

Sister Rhetors

Cheryl Glenn and Andrea A. Lunsford

Abstract: We begin this essay with an apparently simple question: Because feminism and Western rhetoric have been infrequent and reluctant companions, how might they become strong allies? We answer with four different and sometimes overlapping responses to this question, answers that focus on rhetorical origins; the scope of rhetorical application; resistant rhetorical possibilities; and a rhetorical future of resistance, re-seeing, and reshaping.

Sister Rhetors

We cannot achieve democracy and lasting peace in the world unless women achieve the same opportunities as men to influence developments at all levels of society.
—2011 Nobel Committee Chairman, Thorbjørn Jagland

Across the globe, women are speaking and writing their way into the public sphere, a space too long reserved for aristocratic, political, agonistic males. While we know that women have *always* practiced rhetoric, for millennia, rhetoric itself, as recorded in treatises and other records, seemed completely removed from women and their “sphere”; canonical histories of rhetoric by Thomas Conley, Edward P.J. Corbett, W.S. Howell, George Kennedy, and James J. Murphy make no mention of women’s participation in or contributions to rhetorical history, theory, or practice. In fact, until the late 1980s, rhetoric and women seemed to be mutually exclusive concepts, and any coupling between rhetoric and feminism seemed unthinkable.

But the last three decades have brought change, and in a big way. When the 2011 Nobel Peace Prize was divided three ways—among Liberian President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, Yemeni human-rights activist Tawakkul Karman, and Liberian peace activist Leymah Gbowee—the whole world watched as women, and feminists at that, rose to the stage to accept their award, “for their non-violent struggle for the safety of women and for women’s rights to full participation in peace-building work” (Nobel). With the world’s gaze on them, each of the three spoke, eloquently, wisely, and forcefully. “I urge my sisters,” admonished Sirleaf, “not to be afraid . . . even if your voice be small.” She went on to extol her sister rhetors, “Each of us has her own voice,” urged recipient

Sirleaf, “and the differences among us are to be celebrated. But our goals are in harmony” (“A Voice”). Female rhetors, *feminist* female rhetors, had come into their own, overcoming rhetoric’s unremitting focus on the persuasion, dominance, and winner-take-all, goals and practices that have served to discourage women (and other subaltern groups) from its sphere.

We would like to begin this essay with an apparently simple question: because feminism and Western rhetoric have been infrequent and reluctant companions, how might they become strong allies? We answer with four different and sometimes overlapping responses to this question, answers that focus on rhetorical origins; the scope of rhetorical application; resistant rhetorical possibilities; and a rhetorical future of resistance, re-seeing, and reshaping.

In the Beginning

I have no complaint
Prosperity that
the golden Muses
gave me was no delusion: dead, I
won’t be forgotten—Sappho, Frag. 100

The major origin story of western rhetoric situates its inception in the litigious Greek city states of Syracuse and Athens. This masculinist society made little public room for women (save Aspasia and a few others), and feminists have understandably resented a tradition of irredeemable male dominance. These are legitimate views, and many scholars (Ballif, Bizzell, Campbell, Cape, duBois, Enos, Gleason, Glenn, Hallett, Jarratt, Swearingen, Welch) have analyzed the patriarchal core of western rhetoric. But what if Western rhetoric had another origin story? Jane Sutton argues for tracing rhetoric to “a scene in history when the earth was young, . . . the Amazon ruled,” and no Tyrants

could control society” (“Taming” 104). She relates the Amazon story to Aphrodite and thus links the origins of rhetoric with Aphrodite’s female entourage, which slays the Tyrant. Or what if we could trace the origins of rhetorical prowess to Sumerian high priestess Enheduanna (c.2300 BCE), Greek lyricist Sappho (c. 530 BCE), or Athenian cultural force Aspasia (c. 450 BCE)? What if the story of Western rhetoric actually starts with any of these three female figures? If the origin story of Western rhetoric had changed, possible alliances between rhetoric and feminism would almost surely have already been forged.

O my Lady,
 Beloved of Heaven,
 I have told your fury truly,
 . . .
 Praise to the destroyer endowed with power,
 To my Lady enfolded in beauty.
 Praise to Inanna
 --Enheduanna 5-6

It is the Muses
 Who have caused me
 to be honored: they
 taught me their craft—Sappho, Frag. 63

[I] should be able to make the speech . . . for [Aspasia] who is my instructor is by no means weak in the art of rhetoric.
 --Plato’s Socrates, *Menexenus* 235.e

Instead, for thousands of years, women-inflected rhetorical practices, even those deployed by powerful, public women (Elizabeth I [1533-1603 CE] comes to mind), went unrecognized by men (from Aristotle through G. Kennedy), who were all the while writing and recording a male-only rhetorical tradition. Little wonder, then, that female activists in the early days of feminism applied their verbal prowess to political concerns, giving scant consideration to rhetorical studies, per se.

Early Activists/Applications: Shaping Our Rhetorical Inheritance

The fact that we—two women from Liberia—are here today to share the stage with a sister from Yemen speaks to the universality of our struggle.—2011 Nobel Lecture, Ellen Johnson Sirleaf

Instead of focusing on rhetorical training, America's early feminists applied their activism to politics; to wit, to earning women's right to vote, to gaining women's right to participate fully as U.S. citizens. Joining the universal struggle of women, a small group of suffragists, including Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott, gathered at the first (1848) Women's Rights Convention in Seneca Falls, New York. There the women collaborated on their Declaration of Sentiments, listing eighteen rights in the U.S. Declaration of Independence that men—but not women—enjoyed, despite the fact that the U.S. Constitution reference “people” and “citizens,” never specifying “men” or “women.” Those eight specific rights, which would accord women equal treatment under U.S. law, included speaking in public, testifying in court, preaching from a pulpit, pursuing education, and entering into professions—all rights that would afford them opportunities to display rhetorical abilities, though they were not identified as such until nearly 150 years later. American women also sought to obtain civil existence after marriage, control wages and property, hold legal custody of children, earn wages equal to those of men doing the same jobs, and, of course, secure the vote.¹ Seventy-two years later, in 1920, U. S. women finally won the right to vote, guaranteed by the Nineteenth Amendment: “The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or

¹ Controversial as those eighteen rights were for women to achieve, the most controversial and difficult to obtain would be the right to vote—even though a number of other countries had already met the demand: New Zealand (1893), Australia (1901), Finland (1906), Norway (1913), Denmark (1915), Iceland (1915), Russia (1917), Austria (1918), Poland (1918), England (1918), Ireland (1918), Scotland (1918), and Wales (1918). In 1919, women in Germany, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands also won suffrage.

abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.”² These first-wave feminists rallied around issues of voting rights for women, the abolition of slavery, and patriotism vis-à-vis both the Civil War and what would eventually be called World War I. Along the way, they continued to develop skills in speaking out and up on the lecture circuit, organizing public meetings, and composing and then gathering petitions (the only legal means of political expression open to women at the time). But despite the fact that each of these efforts constituted a rhetorical practice, early feminists were not considered (by themselves or others) to be rhetorical figures. After all, they were women, a status mutually exclusive with that of rhetorician. As Brigitte Mral reminds us, women’s ability to inhabit *both* categories has to do with “status”:

Rhetorical practice is always dependent on the speaker’s position in society’s social and cultural power hierarchy Status is not inherent, but is assigned by society, or in the case of rhetoric, by the audience or the opponent. 11-12

The political (not yet considered rhetorical) activism of first-wave feminism is considered to have ended successfully with the 1920 passage of the Nineteenth Amendment.

I bring you these women.
Listen.
They speak, but their lives
are under attack.

They . . . are denied adjustment of status
in the land of the free. In the home of the brave.
—Margaret Randall (1936-), “Under Attack”

² African-American males were granted the right to vote in 1870 by the Fifteenth Amendment. Native American males and females were granted the right to vote in 1924, though individual states, such as Utah and New Mexico, withheld that right until the 1950s and 1960s.

Resistant Practices: Toward a Future of Equality and Rhetorical Possibilities

I have met brave women who are exploring the outer edge of possibility, with no history to guide them and a courage to make themselves vulnerable that I find moving beyond the words to express it.—Gloria Steinem, “Sisterhood”

During the second wave of feminism (from the 1950s through 1980s), sociocultural activists were once again employing rhetorical power publicly. However, none of these women referred to themselves as--nor were they referred to as--rhetors. Bella Abzug, Susan Brownmiller, Mary Daly, Andrea Dworkin, Marilyn French, Betty Friedan, Carolyn Heilbrun, Maxine Hong Kingston, Barbara Jordan, Audre Lorde, Adrienne Rich, Gloria Steinem, and many others were all writing and speaking publicly, politically, and persuasively, but yet they were regularly ignored by the rhetoric community and vice versa, save for Karlyn Kohrs Campbell’s brilliant 1972 rhetorical analysis, “The Rhetoric of Women’s Liberation: An Oxymoron.” According to Campbell, American culture was unable to acknowledge women as rhetors, given that “the role of rhetor entails qualities of self reliance, self confidence, and independence,” which was (and often is) “a violation of the female role” (75). Furthermore, the feminist argument for equality was disregarded, attacking as it did “the entire psychosocial reality, the most fundamental values, of the cultural context in which it occurs” (75).

Despite difficulties in reaching a rhetorical audience (one that could make change), second-wave feminism resisted the status quo while pressing ahead for a brand of equality that went beyond women’s right to vote, addressing the male domination of contemporary political movements (from Civil Rights to anti-war). Second-wave feminists campaigned (taking the page, the stage, the pulpit, the airwaves) on a Pro-Woman/Women’s Liberation platform to promote the rights of women as well as the

rights of other so-called minority groups to participate fully and equally in cultural, political, legal, and personal affairs.

“The personal is the political,” coined by Carol Hanisch, became the movement’s slogan, locating, as it did, the cultural expectations of any individual body (as marked by sex, race, culture, and socioeconomic status) within the infinite yet predictable network of power relations that reflected social values. The movement’s clarion call would become materialist feminism, an insightful analysis of the material conditions that shape women’s and men’s daily lives and pursuits (or lack thereof). Because women—all women—endured the same constraints to their personal lives and bodies, their release depended on the power of collective resistance, which these women could not leverage at the time. After all, they were writing and speaking at a cultural moment during which their words went mostly unheard and unheeded by an audience facing what can only be described as a moral dilemma. As Campbell explains, “The listener must either admit that this is not a society based on the value of equality or make the overt assertion that women are special or inferior beings who merit discriminatory treatment” (76).

The publication of such resistant feminist works as *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution* (Firestone, 1970); *The Feminine Mystique* (Friedan, 1963); *Intercourse* (Dworkin, 1987); *Our Bodies, Our Selves* (Boston Women’s Health, 1971); *Outrageous Acts and Everyday Rebellions* (Steinem, 1983); *Pornography: Men Possessing Women* (Dworkin, 1979); *Titters* (Stillman and Beatts, 1976); *The Cancer Journals* (Lorde, 1980); *This Bridge Called My Back* (Moraga and Anzaldúa, 1981); *Toward a Recognition of Androgyny* (Heilbrun, 1964), and many others all contributed to the emergence of a recognizable feminist rhetorical power that was slowly leading to

societal transformation. Men and women were gradually beginning to reconsider the sexual division of labor (work outside and inside the home); some women began receiving equal pay for equal work, sometimes earning well-deserved promotions; women were admitted to graduate and professional schools in larger numbers than ever before; and, most of all, in theory (but not always in practice), women had won the right to control their own bodies in terms of safety, reproduction, and sexuality. In addition to the anti-sexual assault and anti-domestic violence campaigns (again, the personal is political) that effected changes in social work and legal procedures, feminists pursued reproductive rights. Oral contraceptives were available (not always readily) to married women in 1965 and to unmarried women in 1972. In 1973, the U.S. Supreme Court's landmark *Roe v. Wade* decision was handed down, giving women the right to choose an abortion during the first trimester of pregnancy (though, like the pill, legal abortions were not readily available, either). In addition, the cultural expectation of heterosexuality (heteronormativity) was rigorously questioned, opening up relatively safer spaces for lesbian identity, which feminists and nonfeminists alike embraced.

Despite the cultural advances created by second-wave feminist resistance, the movement was not an unmitigated rhetorical success. The activists had not achieved a crucial goal, the passing of the Equal Rights Amendment, which Alice Paul had introduced in 1923. The Amendment (which has yet to be seriously considered, much less passed) reads: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of sex." Moreover, the mostly unremitting focus of second-wave feminists on the concerns of white, middle-class, heterosexual women exasperated other women (nonwhite, working-poor, lesbian, bisexual, non-Western) who

wanted (and needed) to participate in collective action. Because none of the feminist leaders seemed to possess the rhetorical expertise necessary to forge an authentic feminist collective, the leadership made repeated sincere but ultimately unsuccessful gestures toward inclusivity. Therefore, the “other” women considered themselves and their issues neglected by an otherwise cooperative movement that could have easily leveraged those “other” concerns as rallying points. This difficult and deeply regrettable situation, illustrated eloquently in Audre Lorde’s “Open Letter to Mary Daly,” demonstrated once again the degree to which the personal *is* political.

Over the course of more than 150 years, then, U.S. feminists have actively used public persuasive language—that is to say, rhetoric—to invite men and women into the movement, inform the public about sociocultural ills and possibilities, and persuade legislators to underscore equality under the law. But their rhetorical practice was not yet informed by rhetorical theory or training. Only when second-wave feminism sparked a scholarly interest in Women’s Studies, however, did feminists officially stake a claim in academia, where they initiated women-centered courses in sociology, anthropology, linguistics, literature, law, medicine, and religion. Still, not until the advent of third-wave feminism, did feminism and rhetoric finally commence a series of encounters that would result in a serious, mutually enhancing relationship.

Given the fact that even the male bastion of philosophy had begun to consider the contributions of women, rhetoric’s turn to a similar inquiry was markedly late. But as more feminists took up studies of rhetoric (in English, Speech Communication, and Linguistics Departments), they began questioning the very foundations of the discipline: Where are the women? How can their exclusion be accounted for? Are their contributions

simply waiting to be found? These questions gained urgency between the second and third waves of feminism, so much so that by the mid-1980s, academic feminists of many stripes began the arduous but necessary work of resisting and then rethinking every feature of the Western rhetorical tradition, and doing so armed, at last, with feminist theory, methods, and practice.

Poets, and poems, are not apolitical.
 Women and other radicals who choose
 venerable vessels for subversive use
 affirm what Sophomore Survey often fails
 to note: God and Anonymous are not white males.
 “We always crafted language just as they did.
 We have the use, and we reclaim the credit.”
 —Marilyn Hacker (1942-), “Introductory Lines”

Rhetorical Resistance, Re-Seeing, and Reshaping

Now we have the dreams and tools to move beyond words and history, beyond the possible to the imagined, and into a life both ancient and new, where we will look back to see our present dreams trailing behind us as markers of where we have been.—Gloria Steinem, “Take Our Daughters To Work Day”

Among the first to respond to this call for change were Patricia Bizzell, Campbell, Lisa Ede, Cheryl Glenn, Shirley Wilson Logan, Andrea Lunsford, Krista Ratcliffe, and Jacqueline Jones Royster, all of whom argue that feminist rhetoricians must pursue several means of bringing about social, academic, and political change, including (1) resistant rereadings of canonical rhetoric treatises; (2) recovering and recuperating female-authored texts and performances; (3) constructing feminist theories and practices of rhetoric; and (4) extrapolating theories from texts not usually thought of as rhetorical.

Focusing on these four contemporary goals gives us an opportunity to highlight some of the strategic efforts that have brought feminism and rhetoric—and our rhetorical

sisters—into alliance with one another in the United States. The first goal—resistant rereadings of canonical rhetoric treatises and categories—has proved to be fundamental to achieving all the other feminist-rhetorical goals and, as such, has been carried out by scholars (too numerous to mention) in rhetoric and writing studies as they have produced various publications and presentations. For our part, we (initially with [Z]) took on the challenge of re-seeing traditional rhetorical categories in order to articulate the unspoken relationships between rhetoric and feminism, an investigation that continues to tug at our feminist-rhetorical consciousness, for the work is far from done. Back when we started the work, we began with the traditional rhetorical canons of invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. This early work continues to energize our determination to continue with our resistant reading and re-seeing of the rhetorical canons vis-à-vis then-underappreciated (if not disregarded altogether) feminist rhetorical displays.

Upon examining the canon of invention, for example, we have found women claiming the right to the arts and practices of invention conducted in nonrational ways (i.e., drawing on neither Aristotelian nor Platonic epistemologies). Audre Lorde reminds us that

as women, we have come to distrust that power which rises from our deepest and nonrational knowledge. We have been warned against it all our lives by the male [rhetorical] world, which values this depth of feeling enough to keep women around in order to exercise it in the service of men, but which fears this same depth too much to examine the possibilities of it within themselves. (“Erotic,” 53-54)

Feminists like Lorde challenge this distinction between supposedly rational or logical and nonrational or intuitive invention, insisting that knowledge and wisdom come also from “non-rational” and private domains. In addition, feminists have reenvisioned what counts as knowledge in the first place. Why not go, they ask, to “topoi” other than the classical ones suggested by Aristotle? Instead of automatically moving into definition, comparison, relationship, circumstance, and testimony, why not go directly to “ephemera” that reveal the information we need—to household accounts, cookbooks, secondary references to women’s compositions, journals, commonplace books—to books of memory of all kinds to “invent” our arguments?

In raising these challenges, contemporary feminism continues to find ways to expand invention, link it to memory, and open it up to the use of new materials, to the intuitive, the experiential, the paralogical, the non-mainstream—as well as to the words/works of “others.” We have noted, in this regard, the ways in which women have linked invention to memory to strong effect, as in the work of writers like Toni Morrison, who tells us that memory is “a form of willed creation” (385). In their writings, Alice Walker and Isabel Allende regularly weave together past, present, and future events that result not in “individualistic autobiographical searchings but in revelations of traditions, re-collections of disseminated identities...that are a modern version of the Pythagorean arts of memory: retrospection to gain a vision for the future” (Fischer 198). Walker’s *In Search of Our Mothers’ Gardens* and *The Temple of My Familiar* as well as Allende’s *House of Spirits* and *The Sum of Our Days* provide spectacular cases in point.

Turning to the canon of *dispositio* or arrangement, we continue to chronicle a long list of feminist challenges and appropriations, all of which resist Aristotle’s dictum that

“a speech has two parts. You must state your case, and you must prove it” (*Rhetoric* 111.12). Obvious feminist patterns range from Tillie Olsen’s uses of silences within her texts to the double-voiced discourse of Geneva Smitherman; the seemingly erratic line patterns of Emily Dickinson, who preferred to “tell it slant” rather than in a linear way; the conversational and circular movements of Margaret Fuller (whom Orestes Brownson insisted never had a “beginning, middle, or end” to anything she wrote); the feminine écriture of Hélène Cixous; and the autoplagerisms of Kathy Acker that juxtapose materials from her own life with swatches from canonical literary texts (like *Don Quixote*) to such startling effects. Such texts resist the linearity of beginning, middle, and end, preferring to alternate warp and woof, to move in circular or spiral rhythms, to weave and dance rather than march in a straight line.

In terms of style, we find women busily re-seeing and reshaping stylistic possibilities, from Mary Daly, who invented a whole new feminist vocabulary (showcased in her *Intergalactic Wickedary*), to writers like Susan Griffin and Michelle Cliff, both of whom write in multiple voices, genres, and often wrenchingly different or incompatible styles, such as Cliff’s attempts to “write in fire.” We also find that style marks a borderland where conflicting ideological, cultural, and political forces important to both rhetoric and feminism contend. Gayatri Spivak’s “Can the Subaltern Speak?” wonders, in essence, whether a style of any kind is even available to the subaltern. After all, as Lorde reminds us, “The master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house” (110). And even if those whom Spivak refers to as the “subaltern” could speak, would anyone really hear them? And what might those listeners actually (be able to) do? In other words, for feminist experiments with style to “count” in the rhetorical tradition, a

rhetor requires an audience who agrees to listen to and authorize her, maybe even be moved by her words. For these reasons, Spivak has turned toward a kind of self-authorization, which she calls “strategic essentialism.” (“Deconstructing”).

“Delivery, delivery, delivery”--Demosthenes’s response when asked to name the three most important parts of rhetoric—has never been more true than today, especially given the opportunities afforded us by new technologies of communication, many of which are decoupled from traditional print texts. In the U.S., scholars are only now beginning to understand the full extent of repression resulting from the growing hegemony of writing, with the concomitant erasure of oral, performative and embodied traditions of rhetoric. What became a thoroughly textualized rhetoric systematically erased rhetorical practices delivered in nonprint, nonverbal, embodied ways, practices often employed by women. The work of James Fredal helps illuminate the fallout from such a textualized rhetoric and provides a historicized response to calls for a writing of the body.

After all, according to Western ideology, the body is marked as “feminine” and the mind as “masculine.” Therefore, removing validated rhetorical performance from the body and grounding it, instead, solely in mental activity and externalized textuality has worked to obliterate women’s embodied performances as rhetorical. Yet, throughout Western rhetorical history, women have been denied access to endorsed mediums of delivery (forbidden to speak in public, preach, teach, publish, and even learn); have been silenced (with torture, shunning, and other instruments of power); have been erased (consider the history of Sappho and Aspasia); or simply ignored as insignificant or worse

(especially those who “spoke” through mystical visions, translations, letters, preaching, teaching, and performance).

Re-seeing and re-shaping the rhetorical canons in this way directs us to see that other rhetorical categories could and should be rethought as well. In rereading the Western rhetorical tradition, for example, feminist rhetoricians can turn to the traditional *pisteis* or proofs of classical rhetoric—ethos, logos, and pathos—which call out for reconsideration and recuperation from feminist perspectives. In addition, we can reexamine traditional concepts such as *kairos* and *metanoia* to see how feminist theory and method can transform them in ways that will speak to the abilities, and the needs, of women and other disenfranchised groups who want and need to speak out even or especially when doing so is seen as inappropriate by those with the most power. Such groups may be particularly attuned to *metanoia*, to the change of heart relevant to any person who moves from an apolitical into any politicized stance (from suffrage and abolition to equal rights and peace, for example). In her coupling of *kairos* and *metanoia*, Kelly Myers explains how *metanoia* follows on the heels of *kairos*, when the appropriate opportunity to speak up and out is missed. Carrying regret, *metanoia* can be paralyzing *or* transformative (as in the case of many newly politicized, newly transformed rhetors).

Somewhere in the landscape past noon
I shall leave a dark print
Of the me that I am
And who I am not
--Audre Lorde, “Prologue”

The resistant re-seeing of canonical rhetorical texts, categories, and concepts continues to serve as a crucial element in all the other goals that contemporary feminist rhetoricians have set for themselves. Such resistant re-seeing has been particularly useful

in the recuperation of erased or marginalized women's rhetorical works. After all, if women's rhetorical contributions are ever to be fully recognized, we must use criteria different from those that excluded them in the first place. As this essay demonstrates, women never had the opportunity to speak or write as did public, political, agonistic, aristocratic *men*; therefore, they were never considered rhetors. But once the definition of rhetoric was expanded to include private, collaborative, domestic, any-class *women*, rhetorical studies blossomed in terms of who and what rhetorical displays merited our study. Little wonder, then, that the last twenty-five years in particular have seen an outpouring of work on feminism and rhetoric. Glenn's *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity Through the Renaissance*, Jarratt's *Rereading the Sophists: Classical Rhetoric Refigured*, Logan's "*We Are Coming*": *The Persuasive Discourse of Nineteenth-Century Black Women*, Lunsford's *Reclaiming Rhetorica*, Royster's *Traces of a Stream: Literacy and Social Change Among African American Women*, and Welch's *The Contemporary Reception of Classical Rhetoric* all represent outstanding examples of such recovery and recuperation work. This critical mass of scholarship paved the way not only for the inaugural Feminism(s) and Rhetoric(s) biennial conference (organized by Ede and Glenn and first held at Oregon State University in 1997) but also for the development of a Southern Illinois University Press series, "Studies in Rhetoric and Feminism."³ It seems fair to say that if rhetorical studies once lagged behind in building

³ To date, this series, edited by Cheryl Glenn and Shirley Wilson Logan, includes the following works: Wendy Hayden's *R/evolutionary Rhetorics: Sex, Science, and Free-Love Feminism in Nineteenth-Century America*; Jacqueline Jones Royster and Gesa Girsch's *Feminist Rhetorical Practice: New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy Studies*; Jane Donawerth's *Conversational Rhetoric*; Suzanne Bordelon's *A Feminist Legacy: Gertrude Buck's Democratic Theory of Rhetoric and Pedagogy*; Lindal Buchanan's *Regendering Delivery: The Fifth Canon and Antebellum Women Rhetors*. Krista Ratcliffe's *Rhetorical Listening: Identification, Gender, Whiteness*; Wendy Sharer's *Vote and Voice: Women's Organizations and Political Literacy, 1915-1930*; Hollis, Karyn L. *Liberating Voices: Writing at the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers*; Mountford, Roxanne. *The Gendered Pulpit: Preaching,*

on the insights of feminism, feminist scholars in the field have worked very, very hard to catch up, reshaping both rhetoric and feminism with vigor and determination.

In terms of the third goal we listed above—of shaping feminist theories of rhetoric—feminist rhetoricians have proved to be both resourceful and successful. Perhaps the most unusual and striking effort to fashion a feminist theory of rhetoric has been carried out by Starhawk, whose *Truth or Dare: Encounters with Power, Authority, and Mystery* sets forth and staunchly defends a new-age rhetoric that finds its origins in theories of the Goddess and in the conviction that we must return to the most basic tenets of democracy—that is, people sitting together, in a public forum, searching for ways to make good decisions. In a recent posting to the *Washington Post* blog, Starhawk takes a look at the Occupy Wall Street movement and its goals, arguing that it “demonstrates a different model of organizing: emergent, decentralized, without a command and control structure.” Such new models of organizing are part of the theory she seeks, a rhetoric founded on inherent human value and capable of accounting for thoroughly democratic, feminist performances. Starhawk is not alone in attempting to create feminist theories of rhetoric. In *Communication Studies*, Sonja Foss and Cindy Griffin have worked out the characteristics and strategies of what they call “invitational rhetoric,” a rhetoric of mutual engagement, while in composition studies, Susan Kates has articulated an “activist” rhetoric, a pedagogical paradigm designed to prepare marginalized learners to take on social responsibility.

Over the last seven years, a group of feminist scholars has been working to articulate a concept of rhetoric adequate to explaining and valuing the rhetorical practices

Rhetorical Space, and American Protestant Culture; Flynn, Elizabeth. *Feminism beyond Modernism*; Johnson, Nan. *Gender and Rhetorical Space in American Life, 1886-1910*; and Mattingly, Carol. *Appropriate[ing] Dress: Women’s Rhetorical Style in Nineteenth-Century America*.

of women and other marginalized groups for the forthcoming *Norton Anthology of Rhetoric and Writing*. Anthologies can be a powerful influence, and in this instance the editors hope for nothing less than reshaping the field of rhetoric and writing, first by refusing a separation of the language arts (reading, writing, speaking, and listening), second by refusing a separation of theory and practice, and finally by refusing to define rhetoric as a western phenomenon only. Thus the anthology will include not only the “theory” of white male authors but the rhetorical practices and performances of women and people of color—in speeches, pamphlets, manifestos, letters, and so on, drawn from a number of cultures.

Women have sat indoors all these millions of years so that by this time the very walls are permeated by their creative force, which has, indeed, so overcharged the capacity of bricks and mortar that it must need harness itself to pens and brushes and business and politics.—Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own* 91

A very recent move toward articulating a feminist conception of rhetoric is Jane Sutton's *The House of My Sojourn: Rhetoric, Women, and the Question of Authority*, in which Sutton figures rhetoric as a house, one that has consistently denied entry to women. She demonstrates that even when women gained a toehold on some space in the house, they were never recognized as speaking or writing with real authority. (The Master's tools cannot dismantle the Master's house.) Sutton mixes memoir, research report, photography, analysis, and metaphorical projection in demonstrating that building a new house of rhetoric from the foundation up will not be done easily and never by simply allowing time to pass. Instead, Sutton calls on feminist rhetors to use their hands and feet—and their speech—to begin material and symbolic work on reenvisioning a new

foundation, maybe not to a new house but to a “new standard of construction” altogether, in which women and men can participate “equally with authority” (144).

While alternative theories of rhetoric are still few and far between, scholars like Damián Baca are working to develop them. Baca’s *Mestiz@ Scripts, Digital Migrations, and the Territories of Writing* provides an alternative history of writing in the Americas. Building on the insights of Anzaldúa, he draws on ritual dances, for instance, to show how their use of improvisation and embodied performance resists dominant narratives. He also employs her idea of a mestiza consciousness,⁴ which “promotes the resistant movement between diverging cultural practices,” particularly rhetorical practices (5). LuMing Mao’s scholarship helps us realize the hybridity of Chinese American rhetoric, an English that speaks itself in the space between Chinese and European-American rhetorical practices, two competing, “if not entirely incongruous, traditions” (3). How might English be used, Mao asks, in such a way that “promotes other voices and that incorporates other modes of doing things with words,” namely representing “Chinese face, indirectness, and personhood,” which tend to be anathema to European American rhetoric (149). In addition to Baca’s and Mao’s work, Jaime Mejia’s expansive review essay illuminates the potential of newly recognized rhetorical theories and practices, shining a light into the “dark shadow of the Western tradition of rhetoric,” which is not and has never been “everyone’s rhetoric” (147). He extols the scholarship and pedagogy that “acknowledge[s] and respect[s] the cultures and rhetorical strategies that our students of color bring with them,” for when the opposite occurs (as it has for far too long), “we

⁴ Although Anzaldúa coined the term, she was not the first to employ it. In his 1903 *The Souls of Black Folk*, W.E.B. DuBois called attention to the “double consciousness,” “this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of [whites]” (45). Furthermore, in a 1934 issue of *The Crisis*, which DuBois founded and edited from 1910-34, Madelen C. Lane writes about “black mestiza,” in her short story by the same name.

deprive ourselves of richer and deeper understandings of different cultures from around the world as well as from within our nation's borders" (149). Such new rhetorical theories hold the power to help each of us gain insight into the experiences, histories, hopes, and dreams of others (anyone other than ourselves, that is to say)—and to move into the future together.

Nothing moves in a straight line,
 But in arcs, epicycles, spirals and gyres.
 Nothing living grows in cubes, cones, or rhomboids,
 But we take a little here and we give a little there,
 And the wind blows right through us,
 And blows the apples off the tree, and hangs a red kite
 suddenly there,
 And a fox comes to bite the apples curiously,
 And we change.
 Or we die
 And then change.
 It is many as raindrops.
 It is one as rain.
 And we eat it, and it eats us.
 And fullness is never,
 And now.—Marge Piercy, "I Saw Her Dancing"

The last goal of feminist rhetoricians has been that of reshaping rhetorical theories by extrapolating from other kinds of texts (i.e., not rhetorical manuals or treatises).

Again, we can discern some progress, most notably in Foss, Foss, and Griffin's *Feminist Rhetorical Theories*, in which they examine the writings of Cherris Kramerae, bell hooks, Gloria Anzaldúa, Mary Daly, Starhawk, Paula Gunn Allen, Trinh Minh-ha, Sally Miller Gearhart, and Sonia Johnson, effectively arguing that each of these women's works (from sociolinguistic analyses and memoir to theological treatises and religious critiques) can yield a distinctly feminist theory of rhetoric. In this groundbreaking text, Foss, Foss, and Griffin describe their own metanoic journey from a traditional to a feminist rhetoric,

saying that “The three of us eventually came to see feminism as more than the effort to achieve equality for women with men: as the means to create a different kind of world characterized by different practices and values” (4). Their goal, like that of all feminist rhetoricians, is to use language in such a way as to create a world that is rounder, more humane, more present- *and* more future-oriented. As Lorde admonishes us, “To refuse to participate in the shaping of our future is to give up. . . . And in order to do that we must allow each other our differences at the same time as we recognize our sameness” (“Learning” 141-42).

I came to explore the wreck.
 The words are purposes.
 The words are maps.
 I came to see the damage that was done
 And the treasures that prevail.
 —Adrienne Rich, “Diving into the Wreck”

Sister Rhetors Today and Into the Future

I believe, I *know* that if you have unshakable faith in yourself, in your sisters and in the possibility of change, you can do almost anything.—Leymah Gbowee, *Mighty Be Our Powers* 230.

This summary demonstrates, we hope, that scholars of rhetoric and writing studies have begun to coalesce and, moreover, to resist, re-see, and re-shape the rhetorical tradition in ways that not only admit but embrace and celebrate women and feminist understandings that are beneficial for all human beings. After all, feminist rhetorical principles of invitation, inclusion, and full representation give us access to alternative perspectives, the kind of knowledge that feeds our process of intellectual, emotional, and moral growth.

Has this work been successful? Yes, but the advances remain modest at best. As we write this essay, women around the world are being beaten, raped, tortured, murdered, and otherwise violated apace. The World Health Organization asserts that violence against women—both intimate partner violence and sexual violence against women—are major public health problems. The organization reports that, in the United States alone, an average of nine women are murdered every day, three by an intimate partner (National). Such physical violence, according to sociologist Carol Gilligan, exemplifies “the gendered universe of patriarchy” (19), a universe of oppression, injustice, and physical as well as verbal violence. We believe this violence is related to the age-old agonistic base of the rhetorical tradition, with its reliance on combat, on dominance, and on winner-take-all. That this traditional understanding of rhetoric is still too often accepted without critique is now completely unacceptable

And yet such violence also can serve, as it has over millennia, as the exigence for women to respond rhetorically, but in a markedly different and completely performative, embodied way. Consider the work women perform on International Women’s Day (March 8th). All around the world—from Santa Fe, New Mexico to Cape Town, South Africa and from Antarctica to Hiroshima Japan—women celebrate the day with antiwar protests. They meet in groups large enough to create artistic shapes with their bodies, which they form into the international peace sign or into letters that spell out “PEACE,” “PAZ,” “NO WAR,” or “WHY?” (Go to www.baringwitness.org to see what we mean.) One aspect of this performance that makes their protest newsworthy is the fact that they form these shapes with their *naked* bodies, with photographers on hand to document and then help them circulate their message. Another feature of their rhetorically powerful

protests is their silence. Inspired by the tradition of world-wide nonviolent demonstrations, these women cast off the old paradigm of public, verbalized, well-armored aggression to inhabit, instead, a new paradigm of public silence in all its human vulnerability. They make the papers, the newscasts, the webpages, of course—as well as their cooperative point. No doubt, their purposeful nudity enhances their newsworthiness, but it is their purposeful *silence* that enhances their rhetoric of community.

Using silence to foster community effort is not new, even though it is rarely thought of in those terms. Ever since Lysistrata and the coalition of women from Sparta, Thebes, and Athens closed their bodies to their warring men, nonviolent, nonverbal protest has provided a vibrant alternative to verbal and physical combat. The Dalai Lama, Martin Luther King, Jr., Aung San Sui Kyi, Mahatma Gandhi, and many others have followed along that same pathway, closing their mouths in order to draw attention to their situations and invite understanding and exchange.

Given that our aggressively talkative Western culture has paid such homage to verbal prowess, eloquence, and persuasion and has systematically tried to deny women the opportunity to engage in such practices of speaking out, it comes as no surprise that positive, productive silence (often deployed by women) has long been overlooked as a source of rhetorical power. What we refer to here as positive silence (see Glenn, *Unspoken*), Ratcliffe refers to as “rhetorical listening” (see *Rhetorical Listening*), which she defines as a “stance of openness that a person may choose to assume in relation to any person, text, or culture” (xiii). Feminist rhetoricians are drawn to a stance of openness, which declares a vulnerability not unlike that of the naked antiwar protesters and antiwar journalists (see Lunsford and Rosenblatt). The overarching purpose of

productive silence and rhetorical listening, closely aligned rhetorical positions, is to transcend self-interested intent, which has for too long been the preferred stance of rhetors. To do so is to anticipate the other person's interest—the first move toward mutual receptivity and understanding and a purposeful departure from the traditional rhetorical ideal of mastery over another.

Thus, positive silence and listening reveal the already existing grounds for feminist rhetorical negotiation. One person honors another person's desire to be heard by listening intently, delivering peaceful silent presence, listening for the ideas and emotions of another, listening across a divide of cultural, experiential, or intellectual difference. Such offerings of reciprocity provide the ideal rhetorical engagement: rather than concentrating on one's own opportunity to talk or talk back, one attends to another person's position, anticipating the grounds for negotiation and collaboration.

We should note that in their use of silence, women are creating a *performative rhetoric*, one that is not tied to written texts that for too long failed to address the gender-based violence rooted in a worldwide culture of denial of women's rights. In that regard, we might point to Code Pink, a women-initiated grassroots network that has spread to 150 communities around the world; their work is grounded in the body, in performance, and in the ludic. Or we could note the work of Women in Black, inspired by the anti-apartheid Black Sash in South Africa and the Madres de la Plaza de Mayo in Argentina. Since 1988, this movement has spread across the globe, with large groups in the UK, the U.S., Europe, South America, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Bahrain, Egypt, India, Japan, Mexico, and Turkey. And we could cite Liberia's Women in White, the first Christian/Muslim alliance that grew into the Liberian Mass Action for Peace, a

nonviolent women's movement that helped end Charles Taylor's dictatorship and the war there. In our introduction, we alluded to one result of this nonviolent, rhetorically savvy women's movement—the 2011 Nobel Peace prize—that was awarded to Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, the president of Liberia, Leymah Gbowee, a prominent Liberian peace activist, and Yemeni pro-democracy campaigner Tawakkol Karman. All three rhetorical bodies shared the prize, in recognition of their eloquent non-violent struggle for women's safety and women's rights. In front of a global audience, Sirleaf encouraged sister rhetors everywhere, "If I might thus speak to girls and women everywhere, I would issue them this simple invitation: My sisters, my daughters, my friends, find your voices! ("A Voice"). Sister rhetors around the world can join forces with Sirleaf, Gbowee, and Karman, who, for decades now, have spoken and performed a rhetoric of peace, justice, and coalition.

*A reasonable woman adapts to the world.
An unreasonable woman makes the world adapt to her.
What this world needs are more unreasonable women.
--Unreasonable Women of the Earth*

In short, feminists today are attempting to reshape traditional agonistic rhetoric, through their strategic use of speech, silence, and resistance guided by nonviolent principles, a thoroughly feminist rhetoric that can account for embodied, performed rhetorical practices. What will such a rhetoric entail? At the very least, it will focus not only on the written but also on the performed (whether virtual or "real"), not on linearity but on webbed connection and collaboration; not on consumers of knowledge, art, and craft but on active, mutually informing producers of the same; not on winning at all costs but on *understanding* and working together. Such a rhetoric and the multiple practices it will evoke, render, and embody can help women and men, disenfranchised and powerful

alike, in the U.S. and everywhere, break the links between traditional rhetoric and dis/empowerment, between power and violence. Such a rhetoric of invitation, productive silence, listening, and empathy can transform the rhetorical tradition from one of persuasion, control, and discipline (on the part of the rhetor) to one of inherent worth, equality, and empowered action (for rhetor and audience alike). Rhetors using such a rhetoric will be embodying/performing rhetoric in ways that will reject combat and dominance in favor of sharing perspectives, understandings, and power. These are the goals an interanimating connection between rhetoric and feminism can—and must—achieve. Indeed, feminists and traditionalists, the subaltern and powerful, men and women are all the same species: we are all human beings, humans with an innate capacity for language and the ability to care about one another, to work together, to change, to respond to kairos and metanoia.

The feminist rhetorical possibilities we offer support our belief that rhetoric is an endlessly pliable human art, one that always has the potential to be used toward *eudaimonia*, the greatest good for all human beings. Such feminist interventions into traditional rhetorical principles provide opportunities for new ways of being rhetorical, of showing respect, making commitments, sharing power, and distinguishing ourselves as human. Achieving these goals is the new, urgent, and ongoing work of feminism and rhetoric, of Sister Rhetors all over the world.

Works Cited

Abzug, Bella with Mim Kelber. *Gender Gap: Bella Abzug's Guide to Political Power for Women*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1984. Print.

- Acker, Kathy. *Don Quixote: A Novel*. New York: Grove Press, 1986. Print.
- Allen, Paula Gunn. *Spider Woman's Granddaughters: Traditional Tales and Contemporary Writing by Native American Women*. New York: Ballentine, 1990. Print.
- Allende, Isabel. *The House of Spirits*. New York: Knopf, 1985. Print.
- . *The Sum of Our Days*. New York: HarperCollins, 2008. Print.
- Aristotle. *The Rhetoric and Poetics of Aristotle*. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts and Ingram Bywater. New York: Modern Library, 1984. Print.
- Baca, Damián. *Metiz@Scripts, Digital Migrations, and the Territories of Writing*. New York: Palgrave, 2008. Print.
- Ballif, Michelle. *Seduction, Sophistry, and the Woman with the Rhetorical Figure*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2001. Print.
- Bizzell, Patricia. "Opportunities for Feminist Research in the History of Rhetoric." *Rhetoric Review* 11.3 (1992): 50-58. Print.
- Bordelon, Suzanne. *A Feminist Legacy: Gertrude Buck's Democratic Theory of Rhetoric and Pedagogy*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2007. Print.
- Brownmiller, Susan. *Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape*. New York: Ballantine, 1975. Print.
- Brownson, Orestes. "Miss Fuller and Reformers." *Brownson's Quarterly Review* 7 (April 1845): 249-57. Rpt. in Myerson 7. Print.
- Buchanan, Lindal. *Regendering Delivery: The Fifth Canon and Antebellum Women Rhetors*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2005. Print.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. "Biesecker Cannot Speak for Her Either." *Philosophy and*

- Rhetoric* 26 (1993): 153-59. Print.
- . "The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 59.1 (1973): 74-86. Print.
- Cape, Robert W., Jr. "Roman Women in the History of Rhetoric and Oratory." *Listening to Their Voices*. Ed. Molly Wertheimer. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1997. 112-32. Print.
- Cixous, Hélène, and Catherine Clément. *Newly Born Woman*. 1975. London: Tauris, 1996. Print.
- Cliff, Michelle. *If I Could Write This in Fire*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2009. Print.
- Daly, Mary. *The Church and the Second Sex*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968. Print.
- . *Websters' First New Intergalactic Wickedary of the English Language*. Boston: Beacon, 1989. Print.
- Dickinson, Emily. "Tell all the truth but tell it slant." *Dickinson: Selected Poems and Commentaries*. Helen Vendler. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2010. 431. Print.
- Donawerth, Jane. *Conversational Rhetoric: The Rise and Fall of a Women's Tradition, 1600-1900*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2011.
- duBois, Page. *Sappho Is Burning*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995. Print.
- DuBois, W.E.B. *The Souls of Black Folk: Essays and Sketches*. 1903. Greenwich, CT: Fawcett, 1961. Print.
- Dworkin, Andrea. *Intercourse*. New York: Free Press-Simon & Schuster, 1987. Print.
- . *Pornography: Men Possessing Women*. New York: Putnam, 1979. Print.
- . *Woman Hating*. Boston: Dutton, 1974. Print.

- Ede, Lisa, Cheryl Glenn, and Andrea Lunsford. "Border Crossings: Intersections of Rhetoric and Feminism." *Rhetorica: The International Society for the History of Rhetoric* XIII.4 (Autumn 1995): 401-41. Print.
- Enheduanna. "The Hymn to Inanna." *Women in Praise of the Sacred*. Ed. Jane Hirshfield. New York: HarperCollins, 1994. 4-7. Print.
- Enos, Richard Leo. "The Archaeology of Women in Rhetoric: Rhetorical Sequencing as a Research Method for Historical Scholarship." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32 (2002): 65-79. Print.
- Firestone, Shulamith. *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*. New York: William Morrow, 1970. Print.
- Fischer, Michael M. J. "Ethnicity and the Post-Modern Arts of Memory." *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography; A School of American Research Advanced Seminar*. Eds. James Clifford and George E. Marcus. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986. 194-233. Print.
- Flynn, Elizabeth. *Feminism beyond Modernism*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2002. Print.
- Foss, Karen A., Sonja K. Foss, and Cindy Griffin. *Feminist Rhetorical Theories*. Sage Publications, 1999. Print.
- Foss, Sonja, and Cindy L. Griffin. "Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for an Invitational Rhetoric."
- Fredal, James. *Rhetorical Action in Ancient Athens: Persuasive Artistry from Solon to Demosthenes*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2006. Print.
- French, Marilyn. *The Women's Room*. New York: Random House, 1977. Print.

- Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Norton, 1963. Print.
- Fuller, Margaret. *The Portable Margaret Fuller*. Ed. Mary Kelley. New York: Viking, 1994. Print.
- Gbowee, Leymah. *Mighty Be Our Powers: How Sisterhood, Prayer, and Sex Changed a Nation at War*. New York: Beast-Perseus, 2011. Print.
- Gilligan, Carol. *Joining the Resistance*. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2011. Print.
- Gleason, Maud W. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1995. Print.
- Glenn, Cheryl. *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity Through the Renaissance*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1997. Print.
- . "sex, lies, and manuscript: Refiguring Aspasia in the History of Rhetoric." *College Composition and Communication* 45 (1995): 180-99. Print.
- . *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004. Print.
- Griffin, Susan. *Woman and Nature: The Roaring Inside Her*. New York: Harper Colophon, 1980. Print.
- Hacker, Marilyn. "Introductory Lines." *100 Great Poems by Women*. Ed. Carolyn Kizer. New York: Ecco-HarperCollins, 1955. 148-49. Print.
- Hallett, Judith. *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society: Women and the Elite Family*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984. Print.
- Hanisch, Carol. "The Personal Is Political." *Notes from the Second Year: Women's Liberation*. Eds. Shulamith Firestone and Anne Koedt. New York: Radical Feminism, 1970. Print.

- Hayden, Wendy. *R/Evolutionary Rhetorics: Sex, Science, and Free-Love Feminism in Nineteenth-Century America*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2012.
- Heilbrun, Carolyn. *Toward a Recognition of Androgyny*. New York: Knopf, 1964. Print.
- Hollis, Karyn L. *Liberating Voices: Writing at the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004. Print.
- hooks, bell. *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*. Cambridge: South End P, 1981. Print.
- . *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black*. Cambridge: South End P, 1989. Print.
- Jarratt, Susan. *Rereading the Sophists: Classical Rhetoric Refigured*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1991. Print.
- Johnson, Nan. *Gender and Rhetorical Space in American Life, 1886-1910*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2002. Print.
- Jordan, Barbara. Keynote Address, 1976 Democratic National Convention. New York: July 12, 1976. <http://www.elf.net/bjordan/keynote.html>. 31. Dec. 2011. Web.
- . *Barbara Jordan: A Self-Portrait*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1979. Print.
- Kates, Susan. *Activist Rhetorics and American Higher Education, 1885-1937*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2001. Print.
- Kingston, Maxine Hong. *The Woman Warrior: Memoirs of a Girlhood Among Ghosts*. New York: Random House, 1975. Print.
- Kramerae, Cheri. *Women and Men Speaking*. Boston: Newbury House, 1980. Print.
- Lane, Madelen C. "Black Mestiza: A Story." *The Crisis* 41.3 (1934): 63-64. Print.

- Logan, Shirley Wilson, ed. *With Pen and Voice: A Critical Anthology of Nineteenth-Century African-American Women*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1995. Print.
- . *We Are Coming”: The Persuasive Discourse of Nineteenth-Century Black Women*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1999. Print.
- Lorde, Audre. *The Cancer Journals*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1995. Print.
- . “Learning from the 60s.” *Sister Outsider*: 134-44. Print.
- . “An Open Letter to Mary Daly.” *Sister Outsider*. 60-71. Print
- . “The Master’s Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master’s House.” *Sister Outsider*. 110-13. Print.
- . *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Berkeley: The Crossing Press, 1984. Print.
- . “Uses of Erotic: The Erotic as Power.” *Sister Outsider*. Freedom, CA: Crossing, 1984. 53-59. Print.
- Lunsford, Andrea, ed. *Reclaiming Rhetorica*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1995. Print.
- Lunsford, Andrea A., and Adam Rosenblatt. “‘Down a Road and into an Awful Silence’: Graphic Listening in Joe Sacco’s Comics Journalism.” *Silence and Listening as Rhetorical Arts*. Eds. Cheryl Glenn and Krista Ratcliffe. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2011. 130-46. Print.
- Lunsford, Andrea A., and Lisa Ede. “Rhetoric in a New Key: Women and Collaboration.” *Rhetoric Review* 8.2 (1990): 234-41. Print.
- Mao, LuMing. *Reading Chinese Fortune Cookie: The Making of Chinese American Rhetoric*. Logan: Utah State UP, 2006. Print.
- Mattingly, Carol. *Appropriate[ing] Dress: Women’s Rhetorical Style in Nineteenth-Century America*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2002. Print.

- Mejía, Jaime Armin. "Ethnic Rhetorics Revisited." *College Composition and Communication* 63.1 (Sept. 2011): 145-61. Print.
- Minh-ha, Trinh T. *When the Moon Waxes Red: Representation, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. New York: Routledge, 1991. Print.
- Moraga, Cherrie, and Gloria E. Anzaldúa. *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*. Boston: Persephone, 1981. Print.
- Morrison, Toni. "Memory, Creation, and Writing." *Thought* 59 (1984): 385-90. Print.
- Mountford, Roxanne. *The Gendered Pulpit: Preaching, Rhetorical Space, and American Protestant Culture*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2003. Print.
- Mral, Brigitte. "A Womanization of Public Discourse? Reflections on Rhetorical Strategies Used by Swedish Female Politicians." *Women's Rhetoric: Argumentative Strategies of Women in Public Life, Sweden & South America*. Ed. Brigitte Mral, Nicole Borg, and Philippe-Joseph Salazar. Åstorp, Sweden: Retorikförlaget, 2009. 11-30. Print.
- Myers, Kelly. "Metanoia and the Transformation of Opportunity." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 48.1 (Jan. 2011): 1-18. Print.
- Myerson, Joel, ed. *Critical Essays on Margaret Fuller*. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1980.
- National Organization for Women. (now.org/issues/violence/stats.html#endref1). Web.
- "Nobel Peace Prize 2011 Handed Jointly to Three Women." *The Telegraph* (7 Oct. 2011). <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/30> Jan. 2012. Web.
- The Norton Anthology of Rhetoric and Writing*. Eds. Andrea A. Lunsford, Susan Jarratt, Jacqueline Jones Royster, Robert Harriman, Tom Miller, and Jody Enders. New York, Norton: Forthcoming. Print.

- Olson, Tillie. *Silences*. 1965. New York: Feminist P, 2003. Print.
- Our Bodies, Ourselves: A Book for and by Women*. Boston: Boston Women's Health Book Collective, 1971. Print.
- Piercy, Marge. "I Saw Her Dancing." *Available Light*. New York: Knopf, 1988. 118-21. Print.
- Plato. *Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo, Phaedrus*. Trans. H. N. Fowler. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1977. Print.
- Randall, Margaret. *Ain't I a Woman!* Ed. Iloona Linthwaite. New York: Peter Bedrick, 1988. 142-43. Print.
- Ratcliffe, Krista. *Anglo-American Challenges to the Rhetorical Tradition(s): Virginia Woolf, Mary Daly, and Adrienne Rich*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1996. Print.
- . *Rhetorical Listening: Identification, Gender, Whiteness*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2005. Print.
- Rich, Adrienne. *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution*. New York: Norton, 1976. Print.
- Royster, Jacqueline Jones. *Traces of a Stream: Literacy and Social Change Among African American Women*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2000. Print.
- Royster, Jacqueline Jones, and Gesa Girsch. *Feminist Rhetorical Practice: New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy Studies*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2012. Print.
- Sappho. *Sappho: A New Translation*. Trans. Mary Barnard. Berkeley: U of California P, 1958. Print.

Sirleaf, Ellen Johnson. "Nobel Lecture: A Voice for Freedom!" (10 Dec. 2011).

Nobelprize.org 1 Jan. 2012. Web.

Sharer, Wendy. *Vote and Voice: Women's Organizations and Political Literacy, 1915-1930*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004. Print.

Smitherman, Geneva. *Talkin and Testifyin*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1977. Print.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakrovorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1988. Print. 271-316.

---. "Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography." *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Routledge, 1987. 197-221. Print.

Starhawk, "What Drives Occupy Wall Street?" *The Washington Post*. (20 Oct. 2011).

http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/on-faith/post/faith-in-the-99-percent-what-drives-occupy-wall-street/2011/10/20/gIQAS2R30L_blog.html. 30. Dec. 2011.

Web.

Steinem, Gloria. *Outrageous Acts and Everyday Rebellions*. New York: New American Library, 1983. Print.

---. "Sisterhood." 1972. Rpt. *Outrageous Acts and Everyday Rebellions*. New York: Holt, 1983. 121-27. Print.

---. "Take Our Daughters to Work Day."

Stillman, Deanne, and Anne P. Beatts, ed. *Titters: The First Collection of Humor by Women*. Springfield, OH: Collier, 1976. Print.

Sutton, Jane. *The House of My Sojourn: Rhetoric, Women, and the Question of Authority*. U Alabama P, 2010. Print.

---. "The Taming of *Polos/Polis*: Rhetoric as an Achievement without Women."

Contemporary Rhetorical Theory. Eds. John Louis Cucaites, Celeste Michelle Condit, and Sally Caudill. New York: Guilford, 1999. 101-26. Print.

Swearingen, C. Jan. "A Lover's Discourse: Diotima, Logos, and Desire. *Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition*. Ed. Andrea Lunsford. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1995. Print.

Walker, Alice. *In Search of Our Mothers' Gardens: Womanist Prose*. New York: Harcourt, 1983. Print.

---. *The Temple of My Familiar*. New York: Harcourt, 1989. Print.

Welch, Kathleen. *The Contemporary Reception of Classical Rhetoric: Appropriations of Ancient Discourse*. New York: Routledge, 1991. Print.

Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. London: Harcourt, 1983. Print.