Syracuse University

SURFACE

Dissertations - ALL   SURFACE

May 2014

Seattle, Rhetorical Velocity, Identity Shift, Transnational Politics, and Materiality: Watching Rhetoric Bleed

Brian J. Bailie
Syracuse University

Follow this and additional works at: https://surface.syr.edu/etd

Part of the Arts and Humanities Commons

Recommended Citation

Abstract

Seattle, Rhetorical Velocity, Identity Shift, Transnational Politics, and Materiality: Watching Rhetoric Bleed examines how the writings of Zapatista spokesperson Subcomandante Marcos shaped the philosophical underpinnings of the overall 1999 WTO protests, and more specifically, the philosophical underpinnings *and* the physical experience of one protest group in particular: the Mechistas of Washington State. This project achieves this through three different means.

First, the objects of study analyzed at length in this dissertation are interviews housed on the WTO History Project's website. Using those interviews as the foundation for the project, I then found various secondary and tertiary sources related to the protest. Consequently, this dissertation is primarily an archive based project.

Second, this project adheres to the concept that rhetoric is material; rhetoric is both transmitted and understood through the interactions of people with other people and the objects in their experiential worlds. To articulate how this occurs and make claims about the consequences of what such interactions meant to the WTO protest of 1999, I employed both Margaret Syverson's concept of complex writing systems and Carole Blair's schema for performing a material rhetorical analysis.

Third, and finally, this leads to my claims about how Zapatismo, as a rhetoric, was created in Mexico, how it spread, and how it was rewritten by the various participants in Seattle 1999; however, this is done more to contrast how other activist organizations defined and enacted Zapatismo in comparison to the Mechistas, who used the rhetoric as an organic pedagogy to teach themselves how their organization was connected to and could resist global

organizations like the WTO. This not only backs Jeff Conant's claim that Zapatismo and Zapatistas can be both whatever and whoever is needed to combat neoliberal economic theory and practices, but is also a way to use the intersection of a material rhetorical analysis and an archival study to make a comment about rhetorical historiography.

Using my definition of rhetorical historiography as a rhetorician's attempt to articulate how a designated rhetoric was used by whom and for what purposes, I begin the final chapter by asserting that my methodology can be used as a way to critically think about and analyze how everyday acts, undergirded by everyday talk and writing, must be foregrounded in the theorizing of rhetoricians studying protest movements and their concomitant rhetorics. To demonstrate the difference such a seemingly mundane prescription can make, I apply a truncated version of my methodology to the claims surrounding the "Twitter Revolution," which is also referred to as the "Arab Spring."

I then conclude the dissertation by explaining the pedagogical implications for composition and rhetoric. I assert that in the composition classroom, protest and social movement rhetorics–especially the protest movements where the participants are not white—could serve as a way to bring public sphere rhetorics to a classroom setting. In turn, this would be the creation of pedagogical goals reminiscent of James Berlin and Sharon Crowley: to use the classroom as a space to engage the histories and rhetorics that are "transforming what we do and how we live" (Miller 255).

Seattle, Rhetorical Velocity, Identity Shift, Transnational Politics, and Materiality:

Watching Rhetoric Bleed

By

Brian Bailie

B.A. California State University, San Bernardino, 1998

M.A. California State University, San Bernardino, 2007

Dissertation

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of doctor of Philosophy in Composition and Cultural Rhetoric in the Graduate School of Syracuse University

May 2014

Acknowledgements

My time in graduate school at Syracuse University has been marked by a long history of collaboration with my various CCR cohorts, the Writing Program faculty, generous readers and responders from the wider discipline, and my family. Without the various contributions from the people constituting each of these groups, I would have never finished writing this dissertation. This project bears the marks of these people in numerous, small ways; I am deeply indebted to each and every one of these men and women for their contributions.

First, I need to thank my director, Eileen Schell. My dissertation project had its beginnings in her 2007 "Social Histories of Rhetoric" course. Without her feedback, guidance, and at times, goading, I would have never thought to write about protest movements and protest rhetorics. Moreover, without her patience and perseverance I would have never been able to present the project in its finished form. When the project began, I had much different, very grand, and—in retrospect—an exceptionally nebulous set of goals for this project. Almost each and every one of them proved unfeasible; however, through Eileen's above mentioned patience and perseverance, we collaboratively came up with a project that was both feasible and focused through long meetings in her office or marathon telephone conversations. Most importantly, she shared with me how such a project could contribute to both composition and rhetoric studies, not just rhetoric studies. By focusing on what the field could become instead of what it is currently or what it was in the past, Eileen enabled me to see how my dissertation contributed to the larger, scholarly conversation of writing studies, and moreover, how such a project joined rhetoric and composition together.

Next, I'd like to thank Steve Parks. From very early on during my time at Syracuse, Steve has always expressed a genuine and continuing interest in my research. As someone who's

keenly aware of the intersections and overlaps between composition pedagogy and practice, the material reality of composition programs in the neoliberal university, liberatory pedagogies, community partnerships, and political theory, Steve always provided advice and constructive criticism concerning this project as well as my other scholarly pursuits. Steve has also always been amazingly confident about my ability to finish my dissertation. More than anything else, I would like to thank Steve for his confidence in me.

I would also like to show my gratitude to other members of my committee. I would like to thank Patrick Berry for his extensive and honest feedback every time I turned a chapter draft into him. Without his suggested readings or advice on how to streamline chapters/sections/paragraphs, this document would have been twice the size and yet said only as half as much as it does now. I would like to thank Kevin Mahoney for his patience, enthusiastic encouragement, and for collaboratively writing *Democracies to Come: Rhetorical Action, Neoliberalism, and Communities of Resistance* with Rachel Riedner. Without their book, this project would read much differently than it does now.

And last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank Jackie Rhodes for her pep talks every time I hit a roadblock with this project and her ability to completely rearrange her busy schedule to make time for any scrap of writing, any free write, any rewrite, or any document I've sent her way over the last few years. For a relationship that started over an innocuous comment she made in a class she was teaching about a t-shirt I happened to be wearing that day ("Your shirt says "Drow." I'm running a level 10 Drow wizard in one of my games at the moment."), our professional relationship has been remarkably productive and affirming. Jackie has been a stalwart colleague whose advice always lightens whatever neurotically imagined cross I feel that I'm bearing.

In a small and collegial minded program like CCR, invariably you, as a grad student, share almost everything with your cohorts. In my case, I shared quite a bit with two cohorts in particular: Justin Lewis and TJ Geiger. Both served as confidants and intellectual sparring partners. Without them, the early stages of this project would have been brutally slow and the project—most likely—would have ground to a halt completely if not for their ability to listen to my whining, offer sympathy, and then refocus me on the business of dissertation writing. Thank you.

I would also like to pass my thanks on to the poet, Santee Frazier. Santee served—and continues to serve—as my "offstage" friend whom I complain to about any number of the personal and professional issues that irk me daily, yet would land me in serious hot water if I shared these thoughts and observations with anyone else. Without his unique perspective, Stoic demeanor, and practical advice, I would have long ago left Syracuse to become a cranberry farmer. Thank you.

To my parents, Paul and Felisa Bailie, I would have not been able to see this project to its completion without your enthusiasm, affection, and support. Thank you for the year you both gave me in Missouri and for the use of the yellow house on Main Street. To my brother Seth and my sister-in-law Kate, thank you for the financial support you both provided so I only had to work part-time during my year in Missouri. I now realize that, contrary to what I thought when I was younger, I need my family.

Finally, I want to thank Shara and William. Thank you for reminding there is more to life than work, the academy, and dissertation writing. There's something better just around the corner. Let's go find out what it is together.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Material Rhetorics—A Literature Review

The event I'll examine in this project is the World Trade Organization (WTO) protest of 1999, also known as the Battle of Seattle, through the texts found at the WTO History Project[1]. This archive contains a plethora of materials—pamphlets, fliers, teach-in documents, and zines—associated with the five days that rocked Seattle and became a significant moment in the history of popular protest. Thousands of protestors from various backgrounds, professions, and causes—elementary and secondary school teachers, environmentalists, Teamsters, faith-based coalitions, Communists, members of nongovernmental organizations, high school students, Wobblies, farmers, college students, Longshoreman, Metal Workers, and neighborhood activists, from both the United States and around the world—came together and disrupted the world's then most influential trade-governing body. The members of this diverse demonstration were pepper-sprayed, tear-gassed, shot with rubber bullets, corralled, and jailed, but stayed, in the words of writer-participant David Solnit, "firm in the midst of it all till the front page of national papers cried out, 'Talks Collapse'" (1).

Throughout the series of events that made up the Battle of Seattle, there was what sociologist Sidney Tarrow describes as an "identity shift." In *The New Transnational Activism*, Tarrow claims that in a moment of identity shift there is a "cynical" drive to mobilize "new and 'detached' elements of identity onto 'embedded' ones" (123), by local activists in an attempt to win a local conflict at the local level through staging a collective action made up of various partisan groups.

---

[1] *The WTO History Project* website explains that that The WTO Project is "a joint effort of several programs at the University of Washington—the Harry Bridges Center for Labor Studies, the Center for Communication and Civic Engagement, the Digital Initiatives Project and the Manuscripts, Special Collections and University Archives (MSCUA) division and the University Libraries." The point of the project is "to make a wide array of resources available to researchers and the interested public via the Internet" (*The WTO History Project* website).

Tarrow's writing partner, Donnatella della Porta, has a much more nuanced view of identity shift. In "Multiple Belongings, Tolerant Identities, and the Construction of 'Another Politics': Between the European Social Forum and the Local Social Forum," della Porta explains that identity shift is not a cynical move but a way to "*fluidify*" (187, emphasis original) identity. This fluidity allows for overlapping memberships between protest groups and for common values to propagate from group to group, as well as the creation of communication channels that allow for the "borrowing" of bodies for future protests. This ability to make identity fluid allows for the creation of an awe-inspiring (when mobilized for street action) "movement of movements" built on the members' "multiply faceted identities that reflect [the very mundane and very often overlooked] social complexity" of an issue while also respecting the individual activist's "'subjectivity'" (186). The outcome is an "emphasis on diversity" and the development of "common campaigns on objects perceived as 'concrete' and nurtured by an 'evangelical' search for dialogue" (186) among the members of temporary coalitions.

The purpose of this project is to discuss identity shift in a fashion similar to how della Porta describes it; however, the main component of this project is to explain *how discourse and language engender such a shift*. Guiding this exploration are three questions:

1. How did the texts and artifacts preserved at the WTO History Project help create the various moments of identity shift that occurred among the different protestors who participated in the Battle of Seattle[2]?

2. In what ways are these texts and artifacts connected to alternative globalization movement forums, like the World Social Forums?

---

[2] The Battle of Seattle occurred over five days: November 29th through December 3rd, 1999 and is the time period I reference above.

3. If the Seattle Direct Action Network (DAN) was connected to these alternative

    globalization forums, then how did the texts and artifacts saved by the WTO

    History Project work as the bridges connecting these activist organizations?

Using the concept of rhetorical action [3] from rhetoric and composition studies, I will claim that there is a way to describe collective actions as something meaningful and at the same time a meaning-making process requiring activist-actors to exhibit agency to participate in. Essentially, using my research at the WTO History Project, I argue that the Battle of Seattle protests were enabled by material rhetorics[4]. Through this combination, I argue that identity shift is a purposeful, self-teaching act requiring actors to conceive of themselves as new subjects that interpolate the world around them in ways counter to the dominant hegemony. I plan to trace out this process by performing a rhetorical analysis foregrounding material rhetorics; in such a methodology, agency is a quality occurring in the "in-between zone or state where 'brain, body, and culture conflate'" where the mind is not "'a disembodied reasoning engine,'" but rather an organ of "'environmentally situated control'" (Malfouris qtd in Gries 6).

Material Rhetorics: A Definition and Three Categories

What are material rhetorics? They are more than a variation of classical rhetoric, just as studies in African American rhetoric are more than an exercise in demonstrating how the rhetorical practices coming out of the African American community are similar to, if not the same as, the rhetorical practices of the Greeks or Romans of antiquity. Material rhetorics attempt

---

[3] To paraphrase Rachael Riedner and Kevin Mahoney, rhetorical action is the set of practices contributing to everyday meaning-making, and more specifically, social-political practices of making, reproducing, and remaking social relations and identities so as to intervene in relations of dominance and exploitation.

[4] To borrow from Carole Blair, to construct rhetorics as "material" means thinking of a given rhetoric as having some type of consequence beyond what the speaker/writer intended, and simultaneously, having an effect on experiential reality, too. Later in the chapter I will discuss material rhetorics at length.

to unsettle the codified practices in rhetorical studies about what constitutes the proper topic of study, often

- providing a critical account of how affective connections work within the creation, production, and effect of rhetoric;

- reimagining the amount of power a speaker or writer wields over an audience;

- analyzing the relationship between a writer or speaker and the audience and the power of the audience to make meaning;

- understanding how identities can be created using rhetoric;

- paying attention to how rhetoric circulates within specific, social ecologies, and

- addressing how social histories enable or influence the reception of specific rhetorical tactics.

In short, material rhetorics aim to restructure how rhetoricians understand how rhetoric works. First, it promotes the idea that rhetoric is not static. In the realm of material rhetorics, the meaning of rhetorical artifacts change over time and communicative messages can be edited, rewritten, remixed, mashed up, and filtered so as to meet the goals of new rhetors. Second, it promotes the view that the present social reality is the product of history, social relationships, and the institutional forces shaping individuals of a given society—not the outcome of some essentialist, teleological narrative. For the material rhetorician, history, social relationships, economics, and institutions play a reciprocal part in the (re)creation of rhetoric. Third, material rhetorics contextualize rhetoric as the product of experiential reality.

Rhetoricians using a material rhetorical analysis see rhetoric neither as a purely cerebral activity, moving a single individual through *logos,* nor as something confined to the floor of the

debate hall or the speaker's platform. Rhetoric, from a materialist point of view, is probabilistic reasoning that occurs in all spaces and at all times in response to either the most mundane issues or to the most life-altering events; moreover, it can occur in the binaries of speaker/audience, writer/audience, individual/individual, group/group, and can be either a top-down, hierarchical affair or a situation where single (or multiple) interlocutor(s) work with (or against) another (or other) interlocutor(s) of equal footing. Finally, material rhetorics assert that physical spaces transmit rhetoric—*sans* any corporeal speaker or writer or architect or explanatory text—offering specific rhetorical messages to passersby. Moreover, material rhetorics allow us to understand how passersby work with these spaces to either promote the creator's original intent or complicate that creator's intent and reinvent the rhetorical significance of a given space.

In turn, this means awareness on the part of material rhetoricians that rhetors develop or reinvigorate various rhetorical strategies to meet the demands of the situation in which they (the rhetors) find themselves. Hence, there is a constant emphasis on the part of material rhetoricians to map out the affective connections among the words, artifacts, monuments, or spaces they examine and the current socio-political context. Certainly, other disciplines do similar work; however, this approach is important for rhetorical studies as it clashes with and calls into question individualist and structural determinist methodologies. The benefit of this type of rhetorical analysis (although at times unwieldy) is a belief in agency on the part of the individuals participating in moments of rhetoric as practical reasoning and the belief that individual agency and social structures are interdependent, historical, and material. Consequently, there is a belief that material rhetorics can create change in both individuals and the structures they work with/in or against, and furthermore, that rhetoric as probabilistic reasoning can reproduce or revise current social relations.

This belief in change means there is a concomitant concern with understanding how rhetors make these changes using their specific suasive tactics. Therefore, in combination with the concern for the relationship of rhetorical events to the material world that sustains and produces them, material rhetoricians make it a point to map out how a given rhetorical act is connected (whether through remix, mash-up, or the traditional work of editing a multi-edition text) to the tropes, institutions, and previous rhetorical acts. This move is predicated on overtly articulating how a given meme, slogan, monograph, argument or pedagogy is perceived as valid, and thus, is more persuasive in contrast to other memes, slogans, monographs, arguments or pedagogies.

All of the works cited in this review interrogate the traditional notions of rhetoric by offering different versions of material rhetoric from approximately the last two decades. My aim in this chapter is to organize, sort, and arrange these works thematically to demonstrate how material rhetorics can be useful to analyzing social protest movements. Instead of attempting a comprehensive review of all the work on material rhetorics, I have selected specific monographs, critical articles, anthologies, and special issues of journals that most cogently deal with the central points of material rhetorics as identified earlier in this chapter. While most scholarship concerned with the rhetoric of social movements or the rhetorics of protest discusses how organizations recruit or assesses the effectiveness of how specific demonstration tactics work as persuasion, I claim an analysis mindful of material rhetorics makes for a more probing, deeper analysis and provides a thicker description of how protests and protestors use rhetoric. Material rhetorics complicate, politicize, and allow for agency among the demonstration participants—something unheard of within most traditional studies coming from the abovementioned disciplines. I provide, then, a *telling* overview rather than a *comprehensive* one; however, I

believe the texts here can reshape and retool how rhetoric is discussed in the context of protest and demonstrations.

I've organized the selected body of texts into three broad categories:

1. Material rhetorics shaped by history,

2. Material rhetorics shaped by the concept of mapping,

3. Material rhetorics that emphasize affective connections.

My aim is to demonstrate how pervasive discussions about material rhetorics are in the fields of communication, rhetoric studies, and writing and rhetoric studies as well as to demonstrate what counts as material rhetorics, and moreover, to highlight the flexibility of material rhetorics as part of a methodology.

Historical

The following texts discussing material rhetorics are influenced by the core principles of Marxist thought, that is:

- reality itself can be defined and understood;

- society shapes our consciousness;

- social and economic conditions directly influence how and what we believe as well as what we value;

- everyday life and interactions with others shapes an individual's self-image as well as ideas about what's true, possible, and probable;

- language is the carrier of social change;

- the economic base (and who controls it) influences and shapes the superstructure of a given society;

- and the utopian ideal that Marxism can change the world to a classless society where moderate wealth, opportunity, and education are accessible for all peoples is possible. (Bressler 162)

The texts addressed below use these tenets as the warrants that undergird their claims about material rhetorics. The overall message of these texts is the changing of the dominant hegemony through understanding rhetoric and the processes involved in composing written texts. Through having a facility with rhetoric and understanding what goes into the production of a written document, it is assumed—by the authors—that the students will come to understand the history of class warfare in the United States. Basically, a previously apolitical student becomes an organic intellectual by acquiring a critical literacy founded on Marxist principles that can be applied to any object or product or body produced by and traversing through a capitalist society. In terms of my project, these texts demonstrate how it is plausible to encourage identity shift through an education built on a historical understanding of present-day material conditions.

A materialist, Marxist text of note coming out of composition and rhetoric is the 1992 special issue of *Pre/Text*, guest edited by John Trimbur and James Berlin. In the introduction, Berlin and Trimbur explain the lack of a Marxist rhetoric. Citing the American fear of all things Marx (the Red Scare, the Cold War, liberalism, McCarthyism) Berlin and Trimbur claim the discipline has no Marxist rhetoric since it came of age when discussing such a philosophical foundation was forbidden.

This issue, therefore, is a deemed a report that unevenly and sometimes stutteringly seeks to articulate some of the determinants of what might become a "fully developed [Marxist] position–Gramsci, feminism, British cultural studies, institutional critiques, American radicalism, the New Times' Post-Fordism, radical pedagogy, working-class academics" (7). As an attempt to unify such a broad corpus of texts, Trimbur and Berlin describe the contributors to their issue as public teachers/intellectuals, and then situate these public teachers/intellectuals within the project of Antonio Gramsci's organic intellectuals. These public teachers turned organic intellectuals are of the working class who must be constant, persuasive advocates who speak "for the workers and to the workers, articulating their interests and encouraging their rise to economic and political control in word and action" (Berlin and Trimbur 11, Gramsci qtd in Berlin and Trimbur 11). After explaining Gramsci's concept of dual superstructure and hegemony, Berlin and Trimbur assert that within this overarching ideological framework the writing and rhetoric instructor's function, while occupying the structural position of the traditional intellectual, is to critique the rhetorical devices of hegemonic discourse, thus offering an alternative rhetoric to students—one that forwards an emancipatory counter-hegemony.

Using a Marxist idea of material reality yet couching it in the work of Italian Marxist philosopher Antonio Gramsci, this special issue of *Pre/Text* describes the work inside the writing classroom as the battle for social hegemony. In the essays within the issue, the writing and rhetoric instructors who contribute embody Gramsci's ideal teacher; they are "active participants in practical life, as constructor, organizer, and 'permanent persuader,' presenting the teacher as activist continually relating the materials of the classroom to the struggle of the larger social setting" (12). The overall goal for all the writers in the anthology, according to Berlin and

Trimbur, is to gauge the kind of political action possible, pursue it with due intensity, and pass those options along to their students.

One essay of note in this special issue of *Pre/Text* is C. Mark Hurlbert and Michael Blitz's "The Institution('s) Lives!". Hurlbert and Blitz's essay starts out with discourse and teaching like the other texts mentioned in this section, but then overtly maps out how the discourse of the university forms an architecture of power to shape and shift identity, and consequently, mold the experiential realities of physical bodies. In sum, its analytic discusses rhetoric as practical reasoning and stretches that concept by likening institutions to living bodies, and then maps out how those institutional bodies shape and use the meat of living, human bodies. While this essay demonstrates the diversity of approaches contained within this issue of *Pre/Text*, it also points to the interesting connection between language and physical objects. Language, often seen as slippery and ephemeral, creates real, solid, and experiential roles for objects in Hurlbert and Blitz's article—whether those objects are human bodies or brick-and-mortar institutions. Language, and the texts, which codify and embody the official language of the ruling class, modify and mobilize the desire of these living institutions. In turn, these living institutions modify and mobilize the desire of the human bodies they have within their purview. By its very presence in the special issue, this essay seems a subtle call from the editors for a move away from vulgar Marxist analyses[5] in writing and rhetoric studies towards a more detailed type of Marxist analysis looking to explain the discursive tactics of the dominant class in very detailed ways.

---

[5] By using the phrase "vulgar Marxist analyses," I am referring to work of Marxists who use reflection theory, i.e., that superstructure directly reflects the economic base, and thus those who control the base shape the superstructure of a given society. While helpful in explaining the general idea of Marxist thought, such work based on this type of foundation tends to neglect the complex relationships in a society as well as the possibility of agency by individual actors.

Continuing this discussion of how institutional bodies shape living, human bodies is Bruce Horner's *Terms of Work for Composition: A Materialist Critique* (2000). Horner grounds his material analysis of composition studies through the Marxist tradition of historical materialism. For Horner, the way to remedy the common claim that historical materialism is too wound up in the base-superstructure dichotomy is to assert that historical materialism has not been material enough. Borrowing from Raymond Williams, Horner claims that focusing on intellectual work in material terms stops the actual discussion of the material processes—the physical work done in experiential reality. Horner argues that by foregrounding the actual steps involved in intellectual work, it is possible to see such work as coming from material reality, not working against, autonomously, or in spite of the material conditions around it. This point is important to Horner as he's arguing that composition classrooms are the place to spread counter-hegemonic discourse to the masses, and that potential relies on a continuing focus on the work done in the composition classroom by the living, breathing bodies of composition instructors and students. Essentially, Horner argues that what students and instructors do with their hands and minds matters; such work shapes the reality of each person in the classroom as well as his/her identity. Claiming that the work done in the classroom is part of a larger, interconnected web of institutional requirements, disciplinary discourses, and in-class assignments, Horner uses historical materialism to fight off what he sees as composition studies' turn to professionalization and the devaluation of work done in the writing classroom.

The exigency of Horner's argument is built on a belief that both agency and social structures are connected. Paraphrasing Anthony Giddens, Horner makes the case that the use of structural determinist and individualist methodologies in research such as his often removes structures from their "instantiation in time, eliding their material historicity" (xix), consequently

over-exaggerating or foreclosing the possibility of agency on the part of individuals as well as

imagining both agency and structure becoming construed as "discrete and opposed rather than

material, historical, and interdependent" (xix). The duality of structure serves as an important

piece to this book since it addresses oversight by recognizing the interdependence of agency and

structure and their location in time. Horner claims "[t]his enables us to identify the limited

effectivity, and so the potential for changes to, and within, both agency and structure. From this

perspective, work is the occasion for both "reproducing and revising material social relations"

(xix). Using a material rhetorical critique based on such foundations, Horner makes the overall

goal of *Terms of Work* to acknowledge the power of existing material conditions in composition,

how those conditions shape the work done in composition, and the historicity of those

conditions–so as to point out "their susceptibility to changing consciousness and action" (xvi).

In contrast, Victor Villanueva's "The Material Matters: Rhetoric and Political Economy"

(2007) is a more recent text returning the discussion of materialist rhetoric to the concept of the

organic intellectual created via pedagogy. In this short essay (a longer version appears in *Radical*

Relevance: Toward a Scholarship of the Whole Left) Villanueva builds his claims about

materiality on two pillars: rhetoric and political economy. Villanueva explains that rhetoric is

> the art of persuasion, or the finding for any given case the available means of
>
> persuasion, to paraphrase Aristotle. With Kenneth Burke, anything that is
>
> symbolic…Those symbols are language—the language of the alphabetic sign
>
> system, the language of musical and visual arts, the language of mathematics. If
>
> we communicate it, it is rhetorical (n.pag.).

Villanueva then defines political economy as concerned with the relationships of the "economic

system and its institutions to the rest of society," and continues, explaining that the political

economy is affected by non-economic factors like "social institutions, morality, and ideology in determining economic developments" (Ridell, Schakford, and Stamos qtd in Sackrey and Scneider, vi)" (n.pag.). Finally, Villanueva makes his focusing claims, stating when power is not coercive, then political economy is concerned with the "rhetorical and the economic" (n.pag.).

Based on this, Villanueva claims we need the tools of both political economy and rhetoric—since both demystify economics and symbolic communication—so as to influence change in the larger social/political/public spheres. In using the example of W.E.B. DuBois's *Black Reconstruction in America*, Villanueva demonstrates (through rhetorical analysis of an excerpt) how the slave economy of the American South gave rise to a set of political practices that used rhetoric to convince people of its appropriateness within that milieu. Villanueva sums it up by explaining the process like this: "Political exigency arising from economic conditions gave rise to a rhetorical trope—the inferiority of a race, according to DuBois."

For Villanueva, material histories have an effect on the material reality of people today; material history shapes the ways people believe it's possible to navigate or change experiential reality. In that vein, Villanueva claims in the conclusion of "The Material Matters" that rhetoric and political economy are bound together, and therefore, there is a pressing social need for all citizens to understand rhetoric. Through understanding rhetoric, goes Villanueva's reasoning, it is possible for everyday people to understand institutionalization and the ways that institutions shape identity and material reality. Fundamentally, Villanueva claims that rhetoricians can foster the creation of organic intellectuals through their positions within the academy. The unstated warrant of Villanueva's argument is that this is done through teaching, and hence, the task of the rhetorician is to make the affective connection of rhetoric and the political economy visible— either as a pedagogue or a public intellectual.

This brief review of texts demonstrates that Marxist thought shapes material rhetoric in two distinct ways: 1) through discussion and analysis of work in relation to historical materialism and 2) through the idea of the organic intellectual and pedagogies that contribute to the shaping of said intellectuals. While both these facets of material rhetoric are important, what I find troubling is that these texts stress the importance of education as the way to individual agency; each text also assumes this awakening concerning individual agency happens due to an individual's time within the academy, an institution of the superstructure. Even though the figure of Gramsci looms large in both the special issue of *Pre/Text* and in Villanueva's "The Material Matters," none of the texts in this section broaches the idea of the creation of organic intellectuals through unsponsored—meaning outside of the academy's reach—discursive and/or physical activities. And yet each text is important as it demonstrates how consciousness, and, I would forward, *identity* can be changed through an education focused on rhetoric, writing, and materiality.

Mapping

While the above Marxist influenced pieces on material rhetoric see the classroom as a space for liberation, there are a series of articles that "map out" how rhetoric influences material reality through the lens of discursive analysis. These articles are different from those I've placed under the heading "historical" because they do not see the classroom as a space for liberation nor do they see the inevitable, teleological conclusion of their projects as the liberation of the proletariat and the proletariat's inevitable (and successful) uprising against the bourgeois. These articles lean towards a poststructuralist standpoint. In these articles, rhetoric and discourse matter as they do create the structures and institutions that shape the lives of everyday people, yet their

arguments are couched more from the standpoint of an observer with a flashlight demonstrating for a reader lost in the dark how the present moment is a pastiche of history, present context, and texts/language. While not exceptionally different from the articles I'll place under the heading "affective connections" nor antithetical to the articles under the above heading, that is, "historical," the difference between these articles and the others is their lack of overt concern with physical bodies and their disbelief in a working class revolution founded on education. These exercises are much more cerebral, written in the vein of detachment and intended for a more scholarly audience so as to either extend the audience's knowledge base or help them continue their work as professional experts venturing beyond the walls of the academy. In all the below-mentioned articles, there is a distinct, covert assumption that society works in a top-down hierarchy, evidenced by the writers' collective concern with the public sphere and hegemonic policing on the part of a shadowy ruling class. In terms of my project, these texts demonstrate how discourse is deployed to gain and maintain a hold on the conduct of individuals. More importantly, they demonstrate how material rhetorics can be used to make that discursive architecture of control visible.

Michael McGee's "The 'Ideograph': A Link between Rhetoric and Ideology" (1980) defines an ideograph as an ordinary word found in political discourse that is a high-order abstraction representing a collective commitment to a specific but nebulously defined goal; the goal often found to be "normal" and good by the nation-state/culture where the ideograph is deployed. McGee asserts that ideographs warrant the use of naked power, excuses actions and beliefs oftentimes seen as socially inappropriate, and guide "behavior and belief into channels easily recognized by a community as acceptable and laudable" (15). Ideographs also have the power to guide behavior and belief negatively by branding one-time laudable behavior as

unacceptable. For example, the Taliban in Afghanistan were at one time "freedom fighters" resisting the advance of the Soviets which made them allies of the American people; however, now they are "Islamo-fascist fundamentalists" who threaten freedom, and therefore, are now enemies of the American people. McGee claims ideographs are culture-bound, yet some can be used across cultures.

McGee finds the ideograph an important concept since he believes it does away with the poetic element of symbolists rhetoricians' constructs. McGee counts Burke, Dewey, and Cassirer among these symbolists yet, simultaneously, he explains the truth about power and ideology undergirding these symbolists constructs. Metaphors like "'[r]hetoric,' 'sociodrama,' 'myth,' 'fantasy vision,' and 'political scenario'… [and] their links with the trick-of-mind that deludes individuals into believing that they 'think' with/for/through/ a social organism" (15) are made tangible and traceable when defined and treated as ideographs. McGee explains that the work of the symbolists is important because it focuses on the "media of consciousness, on the discourse that articulates and propagates common beliefs" (15), and thus, the ideograph makes the truth of symbolists constructs visible through framing them as a "legitimate social reality" accepted by, and propagated through, individuals using a "vocabulary of complex, high-order abstractions that refer to and invoke a sense of 'the people'" (15). By learning the political ideographs that are diffuse and circulate through a given society, McGee closes his article by claiming that it's possible to understand how people are dominated by ideology/hegemony, saying

> By learning the meaning of ideographs, I have argued, everyone in society, even
> the 'freest' of us, those who control the state, seem predisposed to structured mass
> responses. Such terms as 'liberty,' in other words, constitute by our very use of
> them in political discourse an ideology that governs or 'dominates' our

> consciousness. In practice, therefore ideology is a political language composed of
> slogan-like terms signifying collective commitment. (15)

This text, much like "The Institution's Live(s)!", makes clear the ways language harnesses and mobilizes desire. Furthermore, when using the ideograph it provides a way to trace the relationships between language, texts, institutions, policies, and the effects of language on the interplay of objects and bodies in making material, social reality. The text below demonstrates how the ideograph can be used by a rhetorician.

David Coogan's "Service Learning and Social Change: The Case for Materialist Rhetoric" (2006), claims a materialist rhetoric, built on McGee's notion of the ideograph and then applied to service learning, provides the rhetorical means to make "changes in institutional practices" (672) shaping community-based organizations (CBOs). For Coogan, changing these institutional practices is much more important than the oft-sought-after grand scale changes in public discourse, literally, the "publicity effect of rhetoric" (672). This is built on the idea that the public advocacy most service learning/community literacy courses promote and hope to accomplish does not, contrary to current belief, "begin with the principles of good argument…but with an analysis of those historical and material conditions that have made some arguments more viable than others" (668). This means applying a materialist critique to the various communities/CBOs with which a service learning class works. The appeal of service learning for Coogan is, consequently, two-fold. It's not just a case for rhetorical activism in service learning but also "a case for rhetorical scholarship in the public sphere: a challenge to test the limits of rhetorical theory in the laboratory of community-based writing projects in order to generate new questions for rhetorical theory, rhetorical practice, and rhetorical education" (670). Coogan continues, explaining that "in this light, [service learning] offers rhetoricians a unique

opportunity to discover the arguments that already exist in the communities we wish to serve; analyze the effectiveness of those arguments; collaboratively produce viable alternatives, with community partners, and assess the impact of interventions" (668).

Coogan explains that all speakers involved use ideographs; furthermore, instead of speakers expressing themselves in original ways when they use these ideographs, Coogan claims that the speakers use specifically placed ideographs to justify their (the speakers') actions done in the name of the public. In analyzing an ideograph, Coogan asserts that a rhetorician (doing service learning work) can understand the ideological pulse of the community in which she works. A close observation by the rhetorician-teacher, noting how people within the community use the same ideographs to justify, explain, or guide policy in specific situation but for different purposes makes clear the commitments of the various interlocutors in the community. These disagreements also serve as material, visible markers of dissensus and prompt the design of new and viable alternatives to the problems faced by all the stakeholders involved.

The overall goal is to make change through using these analyses to deploy a context based rhetoric specific to a given time and place and interlocutors, that is, for the rhetorician to become a rhetor. This means not just composing criticisms of past rhetorical actions, or moments of decontextualized consciousness raising, or the creation of deliberative bodies consisting of community activists and university students/faculty. The idea is to persuade community members to make material change through linking the identification of ideographs, narratives, and characterizations to "techniques of power," and therefore, train community members how to make material change through enabling people in "under-served communities to 'use language and literacy to challenge and alter the circumstances of daily life' (12)" (Coogan, Cushman qtd

in Coogan 690). Overall, Coogan's text is a call to make changes in communities by accomplishing specific, tactical goals set by either CBOs or individual community members.

R.W. Greene's "Another Materialist Rhetoric" (1998), offers up a third way for material rhetoricians. For Greene, materialist rhetorics often try to account for the representational politics of symbolic communication, not for the tracing out of how material reality forms affective connections and works to diffuse various ruling class rhetoric(s). Because of this, Greene sees two distinct types of popular materialist rhetorics. The first follows what he terms a "logic of influence" model, meaning these materialists "focus on how the interests, often understood as a will to power, of a speaker are hidden, distorted or revealed by that speaker's rhetorical choices" and emphasize "rhetoric's role as a form of persuasion" (38). The second follows what he describes as a constitutive model of rhetorical effectivity, meaning these materialists focus "on how the text functions to politically and aesthetically figure the process of subjectivity" and emphasize "rhetoric as a form of identification" (38).

In the same article where Greene offers his dichotomy of materialist rhetoric, he also offers a third way that eschews this binary, which he describes as the logic of articulation. This logic of articulation is "a way to map the multidimensional effectivity of rhetorics as a technology of deliberation" (39). Greene describes the advantage of this logic of articulation as the foundation for a type of materialist rhetoric that replaces a "hermeneutics of suspicion" (39), with a form of cartography that does not reduce the materiality of rhetorical practices to the interests of the ruling class. This logic of articulation also allows for the maintenance of the "irreducible difference between rhetoric and other material elements" such as the "technologies of power, and the self in the creation of a governing apparatus" (39).

Greene argues that a materialist rhetoric built on the logic of articulation avoids positioning the forces of capitalism, white supremacy, and patriarchy as essential qualities of the U.S. governing apparatus. For Greene, a materialist rhetoric built on his self-described logic of articulation maps out how these forces are transformed, displaced, deployed, or challenged by the governing apparatus. As Greene puts it, "In other words, the 'macro-structures of power' exist less as hidden interests to be uncovered than as technologies distributed, activated, and programmed by rhetorical practices for policing [the] population" (39). Additionally, this model also conceptualizes rhetoric as a form of deliberation, or practical reasoning, that is, a "human technology" (Greene 30), which is something all peoples, regardless of socio-economic class and cultural clout, have access to so as to use as a "technique that makes meaning possible" (Greene 30). In turn, rhetoric constructed in this way is seen as a productive element to society, one which transforms subjects, institutions, and knowledges so as to make these materials useful to the rhetor. Through this notion of rhetoric and the abilities of rhetors, rhetorical studies—at least for Greene—becomes a "geographical project committed to mapping the multidimensional effectivity of reading, writing, and speaking" (35).

Overall, this collection of texts—McGee, Coogan, and Greene—makes clear the importance of rhetoric and discourse to material reality. Mapping out the ideographs or rhetorical tactics in relation to material context of a given rhetor allows the rhetoricians within this section to discern with some reliability what is constructed as "true" in U.S. society. This mapping method simultaneously allows a rhetorician to trace out how said rhetor worked within the confines of the U.S. social reality to make her claims seem valid while at the same time making those of her interlocutors seem "false," and therefore, unpersuasive. While useful, the drawback of these texts is that they do not attempt to show how rhetorics and the phrases signifying such

rhetorics are transmitted from person to person and place to place. That is to say, they do not broach the question: how does a rhetoric as an ideograph or a rhetoric as a deliberative technology have a life beyond the initial rhetor's release into the public sphere? That is, how and why are these techniques and ideographs recycled and reused by various rhetors?

Affective connections

The texts in this section of the review discuss not only institutions and discourse, but the human body itself as it navigates spaces filled with other bodies and discourses, controlled by institutions, with various rhetorics built on various histories deployed by numerous interlocutors. What these texts are concerned with is how rhetorical acts come out of these social ecosystems located within material reality, and moreover, how they evoke specific reactions out of the living, breathing bodies of everyday people. In terms of my project, this category of material rhetorics is the most useful. It takes into consideration the scene of a given rhetorical act; the history, objects, and people working within that scene; and the ways a rhetorical act moves from one social ecosystem to another. While most of these theories do not specifically discuss nor focus on affect, that is emotion, but on materiality, I assert they are useful in thinking about and mapping out the movement of texts/speech acts. Based on that thinking and mapping, I will makes claims about the affect of a rhetorical act, or even the affective connections tied to these rhetorical acts.

A text written about the affect of material reality on the body and the resulting production, reception, and (re)invigoration of rhetoric is *Rhetorical Bodies* (1999)[6]. This anthology, edited by Jack Selzer and Sharon Crowley, is a sustained reflection on material rhetoric in both senses of the term, that is, a "meditation on the material aspects and groundings

---

[6] This anthology is actually a byproduct of the 1997 Penn State Conference on Rhetoric and Composition.

of language as rhetorical action" (Selzer and Crowley 9), and the rhetorical nature of material reality—whether it involves spoken or written texts, i.e., literate reality, or visceral, physical reality.

Due to Crowley and Selzer's design, the contributors included in the anthology do not create a hard and fast dichotomy between the material and the literate, instead opting to consider what it might mean to take "very seriously the material conditions that sustain the production, circulation, and consumption of rhetorical power"(9). In this collection, it does not matter if the "power" wielded by a rhetor as she deploys her rhetoric comes via a written composition, a speech, or some physical form like the composition of a space through the arrangement of walls and statues or images and functions within a digital interface.

More impressive is how Selzer and Crowley created a collection of essays foregrounding the body, literally, how nonliterate practices and realities, "most notably, the body, flesh, blood, and bones" are sculpted by literate practices, and thus, should come under "rhetorical scrutiny" (10). Integral to this move is the belief that to achieve this there must also be a serious attention paid to the material circumstances that sustain (or sustained) these literate practices shaping bodies. With this focus, Selzer and Crowley and the various contributors imagine rhetoric as laying hands on flesh and shaping experiential reality on a visceral level. In this text, the essays rarely discuss formal pedagogy or rhetorical effectivity as envisioned by a rhetor. Instead, the focus is on how bodies work in concert with rhetoric and materiality to make sense of experiential reality. The best example from this anthology is Carole Blair's work on memorial sites.

In "Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric's Materiality," Blair asks readers to consider the materiality of rhetoric by moving away from the traditional notions

of rhetoric as a means to achieve the goal(s) of a specific writer/speaker. According to Blair, due to liberal humanism (and the location of several rhetoricians within humanities departments) rhetoric is often seen as symbolic (or symbolizing or symbolic communication) as well as a set of practices for one actor to achieve a specific goal. Often the goal is to persuade, or influence, or to communicate effectively, which for Blair is all well and good; however, she explains that while these models are a "reasonably accurate description of the motivations people have for engaging in rhetorical practices…it describes a motivation rather than an essential or definitive characteristic of rhetoric" (21). More importantly, this way of conceptualizing rhetoric "creates additional difficulties for rethinking rhetoric as material" (21).

For Blair, constructing rhetoric as "material" means thinking of rhetoric as having some type of consequence beyond what the speaker/writer intended, and simultaneously, having an effect on experiential reality, too. Essentially, Blair asserts that rhetoric is not reducible to pure symbolism and asks her reader to consider what it means to think of rhetoric as extending beyond the goals of an individual rhetor. Blair then challenges the reader to consider rhetoric in these two ways: "we must ask not just what a text means, but, more generally, what it does; and we must not understand what it does as adhering strictly to what it was supposed to do" (23), "what it was supposed to do" as defined by the rhetor creating the moment of rhetoric.

To begin thinking about the materiality of rhetoric beyond the traditional rhetorical triangle, Blair considers five memorial sites (the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the AIDS Memorial Quilt, the Civil Rights Memorial, Kent State University's May 4 Memorial, and the Witch Trials Tercentenary Memorial) while using five questions to guide her exploration of each as a rhetorical text. The five questions are:

(1) What is the significance of the text's material existence? (2) What are the apparatuses and degrees of durability displayed by the text? (3) What are the text's modes or possibilities of reproduction or preservation? (4) What does the text do to (or with, or against) other texts? (5) How does the text act on people? (30)

The overall message of the article is very consequentialist, something akin to Kevin Porter's work in *Meaning, Language, and Time*. Meaning changes with time, various audiences, and even what cultural or emotional baggage individual audience members bring with them to each site; moreover, all of this can be affected by the material conditions of the memorial site on the day of the visit.

In turn, the silent warrants under both Blair's and Porter's claims are that audiences who view a rhetorical artifact have far more power than often attributed to them by more traditional rhetoricians. In both Blair and Porter's work, an artifact "speaks" or is "evocative" or is "persuasive" or seen as a "true depiction" of a moment in time or a feeling because the audience works in concert with the artifact. This move breaks Lloyd Bitzer's concept of the rhetorical triangle because the speaker/writer goes from all powerful individual who can craft a rhetorical act/artifact which will always mean the same thing—if crafted well enough—for all people who happen upon it for time immemorial. Both Porter and Blair assert (Porter overtly, Blair covertly) that time is not panchronic nor is a rhetorical act static. In turn, this means rhetoricians must see rhetoric as more than production by a single rhetor, and, moreover, that the rhetorical effects of a text go beyond the rhetor's intended (and limited) goals.

Blair calls for rhetoricians to begin articulating how rhetoric changes and is diffused throughout a given rhetorical ecosystem. Blair makes these claims because she argues from the

starting point that rhetorical critics have always pushed their readers to ask questions about invention, about the construction of the rhetorical text instead of pressing them to ask "what happens to or with a text once it has been produced?" (21). Essentially, Blair asks us to consider, once the goal of the rhetor is no longer sacrosanct, how a text or artifact circulates, changes, and depends on its environment and future interactants for its relevance. In this vein, Blair asks the reader to imagine rhetoricians who go beyond the "narrow study of effect, understood as goal fulfillment", and once an amount of critical distance has been achieved through the asking of this question, she asks her readers to think about how the study of effect as goal fulfillment currently diverts rhetoricians from the overtly "partisan character" of rhetoric. Blair then asks the reader to consider "[h]ow do we begin to theorize materiality, in the face of these obstacles?" (23). In sum, Blair argues that artifacts have their own materiality, yet that materiality is dependent on the context of time, place, and audience; that their meanings are malleable; and texts (and Blair counts monuments as texts) actually affect one another (physically or at a distance through mediums like film/video photography) as well as affect individuals interacting with the monuments.

Blair uses monuments to explain how her ideas about rhetoric having a physical, material dimension can be observed in the experiential world. Blair claims that any rhetoric introduced into a physical environment changes said environment; to read a book means the reader must stop her other activities, often find a place to sit, and then give time to the act of reading; when discussing public oration, Blair discusses how an audience member must change their routine to go to the place where the talk is being given, then she must stand still or sit, and then be quiet so as to hear the speaker. As Blair explains at the most mundane level rhetoric encourages (or discourages) us to "act or move, as well as think, in particular directions" (46).

Because of this, Blair admonishes her readers to consider the materiality of constructed sites in any rhetorical analysis. Constructed sites, according to Blair, do obvious work on the body. Blair explains constructed sites "direct vision to particular features, and they direct—even control—the vector [and] speed" (46) of the spread of rhetoric. In Blair's model, rhetoric acts on "the whole person…the material aspect of rhetoric does significant work to shape the character of the rhetorical experience" (46).

In the same mindset of shaping bodies, Kevin Mahoney and Rachel Riedner's monograph, *Democracies to Come: Rhetorical Action, Neoliberalism, and Communities of Resistance* (2008), makes specific claims about how the architecture of institutions works to shape individuals. Moreover, Mahoney and Riedner discuss how these institutional rhetorics evoke emotions from individual bodies. The emotions created by rhetoric, according to Riedner and Mahoney, are important since they are the organic responses to the evocative aspects of discourse or a rhetorical artifact. In contrast to the other scholars mentioned above, Mahoney and Riedner speak of emotion in the way it programs bodies to act in specific ways without overt coercion. This discussion of emotion (bodily sensations) brings the concept of material rhetoric even closer to the material self. In Riedner and Mahoney's monograph, the physical self lives in, works with and against, and mitigates an experiential reality that individual bodies do not have complete control over but can still exhibit and practice some level of agency as they navigate/mitigate a reality created through the conflation of mind, body, affective connections and culture.

How emotion is part of the series of discourses defining what is true and consequently persuasive looms large in Mahoney and Riedner's concept of rhetorical action. Early in their monograph, Riedner and Mahoney define rhetorical action as "a political practice of making,

reproducing, and remaking of social relations, identities, and intervening in relations of dominance and exploitation" (7). In their concept of rhetorical action, both writers pit the work of socially conscious instructors working against neoliberalism, a constructed social force they define as "an economic policy of upward redistribution in which public services are privatized, markets are opened up, and weakened government regulations are allowing corporations the 'freedom' to pursue capital by extending market relations ever deeper into…social relations" (10). In an interesting turn, they see neoliberalism as a social force which is actually a socio-political practice of meaning-making where the making, reproducing, and remaking of social relations favorable to neoliberal inspired capitalism; furthermore, these practices even leak their way into the most mundane practices of everyday people as they attempt to compose their social identities as well as any interventions everyday people may attempt so as to disrupt the cycle of dominance of exploitation common to the status quo of the United States.

Mahoney and Riedner's concept of material rhetoric differs from the other writers in this review as they do not couch the power of the various rhetorical forces in the experiential world as practical reasoning or persuasive "truth." They discuss rhetoric's power as emotional, and explain that the ability of neoliberalism as a pedagogy to exist, thrive, and sustain itself is built on the emotions it evokes from individuals. Riedner and Mahoney explain that in a society dominated by neoliberal capitalism, students are prepared to enter into the workforce, and therefore, interpolates subjects into supporting the continuation of the social status quo through the circulation and realization of capital. Riedner and Mahoney claim neoliberalism produces "structures of feeling, imbrications of economics and social life, including emotional life" (40). According to Mahoney and Riedner, these emotions generate value; reproduce capital; and reinvigorate capitalist culture and the capitalist culture of rhetorical circulation. In this way,

people learn to communicate, and consequently see the world, in a capitalist mode. Thus, through these affective connections, people in this system perform and defend any act which ensures the continuation of capitalism.

Essentially, Mahoney and Riedner argue that the rhetoric of neoliberalism is a pedagogy which teaches that the rhetorical ploys of neoliberalism are not socially constructed, but that they are a series of gospel truths. In this way, neoliberalism produces a visceral reaction (emotionally and physically) so individuals see identifying with neoliberal capitalism's goals as concomitant to their own; the veracity of any claims coming from this ideology is "felt" to be true. Due to the traditional divide between mind and body and Romanticism, things "felt" on the visceral level are "felt" to be beyond examination. This concept can be connected to both the work of Greene and Hurlbert and Blitz; all agree that this moment of persuasion, whether described from the angle of logic or emotion, is the product of several discourses coming from, intertwined with, and connected to individuals, institutions, and political/social interests.

Riedner and Mahoney see critical pedagogy as another form of rhetorical action, one that runs counter to the discourses of neoliberalism. Critical pedagogy (the specific pedagogy they forward is built on the foundation of Derrida, Gramsci, and Freire, yet also incorporates the work of Marcos, Hardt and Negri, Harvey, Mohanty, Williams, Spivak, Butler, and Jarratt) is a set of practices—just like neoliberalism—that encompasses a way to learn, live, exist and react to experiential events. According to Mahoney and Riedner, critical pedagogy can be deployed inside and outside the body of the academy. Critical pedagogy, in Riedner and Mahoney's framework, is anathema to neoliberalism since it is a form of rhetorical action aiming for the "production of new critical literacies," which depends, in part, on "'ingenuity, artistry, and swiftness of thought' but also on a relationship to power and abilities of the subject to create

affective relationships in conjunction with dominant and emergent structures of feeling" (41). Critical pedagogy as rhetorical action creates an "openness for new practices and affective relationships" that already exist, yet haven't been "articulated in recognizable, strategic, or liberatory form" (41). Deploying critical pedagogy, assert Mahoney and Riedner, allows for the "complete re-articulation" of the current socio-political landscape, a re-articulation which "sets the stage for intervention in rhetorical spaces fundamental to democracy" (41).

Diffusion of specific rhetorics along these affective connections

Just as important as interconnected networks of people, discourse, and rhetorics are theories about how rhetorics are diffused over these networks, that is, how rhetorics move between seemingly disparate and unconnected individuals and/or groups. More important is theorizing how rhetorics evolve, change, and are (re)invigorated during this diffusion process, and furthermore, the idea that rhetoric moves between people in ways not often discussed in classroom settings. The texts discussed below demonstrate how individuals can work within intertwined social networks, individuals who simultaneously pay special attention to the rhetorical social-historical context and find evocative ways to demonstrate agency through the creation of various rhetorical artifacts/tactics as well as, sadly, how that agency can be subverted[7]. The upshot of these texts is that they provide ways of circumventing the easy move of saying all action by any actor is completely determined by their context and the accompanying rhetorics of more powerful actors who share that context.

First, there is the work of (what I call) ecocompositionists and eco-rhetoricians; ecocompositionist Margaret Syverson's *The Wealth of Reality: An Ecology of Composition*

---

[7] Here I mean Collins's work with the monograph *The Account of Hester Rogers*. While depressing and counter to the more upbeat, liberating discussions of the other texts, Collins's article is still important as it describes how to traverse these affective connections and get closer to the intentions of the original marginalized writers/speakers.

(1999), and eco-rhetorician Jenny Edbauer's "Unframing Models of Public Distribution: From Rhetorical Situation to Rhetorical Ecologies" (2005) in particular. Both scholars present rhetorical ecologies within two venues germane to scholarship in comp-rhet, the various instances of composing (Syverson) and in a pop culture context (Edbauer). Both writers stress the interconnected nature of composing and persuading; Syverson explains how ecological composing works through "interrelated and interdependent complex systems," with a complex system being defined—in a rather oblique and spectacularly nebulous way—as "a network of independent agents—people atoms, neurons, or molecules, for instance—act and interact in parallel with each other, simultaneously reacting to and co-constructing their own environment" (3). These complex systems are "adaptive" and "dynamic," and they defy "any attempt at a strictly mechanistic explanation" (4).

Similarly, Edbauer conceptualizes that the rhetorical situation is in flux, fluid, always changing and in complete opposition to the traditional rhetorical triangle of speaker-audience-message. Edbauer demonstrates her model by tracing out how the slogan "Keep Austin Weird" moves throughout the city of Austin during a public debate about urban sprawl and gentrification. Edbauer argues that the traditional rhetorical scene "of already-formed, already discrete individuals," is a scene where audience is an "unproblematic and obvious site" (7). Quoting Barbara Biesecker, Edbauer explains the problem with this construction of rhetoric is that if the audience of any rhetorical event is

> no more than a conglomeration of subjects whose identity is fixed prior to the rhetorical event itself, then…the power of rhetoric is circumscribed: it has the potency to influence an audience, to realign their allegiances, *but not to form new identities*. (Biesecker qtd. in Edbauer 7, emphasis mine)

Edbauer tracks the use of the "Keep Austin Weird" slogan to demonstrate how rhetoric forms

new identities, as well as create various exigencies—beyond fighting sprawl and gentrifications,

the original exigency which facilitated the creation of the slogan—and alliances between varying

and very dissimilar individuals/groups throughout the city of Austin.

Key to all of this is Edbauer's construction of rhetoric. Instead of seeing rhetoric in the

typical sender-message-receiver framework, Edbauer traces out and articulates the movement,

and more importantly, the creation of identity via the "Keep Austin Weird" catchphrase through

what she calls a framework of "affective ecologies that recontextualizes rhetorics in their

temporal, historical, and lived fluxes" (9). In doing so she theorizes "rhetoric as a public(s)

creation" (9), a means to create and recreate identity and affinity in constantly changing political-

social milieu. This "rhetoric as a public(s) creation" articulates the intertwined nature of rhetoric,

texts (broadly defined), material reality, and individual cognition. The articulation of these

moments within rhetorical studies foregrounds agency and ecosystems/networks of rhetoric, of

complex environments where meaning, ideology, and writing emerge.

To discuss how specific texts can travel these ecologies of rhetoric and composition, Jim

Ridolfo and Danielle Nicole DeVoss's "Composing for Recomposition: Rhetorical Velocity and

Delivery" (2009), address what it means when a text goes beyond a rhetor's intended goals, but

they also attempt to understand how a rhetor can create an open ended, boilerplate text designed

to be changed and modified—so the interactants who come to the artifact later in its lifespan can

actively reinvigorate and retool said artifact (or text) for a new purpose. Ridolfo and DeVoss

begin by asking these two questions: how might a new media text be rewritten by a future writer,

and for whom, why, and where might this text be written? To help readers think through these

questions, their (Ridolfo and DeVoss's) entire text is represented as a press release, a traditional

document often written with these ideas in mind since the original writer wants other writers to take up the information and re-release it within their own publications.

The key concept in this process of considering how to compose with the intention of recomposition is their concept, rhetorical velocity. DeVoss and Ridolfo explain rhetorical velocity in this way:

> The term rhetorical velocity, as we deploy it in this webtext, means a conscious rhetorical concern for distance, travel, speed, and time, pertaining specifically to theorizing instances of strategic appropriation by a third party. In thinking about the concept, we drew from several definitions:
>
> 1. Rapidity or speed of motion; swiftness.
> 2. Physics: A vector quantity whose magnitude is a body's speed and whose direction is the body's direction of motion.
> 3. The rate of speed of action or occurrence (n.pag.)

This is their basic definition of rhetorical velocity; the web text explains several elements that go into rhetorical velocity. However, for the sake of brevity, I'll only recount the example Ridolfo and DeVoss give to demonstrate how texts are composed with rhetorical velocity in mind. Using the example of Iraqi insurgent videos, DeVoss and Ridolfo explain how short "attack videos" are designed to be distributed, re-shown, and re-edited depending on audience, time, and place. The authors use these videos to explain rhetorical velocity as "a strategic approach to composing for rhetorical delivery," asserting the videos demonstrate "delivery as a rhetorical mode, aligned with an understanding of how texts work as a component of a strategy" (n. pag.).

For Ridolfo and DeVoss, rhetorical velocity is the "strategic theorizing for how a text might be recomposed by third parties" and how this recomposing "may be useful or not to the short-or long-term rhetorical objectives of the rhetorician" (n.pag.). Due to the stress of delivery as a matter of tactics, as delivery "leading to social action," delivery is no longer a simple matter of genre convention or a "concern for the management of voice and gestures" (DeVoss and Ridolfo n.pag.). Ridolfo and DeVoss explain:

> In this sense, the rhetorician weighs the positive and negative possibilities of different types of textual appropriation against desired objectives: "If I release the video in this format, could the video be used in this way, and would it be worth their time to do this? And would it be supportive of my objectives for them to do that?" And in this sense, the theorizing of the question of "is it worth the time to do this" calls into question a set of economic and material concerns. (n.pag.)

After such a description, the issue is, then, how does this process happen with more traditional texts, or more succinctly, texts which begin their lives as paper documents.

To discuss how the same process can happen with more traditional texts, there's "The Speaker Respoken: Material Rhetoric as a Feminist Methodology" (1999), by Vicki Tolar Collins. In this piece, Collins defines material rhetoric as the theoretical investigation of rhetorical artifacts by "examining how the rhetorical aims and functions of [an] initial text are changed by the process of material production and distribution" (547). Collins's definition of material rhetoric is based on the notion that the material world matters; that it shapes the conduct of people and the activities in which they engage; and that these activities steeped in experiential reality shape human consciousness.

Using *The Account of Hester Ann Rogers,* Collins begins, inspired by the work of Jennifer Wicke, a "material based conduct of human activities" (Collins 547), examining the various editions of the book to see how each changed with the material events going on around it, e.g., the year, the historical context, the editor, the gender of the editor, the goals of the editor, the publishers; in short, what she calls the "publishing authorities" at the time outside of Roger's sphere of influence.

From here, Collins goes on to identify a difference between the writer and these publishing authorities, literally naming these figures as those beyond the writer who control how a text is printed, reprinted, added to, or used in public speaking engagements. With this in mind, Collins explains the majority of her article will focus on "rhetorical accretion," a process that she claims explains how *The Account of Hester Rogers* has been reprinted, added to, or used in public speaking engagements since its original publication; furthermore, Collins states that the chronicling of the layers built upon *The Account* will be the central project taken up in this article. Collins explains that

> [a]s a reader of multiple texts, the production authority sometimes decides to combine them—for example, to attach an introduction representing a certain ideological viewpoint, to include a dedication indicating who supported the writer, or to publish a work in a volume with other works rather than as a solo text. (547)

However, Collins is quick to point out how rhetorical accretion is the product of human agency; moreover, with "each accretion to the text the speaker of the *core* text is respoken" (548, emphasis mine). For Collins, material rhetoric is key to her project because it penetrates and

examines "the layers of rhetorical accretion, reading each one closely not only for the nature of its own rhetoric but also for how it colors the ethos of the core text and what it, along with the modes of production and distribution, indicates about cultural formation in the larger discourse community" (548). The rest of the article is Collins working with Roger's original, core text, demonstrating the rhetorical accretions of the text, and then illustrating how the purpose of the text changes with each layer.

On the whole, the texts of this section make clear the material, physical consequences of rhetorical acts. All of the writers in this section point to the possibility of a re-articulation of the current social scene through deployment of a specific rhetoric via a composed text. In this sense, rhetoric becomes a human technology, that is, the human technology of probabilistic reasoning. I claim that in moments of protest, probabilistic reasoning shaped by the affective connections between individuals and the immediate context is the space where new possibilities and new solutions are formulated in response to the problems faced by various rhetors. In these instances, an individual rhetor isn't working as "'a disembodied reasoning engine,'" but rather, as Andy Clark argues, an organ of "'environmentally situated control'" (Clark qtd in Gries 6).

In turn, this means that reasoning and agency, that is, the tools and practices available to an individual to navigate a material reality, is not built solely on an individual rhetor's ability to use symbolic communication as a way to solve problems. Agency and probabilistic reasoning are qualities occurring in the "in-between zone or state where 'brain, body, and culture conflate'" (Malfouris qtd in Gries 6); agency, probabilistic reasoning, affect, and social change are things occurring through material engagement.

Being mindful of the material rhetorics from this specific category could also mean much for other subspecialties in rhetorical studies, in particular rhetorical historiography. Instead of an

overriding concern for how the teaching of rhetoric changed the classroom practices in the past or how a set of rhetorical practices serves as the crystallization of social class relations for a particular time period, an awareness of material rhetorics dealing with affective connections would ask future rhetorical historians to work at creating more robust reproductions of the time periods they study. This would mean a more concise reconstruction of the time period in question beyond the documents found in a special collections folder, or in the case of Collins, only analyzing books.

Essentially, new sources of evidence would be needed, pushing rhetorical historians away from the "pristine and venerable" (Octalog 8) world of monographs, as well as towards new methodologies to make sense of these new sources of evidence. To a degree, this work has been started by scholars like David Gold and Jessica Enoch. My work is an attempt to add to this body of scholarship, and specifically, make topics of inquiry from the recent past more common in rhetorical historiography. In turn, more work from rhetorical historians could target more current phenomena like globalization, disaster capitalism, political upheaval, or social/political revolution with a premium placed on first person accounts. This project attempts such a move.

Conclusion

Rhetorical analysis benefits from the precepts of material rhetorics as identified in these different scholarly areas because the inclusion of materiality ensures a much thicker, fuller description of the object of study. When it comes to social protest movements, the inclusion of materiality ensures work done in rhetoric is truly from the discipline, and not a methodology borrowed from the social sciences. Furthermore, using a method based in rhetoric and writing studies means a more nuanced understanding of how everyday people use discursive means to

navigate experiential reality in ways often overlooked by methodologies originating in the social sciences. Even using the limited number of texts discussed above, it is clear that material rhetorics can describe moments of protest in much more complex ways that also plumb the depths of the repercussions coming out of rhetorical acts like protest. Additionally, using such a corpus of text to inform an analytical method can describe the reflexive, intertwined relationship between rhetoric, humans, texts, and the experiential realities created by this relationship.

Chapter Two: Methodology

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I spoke at length concerning material rhetorics. The reason for such a lengthy discussion was to point out that material rhetorics discusses the natures and relations of texts (broadly defined) to humans, and that it asks rhetoricians to consider how the physical qualities of the text, the history of the text, the understanding of that text which a reader brings with her to that text, and the intertextual readings which occur based on the previous elements in this list affect how a given rhetoric is taken up and redeployed when a reader decides to become a re-deploying rhetor. The outcome of this set of mental gymnastics is how people make sense of the various discursive acts they encounter through their lifetime, and in turn this shapes how people understand the material world as well as what they think is probable, possible, and achievable.

In that vein, there are two major claims to this project. First, texts are objects that can mobilize the subjectivities of individuals. Texts work upon and with humans to create moments of identity shift, that is, change the ways humans see the world, how they present themselves to others, and how they interact with the objects and peoples around them. Second, humans can modify pre-existing, forgotten texts giving them new life, and then use them to mobilize the subjectivities and desires of other humans, that is, introduce texts into an environment to foster an identity shift[8]. Essentially, I am claiming that texts, people, and rhetorical acts are intertwined with materiality and human agency.

---

[8] In this paragraph I use the verb "foster" so as to signal individuals still have agency. The degree to which a person changes is still dictated by the individual the text works upon/ with in moments of identity shift, as well as that individual's position in relation to other objects within her specific material ecology.

Based on these claims, I hypothesize that the process of identity shift occurs during protest because texts have the ability to change the way a person at a given moment in time relates to other people, other texts, and various exigencies within that person's immediate, physical environment. In short, identity shift occurs as various texts (broadly defined), people, and exigencies interact with one another. Of course, this means thinking of rhetoric in a new way, "not as it is frequently understood…as 'success' or goal fulfillment" (Blair 21) but as a way to articulate how material objects—people, texts, books, composing/communication technologies, phones, monuments, social histories etc.—work together to create reality and can continue to create reality beyond a specific moment in time. Or to put it more simply, and to paraphrase Blair, rhetoricians need to look beyond the goal of the original rhetor who released a rhetorical act into public. Rhetoricians should also look at the effects of a text—effects that go beyond the rhetor's original goal. And this, I would argue, is the strength of material rhetorics and an analysis built on it: the power of rhetoric, from a material rhetorics standpoint, is not circumscribed. Rhetoric(s) has (have) the ability to influence people, to realign their allegiances, to *reform their identities*, to create material reality through probabilistic reasoning, and can be understood to map this reality making process (Biesecker in Edbauer 7). And none of this is restricted by a rhetor's original intentions for her document or speech act.

The Purpose of this Chapter

This chapter describes my critical method and the theory that will help explain the phenomena uncovered by the "lens" of this critical method. The critical method is rhetorical analysis; however, I'll use Carole Blair's heuristic from her essay "Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric's Materiality" to understand the material consequences of the

various Zapatista texts that influenced the Mechistas'[9] choice to dress as EZLN soldiers, the army of the Zapatistas, on November 30th, 1999 during the Seattle WTO protest. In my endeavor to read the Mechistas' bodies as text in chapter four of this project, I'll lean heavily on Blair's definition of rhetoric, and its concomitant definition of what constitutes a text. Blair explains in "Contemporary," that she takes "rhetoric" to be "any partisan, meaningful, consequential text," the term "text" to be "understood broadly as a legible or readable event or object" (18).

Blair understands this definition can be dangerous and offers one condition, which is this definition "serves [its] purpose to the degree that the characterization seems at least reasonable" (18), meaning the focus of her reader must shift further back to "question the source of the stipulated characteristics—partisanship, meaningfulness, consequence, and even legibility—we must identify what makes these characteristics possible" (18). For Blair, the answer to what makes these characteristics possible is the materiality of the text; she claims "No text is a text, nor does it have meaning, influence, political stance, or legibility, in the absence of material form" (18). Simply put, "rhetoric is not rhetoric" until it is "uttered, written, or otherwise manifested and given presence" (Blair 18). Essentially, a text is the physical presence of a rhetoric, and that presence can come in any form as long as it exhibits partisanship, meaning, consequence, and legibility.

In the case of the Mechistas in Seattle 1999, Zapatismo[10] was given physical presence when they dressed as Zapatistas and marched through the streets of Seattle. Because of this, the bodies of the Mechistas must be read like texts to understand the material consequences of Zapatismo. Through understanding the material outcomes, and even the motivations for

---

[9] Mechista is the term used by interview subjects Randy Nunez and Miguel Bocanegra to describe the individual members of *Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan,* or MEChA.

[10] Zapatismo is the organizing political philosophy and rhetoric of the Zapatista rebels of Chiapas, Mexico.

becoming living texts, I claim it is possible to understand how the rhetoric of Zapatismo traveled to Seattle and even come to understand the Mechistas' motivation for appropriating a set of suasive tactics originally concerned with acquiring farm land for indigenous Mexicans. To do this, we have to ask Carole Blair's questions about the material effects of these Zapatista texts on the experiential reality of November 30th, 1999. Below are the questions that make up Blair's heuristic to delineate the material consequences of a text, and thus the rhetoric it broadcasts:

(1) What is the significance of the text's material existence?

(2) What are the apparatuses and degrees of durability displayed by the text?

(3) What are the text's modes or possibilities of reproduction or preservation?

(4) What does the text do to (or with, or against) other texts?

(5) How does the text act on people? (30)

In answering these questions, the analysis will go from the arena of symbolism, that is, discussing/explaining how the most well-known Zapatista, Subcomandante Marcos, is a metonymic figure and what he, and therefore the Zapatistas, "really meant" to people around the world in 1999. Simply put, this will not be a moment of exegesis. The questions above will guide us to consider the material effects of the Mechistas as Zapatista texts: how dressing in this manner moved bodies; how it affected the entire body and not just in the abstract concept of the mind; how specific rhetorical acts silenced other possible rhetorical acts; how physical space was changed by a rhetorical act that would be different in the absence of said rhetorical act; and how dressing as Zapatistas enabled a "fluidifying" (della Porta 187) of identity among the Mechistas

so they could mobilize and march in the N30 protest in good conscience[11]. I claim Zapatismo's ability to affect material reality is one of the key reasons this rhetoric was taken up by the Mechistas. This also means considering rhetoric from the stand point of material consequences, and not perseverating on the production of these rhetorical acts in deepest, darkest Mexico, pondering how the Mechistas' actions were the outcome of a finally tuned, well-crafted moment of delivery by Subcomandante Marcos.

The rest of this chapter will be devoted to theorists whose work can describe why the construction of a text matters beyond the narrow purpose of success or goal fulfillment. In using material rhetorics, I believe it is possible to discuss how texts and rhetorical acts move about the social world and shape how human beings understand experiential reality. In this process of reality making, the importance is not whether or not the text or act was a successful moment of persuasion, but how the text or act affected the physical, material world and the rhetors writing the text or performing the act. All the work presented below has existed for some time (some of it, like the work of Kenneth Burke, for decades); however, I believe this eclectic collection of scholarship will provide the language, outlook, and frameworks necessary to describe the complex systems of composition that brought Zapatismo to Seattle in 1999.

Kenneth Burke

As Burke explains in *A Grammar of Motives*, dramatism works on five key terms, or grammatical resources. They are: act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose. Using these

---

[11] Miguel Bocanegra and Randy Nunez were the Mechista organizers for N30. Bocanegra and Nunez were troubled by the DAN efforts to organize local communities—especially communities made up of people of color. Specifically, it was the DAN's disregard for existing activist networks in these communities. As Bocanegra recounts in his interview, "I think…that in order to organize a community, you have to be a part of that community. I'm not going to ask somebody from Redmond to come and organize a Chicano community in Eastern Washington. That's ridiculous" (Bocanegra and Nunez 4).

grammatical terms helps a scholar get at the motivations of an actant, or in Burke's term, an agent. The term "act" names what took place, either in thought or deed; "scene" names the background of the act or the situation in which it occurred; the term "agent" names the kind of person who performed the act; "agency" describes what means or instruments the agent used; and "purpose" is the why behind the act.

Burke continues on to explain that these grammatical resources can be thought of "as principles" which rhetoricians can use to understand the motivation of various agents. Regardless of the "various philosophies" an agent uses to navigate material reality, Burke claims these five terms when used in varying combinations—called the pentad—can make clear the motivations behind that agent's actions. For Burke, articulating how cooperation occurs is important. Understanding how one person links with another, the ability to demonstrate this connection, and how one person decides to cooperate with a dissimilar person was the reason Burke developed the pentad and the theory of dramatism in general. According to Burke, the connections between one person[12] and another are ambiguous, that is, unclearly defined and amorphous. Ambiguity, for Burke, exists at all levels of reality and in all relationships. Using the pentad, Burke believes it is possible to understand how people achieve consensus about the nature of reality, what immediate problems need to be solved, and how people create moments of cooperation to solve these problems. For this dissertation, that means the ability to articulate what motivated one agent to take on the identity of another agent or agents (an identity shift), and moreover, how the processes and objects within a given scene enabled cooperation between these various agents. In this case, cooperation would be the transformation of ambiguous and specific differences so as to organize a contingent of people to participate in a massive demonstration.

---

[12] Burke says the pentad is useable for just about anything—terms, words, ideas, principles. Since my dissertation is dealing with people, I will use agent or person throughout this section.

The emphasis on transformation built into the pentad will be important as that is what this project attempts to map out: the transformation of one identity to another and the motivating, material factors or objects behind such a transformation. Specifically within the terms of the Battle of Seattle, I foresee the pentad as the way to come to a deeper, context specific, and more nuanced understanding of what events worked on—or worked with—the various Mechistas from around Washington state to mobilize for a giant protest in Seattle, 1999. In the case of the WTO protests, my claim is that the pentad will illustrate how the Mechistas interacted with Zapatista texts to begin the identity shift from members of MEChA to soldiers of the EZLN, the military arm of the Zapatistas. I assert this shift lasted for the duration of the WTO meetings through identification and consubstantiality, which are two more of Burke's concepts.

This first concept, identification, is what Burke sees as the ultimate goal of rhetoric. Literally, identification means person A uses rhetoric to convince person B that A's cause matches B's interests (*A Rhetoric of Motives* 24). This process of identification simultaneously uses *pathos*, *ethos*, *logos*, and *kairos*. Through identification, person A and person B become similar yet separate; they are separate individuals containing two different loci of motives. However, through identification both individuals become "joined *and* separate, at once a distinct substance" (*A Rhetoric of Motives* 21; emphasis added), yet similar since they now cooperate with one another to achieve the same goal. This joined but different state, when person A and person B see their goals and well-being intertwined, is what Burke names consubstantiality, the second concept I mention above. Essentially, two (or more) people working together based on identification means all see themselves as consubstantial to the other.

Still, while Burke's work provides a macro-understanding of how a rhetorical act works in concert with the other pieces of an agent's scene, it does not explain how discursive acts

(texts, speeches, slogans, teach-ins) create reality. These acts are, very often, ephemeral, or at least deteriorate quickly. They rarely are made of brick or stone or mortar. With this quandary in mind, below I present various concepts from writing studies that explain how discourse becomes material. In this sense, I am both justifying my focus on written documents (artifacts) and introducing the theories I will use in chapter four to explain how rhetoric works as if it were a physical object in creating these moments of identification and consubstantiality.

A Theory of Reality Making from Composition (Writing) Studies

In *The Function of Theory in Composition Studies*, Raul Sanchez's primary claim is that writing is creation. Writing is the mechanism of "doing," e.g., writers "do" ideology, writers "do" culture, writers "do" epistemology. What Sanchez means is that writers reproduce ideology, culture, and epistemology. And this "doing" is writing.[13]

In turn, this means writing, which he also claims is *the* act of signification, is the location of culture. Writing is generative, and culture must be made and remade; ergo, writing is the way a culture is (re)produced and survives from the present into the future. With this in mind, writing becomes an enunciative act, and borrowing from Homi Bhabha, writing as an enunciative act means writing is a moment of creation. Using a quote from Bhabha, Sanchez explains writing as a "more dialogic process that attempts to track displacements and realignments that are the effects of cultural antagonisms and articulations—subverting the rationale of the hegemonic moment and relocating alternative, hybrid sites of cultural negotiation" (Bhabha qtd. in Sanchez 79). For the purposes of this project, this idea of writing as creation serves as a way to justify the importance of focusing on textual artifacts.

---

[13] It can be argued that Paulo Freire and James Berlin have argued the same things. I do not refute that. However, in reading both Freire and Berlin, I never came across a definition about the function of writing that was so simple and compact.

For example, in later chapters I'll be examining how a contingent of students representing MEChA came to the decision to march in the students' demonstration dressed as members of the army of the Zapatistas, the EZLN. Based on my research, this contingent of Mechistas based their protest identities on the seemingly simple act of reading Zapatistas' communiqués and the talk within their communities about NAFTA, the Zapatistas, and globalization. These community conversations, according to the interview subjects, had been going on sometime before the 1999 protest, and the communiqués they claim sparked these talks had already been emanating from the Chiapas for roughly nine years by the time of the 1999 WTO protests. The ability of the communiqués—coupled with the everyday talk of the community and the subjects' memberships in MEChA—to engender an identity shift would make them an important artifact within my rhetorical analysis, as well as be an example of Sanchez's theory "in the flesh," so to speak.

And this idea of "writing in the flesh" would be why I chose to focus on the MEChA contingent. The Mechistas participation in the student protests on November 30th was a moment where writing shaped how flesh and bone bodies presented themselves in public, served as impetus for putting themselves in harm's way on November 30th, and created an epistemology where challenging the prevailing status quo was seen as the right thing to do. Analyzing these communiqués rhetorically could lead to an understanding of how people engage with texts and how these texts engender moments of consubstantiality. Rhetorically analyzing such an interaction between the Zapatista communiqués and the Mechistas could be a way to articulate how texts and humans interacted with each other, and how those interactions created material reality.

In connection to material rhetorics, Sanchez's ideas about writing share common elements with Blair's work since both write about signification. Sanchez discusses writing and

Blair public sculpture, and yet both argue for a consequence beyond a given moment in time. Both writing and monuments "do" something. They evoke feelings, they provide touchstones, they become flashpoints, and they are used as symbols for what a culture is or how a culture grapples with its history. Additionally, these monuments and writings become the strands that connect different points in history, in popular culture, in politics, and in communal folklore in a complex semantic web.

In the case of the MEChA students, I hypothesize the communiqués, as well as the other compositions created by the Zapatistas, are exceptionally evocative considering the material history of Mexican-Americans, Mexico, and Mexican nationals within the capitalist paradigm of the developed north and developing south, the need for migrant laborers, and the history of racism in the United States affecting both immigrants and US citizens of color. When considering this history in relation to the textual objects of the Zapatista communiqués, I hypothesize that it is possible these communiqués became the touchstone that electrified this semantic web, fostering the identity shift of a group of young people from college students to militants. The duration, intensity, and consequence of that shift will be discussed in chapter four.

Returning to the realm of theory, both writing and sculpture in each scholar's (Blair's and Sanchez's) work asks interlocutors to stop, interact, and probabilistically reason with the artifact and other interlocutors about what these artifacts mean. This moment of practical reasoning is a moment of rhetoric on two levels. First, the interlocutors must work together to figure out what the artifacts mean. Second, the interlocutors work with the rhetoric deployed by the progenitor of the artifact. However, what Blair states overtly and Sanchez covertly hints at is that there is a consequence created by this dual layered moment of rhetoric, and furthermore, that this consequence cannot be controlled or planned for by the creator of the artifact. Kevin Porter's

work explains why the consequence of a discursive, rhetorical act like writing or sculpture is

significant. Porter's work will serve as my ontology for this project.

Consequentialism

In *Meaning, Language, and Time: Toward a Consequentialist Theory of Discourse*,

Porter's main project is to work towards a "coherent, explanatory account of meaning and its

temporality" (3). Porter's main claim is that a text survives from the past into the present not

because of some a priori stipulation, but because a text is "fecund" (274). This leads to two

important points:

1. The Meaning [sic] of an utterance or text is fecund not because its

   consequences extend far into the past, but only insofar as its consequences

   continue to propagate into the future.

2. The antecedent fecundity of an utterance does not guarantee continued

   fecundity: Utterances and texts that have been consequential may cease being

   consequential. (274)

For Porter, a text or utterance must have consequence, and therefore, meaning for the audience

engaging with said text/utterance. Utterances and texts move from a state of non-consequence

(i.e. it had no consequence because it had no audience discussing it, reading it, or repurposing it)

to a state of consequence only when some body finds a use for it. This idea of use is what I think

explains why the Mechistas chose to dress like the EZLN on November 30th, 1999. The

Mechistas agreed with the majority of the other protestors associated with the Seattle Direct

Action Network; the WTO was an undemocratic organization making decisions that should have

been hashed out by popularly elected officials. However, the Mechistas also felt that the Direct

Action Network was also flawed when it came to organizing people of color, and the choice to dress as Zapatistas/EZLN soldiers was a way to protest both the WTO and the DAN.

The Mechistas interpreted the documents and talk that meant Zapatismo to them and created a method of organizing that was —to use Porter's term—fecund because it garnered the largest numbers of fellow Mechistas from all over Washington state to participate in their march and compelled individuals to put their bodies and well-being on the line as they turned out onto the streets Seattle to protest. This method based in a reinterpretation of Zapatismo was fecund because it allowed Bocanegra and Nunez (the MEChA organizers) to effectively challenge two adversaries who had more wealth, more cultural capital, and, in the case of the WTO, law enforcement, at their disposal.

Fecundity and History

Acts and texts must be fecund, and this concept extends to history, too. From the standpoint of historiography, I believe this means being mindful of the difference between official history and social histories. Official, state-sanctioned history ossifies as it needs consistency and certitude to prop up the dominant hegemony. Social histories often come from specific communities and cover the issues, topics, and events often glossed over in state-sanctioned history. These "forgotten" topics are often the more radical aspects of a given community in the United States. Essentially, social history is cultural memory. This is where oral histories, linguistic practices, and histories contrary to codified history of the mainstream are kept alive. It is also, to paraphrase Janine Rider, where the creation of a critical consciousness occurs (128).

In writing a rhetorical history, this means paying attention to the stories participants tell when they recount how and why they came to Seattle—even if it counters preliminary claims made in this chapter. These stories that circulate in the "unofficial" world of neighborhood stoops and community centers (loosely defined) are the texts that are fecund in Porter's terms. They serve as the moments of identification that drove activists to adopt specific technologies and align themselves with specific affinity groups as well as adopt the identities of specific international activists. Based on my research, I claim the ability to call upon a history that promotes a different point of view when it comes to the importance and morality of capitalism is part of the identity shift process. From the standpoint of a researcher, this means I cannot assume the role of the expert and "tell" readers of the project the "correct" version of historical events, or worse, speak for the participants in a moment of paternalism.

Language, Text, Rhetorical Acts, and the Mechistas at The Battle of Seattle

As described in chapter one, according to della Porta and Tarrow identity shift is the adoption of a transnational identity in moments of protest. While these sociologists often discuss this concept, what they do not discuss is how this shift occurs in terms of language, rhetorics, and discourse. In chapter four, I'll use the method and the theories discussed in this chapter to focus one group, the Mechistas, to explain how identity shift occurs through language, rhetoric, and discourse. I'll also highlight the importance of this shift was not to become a perfect copy of the original Zapatistas—perfect in the sense of having identical life experiences, interpretations of the Zapatismo, or even goals. I will, on the contrary, argue what was important was the retooling of Zapatismo and the Zapatista/EZLN look is that it became a way to mobilize college students to participate in a large-scale protest. The next chapter will be devoted to the history and rhetorical practices of the Zapatistas and their home of Chiapas, Mexico. The material, place

based rhetoric of the Zapatistas is important in understanding MEChA's contribution to the

November 30th, 1999 protest, and even understanding why the Mechistas veered away from

orthodox Zapatismo—with the full-blessings of the Zapatistas—of Chiapas.

Chapter Three: Zapatismo, Rhetorical Velocity, and Interlocking, Complex Systems

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I claimed that identity shift occurs as various objects, texts, and people interact with one another. I also claimed I could demonstrate how other protestors took up various texts and redeployed them either wholesale or in a revamped form to make a new text more fitting for their immediate situation. In both of these hypothetical scenarios, I theorized that both groups of objects, that is, protestors and texts, are being rewritten as they work with—or on—one another. This brings me to my most ambitious claim, that such a process of mapping and tracing means thinking of rhetoric in a new way, "not as it is frequently understood…as 'success' or goal fulfillment" (Blair 21) but as a way to articulate how material objects, historical artifacts, and actors —people, texts, books, the internet, phones, monuments, social histories etc.—work together to create reality and can continue to create reality beyond a specific moment in time. By making this claim, I join forces with scholars like Carole Blair, Kevin Mahoney, Rachel Riedner, Margaret Syverson, Jenny Edbauer, Jack Crowley, Sharon Crowley, Mark Hulbert and Michael Blitz.

In this chapter, I make good on these claims. In the first section of this chapter, I'll explain Jim Ridolfo and Danielle Nicole DeVoss's concept of rhetorical velocity. Then, I'll discuss the history of the Zapatistas of Chiapas, Mexico, and Zapatismo, their undergirding political and social philosophy that informs their worldview, and thus, their cultural rhetorical practices, including their philosophy of indigenous social action and land rights. Then, I'll discuss how the Zapatistas and Zapatismo provided the foundation for the People's Global Action network; what that network was; and its connection to Seattle, November 30, 1999. In

doing this, the chapter will lean heavily on some of Margaret Syverson's ideas from *The Wealth of Reality: An Ecology of Composition* as an ontology. In using Syverson's work, I believe this is the type of work rhetorical historiographers could do when analyzing protest or social movement rhetorics for a more cogent, apt description of how rhetoric works in the world outside the academy.

In this chapter, that means describing the genesis of Zapatismo, and how this rhetoric underwent a diffusion process that spread it from individuals/organizations through various texts and eventually made its way to the global north. To do this, I'll attempt to situate Zapatista writing within the larger discourses that it was "historically situated" within, meaning a description of all of the "situated technologies, social relations, cultural influences" (Syverson 7) and various social practices that gave it birth, and moreover, how these technologies, social relations, and cultural influences undergirded Zapatismo going viral. In the sense of the larger project, describing the ecologies of composition Zapatismo existed in will explain how Zapatismo spread to Seattle, Washington, and was eventually taken up by the students of MEChA as part of the WTO protests.

The Wealth of Reality

The rhetoric of the Zapatistas serves as a material example of Margaret Syverson's work, *The Wealth of Reality: An Ecology of Composition*. Through this text, Syverson asks readers to reconsider the metaphors we use to describe writing. Oftentimes, she claims the public at large, as well as compositionists, see the creation of a text as the transfer of thoughts directly onto the page. Specifically in the first chapter of her book, Syverson asks readers to reconsider how a text is composed, that is, written. Instead of thinking of it as solely as the transfer of idea to word on

a page, she presses the reader to consider how a text takes shape due to the material conditions in which it was created, not only the act of sitting down to write but also the connecting factors that lead up to and even created the moment of words going onto the page.

In essence, she claims the term "ecology" is a way to think of the act of writing as the outcome of multiple, interlinked complex systems. Syverson advises that in considering an ecology of composition, compositionists should "take into account the complex interrelationships in which writing is embedded," meaning "the people and texts that form a larger conversation in which the writer, text, and reader participate and from which the 'idea' emerges to take written shape" (Syverson 6). Syverson also asserts the writer's interactions with the material environment must be considered, including "technologies of writing, memory aids, the tools and instruments that help shape and support the writing," as well as situating the "composing of the text in a nexus of complex social structures," which include "the personal," "the institutional," and even "the global" (7). Syverson also claims compositionists should "attempt to situate the writing in a historical complex, not only as an unfolding process marked by events such as first drafts and revision" but also "within a larger discourse that is historically situated, and involving situated technologies, social relations, cultural influences, and disciplinary practices" (7).

This is what the following historical discussion of the Zapatistas will be an effort to demonstrate. The Zapatistas existed (and continue to exist) in a specific milieu, using an epistemology coming from that milieu. As the Zapatistas fought with the Mexican government (physically) and released their statements (discursively), they came to see the advantages of a spoken/written revolution over a violent revolution—especially as various NGOs responded to their public statements. In turn, the oftentimes speaker for the Zapatista Party, Subcomandante

Marcos, was created (born? Fabricated? Put in charge of communications?) and began releasing his communiqués into the wider world. Marcos spoke and wrote and was responded to; his ideas about the potential of such communiqués changed as favorable responses emerged, as support emerged, as goals were achieved and new ideas about what winning a revolution looked like.[14]

Additionally, throughout the chapter I will argue that every text—boilerplate or not—can experience rhetorical velocity if these texts evoke a sense of Burke's identification and consubstantiality. These qualities, like most rhetoric, work at the meta level on a reader-interlocutor, and are most effective if they saturate a given rhetorical context. Identification and consubstantiality are the keys to the proliferation of a given text, and recursively, the more a text is reproduced, the stronger the sense of identification and consubstantiality become as these qualities exist in abundance within a discursive system. I claim anyone in a given discursive system, say an individual activist within said system, reads these texts, becomes one with the writer, sees her goals as the same as his, and undergoes identity shift. Using rhetorical velocity in combination with ecologies of composition, I assert it is possible to understand how texts move through large, interlinked discursive systems[15].

Rhetorical Velocity

In "Composing for Recomposition: Rhetorical Velocity and Delivery," Ridolfo and DeVoss develop the concept of rhetorical velocity as way to describe how writers compose texts with delivery, and more importantly, re-delivery in mind. This redelivery, in the framework of the article, occurs as third parties take up a text, reconstitute it, and redistribute said text with

---

[14] For the Zapatistas this meant international support and the establishment of Zapatista controlled zones of Chiapas. These systems, much like the claims of several interlocutors on a given controversial issue, exist on top of, in the middle of, and sometimes in spite of, the Mexican government and its recognized sovereignty of the stretch of North America known as Mexico.

[15] The exact opposite effect is possible, too. Disidentification can occur; however, that is topic for another project.

specific goals in mind. In the paradigm developed by Ridolfo and DeVoss, texts move across networks, interfaces, and mediums with rapidity and for specific purposes; in fact, Ridolfo and DeVoss claim a writer can affect how the text is taken up and reused through strategic choices about delivery. In its simplest form, rhetorical velocity occurs when a composer anticipates and strategizes for a "future third-party remixing…[her] compositions as part of a larger and complex rhetorical strategy that plays out across physical and digital spaces" (n.pag.).

Rhetorical velocity is also a set of actual, material practices. Considerations of medium, distribution networks, and accessible channels are a major part of this set of practices. For example, will a group disperse its message via written press release or video? Internet or television? If the internet, how will it be paid for? What analytics should be used to produce the largest number of search engine "hits"? What should the layout be? What language should be used? Is it possible to curate the page? Could the page be transferred to an archive once the contract with the web host ends? If not the internet, then broadsheets? 'Zines? A press release? DeVoss and Ridolfo explain:

> As a set of practices rhetorical velocity is…a term that describes an understanding of how the speed at which information composed to be recomposed travels—that is, it refers to the understanding and rapidity at which information is crafted, delivered, distributed, recomposed, redelivered, redistributed, etc., across physical and virtual networks and spaces. Thinking with rhetorical velocity in mind requires one to have an idea about the working conditions of the third party and what type of text it would be useful (or not) to provide: What document format should a file be sent in for certain types of future remixing? (n.pag.)

The two bits to focus on in the context of the Zapatistas are "rapidity at which information is crafted, delivered, distributed, recomposed, redelivered, redistributed…across virtual and physical networks and spaces," and "an idea about the working conditions of the third party." What this means is paying attention to how texts are written, delivered, shared, rewritten/respoken, and through what mediums, as well as taking into consideration how these choices were affected by the material conditions of the writer/speaker. In the case of Zapatistas and Subcomandante Marcos, this means considering how a man, or at least a rhetorical icon, crafted messages from the depths of the Lacandona Jungle in Chiapas, Mexico, and, with limited means, sent communiqués around the world. Part of this process means understanding how his messages convey Zapatismo, the rhetoric of the Zapatistas. Creating a highly inclusive, all-encompassing, solidarity filled set of operating principles and organizing philosophy ensures a distribution by many hands over numerous networks (physical and virtual) in several different languages over the entire globe. Additionally, this means understanding how Marcos became a rhetorical icon, and through his status as an icon furthered the cause of the Zapatista Party and the EZLN. To do this, I'll discuss Subcomandante Marcos and his status as an icon, and how the "branding"—to borrow from Jeff Conant—of Marcos, the Zapatista Party, and the EZLN was a consequence of the material history and a series of events occurring in Chiapas, Mexico. Understanding the material history and sequence of events that led to the branding of Marcos, the Zapatistas, and the EZLN occurred can be accomplished by looking at the interlocking compositions and discursive ecologies that formed the milieu of the Zapatistas up until 1999. First and foremost, this means a discussion of land.

The Importance of Land

In *Zapatista!...*, Subcomandante Marcos explains in an open letter to the public,
"Chiapas: The Southeast in Two Winds," the dire situation of the peoples living in Chiapas.
Marcos states:

> Chiapas loses blood through many veins: Through oil and gas ducts, electric lines,
> railways, through bank accounts, trucks, vans, boats and planes, through
> clandestine paths, gaps, and forest trails. This land continues to pay tribute to the
> imperialists: petroleum, electricity, cattle, money, coffee, banana, honey, corn,
> *cacao*, tobacco, sugar, soy, melon, sorghum, *mamey*, mango, tamarind, avocado,
> and *Chiapaneco* blood flows as a result of the thousand teeth sunk into the throat
> of the Mexican Southeast. These raw materials, thousands of millions of tons of
> them, flow to Mexican ports and railroads, air and truck transportation centers.
> From there they are sent to different parts of the world: The United States,
> Canada, Holland, Germany, Italy, Japan, but with the same fate--to feed
> imperialism. The fee that capitalism imposes on the Southeastern part of this
> country oozes, as it has since from the beginning, blood and mud. (n.pag.,
> emphasis mine)

For giving up all these natural resources, Marcos claims there is no recompense. He explains the
cost to the people living in the Chiapas:

> Education [services are]… [t]he worst in the country. 72 out of every 100 children
> don't finish the first grade. More than half of the schools only offer up to a third
> grade education and half the schools only have one teacher for all the courses

offered… One-and-a-half million people have no medical services at their disposal. There are 0.2 clinics for every 1,000 inhabitants, one-fifth of the national average. There are 0.3 hospital beds for every 1,000 *Chiapanecos*, one third the amount in the rest of Mexico. There is one operating room per 100,000 inhabitants, one half of the amount in the rest of Mexico. There are 0.5 doctors and 0.4 nurses per 1,000 people, one-half of the national average. Health and nutrition go hand in hand in with poverty. Fifty-four percent of the population of Chiapas suffers from malnutrition, and in the highlands and forest this percentage increases to 80%. A *campesino's* average diet consists of coffee, corn, tortillas, and beans. ("Chiapas: The Southeast in Two Winds" n.pag.)

Marcos recounts this use of land and these economic/social realities of *Chiapanecos* as a warning. This is what, Marcos implies throughout this particular document, will be the fate of all nations and peoples: living like the citizens of the "banana republics" of the 19th and 20th centuries, yet in today's world, at the peak of the economic "'libertarian revolutions'" where corporations and the elite of the developed world report record profits. Consequently, like the Southeast, everyone will export their raw materials (including human bodies for labor) and in return import neoliberal capitalism's "principal product: death and misery" ("Chiapas: The Southeast in Two Winds" n. pag.). A constant refrain for the Zapatistas specifically articulated by Marcos is that the continuation and spread of colonial era imperialism is now due to transnational corporations; moreover, the economic theory of neoliberalism is the motivating force behind the spread of such barbarism. In a conversation with correspondents Julio Moguel and Hermann Bellinghausen, Marcos flatly states, "the neoliberal project," a venture started by transnational corporations and governments like that of Mexico, is "indefensible" when it creates

so much misery by wresting the natural resources from the land (Moguel and Bellinghausen n.pag.).

The Zapatista Clandestine Revolutionary Indigenous Committee-General Command (CCRI-CG)[16], continues to hammer home this concept of land—that an inability to control land means an inability to control living conditions— with its own press releases. In a May Day statement, the Zapatista CCRI-CG asserts that neoliberalism has created a new unholy alliance of "evil government, corrupt leaders, and the powerful men of money" representing the various global corporations moving the natural resources of Mexico out of Mexico ("To the Workers of the Republic," n.pag.). The CCRI-CG then builds on this claim, saying that Mexico's workers "bleed from three wounds." The powerful "bleed them with unjust salaries, humiliations, and threats." The heads of the evil central government "bleed the workers with extortions, beatings, and death." And in coordination with the other two wounds, individual politicians connected to "powerful men of money… bleed the workers with the dispatches of usurpation" ("To the Workers of the Republic" n.pag.), circling back around to the concept of land by claiming that these politicians write treasonous laws that gives land to foreign investors in return for individual benefit. Due to these three wounds, the CCRI-CG claims that the Mexican worker dies enslaved, humiliated, and in poverty. Additionally, the CCRI-CG claims this miserable existence and end is due to neoliberalism and its endless hunger for Mexican resources and land; furthermore, such a world is possible through corrupt, professional politicians.

The Zapatista answer to this system is direct, transparent democracy. This style of governance is made visible through the governance of the regions—the land— controlled by the

---

[16] The EZLN, the army of the Zapatistas, is actually controlled by the CCRI-CG, a council of indigenous leaders elected by the various groups that live in Zapatista territories.

Zapatista Party. Each region is a given a new, Zapatista name and each also has a designated

meeting time/place for the "*Juntas de Buen Gobierno,*" or "Good Government Councils"

(Conant 281).The Good Government Councils are made up of community members elected on a

rotating basis and are a "bold attempt to create direct democracy" (Conant 281). Each functions a

bit differently in the day-to-day sense, yet as a report filed with *La Jornada* explains:

> [M]embers rotate every eight days, in such a way that they return to repeat their
>
> term various times. Each member travels from her or his municipality to the
>
> Caracol [sic], where they remain day and night for a week until returning to their
>
> houses to continue working the fields and taking care of family and domestic
>
> chores. They receive no salary. It is a responsibility, not a privilege. The practice
>
> of rotation, revocability, and rendering of accounts in the Good Government
>
> Councils, the fact that over time every community member has the experience of
>
> governing and being governed, has a consequence nothing short of *the elimination*
>
> *of the governing class.* (Emphasis original, qtd. in Conant 281-282)

This is an example of the Zapatista vision of governance with a focus on autonomy, self-reliance,

self-government by the people for the people. The councils decide how aid from NGOs is

distributed, the distribution of land for farming, how to and when to support the EZLN,

punishments for domestic crimes, and the drafting of laws. This form of government spreads (as

well as tests) Zapatista ethics and values through this practice of citizen empowerment.

Moreover, it is a new way of seeing and being in the material world, best summed up by Roel, a

member of the *Junta de Buen Gobierno* of *La Realidad*, that the authority of a given area should

"serve but not serve itself, propose, not impose" (qtd. in Conant 282).

Coupled with explanations of the living conditions as covered in "Chiapas: The Southeast in Two Winds," the physical manifestations of Zapatismo represented by the Good Government Councils are perceived as organic activism in the developed North, a move for basic human rights and direct democracy in action, not the beginnings of a bloody *coup d'état*. This ethical *ethos* is important for the delivery and diffusion of Zapatismo. Without it, the Zapatistas and the EZLN would be just another faceless, inconsequential—yet scary—rebel group "south of the border."

A Message of Solidarity—The Outcome of the Material

The material living conditions of extreme poverty and a malleable class structure—coupled with a good dose of university education[17]—means that Marcos's messages crafted for public consumption (and therefore the Zapatista's public messages) are far more egalitarian than the messages coming from other global south rebel groups. For a US comparison, the criteria about who can be a Zapatista is far more inclusive than anything the SDS, the Weather Underground, the Black Panther Party, or SNCC ever made public in the 1960s. And unlike more current social change movements—the AFL-CIO, GLAAD, MEChA, or the NAACP, there is no explicit identity politics involved. The "historical situated...social relations…and complex social structures" (Syverson 7) of indigenous peoples in Mexico described above factored into the creation of this communiqué:

WHO IS MARCOS?

Marcos is gay in San Francisco, a black in South Africa, Asian in Europe, a

---

[17] No one actually knows who Marcos is. Some accounts claims he was a university professor before he went to the jungle, others that he was a university student. Marcos avoids commenting on his life before the EZLN. He has, however, said that he grew up in a family that was "middle class;" a mother and father who at one time "taught in…school[s] in the countryside;" a family "without financial difficulties" (Marquez and Pomba 77). It was, also, a family where "words had a special value…we became conscious of language—not as a way of communicating but of constructing something" (Marquez and Pomba 77).

Chicano in San Isidro, an anarchist in Spain, a Palestinian in Israel, an indigenous person in the streets of San Cristóbal, a gang member in Neza, a rocker on campus, a Jew in Germany, an ombudsman in the Department of Defense, a feminist in a political party, a communist in the post-Cold War period, a prisoner in Cintalapa, a pacifist in Bosnia, a Mapuche in the Andes, a teacher in Flanagan Confederation of Educational Workers, an artist without a gallery or a portfolio, a housewife in any neighborhood in any city in any part of Mexico on a Saturday night, a guerrilla in Mexico at the end of the twentieth century, a striker in the CTM, a sexist in the feminist movement, a woman alone in a Metro station at 10 p.m., a retired person standing around in the Zocalo, a peasant without land, an underground editor, an unemployed worker, a doctor with no office, a non-conformist student, a dissident against neoliberalism, a writer without books or readers, and a Zapatista in the Mexican southeast. In other words, Marcos is a human being in this world. Marcos is every untolerated, oppressed, exploited minority that is resisting and saying 'Enough!'. (Marcos, "Who is Marcos?" n.pag.)

This particular message exemplifies how Subcomandante Marcos has become a rhetorical icon, representing both the Zapatista Party and a new type of political-social activism based in discursive warfare. First and foremost, this is from Marcos himself. He affirms to everyone beyond the border of Mexico that he stands with everyone in the margins of society. While no one is sure who Marcos is or what he did before becoming the voice and public identity of the EZLN, or if he is really just one person, he is the public face of the Zapatista Party and the EZLN, and therefore, he is the party in the eyes of the public. What he says of himself is seen, by

the outside world anyhow, as what the EZLN thinks of itself. So in saying that Marcos is a "gay in San Francisco" or "an unemployed worker" or "a Palestinian in Israel" or "or a doctor without an office," he is, as he asserts at the end of the statement, every person in the world—and in particular, the marginalized (or if not marginalized at least the overlooked) peoples of the world. In turn, this means he identifies with everyone who struggles—regardless of socio-economic class, nation, culture, or political stripe.

Instead of setting up a standard for the ideal revolutionary being from a certain social caste or of a specific race or from a specific place, Marcos is saying he sees himself, and therefore the EZLN and the Zapatistas, in everyone. Conversely, everyone can be a Zapatista and a member of the EZLN since Marcos, as the icon and embodiment of both groups, is in everyone. And since he specifically names every Other, every body in the margins, he's inviting those who are often held, politically and socially, at a distance for being "freaks," or "different," or "malcontents" to join the Zapatistas. Marcos, with statements like the one above and other similar to it, tells those who have been discarded that he is them, they are him, and therefore, his goals match their agendas, that their well-being or causes or their right to exist are intertwined with his, and consequently the Zapatistas', goals. The documents produced by Marcos are examples of Burke's concepts of identification and consubstantiality. And because the party aligns itself with every underdog, "Marcos –and by extension the Zapatistas—are aligned and identified" with everyone who is an outcast. Consequently this moment of rhetoric through communiqués "has the equally important effect of inferring that Marcos (and Zapatismo) is whatever (and whoever) you want it to be" (Conant 239).

This practice of a malleable rhetoric delivered through texts of various genres[18] and the accompanying versatile political action/philosophy is the outcome of a material reality where the identity and goals of the Zapatista Party change every eight days—when the new representatives are rotated into the Good Government Councils. There is no premium placed on controlling the image or identity of the Zapatistas; what matters is that those involved work together to create a reality—in speech and action—that runs counter to the reality of professional politicians and transnational corporations.

Keeping it Simple=Ease of Circulation

Marcos's choice of delivery, spoken word either transcribed into an essay or article format, allows for easy uptake and remixing. And again, this is—at least partially—informed by the material conditions of Chiapas. As recounted above, Chiapas is a poor region. There are very few options when it comes to the "technologies of writing" (Syverson 6) to do more than release a traditional document; and even if the means existed to do something more intricate, these more complicated styles of composing may have been intentionally ignored. One of the aesthetic principles of Zapatismo is to live the simple life of the *campesino*[19]. Any text coming from an ecology of composition that is "historically situated" in a "larger discourse" that believes in simplicity as a virtue is a something that must be considered a cultural influence that operates on a writer within that ecology. Simply put, a life of poverty dictates what types of documents are written and released by Marcos.

---

[18] The varying genres will be mentioned throughout this chapter, but attention won't be explicitly drawn to said genres. The genres sampled here are indicative of Marcos's discursive flexibility and includes the communiqué, the press release, the interview, the letter, and the parable.

[19] "*Campesino*" in English can be translated to mean either a farmer or a peasant, and more often than not, in Spanish has the connotation of both, that is, a peasant-farmer.

In a practical sense, this also makes it much easier to mix, remix, mash up, translate, and spread Marcos's communiqués. There is no need to worry about bandwidth, files, images, the ability to stream video, or even how to convert one medium to another. In the case of Marcos's communiqués it is, usually, a matter of translation. Good translations are difficult in themselves; however, Marcos's rhetorically savvy tactics of employing current events or parable storytelling or tapping into the terms and imagery of traditional leftist circles or his use of humor find ready analogies and translations in various languages and cultures. For example, there's the communiqué, "History of the Little Mouse and the Cat."

In a letter written by Marcos's alter-ego, Don Durito of the Laconda, Marcos uses over-the-top cartoon violence to explain the benefits of localized autonomy and governance. The letter reaches its climax when the mouse, the symbolic common person of the fable, finally decides to rid himself of the cat guarding all the food in the house. Don Durito opens the tale by giving the reader an account of the mouse's frustrated existence:

> There once was a little mouse who was very hungry and wanted to eat a little cheese that was in the tiny kitchen of the small house. And then the little mouse went very decidedly to the tiny kitchen to grab the little cheese, but it happens that a little cat came across the path and the little mouse became very frightened and [ran] away and was not able to get the little cheese from the tiny kitchen. Then the little mouse was thinking of what to do to get the little cheese from the tiny kitchen and he thought and he said:
>
> I know, I am going to put a small plate with a little milk and the little cat is going to start drinking the milk because little cats like very much the little milk. And

then, when the little cat is drinking the milk and is not noticing, I am going to the

tiny kitchen to grab the little cheese and I am going to eat it. Veeery [sic] good

idea—said the little mouse to himself.

The little mouse tries several different ways to work around the cat so he can get to the

cheese, yet the mouse is continually frustrated because the cat is always present, always using its

bigger size and strength to scare him off. Finally, the mouse decides to take matter into his own

hands. Grabbing a machine gun he shoots the cat dead; however, when the mouse finally enters

the kitchen he sees that, "the little cheese were already rotten and could not be eaten"

(flag.blackened.net). So the little mouse:

returned where the little cat was and cut it [to] pieces and then he made a great

roast and then invited all his friends and they made a party and ate the roasted

little cat and they sang and danced and lived very happily. And history started.

Don Durito then ends the letter by writing, "This is the end of the story and the end of this

letter… To end with the first [world] and to make the second [world,]…we only need to struggle

and to be better. The rest follows on its own and is what usually fills libraries and museums. It is

not necessary to conquer the world, it is sufficient to make it anew" (flag.blackened.net)

While the ending of the tale is brutal, if we put it into context the tale is a moment of

comedy on the level of Rabelais. First and foremost, this is Don Durito, *a dung beetle* who

believes himself to be a knight and Subcomandante Marcos his squire. Durito appears often in

Marcos's communiqués, often telling stories as a way to lecture Marcos for his simplistic

analysis of globalization and neoliberalism, and he often tells Marcos he and the Zapatistas are

stupid for fighting this war since the capitalists will run themselves into the ground anyhow.

Marcos takes on this persona when he wants to add levity to his letters to the world outside

Chiapas, and, in this case, he uses a cat and mouse interacting at the level of Itchy and Scratchy

of *The Simpsons*, that is, using absurd violence between two animals personified to have the

qualities of humans, the least pleasant being the hoarding of life-sustaining resources. In the

story, the mouse finally shouts, "Enough!" and instead of continually attempting to work around

the cat, it actually kills the cat and then—along with his mousy brethren—eats the cat.

The story is grotesque. Clearly. However, what is important to look at is that this is a

parable. As the last paragraph explains, this is a way to discuss the removal of the existing

nation-state governing apparatus so as the people at the local level, represented by the other

mice, can live happily ever after. This is a tale about autonomy and controlling land, and

therefore, material conditions, yet it also adds to the public image, or ethos, of Marcos and the

Zapatistas. The ability to tell jokes, to speak using silly voices ("Veeeery good idea!"), to allow

for an absurd, pompous dung beetle to speak for you and the entire movement, ensures that

humor that "disarms and delights" which re-enforces the idea that "these ski masked, gun-toting

rebels" are "sympathetic characters" instead of the dour, hard-edged stereotypes often associated

with terms like "vanguard revolution, popular uprising, or anticapitalist resistance" (Conant 170,

175), terms often applied to the Zapatistas and the EZLN. On a second level, this communiqué

also

> illustrates the Zapatistas' belief in the importance of framing the debate, of
>
> changing the terrain of struggle—not just winning the struggle, but defining the
>
> terms. Rather than continuing to scurry around the kitty cat, the parable tell us,
>
> there comes a time when every little mousy must cry "Ya basta!" ["Enough!"]
>
> and take matters into his own hands. (Conant 172)

This combination of a positive *ethos* and a simple style means there are adequate discursive strategies to translate the messages and the delivery method ensures low-tech, more accessible delivery methods can be used for the reproductions of these talks. Through this low-tech, low-intensity delivery, the ideas of Zapatismo can be diffused all over the world, reproduced, and remixed as seen fit. All of these aspects, that is, discursive warfare, a rejection of Leninist objectives about the primacy of taking over the nation-state, and the ability to make unlikely allies have earned the Zapatistas the designation as the orchestrators of the first postmodern revolution.

There is, however, nothing postmodern about this revolution. The Zapatista's rhetorical practices, the way they use Rabelais-esque humor to describe their worldview as well as provide alternatives to neoliberal economics and spread Zapatismo, and their belief that to control land—in all aspects of the word "control"—will allow them to control their material conditions differs from the way social and political change is discussed, conceptualized, and implemented in the much more formal developed north. This earthy, homespun, and collective style is also informed by their material living conditions. They must work collectively to get things done as they have an abundance of labor power but not capital, which means using bodies—not technologies— to complete projects. This simplicity creates fewer hurdles for sympathetic interlocutors to overcome when it comes to acts of identification and consubstantiality.

Still, these acts of identification and consubstantiality are built on writing. Without the texts there is no vehicle for rhetoric to travel in, to reach readers, to reshape their identities. How the texts of the Zapatistas do this is best described using Syverson's five elements of an ecology of composition: distribution, embodiment, emergence, and enaction.

The Four Elements

Marcus Iturriaga explains in "The Zapatista Rebels" that there is an imagined Subcomandante Marcos who is "[p]unching out communiqués on a lap-top powered from the cigarette lighter" of a jeep and then passing them along to the rest of the world via some techno-mystic combination of a "modem and a cellular phone" (Iturriaga, n.pag.). Yet as Harry Cleaver points out in "The Zapatistas and the Electronic Fabric of Struggle," this isn't reality. As of 1999, "[t]he problem of access" to the internet explains Cleaver, was "great in Chiapas and for the Zapatistas" (n. pag.). Cleaver claims this was "media hype" created by the "discovery of the role of cyberspace in circulating Zapatista words and ideas" (n.pag.); Marcos according to Cleaver was not uploading his communiqués and documents directly to the internet. Cleaver claims—based on his time in Chiapas—that Zapatista messages had to be "hand-carried through the lines of military encirclement and uploaded by others to the networks or solidarity" (n.pag.). Furthermore, Cleaver states that these networks were in the "various rural and urban communities" made up "of Native Americans, Mexicanos, and Chicanos in the U. S. and Canada," who had "few means to plug into The Net [sic]" ("The Zapatistas and the Electronic Fabric of Struggle" n.pag.). Cleaver states that:

> There too, access for most people must be mediated by groups of humanitarian or political activists who download EZLN communiqués and upload expressions of solidarity from off-line organizing. ("The Zapatistas and the Electronic Fabric of Struggle" n.pag.)

With his recounting of the communiqué distribution process, Cleaver makes visible the unseen, undocumented, unsanctioned, ephemeral acts of composing and recomposing of Marcos's messages that diffused Zapatismo throughout activist circles. Most of these acts of

(re)composing, it would seem, also took quite a bit of effort. With these acts of (re)composing a communiqué illuminated, what has been construed as "a moment of singular vision" (Syverson 44) on the part of Marcos is transformed into a moment of shared vision, since a single communiqué is actually *distributed* "materially, psychology, and socially across time and space" (Syverson 44). In the case of the Subcomandante, this distribution process occurred when a communiqué left Marcos's hand, entered the hand of a messenger, crossed enemy lines, crossed borders, was translated, rewritten in various mediums, and edited using various tools with certain aspects emphasized over others due to document design or the medium of delivery. This is an example of how in a complex system, a cognitive process, the act of writing, became a distributed act. Moreover, as that text became a memory for various readers, this, too, meant that memory was a distributed process, not just "simply an individual possession, a map or film of lived experience" (Syverson 44), but a shared memory that was used to motivate and mobilize various populations for action.

This act of distribution built on (re)composition also meant there was a moment of *embodiment* occurring for each writer, too. Writers, readers, and texts have physical bodies. Consequently, not only the content but the process of the above described interaction was dependent on and reflective of their physical experiences. For Marcos, his writings—whatever form they took—were tied into his bodily experience of living the life of a *campesino* in Chiapas. When Marcos wrote, he translated that physical, lived experience into textual forms. The texts affected the physical forms of the runner who smuggled these texts through enemy lines—quite literally affecting her/his bodily well-being. The texts then became part of the physical experience of the translators/writers as they manipulated their bodies in the processes of translating, writing/typing, and transforming those contra-band texts into their own texts, which

then assumed "various physical forms" of their own (pamphlets, leaflets, newsletters, radio broadcasts, web pages, discussion forum topics) at "different stages" of their textual lives once they were disseminated by those translators/writers (Syverson 53).

The spread of communiqués as described by Cleaver was also a moment of *emergence*. Syverson explains this dimension of an ecology of composition foregrounds a temporal element. The "emergence of [a] text seems to be fueled by specific temporal conditions," where a "rupture opened in a relatively stable social system, driving the system towards chaos" (66). Texts coming from these ruptures, like the rupture in indigenous life caused by neoliberal economic policies, are attempts on the part of writers composing texts to have said text "exert its small force in the opposite direction as if to move the system back toward order" (Syverson 66). In this way, a piece of writing becomes an attempt to restore the balance imagined by its writers; an oft told and retold story, or in this case a circulated and oft re-circulated communiqué, was a way for the writer and rewriters to restore the imagined balance of the ecology it moved within; it battled and shored up the cognitive and discursive systems against the entropy brought on by the rupture.

These texts became the glue that both organized and held together a complex, activist system of composing spread over great distances and made up of several interconnected, other complex systems of composing. These texts allowed for the components making up these systems to self-organize, yet this order was not created or determined by a single, central master "executive" or "brain" (Syverson 11). It was through the Zaptista texts diffused within that ecology that this order was created. Syverson calls the process "dependent cooringination" (53). With Zapatismo, the conversion of Marcos's lived experience into textual forms (his communiqués) is how Zapatismo went viral and how it seemed to suddenly be everywhere in the 1990s. Through dependent cooringination, a process made visible and persuasive through the

various physical, textual forms of Zapatismo that flooded activist circles, there were suddenly several new Zapatistas in the developed north discussing protest and the purpose of protest from the point of view of Subcomandante Marcos. Zapatismo, as a rhetoric, was rewriting identities and reshaping worldviews.

Enaction is the final element made visible through Cleaver's description of the diffusion of Zapatista texts. According to Syverson, this term describes knowledge as the result of an ongoing interpretation that emerges through activities and experiences situated in specific environments. Applied to Subcomandante Marcos, this means that through Marcos's life as a middle-class youth growing up in the home of academics, his time spent reading poets and writers of the global south, his time studying in university,[20] his decision to go to Chiapas, his conversion from militant rebel to discursive *campensino*, Marcos was not the classic solitary genius writing away quietly in an ivory tower. He was an agent among other "agents…engaging in activities to coordinate themselves with each other and their environments" (Syverson 68). Marcos was one agent moving in a world built on texts, interacting codependently with other agents, institutions, and systems. He lived through, was shaped by, and performed the ideas of his own and other texts. In turn, he invited and persuaded others to do the same with his texts by composing and releasing them into the larger world.

The act of (re)writing is how a rhetoric like Zapatismo goes viral. It becomes visceral, seems all-encompassing, and universal truth through the act of writing. Through this text, Zapatismo—a rhetoric—is spread, and through the dimensions outlined in *The Wealth of Reality*, it is possible to trace out how this rhetoric transformed identities, and consequently, moved an

---

[20] Most of this information on Marcos's past was gathered from Vincente Lenero's "Interview with Marcos Before the Dialogue," which can be found in *Zapatista! Documents of the New Mexican Revolution*.

audience to make an identity shift. To articulate how rhetoric does this once it has been delivered via a text, Kenneth Burke's work on identification and consubstantiality will need to be discussed.

Kenneth Burke

As mentioned in the previous chapter, when person A is identified, i.e., seen as similar or the same, with person B, then "A is 'substantially one' with a person other than himself" (21). Once individuals or even conglomerations of individuals traditionally at odds with one another begin to identify with one another, they begin to identify their interests as being in line with other individuals or even the other group's cause. And in the case of Subcommandante Marcos, he is persuading others that his, and therefore the Zapatistas', cause matches their interests (paraphrase of Burke 24) by adding texts to intertwined, complex systems of discourse.

On a simple rhetorical level, the messages were evocative. They struck people in specific ways and garnered a visceral reaction from them. In Burke's version of rhetoric, the audience read, identified with Marcos's identification with them, and consequently, with the Zapatistas. Or as Syverson discusses above, there was a moment of emergence. The readers participated in the composition of the communiqués, and through that process, identified with the Zapatistas and saw the goals of the Zapatistas to repair the rupture cause by neoliberalism as consubstantial to their respective situations. The communiqués composed by Marcos facilitated previously unaligned individuals and the Zapatistas to become "interested," meaning they came together collectively, defined a problem, and in the process, locked themselves into place as actors within a unified network and worked together to solve a problem (Spinuzzi n.pag.) And this was all done through language and rhetoric and at distance. Marcos was in Mexico, while several of his,

and therefore the Zapatistas', supporters lived in thousands of miles away from the Lacandona Jungle.

By making the war against the Mexican government discursive, the Zapatistas were able to achieve various goals without violence. Through the leveraging of NGOs, collectives, individual activists, and the celebrity of specific individuals, the Zapatistas stopped the impending, crushing defeat after the January 1, 1994 capturing of San Cristobal, Ocosingo, Altamarino, and Las Margaritas at the hands of the superior numbers and arms of the Mexican army—even establishing zones of Zapatista control and the return of some of the collective, indigenous lands. The ability of these communiqués to work and develop such a network of solidarity was built on identification and consubstantiality, which in turn was predicated on a series of interconnected ecologies of composition.

The International Encounter for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism —Zapatismo Remixed

As discussed above, Marcos's communiqués were (are) primarily distributed in written form. Because they were (are) also in Spanish, they often must be translated. Still, this is a regular occurrence. A cursory search using the Syracuse University library search engine shows and the term "Zapatista" produces 11, 151 books and ebooks that are either just reprints of the communiqués or are reprints of the communiqués with scholarly commentary accompanying them, or are monographs making claims about Zapatista ideology and politics based on Marcos's communiqués. A Google search using the term "Zapatista Army of National Liberation (ezln)" produces 98, 100 results. A second Google search using the term "subcomandante marcos communiqués" produces 10,800 hits. These communiqués have been shared, reprinted, retooled,

discussed, at length by academics and activists, and as will be discussed below, spawned new common cause within activist circles, which means the processes I describe above in the previous two sections are amazingly effective for evoking discussion and mobilizing a general desire for social and political change.

For an example of how this process affected activists in the global north, we can turn to the testimony of Brian Dominick, direct-action organizer and co-founder and editor of *The New Standard.* Dominick explains the effect of Zapatista writing[21] "In the Belly of the Beast," saying, "A bunch of us were struggling to stop…[NAFTA][sic]" yet they didn't have the tools to "raise awareness. We were desperate for some way to raise awareness. We couldn't figure it out" (Sara Burke and Claudio Puty, n. pag.). He claims activists knew NAFTA "would certainly be an important factor in their future, and the future" of their causes and communities, yet they couldn't string together a cogent analysis and set of tactics that mobilized people. There were "some demonstrations"; however, they were "pathetic" (Sara Burke and Claudio Puty, n. pag.). Dominick explains that all changed with the Zapatistas, saying, "the…uprising—which I played absolutely no role in and nobody up here did—was…a big boost for us. It was a big morale boost, and, not just that, *but we began to learn lessons about how to organize against globalization*" (Sara Burke and Claudio Puty, n. pag, emphasis mine.).

The way these lessons came about was through a critical mass of writing that circulated through different activist networks through the translations and rewrites of Marcos's communiqués. Eventually, this lead to the establishment of the *ethos* discussed above, and with that credibility, the Zapatistas called an *encuentros*, or encounter, a type of open-ended dialoguing and discussion (as well public pronouncements and marches) session common to the

---

[21] Remember, "writing" here refers to the (re)production of the communiqués, which were then distributed among several writers and spread throughout the activist world.

Zapatistas when they work internally and when they reach out to surrounding activist groups.

This meeting occurred in July and August of 1996. It was attended by 3,000 people from over 40

countries. The meeting took place in the village of *La Realidad* in Chiapas and was called the

Encuentro International por la Humanidad y contra el Neoliberismo (the International

Encounter for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism). In his preface *to Documents from the First*

International Encounter, Harry Cleaver explains that the call was issued for this encounter "with

some trepidation, high hopes but low expectations, suggested a gathering to discuss the world-

wide phenomenon of neoliberalism, the effects it has had on people, resistances which have

developed and possible paths of further struggle" (Cleaver qtd. in Sara Burke and Claudio Puty,

n.pag.) The call had an unexpected turnout; at "the end of July 1996…The First Intercontinental

Encounter" organized by the Zapatistas "brought together over 3,000 grassroots activists from 42

countries" (Cleaver qtd. in Sara Burke and Claudio Puty, n.pag.).

At the end of this *encuentro*, the Zapatistas issued the call for a Second International

Encounter for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism, making clear that the EZLN and other

Zapatistas would not run the event or claim ownership or attempt to lead the meeting. They

stressed the next encounter should be the foundation for a "collective network of resistance

against neoliberalism, an intercontinental network of resistance for humanity" (Khashnabish qtd.

in Conant 329). The network was also to have "no central head or decision maker," "no central

command or hierarchies" (Khashnabish qtd. in Conant 329); however, it should provide the

communication and support network for the various struggles against neoliberalism around the

world. Finally, the Zapatistas asked that the next *encuentro* be held on another continent—in that

way ensuring the ideas started with written compositions and now coalescing into new tactics

and alliances would diffuse from Mexico to elsewhere.

The Second International Encounter for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism took place in Spain the next year. In July 1997, 4,000 activists from 50 countries laid down the plans for what became the People's Global Action against "Free" Trade and the WTO, commonly referred to as People's Global Action or PGA. The PGA, whose slogan is "May the resistance be as transnational as capital!", became the lynchpin for organizing the series of global protests that came in the years following. The PGA, built on the Zapatista plan outlined in the Second Declaration of *La Realidad* for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism, coordinated the "Days of Action against the WTO, the G8,and the World Bank," (Conant 329), of which the WTO protests in Seattle 1999 were one. Additionally, the PGA was "instrumental in the formation and evolution" (Conant 329) of the World Social Forum, which Jeff Conant points out is essentially a "Zapatista *encuentro* writ large" (329). To solidify this connection between the Zapatistas and the PGA (and consequently Seattle, 1999), here's a quote from Olivier de Marcellus, explaining the importance of the Zapatistas and Zapatismo to this global entity:

> PGA is an offshoot of the international Zapatista movement, founded in a meeting that prolonged the Second Encuentro in southern Spain, and drawing a lot of it European support from people who also support the Zapatistas. There is also a certain ideological and organizational resemblance, both being unorthodox, eclectic networks attempting to stimulate radical opposition worldwide. (Conant 329)

This is a combination of identification and consubstantiality as well as a material example of the scene-act ratio from Kenneth Burke's pentad. As Dominick explains in his quote above, U.S. activists attempting to stop NAFTA couldn't mount an effective protest; the topic was huge, the areas it touched upon far-ranging. There was no one organization that could

address and rally a sizeable body of activists to protest. As he said, there were "a few of us, in every community, who were sitting there scratching our heads, trying to figure what to do. There were some demonstrations, and they were pathetic," they "were desperate for some way to raise awareness" and "they couldn't figure it out" (Sara Burke and Claudio Puty n.pag). If we accept the idea that these activist networks were complex discursive systems with Zapatista texts connecting one to the other, then this is the moment when Zapatismo and its practices took hold.

Through the diffusion of the communiqués there was an awareness of the Zapatistas, there was even the awareness about the International Encounter. The idea of the Zapatistas and their conditions were made concrete through physical interaction at the International Encounter; their means were made real through the operation of the *encuentro*; and through a combination of both the other activists came to identify with the Zapatistas, to see themselves as consubstantial (and everything that means about intertwined goals), and came to understand the concept of one no, many yeses, that is, the idea of a plural culture, the idea that many worlds can fit into one, the idea that there can be several groups aligned to fight a common enemy was the only way to fight NAFTA, the WTO, or any other adversary using peaceful means.

This diffusion of rhetoric and tactics occurred, much like DeVoss and Ridolfo explain in "Composing for Recomposition," through a slightly remixed version of the First Encounter format, i.e., face-to-face meetings. Activists from around the world took the *encuentro* format and "moved quickly to organize a series of continental meetings," and through the "stimulus of those meetings" created new tactics and plans through an "outpouring of thinking, discussion, writing and other creative activities" about how to resist transnational neoliberalism—even though there was no "institutional funding, no high-tech conference facilities, and no promise of

payoff [neither profits nor publication] [sic] except for the opportunity to accelerate the struggle to build a new world" (Cleaver qtd. in Sara Burke and Claudio Puty n.pag.).

Due to a moment of listening rhetoric as described by Wayne Booth (46), the visitors went to Chiapas, listened, talked, and came to an agreement about material reality. The visiting activists not only saw themselves as consubstantial to the Zapatistas, they also saw the scenes they lived in as similar to the Zapatistas' Mexico. In doing so, they saw the tools available, that is, their agency—the ability to form large alliances, the ability to swarm a spot discursively and at times physically like San Cristobal—as the same. Through writing, talk, and listening, the Zapatistas and the EZLN spread Zapatismo; through this diffusion of discursive, rhetorical actions the visiting activists saw their world in the same terms the Zapatistas saw theirs, and these activists came to see the only acts possible in a world (scene) dominated by neoliberalism was affinity based demonstrations (act). And so in this world where activists have only their bodies, limited resources (if any at all), similar yet not the same causes as other activists, and are often taking on entities that have the law, the police, money, and government on their side, the activists decided to adopt the strategies, tactics, and acts of the Zapatistas. With the scene established for all involved, there became "implicit in the quality of a scene the quality of the action that is to take place within it" (Burke, "From *A Grammar of Motives*" 1304). Moreover, the Zapatistas readied Zapatismo for remixing by denying any ownership or "right way" to do it. Everyone can be a Zapatista, and Zapatismo is enacted as long as it works through moments of local consensus building and direct democracy.

Complex Systems

Marcos's communiqués are part of a larger context; a context informed by the poverty, political ideology, surrounding environment, social history of indigenous peoples in Mexico, the

then current event of NAFTA, the lack of internet access, his education, his commitment to the

EZLN and the Zapatistas, his time in the Lacandona Jungle, the political history of Mexico, the

Zapatistas' switch from violence to discourse, and the technology of literacy. From that complex

system, Marcos created his communiqués.

This is what makes Marcos and the Zapatistas so interesting as rhetorical agents. They

are the living, breathing example of a complex system. In a complex system, a network of

independent agents work simultaneously and often parallel to each other to co-create their own

environment. As pointed out above in an interview with Marcos, the Zapatistas and the EZLN

are actually two separate entities. The CCR-GI is the overall committee making decisions, yet

even this is a group made up of several different representatives of various constituencies within

Chiapas. Furthermore, these representatives articulate the will of their constituencies. So there

are several people working together to make decisions. In these complex systems, agents

"seeking mutual accommodation and self-consistency somehow manage to transcend

themselves, acquiring collective properties such as…thought [and] purpose they might have

never possessed individually" (Waldrop qtd. in Syverson 3-4).

In continuing to view the Zapatistas/EZLN through the work of Syverson, the party/army

is a complex system because they are also adaptive. The Zapatistas turned to what happened to

be the most advantageous for them. Specifically, there's the conversion of the revolution from

violence to discourse and the harnessing of NGOs to exert pressure on the Mexican government.

Then, there was the *encuentro* that laid the foundation for the PGA, which was a bold attempt to

fight neoliberalism from multiple fronts, and consequently, change their immediate situation

through a global shift in public opinion concerning transnational corporations and supra-national

organizations like the WTO and the World Bank. Furthermore, continuing with my reading of

Syverson, the Zapatistas/EZLN are a complex system since they are dynamic. This dynamism borders on unpredictable. As a consequence, complex systems are not as orderly as a machine (think the inefficient—by the standards of Fordism—Zapatista/EZLN decision making process) yet more structured, purpose-driven, and coherent than complete chaos. This type of system is alive; it is organic; it seems to grow with and flourish without needing a single figurehead overseeing maintaining it or directing its reproduction—what Marcos's communiqués did to spread Zapatismo around the world.

The birth of the PGA through the Zapatista *encuentro* is an example of this, too. The meeting occurred, yet a unified, top-down organization with Marcos at the head was not created. What was created was a loose confederation of like-minded individuals, so the components didn't quite "lock into place" and even after they returned to their home countries, they didn't "dissolve into turbulence, either" (Waldrop qtd in Syverson 4). The Zapatistas, and the discursive selves they created through their communiqués and the PGA, are a group on the edge of chaos in terms of being a non-traditional political movement and yet were organized enough to be "alive." Alive enough that party, army, and discursive entity were able to sustain itself themselves with no mastermind controlling every extremity. Additionally they were endowed with enough creativity, or shall we say fertility, to be deemed living thing beyond its individual parts, i.e., the EZLN, the CCR-GI, Subcommandante Marcos, or the indigenous peoples of Mexico. With the PGA, Zapatismo had gone viral.

The Return of Rhetorical Velocity

In "Composing for Recomposition: Rhetorical Velocity and Delivery," DeVoss and Ridolfo explain that one way rhetorical velocity occurs is through amplification. Specifically, these co-authors mean amplification as how texts are "delivered, recomposed, and delivered

again" (DeVoss and Ridolfo n.pag.) using the internet. In their example they discuss Iraqi attack

videos; in this chapter the objects for consideration are press releases and communiqués. As

discussed above, Marcos's communiqués were often picked up, translated, and then posted to

various websites, listservs, discussion boards or printed/televised by the mainstream media.

Examples of this abound in the anthology *Zapatista! Documents of the New Mexican Revolution,*

which collects press releases, communiqués, and letters of the CCRI-CG as well as

Subcomandante Marcos. As previously discussed, the Zapatistas helped with the formation of the

PGA, which, in turn, helped in the creation of the Seattle DAN. Again, these are complex,

interconnected systems of composition. Through the writings of the EZLN and the Zapatista

Party, I claim rhetorical velocity occurred, which then spread the *ethos*, tactics, and worldview of

the EZLN and the Zapatista Party. In turn, this moment of rhetorical velocity firmly established

Zapatista protest tactics as *the* protest tactics for the next 20 years. This *ethos*, these tactics, this

worldview is Zapatismo, and Zapatismo became the new normal in activist circles to the point

that most activists never thought to point out that they were enacting Zapatismo, that the protest

methods they were deploying had their origins in Chiapas, Mexico, or to even call what they

were doing Zapatismo.

The PGA

The diffusion of the Zapatistas' tactics and *ethos* occurred primarily through the PGA.

Built on the idea that education, "coordinating with allies, consensus building and direct

democracy at the local level, and that the root of the "mischief" affecting humanity is

neoliberalism," the PGA was launched as a "worldwide network of mass movements resisting

corporate globalization" (Dixon 78); specifically, the World Trade Organization, which the PGA

sees (at least in 1999) as the main disseminator of neoliberal economics. To achieve this, the

PGA called for an "uncompromising" series of nonviolent acts of civil disobedience by local peoples who also could offer up "local alternatives" to the neoliberal practices sponsored by the WTO (Dixon 78).

The PGA began this with the creation of a website announcing its existence. On this website, the organization laid down what could be seen as odd rules; the first bulletin states that the PGA will make available "several information tools, including a regular bulletin, a web page and other publications, which are to be done voluntarily by organisations [sic] and individuals supportive of the aims of the PGA" (*PGA Bulletin*). Additionally, the writing and "elaboration" on these tools is to "take place in a decentralized and rotative manner" (*PGA Bulletin*). Coupled with these rules concerning the information tools is the stated purpose of the alliance itself.

The PGA was designed to meet "approximately every two years, about three months before the Ministerial Conference of the WTO" (*PGA Bulletin*). These conferences were to be "convened by a committee conformed by organisations [sic] and movements from all continents," representing the "different sectors of society (plus the local organisers [sic] of the conference). This committee was to "determine the programme [sic] of the conference, take decisions about participation on the conference and use of resources, decide which publications can be printed under the name of the PGA, and check the content of the information tools of the PGA" (*PGA Bulletin)*. In an effort to stay away from a top-down hierarchy, this committee "cannot speak in the name of the PGA," and every PGA conference "will elect the Convenors' Committee [the official name of this hitherto describe committee] of the next conference" (*PGA Bulletin*).

This may seem peculiar—perhaps, even poorly designed or the outcome of some badly thought out utopian philosophy. Yet if viewed from the historical founding of the PGA, which was discussed at length above, this makes sense. The PGA and its meeting are the reproduction of the Zapatista's *encuentros*. The point of these meetings is to make allies, develop a sense of solidarity and camaraderie, share information (educate), and teach other resistance tactics. In this way, local peoples maintain the maximum amount of autonomy and simultaneously learn the basics of running a democratic organization—very much like the Zapatista municipalities in Mexico. Even sharing its existence is form of Zapatismo. The information tools come in both print and digital form, and like the Zapatistas, they appear in multiple languages.[22]

These meetings, like the press releases described by Ridolfo and DeVoss in "Composing for Recomposition," are boilerplates. The Zapatistas led the first meeting using their *encuentro* format, and from there "[t]his genre, though constrained by rigid formatting conventions," offered a "useful starting point for thinking about how such strategizing may predate and also change shape with the widespread adaptation" (n. pag.). In addition to the format, this meeting style contained within it the genre conventions of consensus building, rotating responsibilities, direct democracy, and the belief that neoliberal economic theory—along with its adherents—was the common enemy. Furthermore, the concept of "one no, many yeses," is implied within the format and administration of the PGA; the idea that several disparate group could network through the PGA is why the design of the groups is so amorphous and based in of the moment voting. Predefining the make-up and processes of the group would limit the future actions of the

---

[22] This is where the Zapatistas and the PGA differ. Instead of counting on the kindness of strangers, the PGA stipulates all information and materials must be available in at least three languages: English, Spanish, and French. For more information, please see *The PGA* website, "Bulletin No. 0."

organization, which in turn would hinder the PGA's ability to adapt and respond to the actions of the WTO.[23]

And yet there are also differences, fitting DeVoss and Ridolfo's definition of boilerplates. The PGA defined itself as the nemesis of the WTO, singling out one organization as the disseminator of—to borrow from Subcomandante Marcos—the neoliberal project. The PGA exists as a supra-national organization, much like the WTO, and does not confine itself to Mexico. The PGA has a set of guidelines to ensure that every incarnation of the PGA is free of racism or xenophobia (the whole section about the current committee being in charge of reviewing the content created by local activists and put into circulation using the PGA's information tools). Finally, the PGA does not use a shared cosmovision. This is why the group defined their adversary as the WTO; they were against "free trade," scare quotes theirs, and in choosing to make one entity the opponent the organization was able to use the ideas of local alternatives to neoliberalism and global, corporate capitalism as their mediatory ground. Through educating one another about global capital and each participating group/individual offering up their critiques and tactics on how to stop it or severely reform it, the mythos became a world free of the WTO, and therefore, neoliberalism. This "better world" became the PGA's cultural glue.

Zapatismo Outside of Mexico

The Zapatistas' insistence that neoliberalism is the root cause of socio-economic disparity for peoples the world over is what the PGA, and later/temporarily the Seattle DAN, are predicated on. Here's an example from the PGA website housing issue number zero of the PGA

---

[23] This also reflects a major tenant of Zapatismo, the idea of constant change. The PGA even votes on its constitution as a way to both reflect their current membership and have the flexibility to deal with the WTO as that organization morphs and evolves. As Conant points out in his book, for the Zapatistas this is based in a cyclical vision of history undergirded by a belief that the gods are *not* infallible. Change is natural and inevitable.

bulletin. A few paragraphs into the statement, the bulletin announces, "The PGA is an instrument of coordination, not an organization," organized so as to "inspire" the greatest number of people to act against what they mockingly refer to as "'free trade'" (*PGA Bulletin*). The PGA stresses that there must be a revival of "traditional knowledge systems and traditional technologies" as well as the "strengthening of traditional local market" through developing "producer-consumer linkages and co-operatives," which are the only "logical alternatives to the domination of people and nature by transnational capital" (*PGA Bulletin*). In the PGA's ideology, the only way to counteract the governments acting as the "creatures and tools of capitalist powers" is for people to "restore for themselves a life with direct democracy," much like the Zapatistas and EZLN use to make decisions, as it is the only way to "stop the mischief of capitalism" (*PGA Bulletin*).

At the root of this "mischief" is—just like the EZLN/Zapatistas assert—neoliberalism. This economic philosophy of free-markets, anti-state approach to economics and international relations, which encourages the privatization of state enterprises, the reduction of state subsidies, and fewer constraints on businesses, is seen as a plague. A plague creating a "globalised [sic]" monster whose agenda is to impoverish the everyday people of the world; a monster represented in the material world by institutions like the "the World Trade Organization (WTO)," the Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation forums, (APEC), or the European Union (EU), and international binding trade liberalization agreements like NAFTA. The PGA tells readers, "Only a global alliance of peoples' movements, which can implement action-orientated alternatives, can defeat this emerging globalised monster. If impoverishment of populations is the agenda of neo-liberalism [sic], empowerment of peoples should become the agenda of the global alliance of peoples' actions" (*PGA Bulletin*).

And the concept took off in activist circles—the PGA's methods, and therefore, Zapatismo, too. As David Solnit, a major player behind the DAN at Seattle and longtime activist explains, he started the Seattle DAN based on the Zapatista principles, methods, and calls for protest. As Solnit explained in an interview, the

> global street party in May 98, which was the first of these internationally-coordinated anti-globalization actions was initiated by Reclaim the Streets. Thirty cities around the globe had street parties[24]. Reclaim the Streets had begun to work with a new formation called People's Global Action which was a group of folks who came out of the Second Enquentro [sic] in Spain that was...[sic] Enquentro [sic] was an international gathering against neoliberalism [and for] humanity that came out of the Zapatista movement in Chiapas. And, that group of people then met again in Geneva and initiated People's Global Action as an international radical network. Came up with a statement of principles calling for civil disobedience and nonviolent direct action. Decentralized autonomous organization and that kind of stuff…And it somewhat was the organizing vehicle for calling and putting out the word about the November 30th actions. [There] had actually been a call for N30 actions beyond our initiation of the mass direct action. (Simer 8)

In that interview, Solnit makes clear that the PGA and the Zapatistas were both influences, and moreover, that the Zapatistas and their methods were well-known within activist circles.

---

[24] Street parties are moments when roads and highways are shut down by an occupying group and, quite literally, a party is put on. At many street parties, there is free music, food, drink, and even play areas for children. The concept is to make protest a celebration, a celebration which draws attention, participation, and media coverage. For more, please see *Beautiful Trouble: A Toolbox for Revolution.*

The same type of acknowledgement occurs with Kevin Danaher, the co-founder of Global Exchange, the group Solnit contacted when it came to forming the Seattle DAN and coming up with events like N30. In an interview, Danaher explains at length how the cause of Global Exchange is to fight transnational capitalism, neoliberal economic theory, and any organization that either participates in the system of transnational capitalism or promotes neoliberal economic theory. And Danaher mentions the Zapatistas, too, as the exemplars for fighting such a widely adopted economic philosophy dispersed through so many intertwined organizations. Danaher asserts that the "Zapatista uprising in 1994/95…had such an incredible response" from activist around the world because "it prevented the Mexican government from crushing them, which [the Mexican government] could have done militarily, but politically there was so much opposition [to the Mexican government] and solidarity with the Zapatistas" (Danaher 13) that this "crushing" did not happen.

That the Zapatistas "rose up against the neo-liberal model" (Danaher 13) is what Danaher finds important about the rebels in Chiapas, and his belief that neoliberalism can only be stopped through a larger global deployment of Zapatismo appears to be the reason why Global Exchange has virtually the same goals as the Zapatistas. And again, here's an activist organization not located in Mexico that professes to have the same goals as the Zapatistas; they even identify with the Mexican rebels and see themselves as consubstantial with the Zapatista Party. This knowing and identifying happened because of the discursive ecologies the Zapatistas occupy. News reports, communiqués, scholarly texts written about the Zapatistas, interviews in the Mexican and the international press, and events like the first international *encuentro* served as the bridges between disparate and dissimilar groups so as to create a series of interconnected, complex discursive systems.

Even the Zapatistas' tactics of using various media outlets to counter the official statements of the Mexican government were well-known by N30. In Seattle, 1999, WTO protestors not only leveraged the mainstream media, they also established the Independent Media Center (IMC). Through this voluntary organization, "alternative [media] networks" were established in Seattle on the model of a "community-based people's newsroom," basically ensuring that a protestor's point-of-view on WTO ministerial meetings got out to the larger world instead of the corporate point of view of "CBS and CNN" (Perlstein 2). This concept was not only based on the convictions of Jeff Perlstein, the person credited with founding the IMC, and his comrades, but also a "long history…the IMC didn't just come out of nowhere. You read it [the long history] everywhere from Radio Venceremos to Liberation news Service in the sixties here in the States, to the Zapatista's use of the Internet in '94 and since then, to a project called Counter Media" (Perlstein 2). This spawned other IMCs to spring up around the country, which was based on a discussion within activist/independent media circles there was a "need for [a] network, the need for…a powerful, vibrant network [that] could really be a true alternative to the corporation's network, a people's network" (Perlstein 4). Again, to demonstrate the link between Seattle protestors and the Zapatistas and show the extent of the Zapatistas' collective rhetorical reach, the most well-known advocate for such a network of independent news networks, according to Pearlstein, was Subcomandante Marcos. Pearlstein explains:

> Marcos, in '97, actually, made a call to this free media, called Freeing the Media Conference in New York. It's about a 10-minute video communiqué, and he is very explicit about this need, the need to have a network of resistance, the people's resistance, that is strong but also allows for people's autonomy, from different sites and location[s]. (Perlstein 4)

By everyone "doing their little piece…in an amazingly short amount of time" and with "amazingly little resources", the Seattle IMC was able to "broadcast every night" through "public access TV stations," as well as create "print publication daily" (Perlstein 3). This "community based newsroom" eventually spawned "33 media centers…in 10 countries" (Perlstein 5).[25]

Conclusion

In summation, the Zapatistas/EZLN wrote, that is, composed, their *ethos* into being—at least for the world outside of Chiapas. They then shared their cause through writing. The writing may have started out as the spoken word, yet due to their *ethos* and worldwide attention, those words were translated to text by the various devices visitors brought with them to speak with the Zapatistas, e.g., tape recorders, cameras, video cameras, movie cameras, pens, paper, cell phones, sat phones, which were then, more often than not, translated into either new languages or new mediums (e.g., Spanish, English, French, German, or Hindi and in the medium of film, web page, newspaper article, listserv posts, the topics of discussion boards, email). This writing became the anchor for the International Encounter for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism, which after the Zapatistas and the EZLN denounced any ownership or leadership over and insisted the next meeting be facilitated by some other organization, left Mexico and became the PGA.

In essence, the Zapatistas/EZLN composed a complex system of writing and interconnected it with other complex systems around the world. Then, they created a boilerplate medium in the International Encounter, and released it into the public sphere to be appropriated and remixed as seen fit. Finally, in releasing this boilerplate medium into the world and

---

[25] To see the IMC website and see how it's grown since the Perlstein interview, please go to indymedia.org.

promoting local control and remixing, the Zapatistas demonstrated nothing about their immediate goal (reforming the land policies of the Mexican government) and everything about the possibility of creating a new material reality, a "better world" as the slogan goes, through the material consequences of a meeting—a rhetorical happening—that would bring together a critical mass of social change activists. Through the Zapatistas, it is possible to see material demonstrations of Syverson's theories concerning ecologies of composition and DeVoss and Ridolfo's theory of rhetorical velocity. The Battle of Seattle is just one point in this moment of complex system/rhetorical velocity/material rhetorics juggernaut. And while the scale and ferocity of the action may be shocking in that it happened in the affluent, developed north, it is merely one layer in an accretion (see Collins) of rhetorical and discursive acts.

The interaction of these complex systems meant that there were numerous texts concerning the Zapatistas diffused throughout the public sphere. Each of those texts were "fecund" (Porter) to various readers because they were evocative or served a particular purpose. In the case of the Mechistas of Washington state, the Zapatistas were fecund as visual meme, one that served their specific needs. Using Syverson's concepts of emergence and enaction, the Mechistas adoption of the Zapatista look was a tangible example of "how self-organization [arose] globally in networks of simple components connected to each other and operating local" via discourse without a single master brain, that is, it was a moment of emergence (11). Simultaneously it was also a moment of enactment, when "agents …engaging in activities to coordinate themselves with each other and their environment" (68); or more simply put, the Mechistas lived a moment of their collective lives through a collection of texts summed up in the look of an EZLN soldier. When these students put on their fatigues and masks, this text deployed

a rhetoric that in turn shaped their lives—through inhibiting and empowering their bodies within a specific space for a specific time—on N30 through their performance as EZLN soldiers.

In the next chapter, I'll discuss the Zapatismo informed Seattle Direct Action Network—from the angle of Mechistas who were unhappy with the Seattle DAN, and how they adapted the image of the EZLN soldier to protest both the WTO and the DAN. Specifically, I'll be examining the MEChA contingent that marched in the November 30th students' demonstration and their rhetorical displays during the 1999 WTO protests, their connections to the Zapatistas, and how the MEChA contingent's protest is Zapatismo, yet also different, too. Noting the differences between the Mechistas and the Zapatistas/EZLN will demonstrate not only rhetorical velocity but also Jeff Conant's concept of one no, many yeses; Blair's ideas concerning material rhetorics; creation through composition; consequence; Edbauer's theory of rhetorical ecologies; and Collins's theory of rhetorical accretion. More importantly, studying the Mechistas demonstrates the importance of how rhetoric is practiced in a certain moment and deployed through everyday language, the ephemeral texts of temporary coalitions, and the stimuli of a specific physical location. In short, studying the Mechistas provides university-locked rhetoricians with an example of how organic writing/talking spreads rhetoric in ways overlooked in the classroom and most academic journals.

In the final section of the upcoming chapter, I'll place the Mechistas into Kenneth Burke's pentad. Through understanding the motivations of this group as it related to their context, or rhetorical ecologies, I'll show how moments of identification and consubstantiality are created. By doing this, I'll demonstrate not only how experiential reality works with, on, and is rewritten by the relationships between people and groups of people; I'll also show how rhetoric is diffused in starts and stops. I make clear that this starting and stopping is the

packaging and repackaging of a specific philosophy and rhetoric, that is, Zapatismo. I'll also

argue that the exigency for individuals to rewrite/repackage comes from a drive to create "a

common ideology, while at the same time excluding alternate terms, other groups, and

competing ideologies" (Bizzell and Herzberg 1296), and additionally, as activists rewrite

Zapatismo to face the challenges they in their immediate protest situations they also

simultaneously rewrite and repackage their ideologies and worldviews.

Chapter Four: A Material Rhetorical Analysis of the MEChA N30 Protest

To explain how rhetoric persuaded, shaped, and moved bodies throughout the streets of Seattle, in this chapter I'll be examining the Mechistas[26] of Washington state who participated in the students' march at the WTO protests on November 30, 1999 (N30).

MEChA

Members of the *Movimiento Estudiantil Chican@ de Aztlan* (The Chican@ Student Movement of Aztlan) (MEChA) chapters at the University of Washington, Seattle; Washington State University; Yakima Community College; and Central Washington University (Bocanegra and Nunez 7) and their allies participated in the November 30th protest in Seattle, 1999. Part of their motivation came from their history as a traditional, hierarchical activist organization on the level of NOW or the NAACP. According to their national website, they were formed in "April of 1969 by over 100 Chicanas/Chicanos" who "came together at UC Santa Barbara to formulate a plan for higher education: *El Plan de Santa Barbara*" (*Movimiento Estudiantil Chican@ de Aztlàn Official National Website*). With this document they were successful in the development of "two very important contributions to the Chicana/o Movement: *Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán* (MEChA) and Chicano Studies" (*Movimiento Estudiantil Chican@ de Aztlàn Official National Website*). Their overriding mandate is to "seek an end to [the] oppression and exploitation of the Chicano/Chicana community," and a major part of this is "recognizing that the majority of [*La*] *Raza* are members of the working class," and therefore, using an "anti-imperialist analysis" of Euro-American, mainstream US culture that "includes Chicana /Chicano determination" (*Movimiento Estudiantil Chican@ de Aztlàn Official National Website*). This analysis is founded on "higher education, *cultura*, and *historia*" (*Movimiento Estudiantil*

---

[26] *Mechista* is the term used by interview subjects Randy Nunez and Miguel Bocanegra to describe the individual members of *Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlan,* or MEChA.

Chican@ de Aztlàn Official National Website), the use of Spanish denoting a hybrid foundation built on the available institutions of education fused with a Chicano/a point of view on American culture and history, that is, an angle informed by the unofficial histories and cultures found in Mexican-American communities throughout the US.

Since MEChA was founded on the principles of self-determination and the liberation of Chicanas/os via a social revolution, they state that "political involvement and education is the avenue for change" (*Movimiento Estudiantil Chican@ de Aztlàn Official National Website*) in American society. This education means both in the formal sense and in the organic sense. This emphasis on education both in and out of the classroom means a belief that the "strength of [their] movement" is also rooted in the "*barrios*" (*Movimiento Estudiantil Chican@ de Aztlàn Official National Website*) not just in secondary and university classrooms. Due to this, MEChA pledges itself to "reach out to the community and schools, to establish new educational opportunities" through classroom pedagogy and outside the classroom education, which is organizing students and non-students for social activism that furthers their organizational goals (*Movimiento Estudiantil Chican@ de Aztlàn Official National Website*).

The other part of their motivation came from the organizers, Miguel Bocanegra and Randy Nunez, understanding the WTO through the lens of "NAFTA and the Zapatistas" (Bocanegra and Nunez 2). As both explained during their May 30, 2000 interview with Monica Ghosh, the passing of NAFTA under "neo-liberal economic policy…[and] the concepts of free trade…[which] the WTO represented" made the WTO meeting in Seattle consubstantial with the "passing of NAFTA" in their minds (Bocanegra and Nunez 2). Using this set of terministic screens, Nunez and Bocanegra stressed to their comrades that the WTO meant to spread policies like NAFTA through the entire world. Since many of the folks they were attempting to organize

were either Mexican-Americans with existing ties to Mexico or Mexican nationals in the US for various reasons, this equating of the WTO with NAFTA served as an evocative warning.

As I discussed in chapter two, I'll deploy Carole Blair's heuristic for performing a material rhetorical analysis of the Mechista march on N30. If we viewed the march from the orthodox framework for rhetorical analysis, then the easy answer is that MEChA was motivated to participate in the WTO protests through the persuasiveness of Subcomandante Marcos's communiqués. This would mean, literally, through a combination of Marcos's communiqués and a moment of *kairos* based on the Mechistas background as Mexicans in America, Marcos's words (written or spoken) moved the Mechistas to participate in the November 30th students' protest march. Additionally, as Jack Selzer points out in his introduction to rhetorical bodies, orthodox rhetorical analyses imagine rhetoric working only at an intellectual, almost mystical level. However, there was more—much more—involved in the Bocanegra and Nunez organizing a MEChA contingent to march on November 30. By using Carole Blair's methodology for a material rhetorical analysis, this chapter will analyze how the texts of the Zapatistas acted intellectually and physically on the Mechistas, e.g., how the texts motivated the presentation of their bodies in an act of protest; how the texts became embodied by the Mechistas; and how these texts and the protesters bodies changed the cityscape of Seattle on November 30, 1999. This methodology serves as the focal point for this chapter because without it I would run the risk of performing an orthodox rhetorical analysis, and thus, lack the critical apparatus to discuss how rhetoric works on both minds and bodies.

Blair's methodology is predicated on these questions:

(1) What is the significance of the text's material existence?

(2) What are the apparatuses and degrees of durability displayed by the text?

(3) What are the text's modes or possibilities of reproduction or preservation?

(4) What does the text do to (or with, or against) other texts?

(5) How does the text act on people? (30)

Through the questions asked by this heuristic, I assert it's possible to see why the Mechistas chose to take on the image of the EZLN soldier. In short, the Zapatistas became memes—before memes became a method of argumentation on the internet, and yet also more than memes. In taking on the look of an EZLN soldier, the Mechistas took on a new way of thinking about globalization in relation to their lived experiences as Chicanos and Chicanas. And yet at the same time, the Mechistas also took on a different way of organizing and arguing for social justice than prescribed by the traditional MEChA leadership. Both of these aspects helped in creating long-term, articulated change in the organization.

 (1) The significance of the text's material existence and (2) the apparatuses and degrees of durability displayed by the text

      I posit that the material existence of the EZLN, the images, the communiqués, the black masks, the battles on January 1st, the Zapatista autonomous zones, the Zapatista marches to Mexico City, the negotiations between the Zapatistas and the Mexican government, Marcos's communiqués, the Zapatistas *encuentros* and a tie to those events and artifacts through a shared history meant a desire to reproduce those images and stories and work and talk about neoliberal globalization that had been "going on in our community since 1994 and before" (Bocanegra and Nunez 6). For Bocanegra and Nunez, a member of MEChA at the University of Washington and

the Pacific Northwest MEChA regional chair at the time of the demonstration respectively, the

issues that the Seattle Direction Action Network (DAN) wanted to highlight about neoliberal

globalization through N30 were "old issue[s]" (Bocanegra and Nunez 6). According to

Bocanegra, by the time "white people started" started publicly discussing these issues in 1998 in

preparation for the 1999 protests, they felt they, as Chicanos, had been talking about it since

"1994"due to the passage of NAFTA (Bocanegra and Nunez 6). In my reading of Bocanegra and

Nunez's interview, Zapatismo was made durable through the collective memory and informal

talk of the Mexican-American community. To demonstrate their solidarity with the Zapatistas

and to delineate themselves from what they clearly considered the late comers to the anti-

globalization conversation, the Mechistas chose to by physically represent the Zapatistas at the

protest, those who "had been fighting and dying for in Mexico since '94" (Bocanegra and Nunez

6).

This decision to dress as Zapatista soldiers also helped correct the issue Bocanegra and

Nunez cite when it came to working with the DAN, which was also pointed out by Cabasco in a

separate interview, who eventually chose to march with Bocanegra and Nunez in the MEChA

contingent: the DAN couldn't "find a way to connect" (Cabasco 3) the policies of the WTO to

people of color in and around Seattle. What Cabasco claims was the major organizing thesis of

the DAN was "environmental justice issues…about saving the dolphins and the turtles and beef"

(Cabasco 3), which from Cabasco's point of view was hard to sell to people of color. As

Cabasco continued to explain in her interview, this was a problem since people of color were

(are) "at the bottom of the totem pole," meaning that several of the issues faced by people of

color, e.g., underemployment, access to education, unsafe work conditions, being used as

disposable labor, access to medical care, clean water, safe living conditions, are a "direct result of structural adjustment and GATT policies and free trade" (3).

Bocanegra agreed with Cabasco. In his interview, Bocanegra claimed that he "didn't see a whole lot of mobilizing on a large scale for people [of color] to come out and participate" (Bocanegra and Nunez 6). From Bocanegra's perspective, what should have happened was that organizers should have built "connections with what's going on with globalization, [the] de-industrialization of the urban centers, un-unionized labor, and service sector economies, [like] McDonalds" and asking why is it that predominately "people of color [are] working in these areas?" (Bocanegra and Nunez 6).

What happened instead, according to Bocanegra, was that none of the organizations affiliated with the DAN came onto the UW campus to perform the "structured organizing" (Bocanegra and Nunez 5) needed so students of color could make "those connections"(Bocanegra and Nunez 6). Referencing both a lack of historical perspective and free time, Bocanegra explained it is "hard for students" of color to organize when these connections are "not laid out" for them because "there's no leadership [from] the community coming [onto campus] and helping…out" (Bocanegra and Nunez 6). Bocanegra claimed in his interview that this translated into low numbers of participation by students of color in the N30 students' march and the other WTO protests he attended independent of MEChA. "I didn't see large groups of people of color. There were Native American drummers at times," Bocanegra wryly told Ghosh during their interview (6).

The participation in the protest against the WTO was important for the Mechistas since they saw the WTO and NAFTA as consubstantial, which was built on their understanding of the

issues via the Zapatistas. By donning a ski mask or a bandana, they were marching as Zapatistas who understood the issues of neoliberalism and organizations like the WTO from an analysis that articulates a position on "sovereignty, environmental [issues], [and] human rights" (Cabasaco 10), which Nunez, Bocanegra, and Cabasaco felt were broad topics that could have included the local issues important to people of color in the Seattle area.

 (3) The text's modes or possibilities of reproduction or preservation

For the Mechistas, the reproduction of a Zapatista march was a moment of pedagogy, which was both a way to reproduce and preserve Zapatismo and a way to mobilize local Chicanas/os and *Mexicanos*. As Riedner and Mahoney point out, pedagogy and rhetorics can be one and the same and affective/effective; people "feel" something is important and is useful in laying discursive hands onto people so as to move them to a specific action. Mahoney and Riedner explain:

> If we think about pedagogy in this way, it becomes a cultural force for democracy in its own right; a cultural literacy, which intervenes in a multiplicity of systems, institutions, formations, and constituencies to create meaning. As a practice of meaning-making, pedagogy becomes rhetorical action: a political practice of making, reproducing, and remaking of social relations, identities, and intervening in relations of dominance and exploitation. (7)

This was a moment of solidarity because the Mechistas marched "*en totos somos Zapatists*," that is, they were "all Zapatistas" for that day. For the Mechistas, this was a moment of organic "meaning-making" where they connected their individual and organizational struggles, issues, and goals across nation-state boundaries and cultures to the Zapatistas of Chiapas, Mexico. It

was also a moment to create a spectacle, to make the existence of people of color visible in the moment of *detournment*. And based on Bocanegra's comments in his interviews, the Mechistas knew what the masks represented, the dress, and chose this garb in an attempt to remind onlookers and white participants that the issues of neoliberalism affected people of color in specific, concrete ways, and moreover, that there had been a critique of neoliberalism for some time before the WTO protests in Seattle.

(4) What does the text did to (or with, or against) other texts

I will approach this using only the concepts of *enabling, appropriating, supplementing, challenging,* and *silencing*, just as Blair does in "Contemporary US Memorial Sites" since the linkages "among texts can be so varied and numerous" (Blair 39). Zapatismo *enabled* this march, i.e., this look *enabled* the Mechistas to both participate and still delineate themselves from the majority of protestors through their visual presentation alone. To wit, even though the Mechistas were upset by the lack of organizing in communities outside of white Seattle, they followed the primary principle of Zapatismo—one no, many yeses—yet they could still manifest their displeasure with the DAN by looking and acting like a centrally controlled military unit—the exact opposite of the freewheeling, come as you are style of the DAN.

This was an *appropriation* of the most physical and embodied aspect of Zapatismo—the marches and ceremony of the *encunetros*—and was also an appropriation of the mystique and *ethos* of the EZLN, the army of the Zapatistas. Such a militant look was a way to demonstrate Bocanegra, Nunez, and Cabasco's belief that a majority of the other activists had come to the fight against neoliberalism late. It was an attempt to broadcast that there were people of color discussing, fighting, and dying for the same principles long before any articulated platform by

the various developed north organizations making up the DAN. Most importantly, this act of appropriation was a demonstration of solidarity with those who have died and those who continued to fight a physical, material, and unending discursive/physical war to maintain the autonomous Zapatista zones in Mexico.

The action *supplemented* the DAN protest of the WTO. For Bocanegra, it represented an alternate method of protesting the WTO, that is, the MEChA march was a centralized, top-down, traditional affair put on by an established activist organization, not a decentralized movement of movements implementing direct action projects. For Bocanegra, the MEChA contingent represented his ideal anti-globalization movement; a movement would make headway "as an organization" which could create a stable "platform" so that WTO protests weren't just "an isolated incident," but an on-going resistance project that people could leave and come back to as it fit with their lives outside their activism. People could "work with each other over and over again" through a constant "organizing [of] the community" via MEChA (8).

Bocanegra's warrant is that the type of constant resistance needed to challenge the WTO could not/would not happen with decentralized protest networks like the DAN. He articulates this when he says in his interview with Ghosh "Only under an organization can that really happen. Because that's what happened after the WTO…there [were] all these meetings [with people asking] well what are we going to do?" (8). Organizing, for Bocanegra, is easier, more efficient, and more effective when there is an enduring organizational "structure" dedicated to

"organizing the community" against supranational organizations like the WTO (Bocanegra and Nunez 8)[27].

Challenging and silencing. According to Bocanegra, the Mechistas were "acting autonomously," (Bocanegra and Nunez 4), not because the Mechistas saw themselves as in "opposition to what they [the DAN] were doing, but simply because there was no formal relationship" (Bocanegra and Nunez 4), because, just like other communities of color, no representative from the DAN had approached MEChA. MEChA through Bocanegra had approached NO! to WTO[28], and the Mechistas stayed abreast of the larger activities because they sent an appointed liaison to the NO! to WTO meetings. Again, marching as Zapatistas was to *challenge* the predominately white angle on and participation in the WTO protests. The challenge was a visual, visceral, and ideological/historical, yet communicative act that signaled the Mechistas' displeasure as it also allowed them to still participate in the protest of the WTO ministerial meetings. It was a challenge to what Nunez, Bocanegra, and Cabasco saw as the overall whiteness of the protest and simultaneously a political statement, to illustrate people of color were present; to illustrate this presence by presenting themselves in public as a recognizable, separate, militant unit; and through taking on this ethos and image, re-affirm their commitment to *la raza*[29]through the community defined notion of Zapatistas, and be self-sufficient as no DAN affiliated organizers came out to them.

---

[27] I surmise this is an outcome of MEChA's history as an organization. Founded in 1969, MEChA is an organization whose overriding mandate is to "seek an end to [the] oppression and exploitation of the *Chicano/Chicana* community," through a traditional, top-down hierarchical structure.

[28] NO! to WTO or Network Opposed to the WTO and also known as People for Fair Trade was a more mainstream organization run by Mike Dolan. Dolan has worked for or run different nongovernmental organization over the years; he and Cabasco worked together but were often at odds. Moreover, he was at odds with several of the activist groups from the Seattle area associated with the DAN since he believed in traditional, hierarchical organizations with paid staff over organic, consensus building volunteer groups.

[29] "La raza" literally translates to "the people." Groups like MEChA use the term to denote its members as well as the community they advocate for, that is, Mexican-Americans.

Taking the look and physical style of the EZLN also *silenced* the traditional message of MEChA. While there are similarities between Zapatismo and the philosophical principles of MEChA, to present oneself in this specific way ensured that the onlookers were confused about which organization was present, and what the MEChA contingent's specific issue with the WTO even was. Even Bocanegra admitted that the Mechistas "ended up looking like Anarchists" (Bocanegra and Nunez 7), pointing out the cognitive dissonance that was created by the Zapatista march. In becoming Zapatistas at an event where there wasn't a narrator explaining the context or reasons behind the public performance, this was a moment of contradiction to MEChA's traditional goal: fostering the social justice for Chicanos/as through education and activism. To return to Blair's essay, this is a moment where the "audience's familiarity with the syntax" of a given rhetorical act built on another rhetorical act comes into play (Blair 40). Without understanding the context or the "famous forerunner," an onlooker would have had a difficult time forming an "intertextual reading" (Blair 40) that allowed for an understanding that the Mechistas marched as MEChA, with all the attendant beliefs of the organization in mind, and concurrently as Zapatistas.

A happy accident of this moment is that it demonstrates the participants were doing more than being cynical and adopting an international image and stance for screen time. Through the accounts in Nunez, Bocanegra, and Cabasco interviews, it's clear that none of them saw MEChA's goals and the Zapatistas' goals as incompatible; they seemed to see no conflict by representing both MEChA and the Zapatistas. For the participants, one group's goals and ideology were consubstantial to the other. Bocanegra and Nunez's understanding of the WTO through the lens of NAFTA and the Zapatistas meant they understood neo-liberal economic policy and the concept of supposed "free trade" as an extension of NAFTA. Because of the

influence of the Zapatistas within activist circles (as described in chapter three) and a sense of community that stretched beyond the US border due to language, family, history, and culture, Nunez and Bocanegra and the rest of the Mechistas had a set of terministic screens that facilitated a negative interpretation of the WTO and its policies. And as a consequence, the MEChA organizers, and participant-comrades like Cabasco, saw the Zapatistas/EZLN and the Mechistas as completely simpatico. This point serves as the most striking difference between the Mechistas and the rest of the affiliated DAN groups. Most DAN affiliated groups could articulate that the Zapatistas played a role in the then current moment of protest by helping to create groups like the PGA through the First International Encounter, yet they kept their own individual groups' goals and platforms as sacrosanct[30].

The experiential implications for both the Mechistas and the DAN affiliated groups were immense. The ability for the DAN and groups associated either directly or indirectly with the DAN (e.g., the Sierra Club, the AFL-CIO, the Rainforest Action Network, Jobs with Justice, Seattle Radical Women) to keep their own platforms sacrosanct was both a victory and a defeat. On the one hand, the WTO protest in Seattle served as a living example of the Zapatista belief in one no and many yeses, the ability of a diverse coalition of groups with various goals to come together united against a common enemy. And yet it was also a defeat as this meant the mainly white, mostly Euro-American activist clique from the Seattle area could march and participate in the protest unreflexively. In turn, this meant an inability by these groups to consider ways to expand their organizing efforts beyond their established membership and gain new members or allies; an inability to articulate the larger architecture of social and political machinations that allowed an entity like the WTO to exist; an inability to cogently articulate a sense of solidarity

---

[30] For examples of this, please read the interviews with David Solnit and Kevin Danaher found in the WTO archives or on *The WTO History Project* website.

with movements outside the US; an inability to see or articulate—as pointed out by Cabasco—the intersections of poverty, race, and neoliberal economic theory in the United States; and even an inability to present a cogent message to the mainstream media.

Of course, none of these groups saw their actions in this light; moreover, no group released a statement explaining they intended to *not* organize specific populations due to a belief in segregation built along class and race lines. Yet the inability to see such issues and react accordingly spoke volumes for Bocanegra and Nunez, who reacted accordingly. Bocanegra and Nunez chose to organize on their own and connect these issues of globalization, poverty, and racism to the WTO for the members of MEChA. And the easiest way for them to make those connections for their peers was to present it from the angle of the Zapatistas because there already existed a shared understanding about Zapatismo within MEChA.

And yet this could be construed as a failure for the Mechistas, too, because without an intertextual reading most onlookers would have been confused as to why the Mechistas were dressed in such a way. However, I claim that only in a traditional rhetorical analysis, an analysis using the warrant of the rhetorical triangle to undergird its claims, that this moment of rhetoric would be seen as a failure. If we think of a rhetoric as an organic pedagogy used to teach individuals how to think and move in the material world, then Bocanegra and Nunez were master rhetors.

(5) How the text acted on people

Blair asserts that the largest "miss" of symbolic concept of rhetoric is that such a construction appeals exclusively to the mind of the reader/listener. Blair asserts that:

Rhetoric of all kinds acts on the whole person—body as well as mind—and often

on the person situated in a community of other persons. There are particular

physical actions the texts demands of us; ways it inserts itself in our attention, and

ways of encouraging or discouraging us to act or move, as well as think, in

particular directions" (45-46).

The way that the uniform (think: text) of the EZLN soldier demanded physical action from the

Mechistas, the way the uniform (text) inserted itself in their minds when it came to preparing for

N30, and the ways it encouraged the Mechistas to act or think in specific directions can be

discussed by looking at the very mundane topics of preparation and destination. Through the

choice to march as Zapatistas, the Mechistas had to put together the appropriate attire, complete

with ski mask or bandana, so they could pull off their public performance. Marching on N30 also

required that each Mechista perform the "physical labor….to negotiate their physical

dimensions" (Blair 37) to take "buses, to meet in all in one place" (Cabasco 12) to begin their

march. This navigating of the city during the ministerial and during a protest was "really, really

frustrating" (Cabasco 12), and yet was done by several because they were physical motivated by

the intertwined rhetorics of MEChA and the Zapatistas. These rhetorics demanded the "physical

labor" (Blair 37) of the participants to go to these sites, they required the Mechistas well as non-

protestors use their "mobility to negotiate their spatial dimensions" (Blair 37).

For non-protestors negotiating "their spatial dimensions" meant navigating the downtown

cityscape of Seattle once it was shut down on N30, which meant having to avoid "dumpsters in

the middle of the street, so that "armored personal carriers couldn't come through," navigating an

urban landscape where "[m]ountains of [tear] gas [were] going up into the air," or changing

normal travel routes because "militarized police" armed with "clubs" had formed lines and were

telling pedestrians, "'You can't go there'" (Page 3), "there" being wherever the pedestrian normally walked during her routine day around Seattle. For the Mechistas, it meant being jailed; being pepper sprayed; being tear gassed even as they "were already dispersing" (Cabasco 14) since they had been instructed to do so; being kettled; being arrested; marching in the rain; dressing up in specific clothes or carrying specific banners to identify themselves as from a specific group or demonstrating against a specific policy. Bodies were moved, modified, motivated, coerced, and disciplined because of a rhetoric, which was transmitted through the texts of communiqués, meetings, and the garb of the Zapatistas.

In this vein of physical space, the epicenter of this protest—downtown Seattle—also became a communal space when the Mechistas—along with others—participated in the N30 march. Blair explains the importance of these communal spaces when she asserts that in these spaces "[o]ne may seems alone with one thoughts but still moving among others" (48). The consequence of this ability to be alone but with others according to Blair is the ability for a protest to be an "*event*" that is "*felt* as important" (Blair 48).

Specifically in the case of the Mechistas, Lydia Cabasco recounts how this communal space created by the protest was important. Cabasco marched with the Mechistas as a Zapatista, and when all the groups participating in the N30 student march deployed, the march:

> blanketed Denny [Street]…And it was huge. It was beautiful. We were walking
> down Denny…we looked back, and we had totally blanketed Denny. It was
> completely covered, and then more people kept on coming and coming. And the
> fact that…MEChA [was] there at the forefront was really powerful. (Cabasco 10)

This communal space that was "really powerful" (Cabasco 10) is what made the protest an "*event*" and created the bodily sensation that protesting the WTO was "important" (Blair 48). The rhetoric of Zapatismo operated, through the talk, the training, the dress, the marching, and the memories of the MEChA contingent; literally, on the "whole person" of each Mechista, not just the metaphysical "'heart and minds'" of each Mechista (Blair 46). The plan to march as Zapatistas, the attempt by Bocanegra and Nunez to have their fellow Mechistas make the connection between the WTO and the issues of the Zapatistas in Mexico, was the way Zapatismo summoned the attention of the Mechistas, forced the Mechistas to consider, think about, or attempt to discover the connections between neoliberal economic theory, the American racial caste system, and poverty in the US. The EZLN uniform pushed the Mechistas to consider the WTO and United States from the angle of the Zapatistas. The bodies representing Zapatismo became a text that effected "material lives as well as…mental activities," which concomitantly meant "treating particular texts as objects of desire while functionally ignoring others" (Blair 46). In this case, Zapatismo, as a rhetoric, acted upon the whole person "to garner attention" (Blair 47).

The preparation leading up to N30 and the physical act of marching on N30 forced the Mechistas to also think about their organization, the Seattle DAN, and the WTO in specific ways. For Nunez, a value added quality of marching as Zapatistas was that the Mechistas had to both go through "teaching" and "training" from the Third Eye Movement[31] of San Francisco to get themselves ready for N30. Nunez claims this teaching about the issues surrounding the WTO and training the Mechistas received about how to handle themselves during a demonstration

---

[31] Nunez explained in his interview that the Mechistas "organized with…the Third Eye Movement…from San Francisco" as well with "Gail Shannon, who had done a bunch of campaigns…in Seattle" who had "worked on a lot of I-200, Anti-200 stuff," and she helped Nunez and Bocanegra "organize [their] group as a whole as far as strategically" (Bocanegra and Nunez 5).

"really mobilized the group" (Bocanegra and Nunez 5) and simultaneously allowed the individual Mechistas to tie MEChA to the international cause of thwarting neoliberal economics. This tactic also ensured the rank-and-file membership were onboard with establishing a distinct, separate identity from the other marchers in protest of the organizing people of color, and therefore, a buy-in to resist "being incorporated into [the] much broader group" (Bocanegra and Nunez 5) of the almost exclusively white DAN.

In this way, the MEChA organizers combined a physical style of dress and the accompanying *ethos* to persuade its members to participate but stay separate as a way to protest both the DAN and the WTO; to still march in the most evocative dress possible to challenge the neoliberal policies of the WTO; to embody Bocanegra's belief the best method of organizing for long-term resistance to the WTO was through a top-down, centralized organization; and through this talking, teaching, organizing and marching see their political and social goals as connected to the goals of a larger, international movement. To harken back to the work of Edbauer, a new identity was created through the affective aspects of rhetoric.

That this one, physical act had so many consequences is best described by Rachel Riedner and Kevin Mahoney's concept, "rhetorical action" (41). Specifically, rhetorical action best describes the intra-network communication that was going on through the rhetorical act of marching as Zapatistas. Rhetorical action depends on "'ingenuity, artistry, and swiftness of thought'" as wells as a "relationship to power and abilities of a subject to create affective relationships in conjunction with dominant and emergent structures of feelings" (41). Through rhetorical action, it is possible to create "an openness for new practices and affective relationships that are already existing, but not yet articulated in a recognizable, strategic, or liberatory form" (Riedner and Mahoney 41). Through this the use of the Zapatista look and

ethos, Zapatismo acted specifically on/with/through Nunez and Bocanegra as they attempted for a "complete re-articulation" of how MEChA and it members viewed its mission as an organization (Riedner and Mahoney 40). Marching as Zapatistas set "the stage for intervention" in the "rhetorical spaces" (Riedner and Mahoney 40) of MEChA by asking the MEChA contingent, built on various MEChA chapters, to participate in the rhetorical action of the N30 march and come to accept that the goals of the Zapatistas and MEChA were one and the same, and then take this concept back to their home chapters, thus creating an organic change within MEChA from the grassroots.

For Nunez and Bocanegra, without this militant display the Mechistas would have fallen into "the background," and the N30 march wouldn't have had "much significance" for the MEChA contingent (Bocanegra and Nunez 5). This became both a way to create an evocative *ethos* and a way to internalize the concepts of Zapatismo. As Mahoney and Riedner point out, this is rhetoric acting as an affective connection that shapes and fosters a critical, lifelong consciousness. This talk of teaching and self-determination is different from the others interviewed for the WTO History Project; the "others" I refer to were the activists who were long-time protestors, and who had participated in several other protest campaigns. Hence, the act of preserving Zapatismo, in contrast to the other DAN participants, was done through embodying Zapatismo by dressing as an EZLN soldier. Through that embodiment, a transfer of Zapatismo occurred, and this transfer was a method to encourage MEChA as a national organization to incorporate the fight against neoliberalism by incorporating Zapatismo into its organizational

philosophy.[32] Zapatismo acted on the whole body of the Mechistas and in doing so ensured a multi-faceted rhetorical effect.

Major Ana Maria: The Speaker Respoken

In a taped interview from February 28, 1994, Major Ana Maria explains how the EZLN, and later the Zapatistas, came into being. They did so by synthesizing the indigenous ways of know and being with their material conditions through the spoken word. A major component of the indigenous (often in shorthand referred to as "Mayan") philosophy is the connection to the land; land is central to the ability of people to care for themselves; that land is cared for so it can continue to provide for the people. Major Ana Maria explains that the EZLN began with simple questions surrounding food, starvation, and land. First, according to the major, the soldiers began to grapple with the question, "Why does the government not resolve our hunger problem?", which then led to the group examining their lived experience. These neo-Zapatistas openly discussed and questioned why they were forcibly removed from vacant farms they reclaimed for subsistence farming, which they had obtained without using "arms or anything" (Major Ana Maria n. pag.) since there was no one there to claim or farm the land.

After recounting how the Mexican government always deemed such a practical act to avoid starvation "an invasion," they then all began to recount how "Public Security forces," would then appear to "burn [down] the houses that had been built," forcibly "evict" the inhabitants "with canes," and in this eviction process "beat" the indigenous farmers with said canes (Major Ana Maria n. pag.). After that ordeal, the Public Security forces would "take"

---

[32] This did happen as far as I can tell. In 2012, MEChA had its 2nd National Encuentro, where "[w]ith *Zapatismo* as our main focus," they hoped to "promote the ideals and philosophies adopted by the *Zapatista Communities*" in an effort to "invoke a desire for MEChA as a national organization to further become politically conscious through community involvement" (*Movimiento Estudiantil Chican@ de Aztlàn Official National Website*).

anyone designated as "leaders," "put them in jail" and torture them publicly with techniques like "dragging." Public Security would have the leaders "dragged with horses" (Major Ana Maria n.pag.) as an example of what happened to indigenous farmers who claimed fallow land to feed their families. Major Ana Maria explains the consensus of those early Zapatistas was that this type of violence was how the Mexican government always responded to the problems faced by the citizens of Chiapas, so the Zapatistas decided it was time they "took up arms" (Major Ana Maria n. pag.).

This is an early public explanation of the warrants undergirding the claims of Zapatismo, the rhetoric of the Zapatistas and later anti-neoliberal protests. This snippet demonstrates that before the rhetoric went viral, Zapatismo was a placed based rhetoric. Major Ana Maria and her confederates were driven by land, which they saw as where they lived and like their "mother" that took "care" of them and fed them (Major Ana Maria n. pag.). In the sense that food is sustenance and ensures the Zapatistas make it from one day to the next, this is a strong example of a material rhetoric. Zapatismo was a rhetoric tied to daily survival.

As we read the Mechistas' bodies as texts, it becomes easier to understand how such land-based rhetoric was sincerely appropriated by activists protesting the WTO ministerial meetings. In Collins's "The Speaker Respoken: Material Rhetoric as Feminist Methodology," there is a difference between the writer and the "publishing authorities"—literally those who come later or are beyond the physical proximity of the writer, who control how a text is printed, reprinted, added to, or used in public speaking engagements. Shortly thereafter, Collins explains "rhetorical accretion," saying

As a reader of multiple texts, the production authority sometimes decides to

combine them—for example, to attach an introduction representing a certain

ideological viewpoint, to include a dedication indicating who supported the

writer, or to publish a work in a volume with other works rather than as a solo

text. This process of layering additional texts over and around the original text I

call rhetorical accretion. (547)

However, Collins is quick to point out rhetorical accretion is the product of human agency;

moreover, with "each accretion to the text the speaker of the *core* text is respoken" (548,

emphasis mine).

If we think of Bocanegra and Nunez as the publishing authorities and Major Ana Maria

as the writer from Collins's model, then we see Bocanegra and Nunez have removed the concept

of place, the farm land of Chiapas, from Zapatista rhetoric. Much like the examples listed above,

Bocanegra and Nunez decided to focus on key aspects of Zapatista rhetoric and delete others. For

Bocanegra and Nunez, the focus was the uniform of the Zapatistas and the soldiers of the EZLN,

not the fight for farm land and indigenous rights. Through their choices, Nunez and Bocanegra

colored "the ethos of the core text" through their very material "modes of production and

distribution" (Collins 548), and moreover, in the time and place they (re)produced Zapatismo.

The motivation for Bocanegra and Nunez's layer of accretion was formed by their

exigency: organizing Chicanos/as and *Mexicanos/as* for a march they did not—at least initially—

feel welcome at. Their will to act, again to borrow from Burke, is based on their collective

admission that they wanted to protest against neoliberalism, and within the immediate scene of

Seattle that economic and political philosophy was represented by the WTO. However, Nunez

and Bocanegra's larger scene, in the pentadic sense, is informed by the history of Mexican-Americans and Chicanos/as in the United States, as well as the issues I described at length with the DAN and its affiliated groups. Added to this were the goals and history of MEChA. As Burke explains in a *Grammar of Motives*, when considering the scene-agent ratio for pentadic analysis:

> [t]he correlation between the quality of the country and the quality of its inhabitants…by the logic of the scene-agent ratio, if the scene will partake of the same supernatural quality. And so, spontaneously, purely being the kind of agent that is at one with this kind of scene, the child is "divine." The contents of the divine container will synecdochially share in its divine. (1305)

Through the network of activism the two found themselves connected with and the scene they both occupied, i.e., Seattle in 1999 gearing up for a major protest, and due to the larger scene of growing/becoming Chicano in the US, both Nunez and Bocanegra had a propensity towards activism and protest.

Additionally, if we examine not only Bocanegra and Nunez's position as agents within this network but also the act they chose to enact within the scene, we see that this, too, is dependent on their surroundings and the affective connections to that scene. Burke provides the lens for analysis when he explains "there is implicit in the quality of a scene the quality of the action that is to take place within it. This would be another way of saying that the act will be consistent with the scene" (1304). The scene leading up to and on the day of November 30th, 1999 was protest. A large march was planned as well as direct action activities. Both were designed to disrupt the WTO ministerial meetings. Using the tools and practices, or the agency in

Burkean terms, available to them through the given scene, Bocanegra and Nunez chose to participate by putting their group into the protest march; and even this choice was informed by the scene and purpose of their endeavor. The purpose of the act by these two agents was to disrupt the WTO meetings; an element of the scene was a concern for the "people in the organization itself who are residents" of the United States but not "citizens" (Bocanegra 6). In turn, this meant participating in the legal and city sanctioned students' march, not the riskier, technically illegal direct action happenings designed to either slow down WTO representatives' ability to travel to meetings or barring these participants from entering the buildings where the various meetings were being held.

Burke explains the overall framework for the grammar of motives in these terms:

> The hero (agent) with the help of a friend (co-agent) outwits the villain (counteragent) by using a file (agency) that enables him to break his bonds (act) in order to escape (purpose) from the room where he has been confined. (1301)

If we place the Bocanegra and Nunez into this framework, we get both men (agent and co-agent) organizing a MEChA cohort (agency) in an attempt to stop the WTO (counteragent) from meeting by denying easy access to the meeting places by adding their bodies to the overfilling the city streets with physical bodies (act), which enables them to contribute to the shutdown of the 1999 WTO ministerial meetings as a protest of neoliberal economics (purpose).

How this formation of new identities occurred can be described by looking at Bocanegra and Nunez's act through Collins's discussion of publishing authorities. Bocanegra and Nunez took in the various accretions of the rhetoric produced by the various publishing authorities, and then rewrote the rhetoric to fit their needs, their exigency, their purpose, their scene, their

agency, and their act. Most likely, it is safe to say that Bocanegra and Nunez learned about the EZLN and the Zapatista Party through multiple texts, and as readers of "multiple texts" and as the eventual "production authority" for a very public, embodied enactment of Zapatismo, they decided to "combine them," to use them to represent "a certain ideological viewpoint" (Collins 547) existing in the previous incarnations of Zapatismo. And this "process of layering additional texts" such as the politics and philosophy of MEChA and working in conjunction with the Seattle DAN within their own set of pre-defined limitations, served as a material, discursive, and embodied moment of "rhetorical accretion" (Collins 547). Major Ana Maria, through "each accretion of the text" that became Zapatismo, was "respoken" (Collins 548). Through removing land as the foundation for Zapatismo, Bocanegra and Nunez were able to craft a new version of Zapatismo, one that fit their needs, in a process akin to what Collins describes in her analysis of the editors behind the various editions of *The Account of Hester Ann Rogers*. And in doing so, Bocanegra and Nunez provided an example of rhetorical accretion that worked outside the confines of print.

Conclusion

The "fluidifying" of identity undergone by the Mechistas was a move so as to form a temporary coalition with the other organizations loosely tied together by the Seattle DAN. While there was no evangelical search for dialogue, it still achieved the material goal of putting Mechista boots on the ground, and the process of becoming Zapatistas taught the Mechistas how to organize themselves and determine their own course of action through the act of protesting. This concept of the teaching moment, and of a pedagogy undergirding that teaching moment, is important in trying to explain how this identity shift was organic and meaningful.

In *Democracies to Come*, Rachel Riedner and Kevin Mahoney designate such a critical pedagogy created by Bocanegra and Nunez as rhetorical action, that is, a political practice of making, reproducing, and remaking social relation, identities, and devising ways to intervene in relations of dominance and exploitation. In turn, according to Mahoney and Riedner, these types of pedagogies shape democratic practices, providing the frame from which *to view rhetorical acts and assign them meanings*. Speaking specifically of emotion in moments of protest, Riedner and Mahoney claim affective connections are made by participants to the event, affective connections that allow for a moment where the social and political status quo can be questioned. For them, "pedagogy becomes a space of learning whose purpose is to develop an understanding of new structures, and in doing so, develop literacies for new, critical perspectives for democracies to come" (7).

I would argue that this happened before and during N30. As Bocanegra explained in his interview with Ghosh, "It wasn't like people were coming to our meetings and asking to organize us or helping us to organize us" so he and Nunez decided they should "organize ourselves" (Bocanegra and Nunez 4, 1). Considering these were university students, taking on the responsibility to organize a group of other university students was out of character for Bocanegra and Nunez—even though they were members of a group like MEChA since they organized without any direction or assistance from the MEChA national office.

Moreover, the social reality of Bocanegra and Nunez was the American university; a system of higher education where the "move to connect education to the market has slowly eclipsed" the "parallel tradition" of preparing "students for their roles as citizens in a democratic culture," in a larger society that believes "democracy has already been assured by other means," that the US is a "free and fair society, and that the government, police, and institutions of civil

society protect these freedoms," where "dialogue and innovation that…protests offer are not…democratic" (Riedner and Mahoney 17, 5). The move to become Zapatistas, "insofar representation is an act" and is therefore "rhetoric" (Riedner and Mahoney 20), meant that Bocanegra and Nunez were attempting to affect that specific intersection of time, space, and event, and furthermore, using the teaching moment of organizing with university students as a way to establish "links and connections between the social relations of capital and the arena of education…generating discourses that foreground the relationships between neoliberalism and labor," to articulate the "contradictions, differences, and possibilities" presented in a protest where they were such "differently situated groups" (Riedner and Mahoney 18). Essentially, Bocanegra and Nunez were pointing out the affective links that were always already happening, and demonstrating for themselves and their fellow Mechistas by dressing as Zapatistas the way to create a space for participation in the public sphere: through protest and international solidarity.

This ability to choose this method was produced by the existing affective links formed by the documents, talk, and organizing between the Mechistas' network and the other discursive networks they were connected to; the network of note being the Mexican American community. And due to the rhetorical velocity friendly boilerplate style[33] of Zapatismo—the fact that Zapatismo "is whatever (and whoever) you want it to be" (Conant 239)—Zapatismo was the most viable rhetoric traveling through these networks spread by the various discursive ephemera either produced by or for the Zapatistas. As these texts reached Bocanegra and Nunez, they retooled them so as to move the Mechistas—emotionally, intellectually, and physically—they also began to affect their immediate, activist environment around them by making clear the

---

[33] "Boilerplate" as described in Devoss and Ridolfo's "Composing for Recomposition: Rhetorical Velocity and Delivery."

issues of race, class and privilege among the DAN. The identity shift from Mechista to Zapatista occurred because the agency matched the act, the scene, and embodied everything the counteragent (the WTO) stood for and promoted. Additionally, and to use Burke's theories once more, this shift was bolstered by the simultaneous moment of identification and consubstantiality that occurred as the Mechistas went through their "teaching" and "training" to become an EZLN platoon with the Third Eye Movement.

In addition, the Mechistas became Zapatistas because it was an emotional reaction to the WTO and the DAN; those emotions generated exigency and value; and because of this a rhetorical act was formulated from these foundations which was a process that had to be undergone, "like a passion must be undergone, a process of becoming," a protest in which the "affective experiences and practices" became "moments of new possibility, of lived solidarity" (Mahoney and Riedner xiv). This rhetorical action, spread by the various, other experiential, material moments of texts, talk, and organizing, created a rationality specific to this contingent of Mechista-Zapatistas, gave each member a new subject position, and through that position the world became knowable, stable, and each member knew what actions to take going forward.

Simply put, becoming Zapatistas allowed the Mechistas *to view rhetorical acts going on around them and assign them meanings.* This is what is often described as an organic, grassroots change. This happens, I claim, through the material affect and effect of rhetoric, and I claim this is also the way transnational protest identities are diffused. It isn't a cynical move or the undue influence of provocateurs, but a moment of becoming. Protestors become the international activist identities they take on as they come to understand how their individual struggles connect to their international allies and those allies' struggles.

This "becoming" is an outcome of material rhetoric. In this model texts are written onto bodies with specific rhetorical goals in mind and are released into the public sphere; the texts are read; they are evocative; readers/listeners/viewers take them up deploy them in their lives as fits their material situation; they take the pieces of the text, and therefore rhetoric, which meet their specific need; new texts are created (spoken, written or digital) and the rhetorical goal is the same but different; similar but new. This ability for texts and their accompanying rhetoric to be similar yet different is the outcome of the various material exigencies a rhetor/writer faces various challenges. As a rhetoric proves fecund due to these material exigencies, that rhetoric it is taken-up, retooled, and enacted by a different rhetors or writers. The physical act of deployment changes both rhetor/writer and physical space; the effect may linger or fade depending on the outcomes of the act and the new challenges which arise after the moment of deployment.

The Mechistas chose the look of the Zapatista soldier, a member of the EZLN, as it would affect the Mechistas themselves. The Mechistas, due to a plethora of factors already discussed, were exposed to the boilerplate text of the Zapatista soldier through various discursive outlets and chose to reproduce that text in Seattle because it was affective for their members and effective in mobilizing Mechistas for a potentially risky undertaking.

While this act's effectiveness with onlookers may be debated, what is important to note is that the Mechistas became Zapatistas for the day because it helped them create a rhetorical response to the stressors of Seattle in 1999. The Mechistas became Zapatistas not because they were entranced by Subcomandante Marcos's words, but because the image of the EZLN was the most evocative argument Bocanegra and Nunez could make to organize a contingent of Mechistas for N30. This is an experiential example of how rhetorics are diffused and are

dependent on material factors; however, this example also demonstrates how this diffusion is tempered by agency *and* contextual factors. Agency and the act stemming from it may obfuscate an intertextual reading by onlookers (and even rhetoricians), yet the point of rhetoric is not always to convince/convert an audience. It also a set of practices used to self-teach, to learn how to resist the status quo, and to rewrite the relationships between individuals or groups of people.

Chapter five: Discussion and Pedagogical Implications

Discussion

This project is one part material rhetorical analysis and one part rhetorical historiography, in that I understand rhetorical historiography to be the recounting of a rhetoric used in the near or distant past, by whom, and for what purposes. And I feel I would be remiss if I did not state that this project analyzes only a small part of a much larger, much more complex moment in time; moreover, the interviews and secondary/tertiary sources it utilizes are subjective, limited, and disconnected from each other. Only through my work to put the all of these artifacts and secondary sources in conversation have I cobbled together a coherent narrative of how Zapatismo moved from Chiapas, Mexico to Seattle, Washington. This account is "like all accounts…subject to challenge and hence to revision, small and large" (Agnew et al. 247).

For the most part, I have tried to write a history about a protest as well as the creation of specific protest rhetoric. The writing of this history and the rhetoric used at this time has been constrained by my material situation, the amount of time available for such a project, and even my physical location. I have written this dissertation from a distance—like all historians of rhetoric do—yet unlike most historians I wrote from a distance measured in years *and* a distance measured in miles. I have had no physical contact with the archives I've researched as I've had no funding to do so; it is not popular, and thus difficult to acquire funding for, a project about a protest rhetoric. And yet without having to focus on a digital interface I would have not had the tunnel vision required to write almost exclusively using interviews from the WTO Collection.

And yet this has also been a blessing. Most scholarly monographs I've encountered only deal with the "on the fly" decision making processes made possible by then nascent social

networking technologies. Several news broadcasts from the time took the position that the protests were the work of anarchists looking to do property damage. The placards and photos available through the digital interface often focus on the protests or direct action projects of a few DAN affiliated groups. And the accounts of long time activists involved with the 1999 protest, like Dave Solnit, found both in sources inside and outside the archives, almost always skirt discussion about the efforts to organize communities of color during the beginning phase of the WTO protest, or at best only mention a post-protest self-critique that blandly affirms they could have done better a job to organize these communities.

Additionally, without reading the interviews I would have never been made aware of the connection between the Mechistas of the Seattle area and the Zapatistas of Chiapas. In writing about the Mechista-Zapatista connection, and how the rhetoric of the Zapatistas was repurposed for Seattle, I had hoped to make a comment about the rhetoric of history itself, and make clear how the accepted recounting of an event also informs which rhetorics are seen as present in a given rhetorical situation. Only because of my unique angle on the WTO protests was it possible for me to understand there was more to the Seattle protests than internet organizing, a mythical harmonious, decentralized gathering of fellow travelers, and anarchists. The protests that rocked Seattle were effective in that they achieved their shared goal: shutting down the WTO Ministerial Meetings. However, much like other aspects of experiential reality, the effort, partnerships, and routes to that goal were messy, confused, agonistic, fraught with controversy and conflict, and only happened due to individuals working cooperatively to solve the problems which presented themselves at that time.

Due to "the messiness" of material reality, researchers looking to work with the rhetorics of specific protests would do well to be mindful of the current debates in rhetorical

historiography. As demonstrated by Octalogs one, two, and three, the importance of how rhetoric is practiced in a given moment and deployed through everyday language use by various discourse communities is just as important as the theories of rhetoricians or the mainstream media narratives about the impetus for a demonstration. In the case of Seattle, the mainstream narrative was that the internet and anarchists were responsible for the multiple, city-wide demonstrations. By reading the interviews housed in the WTO History Project, it became clear the internet certainly was important and that there certainly were anarchist elements about, yet the internet was just one tool used to organize the demonstrations and the importance of the anarchists depended on a protestor's clique and affiliation.

For Bocanegra and Nunez, the internet had its uses. Yet the most important tools used by Bocanegra and Nunez to organize were the conversations, phone calls, and social connections made through previous demonstrations. In short, what was important were the tools—whichever tools—that allowed them to communicate, persuade, organize, plan, and make alliances using everyday language. More importantly, the tools were secondary to the talk. History, an established rhetoric, a common goal, a problem: these were the elements of a shared experiential reality discussed and deployed during these talks. All of these material elements existed before the internet and these elements of material reality were the driving force behind the Mechista demonstration, not vice versa.

Methods Application: The Arab Spring

My method can also be applied to more current protests. When it comes to the Arab Spring, there is a generalized, western point of view that the protests occurred because of social media sites like Twitter or Facebook. However, doing a simple Google search while writing this chapter reveals how facile this conclusion is. Several scholars and activists outside the United

States have made it known that the concept of a "Twitter Revolution" or a "Facebook Revolution" are both erroneous. As Sultan al Qassemi explained at the Arab Media Forum, "The role of social media in the revolution has been exaggerated. It did play an important role. But social media facilitated—it did not cause [the uprisings]" (Flanagan n. pag.). al Qassemi pointed out the causes were "corruption, graft, lack of human rights, and [the] oppression of young Arabs" (Flanagan n. pag.), not some zeitgeist created by the introduction of social media. Moreover, as these ills were apparently experienced on a large scale, it's safe to assume the conversations about these issues and counterpublics built around these topics existed before social media sites.

Indeed as Sashi Kumar[34] explains, there were what he calls a number of "small media" ("Indian Article Examines Social Media's 'Decisive' Role in 'Arab Spring'" 3) texts that formed these counterpublics years before the use of social media in the Arab world. Kumar claims that at the beginning of this century these small media texts formed "an established practice of agitation and indignation" that was disseminated by consumers purchasing and sharing audio and video cassettes of various "popular, if not controversial, Islamist folk heroes" ("Indian Article Examines Social Media's 'Decisive' Role in 'Arab Spring'" 3). Mostly sheiks, theologians, and television evangelists, these recordings also "jostled and vied for attention with a repertoire of hot-selling recordings and albums" by a "constellation" of Arab musicians and singers also agitating for change; and all of this formed an "eclectic spread of rhetorical, satirical, and musical work" containing an "undercurrent of aspirational Arab-hood and political identity"

---

[34] This was also part of my simple search—although I did access the Syracuse University Library databases for world newspapers in this part of the search. However, the search line was easy enough to compose. I merely typed in the Boolean phrase "twitter and Arab Spring."

("Indian Article Examines Social Media's 'Decisive' Role in 'Arab Spring'" 3). This pan-Arab identity was built on a demand for change in the ruling regimes.

And as Kumar points out, he uses this phrase, "change in ruling regimes," in contrast to "regime change" for specific historical reasons, and this history should be something paid attention to by rhetoricians doing work with the Arab Spring. This turn of phrase is related to the distinct dichotomy in the Arab world between liberalization and democratization. Liberalization began in the 1980s via the existing ruling regimes themselves, with "liberalisation [sic] [being] a top-down initiative launched in the late 1980s" by these regimes working in tandem with "traditional oligarchs co-opting an emerging economic elite and thereby keeping grass-roots popular democratic churning at bay" ("Indian Article Examines Social Media's 'Decisive' Role in 'Arab Spring'"6). This "calibrated" ("Indian Article Examines Social Media's 'Decisive' Role in 'Arab Spring'" 6) exercise in liberalization "saw fairly free parliamentary elections being held in Jordan (1989) and Yemen (1990)"; local, free elections "conducted in Algeria (1990)"; and even "rigid Saudi Arabia" experimenting with a "60-member consultative body, the *majlis ash-shura*, and a code of basic civil rights, the *al-hukum al-asasi*" ("Indian Article Examines Social Media's 'Decisive' Role in 'Arab Spring'"2).

The ruling regimes were, in effect, "soft-pedaling" a plethora of "structural adjustment programmes in the 1980s" to deal with the numerous "class-based protest by trade unions or the peasantry," that occurred so that they were "marginalised [sic]" ("Indian Article Examines Social Media's 'Decisive' Role in 'Arab Spring'" 2) and kept under the radar of the international press. These regimes, however, when they "reached their respective th[i]s-far-no- further thresholds" concerning these liberalization policies took a "U-turn into a counter phase of active de-liberalisation [sic] marked by draconian laws against the press, suspension of elections," and a

"clamp down" on any opposition parties, "particularly the Islamists" ("Indian Article Examines Social Media's 'Decisive' Role in 'Arab Spring'"2).

This is when the texts of small media—videocassettes, audio cassettes, and songs—were diffused throughout the Middle East. While there are several consequences to this history of liberalization, what is important to note is that there were several factors involved in the Arab Spring; that these factors influenced the protests seen during the Arab Spring; and that these factors shaped events post-Arab Spring. There were a plethora of incremental steps and events which led to the Arab Spring, not a wildfire of activism once Twitter reached a critical mass of Arab users. Most importantly, and similar to the WTO protests, various communication technologies were used to create the everyday language—the talk, the "word on the street"—to begin building the counterpublics that would eventually make-up the Arab Spring.

For western rhetoricians looking to study the Arab Spring, the only way to approach this event and make credible claims about the event is to understand how various rhetorics were practiced in a given moment and deployed through everyday language used by various discourse communities, as well as the texts these communities composed to spread their rhetorics beyond their immediate context. I believe the methodology I've used throughout this project, e.g., reading interviews given by protest participants; doing research in collections dedicated to the protest moment; attempting to contact protest participants for interviews; reading secondary and tertiary accounts; tracing the outcomes of given rhetorical acts (physical demonstrations, talk, or writing); attempting to understand the complex systems of history, writing, and cultural rhetoric that these acts come from; the physical consequences for the performance of those rhetorical acts; is the only ethical way to make an attempt at such an understanding. It is tedious. It is time consuming. Yet in doing this, said rhetoricians would have the historical perspective, cultural

context, and an understanding of the rhetorical ecologies at play so as to challenge the facile western mainstream media narrative that the Arab Spring was the "Twitter Revolution."

Pedagogical Implications

In pointing out the various innovative qualities of Zapatismo throughout this dissertation, I've hoped to further the discussion about who counts as a rhetor and what counts as rhetoric in rhetorical studies. Nan Johnson's concern that "we have thought too little about 'whose rhetorical legacies and traditions get to be centered in the curriculum such that students cannot leave without learning them' (Agnew et al., Ronald Jackson qtd in Agnew et al. 241), is a concern I share. And like Johnson, I also think "Border and nonwhite discourses cannot be seriously considered" as important in rhetoric studies "until rhetorical studies drops its claim to fame as the insider resource for analyzing discourses of influence; discourses of influence meaning white discourse and rhetoric" (Agnew et al. 242). By highlighting the fecundity, scale, and flexibility of Zapatismo, I have tried to demonstrate the ingenious nature of Zapatismo and how people have utilized this rhetoric as a way to argue for change in the public sphere using other means than the "white discourse and rhetoric" often used in mainstream politics.

These same moments of nonwhite discourse and rhetoric can also be studied in other protests, too. To return to the Arab Spring, it is possible to view the perseveration on social media as "discourses of influence meaning white discourse and rhetoric." As noted in the previous section, there were several events and different types of media that helped create the Arab Spring, and yet the phrase, "Twitter Revolution" has had been used—often—by the western press. If we think about the mental gymnastics involved in making such a conclusion, it is possible to view this fixation on social media as the deployment of a white discourse and

rhetoric. As Aleksey Chadayev explains in his interview with Yelena Chernenko, Twitter is the physical representation of a "classical progressive myth," that the west "creates technologies that penetrate the underdeveloped world and inspire in their inhabitants a desire for a different life. For the Western…consciousness it is customary to insist on the 'civilizing missions' of new technologies" ("Russia: Internet Expert Says 'Twitter Revolution' no Threat to Russia" 1). "Civilizing missions" is just a turn of phrase for the racist idea of white superiority; using this as their undergirding warrant, American politicians and journalists rushed forward with claims that the new means of communication—Twitter—had engineered "social change" and various "cataclysms" ("Russia: Internet Expert Says 'Twitter Revolution' no Threat to Russia" 1) for the non-white Mubarak regime in Egypt. That is to say, white America (a misnomer in itself yet the topic for another project) had given the non-white people of Egypt, through a technology developed in the United States, the desire for political change. As citizens in other nation-states joined the so-called Arab Spring, the reading of these revolts—due to the undergirding warrant explained above—was also conflated with a fabricated "popular demand for the Western liberal democratic model," even though Islamist parties, which are decidedly not enthralled with the Western democratic model, were at the time "best placed to win the elections marking regime change in each country" ("Indian Article Examines Social Media's 'Decisive' Role in 'Arab Spring'" 5). Studying the rhetorics of these Islamist parties, understanding how they mobilized desire, and what acts these rhetorics engendered during the Arab Spring could be a way to lead students through a study non-western, non-Christian, non-Anglo rhetorics within their contexts and consequences.

And in looking beyond "white discourse and rhetoric," I am also adding my voice (figuratively) to arguments being made by rhetoricians like Susan Kates. In *Activist Rhetorics*

and American Higher Education, Kates pointedly argues that is it important to examine the rhetorical practices of protests groups. Kates pushes rhetoricians to "reorient our discipline toward investigations" focused on the "heuristic potentials and political uses" of rhetorics developed and deployed by rhetors who were "not taught the arts of rhetoric" in a formal setting like the university classroom. New investigations into places "ranging from classes in basic writing to the archives of temperance societies," are allowing rhetoricians to "look past the commonplaces" and towards these protesters who have organically acquired the "uncommon skills [needed] to invent the power of speech because they were schooled to be mute" (Miller and Jones 437). I think the Zapatista-Mechista moment in Seattle and any of number of the protests in the Arab Spring are both case studies adding strength to this argument. If nothing else, it adds to what I see to be the warrants undergirding Kates's argument; a thicker description of what constitutes rhetoric and how rhetoric works are happening, every day, in material reality.

In the composition classroom, protest/social movement rhetoric of non-white demonstrators could serve as a way to bring Kates's notions of rhetoric to a classroom setting. In turn, this would be the creation of pedagogical goals reminiscent of James Berlin and Sharon Crowley: to use the classroom as a space to engage the histories and rhetorics that are "transforming what we do and how we live" (Miller 255). In this situation, a compositionist could use this notion of "transforming what we do and how we live" as a guide and find other, similar topics ripe for discussion. Such topics could include technology in the university classroom; the rise of distance learning; outsourced work; adjunct labor in the academy; the decline of unions; labor organizing in the time of transnational capital; the definition and practical uses of the label "subculture"; environmental sustainability; global warming; voter i. d. laws in the United States; images of poverty in the public sphere; images of disability in the

mainstream media; the history and production of 'zines; discourses concerning public space and ownership. The list is endless; the possibilities are limitless. My point, however, is that "a rhetoric, any rhetoric, ought to be situated within the economic, social ,and political conditions of its historical moment" (Berlin qtd in Miller 255), and the time needed to stop, read, reflect, and write on issues of consequence, ethics, and power often only occur in the composition classroom. Other classes in other fields are overwrought with a concern for covering discipline specific content; the places where discussions about how discourse, language, and rhetoric inhabit, bind, or empower people can happen in the space of the writing classroom.

My idea about how this particular project and its topic could be brought to the composition classroom is bolstered by the work of composition and rhetoric scholars like Thomas Miller. As Miller points out in "Rhetorical Historiography and the Octalogs," "Rhetoricians have long claimed to be concerned with acting in a timely manner to address the pragmatics of particular situations" (Agnew et al. 254), that we, as a discipline, "profess to value *kairos*—those pivotal moments when assumptions turn critical as paradigm shifts" (Agnew et al. 254). And yet in a very long digression, Miller points out that several of the rhetorical histories employed as the foundation for composition classrooms overlook the very real and very important issues of cuts to education.

In particular, Miller cites his own immediate context where the state of Arizona—at the time of his writing—was preparing to cut "$80 million" from its operating budget, on top of a "$100 million drop in state funding in the last two years…it [has also] relied on the most regressive form of taxations, sales taxes, with corporate taxes cut to make the state more 'friendly' to business" (Agnew et al. 254). In addition, "[e]ducation has been left to compete for funding against the poor" because legislators believed Arizona had been "too 'generous'"

(Agnew et al. 254), and wanted to overturn basic health services to those below the poverty line as a way to free up some money for land grant institutions.

Miller's digression about education in Arizona was his attempt to illustrate how little these types of topics have been considered in rhetorical studies, even though it is similar to the situations several scholars work in all over the United States. Miller continues on to argue the immediate situations of the university "seem unrelated to our histories of rhetoric," and that our professional organizations such as "CCCC and RSA have been remarkably indifferent to the economic and political forces that are transforming" (Agnew et al. 254) the lives of the scholars and students who work and study in the American academy. This is a turn, according to Miller, from the work seen in composition and rhetoric in the 1980s; the "first Octalogers" represented a general movement in the field to use a "critical stance on classicism and a material perspective on composition," which we slowly divorced ourselves from as we became an "established discipline" (Agnew et al.254).

This divorcing of "our work from the political and institutional contexts within which we work" (Agnew et al. 254), is what I think my project will help remedy; a composition class in social movement and protest rhetorics could discuss how the texts created in a social movement are intimately linked to the political and institutional contexts within which they work (in the sense of Syverson's ecology of composition); moreover, it would be possible to study how those texts affect readers' identities (Edbauer), produce subsequent texts (Collins/Ridolfo and DeVoss), and how texts can dictate physical and mental dispositions in material reality (Blair). The work of the scholars in parenthesis could be used in the classroom. Each is readily accessible by any student, undergraduate or graduate.

For example, the influence of Marcos's communiqués on Bocanegra and Nunez could be studied, or perhaps more succinctly, the influence of these texts on Bocanegra and Nunez's rhetorical and compositional ecologies. Because of Marcos's communiqués, Bocanegra and Nunez organized a march of Zapatistas in Seattle. Bocanegra and Nunez dictated a "disposition" that effected their fellow Mechistas in all senses of the word; they "created a state of mind regarding" the WTO by using the Zapatista stance on neoliberalism as their rallying point; they created a "physical inclination or tendency" by physically demonstrating this state of mind through the military dress and movement of the Mechistas through the streets of Seattle in 1999; and by their "arranging or placement" as a military unit, complete with military police style peace keepers to ensure their segregation, that was separate and at the head of the student march (Dictionary.com). In short, by borrowing an identity for a public display, Bocanegra and Nunez persuaded their fellow Mechistas to participate in the N30 march through a shared understanding of the WTO created by becoming Zapatista for a day. Shifting the identity of rank-and-file members through dress and movement changed the way Mechistas saw the importance of the WTO student march. Consequently, the Mechistas were moved to action through a rhetoric broadcast through compositions aimed at their *minds and bodies*. And those compositions had their genesis in the communiqués of Subcomandante Marcos.

Moreover, such a class would explain why such an identity can be left behind after situation specific environmental stimuli are removed or at least are ameliorated/ mitigated for each individual protestor. A class examining social and protest movements would be a way for students to begin interrogating technophile explanations; racist explanations; essentialist explanations; or stereotypical explanations (e.g., he's a bleeding-heart; she's a feminist) for the activisms practiced by everyday people. In a public sphere increasingly reliant on such simplistic

explanations, the hypothetical composition class described above would be a way to challenge

such trite tropes through studying writing for social and political change, history, rhetorical

historiography, marginalized writings and rhetorics, and the uses of agonistic discourse in the

public sphere.

Bibliography

Agnew, Lois, James J. Murphy, Cheryl Glenn, Nan Johnson, Jan Swearingen, Richard Leo Enos, Jasper Neel, Linda Ferreira-Buckley, Janice Lauer Rice, Janet M. Atwill, Kathleen Ethel Welch, Roxane Mountfourd, Thomas Miller, and Victor J. Vitanza. "Rhetorical Historiography and the Octalogs." *Rhetoric Review* 30.3 (2011): 237-257. Print.

Berlin, James and John Trimbur. "Introduction." *Pre/Text: A Journal of Rhetorical Theory* 13.1-2 (1992): 7-15. Print

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

Blair, Carole. "Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric's Materiality."*Rhetorical Bodies*. Eds. Jack Selzer and Sharon Crowley. Madison, WI: The U of Wisconsin P, 1999. 16-57. Print.

Bocanegra, Miguel, and Randy Nunez. Interview by Monica Ghosh. *University of Washington Digital Collections: The WTO Seattle Collection*. U of Washington Libraries, n.d. Web. 18 July 2012.

Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Rhetoric: The Quest for Effective Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. Print.

Bressler, Charles E. *Literary Criticism: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*. 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, 2003. Print.

Burke, Kenneth. "From *A Grammar of Motives*." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. 2nd ed. Eds. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. New York: St. Martin's, 2001. 1298-1324.

Burke, Kenneth. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Los Angeles: U of California P, 1950.

Burke, Sara, and Claudio Puty. "In the Belly of the Beast. A Perspective on the global Justice Movement in the United States: Its Roots and Emergence." *Gloves Off: Bare-Fisted Political Economy*, 2004. Web. 3 Feb. 2013.

Cabasco, Lydia. Interview by Monica Ghosh. *University of Washington Digital Collections: The WTO Seattle Collection*. U of Washington Libraries, n. d. Web. 24 June 2013.

Clandestine Revolutionary Indigenous Committee-General Command of the EZLN. "To the Workers of the Republic." *Zapatistas! Documents of the New Mexican Revolution*. Eds. The Editorial Collective. Brooklyn, New York: Autonomedia, 1994. n.pag. Web.

Cleaver, Harry. "Introduction." *Zapatistas! Documents of the New Mexican Revolution*. Eds. The Editorial Collective. Brooklyn, New York: Autonomedia, 1994. n.pag. Web.

--. "The Zapatistas and the Electronic Fabric of Struggle." *Harry Cleaver*. The U of Texas at Austin, 01 Nov. 1995. Web. 15 Feb. 2013.

Collins, Vicki Tolar. "The Speaker Respoken: Material Rhetoric as Feminist Methodology." *College English* 61.5 (1999): 545-573. Print.

Conant, Jeff. *A Poetics of Resistance: The Revolutionary Public Relation of the Zapatista Insurgency*. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2010. Print.

Connors, Robert J. "Dreams and Play: Historical Method and Methodology." *Methods and Methodology in Composition Research*. Eds. Gesa Kirsch and Patricia A. Sullivan. Carbondale: S. Illinois UP, 1992. 15-37. Print.

Coogan, David. "Service Learning and Social Change: The Case for Materialist Rhetoric." *CCC* 57.4 (2006): 667-693. Print.

Danaher, Kevin. Interview by Miguel Bocanegra. *University of Washington Digital Collections: The WTO Seattle Collection*. U of Washington Libraries, n.d. Web. 11 Apr. 2013.

Day, Bill. "The NAFTA Nightmare." *Multinational Monitor*. Multinational Monitor, 01 Oct. 1992. Web. 16 Feb. 2013.

della Porta, Donatella. "Multiple Belongings, Tolerant Identities, and the Construction of 'Another Politics': Between the European Social Forum and the Local Social Fora." *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*. Eds. Donatella della Porta and Sidney Tarrow. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2005. 175-202. Print.

DeLuca, Kevin Michael, and Jennifer Peeples. "From Public Sphere to Public Screen: Democracy, Activism, and the "Violence of Seattle." *Readings on the Rhetoric of Social Protest*. 2nd ed. Eds. Charles E Morris III and Stephen Howard Browne. State College, PA: Strata Publishing, 2006. 244-266. Print.

"Disposition." Dictionary.com. Dictionary.com, LLC, 2013. Web. 28 July 2013.

Dixon, Chris. "Five Days in Seattle: A View from the Ground." *The Battle of the Story of The Battle of Seattle*. Eds. David Solnit and Rebecca Solnit. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2009. 73-107. Print.

Edbauer, Jenny. "Unframing Models of Public Distribution: From Rhetorical Situation to

    Rhetorical Ecologies." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 35.4 (2005): 5-24. Web. 4 Aug.

    2010.

Enoch, Jessica and Cheryl Glenn. "Invigorating Historiographic Practices in Rhetoric and

    Composition Studies." *Working in the Archives: A Practical Research Guide for Rhetoric*

    and Composition. Ed. Alexis E. Ramsey, Wendy B. Sharer, Barbara L'Eplattenier, and

    Lisa S. Mastrangelo. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2010. 11-27. Print.

Flanagan, Ben. "Facebook Revolution 'A Myth', Critics Say." *The National*. Abu Dhabi Media.

    18 May 2011. Web. 27 Dec. 2013.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Random, 1976.

    Print.

Gold, David. "Remapping Revisionist Historiography." *College Composition and*

    Communication 64.1 (2012): 15-34. Print.

Greene, Ronald Walter. "Another Materialist Rhetoric." *Critical Studies in Mass*

    Communication 15 (1998): 21-41. Print.

Gries, Laurie. "Still Life with Rhetoric: Toward a Consequentialist Methodology of Material

    Rhetorics." Diss. Prospectus. Syracuse University, 2010. Print.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New

    York: Penguin Books, 2004. Print.

Horner, Bruce. *Terms of Work for Composition: A Materialist Critique*. Albany, NY: SUNY P,

    2000. Print.

Hulbert, Mark C. and Michael Blitz. "The Institution('s) Lives!"*Pre/Text: A Journal of Rhetorical Theory* 13.1-2 (1992):60-75.

"Indian Article Examines Social Media's 'Decisive' Role in 'Arab Spring'." Frontline Online (provided by World Connection). 10 Mar. 2012. ProQuest. Web. 30 Dec. 2013. PDF.

Iturriaga, Markus. "The Zapatista Rebels." *Markus Iturriaga*. U of Tennessee, n.d. Web. 01 Feb. 2013. Brooklyn, New York: Autonomedia, 1994. n.pag. Web.

Lenero, Vincente. "Interview with Marcos Before the Dialogue." *Zapatistas! Documents of the New Mexican Revolution*. Eds. The Editorial Collective. Brooklyn, New York: Autonomedia, 1994. n.pag. Web.

Major Ana Maria. Interview by Unknown. *Zapatistas! Documents of the New Mexican Revolution*. Latin American Network Information Center, n. d. Web. 04 Apr. 2013.

Marcos, Subcomandante. "Who is Marcos?". *Anthropology Department*. Vanderbilt U, 22 Sept. 2003. Web. 05 Feb. 2013.

--. "Chiapas: The Southeast in Two Winds." *Zapatistas! Documents of the New Mexican Revolution*. Eds. The Editorial Collective. Brooklyn, New York: Autonomedia, 1994. n.pag. Web.

Marquez, Gabriel Garcia, and Roberto Pombo. "The Punch Card and the Hourglass: Subcomandante Marcos Interviewed by Gabriel Garcia Marquez and Roberto Pomba." *The New Left Review*. The New Left Review, May 2001. Web. 2 Feb. 2013.

McGee, Michael Calvin. "The 'Ideograph': A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology." *The Quarterly Speech Journal* 66.1 (1980): 1-16. Print.

Miller, Thomas, P. and Joseph G. Jones. "Working out Our History." *College English* 67.4
(2005): 421-439. Print.

Moguel, Julio, and Hermann Bellinghausen. "A Conversation with Subcomandante Marcos After
the Dialogue." *Zapatistas! Documents of the New Mexican Revolution*. Eds. The Editorial
Collective. Brooklyn, New York: Autonomedia, 1994. n.pag. Web.

Movimiento Estudiantil Chican@ de Aztlàn Official National Website. Movimiento Estudiantil
Chican@ de Aztlàn, n .d. Web. 04 May 2013.

Octalog. "The Politics of Historiography." *Rhetoric Review* 7.1 (1988): 5-49. Print.

Page, Jim. Interview by Monica Ghosh. *University of Washington Digital Collections: The WTO
Seattle Collection*. U of Washington Libraries, n.d. Web. 20 May 2013.

Perlstein, Jeff. Interview by Miguel Bocanegra. *University of Washington Digital Collections:
The WTO Seattle Collection*. U of Washington Libraries, 15 Oct. 2000. Web. 18 July
2013.

*PGA Bulletin: Peoples' Global Action against "Free" Trade and the WTO. PGA Bulletin No. 0,
November-December 1997*. The Convenors' Committee of the PGA Conference, 1997.
Web. 2 Feb. 2013.

Porter, Kevin J. *Meaning, Language, and Time: Toward a Consequentialist Philosophy of Time*.
West Lafayette: Parlor P, 2006. Print.

Rider, Janine. *The Writer's Book of Memory: An Interdisciplinary Study for Writing Teachers*.
Hillsdale: L. Elrbaum Associates, 1995. Print.

Ridolfo, Jim and Danielle Nicole DeVoss. "Composing for Recomposition: Rhetorical Velocity and Delivery." *Kairos* 13.2 (2009): n. pag. Web. 15 Dec. 2009.

Riedner, Rachel and Kevin Mahoney. *Democracies to Come: Rhetorical Action, Neoliberalism, and Communities of Resistance.* New York: Lexington Books, 2008. Print.

"Russia: Internet Expert Says 'Twitter Revolution' no Threat to Russia." Russian and Miscellaneous Documents (provided by World News Connection). 16 Mar. 2011. ProQuest. Web. 30 Dec. 2013. PDF.

Sanchez, Raul. *The Function of Theory in Composition Studies*. Albany, NY: State U of New York P, 2005. Print.

Selzer, Jack, and Sharon Crowley, eds. *Rhetorical Bodies*. Madison, WI: The U of Wisconsin P, 1999. Print.

Solnit, David. "The Battle of the Story of the Battle of Seattle." *The Battle of the Story of the Battle of Seattle*. Eds. David Solnit and Rebecca Solnit. Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2009. 5-55. Print.

Spinuzzi, Clay. "Reading: The Zapatista Social Netwar in Mexico." *Spinuzzi: A Blog about Rhetoric, Technology, Research, and Where We're Headed Next*. Web. 02 Apr. 2013.

Syverson, Margaret. *The Wealth of Reality: An Ecology of Composition*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1999. Print.

Tarrow, Sidney. *The New Transnational Activism*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.

"The History of the Little Mouse and the Cat." *flag.blackened.net*. flag.blackened.net, n.d. Web. 24 Feb. 2013.

Villanueva, Victor. "The Material Matters: Rhetoric and Political Economy." *Meat: A Journal of*

Writing and Materiality 2.2 (2007): n. pag. Web. 5 May 2011.

Vita

NAME OF AUTHOR: Brian Jacob Bailie

PLACE OF BIRTH: Downey, California

DATE OF BIRTH: May 30, 1975

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTIONS ATTENDED:

California State University, San Bernardino—San Bernardino, California

DEGREES AWARDED:

Masters of Arts in English Composition, 2007, California State University, San Bernardino

Bachelor of Arts in English, 1998, California State University, San Bernardino

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Professional Writing Instructor, Syracuse University, 2013
Primary and Secondary Teacher, State of Missouri, 2012
Teaching Associate, Syracuse University, 2011
Teaching Assistant, California State University, San Bernardino, 2007
Special Education Teacher, State of California, 1998