as Burk, the journalistic norm. The writer wrote:

In a scene that was one Incredible Shrinking Head short of a carnival, polished cars shone like hard candy under the sun, parked in rows to divide the protest freaks (the KuKlux Klan's pro-Hootie contingent of one), from the protest meek (the two dozen Martha Assembled for change). (Roberts, 2003)

Table 3: Analysis of Guest Columns and Letters to the Editor, Rants and Editorials

Editorial Section Comparison	NYT	%	AJC	%	Chronicle	%	Total
Letters/columns supporting Burk	1	20%	0	0	2	11%	3
Letters/Columns supporting Augusta National	1	20%	2	100%	18	77%	21
Letters/Columns that are neutral	3	60%	0	0	0	11%	3
Total	5	100%	2	100%	20	100%	27

If news stories are subtle in their support or non support of an issue (i.e. including more negative or positive language or quotes) towards either side, the editorial page can be assertively biased by its very nature as an opinion page. Fifty-seven percent of the *Chronicle's* published pieces about the protest appeared on the Op/Ed page, while only 5% of the *AJC's* coverage came from Op/Ed columns and "Letters to the Editor." The *NYT* ran four "Letters to the Editor" about the protest during this time frame. Of the letters and columns published in the *Chronicle*, 88% supported the Augusta National and its male-only

policies. The Chronicle's letters to the editors were particularly barbed, and at times even questioned whether the protest was "legitimately" about women's rights. One letter writer wrote:

When it comes to the issue of a woman member at the Augusta National Golf Club, National Council of Women's Organizations Chairwoman Martha Burk is a leech sucking the blood out of the legitimate discussion of gender inequity. (Hagerty, 2003)

The fact that the majority of the pieces in the editorial section in the Chronicle were negative in tone is perhaps not surprising. Given that the editorial page is a reflection of the subjectivity of the newspaper's managers, those managers have the right to pick and choose what "Letters to the Editor" and guest columns they deem worthy. While some newspapers have policies for printing letters to the editor, these policies are often vague in nature (Hill, 1981). It should be noted that *The Augusta Chronicle* is owned by Morris Communications, which is owned by Billy Morris, an economic force in Augusta as well as an active member and public supporter of the Augusta National (Bamberger, 1999). Michael Bamberger, reporter for *Sports Illustrated*, examined the relationship between The Augusta National and local media, including the Chronicle, in an article on April 5, 1999:

The Chronicle's coverage of the Masters is so positive and so pervasive it cannot help but influence the national and international coverage of the event. Today, when so much sports writing in daily newspapers has become caustic, the coverage of the Masters in *The Chronicle* remains buoyant. So is the coverage, it so happens, most everywhere else. (p.1)

One such example of "buoyant" coverage in support of the Augusta National came from Scott Michaux, a *Chronicle* sports writer, who wrote:

There you have it. On the issue of female members at the Augusta National Golf Club, Johnson was as clear as a Masters crystal. When the club invites a female member, it will be its decision and its alone. Thank you for your interest. Now please enjoy your little protest; we have a tournament to hold here... (Michaux, 2003, M05)

"There you have it" and "clear as a Masters crystal" are dismissive phrases that position the protesters' argument as having already been settled. The phrase, "little protest," belittles the NCWO's action, implying that the cause was "little" as well, and should be dismissed while power remains in the hands of men—the men deciding the issue—leaving the status quo to continue unchanged.

The first two words of one guest column in the *AJC* written by a former *Chronicle* editorial page editor matter-of-factly labels Burk as a "feminist harpy." He then describes how the NCWO and Jesse Jackson had proposed legislation that would prevent private clubs from discriminating on the basis of gender or race. He followed that discussion with the comment, "This is the same old liberal party line that always underscores victimhood. The phony 'victims' in this case are women who can't join one of the world's most exclusive all-male private clubs" (Kent, 2003, 19A). "Liberal" has long become viewed as a pejorative label, even among those on the political left (Kenix, 2009; Eisinger, Veenstra, & Koehn, 2007). The statement also positions the women as merely jealous of a privilege that only a few "others"

have earned. “Private” asserts the stance that the membership issue is simply a local, singular condition without any larger implications.

Across the state in Atlanta, a guest column in the *AJC* took a similar tack: Why did Burk select the Masters for this proverbial ‘bra-burning’? Follow the money. Augusta National generates the kind of media attention that is the lifeblood of political activists—on both ends of the political spectrum. Publicity ‘galvanizes’ the core membership. It gets their checkbooks out, which equates to cold, hard cash contributions. That reality is the slimy underbelly of this ‘protest.’ (Parks, 2003, 19A) The “bra-burning” is clearly antifeminist code language, even though “bra-burning” never actually happened as an organized protest action during the women’s movement (Bradley, 2003). The column blatantly dismisses the legitimate reasons for the Augusta National protest—a word that is itself highlighted in quotation marks and derided as “slimy”—and accuses the NCWO of creating a staged event solely to generate donations to sustain the organization.

Only two pieces appeared on the editorial page of the *AJC*; one was a guest column and the other a letter to the editor, and both supported the Augusta National. The “Letters to the Editor” that ran in *The New York Times* were divided in their opinion. Two of the letters supported the feminist cause and two of them were in support of the Augusta National, an example of letter-selection gatekeeping that was fair to both sides.

What then of the many responses from the Augusta community? Did at least the women in the readership feel comfortable coming forth with their support? Only a few letters to the editor published in *The Augusta Chronicle* were written by women, and 100% of them opposed the NCWO’s protest of the Augusta National. One woman sarcastically wrote, “. . . in Ms. Burk’s effort to make a name for herself, she has taken food out of our children’s mouths and clothing off of our backs. Augusta women thank you” (Cox, 2003, A05). The collective nature of the writer’s phrasing – *our* children, *our* backs – implies that she writes for all Augusta women, effectively silencing those women in the community who might agree with the protest. Another woman wrote, “. . . only in my dreams would I see a token millionaire female being admitted to the Augusta National” (Thomas, 2003, A04). Both of these letters reflect patriarchal views surrounding the protest. The status quo had clear economic benefits to Augusta businesses and citizens, and in the lead-up to the protest, the NCWO had been pressuring corporate sponsors to drop their support of the Masters tournament because of the exclusion of women from club membership. The phrase, “token millionaire female,” implies that only wealth and singularity would get a woman into the club’s ranks, and even then, only one woman.

This research also addressed whether the gender of the reporter made any difference in terms of support for this feminist cause. The results, however, were inconclusive. Of the articles penned by male reporters at *The Augusta Chronicle*, 5% supported the feminist cause, and 71% of the *Chronicle*’s female-authored pieces had a negative tone towards the NCWO. No female reporters or contributors at the *Chronicle* provided supportive coverage of the feminist protest.

Table 4: Gender and Tone

Comparison	NYT	%	AJC	%	Chronicle	%
Number of supportive articles by female reporters and contributors	1	25%	2	50%	0	0
Number of supportive articles by male reporters and contributors	3	23%	0	0	1	5%
Number of neutral articles by female reporters and contributors	3	75%	2	50%	2	28%
Number of neutral articles by male reporters and contributors	5	38%	11	34%	6	31%
Number of negative articles by Female reporters and contributors	0	0	0	0	5	71%
Number of negative articles by male reporters and contributors	3	23%	21	65%	12	63%

*In this table supportive refers to supporting the NCWO, negative refers to opposition to the NCWO. Percentages are calculated on the number of pieces by each gender in each newspaper, not the articles in their entirety.

The *Atlanta Journal Constitution's* female reporters presented this feminist issue in a positive light, educating their readers about the issues surrounding the event and describing the all-male policy. At the *NYT*, 25% of the female-contributed stories supported the NCWO and 75% remained neutral, with none of the female contributed stories being negative. Interestingly 23% of the *Times's* male contributed pieces were also supportive of the NCWO, 38% were neutral, and 23% were negative.

Tables 1 through 4 indicate that the farther from the Augusta National the newspaper, the more support was given to the NCWO and the less to the male-only golf club. In Augusta, the newspaper appears to be influenced by local politics as well as possibly by the financial boom that is created by Masters Week advertisers. *The New York Times*, on the other hand, showed a reporting style that was more fair and balanced.

Discussion

This analysis of three newspapers' coverage of the 2003 NCWO protest in Augusta, Georgia, finds much of it was negative and dismissive in tone toward this feminist cause. Rather than representing the two "sides" in a fair and balanced manner, the coverage—on the whole—continued a theme long established in scholarship about media attention to feminists and feminism. Many articles focused on the individual conflict between "sides," rather than on the issue of equal access for women to an organization

that has historically represented male power, privilege, and hegemony. The focus and importance of the protest to larger political and structural forces that marginalize women were largely absent. Instead, the message was that Martha Burk was hungry for publicity or donations to the NCWO, that she and her supporters were jealous of a privilege they had not earned, or that she took “food from the mouths of children” with a protest that had the potential to urge sponsorship away from the tournament. Much of the language chosen dismissed the movement, and Burk, and sought to put her “back in her place,” with name calling or trivializing labels such as the mere “Martha”, as if she was a child, never disclosing the fact that Burk has a Ph.D. Much of the negative coverage also implied that this leading feminist was an “other,” representative of only a small, out-of-the-mainstream minority, much like the Ku Klux Klan or Insanely Queer, two groups with which she was described as being in league. The placement of most articles in the sports section also categorized the protest as just another distraction or form of play activity—as sports are—and not to be taken as seriously as the articles in the news section would be. In fact, positioning articles about the protest on the sports pages marginalized the NCWO grievance in its entirety, as if it was about nothing more than women getting to play golf, rather than about equal access to locations of power.

Secondly, the editing of the Op/Ed section of the newspaper also supported the privileging of a status quo that benefitted males and disadvantaged females. Even if the submitted letters to the editor bend dramatically toward one side or another, newspaper editorial staffs can balance out those opinions by requesting a guest column that represents the other side. Many newspapers take such actions in an effort to balance the editorial page with both sides of a cause. It is essential to the public that the editorial page attempts to represent marginalized groups in good faith as well as it does for the mainstream, because many readers are not aware of the gatekeeping bias, and because the very selection of letters and guest columns gives them legitimacy. Research has found that appropriate news organization policy can result in more fairness and balance (Cooper, Knotts, & Haspel, 2009; Hill, 1981; Hynds, 1992), but such policies are not always in place.

The third theme explored the coverage according to the differing geographic locations of each newspaper. In this case study, it was clear that the proximity of the newspaper to the protest and to the adjoining Masters tournament influenced the coverage, both on the editorial page and in news and sports stories. *The Augusta Chronicle*'s overwhelmingly negative position towards the protest compared to *The New York Times*' more positive position tells a tale of local financial and political influence in preserving the status quo and its beneficiaries. The finding also suggests that scholarly analyses of the national press may be missing important patterns and pressures unique to local or regional news organizations—especially given that gender staffing diversity increases in tandem with the size of newspapers (Hardin & Whiteside, 2006). While small, these news outlets are nevertheless widespread and influential among their many combined readers. As a result, the discoveries here provide an important window into how local and regional newspapers cover women's sport controversies.

The last question examined whether the gender of the reporter influenced the overall gender ideological tone of the stories. In exploring this variable, the study cannot conclude that female reporters

supported this feminist issue based on their gender—but only because of the *Augusta Chronicle*. While female reporters at the *Chronicle* presented the protest as a negative issue, female reporters from the *Atlanta Journal Constitution* and *The New York Times* wrote articles in support of the feminist cause or remained neutral. In this story, it appears that the reporters' geographic location may have played more of a role than their gender did in terms of journalistic support for the NCWO. Not only would it have been difficult for the women journalists in Augusta to face down the overwhelming local financial pressure to support the status quo, but like all women in sports journalism, they also most likely confronted the long established gender challenges of having to support entrenched male hegemonic values. Advocating for women could label them as deviant in a male dominated environment.

In newspaper journalism it is well known that jobs at larger-circulation newspapers are more competitive to get than those at small, often entry-level papers such as the *Augusta Chronicle*. That might have given the female journalists at the *New York Times* and even *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* the additional professional clout needed to better support this feminist protest in print.

Overall, the newspaper discourse that emerged from the NCWO's protest for gender equality largely legitimized the continued claims for male privilege. Morality was mostly framed as lying with the status quo and dominant power structure. Moreover, the NCWO protest was primarily depicted as a disruption that would result in costs and repercussions to the women of Augusta, rather than as a benefit to gender equality. As for Burk, she was frequently belittled or ridiculed, often in very personal ways, which is a common method of distracting attention away from the issues her movement raised. When more than 50% of the news and sports articles are negative towards the NCWO and when 100% of the pieces appearing in one newspaper's (the *AJC*) editorial page are vehemently opposed to this feminist cause, then readers are not receiving balanced coverage, and the larger ramifications for women's equality and access are silenced.

Eight years after the NCWO protest, *USA Today's* Brennan (2012) provided a succinct notion as to why the Augusta National Golf Club finally opened its doors to women. Calling it "capitalism trumping altruism," Brennan attributed the famed golf club's change of face to the sport's sudden "hemorrhaging [of] participants" and needing to offer a friendlier face to women in order to attract an untapped demographic that would allow it to remain viable. In 2003, the news coverage largely reflected the view that women were neither wanted nor needed.

References

- Anderson, D. (2002, September 1). Sports of the Times; Augusta compounds mistakes. *The New York Times*, Sports Desk p.7.
- Armstrong, C. (2004). The influence of reporter gender on source selection in newspaper stories. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(1), 139-154.
- Bamberger, M. (1999, April 5). Stop the Presses. *Sports Illustrated*, p.1.
- Bamberger, M. (1999, April 5). Stop the Presses. 1. Retrieved from <http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/vault/article/magazine/MAG1015584/index.htm>

- Beasley, M. H. (1993). Newspapers: Is there a new majority defining the news? In P. J. Creedon (Ed.), *Women in mass communication* (pp. 118-133). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Beasley, M. H. (2005) *First ladies and the press: An unfinished partnership of the media age*. Chicago: Northwestern University Press.
- Beasley, M. H. & Gibbons, S.J. (2003) *Taking their place: A documentary history of women and journalism*. State College, PA: Strata Publishing.
- Boyette, J. (2003, March 20). War Forces Burk to Reconsider Protest Push NCWO Chair says She will call off Protest is Masters is Canceled. *The Augusta Chronicle*, p. C01.
- Bradley, P. (2003). *Mass media and the shaping of American feminism 1963-1975*, Jackson, MI: University Press of Mississippi.
- Bradley, P. (2005). *Women and the press: The struggle for equality*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Brennan, C. (2012, August 20) Finally! Augusta National does right thing and admits women, *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/sports/golf/masters/story/2012-08-20/Masters-women-Condoleeza-Rice-Darla-Moore-Christine-Brennan/57160258/1>
- Bronstein, C. (2005). Representing the Third Wave: Mainstream print media framing of a new feminist movement, *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(4), 783-803.
- Burette, J. (2003, March 20). War forces Burk to reconsider protest, push NCWO chair says she will call off protest if Masters is cancelled. *The Augusta Chronicle*, p. C01.
- Bronstein, C. (2005). Representing the third wave: Mainstream print media framing of a new feminist movement. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 82(4), 783-803.
- Castello, E. (2010). Framing news on risk industries: Local journalism and conditioning factors. *Journalism*, 4(11), 463-480. doi:0.1177/1464884910367592
- Chambers, D., Steiner, L., & Fleming, C. (2004). *Women and Journalism*. Routledge: London.
- Claringbould, I. & Knoppers, A. (2012). Paradoxical practices of gender in sport-related organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 26(5), 404-416. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=82515719&site=ehost-live>
- Cooper, C., Knotts, H. G., & Haspel, M. (2009). The content of political participation: Letters to the editor and the people who write them. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 42(1), 131-137. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20452387>
- Coryell Williams, H. (2003, April 13) Burk leads small rally amid crowd of protests. *The Augusta Chronicle*, p. A01.
- Cox, S. (2003, April 13). Plan to make a name for herself, *The Augusta Chronicle*, p. A05.
- Creedon, P. J. (1993), The Challenge of Revisioning Gender Values. In P. J. Creedon (Ed.), *Women in Mass Communication* (2nd ed., pp 3-23). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- da Silva, M. T. (2012), Newsroom practices and letters-to-the-editor: An analysis of selection criteria, *Journalism Practice*, 6(2), 250-263.

- de Bruin, M. & Ross, K. (2004). *Gender and Newsroom Cultures: Identities at Work*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Dicker, R. & Piepmeier, A. (2003). *Catching a Wave*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Douglas, S. (1994). *Where the Girls Are: Growing up Female with the Mass Media*. New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Eisinger, R. M., Veenstra, L. R., & Koehn, J.P. (2007). What media bias? Conservative and liberal labeling in major U.S. newspapers, *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 12, 17-36. DOI: 10.1177/1081180X06297460.
- Eldredge, R. L. (2003, April 22). Columnist Learns Painful Lesson, *The Atlanta Journal Constitution*, p. 2.
- Elmore, C. (2007). Recollections in hindsight from women who left: The gendered newsroom culture. *Women & Language*, 30, 18-27.
- Elmore, C. (2008). A woman's (and man's?) right to choose: Journalists' language choices in news about abortion, *The Electronic Journal of Communication*, 18. Retrieved from <http://www.cios.org/EJCPUBLIC/018/1/01814.HTML>
- Gist, M.E-(1993) Through the Looking Glass: Diversity and Reflected Appraisals of the Self in Mass Media. In P. J. Creedon (Ed.), *Women in Mass Communication* (Second ed., pp. 104-117). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Greer, G. (1995, June, 25). Abolish her: The feminist case against first ladies. *New Republic*, pp. 21-27.
- Grey, D.L. & Brown, T.R. (1970). Letters to the editor as hazy reflections of public opinion, *Journalism Quarterly* 47, 450-456.
- Hagerty, M. (2003, April 13). Burk seeks, abuses media attention. *The Augusta Chronicle*, pp. Editorial, Pg. A05.
- Hardin, M. & Shain, S. (2005). Strength in Numbers? The Experiences and Attitudes of Women in Sports Media Careers, *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(4), 804-819.
- Hardin, M. & Shain, S. (2006). "Feeling Much Smaller than You Know You Are": The Fragmented Professional Identity of Female Sports Journalists, *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 23(4), 322-338.
- Hardin, M. & Whiteside, E. (2006). Fewer Women, Minorities Work in Sports Departments, *Newspaper Research Journal*, 27(2), 38-51.
- Hardin, M. & Whiteside, E. (2009). Tokened responses to gendered newsrooms: Factors in the career-related decisions of female newspaper sports journalists. *Journalism*, 10 (October), 627. doi:10.1177/14648849090100050501
- Hesse-Biber, S., Gilmartin, C., & Lydenberg, R. (1999) *Feminist Approaches to Theory and Methodology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Hill, D. (1981). Letter opinion on ERA: A test of the newspaper bias hypothesis. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 45(3), 384-392.
- Hume, J. (2002). Saloon smashing fanatic, corn-fed Joan of Arc: The Changing memory of Carry Nation in Twentieth Century American magazines. *Journalism History*, 28, 38-48.
- Husting, G. (1999). When a war is not a war: Abortion, Desert Storm, and representations of protest in American TV news. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 40 (1), 159-178.
- Hynds, E.C. (1991). Editorial page editors discuss use of letters. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 13(1/2), 124-136.
- Kahn, K. F. & Goldenberg, E. N. (1991). Women candidates in the news: An examination of gender differences in U.S. senate campaign coverage. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 55(2), 180-199.
- Kenix, L. J. (2009). A historical framing analysis of liberalism in American print media (1978-2002), *Southwestern Mass Communication Journal*, 25(1), 81-97.
- Kent, P. (2003, March 28). Why Radicals target the Augusta National, *Augusta Chronicle*, p. 1. Retrieved from http://chronicle.augusta.com/stories/2003/03/28/op__474628.shtml
- Kerr, P. A. & Moy, P. (2002). Newspaper coverage of fundamentalist Christians, 1980-2000. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79(1), 54-72.
- Lawless, J. (2009). Sexism and Gender Bias in Election 2008: A More Complex Path for Women in Politics. *Politics & Gender*, 5(1), 70-81.
- Lenkiewicz, T.M. (2011). Green jackets in men's sizes only: Gender discrimination at private country clubs. *The Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, 4, 777-817.
- Liebler, C.M. & Smith, S.J. (1997). Tracking gender differences: A comparative analysis of network correspondents and their sources. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 41(1), 58-68.
- Lind, R. & Salo, C. (2002). The framing of feminists and feminism in news and public affairs programs in U.S. electronic media. *Journal of Communication*. 52(1), 211-227.
- Markiewicz, D. (2003, April 13). Masters protest has little impact. *The Atlanta Journal Constitution*, p. 1A.
- Mastro, D. Seate, A., Blecha, E. & Gallegos, M. (2012). The Wide World of Sports Reporting: The Influence of gender-and race based expectations on evaluations of sports reporters. *Journalism & Mass Communications Quarterly*. 89(3), 458-474.
- Meeks, L. (2013). He wrote, she wrote: Journalist gender, political office, and campaign news. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 90(1), 58-74.
- Mendes, K. (2011a). *Feminism in the News: Representations of the Women's Movement since the 1960s*. London: Palgrave.
- Mendes, K. (2011b). The lady is a closet feminist! Discourses of backlash and post feminism in British and American newspapers. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 14, 1-17.

- Mendes, K. (2011c). Reporting the women's movement: News coverage of second-wave feminism in UK and US newspapers, 1968–1982. *Feminist Media Studies*, 11(4) 483-498.
- Mendes, K. (2012). 'Feminism rules! Now, where's my swimsuit?'. Re-evaluating feminist discourse in print media 1968-2008. *Media, Culture & Society*, 34(5), 554-570.
- Michaux, S. (2003, April 10, 2003). Johnson says to Burk: Forget it, *The Augusta Chronicle*, p. M05.
- Mills, K. (1988). *A place in the news*. New York: Dodd, Mead.
- Mills, K. (1997). What difference do women journalists make? In P. Norris (Ed.), *Women, Media and Politics* (pp. 41-55). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mitsu Klos, D. (2013). The Status of Women in the U.S. Media 2013. Women'smediacenter.com. retrieved: March 20, 2013. http://wmc.3cdn.net/51113ed5df3e0d0b79_zzzm6go0b.pdf
- Oliver, P. & Maney, G. (2000). Political processes and local newspaper coverage of protest events: From selection bias to triadic interactions. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 106(2), 463-505.
- Oliver, P. & Myers, D. (1999). How events enter the public sphere: Conflict, location and sponsorship in local newspaper coverage of public events. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(1), 38-87.
- Parks, L. (2003, April 3). Burk's fight targets magic of the Masters. *The Atlanta Journal Constitution*, p. 19A.
- Pedelty, M. (1997). The marginal majority: Women war correspondents in the Salvadoran press corps association. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 14(1), 49-76.
- Peiser, W. (2000). Setting the journalist agenda: Influences from journalists' individual characteristics and from media factors. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 77(2), 243-257.
- Pingree, S. & Hawkins, R.P. (1978). News definitions and their effects on women. In: L.K. Epstein (Ed.) *Woman and the News*. New York: Hasting House.
- Pounds, G. (2006). Democratic Participation and Letters to the editor in Britain and Italy. *Discourse & Society* 17(1), 29-63.
- Pozner, J. (2003). The "Big Lie": False feminist death syndrome, profit, and the media. In R. Dicker & A. Piepmeier (Ed.), *Catching a Wave* (pp.31-56). Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Reader, B. & Moist, K. (2008). Letters as indicators of community values: Two case studies of alternative magazines, *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 85(4), 823-840.
- Reader, B., Stempel III, G. H., & Daniel, D. K. (2004). Age, wealth, education predict letters to editor. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 25(4), 55-66.
- Renfro, P.C. (1979). Bias in selection of letters to editor, *Journalism Quarterly*, 56(4), 822-826.
- Rhode, D. (1997) Media Images/Feminist Issues. In Fineman and McCluskey (Eds.), *Feminism, media and the law* (pp. 8-21). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Richardson, J.E. & Franklin, B. (2004). Letters of intent: Election campaigning and orchestrated public debate in local newspapers' letters to the editor. *Political Communication*, 21(4), 459-478.

- Roberts, S. (2003, April 13). Sports of the times; At Augusta, Burk has just cause but naive blueprint. *The New York Times*, pp. 4.
- Robinson, G. J. (2005). *Gender, journalism, and equity*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Ross, K. & Carter, C. (2011). Women and news: A long and winding road. *Media, Culture & Society*, 33(8), 1148-1165.
- Scott, J. (1991). The evidence of experience. *Critical Inquiry*, 17, 773-797.
- Sheridan, S., Magarey, S., & Lilburn, S. (2007) Feminism in the news. In J. Hollows, & R. Moseley (Eds), *Feminism in popular culture* (pp. 25-40). New York: Berg.
- Shipnuck, A. (2004). *The Battle for Augusta National*. New York: Simon and Shuster.
- Sigelman, K. & Walkosz, B. J. (1992). Letters to the editor as a public opinion thermometer: The Martin Luther King holiday vote in Arizona. *Social Science Quarterly*, 73, 938-946.
- Singletary, M.W. & Cowling, M. (1979). Letters to the editor of the non-daily press. *Journalism Quarterly*, 56(1), 165-168.
- Skirstad, B. (2009). Gender policy and organizational change: A contextual approach. *Sport Management Review*, 12(4), 202-216. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/10.1016/j.smr.2009.03.003>
- Startt, J. & Sloan, D. (2003). *Historical methods in mass communications*. Revised Edition. Northport, AL: Vision Press.
- Terkildsen, N. & Schnell, F. (1997). How media frames move public opinion: An analysis of the Women's Movement. *Political Research Quarterly*, 50(4), 879-900.
- Thomas, L. (August 22, 2012). Move on, Nothing to see at Augusta. *Grantland*: retrieved from <http://grantland.com/the-triangle/move-along-nothing-to-see-at-augusta/>.
- Thomas, W. (2003, March 21). Burk a disgrace to the Women's Movement, *The Augusta Chronicle*, p. A04.
- Tuchman, G. (1972). Objectivity as strategic ritual: An examination of newsmen's notions of objectivity. *American Journal of Sociology*, 77(4), 660-679.
- Tuchman, G. (1978). The newspaper as a social movement's resource. In: G. Tuchman, A.K. Daniels, & J. Bennett. (Eds) *Hearth and home: Images of women in the mass media*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tuchman, G. (1979). Women's depiction by the mass media. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 4(3), 528-542.
- van Zoonen, E.A. (1992). The Women's Movement and the media: Constructing a public identity. *European Journal of Communication*, 7(4), 453-76.
- van Zoonen, L. (1998). One of the girls? The changing gender of journalism. In S. Allan, G. Branston, & C. Carter (Eds) *News, Gender and Power* (pp. 33-46). London and New York: Routledge.
- Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2001) Letters to the editor as a forum for public deliberation: Modes of publicity and democratic debate. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 18(3), 303-320.

- Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2002). The normative-economic justification for public discourse letters to the editor as a wide open forum. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79(1), 121-133.
- Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2004) "A 'legitimate beef' or 'raw meat'?" Civility, multiculturalism, and letters to the editor, *The Communication Review*, 7, 89-105.
- Zoch, L. & Turk, J. V. (1998). Women making news: Gender as a variable in source selection and use. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 75(4), 762-775.
- Zoch, L.M. & Vanslyke Turk, J. (1998) Women making news: gender as a variable in source selection and use. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 75(4): 762–775.

Engaging Appalachia: Digital Literacies, Mobile Media, and a Sense of Place

Mark Nunes

Courses: Media & Society, Social Media Strategies, Intro to New Media

Objectives: To provide students with an opportunity to explore the intersection of digital and civic engagement through project-based learning; to develop digital literacy skills through critical media practices.

Rationale

While it has become a commonplace of sorts to assume that students who have grown up in a period of widespread access to web-based resources and mobile devices will have well-developed digital literacy skills, a growing body of knowledge would seem to suggest that so-called “digital natives” are by no means generationally united in their ability to critically engage in new media practices (Selwyn, 2009; Davies, Halford, & Gibbins, 2012). To compound matters, our classroom practices often tend to stress the importance of critical thinking as it applies to *reading* the media, with less emphasis on *producing* media objects. But as Jenkins (2006) notes, “Just as we would not traditionally assume that someone is literate if they can read but not write, we should not assume that someone possesses media literacy if they can consume but not express themselves” (p. 170).

Project-based learning provides an opportunity for students to produce media objects as a means of reflecting upon theoretical concepts. As Thomas (2000) notes, in project-based learning, “projects are central, not peripheral to the curriculum” (p. 3); in addition, the projects should enable students to explore critical course learning outcomes through an application of these concepts to “authentic (not simulated) problems or questions” (p. 4). Lee, Blackwell, Drake, & Moran (2014) note that while project-based learning has become fairly well-established in K-12 reform, higher education has been slower in adopting project-based methodologies, even though an emphasis on experiential learning, and a liberal education model informed by the related, Deweyian concept of *problem*-based learning, are by no means novel concepts on college campuses.

Courses that explore the impact of social media on culture and society provide an excellent opportunity for project-based learning. Rather than merely discussing concepts, or exploring case studies, students can apply these concepts to their everyday environments beyond the classroom. The activity described below was used in an interdisciplinary class on mobile storytelling, in which students explored the affordances and constraints of mobile media, with a particular eye toward story and narrative. Through its focus on the location-aware aspects of mobile media, the course also explored the role of digital media in creating and sustaining a sense of place. This activity, and all of the other projects in this course, required students to critically engage in the region in which they found themselves going to school—Southern Appalachia.

Mark Nunes is professor of interdisciplinary studies and chair, department of cultural, gender, and global studies Appalachian State University. Correspondence to: Mark Nunes, Department of Cultural, Gender, and Global Studies, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC, 28608, USA. Email: nunesm@appstate.edu

This final rationale is indeed site-specific, but with implications that are relevant to other regions and other institutions in the Carolinas, and in fact across the country. Appalachian State University was founded by the Dougherty brothers in 1899 as Watauga Academy to serve school age youth in the mountainous “lost provinces” of Western North Carolina (Mitchem, 2014). Shortly thereafter, the Academy became a state school, specifically to serve the region and to train teachers to serve the public schools in the region. The school grew considerably over the years, and with that growth came a broadening of mission, to the point where in 1967 it became a comprehensive university, and in 1971 became a part of the UNC System. That growth also led to a significant shift in its student demographics as well, such that by 1976, only 22.6% of students came from Watauga County and surrounding counties in Western North Carolina (Office of Institutional and Academic Research, 1977). By fall, 2014, that number was 18.6% (Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning, 2015). In short: most Appalachian State students are outsiders to Appalachia--drawn to the region for a number of reasons, no doubt, but outsiders nonetheless. While this institutional history served as a backdrop for my students throughout the course, as they attempted to develop a more nuanced sense of place beyond the walls of their campus, the regional engagement that provides a context for this project-based digital literacy activity is certainly generalizable to many other campuses and many other regions.

Activity

While the project described below can occur as a stand-alone activity, it is worth noting that it took part within a larger framework of a course devoted to an exploration of what Farman (2014) and others have described as site-specific writing and mobile storytelling. Much of the writing and media production in the class called upon students to think about site-specific writing, what it meant to “write place,” and how place expresses itself in image, word, and daily experience. The course asked them to engage Appalachia as a region--defined by the Appalachian Regional Commission in its own way, but also defined by a number of other cultural, geographic, and economic boundaries as a *construct*, and one often imposed from outside of the region, rife with positive and negative stereotypes.

Needless to say, even as a stand-alone activity, this exercise in project-based learning involves a commitment of more than one class period, plus additional, out-of class activity on the part of students. Within the context of the mobile storytelling course, students spent three class periods over three weeks on this project: the first to orient to the mobile app and website, and to discuss ideas for the project; the second as an out-of-class “content development day”; and the final session to discuss the completed project.

Preparation

Students will need to become familiar with a photo-sharing application called Trover (<http://www.trover.com>), a smartphone app that runs on both Android and iOS mobile devices. They will also need to create a free Trover account. While there are many photo-sharing social media sites and mobile apps, some of which students may already use in their daily media practices, Trover’s design makes it a particularly useful app for this project. Users can search photos by hashtag, and the app will present these tagged images as a cluster of photographs, arranged by

proximity to the user's physical location. The app also provides users with a map interface, which will display all photograph locations as pinpoints on a map. Finally, Trover does not limit the length of texts that users can add as annotation to any given photograph. While designed for photo upload from a mobile device, Trover also allows for geo-tagging and image uploading from a web interface as well. This functionality allowed all students to participate, even if they did not have access to a smartphone.

Planning

Throughout the course, we made heavy use of the metaphors of “hauntings” and “echoes” to try to conceptualize the affective, evocative elements of place memory and its ability to call forth what is still present, but no longer here. Students discussed their own understanding of Appalachia as a region and were called upon to question and explore their own assumptions. We discussed media images of the region, with particular attention to what Williams (2002) refers to as the binary stereotypes of “the quaint and stalwart mountaineer” and the “ignorant and impoverished hillbilly” (p. 199). We also discussed the varying cultural constructions of Appalachia as a place of natural beauty, outdoor recreation, and tourism—as well as a base for extractive economies, environmental damage, and social deprivation.

Students then decided on a thematic focus for their photographs. The only restriction on content was that each photograph should in some way provide a visual commentary that spoke to some aspect of the region—an “Appalachian echo.” Students shared their ideas and gave each other feedback in class and on a discussion board through our course management system.

Image Gathering

Students uploaded at least five photographs from anywhere in the county. Students needed to note the location of each photograph, either through the GPS-enabled features of the mobile app, or by indicating the location on the map interface on the Trover website.

Students also provided text to accompany each photograph. The amount of text could vary, but in total, students needed to produce around 500 words total for all five photographs. The goal was to produce text appropriate to the affordances of a smartphone screen—in other words, blocks of text that involved little or no scrolling. The text provided students with an opportunity to reflect in words what they had tried to capture in image. The final step required students to tag the image with #appalachianechoes. The result of their collaboration created a *constellation narrative* on Trover—a collection of like-tagged reflections on Appalachia as a landscape, a region, and a cultural construct.

In order to make this assignment seem even more like a media project intended for a public audience, rather than merely a classroom exercise, I opted to participate as well, contributing my own five images and accompanying text. I would encourage other instructors to do the same.

Discussion

After completing their uploads, students then explored the project as a whole—again, either using the mobile app or the web interface. Students were encouraged to use the map interface as well to experience not only the image on their mobile devices, but also the location in which the photo was taken. They discussed the networked, multifaceted narrative that developed from the collection of photographs and accompanying text. Students reflected on their own

practice—the process of deciding what theme they wished to explore, as well as which images they would capture to express this perspective on the region. Students also reflected on the interface design for Trover, noting both its affordances and its constraints as a social media application.

Debriefing

Students responded positively to the assignment. In giving them an opportunity to move their studies beyond the classroom, they had a chance to explore their region in a direct fashion through the use of mobile media. At the same time, they were able to recognize that every photograph reveals not only the image captured, but also the eye and the hand that pointed the camera (or cellphone, as the case may be). They commented on their own growing awareness of place, and the impact of Trover's location-aware features in creating a constellation narrative of Southern Appalachia, as seen through their eyes.

Appraisal

While this project offers a number of opportunities for students to gain both media literacy skills and a greater sense of local engagement, it does have some limitations. First, of course, is the issue of access to mobile devices or digital cameras. Given that Trover allows for a web-based upload of photographs, a student without a smartphone could still participate, but not without borrowing a camera from our university library's digital equipment check-out service (or, more likely than not, from a classmate or a friend). Another limitation of the project involved, ironically enough, mobility. Nearly half of the class did not have easy access to transportation other than by foot, bike, or public transportation. As a result, many of the images did tend to cluster around campus. Some students, however, did make an effort to move well beyond their normal circles, in effect using the project as a means of becoming more engaged in their local environment.

Finally, we should remain mindful that this project runs the risk of functioning as yet another representation of Appalachia from the outside, one that harvests raw material for cultural export, into the classroom and onto the web. Greater community involvement through partnerships with local cultural organizations and heritage groups would help mitigate this risk.

Even with these limitations, however, a majority of students found the project engaging and informative—and to some degree transformative in helping them see their region differently. In addition, while individual student engagement varied, many students seemed to gain a better sense of the affordances of mobile devices and social media platforms for creating a coherent, yet multi-faceted sense of place.

Writing on urban preservation, Hayden (1997) reflects on how “place memory” can operate as a site-specific trigger to activate the stories and histories of everyday life embedded within a city. She writes, “While a single, preserved historic place may trigger potent memories, networks of such places begin to reconnect social memory on the urban scale. . . . People invest places with social and cultural meaning, and urban landscape history can provide a framework for connecting those meanings into contemporary urban life” (p. 78). The project described here offers a similar opportunity to mark multiple place memories within a network through critical media practices. This sort of project-based learning activity provides an opportunity for students to engage in their region at a level

that is often absent, either because the student is not native to the region, or as is equally likely, *is indeed* native to the region but has not been given the opportunity to explore, both critically and productively, the hauntings and echoes that define place. Providing students with this sort of active engagement in new media practices, while at the same time encouraging them to think critically about these media practices and their increasingly important role in society, offers a truly dynamic example of digital literacies played out at the intersection of theory and practice.

References

- Davies, H., Halford, S., & Gibbins, N. (2012). Digital Natives? Investigating young people's critical skills in evaluating web based information. In *WebSci 2012: Proceedings of the 4th annual ACM web science conference (WebSci '12)*, 78-81. New York, NY: ACM. <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2380718.2380729>
- Farman, J. (Ed.). (2014). *The mobile story: Narrative practices with locative technologies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hayden, D. (1997). *The power of place: Urban landscapes as public history*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Lee, J. S., Blackwell, S., Drake, J., & Moran, K. A. (2014). Taking a leap of faith: Redefining teaching and learning in higher education through project-based learning. *Interdisciplinary journal of problem-based learning*, 8(2), 19-34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1541-5015.1426>
- Mitchem, P. (2014). *Appalachian State University (campus history series)*. Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing.
- Office of Institutional and Academic Research. (1977). *Factbook 1976-1977*. Boone, NC: Appalachian State University. Retrieved from http://irap.appstate.edu/sites/irap.appstate.edu/files/fb76_77.pdf
- Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning. (2015). *Appalachian State University in-state enrollment by county fall 2014*. Retrieved from http://irap.appstate.edu/files/FB20142015_s17instate_by_county_INPROGRESS.pdf
- Selwyn, N. (2009). The digital native—myth and reality. *Aslib proceedings: New information perspectives*, 61(4), 364-379. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00012530910973776>
- Thomas, J. (2000). *A review of research on project-based learning*. Retrieved from http://bie.org/object/document/a_review_of_research_on_project_based_learning
- Williams, J. (2002). *Appalachia: A History*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Assessing Conflict Management Through Self-Authored Student Mediation Role-Plays in the Basic Course

Andrew W. Cole

Courses: Basic Course, Introduction to Communication, Fundamentals of Human Communication, Interpersonal Communication, Introduction to Conflict Resolution.

Objective: In this summative course assessment, students demonstrate competency in using effective verbal and nonverbal communication; recognizing causes of interpersonal conflicts; applying conflict management strategies; and recognizing the influence of perception on communication.

Introduction and Theoretical Background

At some point in their post-college careers, students will find themselves in workplace conflict. Practicing communication skills and applying conflict management strategies in class assignments, as well as receiving peer and instructor feedback on these practices, can assist students in proactively and productively addressing future workplace conflicts when they arise. The self-authored mediation role-play (SAMRP) assignment detailed in this article requires students to identify, develop, perform, and reflect on potential workplace conflict scenarios. In completing the SAMRP, students must demonstrate productive means to address interpersonal conflicts in the workplace, and to reflect on how they approach conflict in these unique relationships.

The core goal of the SAMRP is for students to better understand how individuals can perceive the same conflict scenario differently. Often individuals see conflict scenarios as having a “winner” and a “loser.” However, in such a view of conflict, few individuals would be apt to view themselves on the “losing side.” Therefore, the notion of conflict framing can assist students in realizing that conflict is not win-lose. Conflict framing can generally be described as the idea that the influence of a message depends on how the message is both packaged, by the message sender, and interpreted, by the message receiver. Cognitive linguist George Lakoff (2004) suggests that frames serve as structures through which individuals process messages. An internal frame represents a “cognitive frame” through which a message receiver processes new messages. An external frame represents a “rhetorical frame” concerning how a message sender crafts the language of a message to fulfill a particular purpose. Both types of frames aid in understanding how individuals respond to conflict scenarios. Typically, individuals readily accept newly received information consistent with a previously established perception (e.g, the cognitive frame). Such information further reinforces already established beliefs concerning the topic or situation. The integration of new, supporting information as a means to reinforce previously established beliefs also results in what Peter Coleman (2006), of the International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution, refers to as a “positive feedback loop.”

Andrew W. Cole is an instructor of communication in the department of communication and social sciences at Waukesha County Technical College. Correspondence to: Andrew W. Cole, Department of Communication and Social Science, Waukesha County Technical College, 800 Main Street B-185, Pewaukee, WI 53072, USA. Email: acole13@wctc.edu

Frames are an important aspect of understanding conflict but equally important is understanding how destructive conflict “spirals” (see Folger, Baruch Bush, & Della Noce, 2010). As conflict spirals, disputants typically focus their efforts more and more on supporting their original positions instead of engaging the complexities of the situation. Simplifying the issues at hand, and focusing efforts on reaffirming positions, produces what Coleman (2006) refers to as “a more homogenous and polarized view of the ingroup and outgroup” (p. 330). Such thinking supports the notion that each conflict has a winner and a loser. Further, polarization increases the amount of “positive feedback loops,” reaffirming conflicting individuals’ already held beliefs. To Coleman, reduced attention given to the multidimensionality of conflict scenarios disrupts a necessary balance between positive feedback loops, and “negative feedback loops,” where alternative information can disrupt the established patterns of thought and behaviors, causing conflicts to further spiral.

According to Lakoff (2004), newly received information inconsistent with an established cognitive frame may “bounce off” (e.g. fail to be processed). Information that is not processed cannot contribute to an individual’s understanding of a “hot button” topic or conflict situation in a meaningful way. Therefore, Lakoff suggests that the most effective frames are highly inclusive frames that offer a higher level understanding of a concept. In other words, rather than tackling a particular contentious issue head-on, an appeal can be made to a more high order understanding held by an individual. Coleman (2006) suggests that if common ground is established between disputants at a higher level framing of an issue, individual attitudes and behaviors in lower level frames are then more easily modified. These more inclusive frames allow individuals to view specific conflict issues and situations differently, ideally in a more constructive way, while still allowing individuals to stay true to their own beliefs.

In sum, individuals have structured ways of interpreting events, rooted in previous experience, which contribute to how they perceive conflict scenarios, as well as how they communicate in instances of interpersonal conflict. Conflict perceptions appear modifiable through targeted attempts to influence disputing individuals at a more inclusive framing of the particular issue at hand. Even hotly contested issues may be resolvable when individuals move beyond continuously reinforcing initial frames, engage the complexity of conflict scenarios, and work together to create more inclusive alternative framings of the specific conflict scenario.

The Activity

The SAMRP assignment requires students to write, prepare, and present a 10-20 minute role-play on a conflict in the workplace. The SAMRP can be utilized in relatively small classes (approximately six students), as well as larger classes (20+). The activity can be used as long as there are enough students to have at least three students in a group (e.g., two disputants and a mediator). In the typical group, two students serve as disputing coworkers, and one person assumes the role of a mediating third party. The mediating third party can be internal to the organization, such as an assistant manager or HR manager, or can be an outside mediator.

Prior to the SAMRP, students should already be familiar with concepts such as conflict styles and strategies and/or approaches to conflict. Therefore, the SAMRP can be used to conclude a unit on basic communication concepts like perception, conflict, nonverbal communication, language, and communication in relationships. The SAMRP could also be utilized as a summative assessment near the end of the semester of a course, in order to

demonstrate student understanding of conflict and relationships, as well as achievement of course competencies throughout the semester.

Learning Objectives

Within the SAMRP, each student is required to deliver organized and persuasive articulations of their position in the dispute. The assignment requires students to think critically about conflict situations from different perspectives. Therefore, even though the SAMRP is a group activity, each student is still required to deliver a reasoned individual presentation backed by evidence. The disputing individuals must present evidence to support their positions. The mediator must facilitate the mediation process by providing an opening statement, challenging disputants' frames of the conflict, and facilitating solution brainstorming between the parties. In order to successfully complete the assignment, each group of students must display effective verbal and nonverbal communication, including listening skills. Students are also required to critically engage potential conflict scenarios, devise potential solutions to commonplace workplace conflicts, and interact professionally and ethically within the simulated workplace mediation scenario.

Preparation

The time allotted for preparation depends on whether the SAMRP is used as an exclusively in-class exercise, or as a graded assignment requiring outside work. The assignment can work as an in-class activity or an outside class assignment, if students are able to meet in their groups outside class, or as a combination of both. If the SAMRP is used as an exclusively in-class activity, the instructor can extensively work with student groups directly as they prepare the role-play. As an in-class assignment, one to two roughly 75 minute class period(s) can be used to prepare the role-plays and one additional class period can be used to present the mediation. As the amount of preparation time needed may vary based on class size, and group size, checking in with students at the end of the first class work period dedicated to the role-play usually gives the instructor an idea of how much more time students need to prepare. If work for the assignment is exclusively done outside of class time, a few minutes for checking in on groups' progress during the class period prior to presentations and then one class period for presentations should be allotted. Typically, most groups are ready to present the SAMRP with one and a half to two hours of in-class preparation.

The activity begins by overviewing the assignment expectations and, when applicable, the associated rubric for the assessment. Students then begin by choosing groups. As the students settle into their groups, the instructor explains that many topics and situations could be relevant to a work conflict and allows groups a period of time (15 to 45 minutes) to brainstorm ideas based on previous conflicts at work. For any students that are not currently employed, and/or have never been employed, the instructor encourages students to think about previous interpersonal conflicts with classmates, friends, or family that could potentially translate over to a work context.

As students work to decide on topics/situations, the instructor reinforces that the conflict situation must be relevant to the work context. For example, a common source of workplace conflict is scheduling. Further, as students act out parts of the conflict during the role play, the instructor should inform students to use a

topic/situation they will feel comfortable acting out for the role-play. As audience members may have questions about the different characters' motivations following the performance, students might find it helpful to create short back stories for each disputant. For example, students might wish to decide how many years each disputant has been with the organization. Creating back stories for the role play characters also assists with developing the overarching conflict narrative of the role-play. If the instructor wishes to allow students time to generate character backstories, another 15-30 minutes should be added to preparation time. Finally, students should decide the extent to which they want to map the role-play out. Some students may wish to fully script the role-play, while others will value the opportunity to "ad-lib." Allowing students to keep some information private from other group members can make the mediation portion of the SAMRP appear more like a genuine workplace conflict. At the very least, students should decide on an industry and organization, as well as the positions of the individuals involved in the conflict.

Role-Play Content

Once students select their topics/scenarios, the instructor walks them through the basics of a mediation session. Video examples of a mediation may be useful to assist students in understanding the mediation process (for an example, see Burrell, 2013). Much like a traditional in-class speech, each mediation session should have a clear introduction, body, and conclusion. For the purposes of the SAMRP, mediation role-plays should be no less than 10 minutes, but no longer than 20 minutes. Therefore students should select conflict scenarios that could realistically be worked out in a limited amount of time. A handout describing the different parts of the mediation process may offer students a helpful way to organize their thoughts. In generally, the three components of the session should resemble the structure outlined below.

Introduction

The role-play should begin with introductions of each party. Each party, including the mediator, should introduce themselves and provide titles/positions within the company/organization. As organizations will not always have the opportunity to bring in outside mediators, the mediating individual may take on the role of an in-house manager, or human resources person. Regardless of the mediator's title, the mediator issues a brief statement at the beginning of the role-play describing the mediation process and establishing credibility with the disputants. Following the mediator's opening statement, the mediator encourages each disputant to contribute in establishing ground rules for the mediation session. The individual filling the complaint typically presents first. However, just as in an actual mediation session, groups can decide how to take turns throughout the mediation. To conclude the introduction, the disputants and mediator write out ground rules for the mediation.

Body

The objective of each disputant in the body of the presentation is to clearly present their positions in the conflict with supporting evidence (e.g., specific details and/or demonstrations). Requiring students to support their positions requires students to think beyond a simple characterization of the conflict, such as one person being "correct." If the SAMRP is utilized late in a semester, students should already be familiar with using evidence to support points from previous presentations. If not, a brief overview on how to support arguments should be provided along with the assignment overview. More on support and evidence in the SAMRP appears below. As the disputants present their

positions during the body of the role-play, the mediator paraphrases the disputant's points to make sure s/he adequately understands the positions. Once each party has provided their case, the three parties brainstorm potential solutions to the conflict.

Conclusion

The objective of the conclusion is for the disputants to determine a mutually acceptable solution. The solution must address the disputants' particular concerns, yet also address individual issues at a higher conceptual level in order to reframe the conflict. When the parties agree to a mutually-agreeable solution, the mediator has them sign a document in agreement. The mediator then thanks the disputants for their participation in the process and ends the role-play.

Support and Evidence

As each disputant works to have their position acknowledged by the other parties, students must think up concrete examples of evidence that could support their framing of the conflict. For example, as part of the back story, both disputants may wish to briefly summarize their experiences interacting with each other in the past. Producing previous written complaints to managers, for example, could show a history of negative interactions between the individuals that may have led to the current conflict. Providing such evidence allows students to create shared experience from which to draw as the mediation unfolds. The more specific that students can get with their characters' perceptions of the conflict scenario, the more insightful the role-play will be for the students in the group, as well as those watching the role-play.

Students should also use relevant props and visual aids to support their positions. As mentioned above, students may create grievance or complaint documents filed by one of the disputants, or by customers, and provide it to the mediator during the session. Students may also pre-record staged work scenarios and interactions to display in class as evidence. Many students are excited about the ability to use props and can be very creative. At a minimum, however, students need to write up a mediation agreement that all parties sign at the conclusion.

Variations

Depending on the number of students in the class, group size can vary. However, groups larger than four students might find difficulty ascribing roles to each group member. If a group decides on having an outside mediator as part of the role-play, a fourth group member could serve as a representative for management, or another department within the organization. Though above it was suggested that students decide how they want to map out the role-play, instructors can also choose how they want students to develop and deliver the role-play. Extemporaneous delivery seems to result in the most engaging role-plays for those presenting and for those watching. However, depending on the specific utilization of the activity within the context of the course, the instructor may also allow students to memorize their dialogue, or utilize scripts.

Additionally, instructors can modify the amount of time allotted for the assignment in-class depending on what topics are chosen and how much preparation time students require. As a graded presentation, the role-plays seem to work best in 10-20 minutes. However, such time constraints inherently limit the severity and complexity of the conflict situations that students can use in the role-play. Many important and timely issues, such as racial conflict

and lower wages for women than men, would certainly be appropriate topics within the context of the workplace. Such topics, however, could be difficult to address and resolve in 20 minutes or less. Therefore, if instructors and students wish to use the SAMRP as an opportunity to bring discussion of larger social issues, such as racism and sexism, into the classroom, the activity would likely need to be adapted with additional preparation and debriefing time, as well as a longer mediation session.

Debriefing

A brief class discussion follows each group's presentation. Each post-presentation discussion should focus on issues relating to course concepts, such as the verbal and nonverbal behaviors of the parties, conflict framings, and how participants' perceptions appeared to change throughout the mediation process. Post-presentation discussions typically last around five minutes. Once all groups have presented, a summative class discussion should center on what students learned about perception, conflict management, and communication within relationships (in and outside of the workplace) through writing and performing the role-play. The debriefing following presentation of all of the role-plays typically last about 15 to 30 minutes. However, depending on the issues addressed in the role-plays, the final debriefing may flow over to the next class period. In that case, outside-class reflection assignments can encourage students to come to the next class period prepared to discuss what they learned from the experience of developing, delivering, and watching the role-plays.

Appraisal

From an instructor standpoint, completion of the role-play requires students to present an organized, formal presentation in front of the class, while also demonstrating an applied understanding of a number of course concepts. The amount of course concepts addressed in the SAMRP can be adjusted based on how much preparation time students are allowed. Rubrics for the SAMRP can focus on performative aspects and/or sufficient application of course concepts. One of the strengths of the SAMRP is the flexibility of the activity format. The activity can be formally or informally assessed and can be conducted completely in-class or require outside group work. The activity can also be used as a reference point for subsequent assignments. For example, requiring written reflections on conflict styles, communication within relationships, communication in the workplace, and/or the process of mediation can further challenge students' understanding of communication and conflict.

In feedback collected following the assignment, both through class discussions and written reflections, students appear to appreciate the ability to choose their own conflict scenario. Many students report that choosing conflict scenarios allows them to work through real-life conflicts they are currently experiencing at work, and do so in a safe setting where they can get peer and instructor feedback. Additionally, many students report never previously considering how supervisors might frame a conflict differently than their employees prior to taking part in the SAMRP. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, student feedback suggests that the SAMRP assists students in understanding how what they learn in class is applicable to life outside the classroom.

References

- Burrell, N. [Nancy Burrell]. (2013, March 18). *Workplace mediation* [Video File]. Retrieved from <http://youtu.be/octPvGiYOq8>
- Coleman, P. T. (2006). Conflict, complexity, and change: A meta-framework for addressing protracted, intractable conflicts-III, *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 12*, 325-348. doi: 10.1207/s15327949pac1204_3
- Folger, J. P., Baruch Bush, R. A., & Della Noce, D. J. (Eds.). (2010). *Transformative mediation: A sourcebook*. Hempstead, NY: Institute for the Study of Conflict Transformation.
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant! Know your value and frame the debate*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing Company.

The Opportunity to Choose Courage,...What Will You Do?

Tamara L. Burk, Kayla L. Mallett, & Kiosha Gregg Boyles

On the morning of June 18th, I rode 20 minutes from the office to meet with a colleague at her home. While she was a nice person and we worked together often, I never actually looked forward to time alone with this particular team member. This is the colleague who listens to Rush Limbaugh when we car pool or who stood in my office and shared how negative she feels President Obama is. This colleague was the last person I wanted to meet with the morning after the Charleston shooting. Sitting across from her at her perfectly polished dining room table and looking out at the crisp blue pool water, I silently prayed, "Please don't let her mention Charleston." As we put the final touches on our project, I exhaled a sigh of relief and began to calculate how much time I had before I would be late to my next appointment. My mental math was interrupted by: "So ... did you hear about Charleston?" "Yeah, so sad," I answered curtly, hoping my brevity would bring the conversation to an end. It didn't, and I felt overwhelmingly uncomfortable – not in that "OK. This is awkward" kind of way, but in a "This is going to be painful" way.

Nodding my head in agreement, I listened to her express sympathy for the family. I listened patiently as she conjured up theories explaining how anyone could commit such a heinous act. That's when my middle-aged white colleague - her brow furrowed - locked eyes with me, an almost 30-year-old African-American woman, and said, "I hope they don't make this about race. I mean, I heard they're already sending Al Sharpton down here ... It seems to be more of an attack on Christianity ... We don't really have problems with race, but all of these outside people ..." I should have said something. It was the perfect opportunity to challenge her lack of empathy and unwillingness to consider that her comments may be perceived not only as distasteful but also as insulting. The opportunity to choose courage presented itself, and I did nothing. I hurriedly packed my things, using my next engagement as an excuse. After an awkward goodbye, I was in my car and on my way. Within minutes, my best friend was on the phone vocalizing all of the emotions I was still too taken aback to express.

In an auditorium filled with small children and adults of various backgrounds, the speaker at my next event encouraged members of the audience to believe in themselves. As she spoke, I was distracted by thoughts of my colleague and her earlier remarks. As people filed out of the auditorium, I noticed a familiar face, Dr. Tamara Burk. I smiled at my former professor and asked, "How are you?" Dr. Burk, usually full of energy and enthusiasm, looked at me with tears in her eyes and said, "I don't know how I should be doing." I was momentarily stunned into silence. I knew her reply was in reference to the Charleston shooting, and right away I began to draw a comparison in the two conversations. She looked at me and said, "We have got to do something about race relations in this state."

She listened attentively as I recounted my earlier conversation and my failure to choose courage. We shared thoughts on what it would take for people to have real conversations about race with people they don't ordinarily feel comfortable having those conversations with. We agreed that people needed to feel empowered, equipped with tools, and supported by others willing to have the same conversations. Before we left the auditorium, Dr. Burk declared, "Let's do it. We're going to start the Courage Campaign." Before the day was over, she announced the concept on Facebook, and people were expressing willingness to get involved. The rest is history – in the making.

Tamara L. Burk is the John Reeves Endowed Chair of Leadership, and a professor of communication studies at Columbia College. Kayla L. Mallett is a 2008 graduate of Columbia College, and currently works as a Community Development Manager for Girl Scouts of South Carolina. Kiosha Gregg Boyles, a 2010 graduate of Columbia College, is the Owner of Digitize Marketing. The authors dedicate this article to Rev. DePayne Middleton-Doctor, a Charleston Massacre victim, who earned her Bachelor's Degree in Biology from Columbia College in 1989. Correspondence to: Tamara L. Burk, Columbia College, Communication Studies Program, 1301 Columbia College Drive, Columbia, SC 29203, USA. Email: tburk@columbiasc.edu

The South Carolina Courage Campaign
“Seeing People Instead of Issues”
@SCCourage (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram); #StartTalkingSC

“There is no greater agony than bearing an untold story inside you.”

--Maya Angelou, **I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings**

On June 17, 2015, nine people were massacred while gathered for Bible study at Mother Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal (A.M.E.) Church in Charleston, SC. The South Carolina Courage Campaign is our response to this tragedy. As in other places in our country, South Carolina is marked by many forms of institutional separation and self-segregation, stemming from both habit and design. The goal of the SC statewide Courage Campaign is to empower South Carolinians to make new human connections with those unlike themselves.

We believe that by encouraging diverse individuals to engage one another--on their own terms--through social media and face-to-face conversations, we can make a difference and build on the unity movement sparked by the Charleston tragedy. Through cultivating proactive and thoughtful interaction, we can build racial empathy, and ultimately, justice. Without that communication process, peace, healing, unity, and reconciliation are impossible. By working together and using the power of sharing our stories, we can change the narrative in our state.

It is our hope that by facilitating meaningful and necessary opportunities for conversation among people throughout South Carolina, the nine Charleston massacre shooting victims will be justly honored: Rev. Clementa Pinckney, Tywanza Sanders, Cynthia Hurd, Rev. Sharonda Coleman-Singleton, Myra Thompson, Ethel Lance, Rev. Daniel Simmons, Rev. DePayne Middleton-Doctor, and Susie Jackson.

Why Must We Use the Charleston Massacre as a Teachable Moment?

It is the authors’ opinions that racism continues to be perpetuated generally, but especially in the South. While the overt racism of decades past has been softened by the passage of Jim Crow Laws and the evolution of cultural norms defining “acceptable” communication behavior, the ideologies at the root of racism, as well as the economic factors at the root of poverty, remain alive and well. Generally, in the South, resistance to “the outside” remains, and an inordinate amount of energy continues to go into defending and protecting the lore of racist rationales, both past and present. Economic disparities remain perpetuated by family privilege and property, and the passing down of both racism and anger has a significant impact on both social and political spheres. The reality that many Southern whites generally have more wealth for no other reason than their ancestors exploited black people, is a truth that continues to be blurred by claims of tradition, heritage, and southern identity.

The Charleston Massacre, so overt and visible in its link to racist ideology and behavior defies any subversive denial or justification as to its root cause, racism. Nine people, in a notable and historically black church, welcomed a young white stranger into their circle of Bible study, only to be murdered an hour later, explicitly, because of their race. Unlike many other crimes, this action so palpable in its ties to racism cannot be explained away to soften its roots in social stratification. This heinous act demands attention through its overt and public nature. Because it cannot be denied, the Charleston Massacre makes talking about race not only possible, but acceptable, and an urgently necessary and powerful teaching moment. In the classroom, on the streets, in our

churches, and in public forums, it is suddenly unusually safe to *encourage* conversations so desperately needed to acknowledge long-held patterns of cultural violence. It is our belief, then, that the severity of the Charleston Massacre uniquely challenges the usual silence and denial so often tied to alleged instances of racism because *not* acknowledging this horrific event involves risk, as well—we risk our very humanity.

How Does the SC Courage Campaign Work?

The SC Courage Campaign believes that while the removal of the confederate flag was significant symbolically, the fight against racism and the racist narrative in our state requires a more intentional effort to improve communication. While removing the confederate battle flag had an impact on the social and cultural shift taking place in South Carolina, it is the beginning, and not the end. Accordingly, our approach to change is one of “boots on the ground.” The campaign is founded on the belief that it is only through the power of connection and communication that we will counter the forms of institutional separation and self-segregation discussed earlier. By encouraging diverse individuals to engage one another—on their own terms—through social media and face-to-face conversations, we can help dismantle interpersonal barriers to more successfully combat social, economic, and political challenges in our state. We believe that by cultivating proactive, real, and thoughtful interactions, we can build racial empathy and, ultimately, justice. Without such a communication process in place, peace, healing, unity, and reconciliation are impossible.

As communication scholars, we know that for most, talking with someone unlike ourselves is not always easy. When it comes to race or other identity markers, the communication process may be awkward, uncomfortable, or even risky, for some. Therefore, we challenged people to practice “conscious and courageous conversations” noting that these exchanges need not be big productions, but should push participants slightly (or more) out of their comfort zones.

In order to launch the SC Courage Campaign, we challenged people to sign on as “Ambassadors” and to initiate small meet-ups (4-8 people) and/or one on one coffee or lunches with others unlike themselves (beginning the week of July 13th). We requested that participants send the date, location, a photo, and an anecdotal story to us for our social media outlets. Ultimately, through the power of story, we hoped (and still hope) to demonstrate that there is more that unites us than divides us. That together, on our own terms and in our own communities, we can at the very least improve the culture of unity throughout South Carolina, one conversation at a time.

To date, we have over 70 Ambassadors in over a dozen counties, and we have reached out to thousands throughout the state (and beyond). Individuals and activists initiated two additional Facebook pages with links to our original: the SC Courage Campaign-Charleston, and the SC Courage Campaign-Greenville. Meet-ups have happened throughout the state in pairs and small groups, both formally and informally, among strangers and friends alike. In the context of the Campaign, the viewing of films, TED Talks, book groups, and storytelling sessions have been organized. Pictures, narratives, and authentically difficult conversations can be found on our social media pages. New events continue to be hosted by diverse people on a weekly to monthly basis. The number of Ambassadors is growing, and we are looking for more. There is no magic or easy solution, there is simply the

willingness to engage in and to cultivate conversations that encourage connection through our similarities, and improve understanding of our differences. If you are interested in participating or observing, go to <http://bit.ly/SCCourageAmbassador> to sign up to be a SC Ambassador, or join us on Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram @sccourage. You will find a simple Ambassador Sign-Up and the SC Courage Campaign Talking Guidelines on the left bar. More importantly, you will discover comments, pictures, and disagreements that renew your faith in the human ability to connect and understand, despite distinct differences. In a recent post, two diverse participants summed up how the SC Courage Campaign has impacted them:

“Our luncheon discussions have affected me profoundly. Speaking for myself, over the weeks I have been able to put together various parts of my life dealing with race and racism, and I see a "whole" picture, rather than the "snapshots" I have always seen before. Also, communicating with various people on-line has been extremely helpful because [it has] opened up my eyes, and now I am practicing empathy on a constant basis: putting myself into the shoes and hearts of many Black Americans. I am so grateful for these opportunities.”

“Being a part of this campaign has introduced me to some interesting and candid persons. Also, it has made me more aware of the differences in people and how they think. Varying opinions shouldn't bring about hatred or confusion, but promote understanding and broaden conversations.”

We sincerely hope that you join us in celebrating the power of communication by joining in courageous conversations. For all of us, our experiences with race (and other identities) deeply shape our ideas about society. It is inevitable. We each experience the world through our own frames of reference, and we cannot experience the life of another without their help. As Founders of the SC Courage Campaign, we sincerely invite your participation in the shaping of our future--the world which our children will inherit,...one we hope, where people are seen *before* issues.

So, when you next have the opportunity to choose Courage,...what will *you* do?