

Spring 2011

The True Knowledge of Women

Karen Cochran Roop
Kennesaw State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/etd>



Part of the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Roop, Karen Cochran, "The True Knowledge of Women" (2011). *Dissertations, Theses and Capstone Projects*. 443.
<https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/etd/443>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses and Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@kennesaw.edu.

The True Knowledge of Women

A Proposal for a Concentration in Women's Rhetoric(s)

By

Karen Cochran Roop

A capstone project submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Professional Writing
in the
Department of English

In the College of Humanities and Social Sciences
of
Kennesaw State University

Kennesaw, Georgia

2011

College of Humanities & Social Sciences
Kennesaw State University
Kennesaw, Georgia
Certificate of Approval

This is to certify that the Capstone Project of

KAREN COCHRAN ROOP

Has been approved by the committee
for the capstone requirement for

the Master of Arts in Professional Writing
in the Department of English

At the (month and year) graduation

MAY 2011

Capstone committee:

[Signature]

Member

[Signature]

Member

Acknowledgements

A master's degree is an accomplishment that can rarely be completed without the love and support of others, and this one is no exception. My sincerest thanks and heartfelt appreciation go to my husband, John, and to my children, Nikki and Tyler, for their love, support, and understanding during the past three years. I would also like to express my gratitude to Dr. Mary Lou Odom and Dr. Todd Harper for their invaluable guidance toward this capstone project.

Table of Contents

Preface.....	5
Chapter 1: Why Study Women’s Rhetoric(s).....	8
Chapter 2: Beginnings: Women as Rhetorical Pioneers.....	42
Chapter 3: Rhetoric in Three Waves: A Rhetorical Study of the Three Waves of Feminism in the U.S.	57
Chapter 4: Modeling Women: Using Women’s Rhetorics as Composition Models.....	75
Chapter 5: Signposts: Landmarks in Women’s Rhetorics.....	88
Chapter 6: Where Do We Go From Here?.....	103
Works Consulted.....	111

Preface

...listening and watching in art and literature, in the social sciences, in all the descriptions we are given of the world, for silences, the absences, the nameless, the unspoken, the encoded—for there we will find the true knowledge of women.

Adrienne Rich

Ann Berthoff said that it is through writing that we make meaning, that writing is one of the ways we “make sense of the world” (648). If we stop to consider texts, and especially rhetorical texts, in this light, we can begin to comprehend just how important these artifacts are to our understanding of our own and others’ cultures, ideologies, beliefs, and knowledge. Moreover, if we consider Rich’s assertion above, we may come realize that if we make sense of the world through writing and women’s writings have been silenced and absent, perhaps we should question what nuances, what meanings, what knowledge may be missing from our sense of the world.

The seeds of this project began in 2005 in a rhetorical theory course I took as an undergraduate at North Georgia College & State University. As the class made its way through *The Rhetorical Tradition*, I came to realize that, even though there were a few included in the text, the lack of women rhetors was troubling. Ironically, the class was comprised entirely of female students and a female instructor. As the semester drew to a close, I was left with more questions than answers about the near absence of my rhetorical foremothers. Where had all the women gone? Where were their writings? Their rhetorics? What important people or events had they influenced, and what was the impact of their rhetoric(s)? In my research to answer these questions, I discovered the rhetoric of women such as Queen Elizabeth I, Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Astell, Gertrude Buck, the women of the Seven Sisters Colleges, and others. But the story

of Anne Askew and the consequences of her rhetoric impressed on me not only the power of rhetoric, but also that women, as well as men, were adept at using it.

Askew's public oratory was so powerful that she was turned on the rack at the Tower of London and burned at the stake for her faith. *Examinations*, her written account of her tortures, was so eloquently written and rhetorically sound that they "inflamed" the reformation movement (Glenn *Rhetoric* 152). Cheryl Glenn describes Askew as, "the only woman of her time to leave a record of her religious sufferings," and "one of the first Renaissance women to stride into the public arena, wielding her rhetorical power for persuasion, exhortation, and self-defense, delivering her rhetorical contributions to the reformist movement" (*Rhetoric* 152). Askew's understanding of rhetorical theory was so keen that during interrogations, she would frequently ask questions back to her accusers causing them to indict themselves (Glenn *Rhetoric* 155). Glenn characterizes Askew as the Renaissance woman's "patron saint" (*Rhetoric* 158). In the end, I was left with the sense that indeed much was missing from rhetorical studies if rhetoric as important and powerful as Askew's was being left out.

When I reached Kennesaw State University and began studying composition and rhetoric in the Masters in Professional Writing program, I was once again confronted with women's missing rhetorics. As I learned about rhetorical and composition theories and pedagogies, I contemplated what difference gender might make in the writing process, in rhetorical theory, and in styles of argument. What I found was that, while many women scholars have entered the field of composition and rhetoric and have argued for more inclusion of women's rhetorics in the classroom, women's rhetorical artifacts have not been integrated into the curriculum in meaningful and impactful ways. This project, then, is an attempt to draw attention to the missing rhetorics while focusing on them in four courses devoted to the study of women's rhetorical

artifacts. Arguably, a focus on women's rhetoric(s) runs the risk of continuing the marginalization of women's texts as "other," but I believe it is worth the risk in order for works like Anne Askew's to be studied for what they add not only to our understanding of rhetoric, but also to our cultures, ideologies, beliefs, and knowledge, as well.

Chapter one provides an introduction outlining the underrepresentation of rhetorical artifacts produced by women—and their accompanying knowledge, voices, perspectives, and strategies—that persists in many of our academic disciplines and discourses, the results of that deficiency, a proposal for a concentration of courses at Kennesaw State University that attempts to begin to rectify that deficiency, and the projected benefits that could result from such an endeavor. Chapters two through five describe the four proposed courses including suggested texts, assignment descriptions, and syllabi. Chapter six wraps up the project with some suggestions for further expansion of women's rhetorics.

While preparing for this proposal, I previewed many books for possible inclusion as texts. One day my husband noticed my copy of *The Black Woman: An Anthology* and mused over the fact that there is not a *White Woman* anthology. I smiled at his comments, until I realized there is no white woman anthology because white women have, for the most part, written from a place of privilege compared to African-American women—just as there is no *Men's Anthology*, because men have written from a place of privilege. As this project unfolds on the pages that follow, my desire is that those who read them will begin to understand that women are competent, complex, thinkers and that their ideas, knowledge, and rhetoric(s) are important and deserve to be studied—they deserve to be privileged.

Chapter 1

Why Study Women's Rhetoric(s)?

Now that women's rhetorics have been recovered and reclaimed, we think we should analyze the ways we can make use of them.

Kate Ronald and Joy Ritchie

Introduction

Why should we study women's rhetoric(s)? Who benefits from such a study? And why should Kennesaw State University offer a concentration in women's rhetoric(s)? In the pages that follow, my desire is that we will discover the answers to these important questions as I describe the shortfall of women's rhetorics currently offered to most university students and argue for a concentration of courses focused on these rhetoric(s).

While women have been affecting their worlds through rhetorical acts as far back as Aspasia, c. 410 B.C.E, for the most part, we have not had the opportunity to benefit from their works, because historically, women's texts have not been available for study in the public realm. One reason for this deficiency may be that fewer of these works exist. The case could be made that, until the recovery and reclamation efforts of the past three decades, few scholars knew of their existence, because historically these works have been, at best, undervalued and, at worst, intentionally silenced. Furthermore, despite the efforts of educators, writers, publishers, and administrators who are forging new ground in their attempts to bring women's rhetorical texts into the fore in higher education, traditional curricula, textbooks, anthologies, and courses remain overwhelmingly male in their voice, ideologies, perspectives, and rhetorical strategies. The courses proposed in this concentration respond to Kate Ronald and Joy Ritchie's challenge in the

opening epigraph about “using” women’s rhetorics by examining these rhetorics: for rhetorical strategies, analysis, and criticism; as composition models; for what they add to our understanding of argument; and as a new way to understand segments of history.

In their landmark essay, “Border Crossings: Intersections of Rhetoric and Feminism,” Lisa Ede, Cheryl Glenn, and Andrea Lunsford discuss how, as the title implies, these two disciplines intersect and, through that intersection, change each other. The authors especially link invention, “the heart and soul of inquiry” and memory, “the very substance of knowledge” calling the intersection a “rich overlap” (410). They explain that “invention and memory constrain and shape both who can know and what can be known” (411), and that the “rhetor must rely heavily, in all searches, on memoria” – that storehouse of knowledge (410). Their observations are especially relevant to our discussion of missing women’s rhetorics, and the resulting proposal for this concentration, in that if invention relies on access to available means and a storehouse of memory (knowledge), students need more than the male voices in their heads to draw from – they need the voices, knowledge, wisdoms, and rhetorics of their foremothers as well as their forefathers.

In order to begin to rectify and, in some instances, draw attention to the absence of these voices, wisdoms, rhetorics, and knowledge, I propose a concentration of courses designed to explore, examine, and explicate these works and others to heighten awareness of women’s rhetorical power, prowess, and politics. I employ the verbs *explore*, *examine*, and *explicate* to describe three separate processes in the study of the works in this concentration: To explore is to investigate or search for something; after finding it, to examine is to test by questioning, which can be the academic equivalent of looking at something under a microscope; once the item is found and examined, to explicate it is to understand its implications. While I appreciate that the

term *rhetoric* has many academic and culturally-based definitions, for the sake of this discussion, I am defining *rhetoric* as those verbal, visual, and textual artifacts that emerge in response to an exigence, make use of consciously-chosen strategies for a fitting response, are directed toward an audience that has the power to act, and are persuasive in nature. For example, most political speeches are rhetorical in nature, because they seek to win over a particular audience and utilize strategies (like those listed above) to do so. While forms characterized as communication, such as news broadcasts, are not necessarily rhetorical, because their primary purpose is the relaying of information. Or, as Lunsford and Ede explain (with a nod to Aristotle), “rhetoric is... the search for the best available means of persuasion in a particular situation...” (Crimes 30). Women’s rhetorics, then, are rhetorically sound artifacts devised by women. I use the term rhetorics, because I consider these artifacts as having strategy—that the rhetors thought about their audience, the appropriate genre, the entire rhetorical situation, culture, and context. They were acutely aware of these elements. While a complete delineation of women’s rhetorical theory and practice is too broad for this discussion, it is worth noting here that studying women’s rhetorics may represent an expansion of the accepted rhetorical tradition. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell writes that the five canons of traditional rhetorical theory (invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery) may not be adequate to analyze and characterize women’s rhetorical theories and practices (“Theory” 125). Campbell also explains that “because their rhetoric often did not fit the categories of or assumptions underlying traditional theory, [women’s rhetorics] may be deemed unworthy of attention or study or be denigrated as atheoretical” (“Theory” 126). Additionally, Jane Donawerth argues that the rhetorical theory that women wrote from 1600-1900 was “quite different from the textbooks and treatises of the men’s rhetorical tradition” (“Authorial” 107). Donawerth gives two reasons why this was the case:

men's rhetorics were considered public (and addressed mixed audiences) and women's rhetorics were primarily for women's education; and "women had—and still have—[difficulty] in establishing ethos with the authority to construct a theory and persuade readers of its value" ("Authorial" 107). While some women rhetors adopted traditional strategies of rhetorical theory and practice, perhaps as a way to counter these and other challenges, other women developed new rhetorical theories and practices, including different argumentation styles.

For example, Margaret Fell wove scriptures through her pamphlets arguing for the right of women to preach, thereby utilizing a common "hermeneutic[al] approach in Europe during the Reformation" ("Authorial" Donawerth 109). Whereas others, such as Adrienne Rich, demonstrate that intersecting the academic, personal, and critical opens up a new strategy for argument that is more collaborative (Ritchie and Ronald *Available* 267). The rhetorics of letters, conducts books, memoirs, and even some novels, forms that have generally been associated with women's writings, also serve to agitate and expand our traditional understanding of rhetoric and argument.

Additionally, it might be helpful here to clarify what it means to refer to works as women's rhetorics versus feminist rhetorics. While it may not be feasible to completely differentiate the two, one distinction I make in this proposal is that women's rhetorics are rhetorical works produced by women, whereas feminist rhetorics may or may not be written by women. Feminist theory may also be considered a system of thought or criticism and/or of rhetorical methods and methodologies (to borrow from the title of Eileen Schell and K. J. Rawson's *Rhetorica in Motion*). However they are classified, the issues with which feminist and women's rhetorics concern themselves are important to more than just women, addressing topics such as access to education for everyone, the environment, soul salvation, questioning of

cultural norms, and more. In fact, it might be fair to say that these rhetorics address issues in every aspect of life—even politics, into which American women have been very slow in making progress. Therefore a serious study of women’s rhetorical theories and their resulting practices such as the ones proposed in this concentration are important, because it broadens the scope of our understanding of all rhetorical theories and their practices.

Even though some of the rhetors represented in the following courses might actually be more appropriately described as orators (loosely defined as one who uses spoken language for persuasive purposes), because so few of their speeches are available aurally, we are left to analyze the written forms instead. For this reason, I will refer to them and others who produce textual and visual, as well as verbal, rhetorics as rhetors, and those who theorize how others might utilize rhetorical strategies to formulate arguments as rhetoricians. Additionally, for the sake of this discussion, I may employ the terms rhetoric, rhetoric(s), texts, and writings almost interchangeably to refer to those artifacts described above.

Institutional Contexts

Kennesaw State University (KSU), a public, comprehensive university comprises nearly 23,000 undergraduate and graduate students who represent not only Georgia and the U. S., but also 136 countries (KSU Fact Book). The student body is 68% Caucasian, is non-traditional, with an average student age of 25, and along gender lines is approximately 60% female (KSU Fact Book). As we will see, KSU follows the national trend in the ratio of female to male students. Since 1991, the number of 18-24 year-old female students in U. S. universities has exceeded male students of the same age group (Mather). As of 2005, female students of all age groups made up 54 percent of the over 10.8 million college students in the United States

(Mather). These statistics are especially pertinent for Kennesaw, because while the gap differs according to region, “southern states have the largest gender gap in enrollment, with an average enrollment ratio of 1.4 (A ratio of 1.4 indicates that there are 140 females enrolled in college for every 100 males.)” (Mather). In fact, Kennesaw State University’s 60% female population represents a ration of 1.5.

While we might concede that this trend of females outnumbering male students could still be considered an emerging trend (with the female student population increasing over the last 30 years or so), we should expect that new curricula, textbooks, and anthologies would be adjusting to a more balanced approach according to gender. Sadly, this is not the case. Female students continue to encounter a canon in many disciplines that is overwhelmingly male in its voice, ideologies, and perspectives. KSU is no exception. With more than 60 major and degree programs, KSU students are afforded educational options ranging from business and nursing to leadership and conflict management. Until recently, though, few opportunities existed for KSU students to focus their educational experience specifically on gender or women’s studies. With the recent installation of the new Gender and Women’s Studies minor, KSU is beginning to rectify this deficit, but much work remains to bring women's rhetorical texts into the mainstream. So why should KSU consider a concentration in women’s rhetorics? The concentration of courses outlined below would contribute to the course work in this new minor, in addition to English and other disciplines such as political science. KSU currently offers forty-nine undergraduate English courses covering topics as varied as Ethnic Literatures, Studies in Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Literature, and Major African-American Writers; however, there are no published courses focusing on texts (rhetorical or otherwise) written exclusively by women. Because the courses proposed in this concentration focus on rhetorical artifacts written

by women, they would also provide a complement to and expansion of the Histories of Rhetorical Theories course, thereby situating Kennesaw's undergraduates as well grounded in more areas of rhetorical study.

The courses I propose would provide both female and male students with a multiplicity of ideas, perspectives, and rhetorical strategies previously unavailable, as I believe this concentration to be unique in higher education in the United States. Many universities currently have Gender and Women's Studies concentrations, minors, and majors, but in my research, I can find no program that focuses an entire concentration of courses on women's rhetorics in particular. This concentration would provide Kennesaw State University a unique opportunity to be a leader in rectifying these inequities through its support of this concentration in women's rhetoric.

Textbooks and Anthologies and the implications of omission

Even with all the advances that have been made toward a more egalitarian, multi-focused society, the hard truth remains that our secondary and higher educational experiences lag behind by continuing to reflect a social reality of the singular, male-dominated perspective. Rather than women's experiences/perspectives being incorporated into literature, textbooks, etc., they are still being separated into women's or minorities' experiences rather than being represented as American experiences. Because women's writings remain underrepresented in anthologies and across the disciplines, as we will see in the following discussion, courses that focus on women's rhetorics, such as the ones in this proposal, are necessary – even at the risk of furthering the view of women as “other.”

History

Our speech, thoughts, and writings are individual, but they also connected to the history in which they are conceived, and it is that history that situates the thoughts in a context—without a clear connection to that historical context, the effects of those thoughts and writings begin to break down. Decontextualizing or even ignoring a segment or group in history makes it much easier to ignore that groups' contribution to that history. When a group's contribution to its own history is ignored, it's easier to ignore what that group says about that history. This is why we must interrogate our history books.

In her 1986 article, “Integrating Women’s History: The Case of United States History High School Textbooks,” Mary Kay Johnson Tetreault calls the treatment of women in U.S. history books into question and finds that women and their perspectives were “largely excluded” (211). Tetreault cites a 1975 essay by Gerda Lerner in which Lerner puts forth a five-phase “framework” and the resulting questions accounting for historians’ attempts at handling women’s contribution to history (212).

Briefly stated, Lerner’s phases begin with “Male History” in which no questions about women were asked, advance to “Compensatory,” which began to ask who “notable” women were and what did they contribute to women’s lives, to “Bi-focal” which explored the differences between public and private spaces and drew attention to their affect on history, to “Feminist History,” which focuses on establishing a women’s history as a separate vein of study (Tetreault 215-216). The phases culminate in “Multifocal, Relational History” in which the questions range from whether both men and women’s contributions to history are seen as a “continuum” on the same timeline to questions of how all the equal yet distinct aspects of “race, ethnicity, social class, marital status, and sexual preference affect women’s and men’s

experiences in history” (Tetreault 217). Clearly, Lerner’s multifocal, relational history should be the goal education strives for in its courses and textbooks.

Tetreault conducted her own study of high school textbooks in the late 1980s by gauging her findings against Lerner’s phases. She found that even though women’s experiences were being inserted into the later textbooks, albeit not at a level consistent with scholarship about women at the time, the texts’ continued “emphasis on political, diplomatic, and military history leads to the exclusion of women” (230). This focus on only certain aspects of history also gives the impression that everything important about that period is being included. According to her findings, Tetreault concluded that while more women were included in the later textbooks, they were being “incorporated primarily at the levels of compensatory and bi-focal” levels (221). She found that even though women like Eleanor Roosevelt and Abigail Adams were included in the textbooks, they were always in the socially acceptable roles of someone’s wife or in a role viewed as an extension of their private lives – usually caretaking or nurturing (221).

Tetreault posits that “as long as events in the public spheres are conceptualized as history while those in the private spheres are not, women’s history and relational history will continue to be excluded” (248). When women’s contributions to history are excluded or marginalized, the ripple effect is felt in other ways that might not be as obvious. A redacted account of women’s contribution to history means that textbooks are free to simply mention women without actually demonstrating or discussing how women contributed to that history, letting students hear women’s voices, or offering students women’s perspectives on that history.

Composition and Rhetoric

Despite the near heroic efforts of scholars such as Ronald, Ritchie, Lunsford, Campbell, Glenn, hooks and many others to uncover women's writings and rhetorics and bring them into mainstream curricula and pedagogy, the male voice continues to dominate the fields of composition and rhetoric, as well. Campbell writes that it is even difficult to accomplish curricular changes to include the works of women and minorities because, "they pose ideological as well as pedagogical challenges" ("Hearing" 33). Writing in the late 1980s, Campbell points out that even after the oversight of leaving works by women out of earlier public address and public speech anthologies was acknowledged, "such omission continues" in current anthologies ("Hearing" 1).

Indeed the situation is no better in composition anthologies. *The Norton Reader*, now in its twelfth edition (2008), the anthology that Lynn Bloom refers to as "the industry point of reference," because of the "propensity of other editors to copy its selections" (412) consists of 206 works out of which only 65 are written by women – 31 percent of the total. Of the seventeen works included in the "Cultural Critique" section, only four are by women; of the eleven offered in the "Education" section, only three are by women; of the fourteen in the "Ethics" section, only three; "History," only three, "Politics and Government," two; in "Science and Technology," no women appear as authors in their own right – one piece has five authors, three of whom are women. Finally, of the nineteen works in the "Literature, The Arts, and Media" section, a section in which it would seem many women could easily be included, there are only six female authors. Ironically, one of the pieces included in this section is Katha Pollitt's "Does a Literary Canon Matter?" in which she discusses the arbitrary nature of the canon, and, among other ideas, imagines the "conservatives" debating over which new writers *could* be added to the canon while

Jane Austen, Virginia Woolf, Willa Cather, and George Eliot “breathlessly” wait in “Writers’ Heaven” to learn if they’ve “finally made it into the club” (1047). Her observations would be humorous if they weren’t so tragic. When women’s writings are not included in the anthologies in equal number with men’s, works by women are not considered equally important and those educators who want to equal out their representative readings must seek out additional women’s works elsewhere.

Furthermore, Bloom asserts, “No matter where an essay first appeared—in the *New Yorker* or a little magazine or on a newspaper’s op-ed page—if it is to survive in the hearts and minds of the twentieth-century American reading public it must be reprinted time and again in a composition Reader” (401). She argues that the,

Contemporary essay canon has profound implications—intellectual, aesthetic, pedagogical, and political—not only for what but also for how our nation’s 2.2 million first-year college students read, and think, and write—and for how they’ll think about reading and writing for the rest of their lives. The teaching essay canon may, indeed, constitute the core of a liberal education for many of these students. (401-2)

Even though Bloom is arguing for the essay as a specific genre that she asserts has “been shoved to the dim recesses of the shelves loaded with fiction, poetry, and drama,” her statement is no less powerful if applied to the importance of all works included in the anthologies and Readers produced for all students. Bloom’s arguments are based on her research of a representative sample (58 titles) of composition Readers published over the fifty-year period between 1946 and 1996. She found that, even with all the cultural, educational, and pedagogical changes that occurred during this span, “to [her] surprise, [she] discovered that the canon itself has remained surprisingly stable over the past fifty years” (407).

Bloom's research resulted in a list of the most frequently reprinted essay titles, which I chose to examine with the query as to how many women writers would be included. Of the fifty essayists "whose works have been most frequently reprinted" fourteen are female with only Joan Didion's "On Keeping a Notebook" and Virginia Woolf's "The Death of the Moth" in the top ten (427). Frank Kermode views the canon as "strategic constructs by which societies maintain their own interests, since the canon allows control over the texts a culture takes seriously and the methods of interpretation that establish the meaning of 'serious'" (qtd. in Altieri 42). In "Editing the Rhetorical Tradition," an essay in which she discusses her experience as one of the editors of *The Rhetorical Tradition*, (discussed later) Patricia Bizzell admits that anthologies "have played a large role in the definition of the rhetorical tradition" (109). Bloom's, Kermode's, and Bizzell's assertions may, in reality, provide some of the weightiest evidence on which to rest the crux of my argument for the equal inclusion of women's rhetorics and writings in academia and certainly provides the foundation upon which this concentration of classes will form.

In what might be considered the bible of rhetorical anthologies, *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present* features readings from fifty-two different rhetoricians who are not listed as anonymous, of which only thirteen are women. Of the fourteen rhetoricians in the Modern and Postmodern section (a period in which there have been numerous influential women rhetoricians) only three are women: Virginia Woolf, Hélène Cixous, and Gloria Anzaldúa. Where, for instance, are the writings of Kate Ronald, Joy Ritchie, Sonya Foss, Ann Berthoff, Karen Foss, Andrea Lunsford, Cheryl Glenn, bell hooks, Adrienne Rich, Jacqueline Jones Royster, Audre Lorde, Mary Daly, or Gertrude Buck? Are they not part of the "present" rhetorical tradition referred to in the title?

Results of exclusion

What affect should this situation have on our pedagogical ideologies for women's rhetoric? Tetreault concludes that as long as attention to these facts is not illuminated, students cannot come to "understand that a history which excludes half the population is an inaccurate human history" (230). Tetreault asserts that because of the lack of "Relational" history, "females have been trained not to think of their own situation" (250). She continues,

If we want [females] to be able to think clearly about their situation so that they can meet the pressing need for institutions that will help the family, restructure work or further shape diverse patterns for both women and men, we need to provide them with historical perspective to enable them to shape their situation. Part of our ability to help them to think about their situation is to rid our textbooks of stereotypic thinking." (250)

I would add to Tetreault's conclusions that not just female students, but all students are impaired by the misrepresentation that comes from the stereotypic thinking. Sharon Crowley and Debra Hawhee state in *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students* that one reason for studying rhetoric is to "rectify[y] power inequities among citizens" (6). If this is true, how can the power inequities between men and women that still exist both in our culture and our universities be rectified if students are not provided the opportunities to study all rhetorics?

Students need to comprehend that women have written and are still writing significant works that seek to "alter reality" – female authors writing timely, rhetorical works that respond to an "imperfection marked by urgency," are written to an audience who is "capable of being influenced by discourse and of being mediators of change." (Bitzer 3). Too often women's rhetorical acts are dismissed by the mainstream disciplines, differentiated and marginalized as important only to women's issues (which might explain why they are often relegated to the

Women's Studies department). The tendency, I believe, is to characterize writing by men as speaking for "humankind" while writing by women as speaking for women only. The problem with this way of thinking is that writing by men doesn't always speak for everyone. When Thomas Jefferson (and other men) wrote that "all men are created equal," we assumed he meant everyone, when in reality, he meant what he said – all white men (probably closer to all white, landowning men) are created equally. Had the intention of Jefferson been to write for everyone, the slaves would have been immediately freed, and women would have been able to own property, get divorced from their husbands, keep their earnings, and participate in democratic elections. Yet, in spite of this misunderstanding, this document continues to be esteemed as the document that guarantees freedom for everyone.

Writing by women can and should be considered as writing for everyone just the same as the works by their male counterparts. Campbell asserts that Elizabeth Cady Stanton's "Solitude of Self" speech is "one of the greatest speeches of U. S. history" ("Hearing" 35). Campbell further posits, "The speech is important historically and ideologically because it is the clearest and most forceful statement defending natural rights philosophy, the view that persons have rights by birth and that the only function of government is to make those rights secure, the philosophy underlying the Declaration of Independence" ("Hearing" 35). Campbell explains that, "Apart from the speech, few would find it easy to justify the natural rights position ("Hearing" 35). Students have grown up reading and studying the words Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" speech and President Kennedy's inaugural speech, yet few students have had the opportunity to read Elizabeth Cady Stanton's "Solitude of Self" or to study its rhetoric, because it is not equally represented in the anthologies and, therefore, less available for study.

Although her article deals specifically with the study of women's literature rather than women's rhetorical texts, Germaine Greer, nevertheless, explains the rationale supporting the University of Tulsa's decision that students should learn the importance of women's writings speaking for everyone:

We are now gradually realizing that if we are to learn the lessons that history holds for a future which will be more or less democratic and cooperative, we must uncover the past of the masses. We need to know the form and pressure of the daily life of past ages more than we need to know the terms of treaties and the bloodlines of monarchs. It was women who set down the minutiae of the joys and sorrows of ordinary people, their idealism, their skepticism, their heroism, and their wisdom. Nothing has shocked us into as stark an awareness of the cost of the settlement of the United States and the building up of the richest country in the world as the uncomplaining records kept by pioneer women. (6)

If we are to take Campbell's assertion to heart or accomplish what Greer suggests, we will have to consider women's writing as speaking for everyone and study them in mainstream disciplines the same as we do men's writings.

This missing, or at least redacted history, makes it hard to construct courses like the ones I am proposing, because most students will not have the knowledgebase they need in order for their study of women's rhetorics to make any sense. When I contemplate this gap in knowledge, I am reminded of the day in 2006 when my high school daughter came home to tell me what she was studying in the early 20th century section of her Advanced Placement American history class; I casually asked her what she thought about Alice Paul. She did not know who I was talking about. After I explained to her what Paul and the other suffragists did, and we watched

the film, *Iron Jawed Angels*, she was upset at the omission of Paul's contribution and disturbed that her fellow classmates would not hear Paul's story. The next day she raised her hand to ask the history teacher about Alice Paul. Her question prompted a class discussion about the contributions (and sacrifices) of Paul and her fellow suffragists to women gaining the right to vote in the United States. If, as Ritchie and Ronald explained earlier, we cannot separate a group from its history, because often it is the history that provides the reason for the writing, then the lack of historical knowledge must be ameliorated either before or at least alongside the study of the rhetorics.

Furthermore, continuing the male rhetorical tradition of purporting only one mode of argument deemed acceptable may encourage the tendency to assess students' writing abilities based on what Patricia Sullivan calls a "substandard" rather than simply a "nonstandard performance in a course where male conventions of discourse [are] allowed to define the standard" (128). Sullivan may have characterized the "conventions of discourse" with the gendered language, but I have encountered both male and female students who struggled with what I am calling the autonomous (Farrell's male mode) mode of argument. In this regard, Sullivan warns that the academy has,

Been slow to take into account either the patriarchal structures and values embedded in our culture that students bring to the classroom or the ways that men's and women's differential relationships to various cultural institutions, including the academy, influence their discursive practices. Women students enter an academic community in which men have largely determined what is important to know, how knowledge is organized, how knowledge is made, and, most importantly for composition scholars and teachers, how knowledge is expressed. The academic discourses that men and women students must

‘master’ in order to succeed in the academy are largely inscriptions of male subjectivities; women have inherited modes of discourse that they have had little voice in shaping. (125-26)

Continuing the male rhetorical tradition and its corresponding mode(s) for argument is easier when the primary voice students are required to read and emulate is male. Adding those rhetorics written by women may offer students new modes for argument. In his article, “The Female and Male Modes of Rhetoric,” Thomas Farrell discusses the differences in the ways males and females can approach academic writing. Farrell discusses the findings of his colleague, Sarah D’Eloia, in which she identifies the male mode and female mode of writing and speaking based on the gender of the author or speaker. In the male mode of argument, writers state their conclusion at the beginning, while the female mode, perhaps written by women who may feel their arguments less likely to be taken seriously, tends to “lead the audience through the line of reasoning” on the way to the conclusion (qtd. in Farrell 909).

Farrell furthers the discussion by showing how males and females can and do write in both modes. He points out that since it is the male mode that is taught in schools and universities, females are taught to write in the male mode and that although not as often, males do write in the female mode. He explains the differences between the modes by suggesting that the male mode presumes an antagonistic approach in which sides are taken, while the female mode often utilizes the Rogerian approach in which an opposing viewpoint is acknowledged (Farrell 916). Here we can realize yet another reason why more women’s texts need not only to be integrated into the canon, but also assigned for reading, and discussed in class – not as a way to essentialize women’s or men’s writings or argument modes—but to offer the variety of voices, experiences, ideas, and writing (and arguing) styles essential to the study of composition.

Benefits

Who benefits from a study of women's rhetorics? Perhaps the better question is—who doesn't? Much like the emerging focus on African-American studies has enriched the educational experience for students of all ethnic backgrounds who participate in such courses because of a broadening of perspectives and culture, so a study of women's rhetorics will enrich male as well as female students' experiences. In fact, because the courses in the concentration include the works of women from different cultures and ethnicities, they will serve to further not only women's rhetorics, but also those, like African-American, which are already beginning to be incorporated into the curriculum.

Composition pedagogy has come to realize that cultural, class, race, and ethnic differences become evident not only in the writing product, but also in how students approach writing assignments. Likewise, pedagogies must also come to terms with the fact that over one-half of all these students are also female, and that in addition to cultural or ethnic differences, the binary of gender further marginalizes all female students.

Possibly more than other discipline, Composition Studies has the most to gain in both its readings and its composition modes by rectifying the deficit of women's rhetorics. Ronald and Ritchie question how the composition traditions and praxes might be changed by the presence of works written by women:

How can recovery work and rhetorical rereadings influence the teaching of writing itself—not simply the pedagogy of a writing classroom, or its readings, or its social/cultural/political agendas, but the writing taught and practiced there? ... Since we have developed composition from the male rhetorical tradition, can we use women's disruption, accommodation, interruption, extension, and reimagining of that tradition to

design or describe a different way of writing that does not come directly from the patriarchy? And that does not serve its ends? (“Pedagogy” 209)

One way we can change the writing and praxis Ronald and Ritchie refer to is to begin having that discussion with students – making them aware that there are more ways to compose an argument than the one they have most likely been taught, and that each of these different ways can and should be used in different settings, for different rhetorical purposes, and how to decide which is best for which setting. The introduction of more women’s rhetorics provides a platform for more transparency in these discussions about writing.

Additionally, because women have rarely worked from the position of privilege, and because they emerged from the silence(d), women’s rhetorics may be uniquely situated to offer students a way to “move from passivity to action,” to understand the “connection between language and action” (Ronald 227). One of Ronald’s graduate students put it this way: “The transformation from silence to action is not just a shift in how one “acts”... action also requires a complex understanding of rhetorical exigencies, one’s own sources of authority, and the interconnection between her academic and personal lives, between theory and personal experience” (qtd. in Ronald “Pedagogy” 221). These new women’s rhetorics and their resulting discussions may remedy the disadvantage of female students in finding a voice. Early feminist theorists—Elizabeth Flynn, Joan Bolker, Adrienne Rich, Audre Lorde, among others—grappled with the oppressive climates female students encountered; even if we allow for improvement in that regard, because women’s rhetorics are not equally represented in courses, female students continue to be at a distinct disadvantage when it comes to finding their own voice or even a familiar voice in readings, researching, and writing. Furthermore, male students would also benefit from experiencing voices other than the male viewpoint in curriculum from literature to

history. In essence, both genders would benefit from this expansion of the current monolithic perspective.

Cindy Moore suggests that “attention to voice in writing seem[s] to be a way that teachers [can] help students (especially women students) feel authoritative, empowered – ‘integrated’ (194). She further argues that “voice is a patriarchal metaphor” that “brings with it a certain amount of cultural clout, a certain degree of power – just as words like *author* and *owner* bring” (196). She points out that women who have learned to “speak up” in class, or “talk back in their writing” can come to, in the words of bell hooks, “move from being an object to a subject within the culture” (qtd. in Moore 196). Academia and her students have already witnessed the benefits of courses showcasing African-American, Chicano, gay and lesbian, and Native American voices among others, and we should remember that the male/female binary exists within all of these categories.

Discussion of the Courses

When I began planning this concentration, it was suggested that courses in rhetorical theory must begin with Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero. However, as important as these rhetoricians obviously are to the discipline of rhetoric, I did not want to simply duplicate the “Histories of Rhetoric” course already offered at KSU, adding in some women’s rhetorics. Additionally, I feared that starting with the patriarchs would not only leave little time to adequately examine the women’s rhetorics, but might also create a situation where students would, as Kathleen Ryan says “read women’s texts as secondary” to the rhetorical patriarchs (“Women” 3). Instead, I have attempted to design each course so that students will be exposed to enough rhetorical and feminist theory and criticism to afford those who are not as familiar with either discipline the

necessary tools for discussion and understanding of the works without making theory the focal point of the courses.

Furthermore, students' lack of knowledge of women's contributions to history, from which much of women's rhetorics grows, means that any course focusing on women's rhetorics runs the risk of becoming a women's studies course, changing the focus from rhetorics to historical acts. Consequently, each course may represent another border crossing – an intersection of women's rhetorics and women's histories.

Four courses are proposed for this concentration. Each course is designed to stand alone allowing for the greatest flexibility for KSU and students, but students would gain the most by taking all four courses, as each course is unique. Students taking all four courses may find some overlap of texts and authors, but I have found that recognition and familiarity of texts and authors builds a sense of confidence and helps students begin to make the connections between the authors and their histories, ideas, and rhetorical strategies necessary for a comprehensive understanding of the impact and importance of these works.

A common assignment among all four courses is “Talking Back” papers—weekly short responses to the readings in which students question, respond to, and analyze not only the texts, but the students' reactions to the texts. Often, I find that students think that talking back or disagreeing with a text is in bad taste. Perhaps, because my own experience has been so, it comes from being raised in the South, where we are taught not to sass our elders. When I decided to include these sassy papers in the course designs, I was reminded of bell hook's story of talking back to her elders as a way to get into their conversations; talking back "meant speaking as an equal to an authority figure...daring to disagree and sometimes it just meant having an opinion" (“Talking” 73). My goal with these talking back papers is to help students begin to have

conversations with the texts, to interrogate them, to tease out meanings. The talking back papers will also provide a starting point for discussion or encourage the discussion along in class. I believe they will also help students who might feel uncomfortable speaking out in class by giving them some place to start their comments.

Finally, as a complement to the courses, I propose that KSU begin a wiki-type website with the implementation of and devoted to this new concentration. The website would serve to collate and preserve the research and rhetorics of the students who will participate in the courses. Each course in the concentration requires students to produce research and rhetorical analysis that could be published to the website. The writer's pages from the survey course provide a history and context of many of the rhetors covered in that and other of the courses and could form the basis for one section of the website. Each successive class would add to or amend the already existing information on the particular rhetors with all student authors recognized for their contributions. Students participating in the courses would have the experience of publishing a work to the web, and the information produced would provide other KSU students with a knowledgebase from which to draw. The website offers many benefits for KSU students, not the least of which is the opportunity to talk about topics such as collaborative authorship, plagiarism, and the ever-changing nature of knowledge and knowledge making.

Course One:

Beginnings: Women as Rhetorical Pioneers

This course is a study of selected women rhetors and their texts that might characterize them as rhetorical pioneers. As they learn about both the women who produced these texts and the texts themselves, students will examine women's rhetorical practices and begin to understand

how and why these texts were either pioneering in terms of rhetorical strategy, subject, or influence on their intended audience and on those women who wrote after or in conjunction with these rhetors. Consequently, this course represents a blending of both biographical and rhetorical inquiry in that students need to know about the women and the context in which they wrote in order to understand their rhetorics.

One of the key objectives for the course will be helping students make these connections. For instance, Margaret Fuller's *Women in the Nineteenth Century* "is one of the landmark manifestos of women's rights, widely read in the nineteenth century and said to have been a catalyst for the Seneca Falls Convention" (125), and Gloria Anzaldúa "was one of the first writers to confront the realities of being a Chicana in North American culture" (Ritchie and Ronald *Available* 356). Of course, as with any selection, there are many more women's rhetorics, which are deserving of study, but we will limit our study to those works that emerged in such a way or had such influence as to be considered pioneering.

One of the first activities the course will undertake is the development of a timeline to provide context for the works students will be reading. In fact, Ritchie and Ronald, state in the introduction to *Available Means*, one of the course's textbooks, that they were careful to choose the title for the anthology using Aristotle's definition of rhetoric as the "discovery of the available means of persuasion" because they not only desired to "locate women squarely within rhetoric but also to acknowledge that their presence demands that rhetoric be reconceived" (xvii). They also point out that women have "discovered different means of persuasion, often based in contexts other than those Aristotle might have imagined: the kitchen, parlor ... the garden, the church, the body" (xvii). Shima Carter argues that not only did these women find different ways

to “do rhetoric,” but that they understood the connections necessary to make their rhetoric effective:

The history of women’s rhetoric exemplifies this connection among conflict, theory, and revolutionary action. The writings of women were often a function of their rhetorical efforts to claim the rights to speak and write for themselves. Embodied in their emancipator fight was the movement from passive positions to active stances. (388)

This course will further the uncovering of the ways women changed rhetoric by examining their writing both against and adjacent to accepted rhetorical traditions of the day and searching for ways the writers (indeed rhetors) commanded words to signify both their voice and the lack of it, to posit new ideas, to illuminate their status, and to call for action. Students will learn/discover how, in surprising ways and often without formal instruction, the women covered in this course had a sense of rhetorical strategy. Even if students don’t take the other three courses in the concentration, participating in this course will provide students with a foundational knowledge of women’s rhetoric and exposure to some of the important works by women over the past 2500 years.

Course Two:

Rhetoric in Three Waves: A Rhetorical Study of the Three Waves of Feminism in the U.S.

Rhetoric in Three Waves is designed to familiarize students with the diverse textual, verbal, and visual rhetorics of what are commonly known as the three waves of feminism in the United States. While it is noted that feminism is, in reality, feminisms and that their rhetorics are not limited to the United States, in order to cover the subject matter in a meaningful way, this course will focus on the American woman’s experience as it relates to the three waves of

feminism from the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848 through the present. The first wave was concerned primarily with winning the right to vote, the second wave with equal rights and oppression, and the third wave continues to seek diversity, a diffusing of differences, and a dispelling of women and minorities being viewed as the “other” (Krolokke and Sorensen 1-2). A study of the three waves of feminism in the U.S. is important, because without the visual and verbal contexts of the first and second waves, in particular, much of contemporary feminist rhetorics makes no sense. Indeed without understanding the rhetorics of the three waves, it is difficult to fully understand the general history of the period, because it is impossible to separate a group’s history from the words it uses to describe and define that history. Rich explains: “The entire history of women's struggle for self determination has been muffled in silence over and over ... Each feminist work has tended to be received as if it emerged from nowhere; as if each one of us had lived, thought, and worked without any historical past or contextual present” (*Lies* 11). Her thoughts are especially pertinent here because she points out that not only have women’s works not been considered in light of other women’s works (thereby giving the perception of no legacy), but that they have been, when not “strangled or wiped out,” read out of context of the periods in which they were written (*Lies* 11). I would add that not only do the rhetorics suffer from this contraction, the history does as well, and the severing results in a deficit in the understanding of our collective experiences.

Consider that the civil rights march on Washington makes no sense without Martin Luther King, Jr.’s “I Have a Dream” speech. And if we did not know what Lincoln said at the dedication of Gettysburg, the event would be almost meaningless (maybe not even recorded). In both cases, the rhetoric used to describe the event may be as important as the event itself. Equally important, (yet rarely read outside the Women’s Studies department or a class such as

the one proposed here), the writings of bell hooks, Alice Walker, Audre Lorde, and others are essential to understanding the African-American woman's dual struggle with racism and oppression in the 1960s and beyond. And the stifling oppression white, middle-class women felt in the 1950s and 60s cannot fully be understood without studying texts such as *The Feminine Mystique*. These texts and their rhetorics are as much a thread in the American fabric as is Martin Luther King, Jr.'s *Letter from Birmingham Jail*, which has been thoroughly studied, anthologized, and is upheld as an effective example of persuasive rhetoric.

Part of what was so powerful in the second wave was the abundance of writings by women in books such as *Sisterhood is Powerful* and others. Along with the outgrowth of writing from the consciousness-raising sessions, these rhetorics foregrounded the struggles for women's rights. A study of the rhetoric of the "waves" also elucidates the progression of feminisms within the movements, showing how, through their rhetorics, African-American, Chicana, Asian, lesbian, and other groups were able to change the focus from mainly white, upper-class women's concerns to a movement that include other marginalized, underrepresented, and oppressed groups. Susan Hartman suggests that we cannot rely on the historians to accurately represent these changes:

Historians' tendency to center the narrative of second-wave feminism around white women has demonstrated how much the women's movement exploited the moral environment, organizational strategies, and legal precedents created by the black freedom struggle. De-centering that narrative, however, demonstrates that the women's movement did more than simply piggyback on civil rights. Rather, African-American feminists reinterpreted civil rights, insisting that women's rights were critical for black women's civil rights to be realized. (74)

Maybe more than any other period, the movements that have come to be known as the three waves of feminism in the United States offer a concentrated timeframe (about 150 years), and a large body of written, verbal (speeches), and visual texts readily available for study that respond directly to the history as it was happening.

Course Three:

Modeling Women: Using Women's Rhetorics as Composition Models

This course is designed as a blend of composition theory, application, and a consciousness-raising exercise. By that, I mean that students will be introduced to some aspects of composition theory and its applications as they examine and explicate women's writings in a side by side comparison with the men's works proffered by tradition as models of composition and rhetoric.

Any discussion that draws the distinction between the binary of male and female can be tricky; indeed, my goal with this course is not to essentialize the modes of writing or the rhetorics or rhetorical strategies of either sex. Indeed, I want to avoid the pitfall of essentializing writers based on gender, so that "If they are male they must write or think *this* way; if they are female, they must write or think another" (Kirsch and Ritchie 11). On the other hand, it is silly to pretend that the experiences, voices, and perspectives that make up the writings and rhetorics in this course are not affected by gender any more than we would argue that they are not affected by race, culture, ethnicity, or class. Susan Bordo points out that "our language, intellectual history, and social forms *are* gendered; there is no escape from this fact and from its consequences on our lives..." (152 *emphasis mine*). In their article, "Rethinking Diversity: Axes of Difference in the Writing Classroom," Beverly Moss and Keith Walters urge educators to

consider gender as another aspect in the diversity mix and to be mindful of the ways in which gender plays a role in writing (432). I am also mindful of discussions as to the social constructs implied in the term *gender*, but for this discussion, I choose to utilize the term to refer to the biological sex of the writer. So while my desire for this course is not to essentialize female writers or to malign male writers, the course will discuss gender as a factor in the texts students will read and discuss, calling attention to the fact that many of the texts by women are missing from the anthological canon.

In designing this course, I aimed to devise a class without creating an atmosphere where the only distinction between writers was gender, while bearing in mind that since this course resides in a concentration devoted to women's writings and rhetorics, the gender of the writer must be brought to the forefront of the discussion. Additionally, I struggled with ways to present the ideas that could enrich and broaden students' thinking and writing and even release students who aren't comfortable writing in the male rhetorical tradition from what Sullivan admits she wrongly assessed in her students as "deficiency" (128) without pitting male and female writers against each other. I am indebted to Sullivan for helping me come to terms with and put words to this struggle when she writes that she "recognize[s] that women and men come in different races, classes, and cultures" and that it would be "mistaken to speak collectively of 'woman's experience' or 'man's experience' ..., while reminding us that "race, class, and culture are also always categories *within* gender" (138 *emphasis mine*). The results are a course that has two foci: first, it will help students appreciate the various rhetorical strategies men and women use. Second, the course will interrogate the single (what some have referred to as male) mode of argument expected of most compositions in the academy.

First, “Modeling Women” seeks to respond to the questions Ronald and Ritchie posed earlier about how the composition traditions and praxes might be changed by the presence of works written by women. The dual foci of this course will challenge and broaden the long-held traditions and practices of composition by offering opportunities for students to discover new voices, ideas, and perspectives and to explore different ways to persuade their audiences than they may have previously been exposed to.

Similarly, Sullivan urges, “If we do not . . . undertake to understand issues of gender difference and sexual politics, we can never hope to achieve the full understanding of composing that has been the goal of composition studies from its inception” (138). She also reminds us that we have already asked “what it means to compose as basic writers, nontraditional students, college freshmen, technical writers, graduate students, biologists, chemical engineers, corporate executives, and so on . . .” and that we have “generally assumed that the gender of the writer was irrelevant” to the basis “of our inquiry” (133). This course seeks to provide a platform from which to discuss the idea that gender *may* play a role in the way writers write just as a writer’s culture, ethnicity, race, and class *may* – that *people* write differently from one another and that a writer’s gender is only one piece that makes up the place from which the writer writes. We should not, according to Elizabeth Flynn, erase difference “in a desire to universalize” experiences in the classroom (245). Nor, she admonishes, should we “assume that males and females use language in identical ways or represent the world in a similar fashion” (251). The readings and assignments in this course brings the discussion of gender’s possible role in composition to the students, so they can come to realize that human beings are too complex and their experiences too diverse and disparate for readers to either value or disregard a writer’s work based solely on, class, race, ethnicity, or gender.

Second, it may seem odd to include a course with a focus on the modes of composition and works written by men in a concentration devoted to women's rhetoric, but I believe it provides an opportunity to examine ways to broaden the accepted modes of composition in academia and to explore why the works we ask students to read and emulate should be expanded to include more women writers. I wanted to create a course that would showcase women writers and their rhetorics alongside some of those works by male writers which have long been held as the gold standard for works students are required to read and emulate in their own writing. I want to show that women were/are writing on equally important subjects and with many of the same rhetorical strategies as their male counterparts. For example, students will read excerpts from Christine de Pizan's *The Treasure of the City of Ladies* together with excerpts from Niccolò Machiavelli's *The Prince*. Study materials in the composition reader *Reading the World: Ideas That Matter* make the connection between these two texts asking students to compare them in terms of content (Austin 182). Additionally, students will read Mary Astell's *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies II* together with Jonathan Swift's *A Modest Proposal*, two pieces that Christine Mason Sutherland compares in terms of rhetorical strategy and even composition mode in that both writers postpone their arguments "until about one-third of the way through ... whetting [their] readers' appetites for a solution" (100). My desire in these comparisons is not to denigrate the men's writings, but rather to elevate those written by women to the same level of respect and to begin to redefine the gold standard. Focusing our lens on the rhetorical writings of women and drawing students' attention to the gender imbalance in our anthologies and composition models, like the recent reclaiming of African-American writings, may result in the added bonus of students coming to question what (and who) else has been left out.

It's time to answer Ronald and Ritchie's call for women's rhetorics to change how we teach writing and even what good writing looks like. This course seeks to begin the discussion where I believe it must begin – with students.

Course Four:

Signposts: Landmarks in Women's Rhetorics

A landmark can be defined as a marker that allows for the locating of something else or the signpost of a significant event. Signposts can simultaneously reveal not only where the traveler is in relation to other places, but also both how far she's come and how far it is to her destination. Additionally, we might argue that a landmark is something that lasts, writing that withstands the eroding nature of time. I like thinking about the works in this course in these terms. It creates angles in the linear (and sometimes binary: male/female) ways of viewing things that often binds our perspectives, making us miss the good stuff. Glenn asserts that it is through “angular lenses” that we “catch fragmentary glimpses of the previously unconsidered ‘irregularities’ that had been smothered over by the flat surface of received knowledge” (*Rhetoric* 5). My desire in this course is that we approach these landmark works as rhetorically disturbing the world around them rather than from the monolithic perspective of pertaining to women's issues only; then, I believe, we may find some of the “irregularities” to which Glenn refers.

The works in this course can, and do, serve both definitions—locating the rhetorics espoused by the women writers (rhetors) among the significant thoughts of their day, thereby contextualizing and situating the issues and concerns these writers called to the fore. Mary

Wollstonecraft eloquently argued for the education of all citizens regardless of gender. Jamie Barlowe points out that Wollstonecraft believed that she had the same natural rights as men and as such, believed she had the right to “participate in dialogues” with the leading “philosophers, politicians, educators, historians, and artists of her day as an informed, capable, rational thinker” (117). Barlowe further explains that Wollstonecraft tried to convince the thinkers of her day that the “natural extension of their logical positions would lead them to include rather than exclude women...” (118). These beliefs and ideals are evident in all her writing, including the work highlighted in this course.

Closer to our own time, Rachel Carson so remarkably represented the silent world she foresaw if pesticide use continued at the current rate that she sparked an environmental movement that continues to the present day. *Silent Spring*, perhaps a little more familiar to students in the science disciplines, “is considered one of the most influential books of the past fifty years” (Roush 1016). Susan Brownmiller’s *Against Our Will* brought such a spotlight onto the affects of rape that it sparked the opening of rape crisis centers and brought the discussion of rape to the public dialogue. Moreover, many of the freedoms both male and female students now take for granted were argued for by the women who wrote these and other landmark works: freedoms for women like voting, becoming doctors, earning their own livings and keeping their earnings as their own, owning property; freedoms for all like a cleaner environment, civil liberties, access to effective and safe birth control, equal access to education. The works highlighted in this course represent some of the ways women understood the need for and accurately utilized rhetorical strategies to respond to exigencies for societal and cultural change.

Conclusion

Campbell and Tetreault both envision a rhetorical and historical view that is relational and multi-vocal, fully encompassing all experiences and their impacts on social, political, economical, personal, and private realms. Ideally, women's histories and rhetorics would be integrated into the disciplines, thereby eliminating the need for a concentration of courses such as the one I am proposing. I concede that this concentration on women's rhetorics could continue the marginalization that now exists; however, until women's voices and rhetorics are accepted as speaking for everyone, courses such as the ones proposed in this concentration will be imperative.

Consequently, I would like to replace the questions that opened our discussion. Instead of why study women's rhetorics and who benefits, I ask: why aren't we teaching these women's texts in our classrooms? Why are they not studied by twenty-first century men and women alongside Plato, Aristotle, Quintilian, and Burke? With the uncovering of women's rhetorics, academia has the opportunity to finally present women, past and present, in a light that could begin to undermine the male rhetorical tradition and its underlying beliefs by demonstrating, with their own words, that women are genuinely intelligent, deep-thinkers, independent, equal and that their ideas, thoughts, and rhetorics are legitimate and deserve to be heard.

Truthfully, I have difficulty understanding a pedagogy that maintains that we are educating all our students equally when we continue to offer both female and male students limited perspectives at best. The chance to read and interrogate both men's and women's rhetorics in the classroom is important for all students, but are especially important for female students because, as Flynn reminds us, "men have chronicled our historical narratives and defined our fields of inquire. Women's perspectives have been suppressed, silenced,

marginalized, written out of what counts as authoritative knowledge” (245). We must restructure university courses, anthologies, and entire disciplines to make women’s rhetorics accessible and integrated. Teachers must insist that works such as Stanton’s “Solitude of Self” are included alongside King’s “I Have A Dream.” Campbell argues this integration won’t happen until “teachers and scholars ... are committed to hearing the diverse voices of our culture and to empowering all of our students” (“Hearing” 45). Bloom asserts that “teachers have more influence over the canon than they may realize,” (403) because, as Barbara Herrnstein Smith argues “when faculty compile anthologies, construct curricula, and draw up class reading lists ... [these activities] ensure the replication of these lists and the perpetuation of the canon in subsequent generations” (qtd. in Bloom 403).

In the chapters that follow, I will further discuss each of the proposed courses in detail including suggested texts, assignments, course objectives, and syllabi. Through these courses devoted to the exploration, examination, and explication of women’s writings and rhetorics, I believe we can begin to pull the rhetorical contributions of women from the fringes of our collective rhetorical consciousness, incorporating a full historical view of all thoughts, ideals, and beliefs. A study of women’s rhetoric will work to broaden and amalgamate our understanding of all rhetorical perspectives.

Chapter 2

Beginnings: Women as Rhetorical Pioneers

Re-vision—the act of looking back, of seeing with fresh eyes, of entering an old text from a new critical direction—is for women more than a chapter in cultural history: it is an act of survival. Until we can understand the assumptions in which we are drenched we cannot know ourselves.

Adrienne Rich

Introduction

This course is a study of selected women rhetors and their texts that might characterize them as rhetorical pioneers. As they learn about both the women who produced these texts and the texts themselves, students will examine the women's rhetorical practices and begin to make connections as they discover how these texts were pioneering in terms of rhetorical strategy, subject matter, or influence on their intended audience and on those women who wrote after or in conjunction with these rhetors. Consequently, this course represents a blending of both biographical and rhetorical inquiry in that students need to know about the women and the context in which they wrote in order to understand their rhetorics.

Discussion of Assignments and Texts

In planning this survey course to focus on women rhetors and their pioneering rhetorical artifacts, I wanted to be sure not to isolate the women or their texts in such a way that they have no context or so that students would not be able to make connections between the rhetors and those men and women who wrote contemporarily and who would follow after. Kate Ronald and Joy Ritchie assert that such isolation “distort[s] our understanding of women's use of the various means on which they called to speak and write” (*Available* xix). Each of the women selected is

considered a pioneer in some aspect of rhetoric or writing, especially as these terms apply to women. For instance, according to Ritchie and Ronald, Christine de Pizan's "claim to authority marks her uses of innovative rhetorical conventions and her position as the first woman to support herself by writing - as one of the pioneers in women's rhetorical history" (*Available* 32). Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* was one of the inspirations for the second wave of feminism and "secured de Beauvoir's place as an outspoken defender of women's rights long before they became a cause in France" (Ritchie/Ronald *Available* 252). Gloria Anzaldúa "was one of the first writers to confront the realities of being a Chicana in North American culture" (Ritchie and Ronald *Available* 356). Other women covered in this course used rhetoric in similarly pioneering circumstances to, for example, argue that women should be allowed to preach (Margaret Fell), to reason for women's suffrage (Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony), and to expose the immorality of lynching (Ida B. Wells).

One of the key objectives of the course is to offer students ways to make connections between the women rhetors, their contexts, their contemporaries, and their influences on those who followed. For example, Margaret Fell was instrumental in forming the argument underlying the Quaker tradition of women preachers (Donawerth *Rhetorical* 59-60). Gertrude Buck's feminist ideas "which relied on cooperation, collaboration, and social responsibility" (Ritchie and Ronald *Available* 211) about composition pedagogy were so ahead of her time that composition theory has only recently begun practicing some of the strategies she argued for, such as inductive argument, the role of personal experience in reasoning, and using students' interests to generate writing (Donawerth, *Rhetorical* 271-274). Jacqueline Jones Royster's "Time Alone, Place Apart..." is one work that can begin to help students see the ways in which Royster has been influenced by the rhetorical strategies and writings of three different women.

Since there are no prerequisites for students to have taken either rhetorical theory or women's studies from which to draw a basis of rhetorical theory or a knowledge of women's histories, the first part of the course will offer some preparatory readings before we approach the actual texts. Additionally, the reports students will write and present in class will give enough background on the women and their contexts to compensate for any lack of historical knowledge students may have. Jim Kuypers's *The Art of Rhetorical Criticism* chapter one and two "What is Rhetoric" and "The Art of Criticism," and Keith and Lundberg's *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric* will present a brief, yet thorough overview of rhetorical theory and criticism providing some background for students who are not familiar with rhetorical theory and allowing for a common vocabulary for our discussion of rhetorical strategies without creating a standard against which the women's rhetoric must be measured. From there, the Ronald and Ritchie article on the uses of women's rhetorics will expose students to discussions of the recovery work that has reclaimed these texts and suggested uses for them. Donawerth's "Introduction" to *Rhetorical Theory by Women Before 1900* discusses in some detail how women's rhetorics respond to and expand the "classical tradition(s) of men's rhetoric" as well as their connections to the history of feminism (xxxiii). These texts taken together will form the foundation upon which students should have the ability to begin to reach the courses' three other goals: to analyze and critique the rhetorical strategies of the texts, to understand the connections between the pioneers and the other rhetors that followed, and to study these pioneers and their influence on their culture and the rhetorical tradition. These texts will also help us answer the questions that will guide our inquiry during the semester: What is rhetoric? Or, should it be rhetorics? Is there a women's rhetoric(s)? What does it mean to be a rhetorical pioneer? Who were these women rhetors and did their rhetorics change

the rhetorical tradition? If so, how? How did they pave the way for those (especially the women) who came after them?

Throughout the semester, students will write papers that respond to both the theoretical preparatory texts and the women's rhetorical texts. These short papers which I have dubbed "Talking Back" papers provide a way for students to question, respond to, and analyze not only the texts themselves, but the students' own reactions to the texts. These papers will also provide a starting point for discussion or encourage the discussion along in class. I believe they will also help students who might feel uncomfortable speaking out in class by giving them some place to start their comments. The daily analysis of the works will afford practice for the larger rhetorical analysis paper.

My reasons for designing the writer's page and the presentation in class on the day we discuss that writer's work are threefold: First, I want the students to become familiar with the lives and significance of these pioneering women and their rhetorics. Second, posting the students' writer's pages to the concentration's webpage will give students the experience of publishing to the web and will begin to build a body of knowledge at Kennesaw, which would be available for others to utilize in their research. Third, their research forms the foundation for the larger analytical paper, which will be due later in the semester. The analytical paper will provide a chance for the students to apply the analytical skills they have been honing all semester by analyzing a different work by that writer, making connections, and synthesizing the theoretical and practical.

The final assignment of the course adds a bit of fun and gives students a chance to contribute to the rhetorical conversation of women. I am asking students to seek out a piece of unpublished writing that is rhetorical in nature and written by a woman to share with the class

along with a short (1-2 page) reflective essay on the piece. We will read and discuss some of these in class and publish some to the class website.

Syllabus

This course is a study of selected women rhetors and their texts that might characterize them as rhetorical pioneers. As they learn about both the women who produced these texts and the texts themselves, students will examine the women's rhetorical practices and begin to make connections as they discover how these texts were pioneering in terms of rhetorical strategy, subject matter, or influence on their intended audience and on those women who wrote after or in conjunction with these rhetors. Consequently, this course represents a blending of both biographical and rhetorical inquiry in that students need to know about the women and the context in which they wrote in order to understand their rhetorics.

In this course, we will experience mutual learning—meaning we will all teach and learn together. Students will participate in teaching the class through discussions and presentations. We will do a lot of close reading and a lot of writing, both analytical and reflective. Mini-lectures, reading and writing assignments, in-class activities, and peer-review sessions will contribute to the mutual learning experiences.

Course goals

Through the writing assignments, reading assignments, and class discussions, students should:

- Discover some of the pioneering texts in women's rhetorics
- Learn to analyze and critique a selection of their texts
- Understand the connections between these pioneers and their successors
- Study these pioneers and their influence on their culture and the rhetorical tradition

Printed Texts:

Keith, William M. and Christian O. Lundberg. *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric*. Boston:

Bedford/St. Martin's, 2008. Print.

Ritchie, Joy and Kate Ronald. Ed. *Available Means: An Anthology of Women's Rhetoric(s)*.

Pittsburgh: U of Pitt Press, 2001. Print. (listed in syllabus as AM)

Course Pack:

Donawerth, Jane. "Introduction." *Rhetorical Theory By Women Before 1900: An Anthology*. Ed.

Jane Donawerth. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002. xiii-xlii. Print.

Kuypers, Jim and Andrew King. "What is Rhetoric." Ed. Jim Kuypers. *The Art of Rhetorical*

Criticism. Boston: Pearson, 2005. 1-12. Print.

Kuypers, Jim. "The Art of Criticism." Ed. Jim Kuypers. *The Art of Rhetorical Criticism*. Boston:

Pearson, 2005. 13-27. Print.

Ronald, Kate and Joy Ritchie. "Pedagogy and Public Engagement: The Uses of Women's

Rhetorics." *Rhetorical Women: Roles and Representations*. Ed. Hildy Miller and Lillian

Bridwell-Bowles. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2005. 206-28. Print.

Royster, Jacqueline Jones. "Time Alone, Place Apart: The Role of Spiracy in Using the Power of

Solitude." *Women/Writing/Teaching*. Ed. Jan Zlotnik Schmidt. Albany: State U of New

York P, 1998. 267-75. Print.

Possible Resources for Writer's Page and Rhetorical Analysis Paper:

These book-length works would be a good place to start for gathering information and should be available through the KSU library or GIL.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. *Man Cannot Speak For Her: A Critical Study of Early Feminist Rhetoric* Vols 1 & 2

Donawerth, Jane. Ed. *Rhetorical Theory by Women Before 1900*.

Foss, Karen A. and Sonja K. Foss, Cindy L. Griffin. *Feminist Rhetorical Theories*.

Glenn, Cheryl. *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity Through the Renaissance*.

Lunsford, Andrea. Ed. *Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition*.

Logan, Shirley Wilson. Ed. *With Pen and Voice: A Critical Anthology of Nineteenth-Century Women*

Miller, Hildy and Lillian Bridwell-Bowles. *Rhetorical Women: Roles and Representations*.

Ratcliffe, Krista. *Anglo-American Feminist Challenges To The Rhetorical Traditions: Virginia Woolf, Mary Daly, and Adrienne Rich*.

Wertheimer, Molly Meiger. *Listening to Their Voices: The Rhetorical Activities of Historical Women*.

Assignments

1. “Talking Back” response papers – bell hooks said that when she was growing up, talking back "meant speaking as an equal to an authority figure...daring to disagree and sometimes it just meant having an opinion “ (“Talking Back” 74).
 - In this vein, I want you to consider how you will respond to the works we will be reading throughout the semester, both the theoretical works and the rhetorical texts. The idea behind this is that as you read the material for each day of class, you should be learning how to interact with these texts – talking back to the texts

– questioning, jotting down key terms or new ideas, and commenting on points you find interesting/with which you agree or disagree, making connections.

- To encourage this kind of critical reading, students will write ten (10) 200-300 word “talking back” papers during the semester. You may choose which 10 class days you turn in these papers. Bring these to class as a way to begin or further the discussion on the works we are reading. They may also contain questions you desire to pose in class during our discussions.
- Your responses should be typed and proofread with the work you are analyzing or commenting on clearly identified.
- These will be graded mainly on the fact that they are completed; however, I will be reading them and will not record incomplete or shallow responses toward the minimum number of papers required. Shallow responses could be defined as those that have no analytical qualities that just restate the main points of the works, or that just state that you agree or disagree with the writer, but offer no explanation of why that is so.

2. Writer’s Page and Presentation – 2 parts:

- **Report**—Write a 750-1200-word report “introducing” the writer you signed up for. This will be posted to the class website in the writer’s page section. We will be building a body of knowledge about these particular writers.
 - Since we are preparing this for the web, your report can/should include photos (properly cited) and may include small quotes from the writer. The page should include enough of the following criteria that someone reading

it would have a synopsis of the writer. Be sure to cite sources. Your report should focus on:

- the writer’s life, including her personal history and what part that may have played in her writing, and how she might be considered a rhetorical pioneer
 - what connections can be made between her rhetorics and the contexts in which she wrote/spoke (writes/speaks)
 - critics’ assessment of the significance of her work, including how her work may have paved the way for women rhetors who came after her
- Reserve your criticism/assessment for the rhetorical analysis paper later in the semester.
- **Presentation:** On the day we discuss this writer in class, you will access your page from the class website and “introduce” the writer to the class.
 - You will be evaluated on the quality of information, the aesthetics of the webpage, and your presentation in class.
3. Rhetorical Analysis Paper – 8-10 pages, with a minimum of four (4) academic sources
- Building on and incorporating the information you derived from the writer’s page assignment, choose a different work by your writer and provide a rhetorical analysis of the piece(s), situating it within and exploring its significance to the broader scope of the rhetorical canon. Continue with the pioneering theme and making connections between your rhetor and her work, her culture/societal

influences (both ones she influenced and what influence they may have had on her works) and on the women who may have built on her rhetorics.

- This paper should be your analysis of the text as it applies to the issues discussed in this class and should incorporate social, political, religious, etc. issues/ideas of the time in which it was written.
- Some ideas to get you thinking:
 - Explain why and how this piece is important; linking this piece to other works by this writer, discussing how this writer is a pioneer, and how her works impact the rhetorical tradition/her culture. What connections can you make?
 - Speculate how the canon might be different today had this writer and others like her been recognized in her day? Or if the writer is contemporary, discover if and how this writer is having an effect on the rhetorical tradition/contemporary culture, etc.
 - Discuss how your newfound knowledge about this pioneering rhetor and her rhetorical strategies might affect your own understanding of rhetoric and rhetorical strategies.
- The paper will be graded on the quality of a coherent, well-supported analysis, proper formatting (MLA) and number of sources.

4. New Women's Rhetoric

- Search for a new piece of rhetoric and write a short (250-500 words) reflective essay describing why you chose this particular piece and what you think it adds to contemporary rhetorics.

- The new rhetorical work should be a piece of unpublished writing to share with the class (written by a woman, of course).
- This could be a letter your grandmother wrote that is especially rhetorical or a persuasive essay your mother wrote in college. It could be a satirical or political cartoon, an op ed piece, etc. You have a lot of freedom to choose the piece as long as it is rhetorical in nature.
- If you have permission, you may post the piece to the class website in the “New Rhetorics” section and pull it up on the day we discuss them in class. If you do not want to post your piece to the website, bring the piece of new rhetoric to class on the due date.
- In either case, you will need to staple a copy of the new rhetoric to your reflective essay, which should be typed, proofread and in MLA format.

Grading

20% -- Talking Back papers (10 weeks minimum)

25% -- Writer’s Page & Presentation

25% -- Rhetorical Analysis Paper

15% -- New Women’s Rhetoric & Reflective Essay

15% -- Class/Discussion Participation

Schedule

Week One

Introductions

Introduce class, discuss syllabus, and develop rhetorical timeline

Discuss introductory essay/presentation and sign up for writers and presentation dates

Readings: AM – Introduction, pgs xv-xxxi

Week Two

Rhetorical theory/analysis and making connections

Readings: The Essential Guide to Rhetoric

Kuypers, Jim and Andrew King. “What is Rhetoric.”

Kuypers, Jim. “The Art of Criticism.”

Ronald, Kate and Joy Ritchie. “Pedagogy and Public Engagement: The Uses of
Women’s Rhetorics.”

Royster, Jacqueline Jones. “Time Alone, Place Apart: The Role of Spira in
Using the Power of Solitude.”

Week Three

Readings: Aspasia

Julian of Norwich

Writer’s Page Presentations

Discuss Rhetorical Analysis assignment

Week Four

Readings: Christine de Pizan

Margaret Fell

Writer’s Page Presentations

Week Five

Readings: Sor Juana Inéz de la Cruz

Mary Astell

Writer's Page Presentations

Week Six

Readings: Mary Wollstonecraft

Maria W. Stewart

Writer's Page Presentations

Week Seven

Readings: Angelina Grimké Weld

Margaret Fuller

Writer's Page Presentations

Week Eight

Readings: Sojourner Truth

Susan B. Anthony

Writer's Page Presentations

Week Nine

Readings: Elizabeth Cady Stanton

Ida B. Wells

Writer's Page Presentations

Week Ten

Readings: Charlotte Perkins Gilman

Gertrude Buck

Writer's Page Presentations

Week Eleven

Readings: Virginia Woolf

Simone de Beauvoir

Writer's Page Presentations

Week Twelve

Readings: Rachel Carson

Adrienne Rich

Writer's Page Presentations

Week Thirteen

Readings: Audre Lorde

Gloria Anzaldúa

Writer's Page Presentations

Rhetorical Analysis Paper (first draft due for peer review)

Week Fourteen

Readings: bell hooks

Toni Morrison

Writer's Page Presentations

Rhetorical Analysis Paper due

Discuss New Rhetorics assignment

Week Fifteen

Readings: Ruth Bader Ginsburg

Gloria Steinem

Writer's Page Presentations

Week Sixteen

New Rhetorics assignment due

Share new rhetorics in class

Final class wrap-up

Chapter 3

Rhetoric in Three Waves:

A Rhetorical Study of the Three Waves of Feminism in the U.S.

The entire history of women's struggle for self determination has been muffled in silence over and over ... Each feminist work has tended to be received as if it emerged from nowhere; as if each one of us had lived, thought, and worked without any historical past or contextual present.

Adrienne Rich

Introduction

This course will seek to explore, examine, and explicate the textual, verbal, and visual rhetorics during what is commonly referred to as the three waves of feminism in the United States. We will examine the different rhetorical strategies of each wave as we seek to understand if and how these strategies brought about their desired outcomes, and how the rhetoric of the different waves compared to and/or contrasted with the others. For example, what effect might the sight of women picketing the White House in pouring rain in January have had on the outcome? Or what rhetorical strategy was behind the suffragists' decision to appeal straight to President Wilson with their banners? How did African-American women illuminate the fact that they were being left out of both the civil rights and the women's rights movements during the 1960s?

The time period covered is roughly from the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848 through the present. The first wave was concerned primarily with winning the right to vote, the second wave with equal rights and oppression, and the third wave continues to seek diversity, a diffusing of differences, and a dispelling of women and minorities being viewed as the "other" (Krolokke and Sorensen 1-2). This course's focus on the historical, political, and social effects on the

rhetorical strategies makes it suitable for cross listing in political science and gender and women's studies departments.

Discussion of Assignments and Texts

As I began to think of the structure and assignments for this course, I pondered how the structure and assignments might reflect some of the rhetorics we would be examining. After rethinking several of my original assignments, I decided that with so much emphasis on visual rhetoric especially in the first and second waves, traditional written assignments would not afford students the experience that engaging with visuals would. Consequently, I determined that I would offer students almost free reign in the first large assignment with the stipulation that it be visual. With only the provisos that their presentations be rhetorically and historically sound and not PowerPoint presentations, and short of them staging a sit in and burning down the English department, students are free to present as they so desire. My hope is that this freedom will interject energy into the classroom, as we are certain to have many different approaches to this assignment.

For the large research-based paper, I did decide that a traditional written assignment would be the best vehicle for bringing together all of the rhetorics we will have studied by the end of the course. Students are free to build on their earlier project, and since I expect that project to be rhetorically and historically based on the era and subject they are presenting about, students who choose this route will have much of their research completed for the final paper. Additionally, this paper is designed to bring together not only the rhetorics of the three waves, but to incorporate the elements of rhetorical theory we will have discussed throughout the course.

Rounding out the assignments are two definitions of feminist rhetoric. In my own experience as a student, I have found that often when I am required to write my own definition for an idea or subject, it forces me to internalize that idea much more than even writing a large research paper. Not only will the original definition encourage the students to pause and think about the subject of feminist rhetoric in general (and the rhetoric of the three waves in particular), it will also afford the teacher an opportunity to assess where they are coming from as we begin the course. Likewise, the updated definition will offer students and the teacher the opportunity to see how far they have come and what they have learned in the process.

Collaboration is a cornerstone of women's rhetorics, and educational experiences for students are moving toward a more collaborative one at many levels of the university. I chose to encourage the students taking this course to work together to produce their presentations and to offer them opportunities for comments and peer review of written assignments. Additionally, the emphasis on visual rhetoric encompasses and mirrors the visual nature of the rhetoric of the first and second waves.

Over the last thirty years, the scholarly field of feminist rhetoric has blossomed and with that blossoming has come an expansion of feminist texts. Naturally, many of these texts have come about because of the second and third waves of feminism in the United States and elsewhere in the world. For the class, I chose both primary and secondary texts. First, I chose primary texts, because I want the students to experience the flavors of the rhetoric as it was written or spoken—without commentary. However, critical texts are also helpful for explicating, so these secondary texts are woven in to allow the opportunity for the greatest amount of understanding. Theoretical texts, such as *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric* and Jim Kuypers' "What is Rhetoric" and "The Art of Criticism," along with "Outlines of a Theory of Visual

Argument” and the articles discussing the political cartoons will provide students with some theoretical basis from which to analyze the verbal and visual rhetorics of the three waves. Also, I sought to vary the types of rhetorics we would examine: speeches, declarations, articles, professional and personal writings, photographs, and films, in an effort to give the broadest possible range of thought and media.

One of the main texts for the second wave section, *Sisterhood is Powerful*, edited by Robin Morgan and first published in 1970, is still readily available in current editions, perhaps speaking to its relevance and *power*. The anthology remains an excellent representation of the psychological, social, and sexual revolutions occurring during the second wave’s more radical era. It is also a good blend of personal writings, such as poems, and professional writings by physicians and others, and it includes photographs from the period. Even though we are not reading every selection from this text, it will provide students a good resource for their presentations and their final papers.

One of the areas I struggled with in designing this course was how to incorporate enough of the social and political history, especially from the first and second waves to make the resulting verbal and visual rhetoric relevant without turning the course into a class on history or women’s studies. The book, *Daring to Be BAD*, by Alice Echols covers the period in the second wave between 1967 and 1975 with enough historical context and discussion (and inclusion) of some of the rhetorics of the period that students can make sense of the other readings on the syllabus for that era. Similarly, Doris Stevens’ *Jailed for Freedom* offers a historical view of the first wave between 1913 and 1920, and is a valuable resource on the struggles and triumphs of the first wave because it was written from firsthand experience and includes accounts of the rhetorical strategies used by the women during that time. *Jailed for Freedom* also has many

photographs offering students the ability to see as well as read about the events that occurred during the latter part of the first wave. This text will also lay the groundwork for the viewing of *Iron-Jawed Angels* and offers students the opportunity to discuss the differences between firsthand experience and the filmmakers' interpretations of those experiences through film.

Feminist Rhetorical Theories and its companion, *Readings in Feminist Rhetorical Theory*, written and edited by Karen Foss, Sonja Foss, and Cindy Griffin bring together nine of the key theorists in feminist rhetorical theory. One of the difficulties of speaking about the second and third waves of feminism is the conflicting thoughts on when the second wave ended and the third began (or even if there has been a third wave). This inability to strictly define the boundaries of the waves makes the selections in *Readings in Feminist Rhetorical Theory* even more important because in almost every case, these theorists' writings span the two waves. Students will have the opportunity to follow the evolutions of the theorists and their writings sometimes over several decades. This experience will be valuable as we move between the second and third waves.

Finally, the two texts by Jennifer Baumgardner and Amy Richards are timely and written for the women of the third wave. One of the criticisms of the third wave is that it is ambiguous and hard to define. These two texts offer the women of the third wave not only an understanding of *where they are* in relation to their world, but also options and suggestions for involvement. We will end the semester by viewing the film, *Bridget Jones's Diary*, based on Helen Fielding's book by the same name. Viewing the film will provide a platform for discussing many contemporary rhetorical themes.

The impact of visual rhetoric in today's culture cannot be overstated, and one of the major emphases of this course is that visual rhetoric. I want the students in this course to come to

understand that, just as it does today, the visual rhetorics of the first and second wave – the images of women picketing the White House or marching in the streets or the use of political cartoons – had a significant impact in persuading not only lawmakers, but also other women for the cause. Perhaps the fact that the third wave has not yet experienced such a visual impact is one of the reasons it seems ambiguous and so hard to define. In this course, these areas converge in order to assist students in exploring, examining, and understanding the various rhetorics of the three waves.

Syllabus

This course will seek to explore, examine, and explicate the textual, verbal, and visual rhetorics during what is commonly referred to as the three waves of feminism in the United States. We will examine the different rhetorical strategies of each wave as we seek to understand if and how these strategies brought about their desired outcomes, and how the rhetoric of the different waves compared to and/or contrasted with the others. For example, what effect might the sight of women picketing the White House in pouring rain in January have had on the outcome? Or what rhetorical strategy was behind the suffragists' decision to appeal straight to President Wilson with their banners? How did African-American women illuminate the fact that they were being left out of both the civil rights and the women's rights movements during the 1960s?

The time period covered is roughly from the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848 through the present. The first wave was concerned primarily with winning the right to vote, the second wave with equal rights and oppression, and the third wave continues to seek diversity, a diffusing of differences, and a dispelling of women and minorities being viewed as the "other" (Krolokke

and Sorensen 1-2). This course's focus on the historical, political, and social effects on the rhetorical strategies makes it suitable for cross listing in political science and gender and women's studies departments.

In this course, we are all teachers and learners. We will do a lot of close reading and a good deal of writing, both analytical and reflective. Students will participate in teaching the class through discussions and presentations. As such, participation will be essential and will require reading the assigned texts, making notes, and coming to class prepared to engage with the texts and your classmates.

Questions to Consider:

- What does it mean to use the terms “rhetoric of the three waves of feminism”?
- Can feminism have a rhetoric?
- What role did visual rhetoric play in the first and second waves in particular?
- What effect has the lack of a visual rhetoric had on the third wave?
- Why is it important to study the rhetoric of the three waves?
- Does this rhetoric still influence our lives today?

Objectives:

After completing this course, students should:

- understand the significance of the three waves of feminism through their rhetorical strategies
- appreciate the role of visual rhetoric in the three waves
- be familiar with the leading theorists of the three waves of feminism

- begin to engage with their own role in the third wave and beyond

Printed Texts:

Keith, William M. and Christian O. Lundberg. *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric*. Boston: Bedford St. Martin, 2008. Print.

Baumgardner, Jennifer and Amy Richards. *Grassroots: A Field Guide for Feminist Activism*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005. Print.

Baumgardner, Jennifer and Amy Richards. *Manifesta: Young Women, Feminism, and the Future*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2000. Print.

Echols, Alice. *Daring to Be BAD: Radical Feminism in America 1967-1975*. Minneapolis: U of Minn P, 1989. Print.

Foss, Karen A., Sonja K. Foss, and Cindy L. Griffin. *Feminist Rhetorical Theories*. Long Grove: Waveland, 2006. Print.

Foss, Karen A., Sonja K. Foss, and Cindy L. Griffin. *Readings in Feminist Rhetorical Theory*. Long Grove: Waveland, 2006. Print.

hooks, bell. *Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*. Cambridge: South End Press, 2000. Print.

Morgan, Robin. ed. *Sisterhood is Powerful: An Anthology of Writings from the Women's Liberation Movement*. New York: Vintage, 1970. Print.

Stevens, Doris. *Jailed for Freedom: American Women Win the Vote*. Ed. Carol O'Hare. Troutdale: NewSage P, 1996. Print. (also available on Project Gutenberg)

Course Pack:

- Anderson, Karrin Vasby and Jessie Stewart. "Politics and the Single Woman: The 'Sex and the City Voter' in Campaign 2004." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 8.4 (Winter 2005): 595-616. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 7 July 2009.
- Birdsell, David S. and Leo Groarke. "Outlines of a Theory of Visual Argument." *Argumentation and Advocacy*. 43. (Winter & Spring 2007): 103-113. Web. 4 April 2011.
- Borda, Jennifer L. "The Woman Suffrage Parades of 1910-1913: Possibilities and Limitations of an Early Feminist Rhetorical Strategy." *Western Journal of Communication* 66.1 (Winter 2002): 25-52. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 13 June 2009.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. "The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron." *Communication Studies* 50.2 (Summer 1999): 125-137. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 8 July 2009.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. "'The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron' Revisited." *Communication Studies* 50.2 (Summer 1999): 138-142. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 8 July 2009.
- Dow, Bonnie J. "The 'Womanhood' Rationale in the Woman Suffrage Rhetoric of Francis E. Willard." *The Southern Communication Journal* 56. 4 (Summer 1991) 298-307. *Research Library*. Web. 13 June 2009.
- Freeman, Jo. "From Suffrage to Women's Liberation: Feminism in Twentieth Century America." *Women: A Feminist Perspective*. Ed. Jo Freeman. 5th ed. Mountain View: Mayfield, 1995. www.uic.edu/orgs/cwluherstory/jofreeman/books/women5.htm.
- Krolokke, Charlotte and Anne Scott Sorensen. *Gender Communication Theories and Analyses: From Silence to Performance*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2006. Print.

Kuypers, Jim and Andrew King. "What is Rhetoric." Ed. Jim Kuypers. *The Art of Rhetorical Criticism*. Boston: Pearson, 2005. 1-12. Print.

Kuypers, Jim. "The Art of Criticism." Ed. Jim Kuypers. *The Art of Rhetorical Criticism*. Boston: Pearson, 2005. 13-27. Print.

Mann, Susan Archer and Douglas J. Huffman. "The Decentering of Second Wave Feminism and the Rise of the Third Wave." *Science & Society* 69.1 (Jan. 2005): 56-91. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 5 July 2009.

Ramsey, E. Michele. "Inventing Citizens During World War I: Suffrage Cartoons in *The Woman Citizen*." *Western Journal of Communication* 64.2 (Spring 2000): 113-147. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 13 June 2009.

Sowards, Stacey K. and Valerie R. Renegar. "The Rhetorical Functions of Consciousness-Raising in Third Wave Feminism." *Communication Studies* 55.4 (Winter 2004): 535-552. . *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 8 July 2009.

Stanton, Elizabeth Cady, et al. "Declaration of Sentiments" and "Resolutions."
www.usconstitution.net/sentiments.html. Accessed 13 June 2009.

Stanton, Elizabeth Cady. "Keynote Address." Women's Rights Convention. July 19, 1848.
www.thelizlibrary.org/undelete/library.html. Accessed 13 June 2009.

Stanton, Elizabeth Cady. "The Solitude of Self." *American Heritage* 50.7 (Nov. 1999): 101.
Academic Search Complete. Web. 19 July 2009.

Films:

Bridget Jones's Diary. Dir. Sharon Maquire. Miramax Films, 2001. DVD.

Iron Jawed Angels. Dir. Katjz von Garnier. HBO, 2004. DVD.

Assignments

1. Definition of Feminist Rhetoric – This will be our starting point for understanding not only rhetoric, but specifically the rhetoric closely tied to the three waves of feminism. You might start by pondering our “Questions to Consider.” We will post the definitions to the class website prior to our second class meeting to allow for comments and discussion. Each student should read and comment on at least two classmates’ definitions. Then, we will discuss these in class at the end of the first week.

2. Presentation – For this assignment, you will choose one of the following options:
 - Option 1 – Presentation concerning some aspect of the visual rhetoric(s) of either or both of the first and second waves.

 - Option 2 – Presentation on one of the theorists from the Foss text (or some other theorist that you feel strongly about).

Both of these options must be theoretically and historically based and have a strong visual component. By that, I do not mean a PowerPoint presentation. Also, for both of these options, you will collaborate with one other student working toward the best possible presentation.

Some ideas you might consider:

- Make banners or protest signs symbolizing an idea, strategy, or issue in either the first or second wave. Explain how/why it was important/significant. Enlist some of your classmates to picket (quietly) while you present.

- Choose one theme from either the first or second wave and design a pamphlet to illustrate it. You may use the computer to show the pamphlet, but please bring copies for everybody (can be photocopied)
- Design a YouTube video demonstrating how/why the visual rhetorics of the first/second waves were different/similar
- Create a Facebook page that highlights one or more of the issues of the second wave using your best rhetorical techniques to persuade people to join. (you do not have to actually post it on Facebook)
- Compare/contrast newspaper or magazine articles from the first/second waves. Write your own magazine article (with photos) highlighting the ideas of one of the theorists in the Foss text.
- Dress in 1960s garb and present your case for a pertinent issue from the second wave based on one of the theorists in the Foss text.

These are just suggestions. I am open to almost anything visual or verbal (if doing a speech). Discuss your ideas with me. Each presentation should be approximately 20-25 minutes.

Each member of the group will each turn in a separate 2-3 page reflective essay on your project along with a bibliography of all the works you consulted/cited/referenced in your research.

3. Rhetorical analysis paper – This final project is broadly defined to allow the greatest flexibility for you to research and analyze what is of interest to you. As part of this paper, you may choose to build on some aspect of your presentation. You might choose to

analyze the use of political cartoons in both the first and second waves discussing their rhetorical strategies and their effectiveness.

For this paper, you will draw on our discussions of the elements of rhetorical theory such as pathos, ethos, logos, audience, delivery, style. The paper should be 8-10 pages, in MLA format, and have a works cited page. You will post a draft on online one week prior to the due date for peer review and feedback. Everyone will read and comment on at least two papers during the week. We will have time in class to finish the peer review prior to the final due date.

4. Updated Definition of Feminist Rhetorics –It’s time to pull out that definition you wrote way back in the first week and review. Has your understanding of the three waves of feminism changed? Have you been convinced that there even is a feminist rhetoric? Are you able to answer the questions we started the class with? Discuss if and how your updated definition has changed. Like the original definitions, we will post these to the class website to allow for comments and discussion before sharing them in class.

Grading

20% -- Participation

15% -- Definitions

30% -- Presentation and Reflective Essay

35% -- Rhetorical Analysis Paper

Schedule

You should have done a close reading on the texts by the class in which they are listed and come prepared to discuss them.

Week One

Introduction to three waves and review of rhetorical theory

Readings: *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric*

“What is Rhetoric” & “The Art of Criticism”

“Three Waves of Feminism” Krolokke*

“Outlines of a Theory of Visual Argument”

Posting and sharing of initial definitions of Feminist Rhetoric

Assign partners for presentations and sign up for presentation date

Week Two

First Wave Overview and Discussion

Readings: Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions, Stanton’s Keynote Address, Stanton’s “Solitude of Self” speech

“The ‘Womanhood’ Rationale in the Suffrage Rhetoric of Francis E. Willard”
Dow

Week Three

Fight for the Vote: Verbal and Visual Rhetorics

Readings: *Jailed for Freedom*, Gutenberg Project

“Inventing Citizens During WWI: Suffrage Cartoon in *The Woman Citizen*”
Ramsey

“The Woman Suffrage Parades of 1910-1913...” Borda

Week Four

Watch and Discuss: *Iron-Jawed Angels (film)*

Week Five

Radical Feminism

Readings: *Daring to Be BAD: Radical Feminism in America 1967-1975* Echols

“The Rhetoric of Women’s Liberation: An Oxymoron” Campbell

Two Presentations due this week

Week Six

2nd Wave Overview

Readings: “From Suffrage to Women’s Liberation...” Freeman

Sisterhood is Powerful:

Introduction

“You’ve Come a Long Way Baby...” Brown & Seitz

“A Theory on Female Sexuality” Sherfey

“Unfinished Business: Birth Control and Women’s Liberation” Cisler

Two Presentations due this week

Week Seven

Visual Rhetoric of the Second Wave: Miss America and more

Readings: *Sisterhood is Powerful*

“It Hurts to be Alive & Obsolete: The Ageing Woman” Moss

“Media Images 1: Madison Avenue Brainwashing – The facts” Embree

“Media Images 2: Body Odor and Social Order” Florika

Historical Documents

Two Presentations due this week

Week Eight

2nd Wave: Part 2 – Some Rhetorical Theorists Speak Out

Readings: *Feminist Rhetorical Theories*

Introduction

Chapter 2

Cheris Kramarae

Readings in Feminist Rhetorical Theory

Cheris Kramarae

Two Presentations due this week

Week Nine

Readings: *Feminist Rhetorical Theories*

hooks

Anzaldua

Readings in Feminist Rhetorical Theory

hooks

Anzaldua

Two Presentations due this week

Week Ten

Readings: *Feminist Rhetorical Theories*

Daly

Starhawk

Readings in Feminist Rhetorical Theory

Daly

Starhawk

Two Presentations due this week

Week Eleven

Readings: *Feminist Rhetorical Theories*

Minh-ha

Johnson

Readings in Feminist Rhetorical Theory

Minh-ha

Johnson

Week Twelve

3rd Wave Overview and Discussion

Readings: “Negotiating Spaces For/Through Third-Wave Feminism” Kinser

“The Decentering of Second Wave Feminism and the Rise of the Third Wave”
Mann & Huffman

“The Rhetoric of Women’s Liberation: An Oxymoron Revisited” Campbell

Feminism is for Everybody bell hooks

Week Thirteen

Social Action & Politics in the 3rd Wave

Readings: *Manifesta* Baumgardner & Richards

“Politics and the Single Woman: “The Sex and the City Voter” in Campaign
2004” Anderson & Stewart

“The Rhetorical Functions of Consciousness-Raising in Third Wave Feminism”
Sowards & Renegar

Week Fourteen

A New Kind of Rhetoric

Watch and Discuss: *Bridget Jones’s Diary* (film)

Draft of Rhetorical Analysis Paper posted online by end of the week

Week Fifteen

Wrap up and where do we go from here?

Readings: *Grassroots: A Field Guide for Feminist Activism* Baumgardner & Richards

Peer Review of Rhetorical Analysis Paper

Updated Definitions posted to class website before sharing in class

Week Sixteen

Final Paper Due during final time

Chapter 4

Modeling Women: Using Women's Rhetorics as Composition Models

Beyond “adding women,” then, or even beyond revisions of rhetorical history, important as both projects might be, we must encourage our students to use women rhetors as their teachers.

Kate Ronald and Joy Ritchie

Introduction

This course is a blend of composition and rhetorical theory and application, and a consciousness-raising exercise. Students will be introduced to some aspects of composition and rhetorical theory, which they will use to examine and explicate texts in a side by side comparison of women's rhetorics with the men's works often proffered by tradition as models of composition and rhetoric. The course has two foci: first, it will help students appreciate the various rhetorical strategies men and women use. Second, the course will interrogate the single (what some have referred to as male) mode of argument expected of most compositions in the academy.

Discussion of Assignments and Texts

The objectives for the course are that students learn how to apply theory in rhetorical analysis, explore if/how gender and other differences may play a role in a writer's rhetorical strategies and style of argument, understand that effective arguments can take on different forms and strategies, and contemplate the effects of gender imbalance in reading and composition models. The course begins with theoretical texts to give students some foundational knowledge and provide the class with a common vocabulary. Some of the works included are Ronald and Ritchie's "Pedagogy and Public Engagement" and Royster's "When the First Voice You Hear Is

Not Your Own.” Jim Kuypers’ “What is Rhetoric” and “The Art of Criticism” will give the class a starting point for a definition of rhetoric and rhetorical analysis and reading critically once they begin reading the paired works. For example, Kuypers defines rhetoric as “the strategic use of communication, oral or written, to achieve specifiable goals”— rhetoric is “persuasive” (13). Kuypers explains that rhetorical criticism is “tak[ing] a closer look at these efforts to persuade and influence” (13). This criticism, then, can be differentiated from literary criticism in that it goes beyond analyzing words and meanings to analyzing and evaluating rhetorical strategies in the works. Kuypers characterizes “the art of rhetorical criticism” not as scientific but as “a humanizing activity” because “it explores those qualities that make us human” (13). To Kuypers’ slightly theoretical text, we will add Sonja Foss’ “Doing Rhetorical Criticism,” which bring the theory down to application at the student level describing how to analyze the artifact, formulate a research question, and write the analysis essay (Rhetorical 9-20).

From these broad themes of defining rhetoric and doing rhetorical criticism, students will move into reading and discussing the Bridwell-Bowles’ “Discourse and Diversity,” Sterkel’s “The Relationship Between Gender and Writing Style in Business Communications,” and Farrell’s “The Female and Male Modes of Rhetoric” articles in order to begin to apply some of the theory. These articles will also allow for class discussions on topics such as the influence of diversity on writing instruction and composition, on how we do rhetorical criticism, and on the influence of many factors on the modes of argument. These topics should also fit nicely with Kuypers’ idea that rhetorical criticism is a “humanizing activity” and that every critic brings his or her own biases and judgments to the analysis. Even though Farrell’s piece has the unfortunate gendered labeling, it will offer a jumping off point for students to learn about different argument types, the implications of gendered labels, and how we might view these modes differently with

alternate labels such as autonomous and collaborative. Farrell's piece also offers us an added bonus because Kathleen Nichols wrote a comment on Farrell's essay and he responds to Nichols. Through this exchange, students will learn about the academic discourse community and what it means to add and respond to the conversation that is already going on around them.

For the paired works, I chose ten texts by male writers that are highly anthologized and paired them with comparable texts by female writers that are not necessarily anthologized. It was important to me to illustrate for students that women were/are writing on equally important subjects and with many of the same, and some different, rhetorical strategies as their male counterparts. For example, Mary Astell's *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies II* together with Jonathan Swift's *A Modest Proposal* are comparable in terms of rhetorical strategy and even composition mode in that both writers postpone their arguments leaning more toward the female mode of writing (as described by Farrell). Other examples include Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "Letter From Birmingham City Jail" and Frances Beale's "Double Jeopardy: To be Black and Female." In Beale's text, she furthers King's discussion of the oppression of Blacks in America to include Black women – a group Beale felt was underrepresented in the civil rights movement. Orwell's "Politics and the English Language" and Toni Morrison's "Nobel Lecture" both approach language from different perspectives, but both illustrate how language, possibly humankind's most valuable achievement, is important and must be cared for.

At the end of the semester, students will view and compare the 1939 and the 2008 versions of the film, *The Women*, which will provide an opportunity to discuss perspectives, since the 1939 version is shot from the male director's perspective and the 2008 version was produced entirely by women.

Students will begin the course by writing an ungraded, response paper in which they will begin to think about the question “Is gender a difference that makes a difference in writing, argument, and rhetoric?”—one of the guiding ideas expressed in the introduction to *Feminism and Composition: A Critical Sourcebook* (Kirsch 1). Then, for each of the pairs of texts, students will write the talking back papers described earlier. The paired texts will be provided in a course pack, but instead of the teacher providing them with background and critical information on the authors and their texts, students will Google the authors and the texts and will discuss how they used the information they found to inform their understanding, analysis, criticism, and questioning of the texts in the talking back papers. Instructing students to Google for information on the texts and writers may seem a bit unorthodox, but I believe it will work to create active learning. Often when works are assigned in anthologies, students fail to read the prefatory material on either the author or the work. Having students access and find this information on their own and requiring them to use it in their talking back papers, means that they must actively search for and access the information. It also means that when students participate in class discussions, they will probably not all have read the same information providing for (hopefully) a fuller discussion and understanding of these writers and the texts. This activity will also allow for discussions of good information versus bad information gained via the Internet and elsewhere.

At the end of the semester, students will compile a small portfolio of their talking back papers along with a formal position paper that revisits and expands the beginning response paper in which they will bring to bear what they have learned during the semester. In this expanded position paper, students will discuss what impact (if any) what they have learned has had on their understanding of all the texts included in the semester, and will argue for or against a more

gender-balanced essay canon, including scholarly support for their position. Additionally, students will do a bit of self-analysis – analyzing their own mode of argument and commenting on that at the end of the paper.

For the last assignment, students will prepare a 15-minute speech to deliver in class based on their position paper, being prepared to answer questions from the audience (class) and to discuss their rhetorical strategies and mode of argument.

Syllabus

This course is a blend of composition and rhetorical theory and application, and a consciousness-raising exercise. Students will be introduced to some aspects of composition and rhetorical theory, which they will use to examine and explicate texts in a side by side comparison of women's rhetorics with the men's works often proffered by tradition as models of composition and rhetoric. The course has two foci: first, it will help students appreciate the various rhetorical strategies men and women use. Second, the course will interrogate the single (what some have referred to as male) mode of argument expected of most compositions in the academy.

Course goals

The requirements of this course will equip students to:

- comprehend how to apply theory in rhetorical analysis,
- explore if/how gender and other differences may play a role in a writer's rhetorical strategies and style of argument,
- understand that effective arguments can take on different forms and strategies,

- contemplate the effects of gender imbalance in reading and composition models

Course Pack

Bridwell-Bowles, Lillian. "Discourse and Diversity: Experimental writing Within the Academy."

College Composition and Communication. 43 (1992): 349-68. Rpt. In. *Feminism and Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Eds. Gesa E. Kirsch. et al. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003. 294-313. Print.

Farrell, Thomas J. "The Female and Male Modes of Rhetoric." *College English*. 40.8 (Apr 1979): 909-921. *JSTOR*. 21 Mar 2009. Web.

_____. "Thomas J. Farrell Responds." *College English*. 41.5 (Jan 1980): 590-593. *JSTOR*. 1 Sept 2011. Web.

Foss, Sonja K. "Doing Rhetorical Criticism." *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice*. 4th ed. Long Grove: Waveland P, 2009. 9-20. Print.

Kuypers, Jim and Andrew King. "What is Rhetoric." Ed. Jim Kuypers. *The Art of Rhetorical Criticism*. Boston: Pearson, 2005. 1-12. Print.

Kuypers, Jim. "The Art of Criticism." Ed. Jim Kuypers. *The Art of Rhetorical Criticism*. Boston: Pearson, 2005. 13-27. Print.

Lynch, Catherine M. and Mary Strauss-Noll. "Classroom Inquiry: Mauve Washers: Sex Differences in Freshman Writing." *The English Journal*. 76.1 (Jan 1987): 90-94. *JSTOR*. 18 April 2009. Web.

Moore, Cindy. "Why Feminists Can't Stop Talking about Voice." *Rhetorical Women: Roles and Representations*. Eds. Hildy Miller and Lillian Bridwell-Bowles. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2005. 191-205. Print.

Nichols, Kathleen L. "A Comment on Thomas J. Farrell's 'The Female and Male Modes of Rhetoric'." *College English*. 41.5 (Jan 1980): 588-590. *JSTOR*. 1 Sept 2011. Web.

Ronald, Kate and Joy Ritchie. "Pedagogy and Public Engagement: The Uses of Women's Rhetorics." *Rhetorical Women: Roles and Representations*. Eds. Hildy Miller and Lillian Bridwell-Bowles. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2005. 206-228. Print.

Royster, Jaqueline Jones. "When The First Voice You Hear Is Not Your Own." *College Composition and Communication*. 47.1 (1996): 29-40. Rpt. In. *The Norton Book of Composition Studies*. Ed. Susan Miller. New York: W. W. Norton, 2009. 1117-1127. Print.

Sterkel, Karen S. "The Relationship Between Gender and Writing Style in Business Communications." *The Journal of Business Communication*. 25.4 (Fall 1988): 17-38. Web.

Paired Texts

Jonathan Swift: A Modest Proposal

Mary Astell: A Serious Proposal to the Ladies, Part II (excerpts)

Martin Luther King, Jr.: I Have a Dream

Elizabeth Cady Stanton: The Solitude of Self

Frederick Douglass: Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass (excerpt)

Maria W. Stewart: Lecture Delivered at the Franklin Hall

Thomas Jefferson, et al: Declaration of Independence

Elizabeth Cady Stanton: Declaration of Sentiments

Niccolò Machiavelli: The Prince

Christine de Pizan: The Treasure of the City of Ladies (excerpt

Martin Luther King, Jr.: Letter from Birmingham City

Frances Beale: Double Jeopardy: To be Black and Female

Alexander Bain & Adams Sherman Hill: English Composition and Rhetoric and Principles of
Rhetoric

Gertrude Buck: The Present Status of Rhetorical Theory

Al Gore: The Climate Emergency

Rachel Carson: The Obligation to Endure (excerpt from *Silent Spring*)

George Orwell: Politics and the English Language

Toni Morrison: Nobel Lecture

John F. Kennedy, Jr.: Inaugural Address

Eleanor Roosevelt: On the Declaration of Human Rights

Film: *The Women* 1939 and 2008 versions

Assignments

1. Response paper: ungraded
 - Concerning composition models, rhetoric, and argument styles, respond to the question “Is gender a difference that makes a difference in writing, argument, and rhetoric?” 500 words.
2. Talking Back Papers: 10 papers 250-500 words each

- As we read the paired texts, students will Google the authors and the texts and will discuss how they used the information they found to inform their understanding, analysis, criticism, and questioning of the texts in the talking back papers.
 - Students will post their talking back papers to the course website (in a blog-type area each week)
3. Portfolio and Redux Response paper: 10 Talking Back papers +1500-2000 words response paper
- Students will compile a small portfolio of their talking back papers
 - With the talking back papers, students will write a formal position paper that,
 - revisits and expands the beginning response paper that,
 - brings to bear what they have learned during the semester
 - discusses what impact (if any) what they have learned has had on their understanding of all the texts included in the semester
 - argues for or against a more gender-balanced essay canon
 - includes scholarly support for their position
 - Students will finish the paper with a self-analysis of their own mode of argument and commenting on that at the end of the paper
4. Speech – 10 minutes
- Students will prepare a 10-minute speech to deliver in class based on their position paper, being prepared to answer questions from the audience and to discuss their rhetorical strategies and mode of argument

Grading

25% -- Talking Back papers (10)

35% -- Portfolio and Redux Response Paper

15% -- Speech

25% -- Class/Discussion Participation

Schedule

Week One

Introductions/getting acquainted with women's rhetorics

Introduce class, discuss syllabus

Discuss ungraded response paper

Readings: "Pedagogy and Public Engagement"

Week Two

Diversity/voice/ rhetorical theory/criticism

Readings: "Discourse and Diversity"

"Why Feminists Can't Stop Talking about Voice"

"When the First Voice You Hear Is Not Your Own"

"What is Rhetoric?" and "The Art of Criticism"

"Doing Rhetorical Criticism"

Response paper due

Week Three

Modes of Argument

Readings: “The Female and Male Modes of Rhetoric”
“A Comment on...”
“Farrell Responds”
“Classroom Inquiry: Mauve Washers...”
“The Relationship Between Gender and Writing Style...”

Discussion of Talking Back Papers

Week Four

Readings: Swift & Astell

Talking Back papers for in-class discussion

Week Five

Readings: MLK (I Have a Dream) & Stanton (Solitude)

Talking Back papers for in-class discussion

Discussion of Portfolio and Redux Response paper assignment

Week Six

Readings: Douglass & Stewart

Talking Back papers for in-class discussion

Week Seven

Readings: Jefferson & Stanton

Talking Back papers for in-class discussion

Week Eight

Readings: Maciavelli & de Pizan

Talking Back papers for in-class discussion

Week Nine

Readings: MLK (Letter) & Beale

Talking Back papers for in-class discussion

Week Ten

Readings: Bain/Hill & Buck

Talking Back papers for in-class discussion

Week Eleven

Readings: Gore & Carson

Talking Back papers for in-class discussion

Week Twelve

Readings: Orwell & Morrison

Talking Back papers for in-class discussion

Week Thirteen

Readings: Kennedy & Roosevelt

Talking Back papers for in-class discussion

Week Fourteen

Films: *The Women* 1939 & 2008

Draft of Redux Response paper for peer review

Week Fifteen

Student Speeches

Week Sixteen

Students Speeches

Portfolio and Redux Response final draft paper due

Course wrap up

Chapter 5

Signposts: Landmarks in Women's Rhetorics

Thoughts would be lost if not put into writings ... which shadows last longer than men.

Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle

Introduction

A landmark can be defined as a marker that allows for the locating of something else or the signpost of a significant event. Signposts can simultaneously reveal not only where the traveler is in relation to other places, but also both how far she's come and how far it is to her destination. A rhetorical landmark, then, might be described as a work whose influence was so significant in its response to an exegesis as to define an era or an event. Although some of the works we will study in this course were written decades, or in some cases hundreds of years, ago, they are still in print, which speaks to their timelessness and importance. This course will study eleven landmark works in women's rhetorics beginning with Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, published in 1792, and covering subjects as diverse as education for women, race and class, rape, oppression, the environment, and more. The class will be largely student led in that students will each lead discussions and participate in the planning and execution of a semester-long, rhetorically-sound, culturally-based project dealing with an issue/problem chosen by the class. As part of the course curricula, students will learn about collaborative learning and writing, as well as how to lead class discussions. These discussions will provide context for the works we are reading utilizing critical, scholarly, and internet-based secondary sources.

Discussion of Assignments and Texts

Any selection does, by its very nature, exclude as well as include. There are many more works deserving of the nomenclature of landmark, and therefore deserving of the attention and study provided in a course such as this or, even more desirable, integrated into the disciplines where they might naturally fall as higher education continues to work toward a more diverse and gender-balanced gathering of thought and ideas.

The eleven rhetorical landmarks, addressing a breadth of topics of interest to male and female students, were chosen for their importance, scholarship, reputation, and argument. For example, in her introduction to the twenty-fifth anniversary edition of *Silences*, Shelley Fisher Fishkin asserts “*Silences* changed what we read in the academy, what we write, and what we count; it also gave us some important tools to understand and address many of the literary, social, economic and political silencing of the present and the potential silencing of the future” (xii). Wolf’s *The Beauty Myth: How Images of Beauty Are Used Against Women* was listed by *The New York Times* “as one of the seventy most influential books of the twentieth century” which “should take its place alongside such polemics as Betty Friedan’s *The Feminine Mystique*” (qtd in Felder 272). Simone de Beauvoir’s *A Second Sex*, which the Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy (IEP) calls her “revolutionary magnum opus,” was republished in a new English translation in 2010, nearly sixty years after its first translation into English in 1953 (IEP). The IEP states *The Second Sex* is “striking for the breadth of research and the profundity of its central insights... and remains to this day one of the foundational texts in philosophy, feminism, and women’s studies” (IEP). These works will offer students the opportunity to examine their rhetorical strategies and experience their topics from the viewpoint of some of the most influential rhetors of the time.

Because the major project of the class will entail cooperative or collaborative writing, I chose three articles dealing with collaborative writing and textual ownership. These articles should provide a good theoretical foundation for our discussions of writing together as a class as we work on the large project. My choices for the type and number of the other scholarly articles the students will read during the first three weeks serve to foreground feminist research methods, women's writing practices, and basic rhetorical criticism. Furthermore, even though KSU now offers a minor in Women's Studies, I was unsure of entering students' knowledge of feminist concerns and their resulting rhetorics; consequently, I wanted to provide students with some context to assist in their understanding of the landmarks, as well as offer a brief theoretical foundation and mutual vocabulary necessary to the classroom discussions. For example, Ede, Glenn, and Lunsford's "Border Crossings" provides a good beginning discussion of the ways in which feminism and rhetoric intersect and how they change each other. In "Mapping the Silences" Cheryl Glenn explains that "rhetorical history has replicated the power politics of gender, with men in the highest cultural role and social rank" (2). Without this grounding knowledge, students may struggle to understand many of the works like Tillie Olsen's *Silences* or Virginia Woolf's *A Room of One's Own*, for instance. Additionally, since students must prepare for leading the discussions, reading these articles during the first few weeks will give the first groups enough time to read their works and prepare their discussion materials. For these discussions and for the class project, we will access resources at the KSU library, Galileo, and other online and print resources to find relevant and additional materials for context and discussions. I want students to research and find primary texts: political cartoons, newspaper and magazine articles and advertisements, book reviews, etc. from the periods in which the works

were written as a complement to the secondary, scholarly sources to round out the students' understanding of the rhetorics of the landmark works.

This course strives to create both classroom activities and reading and writing assignments to facilitate the goals of mutual learning; considering what a landmark is and understanding of the group of landmark works; writing collaboratively; leading discussions; and writing rhetorically in response to an exegesis. In addition to reading, discussing, and interrogating the landmarks in and out of class, I wanted to offer students more than the traditional research paper as a way to wrap up the semester. I desired an assignment that would facilitate a way for students to connect all they would be learning not only about the rhetorical strategies the writers used to respond to their cultural and societal situations, but also as a means to experience collaborative writing and honing of their own rhetorical strategies. I decided that the one way we could accomplish this goal was for the class to collaborate on a large corporate body of work – a potential landmark – that responds to a current exegesis in our own society.

Consequently, I designed a semester-long, class-wide project that will involve both the students and the instructor working collaboratively. While the assignment is designed to give the class members the most flexibility in deciding on the ultimate form and content, I envision a multi-page, Internet-based researched project (published to the website established for this concentration) whose constituent parts might involve, in addition to text, rhetorical elements such as art, photos, cartoons, videos, and the like. The look and form of this project will be different each time, depending on the interests and talents of each class. Sub-committees, managed by the students, will report each week to the larger group on their progress, problems, etc. The sub-committees will also peer review work within their respective committees and periodically across committees. There will be four drafts for peer review before the final draft is

reviewed by the entire class. Once the project is finished, it will be published to the class website and will provide a starting point for a generous body of research available for other KSU students to access and utilize.

Since one of the goals of the course is mutual learning, each student will prepare a short presentation on one of the landmark works and will be responsible for leading the discussion on the day we cover that work in class. One of the best ways to truly learn something is to teach it to someone else. While the students won't be asked to formally teach a session, they will be expected to know contextual information about the work, its author, the major criticism of the piece, and be able to answer questions posed by other class members. The execution of this assignment will satisfy three of the course goals: mutual learning, a deep understanding of the landmarks, and honing of discussion-leading skills.

As with the other courses in the concentration, students will prepare Talking Back papers to aid in their reading and understanding of the works and to begin to understand what it means to interact with a text. In these papers, students will be expected to question, talk through, wrestle with, and argue for/against the rhetorical strategies and the subject matter contained in the texts. These papers should provide good materials further class discussions and assist the student discussion leaders if they need some encouragement during class.

Syllabus

A landmark can be defined as a marker that allows for the locating of something else or the signpost of a significant event. Signposts can simultaneously reveal not only where the traveler is in relation to other places, but also both how far she's come and how far it is to her destination. A rhetorical landmark, then, might be described as a work whose influence was so

significant in its response to an exegesis as to define an era or an event. Although some of the works we will study in this course were written decades (or in several cases hundreds of years) ago, they are still in print, which speaks to their timelessness and importance. The course will study eleven landmark works in women's rhetorics beginning with Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, published in 1792, and covering subjects as diverse as education for women, race and class, rape, oppression, the environment, and more. The class will be largely student led in that students will each lead discussions and participate in the planning and execution of a semester-long, rhetorically-sound, culturally-based project dealing with an issue/problem chosen by the class. As part of the course curricula, students will learn about collaborative learning and writing, as well as how to lead class discussions. These discussions will provide context for the works we are reading utilizing critical, scholarly, and internet-based secondary sources.

Course goals

The requirements for the course will provide an opportunity for students to:

- Consider what a landmark text is and achieve a fuller understanding of a select group of major (landmark) works in women's rhetorics over the past 200+ years
- Experience mutual learning – meaning that everyone in the class will participate in both teaching and learning and that the instructor is not the repository of knowledge
- Collaborate in learning and writing
- Develop the skills necessary for effective discussion leading
- Write rhetorically in response to a specific exegesis

Printed Texts

Brownmiller, Susan. *Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape*. New York: Ballantine. 1993.

Print.

Carson, Rachel. *Silent Spring*. New York: Mariner Books, 2002. Print.

Chopin, Kate. *The Awakening*. New York: SoHo Books, 2011. Print.

Davis, Angela Y. *Women, Race, and Class*. New York: Random House, 1983. Print.

De Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. New York: Knopf, 2010. Print.

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Norton, 1997. Print.

Olsen, Tillie. *Silences*. New York: Feminist Press, 2003. Print.

Rich, Adrienne. *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution*. New York: Norton, 1986. Print.

Wolf, Naomi. *The Beauty Myth: How Images of Beauty are Used Against Women*. New York: Harper Collins, 2002. Print.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. New York: Konemann, 1998. Print.

Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. Orlando: Harcourt, 2005. Print.

Course Pack

Bizzell, Patricia. "Feminist Methods of Research in the History of Rhetoric: What Difference Do They Make?" *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*. 30 (2000) 5-17. Rpt. In. *Feminism and Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Gesa E. Kirsch, et al. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003. 194-205.

- Ede, Lisa, Cheryl Glenn, and Andrea Lunsford. "Border Crossings: Intersections of Rhetoric and Feminism." *Rhetorica*. 13.4 (Autumn 1995) 401-41. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 Mar 2009.
- Ede, Lisa and Andrea A. Lunsford. "Collaboration and Concepts of Authorship." *PMLA*. 116.2 (Mar 2001) 354-69. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Feb 2011.
- Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. "Infection in the Sentence: The Woman Writer and the Anxiety of Authorship." *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1979. Rpt. In. *Feminisms Redux*. Ed. Robyn Warhol-Down and Diane Price Herndl. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2009. 9-20. Print.
- Glenn, Cheryl. "Mapping the Silences, Or Remapping the Rhetorical Territory." *Rhetoric Retold*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1997. 1-17. Print.
- Kuypers, Jim and Andrew King. "What is Rhetoric." Ed. Jim Kuypers. *The Art of Rhetorical Criticism*. Boston: Pearson, 2005. 1-12. Print.
- Kuypers, Jim. "The Art of Criticism." Ed. Jim Kuypers. *The Art of Rhetorical Criticism*. Boston: Pearson, 2005. 13-27. Print.
- Lunsford, Andrea Abernethy. "Rhetoric, Feminism, and the Politics of Textual Ownership." *College English*. 61 (1999) 529-44. Rpt. In. *Feminism and Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Gesa E. Kirsch, et al. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003. 180-93. Print.
- Lunsford, Andrea Abernethy and Lisa Ede. "Rhetoric in a New Key: Women and Collaboration." *Rhetoric Review*. 8 (1990) 234-41. Rpt. In. *Feminism and Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Gesa E. Kirsch, et al. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003. 257-62. Print.

Rich, Adrienne. "Claiming and Education." *On Lies, Secrets, and Silence: Selected Prose*. New York: Norton, 1979. 231-35. Print.

Ryan, Kathleen. "Making Pathways: Inventing Textual Research Methods in Feminist Rhetorical Studies." *Rhetorica in Motion*. Ed. Eileen E. Schell and K. J. Rawson. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2010. 89-103. Print.

Assignments

1. Talking Back papers – bell hooks said that when she was growing up, talking back meant “speaking as an equal to an authority figure...daring to disagree and sometimes it just meant having an opinion (“Talking Back” 74).”
 - In this vein, I want you to consider how you will respond to the works we will be reading throughout the semester. The idea behind this is that as you read the material for each day of class, you should be learning how to interact with these texts – talking back to the texts – questioning, jotting down key terms or new ideas, and commenting on points you find interesting/with which you agree or disagree.
 - The talking back papers are, in essence, your notes on the landmark works we are reading. These papers will spark discussion during class and may provide a reference for the final project.
 - You are only required to complete them for ten (10) of the landmark works we are reading, as you will not complete one for the day you are the discussion leader.

2. Discussion Leader

- For each of the landmark works, students will work in pairs or small groups (no more than 3) to provide context for the work on the day it is discussed. This context should encompass the social, political, economic, etc. climate to which the work was/may have been responding and should discuss the significance of the work. In other words, why might this work be considered a landmark work? This information may be textual, verbal, and/or visual, and should also consider/discuss the writer's rhetorical strategies relating to audience, choice of genre, etc. as well as contemporary critiques of the work/writer.
- The discussion leaders should prepare items to spark/continue the discussion in class. Students will also use their Talking Back papers to contribute to the discussion.
- No formal written paper will be required for this assignment; therefore, discussion leaders will be assessed on the quality of the contextual information and class discussion.

3. Creating a *potential* landmark:

- Since this is a class discussing some of the landmark works in women's rhetoric(s), it seems appropriate that we create a potential landmark work of our own. As a class, we will find a current issue that needs to be addressed and construct a work together addressing the issue, using our best rhetorical strategies.
- The class will decide on how to break up the work for the final project. Once the decision is made about the form and topic, students will work in sub-committees

to complete each section, coming together for at least an hour each week during the semester for collaborative learning and exchanging ideas and research findings. The grade for this project will be a corporate grade, based on the quality of the finished project. The class will decide together a method of encouraging full and meaningful participation in the work of the sub-committees.

- Following is a brief outline of the tasks for the project:
 - Decide the issue
 - Initial research/discuss findings in class
 - Discuss and decide on the basic outline together
 - Assign sub-committees for different parts of the project
 - Groups meet weekly during class time
 - Regular group reports on progress of sub-committees/ask questions/see guidance
 - Peer review drafts
 - Publish finished project to the class website

- Examples of possible topics: 1) research the selling of young girls into the sex trade – see the books *Half the Sky or Our Own Backyard*, 2) research the poverty that still exists in the US: who is most affected by it and argue for how/why it could/should be remedied. 3) we might also bring it very close to home – dealing with something in the wider Kennesaw/Marietta/Atlanta area.

Grading

20% -- Talking Back Papers

25% -- Discussion leader

55% -- Class project

Schedule

Week One

Introduction to course, introduce class project, sign up for discussion leader

Readings: “What is Rhetoric” and “The Art of Criticism” Kuypers
 “Border Crossings: Intersections of Rhetoric and Feminism...” Ede, Glenn,
 Lunsford

Week Two

Readings: “Feminist Methods of Research in the History of Rhetoric...” Bizzell
 “Making Pathways: Inventing Textual Research Methods...” Ryan
 “Infection in the Sentence: The Woman Writer...” Gilbert, Gubar

Discussion of class project

Week Three

Readings: “Mapping the Silences, or Remapping Rhetorical Territory” Glenn
 “Claiming an Education” Rich
 “Rhetoric in a New Key: Women and Collaboration” Lunsford, Ede
 “Rhetoric, Feminism, and the Politics of Textual Ownership” Lunsford
 “Collaboration and Concepts of Authorship” Ede, Lunsford

Discussion of class project

Week Four

Readings: *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792) Wollstonecraft

Finalize plans for class project including topic and form

Assign sub-committees

Week Five

Readings: *The Awakening* (1899) Chopin

Sub-committee updates on class project

Week Six

Readings: *A Room of One's Own* (1929) Woolf

Sub-committee updates on class project

Week Seven

Readings: *The Second Sex* (1949) (2010) De Beauvoir

First drafts due for class project

Peer review/discussion among sub-committees

Week Eight

Readings: *Silent Spring* (1962) Carson

Sub-committee updates on class project

Week Nine

Readings: *The Feminine Mystique* (1963) Friedan

Second drafts due for class project

Peer review/discussion among sub-committees

Week Ten

Readings: *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape* (1975) Brownmiller

Sub-committee updates on class project

Week Eleven

Readings: *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution* (1976) Rich

Third drafts due for class project

Peer review/discussion among sub-committees

Week Twelve

Readings: *Silences* (1978) Olsen

Sub-committee updates on class project

Week Thirteen

Readings: *Women, Race, and Class* (1981) Davis

Fourth drafts due for class project

Peer review/discussion among sub-committees

Week Fourteen

Readings: *The Beauty Myth: How Images of Beauty are Used Against Women* (1991) Wolf

Sub-committee updates on class project

Week Fifteen

Final drafts due for class project

Final peer review all sub-committees review complete project

Week Sixteen

Finalize class project and publish to website

Chapter 6

Where Do We Go From Here?

And where the words of women are crying to be heard, we must each of us recognize our responsibility to seek those words out, to read them and share them and examine them in their pertinence to our lives.

Audre Lorde

In the introduction, I sought to lay a foundation that illustrates the need for more women's rhetorics throughout the disciplines, and through that discussion, revealed that textbooks, composition Readers, and courses are less than balanced when it comes to women's rhetorics and the effects of that deficiency on all students, but especially on female students. I have suggested and outlined four courses that explore, examine, and explicate women's rhetorics and rhetorical practices, revealing women's knowledge, thoughts, perspectives, and wisdom. And while this narrow focus is not ideal and full integration of women's rhetorics into all appropriate disciplines is desired, when we are able to focus on them, women's rhetorics may just reveal that the focus wasn't so narrow after all – that in fact, these were/are not just women's rhetorics, but rhetorics that can and do speak for everyone and that are worthy of this and further study.

The first course, *Beginnings: Women as Rhetorical Pioneers*, introduces students to women rhetors and their texts that might characterize them as rhetorical pioneers – lesser known women such as Julian of Norwich, Margaret Fell, Sor Juana Inéz de la Cruz, and Gertrude Buck, as well as more well-known rhetors like Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Sojourner Truth, Adrienne Rich, and Virginia Woolf. In addition to discovering some of the rhetorical pioneers, upon completion of the course, students should be able to analyze and critique the rhetorical strategies

of the texts, understand the connections between the pioneers and the other rhetors that followed, and study these pioneers and their influence on their culture and the rhetorical tradition.

The second course, *Rhetoric in Three Waves: A Rhetorical Study of the Three Waves of Feminism in the U.S.*, offers students the opportunity to examine the verbal, textual, and visual rhetorics of American women's struggle for rights covering a period from 1848 to the present. The course is structured in such a way that by the end of the course, students should understand the significance of the three waves of feminism through their rhetorical strategies, appreciate the role of visual rhetoric in the three waves, be familiar with the leading theorists of the three waves of feminism, and begin to engage with their own role in the third wave and beyond.

Course three, *Modeling Women: Using Women's Rhetorics as Composition Models*, focuses on the gender imbalance in much of composition readings and models, and suggests ways that women's rhetorics could provide students the opportunity to expand their argument modes. Students will examine women's rhetorics in a side by side comparison with many of the men's rhetorics that are highly anthologized. These examinations along with other readings, class discussions, and assignments work toward the objectives for the course—that students learn how to apply theory in rhetorical analysis, explore if/how gender and other differences may play a role in a writer's rhetorical strategies and style of argument, understand that effective arguments can take on different forms and strategies, and contemplate the effects of gender imbalance in reading and composition models.

The last course, *Signposts: Landmark Works in Women's Rhetorics*, will explore eleven landmark works in women's rhetorics beginning with Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* and moving forward to the present. The study of these works and the theoretical readings on topics such as collaborative writing and research methods in feminist

theory will provide the necessary foundations to meet the course's goals of mutual learning, understanding of the select group of landmark works in women's rhetorics, writing collaboratively, leading discussions, and writing rhetorically in response to an exegesis.

While contemplating the rationale for the concentration, in general, and designing the courses, in particular, I had to continually resist the urge to think that all the students attending these courses would be women. Even more, the longer I worked on the courses, the more I came to realize that it is just as important that we educate the male students (who may presumably still have the majority of the power in upcoming years) to fundamentally think differently about women's rhetorical contribution to their cultural, societal, and educational systems. That the male *and* the female students need to hear a diversity of voices addressing a myriad of issues with wisdom and knowledge uniquely their own. If we are ever going to complete the changes to our society's patriarchal system of thinking that began with the earliest feminists (maybe Aspasia), we must have classes such as these—ones that raise awareness of what is missing and causes students to question what else might be missing.

Here I am reminded of Kate Ronald and Joy Ritchie's exhortation that now that we have uncovered women's rhetorics, we should allow these women rhetors to be our teachers ("Pedagogy" 208). The courses suggested in this concentration barely scratch the surface of the rhetorics that have been uncovered and created over the past thirty years, and with that in mind, I would like to offer a few suggestions for courses using these rhetorics that are worthy of further exploration.

Suggested Courses for Further Development

1. Women's Religious Rhetorics

Rhetors/rhetoricians for consideration:

Mary Astell, Sarah Grimké and Angelina Grimké Weld, Mary Daly, Margery Kempe,
Margaret Fell, Frances Willard, Hannah More

Suggested texts for further reading:

The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present, Patricia Bizzell
and Bruce Herzberg.

Listening to Their Voices: The Rhetorical Activities of Historical Women, Molly Meijer
Wertheimer, Ed.

Rhetorical Theory by Women Before 1900: An Anthology, Jane Donawerth

Reclaiming Rhetorica, Andrea A. Lunsford, Ed.

*Anglo-American Feminist Challenges to the Rhetorical Traditions: Virginia Woolf, Mary
Daly, Adrienne Rich, Krista Ratcliffe*

Available Means: An Anthology of Women's Rhetoric(s), Joy Ritchie and Kate Ronald.
Ed.

2. Women Writing Rhetorical Fiction

Some texts for consideration:

Maria, or the Wrongs of Woman, Mary Wollstonecraft

Beloved, Toni Morrison

Their Eyes Were Watching God, Zora Neale Hurston

The Awakening, Kate Chopin

The House of Mirth, Edith Wharton

The Yellow Wallpaper, Charlotte Perkins Gilman

3. Women's Political, Business, and Leadership Rhetorics

Suggested resources:

Governing codes: Gender, Metaphor, and Political Identity, Karrin Vasby Anderson and

Kristina Horn Sheeler

Closing the Leadership Gap: Why Women Can and Must Help Run the World, Marie C.

Wilson

Rumors of our Progress have been Greatly Exaggerated, Carolyn B. Maloney

4. Women's Rhetorics of Identity

Some texts for consideration:

Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza, Gloria Anzaldúa

The Black Woman: An Anthology, Toni Cade Bambara, Ed.

Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black, bell hooks

"Discourses of Difference and Identity," Charlotte Krollokke and Anne Scott Sorensen

Sister Outsider, Audre Lorde

On Lies, Secrets, and Silence, Adrienne Rich

Women/Writing/Teaching, Jan Zlotnik Schmidt, Ed.

"Professions for Women," Virginia Woolf

These suggested courses are but four possible ways to continue to respond to Ronald and Ritchie's exhortation that we put women's rhetorics to use. In "Pedagogy and Public Engagement," Ronald and Ritchie relate how their graduate students identified five "principles" of women's rhetorics that could provide students with opportunities to: "speak out/claim a voice,

attend to rhetorical contexts and exigencies, recognize the political/ideological nature of language, include the personal in the academic, and engage ethically with differences/others” (217). The objectives and coursework described in the courses proposed for this concentration strive to rise to the challenge extended by Ronald and Ritchie’s students. As I contemplate these principles and the opportunities women’s rhetorics offer students, I am reminded of Mary Astell’s career as rhetor and rhetorician, which I think exemplifies these elements.

Mary Astell, born in Newcastle, England in 1666, was educated by her uncle until his death when she was fifteen years old. Following the death of her parents, she moved to London at the age of twenty-two to seek a career as a writer. At first, she didn’t meet with much success, as writing was still a closed occupation for women in seventeenth-century England. However, she finally found a supporter in William Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, who supported her while she was getting established (Sutherland 93-94).

Astell looked at the women around her, was “horrified by the waste—of time, of intelligence, of talents given by God,” and, in response, used her rhetorical talents to write *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies for the Advancement of their True and Greatest Interest by a Lover of Her Sex* in which she proposed a “Protestant Nunnery” for unmarried women for companionship and preparation for life (Sutherland 98). Astell used her eloquence and analysis of her audience(s) to craft a very persuasive argument for the nunnery. She appealed to the women who would be attending or sending their daughters by calling attention to their images of style and grace. She spoke to the men who still controlled the finances by suggesting that it was less expensive to send their unmarried daughters to the nunnery than to pay a dowry for them to marry. Then, speaking socially, she pointed out that those girls who never married would be trained teachers ready for their roles in society. Astell’s “voice of reason,” moderate style—

“making little use of startling metaphors or emotional exclamations,”—and controlled argument illustrates that she made conscious rhetorical decisions in how best to approach her subject in light of her audience (Sutherland 101). When no one took her up on her proposal, she wrote “Part 2” where she again employed great strategy in her rhetoric, but this time for clarification and teaching. Astell keeps her ideas balanced and understated, using long sentences like an “excellent navigator” who “keeps the ship of her argument on course by constant adjustments, qualifications, and compensations” (Sutherland 103).

Mary Astell showed her talent for persuasion and argumentation in *A Serious Proposal*, but she went on to show her “skill in satire” in *Some Reflections Upon Marriage*. Astell took notice of the political and societal climate happening around her and used it to make a point about the plight of married women comparing their condition to slaves and using words like “tyranny, depose and abdicate” (Sutherland 104). Astell’s *Some Reflections Upon Marriage* “demonstrates Astell’s skill in argumentation,” and shows her “mastery of style,” as she encouraged the women of her day to go forward with what they already knew – how to be a good Christian – and told them that that was the first step toward good communication (Sutherland 105). She challenged the traditional rhetoric of her day and her contribution to rhetoric in the seventeenth century was one of a breaking down of the traditional male notion of rhetoric as a war between two sides with a winner and a loser (Sutherland 113). In this breaking with tradition, she shows her greatest understanding of the difference between male and female rhetoric, as she calls to her fellow women to use their natural tendency toward caring to bring something new to the rhetorical tradition.¹

¹ Part of the discussion of Mary Astell is from an earlier paper I wrote.

Mary Astell's story provides a historic example of how she made use of her own rhetorics to achieve the five principles outlined by Ronald and Ritchie's students. Astell found her own voice, then saw the bright, talented, and intelligent women around her and used her education and rhetorical talent to help them find a voice, to use their own talents and abilities. Her astute observations of both the domestic and political climate aided her in crafting a rhetorical message addressing the unethical treatment of her fellow women. Christine Sutherland writes that Mary Astell should be claimed "as a contributor to the rhetorical tradition: as a practitioner of rhetoric, she exemplifies the art of writing at its best; and as a theorist, she introduces the feminine element into what had hitherto been a masculine preserve..." and in doing so, "...makes her mark upon rhetorical history (115).

I relate this story of Mary Astell to elucidate that she is just one of the host of women whose rhetorical artifacts are available to study in courses such as the ones proposed here. Rhetorics which, if Ronald and Ritchie's students' observations are correct, have much to offer all the students who choose to study these important texts. Only when we study their rhetorics can we know the true knowledge of women.

Works Consulted

- Altieri, Charles. "An Idea and Ideal of a Literary Canon." *Canons*. Ed. Robert von Hallberg. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1984. 41-64. Print.
- Anderson, Karrin Vasby and Kristina Horn Sheeler. *Governing Codes: Gender, Metaphor, and Political Identity*. Lanham: Lexington, 2005. Print.
- . "Politics and the Single Woman: The 'Sex and the City Voter' in Campaign 2004." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 8.4 (Winter 2005): 595-616. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 7 July 2009.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1999. Print.
- Astell, Mary. "A Serious Proposal to the Ladies, Part II." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 847-861. Print.
- Austin, Michael. *Reading the World: Ideas That Matter*. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 2010. Print.
- Bain, Alexander and Adams Sherman Hill. "English Composition and Rhetoric and Principles of Rhetoric." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 1141-1151. Print.
- Bambara, Toni Cade. Ed. *The Black Woman: An Anthology*. New York: Washington Square Press, 2005. Print.
- Barlowe, Jamie. "Daring to Dialogue: Mary Wollstonecraft's Rhetoric of Feminist Dialogics." *Reclaiming Rhetorica*. Ed. Lunsford, Andrea A. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1995. 117-136. Print.
- Baumgardner, Jennifer and Amy Richards. *Grassroots: A Field Guide for Feminist Activism*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005. Print.

- . *Manifesta: Young Women, Feminism, and the Future*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2000. Print.
- Beale, Frances. "Double Jeopardy: To Be Black and Female." *The Black Woman: An Anthology*. Ed. Toni Cade Bambara. New York: Washington Square P, 1970/2005. 109-122. Print.
- Berthoff, Ann E. "Learning the Uses of Chaos." *The Norton Book of Composition Studies*. Ed. Susan Miller. New York: Norton, 2009. 647-51. Print.
- Birdsell, David S. and Leo Groarke. "Outlines of a Theory of Visual Argument." *Argumentation and Advocacy*. 43 (Winter & Spring 2007): 103-113. Web. 4 April 2011.
- Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy & Rhetoric*. 25.1 (1992): 1-14. Web. 13 Feb 2011.
- Bizzell, Patricia. "Editing the Rhetorical Tradition." *Philosophy & Rhetoric*. 36.2 (2003): 109-118. Web. 21 Apr 2011.
- . "Feminist Methods of Research in the History of Rhetoric: What Difference Do They Make?" *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*. 30 (2000): 5-17. Rpt. In. *Feminism and Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Eds. Gesa E. Kirsch, et al. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003. 194-205.
- Bizzell, Patricia and Bruce Herzberg. Ed. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. Print.
- Bloom, Lynn. "The Essay Canon." *College English*. 61.4 (Mar 1999): 401-430. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Jan 2011.
- Borda, Jennifer L. "The Woman Suffrage Parades of 1910-1913: Possibilities and Limitations of an Early Feminist Rhetorical Strategy." *Western Journal of Communication* 66.1 (Winter 2002): 25-52. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 13 June 2009.

Bordo, Susan. "Feminism, Postmodernism, and Gender-Scepticism." *Feminism/Postmodernism*. Ed. Linda J. Nicholson. New York: Routledge, 1990. 133-56. Print.

Bridget Jones's Diary. Dir. Sharon Maquire. Miramax Films, 2001. DVD.

Bridwell-Bowles, Lillian. "Discourse and Diversity: Experimental Writing Within the Academy." *College Composition and Communication*. 43 (1992): 349-68. Rpt. In. *Feminism and Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Eds. Gesa E. Kirsch. et al. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003. 294-313. Print.

Brownmiller, Susan. *Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape*. New York: Ballantine. 1993. Print.

Buck, Gertrude. "The Present Status of Rhetorical Theory." Michael Austin. *Reading the World: Ideas that Matter*. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 2010. 497-501. Print.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. "Hearing Women's Voices." *Communication Education* 40 (Jan. 1991): 33-48. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 13 June 2009.

---. "The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron." *Communication Studies* 50.2 (Summer 1999): 125-137. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 8 July 2009.

---. "'The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron' Revisited." *Communication Studies* 50.2 (Summer 1999): 138-142. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 8 July 2009.

---. "Theory Emergent from Practice: The Rhetorical Theory of Frances Wright." *Rhetorical Women: Roles and Representations*. Ed. Hildy Miller and Lillian Bridwell-Bowles. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2005. 125-141. Print.

Carson, Rachel. "The Obligation to Endure." Austin. *Reading the World: Ideas that Matter*. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 2010. 419-426. Print.

---. *Silent Spring*. New York: Mariner Books, 2002. Print.

- Carter, Shima. "A Pragmatic Approach to Women's Rhetoric." *Pedagogy*. 8:2 (Spring 2008): 383-389. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 22 April 2011.
- Chopin, Kate. *The Awakening*. New York: SoHo Books, 2011. Print.
- Crowley, Sharon and Debra Hawhee. *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students*. 4th ed. New York: Pearson Longman, 2009. Print.
- Davis, Angela Y. *Women, Race, and Class*. New York: Random House, 1983. Print.
- De Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. New York: Knopf, 2010. Print.
- De Pizan, Christine. "The Treasure of the City of Ladies." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 544-551. Print.
- Donawerth, Jane. "Authorial Ethos, Collaborative Voice, and Rhetorical Theory by Women." *Rhetorical Women: Roles and Representations*. Ed. Hildy Miller and Lillian Bridwell-Bowles. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2005. 107-124. Print.
- . *Rhetorical Theory by Women Before 1900: An Anthology*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002. Print.
- Douglass, Frederick. "Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001. 1071-75. Print.
- Dow, Bonnie J. "The "Womanhood" Rationale in the Woman Suffrage Rhetoric of Francis E. Willard." *The Southern Communication Journal* 56. 4 (Summer 1991): 298-307. *Research Library*. Web. 13 June 2009.
- Ede, Lisa and Andrea A. Lunsford. "Collaboration and Concepts of Authorship." *PMLA*. 116.2 (Mar 2001): 354-69. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 Feb 2011.

- Ede, Lisa, Cheryl Glenn, and Andrea Lunsford. "Border Crossings: Intersections of Rhetoric and Feminism." *Rhetorica*. 13.4 (Autumn 1995): 401-41. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 Mar 2009.
- Echols, Alice. *Daring to Be BAD: Radical Feminism in America 1967-1975*. Minneapolis: U of Minneapolis P, 1989. Print.
- Farrell, Thomas J. "The Female and Male Modes of Rhetoric." *College English*. 40.8 (Apr 1979): 909-921. *JSTOR*. 21 Mar 2009. Web.
- . "Thomas J. Farrell Responds." *College English*. 41.5 (Jan 1980): 590-593. *JSTOR*. Web. 1 Sept 2010.
- Felder, Deborah. *A Bookshelf of Our Own: Works that Changed Women's Lives*. New York: Citadel, 2005. Print.
- Fishkin, Shelley Fisher. "Introduction." *Silences*. Tillie Olsen. New York: Feminist Press, 2003. xi-xlii. Print.
- Flynn, Elizabeth. "Composing as a Woman." *College Composition and Communication*. 39 (1998): 423-35. Rpt. In. *Feminism and Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Gesa E. Kirsch, et al. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003. 243-55. Print.
- Foss, Sonja K. "Doing Rhetorical Criticism." *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice*. 4th ed. Long Grove: Waveland P, 2009. 9-20. Print.
- Foss, Karen A., Sonja K. Foss, and Cindy L. Griffin. *Feminist Rhetorical Theories*. Long Grove: Waveland, 2006. Print.
- . *Readings in Feminist Rhetorical Theory*. Long Grove: Waveland, 2006. Print.

Freeman, Jo. "From Suffrage to Women's Liberation: Feminism in Twentieth Century America."

Women: A Feminist Perspective. 5th ed. Ed. Jo Freeman. Mountain View: Mayfield, 1995. Web. 5 June 2009.

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Norton, 1997. Print.

Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. "Infection in the Sentence: The Woman Writer and the

Anxiety of Authorship." *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the*

Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination. New Haven: Yale UP, 1979. Rpt. In.

Feminisms Redux. Ed. Robyn Warhol-Down and Diane Price Herndl. New Brunswick:

Rutgers UP, 2009. 9-20. Print.

Glenn, Cheryl. *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity Through the*

Renaissance. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1997. Print.

Gore, Al. "The Climate Emergency." Michael Austin. *Reading the World: Ideas that Matter*. 2nd

ed. New York: Norton, 2010. 454-465. Print.

Greer, Germaine. "The Tulsa Center for the Study of Women's Literature: What We Are Doing

and Why We Are Doing It." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*. 1.1 (Spring 1982): 5-

26. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 Jan 2011.

Hartmann, Susan M. "Pauli Murray and the 'Juncture of Women's Liberation and Black

Liberation'." *Journal of Women's History*. 14.2 (Summer 2002): 74-77. *Academic Search*

Complete. Web. 26 March 2011.

hooks, bell. *Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*. Cambridge: South End Press, 2000.

Print.

---. "Talking Back." *The Longman Anthology of Women's Literature*. Ed. Mary K. DeShazer.

New York: Longman, 2001. 72-76. Print.

---. *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black*. Cambridge: South End P, 1989. Print.

Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. "Simone de Beauvoir." Web. 23 April 2011.

<<http://www.iep.utm.edu/beauvoir/#SH3a>>.

Iron Jawed Angels. Dir. Katz von Garnier. HBO, 2004. DVD.

Jefferson, Thomas, et al. "Declaration of Independence." Michael Austin. *Reading the World:*

Ideas that Matter. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 2010. 876-879. Print.

Keith, William M. and Christian O. Lundberg. *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric*. Boston:

Bedford/St. Martin's, 2008. Print.

Kennedy, Jr., John F. "Inaugural Address." *The Norton Reader: An Anthology of Nonfiction*. 12th

ed. Ed. Linda H. Peterson and John C. Brereton. New York: Norton, 2008. 883-885.

Print.

King, Jr., Martin Luther. "I Have a Dream." *American Rhetoric*. Web. 3 April 2011.

<<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/>>.

---. "Letter from Birmingham City Jail." Michael Austin. *Reading the World: Ideas That Matter*.

2nd ed. New York: W. W. Norton, 2010. 202-217. Print.

Kirsch, Gesa E., and Joy S. Ritchie. "Theorizing a Politics of Location in Composition

Research." *College Composition and Communication*. 46.1 (Feb 1995): 7-29. *JSTOR*.

Web. 19 April 2009.

Kolodny, Annette. "Inventing a Feminist Discourse: Rhetoric and Resistance in Margaret

Fuller's *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*. *New Literary History*. 25.2 (Spring 1994):

355-82. Rpt. In. *Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition*. Ed. Lunsford,

Andrea. Pittsburgh, U of Pitt P. 1995. Print.

Krolokke, Charlotte and Anne Scott Sorensen. "Discourses of Difference and Identity." *Gender Communication Theories and Analysis: From Silence to Performance*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Pub, 2006. 89-121. Print.

---. *Gender Communication Theories and Analyses: From Silence to Performance*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2006. Print.

KSU Fact Book. "2009-2010 Online Edition." Web. 23 April 2011.

<<http://vic34.kennesaw.edu/fb/home>>.

Kuypers, Jim. "The Art of Criticism." Ed. Jim Kuypers. *The Art of Rhetorical Criticism*. Boston: Pearson, 2005. 13-27. Print.

Kuypers, Jim and Andrew King. "What is Rhetoric." Ed. Jim Kuypers. *The Art of Rhetorical Criticism*. Boston: Pearson, 2005. 1-12. Print.

Logan, Shirley Wilson. ed. *With Pen and Voice: A Critical Anthology of Nineteenth-Century African-American Women*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1995. Print.

Lorde, Audre. *Sister Outsider*. Berkeley: The Crossing Press, 1984. Print.

Lunsford, Andrea A. Ed. *Reclaiming Rhetorica*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1995. Print.

---. "Rhetoric, Feminism, and the Politics of Textual Ownership." *College English*. 61 (1999): 529-44. Rpt. In. *Feminism and Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Gesa E. Kirsch, et al. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003. 180-93. Print.

Lunsford, Andrea Abernethy and Lisa Ede. "Crimes of Writing and Reading." *Teaching Rhetorica: Theory, Pedagogy, Practice*. Ed. Kate Ronald and Joy Ritchie. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 2006. 13-30. Print.

---. "Rhetoric in a New Key: Women and Collaboration." *Rhetoric Review*. 8 (1990): 234-41.

Rpt. In. *Feminism and Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Gesa E. Kirsch, et al.

Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003. 257-62. Print.

Lynch, Catherine M. and Mary Strauss-Noll. "Classroom Inquiry: Mauve Washers: Sex Differences in Freshman Writing." *English Journal*. 76.1 (Jan 1987): 90-94. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 April 2009.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. "The Prince." Michael Austin. *Reading the World: Ideas that Matter*. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 2010. 185-191. Print.

Maloney, Carolyn B. *Rumors of our Progress have been Greatly Exaggerated*. New York: Modern Times, 2008. Print.

Mann, Susan Archer and Douglas J. Huffman. "The Decentering of Second Wave Feminism and the Rise of the Third Wave." *Science & Society* 69.1 (Jan. 2005): 56-91. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 5 July 2009.

Morgan, Robin, ed. *Sisterhood is Powerful: An Anthology of Writings from the Women's Liberation Movement*. New York: Vintage, 1970. Print.

Moore, Cindy. "Why Feminists Can't Stop Talking about Voice." *Rhetorical Women: Roles and Representations*. Ed. Hildy Miller and Lillian Bridwell-Bowles. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2005. 191-205. Print.

Morrison, Toni. "Nobel Lecture." Michael Austin. *Reading the World: Ideas that Matter*. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 2010. 539-45. Print.

- Moss, Beverly, and Keith Walters. "Rethinking Diversity: Axes of Difference in the Writing Classroom." *The St. Martin's Guide to Teaching Writing*. 6th ed. Cheryl Glenn and Melissa A. Goldwaite. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2008. 417-440. Print.
- Nichols, Kathleen L. "A Comment on Thomas J. Farrell's 'The Female and Male Modes of Rhetoric'." *College English*. 41.5 (Jan 1980): 588-590. *JSTOR*. 1 Sept 2010. Web.
- Olsen, Tillie. *Silences*. New York: Feminist Press, 2003. Print.
- Orwell, George. "Politics and the English Language." *The Norton Reader: An Anthology of Nonfiction*. 12th ed. Ed. Linda H. Peterson and John C. Brereton. New York: Norton, 2008. 581-590. Print.
- Peterson, Linda H. and John C. Brereton. *The Norton Reader: An Anthology of Nonfiction*. 12th ed. New York: Norton, 2008. Print.
- Pollitt, Katha. "Does a Literary Canon Matter?" *The Norton Reader: An Anthology of Nonfiction*. 12th ed. Ed. Linda H. Peterson and John C. Brereton. New York: Norton, 2008. 1046-1053. Print.
- Mather, Mark and Dia Adams. "The Crossover in Female-Male Enrollment Rates." *Population Reference Bureau*. www.prb.org. Web. 23 April 2011.
- Ramsey, E. Michele. "Inventing Citizens During World War I: Suffrage Cartoons in *The Woman Citizen*." *Western Journal of Communication* 64.2 (Spring 2000): 113-147. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 13 June 2009.
- Ratcliffe, Krista. *Anglo-American Feminist Challenges to the Rhetorical Traditions: Virginia Woolf, Mary Daly, and Adrienne Rich*. Carbondale: S. Illinois UP, 1996. Print.

Rich, Adrienne. *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution*. New York: Norton, 1986. Print.

---. *On Lies, Secrets, and Silence: Selected Prose*. New York: Norton, 1979. Print.

Ritchie, Joy and Kate Ronald. Ed. *Available Means: An Anthology of Women's Rhetoric(s)*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2001. Print.

Ronald, Kate and Joy Ritchie. "Pedagogy and Public Engagement: The Uses of Women's Rhetorics." *Rhetorical Women: Roles and Representations*. Ed. Hildy Miller and Lillian Bridwell-Bowles. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2005. 206-28. Print.

Roosevelt, Eleanor. "On the Declaration of Human Rights." *The Norton Reader: An Anthology of Nonfiction*. 12th ed. Ed. Linda H. Peterson and John C. Brereton. New York: Norton, 2008. 913-917. Print.

Roush, Chris. "'What a Book Can Do: The Publication and Reception of Silent Spring.'" Rev. of *What a Book Can Do: The Publication and Reception of Silent Spring*. by Priscilla Coit Murphy. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*. 82.4 (Winter 2005): 1016-1018. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 5 June 2009.

Royster, Jacqueline Jones. "Time Alone, Place Apart: The Role of Solitude in Using the Power of Solitude." *Women/Writing/Teaching*. Ed. Jan Zlotnik Schmidt. Albany: SUNY P, 1998. 267-75. Print.

---. "When The First Voice You Hear Is Not Your Own." *College Composition and Communication*. 47.1 (1996): 29-40. Rpt. In. *The Norton Book of Composition Studies*. Ed. Susan Miller. New York: Norton, 2009. 1117-1127. Print.

- Ryan, Kathleen. "Making Pathways: Inventing Textual Research Methods in Feminist Rhetorical Studies." *Rhetorica in Motion*. Ed. Eileen E. Schell and K. J. Rawson. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2010. 89-103. Print.
- . "Women, Writing, and Rhetoric." *Composition Studies*. 34:2 (Fall 2006): 85-106. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 22 April 2011.
- Schmidt, Jan Zlotnik. Ed. *Women/Writing/Teaching*. Albany: SUNY P, 1998. Print.
- Sowards, Stacey K. and Valerie R. Renegar. "The Rhetorical Functions of Consciousness-Raising in Third Wave Feminism." *Communication Studies* 55.4 (Winter 2004): 535-552. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 8 July 2009.
- Stanton, Elizabeth Cady, et al. "Declaration of Sentiments" and "Resolutions." Web. 13 June 2009. < www.usconstitution.net/sentiments.html >.
- . "Keynote Address." Women's Rights Convention. July 19, 1848. Web. 13 June 2009. < www.thelizlibrary.org/undelete/library.html >.
- . "The Solitude of Self." *American Heritage* 50.7 (Nov. 1999): 101. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 19 July 2009.
- Sterkel, Karen S. "The Relationship Between Gender and Writing Style in Business Communications." *The Journal of Business Communication*. 25.4 (Fall 1988): 17-38. Web.
- Stevens, Doris. *Jailed for Freedom: American Women Win the Vote*. Ed. Carol O'Hare. Troutdale: New Sage P, 1996. Print.
- Stewart, Maria W. "Lecture Delivered at the Franklin Hall." *Available Means: An Anthology of Women's Rhetoric(s)*. ed. Joy Ritchie and Kate Ronald. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2001. 110-13. Print.

- Sullivan, Patricia A. "Feminism and Methodology in Composition Studies." *Methods and Methodology in Composition Research*. Ed. Gesa E. Kirsch and Patricia A. Sullivan. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1992 37-61. Rpt. In. *Feminism and Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Gesa E. Kirsch, et al. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003. 124-139. Print.
- Sutherland, Christine Mason. "Mary Astell: Reclaiming Rhetorica in the Seventeenth Century." *Reclaiming Rhetorica*. Ed. Lunsford, Andrea A. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1995. 93-116. Print.
- Swift, Jonathan. "A Modest Proposal." *The Norton Reader: An Anthology of Nonfiction*. 12th ed. New York: W. W. Norton, 2008. 858-864. Print.
- Tetreault, Mary Kay Johnson. "Integrating Women's History: The Case of United States History High School Textbooks." *The History Teacher* 19.2 (February 1986): 211-262. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 June 2009.
- Wertheimer, Molly Meijer. Ed. *Listening to Their Voices: The Rhetorical Activities of Historical Women*. Columbia: U of S. Carolina P, 1997. Print.
- Wilson, Marie C. *Closing the Leadership Gap: Why Women Can and Must Help Run the World*. New York: Viking, 2004. Print.
- Wolf, Naomi. *The Beauty Myth: How Images of Beauty are Used Against Women*. New York: Harper Collins, 2002. Print.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. New York: Konemann, 1998. Print.
- The Women*. Dir. Diane English. Picturehouse Entertainment, 2008. DVD.
- The Women*. Dir. George Cukor. MGM, 1939. DVD.

Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. Orlando: Harcourt, 2005. Print.

---. "Professions for Women." *Women and Writing*. San Diego: Harcourt. 1979. Print.