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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Mothers Against Drunk Drivers

In the late 1970's, the political milieu in the United States had become more conservative than it was in the turbulent 1960's. More moderate means of accomplishing changes in society were being adopted. Instead of condemning societal values, movements in the late seventies were faulting institutions that failed to uphold previously held values. One of the trends in the conservative movement was society's increased willingness to punish wrong doers and concentrate on victims' rights rather than on the constitutional rights of the alleged criminal. It is upon the reform movements emanating from this conservative trend in American society that rhetorical critics can focus their attention.

A social movement that reflects this moderate trend is Mothers Against Drunk Drivers, a national organization that encourages organized political activism to reduce the number of deaths and injuries caused by drunk drivers. MADD was started in May 1980 by Candy Lightner of Fair Oaks, California, whose thirteen year old daughter was killed by a drunk driver. Had the driver, Clarence Busch, not had a
previous record, had he received a reasonable sentence, and had he shown some remorse, MADD might never have been conceived. However, he was a repeat offender; he did not stop at the scene of the accident; and he served only sixteen months of his two year sentence because of time off for good behavior.\(^1\) Lightner founded MADD to heighten public awareness about the drunk driving problem and to provide a support system for victims of drunk driving tragedies. In the three years since its inception, MADD has grown from a small office in a suburb of Sacramento to a national organization with 202 chapters in forty states; 350 more groups are currently applying for chapter status.\(^2\)

In Columbus, Ohio, a MADD chapter was started in August, 1981, by Sandy Troutman and her husband, Bob. In Montgomery, Alabama, in May, 1979, Sandy’s sons, seven-year old Chuck McMurray and his three-year old brother, Chris, were traveling to Columbus when their car was struck head on by a drunk driver. Sandy survived the crash; the boys did not. The driver, charged with first-degree manslaughter, spent no time in jail nor did he lose his license. He received two years probation. He later moved to Ohio, applied for, and received an Ohio driver’s license. In December, 1981, he was cited for driving while intoxicated, but the charge was reduced to lack of "physical control" by the Mayor’s Court in Piketon, Ohio. He received no points against his license. The Mayor stated he was unaware of any prior record.\(^3\) Until she heard about MADD, Sandy Troutman
thought she was the only one who had lost a child to drunk driving. When she realized there was something she could do to prevent further tragedy, she and her husband formed the first MADD chapter in Ohio.4

The movement against drunk driving was chosen as the case study for this thesis because it is a relatively recent movement that has received a great deal of media coverage in the past three years. MADD chapters across the country are credited with having legislation passed to deter the drinking driver.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to determine whether movement studies are an example of rhetoric in general or rhetoric in particular. Rhetoric in general refers to the concepts encompassed in rhetorical theories that were not created for the purpose of studying social movements. Rhetoric in particular refers to the concepts encompassed in theories specifically intended for the study of movements. To achieve this purpose, the study will apply three general models of persuasion to the case study of MADD to determine to what extent the general rhetorical concepts in the three models can be used to explain the movement. The study is also aimed at discovering the rhetorical strategies employed by MADD. The following questions will be addressed: (1) Is one model of rhetorical theory sufficient to adequately
explain this movement? (2) Would one model of rhetorical theory be adequate to explain a whole series of social movements? (3) What kinds of rhetorical material are available for the study of this contemporary grassroots movement? (4) What kinds of rhetorical strategies does Mothers Against Drunk Drivers employ in seeking to influence the behavior of drivers-in-general, legislators, and law enforcement officials?

Literature Review

In 1970, Herbert Simons argued that "the standard tools of rhetorical criticism are ill-suited for unravelling the complexity of discourse in social movements or for capturing its grand flow." He presented a leader-centered conception of persuasion in social movements grounded in sociological theory. Simons' model 'assumes that the rhetoric of a movement must follow, in the general way, from the very nature of social movements.'

In 1972, Robert Cathcart called for "new approaches to the rhetorical criticism of movements." He argued that rhetorical scholars "have too readily accepted definitions from historians and social-psychologists without questioning whether these definitions are adequate to a theory of movements, a theory which isolates this phenomenon from other events and interactions." It was Cathcart's intention to devise a rhetorical definition of social and political movements.
Cathcart maintained that a rhetorical movement could be identified by its confrontational form. Confrontation referred to a rejection of the societal hierarchies and values.  

In addition to Cathcart, many rhetorical scholars were developing establishment-conflict theories in response to the social and political movements of the 1960's and early 1970's. Bowers and Ochs proposed a theory for study of the rhetoric of agitation and control. Rhetoric was defined as "the rationale of instrumental behavior." These authors rejected traditional definitions of agitation thought to be too inclusive and devised their own definition.

Agitation exists when (1) people outside the normal decision-making establishment (2) advocate significant social change and (3) encounter a degree of resistance within the establishment such as to require more than the normal discursive means of persuasion.

Still later, Smith and Winburn discussed the limitations of the establishment-conflict theories while proposing a different model of "innovational" movements. They argued that while traditional rhetoric allows for the analysis of radical changes in the social order, there is a need to explore "the rhetoric of men acting in concert to modify institutions," and "it must begin in the nature of innovational movements." Similar to the establishment-conflict movement, the innovational movement has social change as
its goal, assumes collective action, and creates drama to fulfill rhetorical requirements. The difference is that while the establishment-conflict movement seeks to reconstruct societal values and institutional arrangements, the innovational movement expects the changes it argues for will not modify the social hierarchy or change existing values.

Hahn and Gonchar believe that determining the appropriate methodology for the study of movements should follow the more important questions of whether movements differ from other forms of collective behavior; and if they differ, are the differences rhetorical. These authors prefer the sociological definition of movements devised by Gusfield in 1971. Gusfield defined a social movement as "socially shared activities and beliefs directed toward the demand for change in some aspect of the social order." The concept of a social movement was first thought of by sociologists, but rhetoricians believe that they need their own theory to explain the phenomenon. Hahn and Gonchar argue that social movements do not utilize a different rhetoric from other forms of collective behavior, so there is no need for a special theory of the rhetoric of social movements. If rhetorical critics are interested in the rhetoric of mobilization, they should study mobilization rhetoric. But they should "study it wherever it is found--in movements, voluntary organizations, political campaigns, etc...and
refrain from assuming that there is something unique about
'movement rhetoric.'

Methodology

The three models have been chosen to be used in this
study as a result of a conversation with William R. Brown,
Chairperson of the Department of Communication, Ohio State
University. The models were selected in order to test the
adequacy of existing communication theory in the area of
movement studies. Although there are other models that
could have served the same purpose, these particular three,
not originally intended for the study of movements, are now
used quite frequently in movement studies.

Each of three models to be employed in the study of
MADD stems from a different starting point, a unique criti-
cal lens. Lloyd Bitzer takes a behaviorist approach in
"The Rhetorical Situation" when he argues that the situation,
or environment, controls the discourse, just as a question
controls an answer and a problem controls the solution.
Bitzer prescribes the requirements for and features of the
rhetorical situation.

Ernest Bormann's approach involves fantasy and
rhetorical visions as a vehicle for criticizing social
reality. Bormann argues that fantasy themes are drama-
tizing messages that are woven together to form a rhetorical
vision. An analysis of fantasy chains provides the critic
with an understanding of how dramas develop, evolve and
decay, and how they affect the behavior of groups of people.

Hahn and Gonchar's modified version of Aristotelian rhetoric represents the third model. Here, the assumption is that the essence of social movements can be unravelled "through the intertwining of four traditional categories of analysis (ethos, logos, pathos, and style)."\(^8\)

The reader of this study should view the following three chapters as three separate studies within the context of a larger study. Because of the nature of this overall work, i.e., examining the same social movement three times, there is bound to be some redundancy.

The Rhetorical Situation. A rhetorical situation is concerned with the context in which rhetorical discourse is created. Bitzer defines a rhetorical situation as

a complex of persons, events, objects, and relations presenting an actual or potential exigence which can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation, can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about the significant modification of the exigence.\(^9\)

Bitzer further argues that a rhetorical situation has three elements.\(^2\) First, there must exist some type of exigence, or urgency, that invites discourse and is capable of being altered by that discourse or at least with the assistance of discourse. Secondly, there must be an audience capable of being influenced by the discourse and of
producing the change or goal for which the discourse was created. Finally, there are usually constraints within the situation that the rhetor attempts to control such as audience beliefs and attitudes, facts, traditions, personal character and rhetorical style.

A bona fide rhetorical situation consists of six dimensions. First, rhetorical discourse is called into existence by the situation. Second, the situation demands a fitting response. Third, the situation prescribes the response which fits. Fourth, the exigence and persons, objects, events, and relations which make up the overall situation exist in reality and are available for scrutiny by a critic. Fifth, rhetorical situations have simple or complex structures and are more or less organized. Finally, rhetorical situations either mature and decay or mature and persist.

Fantasy Themes and Rhetorical Vision. Bormann draws much of his theory from Robert Bales' Personality and Interpersonal Behavior published in 1970. What Bales discovered of relevance to the rhetorical critic was "the dynamic process of group fantasizing." Bales' account explains how the dramatization of communication "created social reality for groups of people" and provided a way to "examine messages for insights into the group's culture, motivation, emotional style and cohesion." The key that links group fantasies is the chaining out of group fantasy events.
Groups with zero-history can develop a common culture through fantasy chains. Bormann argues that dramatizations of fantasy themes occur not only in small groups as described by Bales, but in larger groups hearing a public speaker. Dramatizations that are worked into speeches, chained out into the mass media, and spread to the larger public help to sustain the members' sense of cohesiveness, force them to act, and "provide them with a social reality filled with heroes, villains, emotions, and attitudes." Bormann calls the composite drama which catches up large numbers of people in a symbolic reality a rhetorical vision. Individuals buy into the vision, sustain it, and act upon it. When a rhetorical vision emerges, the participants form a rhetorical community. Members of the rhetorical community can arouse emotional response in one another by alluding to fantasies that have previously chained through the community. When events are dramatized, the story has to have protagonists and antagonists. Members slant, order, and interpret the story according to their own perception of reality. Sharing a fantasy allows persons to make sense out of things that may have been confusing before and provides for a common symbolic ground that participants can share.

Three kinds of fantasy types, or communication forms, are consciousness creating, consciousness raising, and consciousness sustaining. Consciousness creating is the initial process when the first dramatizing message gets...
people caught up in a fantasy chain. When persons pass ideas back and forth, they get involved in the discussion and add emotion to the developing script. While the group is developing its own self-awareness, it often fantasizes about who the outsiders, the enemies, are. After the group has created its own consciousness by examining innovative and diverse alternatives, it may want to gain converts in consciousness raising sessions. These sessions are less open to alternative dramas because they are more persuasive in nature. Once the rhetorical community emerges with a rhetorical vision, it must hold the group together with consciousness sustaining communication. Consciousness sustaining communication prevents insiders from back-sliding or becoming apathetic by putting pressure on the participants to conform to the group's thinking and behavior.

Bormann's model differs from the rhetorical situation in that the critic assumes that instead of the environment determining discourse, discourse determines reality. Thus, by analyzing the meanings that arise from the discourse, the critic can attribute motives for the behavior of participants.

Neo-Aristotelian Configuration. In "Studying Social Movements: A Rhetorical Methodology," Hahn and Gonchar recognize the confusion students face in contemplating inconsistent methodologies in movement studies and hence
suggest a methodology that students might utilize in their rhetorical analyses of social movements. They begin with Gusfield's definition: social movements are "socially shared activities and beliefs directed toward the demand for change in some aspect of the social order." This definition is then broken down into key parts. The student, for example, will want to find out how the movement participants came to share their beliefs, how strong those beliefs are, and how the beliefs are altered through the course of the movement. The student will want to ask what kinds of activities, strategies, and tactics the participants engaged in, whether or not the participants are willing to engage in illegal activities, and what the purpose or goal of the activities is. The student will want to assess the relationship between the societal demands and ongoing public issues and determine whether the demands are substantive or procedural. The student must also be concerned with the climate of the times by looking at how societal rules are applied, the feedback offered by other movements in the society, and how the society copes with the movement strategically.

Hahn and Gombrich argue that through the intertwining of the Aristotelian categories of ethos, logos, pathos, and style, the essence of a movement can be understood. Under ethos, the student will want to discover how the movement defines its ideal member. The intertwining of logos with ethos can be seen in the effect of logical contradictions
upon ethical appeal. Undesirable pathetic appeals such as fear can damage ethos. And, too much concentration on style can detract from a movement's ethical merit.26

Logos can be analyzed by inquiring into the underlying premises of the movement, the form of argument utilized, and the patterns of evidence employed. Ethos interacts with logos when groups refuse to compromise. Logical evidence that is striking or dramatic may evoke emotional response. And, style comes into play in the language used to present evidence.

The student should analyze pathos by examining those emotions to which the movement appeals, those emotions it ignores, and the movement's respective target audiences. The authors suggest that style interacts with pathos in the emotional appeal of "body rhetoric," which appears to refer less to the manner of delivery than to the emotional provocation inherent in nonverbal gesturing.27

A stylistic analysis can determine attitudes by identifying recurring verbal images and metaphors. Body rhetoric is also an element of style. Style can affect logos because of the diverse nature of symbolism. The authors explain that "support of political symbols often seems less related to matters of ideology than to things such as traditions, education, ethnicity, primary group ties, geographical area, or the charisma of a given leader..."28 Further, the interaction between style and emotion can create dissonance when the rhetor must decide between employing fiery images that
might offend the audience and using calmer rhetoric that misses the point.

The student should conclude that because movements are reduced to internal communication, they become trapped in their own rhetoric and accomplish very little. "Rhetorical criticism should help movements adjust their rhetoric to the needs of the times. Without these adjustments, contemporary movements will continue to endanger society through increasing polarization." 29

Research Materials

Data for this study have been gathered from newspapers and news magazines; MADD newsletters, speeches, bulletins, and pamphlets; and personal interviews. Newspapers surveyed include: The New York Times, Washington Post, Christian Science Monitor, Los Angeles Times, Columbus Dispatch, and the Columbus Citizen-Journal. The author also examined News Bank, a reference service that provides access to the contents of newspapers from over one hundred United States cities. 30 Periodicals surveyed include: Newsweek, Time, People, and the Congressional Quarterly Almanac.

MADD newsletters, bulletins, and pamphlets between the years 1981 and 1983 have been reviewed. In order to obtain information concerning rhetorical problems encountered by leaders of a movement, the Central Ohio Chapter co-founder and former co-president, Sandy Troutman, and current chapter president, Marcella Harmon, were interviewed.
Chapter Outline

The second chapter of the study answers the question: To what extent does Lloyd Bitter's model of the rhetorical situation explain a social movement? More specifically, it will examine whether or not the general rhetorical concepts of exigence, audience and constraints adequately explain the rhetoric of Mothers Against Drunk Drivers.

The third chapter answers the question: To what extent does Ernest Bormann's model of rhetorical vision and fantasy theme analysis explain a social movement? More specifically, it will examine whether the general rhetorical concepts of fantasy, fantasy theme, fantasy type, rhetorical vision, chaining out, and rhetorical community adequately explain the rhetoric of MADD.

The fourth chapter answers the question: To what extent does Aristotle's theory of rhetoric explain a social movement? More specifically, it will focus on whether or not Hahn and Gonchar's interpretation of ethos, logos, pathos, and style adequately explains the rhetoric of MADD.

The fifth chapter summarizes the conclusions reached in the preceding chapters and then generates implications for further study into theories of social movements.

This initial chapter discusses the issue of whether or not a special theory for the rhetorical study of movements is necessary if the movement is to be fully understood.
The study should provide insight into the rhetoric of a significant and vocal contemporary movement. It should also allow the reader to assess the strengths and weaknesses of three general rhetorical models currently applied to social movements.
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Articles are selected for NewsBank from socio-economic, political, and scientific areas. News about MADD falls under the broad category of Transportation and under the subheading of Traffic Laws and Enforcement. NewsBank was particularly useful for its references to the Sacramento Bee, the newspaper published closest to Fair Oaks where MADD was founded.
CHAPTER II

THE RHETORICAL SITUATION

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the rhetorical situation faced by Mothers Against Drunk Drivers. In an effort to ascertain the usefulness of Lloyd Bitzer's methodological approach applied to a movement study, this chapter will provide (1) a brief overview of the ways in which the criteria for a rhetorical situation apply to MADD which is serving as a rhetor in response to the exigence; and (2) a descriptive analysis of the rhetorical situation employing the elements--constraints, exigence, audience--which comprise the situation.

Application of the Criteria. Because a social move- ment may be an essential element of a rhetorical situation, it is important to establish the ways in which the criteria for a social movement, as the creator and presenter of the rhetorical discourse, can be applied to MADD. The perceived exigence being addressed by MADD is drunk driving. The audiences which have the capability to modify the exigence consist of those individuals within American society who can prevent intoxicated persons from driving, the legislative branches of the federal and state governments.
the judicial branches of federal, state, county and local governments, and concerned citizens.

The constraints include such factors as the prevalence and acceptance of alcohol in American society; limited forms of inexpensive public transportation; the growing number of alcohol-related automobile crashes; and a growing public concern for the rights of victims perceived as being overshadowed by the rights of the accused.

General Characteristic. Mothers Against Drunk Drivers was established to oppose public, legislative, and judicial apathy regarding drunk driving. Although the abuse of alcohol has been of paramount concern throughout history, the abuse of alcohol in combination with the operation of a motor vehicle did not reach the limelight until the late 1970's and early 1980's. The situation easily suits what Eitzen argues is a rhetorical situation.

First, rhetorical discourse is called into existence by the situation. Nearly 250,000 people died in the last ten years in alcohol-related automobile crashes—about five times as many as died during the entire Vietnam War. Until the recent campaign against drunk driving began, how many people were aware of that? Even today, how many people are aware of the enormity of the problem? MADD did not form as a group because the American public wanted to know the 'facts' about drunk driving. It was the situation, the emotional stress, the physical and monetary destruction,
the lack of public awareness, and the minimal amount of legal recourse that invited the creation and presentation of rhetorical discourse.

Second, the situation demands a fitting response. Suppose MADD presented discourse to a meeting of the local Women's Christian Temperance Union attempting to persuade them not to drink and drive. Why discuss the modification of drinking-driving habits with a group of people who already advocate total abstinence? On the other hand, when Sandy Troutman told a group of Ohio Municipal Judges that it was their responsibility to see that drunk driving laws are being upheld, she was on the right track.5

Third, the situation prescribes the response which fits. One can ask about the nature, purpose, and style of the response dictated by the situation. This situation calls for a response that educates without preaching, uses not only logical, but emotional and ethical appeals, and provides specific recommendations rather than just arousing fear or promoting only abstract ideals.

Fourth, the exigence and persons, objects, events, and relations which make up the situation exist in reality and are available for scrutiny by a critic. One can verify the existence of this situation by reading the literature distributed by MADD, reading newspapers and periodicals, and by contacting the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, various insurance companies, members of the
legal system, law enforcement officers, etc.

Fifth, rhetorical situations have simple or complex structures and are more or less organized. The structure of this situation is very complex in that the situational elements that interact are numerous. Some of those interacting elements are the members of MADD, legislators, the court system, the police, victims, the media, drunk-driving research, the widespread use of alcohol, transportation limitations, and the like. The situation is also relatively loosely structured in that there are different types of audiences with varying degrees of constraints on their ability to modify the exigence.

Finally, rhetorical situations either mature and decay or mature and persist; they evolve to just the time when discourse would be most fitting. In 1982, Newsweek reported "campaigns against drunk drivers have always had sobering truths on their side; what they lacked was a real constituency." After her daughter was killed by a drunk driver, Sandy Lightner launched MADD "giving the public outcry against drunk driving the constituency it has always needed--the victims." Whether this constituency will always be present depends upon how successful MADD and groups like it are in persuading the audience to modify the exigence.
A Descriptive Analysis of the Rhetorical Situation

Bitzer's model is called deterministic because according to the model, the situation creates the rhetoric rather than the rhetor creating the rhetoric. The situation demands that a solution be found to the drunk driving problem; otherwise the number of tragic deaths and crippling injuries will continue to increase with each passing day. Reality is not determined by the rhetor's discourse. Reality is dictated by the situation, and the rhetor has little choice in how he or she responds because of the constraints present in the situation.

A Response to the Exigence. On October 1, 1980 Candy Lightner addressed the United States House of Representatives calling for a presidential Blue Ribbon Commission to study the exigence of drunk driving. Her testimony was included in the Congressional Record of November 19, 1980, by Representative Michael D. Barnes as part of "A National Effort to Combat Drunk Driving - Part II." The exigence Lightner was addressing had touched her personally, and she found the facts surrounding her tragedy "appalling." Lightner's daughter Carla was hit by a repeat offender drunk driver who was out on bail from another hit-and-run drunk driving crash. Despite the fact that he had three prior drunk driving arrests in the past four years, he was still driving with a valid California driver's license.
A constraint Lightner faced was the system. She was told by the district attorney handling her case that it was doubtful Carl's killer would go to prison. Her daughter's death was doomed to become just another statistic, but Lightner would not allow that to happen. "MADD wants to make sure that every possible step is taken to prevent the future killing and maiming of innocent children by drunk drivers... The victims of drunk driving must not be forgotten and that is why MADD has vowed to fight for effective reform of the drunk driving problem in this country."9 Lightner called for the establishment of a Blue Ribbon Commission to "develop realistic solutions to protect the innocent from being maimed by these 'killers' behind the wheel."10 On behalf of all MADD members, she argued that the president was not only capable of alleviating the exigence but was obligated to do something to protect the citizens of the United States. Congressmen Barnes and Robert Matsui introduced legislation aimed at alleviating the drunk driving problem and were asked to be the first to sign MADD's petition calling for the Commission.11

Although Carl is gone, Lightner reminded the members of the House that "there are solutions which can prevent my tragedy from happening to others."12

On October 8, 1981, Candy Lightner came to Columbus to address the first MADD chapter formed in Ohio. The subject of her speech was the need for a State Task Force to deal
with Ohio's drunk driver problem. Early in her speech Lightner made it clear that her daughter Cari "did not die as a victim of an accident. She died as a victim of a crime, a violent crime that kills approximately 26,000 people every year." Although the Probation Department recommended that Cari's killer be given the maximum sentence to prison under drunk driving law because he was a threat to society and had shown no remorse, he did not go to prison at all. Clarence Busch went to a work camp and halfway house because Judge Sheldon Grossfield of Sacramento, California, argued, in Lightner's words, that "this man is an alcoholic and he has a disease and it outweighs the fact that he killed a child."

After starting MADD, Lightner began to investigate the drunk driving problem. She questioned the California Highway Patrol; they blamed the District Attorney's office. The District Attorney's office blamed the judges. The judges blamed the legislators. According to Lightner, one legislator told her "legislators drink and drive. And we have provided some of the laws which they need but the judges won't utilize them. And the rest, they won't pass. And the public doesn't want you to get tough with the drunk drivers." So Lightner went to Governor Jerry Brown and asked for the establishment of a task force to solve the problem. The Governor agreed to this proposal and Lightner became a member of this new group.
Reflecting on her first year since starting MADD, Lightner admitted she was initially "naive and ignorant" but she lost her naivety in the courts and her ignorance in drafting legislation.\textsuperscript{16} She had pictured MADD as twenty local women marching on the State Capital in Sacramento, expanding statewide within a year, and going national in two years. Instead, in its first year of existence MADD expanded to thirty-two chapters in seven states.

In regard to the task force to be formed in Ohio, Lightner recommended that "it should be open to the public, and it should be monitored by the public, and it should answer to the public."\textsuperscript{17}

Response to the Exigence: The Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving. In response to the call of Candy Lightner and others for a blue ribbon commission, President Reagan signed Executive Order 12358 on April 14, 1982, setting up a one year thirty-member commission to find ways to combat the drunk driving problem. Twenty-six members were appointed by the President, and four members were designated by the majority leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. The latter four members included Senators Dole and Pell and representatives Hanson and Barnes. The functions of the presidential commission were: to increase public awareness about the drunk driving problem; to persuade states and communities to take serious action to attack the
drunk driving problem in a more organized and systematic fashion; to encourage states to use state-of-the-art techniques to solve the problem; and to generate public support for increased enforcement of local and state laws related to drunk driving.\textsuperscript{18}

According to John A. Volpe, Chairperson of the Commission, the situation in 1982 was better than it had ever been to confront the drunk driving exigence. When asked why during a hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, Volpe replied,

\begin{quote}
There are probably two or three reasons for it. I think probably the most important reason for it is that victims and relatives of victims are coming forward today, which they were not doing until only the last couple of years. They are MADD--mothers against drunk drivers...Now these people are coming forward and they are making their voices heard, and I think that that has caught public awareness and media awareness.\textsuperscript{19}
\end{quote}

In its spring 1983 newsletter, MADD summarized the recommendations of the commission that had been advocated by MADD for the preceding two years.\textsuperscript{20} The first recommendation concerned support systems. Local and state offender fines and fees should be used to finance drunk driving enforcement, prosecution, adjudication, and treatment. Task forces composed of governmental and non-governmental leaders should be formed at the state and local levels. Inservice training should be provided to improve
detection, prosecution, and adjudication of drunk drivers. And record keeping systems should be kept at the state level.

The second recommendation involves enforcement. Selective enforcement road blocks and other techniques should be applied to increase the perception of risk and thus enhance deterrence of driving under the influence. Every state should establish an implied consent statute that assumes all drivers have given their consent to the blood, breath, or urine tests. Statutes should be enacted in each state allowing preliminary breath tests. Blood alcohol tests should be mandatory for drivers involved in a fatal or serious personal injury crash. A statewide uniform traffic system should be adopted. Citizens should be encouraged to report drunk drivers.

The third recommendation is designed to improve prosecution. Plea bargaining should be eliminated. Legislation should be passed providing that a person with a .08 percent or higher blood alcohol content (BAC) is presumed to be driving under the influence (DUI). Persons with a BAC of .10 percent or higher within three hours of arrest should be prohibited from driving.

Fourthly, adjudication should be improved. Sentencing should be mandatory and not subject to suspension or probation. Pre-conviction diversion to alcohol education or treatment programs should be eliminated in favor of
participation in such programs as a condition of sentencing only after the conviction has been rendered. A trial should be concluded within sixty days of arrest, sentencing within thirty days of the trial, and the appellate process concluded within ninety days. A thorough pre-sentence investigation should be obtained and considered. Causing death or serious bodily injury while DUI should be classified as a felony. Any person convicted of driving with a suspended, restricted or revoked license should be sentenced to at least thirty days in jail. To focus on DUI and eliminate court backlog, minor traffic infractions should be simplified and handled informally. Convicted persons should pay restitution. State and local governments should provide victim assistance. Oral and/or written statements by victims or survivors should be required by the government prior to sentencing in all cases involving death or serious bodily injury.

The fifth recommendation deals with licensing administration. Any driver who is found to have a BAC of .10 percent or has refused to submit to the test should have his or her license suspended by the court upon arraignment or by the administrative agency charged with license administration. Young drivers (age not stated) should have provisional licenses subject to withdrawal upon DUI conviction or an implied consent refusal.

The sixth recommendation concerns alcohol beverage regulation. Every state should adopt twenty-one years as
the minimum drinking age for all alcoholic beverages. States should enact laws establishing liability against any person who sells or serves alcoholic beverages to a person who is visibly intoxicated. Consumption of alcoholic beverages in motor vehicles and possession of open alcoholic beverage containers in motor vehicles should be prohibited.

The seventh recommendation relates to the private sector. Corporations, trade, and industrial associations, labor organizations, civic, fraternal, and social organizations should develop and disseminate policy statements to employees/members, implement educational programs, and become active advocates in state and local battles against drunk driving. All segments of the alcohol beverage industries should initiate or expand their education programs. The Alcohol Beverage Control Commissions should encourage retail establishments to distribute information to their employees. Bartending schools should provide education and training regarding alcohol use and abuse, and party hosts should be provided with information on how to prevent alcohol abuse and methods of intervention to prevent intoxicated guests from driving.

The final recommendation deals with education and treatment. Alcohol treatment and rehabilitation programs should be available and required for a year for those needing such a service, and alcohol education programs should be available only to first time offenders classified
as social drinkers. Juvenile offenders should participate in programs similar to those required of adult offenders.

A constraint the Commission faces is the current administration's concept of New Federalism which favors the delegation of more responsibility to the states and the reduction of the presence of the federal government. While the Commission's recommendations are just that, recommendations, members of Congress have sponsored legislation that would govern all of the United States. Congress appropriated nine million dollars in early 1983 to implement a computerized National Driver Register. The Register would make it possible to find out within minutes whether someone applying for a driver's license has a previous conviction in another state for drunk driving or other traffic offenses.

MADD Responds to the Exigence. Dr. William Havener, Director of Ophthalmology at Ohio State University Hospital, is the Chairperson of the Board of Directors of Central Ohio Chapter of Mothers Against Drunk Drivers. He has argued on several occasions that the only way to modify the exigence is to impound the motor vehicles of the convicted drunk driver. On January 4, 1982, Dr. Havener wrote a New Year's Resolution with the hope and expectation that it would "initiate the series of steps necessary to eliminate the single worst preventable health problem in Ohio and in the nation." Dr. Havener was referring to drunk driving.
He proposed that any person stopped by a law enforcement officer under the suspicion of drunk driving shall be evaluated by that officer. If the officer believes that the driver is intoxicated, the motor vehicle will be impounded. The driver has the immediate option of volunteering for a blood alcohol test or refusing such testing. If he or she refuses the test or if he or she takes the test and is found to have a blood alcohol content of .10 percent or greater, the penalty shall be "the immediate, permanent, and irrevocable confiscation of the impounded vehicle."

The constraints in the past have been the failure of prohibition, suspension of licenses, jail terms, and fines to deter the drinking driver. Dr. Havener argues that "the only certainty is that a drunken driver cannot drive if he does not have a vehicle." He contends that the penalty is not excessive because in due time no more cars would be confiscated because no more offences would occur. "Within six months the carnage of drunken driving would be a matter of past history, as are the ravages of infantile paralysis (poliomyelitis)."

Dr. Havener expressed the same view in his essay "The Concept of Relative Sympathy," It is his belief that MADD is capable of using the concept of relative sympathy to eliminate drunk driving in Ohio. The reason that tough laws have not solved the drunk driving problem, he writes, is because judges and juries are sympathetic human beings
who have mercy for the drunk driver and therefore will reduce charges and suspend penalties. "Because of sympathy, all control efforts directed towards more severe penalties will fail--MADD must not fall into the trap of the 'severe' penalty approach." The way MADD can use the concept of relative sympathy to overcome the constraints is to contrast the drunk driver with the victim and generate greater sympathy for the victim. The way to prevent drunk driving is to immediately impound the driver's vehicle and award it to the victim after a trial is conducted for the purpose of determining whether or not the victim was injured by a drunk driver using the car. If this type of solution were used, and the newspapers printed stories about drunk drivers losing their cars, within a few months drinkers would be less willing to drive.

"Devastated, Consumed, Uplifted" is the title of the speech Dr. Havener delivered at the Ohio Church of God in Christ's Meeting on April 19, 1982.25 "I'm here to warn you," he told his audience. "Maybe especially when you're having a good time you are being hunted by a bloodstained beast named tragedy. Maybe you better think about knocking off that beast before it gets you." The beast named tragedy to which he was referring was the drunk driving tragedy--a tragedy which he said in one incident crushed a five-year old's head, sent three other people to the hospital, and smashed four cars. But that was not an isolated incident.
he explained. Nine hundred persons are killed by drunks every week in the United States. Every year, 40,000 are killed and 750,000 are injured. Devastated is how we feel when tragedy strikes us. When the pain wears off, we feel anger. "Blind, mindless, raging, all-consuming anger."

But the way to uplift ourselves is to try to correct the problem that has harmed us. Dr. Havener argues, however, that "we need not and should not await the stroke of tragedy to be uplifted." He supports a resolution calling upon the legislature and the judges to eliminate the drunk driving crime by saying, "If you drive drunk on Ohio Highways, we will take away your wheels!" Dr. Havener defends his position against the charges that it is too severe. "Remember... drunk drivers have killed and wounded more persons than all of the burglars and murderers and rapists and hunters and airplane accidents and industrial deaths and the Vietnam War and Korean War all put together. Drunken driving is slaughtering us and it's time to put an end to this nonsense."

The constraints that Dr. Havener has introduced into the situation are his exaggerated figures and the lack of any suggestions about what the family members of the convicted drunk driver are to do when their motor vehicle is impounded. MADD's figures which are provided by the National Highway Safety Administration point to seventy deaths per day or 26,000 deaths per year. Rather than
impounding motor vehicles, the local chapter has advocated
the use of special license plates on the convicted driver's
car which would allow family members to continue to drive
but would alert the police that the car does belong to a
- driver whose license was suspended.

The Ohio General Assembly Responds to the Exigence.
On January 27, 1982, the Senate Judiciary Committee began
hearings on Senate Bill 409 and Senate Bill 432. Senate
Bill 409 introduced by Senator John Kasich would require
authorities to revoke permanently the driver's license of
any drunk driver convicted of killing another person in an
automobile crash. Under the existing law at the time, a
drunk driver convicted of killing someone could be charged
with vehicular homicide which carried a penalty of six
months to five years in prison and a fine up to $2,500.
And under existing law, a license in such a case could be
revoked for only thirty days to three years.

Senate Bill 432 authored by Senator Michael DeWine
would require an automatic one-year license suspension for
refusing to submit to a breathalyzer test. Under the
existing law, refusal warranted a six-month license sus-
pension. The bill also would require driver's license
suspensions from thirty days to six months for a first
offense, two years for a second offense, and life in jail
for a third offense.
Under the existing law, penalties for first, second, and third time offenders was a mandatory three day jail sentence. Both bills would have kept intact the three day jail term for first offenders, but DeWine's bill required a year in jail for previously convicted drivers caught violating suspensions.

On March 5, 1982, Senator Kasich proposed Senate Bill 514 which would provide for the impoundment of all vehicle license plates registered in the name of the convicted drunk driver for six months. Kasich argued that seizing license plates would more effectively discourage motorists who continue to drive after their drivers' licenses have been suspended.²⁸

Senate Bill 432 was recommended for approval in mid-April by the Senate Judiciary Committee and was merged with Senate Bill 409.²⁹ In early May the Ohio Senate passed the Omnibus Drunken Driving Bill and sent it to the House for approval.³⁰

While there were many proponents of the strict drunk driving bill, there were also those who opposed it, particularly Representative Terry Tranter, chair of a subcommittee studying the legislation. According to Tranter, the proposed law would be unconstitutional because of denial of the right of due process. "The arresting officer might as well be the judge and jury," Tranter said, referring to the provision under the bill allowing
the arresting officer to confiscate the license of a motorist whose blood alcohol level registered at .13 percent or more on a breathalizer.31

Senator DeWine disagreed, noting that a person could appeal the license suspension on the grounds of improper administration of the test or improbable cause in making the stop on the part of the arresting officer.

Following recommendations made by the Ohio State Bar Association, the House Judiciary Committee watered down the Senate's bill. In the new bill, mandatory sentences would be reduced to three days in jail for third time offenders; automatic conviction for .10 percent blood alcohol content would be eliminated in favor of creating an option for prosecutors to charge the driver with impaired driving, a lesser offense; and the automatic ninety day license suspension would be eliminated in favor of a license suspension hearing before a judge.32

KABD made its presence and opinion known when Lauren Heis presented 25,000 signatures in favor of the original Senate bill.

In a surprise move, however, on November 17, 1982, the house voted overwhelmingly in favor of amendments reinstating the .10 percent BAC standard and removing the impaired driving charge which was primarily for plea bargaining. The House also voted in favor of amendments requiring first offenders to spend three days in jail, second offenders to spend ten days in jail, and third
offenders, thirty days in jail. The proposed amendments were approved by the Senate on November 18, and the bill was sent to Governor Rhodes for signing. Governor Rhodes signed the bill in December giving Ohio one of the toughest drunk driving laws in the country. It went into effect May 16, 1983.

The Supreme Court Addresses the Exigency. On May 17, 1982, the U. S. Supreme Court agreed to decide whether a person's refusal to take a sobriety test may be used as evidence against him or her in court. The Supreme Court's decision to resolve the issue stemmed from the arrest of a Madison, South Dakota, man on charges of drunk driving on July 19, 1980. In that case, the South Dakota Supreme Court held that the state prosecutors could not present evidence that the man had refused to take a sobriety test.

At the time, Ohio was one among sixteen states and the District of Columbia which allowed the prosecution in drunk driving cases to use a person's refusal to take a sobriety test as evidence in court. Under Ohio's implied consent law, any person who has a driver's license is considered to have consented to being tested for drugs or alcohol if arrested. The law also presumes guilt if the driver refuses to take the sobriety test. Both prosecuting and defense attorneys agreed that a response was necessary, but neither could agree with the other as to what that
Defense lawyers contended that the introduction of the refusal evidence by the prosecutor prejudiced a jury which may interpret the defendant's refusal to take the test as meaning he or she was apparently intoxicated when arrested. Defense attorneys also contended that the law violated a person's right under the Fifth Amendment against self-incrimination. Prosecutors wanted the evidence of refusal to be admissible because of the low conviction rate in jury trials when the defendant refused to take a sobriety test. For example, in Franklin County Municipal Court in 1981, the conviction rate was only thirty-eight percent on drunk driving charges when the suspect refused to take the test compared to a sixty-four percent conviction rate for those drivers whose tests showed them to be legally intoxicated. Thus each side perceived the situation as calling for a different response.

Mothers Against Drunk Drivers submitted a friend-of-the court brief in the fall of 1982 informing the justices that their approval of the South Dakota ruling "would have 'devastating consequences...If a suspect may refuse to take a Breathalyzer test and that refusal is automatically excluded from evidence, use of the Breathalyzer will simply disappear.'" 38

On February 22, 1983, the Supreme Court held seven to two that a driver's refusal to take a sobriety test could be used against him or her in court, thus striking down the
South Dakota ruling that held that using a motorist's refusal as evidence against him or her violated the Fifth Amendment. Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, writing for the majority, argued that "the choice to submit or refuse to take a blood-alcohol test will not be an easy or pleasant one for a suspect to make. But the criminal process often requires suspects and defendants to make difficult choices." O'Connor also deplored "the carnage caused by drunken drivers...This court has repeatedly lamented the tragedy." 

Judges Respond to the Exigence. In March 1982 the Legislative Committee of the Ohio Municipal and County Court Judges Association recommended changes in Ohio's old drunk driving laws. The committee, co-chaired by Franklin County Municipal Judge George Smith and Fremont Municipal Judge Paul Albrighta, made several recommendations: Second time offenders (within seven years of first offense) should receive a minimum mandatory jail term of ten days and a mandatory ninety day license suspension. Third time offenders (within seven years of first offense) should receive a thirty day jail term and a one year or longer license suspension. Anyone who is arrested for drunk driving and is found to have a .10 percent blood alcohol content should have his or her license automatically suspended for thirty days. For those who drive with suspended licenses, a thirty day jail term or 240 hours of community
service work should be the penalty. The judges also recommended that there be a standard statewide chemical test for blood alcohol content and that drunk driving cases be taken out of Mayors' Courts.

According to Massillon Municipal Judge Paul Paulson, president of the 250 member judges association, "There isn't any question we have to react to the people who are organized, the MADD ladies and so forth...These people want blood because they've lost blood. I don't blame them for that." 42

It appears that the judge most respected by the local chapter has been Edward Emmett O'Farrell, the sole judge at the New Philadelphia, Ohio, Municipal Court in Tuscarawas County. In March 1983 he spoke at a MADD meeting at the Imperial House North Motel. 43 He also was the guest speaker at MADD's second anniversary celebration in September 1983.

At the anniversary meeting local chapter president, Marcella Harmon, gave a speech about the history and accomplishments of the local chapter and then introduced Judge O'Farrell.

It is truly my great pleasure to introduce Judge Edward Emmett O'Farrell tonight. He has been presiding over the New Philadelphia Municipal Court since January 1, 1982. He earned a Bachelor of Science degree from Spring Hill College in Mobile, Alabama, and graduated with honors from the University of Notre Dame Law School. Judge O'Farrell's legal experience prior to his judgeship included two years of service in the environmental section of the Attorney General's
Judge O'Farrell prefaced his remarks by saying that this would be his opinion about a lot of things, and everyone has his or her own opinion. Judges must adhere to a code of ethics, but judges are still people, people with opinions. "What I have to say to you...has come from my personal experience. It's not something esoteric or theoretical that I've adopted as my own, but is something that I have experienced."

Before talking about what has happened in New Philadelphia where he is the sole municipal judge, he commended the work of MADD.

One of the things that is important to me are you people who are the members of Mothers Against Drunk Drivers who have been working very hard to achieve the goals of your organization. I want you to know how highly I respect you and how much respect I think many people have for you. You've done an incredible job....Your steadfastness, your hard work, your commitment to have that piece of legislation passed, I think was instrumental in its ultimate passage....

Judge O'Farrell did not think the new legislation was needed. He thought that the old law was strict enough with its provisions for six months in jail, a $1000 fine, and a
three year license suspension to deter anyone from driving while intoxicated. However, the law "is only as good as the people in the system are enforcing it." And the law was not being enforced. Judge O'Farrell thinks the dramatic change in the new law is the minimum sentence which did not exist before. There was a three day jail sentence for first time offenders under the old law but it was abused. Most people did not have to serve seventy two consecutive hours. According to O'Farrell there is still a difference of opinion about whether seventy two consecutive hours is to be served in jail or in a residential alcohol treatment program. He reads the law as mandating a jail term. In his court, persons convicted of driving while intoxicated usually serve more than seventy two consecutive hours.

Judge O'Farrell also discussed the minimum sentences for second and third offenses and acknowledged that there does not seem to be a difference of opinion among judges about how the minimum sentence should be served. Other changes in the law concerned refusal to take a blood, breath or urine test and pre-trial license suspensions.

When O'Farrell was campaigning for the position on the bench, he realized that he had to get to the people so he knocked on over 15,000 doors in Tuscarawas County. He was elected on an independent ticket in a three candidate race. "I didn't campaign on the issue of hang 'em high on a DUI context. I did campaign on the issue or
the platform that I believed that judges should be responsible for enforcing the laws that exist." When he was going door to door, he heard over and over from people who were unhappy with the system that did not punish people who committed crimes. And drunk driving was one crime that was not taken seriously by the courts. "It's a peculiar type of crime...It's committed by many people who are not criminals--stereotypical criminals. This particular crime cuts across all segments of society."

The first person who came before O'Farrell was a drunk driver. O'Farrell found him guilty and gave him a stricter than normal sentence which attracted a lot of attention. He continued in the same vein but found that he was not deterring the drunk driver. So he increased the sentence to fifteen days in jail for a first offense, with a $750 fine and a six month license suspension. At this time he also became aware of a law that had been on the books in Ohio since 1967 that allows a judge to confiscate the license plates of a convicted drunk driver. He now gives special family plates that go on the front and back of every motor vehicle that the driver owns. These family plates are bright yellow and can easily be spotted by the police in case the vehicle is being operated by the driver with a suspended license. According to O'Farrell, driving under suspension is one of the most difficult crimes to determine, and this helps to alleviate
that problem because police officers now need no probable case to stop the vehicle.

Judge O'Farrell does not allow plea bargaining (except in very extreme circumstances) which has resulted in a tremendous demand upon the court for jury trials. O'Farrell tries cases every day except Sunday and Monday from 7:30 in the morning until late in the evening. There has been a high conviction rate for DUI crimes, and of all the drunk driving cases that were appealed, none were reversed. As a result of his tough stance, alcohol fatalities have diminished in number. In 1981 there were twenty-one fatalities in Tuscarawas County of which sixteen were alcohol related. In 1982 there were six alcohol related fatalities, and in 1983 (as of this speech), there were only three.

Although he admits that his way of treating drunk driving cases takes a hard toll on himself, the juries, prosecutors, and other members of the court, it has resulted in a change in the drinking driving habits of the residents of Tuscarawas County.

Members of MADD are quick to point out the judges who have not, in their view, adequately responded to the exigence. In its September 1982 newsletter, MADD noted that in August Senator Stanley Aronoff of Cincinnati was arrested in Columbus and charged with driving while intoxicated. "We will be watching this case in the
interest that Senator Aronoff be treated as any other citizen. However, in January 1983, members of MADD observing the case in Franklin County Municipal Court saw Judge Robert Wasylik approve the reduction of Aronoff's drunk driving charge to reckless operation of a motor vehicle. Judge Wasylik suspended Aronoff's nine day jail sentence, fined him $50, suspended his driver's license for thirty days, and ordered him to attend a one day defensive driving course. Local MADD President Lauren Reis told the Columbus Dispatch, "sixty-five percent of the (drunken driving) cases are plea bargained in Franklin County. It's not that unusual."

The national chapter prints both encouraging stories about how judges handle drunk driving cases as well as discouraging ones. One defendant who killed two young girls and seriously injured their mother while driving under the influence was sentenced to four years and four months in the California state prison. According to MADD, this was the longest sentence ever given to a defendant in Los Angeles County for a drunk driving offense.

On the other hand, MADD printed the headlines of a series of articles about a Waukesha County, Wisconsin, Circuit Judge. One headline representative of the others read, "$5 fine set for driver in hit-and-run death."
Conclusion

It is apparent from this chapter that the exigence of drunk driving includes a number of facets that have been addressed by different rhetors in varying ways. Mothers Against Drunk Drivers has responded by encouraging others to modify the exigence in the best way suited to their position. The Governor should form a task force, the president should form a commission, legislators should strengthen the laws, judges should enforce the laws to the letter, and the Supreme Court should do everything in its power to crack down on the drunk driver.

The President of the United States has responded to the exigence by setting up a Blue Ribbon Commission to study and find solutions for the problem. The Ohio General Assembly responded by eventually passing Senate Bill 432 over the objections of a small number of Assembly persons. The United States Supreme Court responded by striking down a South Dakota ruling that did not allow for the presentation of evidence in court that a defendant had refused to take a sobriety test. Judges across the country and in Ohio have responded to the exigence in varying ways. There are many judges who continue to allow drunk drivers to go without punishment regardless of the severity of their crime while judges like Edward Emmett O'Farrell of New Philadelphia, Ohio, are lauded by MADD for fair and consistent but strict sentencing.
The constraints facing every rhetor involved in this situation have been the different perspectives on what will deter the drinking driver, what is fair under the law, and the prevailing attitude of "there but for the grace of God go I to prison." Although many of the rhetors have appeared to overcome the constraints facing them, until the goals of MADD have been achieved—reducing the number of deaths and injuries caused by drunk drivers and supporting the victims—the exigence will not be perceived as eradicated.
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CHAPTER III

THE RHETORICAL VISION OF MOTHERS AGAINST DRUNK DRIVERS

Introduction

This chapter will focus on the rhetorical strategies employed by MADD to create a rhetorical vision as a response to a situation. The objective will be to determine how well the general rhetorical concepts of fantasy, fantasy theme and type, rhetorical vision, chaining out, and rhetorical community can explain the rhetoric of MADD. To reiterate briefly, a fantasy is "the creative and imaginative interpretation of events that fulfills a psychological or rhetorical need." A zero history group removes itself from the here-and-now by engaging in the creation of fantasies. Fantasies often deal with things that have happened in the past or that the group hopes will happen in the future. When people in a group share a chain of fantasies, "the content of the dramatizing message which sparked the fantasy chain is called a fantasy theme." When a number of scenarios have been shared by members of a larger community, they form a fantasy type. A fantasy type is a stock scenario that is repeated over and over by the same or similar characters. When a number of people within the rhetorical community come
to share a group of fantasy types, they integrate them into a coherent rhetorical vision that gives the participants a broader view of some aspect of their social reality.¹

Structure and Organization of Mothers Against Drunk Drivers

Since its inception in 1980, Mothers Against Drunk Drivers has established a grassroots campaign which aims at establishing appeals at all of America.

No, MADD is not for mothers only. It is for everyone and every group who has been, or may be hurt by a drunk driver: for individuals and families, for companies, for personnel directors, for organizations. It is not just the family and friends who suffer when someone is hurt or killed by a drunk driver. Employers of the family and friends are also touched by the tragedy. In fact, every one of us is touched or stained by the drunk driver—-one way or another.²

This basic theme has led to the establishment of 202 affiliate chapters in forty states as of September 1983.³

Participation in this organization annually costs twenty dollars for an individual, forty dollars for a family, and one hundred fifty dollars for an organization. Local chapters are asked to contribute one half of their dues to the national office.⁴ Members of the national chapter receive quarterly newsletters informing them of anti-drunk driving activities occurring in cities throughout the country, pending anti-drunk driving legislation at the
national and state level, recent drunk driving tragedies, and media coverage. Members of the local chapter in Columbus receive a newsletter five times a year reporting area and statewide activities.

The national organization moved its office from California to Texas in June 1983 in order to be more centrally located. It now has a paid professional director; Dr. Philip Roos, a clinical psychologist, joined MADD on April 1, 1983. He was selected by MADD for his "impeccable academic credentials, an extensive and diverse background in counseling, administration, and leadership." He was hired at a $75,000 per year salary to help MADD raise funds.

There is now a national board of directors which includes a representation of chapters nationwide. Since the organization is national, the boards of directors at the local level are now simply advisory boards, and the voting members are the officers.

As of September 1983 there were 202 MADD chapters in forty two states, and there were 350 more in the formative stages. In Ohio there are eleven chapters with many more forming. Membership is not so easily counted because records are not kept. Locally there are about nine hundred people on the mailing list, but the vast majority have not paid their twenty dollars to become official members.
The Rhetorical Vision as a Response to a Situation

The use and abuse of alcohol can be traced far back in American history. In his comprehensive and detailed work, *The Alcoholic Republic*, Rorabaugh traced the history of American alcohol consumption from the colonial period to the present. In 1770 prior to the American Revolution, the annual per capita consumption of alcohol from all sources, but primarily from rum, reached 3.5 gallons (Rorabaugh computed this and the following figures by using the quantity of beverage drunk and the percentage of alcohol in each). After the Revolution, the consumption of distilled liquors declined because of decreased trade with the West Indies; high import taxes on both West Indian rum and on the molasses from which New England rum was made; and a new tax on domestic whiskey. Per capita consumption later rose, however, because of improved distilling technology and the growing popularity of whiskey along with illicit untaxed distilled spirits. By 1800 per capita consumption was back up to the 1770 level. Between 1800 and 1830 annual per capita consumption of alcohol from all sources rose until it peaked at four gallons making the first third of the nineteenth century the highest alcohol consumption period in American history to date.

While alcohol abuse was a serious problem in the nineteenth century, a relatively recent development coupled with alcohol has increased the danger to human life—the motorized
vehicle. In 1982 there were 148 million licensed drivers driving 1,544 billion miles annually. There were 182.2 million Americans fourteen and over considered to be the drinking population. They have each annually consumed an average of 2.77 gallons of pure alcohol producing 11.8 billion dollars in government tax and sales revenues each year. In the past ten years, one quarter of a million people in the United States have lost their lives in alcohol related automobile crashes; 26,000 Americans are killed annually; and over seventy citizens are killed every day in drunk driving mishaps.

The Rhetorical Vision. When a number of persons who share a group of fantasy themes and types integrate those fantasies into a rhetorical vision, it is often what Bormann refers to as a "master analogy" which holds all the elements together. The master analogy or label that holds this particular vision together is found in the name of the group—MADD. What binds the members together is anger. The legal system as it stands forces their grief to become outrage when vehicular homicide is treated as a misdemeanor. When families of victims pour that outrage into lobbying efforts, the vision becomes cohesive; the anger solidifies the membership; and the guilt of not having done something before to prevent the problem keeps the momentum going. The vision is of purging the drunken drivers from society in order to eliminate the physical,
emotional, and monetary destruction that inevitably occurs day in and day out.

Chaining Out The Fantasy

Members of MADD chain out their fantasies in particular ways to form a composite drama, or rhetorical vision. Fantasies are chained out through speeches, promotional material, and the mass media. The scenario always involves citizens taking a more active part in the eradication of the drunk driving problem. Persons should be motivated by their own sense of self-preservation, if not by the concern for the well-being of others. MADD reminds everyone that one out of two persons will be involved in an alcohol-related automobile crash in his or her lifetime. Marcella Harson brings presence to the threat prior to each speech. She asks half of the audience to stand up, tells them how good they look, hopes it is not them, and tells them to be seated. She then says the same thing to the other half. Her point, she says, is that one out of every two people in any gathering will be affected by a drunk driver. Assesses Troutman, "When she has people participating that way, it grabs them right there." 13

Consciousness Creating. The process through which a victim goes is artfully described by Dr. Havener.
Inevitably we are crushed and dazed by the loss of our family or of an arm or an eye. After a while the pain wears off and we patch up our life the best we can. Often the next emotion we feel is anger. Blind, mindless, raging, all-consuming anger. We hate the drunk who killed our family and we want him to suffer as we are. Jail him. Punish him. We rage inside and cry out in anguish and are emotionally consumed. An all the time we are devastated and consumed we are not fit to live with and cannot even bear ourselves...One of my messages to you is that when we face tragedy there is a better way, a constructive way, that can cheer, encourage, and uplift us, and make us better citizens. This better way is to try to correct the problem that has harmed us. The goal is to make a better and safer United States for everyone."4

This method of creating consciousness involves the realization that victims of drunk driving are victims of a crime rather than an accident. And this crime is perceived to be the only socially acceptable form of homicide in our society. Examples of how acceptable this crime is are found throughout MADD's newsletters. "The man who killed Marie Turri's 20 year old son had to pay $151.00 in court costs. The fine for killing a deer in their town is $250.00."15

Consciousness Raising. After members have developed their own consciousness, they are ready to gain converts. Advocating responsible behavior is a significant part of consciousness raising for MADD. Potential converts need to know what involvement entails. Involvement is participation in the fight against drunk drivers. Whether that
participation is in the political realm or the social realm, it involves responsibility.

The strategy is to show that the solutions MADD seeks and the methods for attaining those solutions are feasible, are not radical, and can be enacted by all the characters in the drama. The Columbus chapter passes out its own party guide for hosts who may serve alcohol. The guide suggests a variety of ways for a host to enhance his or her "guests' enjoyment by limiting the possibility of problems caused by drinking to excess." It offers hints about how individuals can help to solve the problem by not contributing to it. The guide does not ask members to radically change their lives, but to continue what they are doing in a more responsible way. According to the national chapter, "MADD is not a crusade against the use of alcohol. MADD's mission is to force effective and workable solutions to the drunk driving problem." "

MADD also distributes REDDI (Report Every Dangerous Driver Immediately) cards sponsored by the Ohio Department of Highway Safety. The card comes with phone numbers for the local police, sheriff, and highway patrol. The accompanying brochure explains how to report a drunk driver in order to protect one's self and one's community. It does not suggest that persons make citizens' arrests. It simply asks that persons notify authorities when they see a driver exhibiting certain characteristics. MADD encourages citizen
participation by presenting the likely alternative of be-
coming a victim. "Together our efforts could save your
life or the life of someone close to you."19

Consciousness Sustaining. Once the rhetorical com-
munity has emerged with a rhetorical vision, the group must
be held together with consciousness sustaining communication.
Consciousness sustaining communication stresses unity.
Although the local chapter succeeded in getting tough
legislation passed, its job is not over.

Our most important task now is the changing
of attitudes...of some public officials who
do not see drunken driving as a serious
problem, of some judges and law enforcement
officers who look the other way. Drinking
to excess and then driving is not accept-
able behavior. Irresponsible actions are
unacceptable. The victim's rights, consti-
tutional and otherwise must be considered.20

The unity there is relied upon more than ever for the chang-
ing of attitudes.

Please don't expect MADD to bring about
this change. An organization does not
accomplish anything! The individuals in
the organization do the work. YOU ARE
MADD! Together we are the organization
and MADD needs your support and your
efforts. With your involvement, this
can be our greatest year yet.21

In sum, the dramatic materials generated by Mothers
Against Drunk Drivers provide evidence that the vision con-
tains three major themes, each essential to its rhetoric:
(1) drunk driving has become a socially acceptable form of homicide in American society; (2) citizens no longer are willing to assume responsibility for their own actions; and (3) through the united efforts of all Americans, thousands of lives could be saved.

**Socially Acceptable Homicide.** On Saturday, May 3, 1980, thirteen-year old Cari Lightner was on her way to a church carnival when a car swerved into the bicycle lane where she and a friend were walking and hit her with such force as to throw her more than forty yards down the road. Cari never knew what hit her and died within an hour.22

Clarence Busch, the driver of the car, was in a drunken stupor when he hit Cari and did not bother to stop. Although Busch had been convicted of drunken driving three times in the previous four years, he had served only 48 hours in jail and had had his license reinstated each time after probation. He had been arrested just two days before killing Cari for another hit-and-run accident while under the influence of alcohol, but was put on bail on that charge.

Although he had smashed up his own car in the May 1 accident, he went home, took his wife's car, and continued to drink. On May 3 he left work at 8:00 a.m. and bought his first six-pack of the day. That afternoon, he smashed into Cari, went home, and eventually attempted to hide the car from his wife by locking it in the garage.

Sharlene Busch suspected something had happened that
day because her husband, Clarence Busch, was acting out of the ordinary. Three days later she called a friend at the California Highway Patrol and asked him to run a check to see whether there had been an accident involving her type of car. This is how she discovered that a brown Pontiac similar to her own was being sought in connection with Carl's hit-and-run death. The following day Busch was arrested, but he insisted he had only hit a tree. He was charged with vehicular manslaughter, felony hit-and-run, and felony drunk driving. The California Highway Patrol told Carl's mother, Candy Lightner, that Busch would in all likelihood receive little or no jail time. Lightner responded with anger. "Carl was the victim of a violent crime. If my daughter had been raped or murdered, no one would say of the killer, 'There but for the grace of God go I.' Death caused by drunk drivers is the only socially acceptable form of homicide."23

Lightner's anger and cynicism is repeated over and over throughout the rhetoric of MADD. Kenneth Charles Watson was fourteen when the car in which he was riding crashed and soared twenty-five yards before exploding into flames. Kenneth's mother, Andrea Rehkamp, lamented, "'...(The driver) paid a $50 fine and the carry-out owner paid $20 for selling liquor to a minor. So for $70 I lost my son.'"
Responsibility Is the Issue. Members of MADD believe that people should take responsibility for their own actions, and the legislators should make laws that will make an impression on those people who may not be so inclined to take that responsibility. Marecella Harmon, current Columbus Chapter President, tells her audiences that when people say to her drunk drivers are alcoholics and they cannot help themselves, she does acknowledge that alcoholism is a disease. "But when we have any other disease such as small pox or something else that is a hazard to the rest of the community, you are not then permitted to communicate that disease to the rest of the community. And while you are not making alcoholics of other people, you are making quadriplegics and paraplegics, and people are in comas..."25 Sandy Troutman, co-founder and past president of the local chapter supports Harmon's point. "We have all heard the excuse that there are just not enough jails to house these misdemeanor criminals. It is just that, an excuse. You can rest assured that if there was (sic) a disease killing at the rate of seventy a day, there would be some action taken."26

Once a person makes the decision to get behind the wheel of a car, he or she has assumed the responsibility that goes along with driving whether or not that person is fully cognizant of the decision at the time. MADD is not trying to interfere with anybody's constitutional rights.
explains Troutman. "We're not out there trying to tell them how to drink; we're trying to tell them how to drink and drive responsibly...It doesn't say anywhere in anybody's state laws that you have a right to drive. It's a privilege, and if you abuse that privilege, then your rights, as you call them, should be taken away from you."  

WADD's philosophy is supported by Ohio's implied consent law. This law states that a person who holds a driver's license implies that he or she will obey Ohio's traffic laws which include his or her consent to be tested for drugs and alcohol. Thus, in Ohio a driver's license is not a right, but a privilege, and one that must be warranted. On February 22, 1983, the Supreme Court ruled seven to two that a motorist's refusal to take a blood alcohol test can be used as evidence in court. The court overturned a South Dakota ruling which held that using a motorist's refusal as evidence against him or her violated the right against self-incrimination found in the Fifth Amendment. Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, writing for the majority, argued that "a refusal to take a blood alcohol test, after a police officer has lawfully requested it, is not an act coerced by the officer and this is not protected by the privilege against self-incrimination...The carnage caused by drunken drivers is well documented...This court has repeatedly lamented the tragedy." Hence, Ohio's implied consent law which presumes guilt if a driver refuses a sobriety test has been deemed constitutionally acceptable.
In Unity There is Power. The final fantasy theme which contributes to the creation of the rhetorical vision is one of unity. Through the united effort of all concerned citizens, this tragedy of drunk driving could be eliminated. Examples of dramatization found within the unity fantasy theme have been disseminated in the MADD literature and in the public speeches and letters written by the leaders. An article in a 1981 MADD newsletter praised members:

Mothers Against Drunk Drivers went public on August 29, 1980. At that time we were faced with tremendous obstacles—pessimism, sarcasm and little hope. Why were we able to overcome incredible odds? Because YOU believed enough to become involved in increasing your community's awareness, signing petitions, writing the media, and contacting your representatives in support of our cause. Your involvement is what has kept us going, rejuvenated our spirits and added to our motivation. This is true 'people power,' and MADD is an example of what a grassroots organization can do when people become involved."

Sandy Troutman explains to audiences that "MADD is not a woman's movement or a woman's issue. It is comprised of men and women, mothers and fathers, friends and concerned citizens who are working together on a volunteer basis, to find a workable solution to this problem."

Dr. William Havener, Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Central Ohio MADD Chapter and Director of Ophthalmology at Ohio State University Hospital, called
for a New Year's Resolution in 1982 to:

eradicate the curse of drunken driving from the State of Ohio...We agree that ultimately, only a vocal citizenry can really get drunken drivers off the streets.' (Columbus Dispatch, 12/30/81). We request all citizens of Ohio, acting in unison within their organizations, to affirm by resolution their support of this proposal. Forward your resolutions to the O.S.U. College of Medicine and to your State Senators and Representatives. Work, and we will together curb the drunken driving problem in Ohio in 1982!" 

According to Candy Lightner, "involvement is the key to waging the battle and winning the war. Together we can make a difference."33

The Dramatis Personae

Protagonists. Because the issue of responsibility is paramount in the rhetorical vision of MADD, the protagonists in the drama are responsible citizens who are opposed to drunk driving but do not advocate teetotaling as a solution to the problem. These Americans are so committed to their concerns that they have joined MADD and become politically involved in the legislative process so that responsible behavior will become the norm.

Changing laws and changing the public's attitude about drunk driving requires grassroots activism. It is this type of activism that is encouraged and commended as the legitimate acts performed by MADD members. Most praise-
worthy are responsible behaviors—all persons should take responsibility for their own actions, and legislators should make laws that will make an impression on those persons who may not be so inclined to take that responsibility. And judges and jurors should dispense with the attitude of "there but for the grace of God go I who could end up in jail and without a license" and replace it with the more socially redeeming attitude of "there but for the grace of God, go my child or my spouse who I could be burying."

Protagonists are volunteers willing to give their time and efforts to get legislation passed. "Betty Glassford obtained 1,329 signatures on petitions in her neighborhood," the Columbus newsletter reports. "Her favorite and most productive post, however, was in front of a busy Graceland drug store, next to a liquor store. Betty's technique was to carry two or three clip boards so that people wouldn't need to wait."34 A list of several women were recognized along with Betty Glassford for their contributions. "MADD gave its congratulations and heartfelt thanks to those ladies' because 'it couldn't have been done without a team effort.'"35

Protagonists are victims recognized for channeling their grief into anger and activism. In Lightner's "tribute to the chapters" featured in the Spring Newsletter she pointed out some of the numerous people who have
fought back. "Pat Owen lost two daughters and two nieces in a drunk driving crash that killed eight. She spoke before Congress (scared stiff) and is now an effective leader."

Husband and wife teams who talk to schools, the legislature, and appear before the media are lauded for taking time away from work and family in support of the cause.

The media are congratulated for their concern and sympathetic coverage. At MADD's March 11, 1982, fund raiser in San Francisco, the Terry Lemons award, named after a drunk driving victim, was presented to the television program "Good Morning America" for its week-long series on drunk driving in September 1982. The award is presented annually in recognition of the efforts of a media personality or organization to heighten public awareness about the tragic consequences of drunk driving. In Columbus, the Dispatch was thanked for its consistent stand in favor of, and reporters Mark Ellis and Mike Curtin for, coverage of the passage of Senate Bill 432.

Local affiliates are recognized by the national chapter for the publicity they command. "Columbus, Ohio (Lauren Heis, President) was given the annual 'Humanitarian Award' by the City's major newspaper. Keep up the great work!" Pike's Peak was congratulated for its "resounding success" of a fundraiser; other chapters are congratulated regularly for their participation in the fight for tough drunk driving laws.
Because prohibition is not a popular American cause, MADD members do not want to present the image that they are teetotalers, but responsible drinkers. "MADD does not have as its goal to abstain from liquor...That is not the issue." To have a responsible drinker is the issue."40

Protagonists are also portrayed as having exceptional talents necessary to accomplish their goals. Dr. William Havener wrote a letter titled "The Concept of Relative Sympathy" prior to his joining the Board of Directors of MADD.

I attended the first Ohio MADD meeting because, as a physician, I have long deplored the senseless carnage and waste resulting from drunken driving. More importantly, I attended because I sensed that MADD has the unique capability of eliminating drunken driving in Ohio. (Not reduce, eliminate!) The emotional power of this first meeting convinced me of the accuracy of my initial impression. MADD really, truly, can eliminate drunken driving in Ohio. Honest to God, it CAN!41

MADD members also try to dispel any notions held by the public that the organization is a vigilance committee. Protagonists are therefore portrayed as "a group of concerned citizens who would like to see justice reign. Our loved ones are gone and the only recourse we have left is to try to prevent another tragedy."42

It is important that MADD members be informed on the issues so that they are not fooled by the arguments of
their elected representatives and public officials. Candy Lightner told the Columbus chapter,

I know the political games that people play when they get involved with these things [State Task Force] because I was a member. But if you keep the public informed and involved, it does not happen or it doesn't need to happen...It is up to you to work together with your officials. Don't listen to their excuses that they have this problem and that problem because those problems can be overcome. And it is up to you to find the solutions.

In this war against drunk driving, MADD members receive extensive instructions in how to wage the battle.

MADD has three programs you can implement in your community to combat the problems of 'driving under the influence.'... Encourage businesses and organizations to use 'responsible hosting tips' by providing food at the party and transportation for the possible 'tipsey driver.'...You can help by distributing literature in your community, presenting information to organizations, and writing letters to the media exposing inconsistencies in our society that deal with the issues of driving under the influence...You can help by observing what goes on in court with the drunk driver and insisting that judges and district attorneys follow current laws in prosecuting and sentencing the drunk driver.

MADD members are also obligated to make their opinions known in the community. They are encouraged to write personal letters to their state representatives in favor of stricter laws and in opposition to laws perceived as detrimental.
MADD leaders receive recognition for testifying before legislative committees and meeting with federal officers in Washington, D.C., traveling nationwide to assist in the formation of new chapters, appearing on television and radio talk shows, and speaking out in any other setting that would spread the anti-drunk driving message to the mass audience.

MADD members are recognized locally for their successful collection of signatures in support of legislation, writing proposals, organizing meetings and conferences, donating materials and equipment, answering phones, and for any other time spent in a volunteer capacity.

Antagonists. The vision of MADD also dramatizes antagonists, enemies or villains, individuals or organizations who are slaughtering or allowing the slaughter of seventy people every day and 26,000 people every year. Those individuals who are most responsible for the drunk driving epidemic are drunk drivers themselves. Drunk drivers are portrayed as homicidal maniacs on the loose. "Drunk drivers, despite their threat to society, are free to roam our highways without fear of effective punishment, even if they kill someone." They "cause more deaths, injuries and destruction than murderers, muggers, robbers, rapists, and thieves," and they "cost society twenty-four billion dollars each year in court time, rehabilitation, lost earnings and other expenses."45
MADD perceives nothing praiseworthy about the drunk driver, so there is no logical reason why the criminal justice system should protect him or her. The drunk driver is a vicious public menace, and so it must be "the mission of MADD to bring the tragic realities of drunk driving and the needs of victims to the forefront of the nation's consciousness." 46

Another group of persons characterized as the enemy are certain legislators who are viewed as unworthy of representing the people. They are ineffective in handling their responsibility for the safety and well-being of their constituents. Candy Lightner appeared in a hearing before the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation of the United States Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation on March 3, 1982. After she had applauded the commitment of certain states to combat the drunk driving problem in order to save countless young lives, she questioned the motivation on the part of the United States Government. Lightner asked Senator Danforth how many senators were present that day in the hearing room to which he replied that there had been about four. "Ms. Lightner: 'You have a room crowded with public support. Every seat is filled. There are at least eight television cameras and, off and on, four members, and right now I see one or two. There is obviously a hue and cry from the public. I want to know why there isn't a hue and cry
from the Government." Villains also include lenient judges who are castigated for their laissez-faire attitudes. Cindi Lamb told the Subcommittee on Courts of the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary that the man who had hit her daughter and paralyzed her for life had been before the same judge on three prior convictions. On this, his fourth appearance, the judge was asked why he had let the man back on the road each time. The judge's response in Lamb's words was, "If I put him in jail he will just get out and do it again." Lamb was not satisfied with the judge's response. "I do not mean to sound like we take an ax to everybody, but this kind of attitude is disgusting and is exposed to the press. We have worked very closely with the press, and we are learning how to utilize the media as far as exposing this type of attitude is concerned and getting out the fact that more people are killed by drunk drivers than victims of crime..."

Conclusion

In sum, Mothers Against Drunk Drivers has created a rhetorical vision for its participants that encompasses highways rid of drunks and a society which puts victims in the forefront of its consciousness. Through the fantasy themes of (1) drunk driving being socially acceptable, (2) responsibility being the forgotten virtue in need of recovery, and (3) unity in behavior and attitude...
being the solution, MADD has propagated this vision throughout the United States.

The protagonists in the scenario are responsible citizens who are attempting to eradicate the drunk driving problem through whatever efforts they deem necessary. Children are major characters in the drama which always evokes pity and fear. The stock scenario is one of a family member being killed and the ensuing grief that turns into outrage as the legal system allows the tragedy to continue.

The antagonists are the legislators and the judges who refuse to make laws or who continue to let drunk drivers get off with minimum sentences. The drunk driver is the archvillain of MADD who has no way of redeeming him or herself in the vision of MADD.

MADD chains out its fantasy by speaking on the issue whoever called upon and by distributing literature of its own and other organizations that encourage people to change their attitudes and drinking driving habits. No matter how many laws are passed, MADD believes its vision will not be realized until the public's consciousness has been raised.
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CHAPTER IV

NEO-ARISTOTELIAN ANALYSIS OF
MOTHERS AGAINST DRUNK DRIVERS

Introduction

Kahn and Gonchar believe that neo-Aristotelian categories provide an adequate model in which to study a social movement. This chapter will focus on the methodology employed by Kahn and Gonchar to study Mothers Against Drunk Drivers. In order to understand Kahn and Gonchar's methodology, this chapter will provide (1) an explanation of ethos, logos, pathos, and style as set forth by Aristotle, and (2) a descriptive analysis of Kahn and Gonchar's modified version of neo-Aristotelian categories applied to the rhetoric of Mothers Against Drunk Drivers.

Aristotelian Proofs

To Aristotle, rhetoric is "the faculty of discovering in the particular case what are the available means of persuasion." Once a speaker examines all the means available, he or she can then embark on the best course of action. Forms of proof necessary to support an argument may be created by the speaker or might already have been available. The latter type of proof, non-artistic, includes
documents, dispositions, testimony, wills, documents, and the like. The former, artistic proofs, include logos, ethos, and pathos. A logical proof demonstrates that a thing is so. A speaker uses enthymemes, refutation of enthymemes, and rhetorical induction (i.e., examples) to support an idea. Ethical proofs depend for their effectiveness on the perceived believability of the speaker. Ethos involves the listener's opinion of a speaker based upon the speech itself. Aristotle included intelligence, character, and good will as the key dimensions of ethos. Pathetic proof is designed to sway a listener's feelings. Pathetic appeals include anger, love, friendship, hatred, fear, confidence, shame, benevolence, pity, indignation, envy, and emulation.

Hahn and Gonchar group style with ethos, logos, and pathos as four traditional categories of analysis. Aristotle classifies style as one of the four canons of rhetoric: inventio (invention or discovery of ideas and messages), dispositio (arrangement or organization of what has been discovered into parts), elocutio (the use of words or rhetorical devices to express ideas), pronunciatio (management of the voice and physical action when delivering the message).

"Style," Hahn and Gonchar write, "is significant because, as Burke says, it is the 'dancing of an attitude.'" Attitudes can be identified by "stylistic analysis"
of recurring images and metaphors. In the succeeding paragraph, however, Hahn and Gonchar expand style to include the study of rhetoric of the body: "Stylistic analysis of body rhetoric may be more important than analysis of verbal rhetoric because, in the verbal sphere, we are not able to distinguish revolutionary communication from dissent from predictions of disaster."

Thus, it is not clear whether Hahn and Gonchar are using style to describe the use of words and rhetorical devices to express ideas or to describe management of the voice and physical action. In order to assess Hahn and Gonchar's methodology applied to a movement, it will be the position of this author that Hahn and Gonchar have employed "style" to include both elocutio and pronunciation as Aristotle described the terms.

In addition to discussing ethos, logos, pathos, and style, Hahn and Gonchar discuss the impact of the media on each of the four categories. While Aristotle did not have to be concerned with the mass media as we now know it, access to various channels of communication often determines the course of a movement today.

**A Descriptive Analysis of MADD**

**Ethos.** A movement's conception of an ideal member can be discovered through an analysis of the movement's self-evaluation. The ideal member, Sandy Troutman, co-founder and past president of MADD, would like to have in her
chapter is an active one. She pictures someone who goes beyond sending in membership dues each year to actively contributing toward the achievement of the organizational goals of MADD.10

Newsletters from both the national and local chapters provide examples of MADD's self image to its members. For example, locally, in September 1982, former President Lauren Heis told readers, "We have made a difference with this bill (S.B. 432). Our letters and petitions have demonstrated a tremendous amount of public support which the legislators cannot ignore—especially before an election. Let's keep this momentum going."11 Nationally, in the Spring of 1983, Sandy Lightner applauded 111 MADD chapters in thirty-six states for "the new legislation passed in their states, the victim services they provide, the education they offer to the young and mature, and programs they are developing and implementing in their own chapters."12 Lightner also measures their successes by the "73% reduction across the nation in alcohol related crashes," and "the gradual change in attitude." The people who are responsible for the tremendous success "come from all walks of life—all over the country—some are victims—some are not—some are parents—some are not—some are professionals—many are housewives."13 But what they all share in common is a belief that drunk driving is a serious crime, but one that is solvable.
By the end of its first year, MADD claimed many accomplishments. The national chapter was successful in aiding community groups in establishing local, county, and state task forces to solve the problem of drunk driving; developing victim outreach programs; supporting legislative reform of laws on drunk driving; establishing chapters nationwide; participating on public, legislative, and law enforcement advisory boards; providing materials for use in medical facilities, and in health and driver education programs; providing consultant speakers for workshops of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.¹⁴

The Columbus chapter, since its inception in August, 1981, has accomplished the following:

(1) Bob and Sandy Troutman formed the Central Ohio Chapter of MADD (first in Ohio); (2) The Troutmans served on the Governor's Task Force on the Alcohol Impaired Driver; (3) Court Watch Program - record survey - court attendance; (4) Victim Assistance - Emotional support and guidance through the maze of court procedures; (5) Speakers Bureau - Addressed 53 groups from April-September 1983; (6) Many television, radio and newspaper interviews; (7) Holiday Ahead Campaign. Theme is 'Stay Alive. Don't Drink and Drive.' (8) Distribution of helpful information - both from MADD and other groups: Cab-Call, REDDI, Know Your Limit, Visual Detection of Drunk Drivers; (9) Produced a $500 record, 'One for the Road'; (10) Staff an office; (11) Held five meetings a year with speaker and educational materials; (12) Bibliography of Periodical Information; (13) Furnish much information to students... (14) Perceived by the community as the focal point for all problems concerning drunk driving... (15) Supported SB 132—the new drunk driving law... (16) Recipient of the
From this self-evaluation, it is apparent that MADD sees itself as a group of politically active, law-abiding, concerned citizens who want to modify the normative structure of American society by working through the established structure to achieve its goals. Members believe that there are solutions to the drunk driving problem, and they strive to find those solutions.

The ideal member can also be understood through an analysis of the kinds of antagonists the members have chosen to villify. MADD has chosen to villify the drunk drivers, lenient judges, and apathetic legislators. Drunk drivers are irresponsible individuals who have caused mass carnage without fear of punishment. "The drunk driver, who is responsible for thousands of deaths each year, repeatedly receives little more than a slap on the wrist." 16

Legislators are the ones perceived as allowing drunk driving to continue to be socially acceptable. In the national newsletter, Candy Lightner discussed how members of the Austin, Texas, chapter were "misled and patronized" by some of their state legislators during a hearing on drunk driving legislation. "These survivors and victims were ignored, interrupted, yelled at and dismissed while their representatives showed little attention and reacted
more to their colleagues than to the witnesses' testimony!" Lightner noted that this was not an unusual occurrence.

"These same feelings have been expressed to me over the past several months by many chapters disappointed by the irresponsible behavior of their representatives! 17

The leniency of judges is pointed out in tragic stories which end in the death or crippling of a victim and a relatively insignificant sentence for the killer. The national chapter cited an August 31, 1981, report that appeared in the Detroit News. Reporters had gone through court records on drunk driving cases in the metropolitan Detroit area where nearly five million people live and found that most of the drunk drivers did not go to jail even if they had killed someone.

Records in the Detroit metropolitan area—Wayne, Oakland and Macomb Counties—showed that 287 of the 548 fatal auto crashes in 1980 were alcohol related—just over 50%. In those 548 fatal crashes, 126 of the drunk drivers killed themselves; of the 161 survivors, 104 were not prosecuted at all; and 30 of the 57 drivers originally charged with manslaughter were allowed to plead to a lesser charge, often one that was little more than a slap on the wrist for taking the life of an innocent party. Only 16 of those drunk drivers guilty of killing another innocent party actually went to jail—some just on weekends. Investigative reporters of the Detroit News concluded that the attitudes of Detroit area judges are typical of the nationwide attitude of sympathy for drunk drivers, an attitude which is doing little or nothing to reduce the appalling toll of traffic fatalities across the nation. 19
The conclusions drawn by the reporters parallel the attitudes of MADD. Troutman told the Ohio Municipal Judges at their summer seminar, "We don't understand when you continually let these criminals back on the roads with little or no punishment...We are tired of a system that tries to find loopholes and beat the charges."^{19}

In sum, members of MADD are not drinking drivers, they are not irresponsible, and they refuse to let the drunk driving problem go unheeded.

The intertwining of ethos and logos can be seen in "logical contradictions upon ethical appeal."^{20} Although MADD presents arguments that are logical, there is a growing concern in the legal realm about whether or not MADD is trying to interfere with the constitutional rights of the accused in favor of the rights of the victim. According to San Francisco's acting head municipal judge, the group's court monitoring project may be unethical. "I question the ethical propriety of any group approaching a judge about any case that could possibly be before that judge for the purpose of influencing that judge's opinion."^{21} When asked her reaction to criticism of the court watch program, Marcella Harmon, president of the Columbus chapter, replied, "Why should any judge be intimidated by someone in their courtroom observing? If indeed a judge is intimidated because someone with a definite view about breaking the law is in his court, then my question is not toward the court watcher but toward the ethical make-up of that judge."^{22}
The ethos of MADD is generally enhanced by playing upon pathetic appeals including grief, anger, and outrage in response to the violent death of a loved one. "You, your son, your daughter, or some other close loved one has been injured or killed by a drunk driver....Be assured that MADD shares your grief and anger. It exists to offer guidance to victims of drunk drivers as well as to serve all citizens as a unified voice that will never be silenced." MADD refers to itself as the voice of the victim, and its very name elicits emotion and indicates its ideological orientation.

According to Hahn and Gonchar, "a movement can become identified with its stylistic tactics, then judged on that basis rather than on the merits of its stands." MADD's style has indeed affected its ethos, and in some cases MADD has had to remind its audience of the praiseworthy of its stand in the face of criticism.

The recurring images that MADD uses that enhance its image center primarily around children and the fatal and crippling injuries that they have suffered at the whim of a driver who has had one drink too many. When MADD juxtaposes the tragic story of a child who has become the youngest paraplegic in the country with the story of the drunk driver who continually escapes relatively unscathed, its credibility as an activist organization with a worthy, while cause is enhanced. When Cindi Lamb appeared
on Capitol Hill to ask President Carter to form a blue ribbon commission, she told the members of Congress what happened to her on November 10, 1979, on her way to the grocery store. On that fateful drive with her five month old daughter Laura, Lamb remembered

"glancing at Laura's face as she lit up with a brilliant smile as she kicked her sturdy legs against the car seat she was in and reached out to touch my hand. I remember thinking to myself and wondering if Laura would like to take dance lessons. No, I thought with her strong legs and perfect body surely she would prefer gymnastics or maybe even horseback riding. But I won't be taking Laura to any dance lessons and she won't be thrilled to show me her first cartwheel because 3 minutes later we were struck head on by a repeat offender drunk driver...."22

Because MADD consistently refers to drunk drivers as a "vicious public menace" who reek havoc on one out of every two persons, it must take care not to produce an image of a vigilante group intent on producing its own brand of law and order. MADD argues that it is not against rehabilitation unless rehabilitation is used in lieu of punishment. According to Dr. William Havener, the goal of MADD is "TO PREVENT DRUNKEN DRIVING. The goal is NOT to punish after the innocent victim has been harmed, not to fill the jails, not even to compensate the victim."

The ethos of MADD has been skewered by the media in the past several months. Rather than focusing on the drunk
driver, the media are highlighting the bureaucratic nature of MADD and the way members are allegedly intimidating judges in the courtrooms. In late March and early April 1983 several stories appeared in the Sacramento Bee concerning the organizational changes MADD is experiencing.

The new national executive director who was hired at $75,000 a year for his expertise in fundraising was the subject of articles as was the firing of several of the original board members. Also covered was Lightner's receiving a substantial salary increase and some board members' expression of concern that the group "is getting away from being a grassroots organization to becoming a self-sustaining bureaucracy."28 Locally, recent coverage on MADD in a newspaper concerned local chapters wanting more respect from the national chapter. Because Lightner earns $57,000 a year while the local chapters have leaders who volunteer their time and work with minimal budgets, some of the local members are disgruntled about having to send in half of the membership dues they collect.29

MADD has had some positive coverage by the national media that has coincided with action events such as recent deaths or current lobbying rather than bureaucratic problems. In 1981 members of MADD appeared on "Hour Magazine," "Today," "Phil Donahue," "Leave it to the Women," "20/20," "NBC Network News," "Good Morning America," and "60 Minutes." MADD was also featured in People, Globe, Family
The most sympathetic media coverage was the made-for-television movie, "Mothers Against Drunk Drivers, The Candy Lightner Story," which aired on March 14, 1983. According to Lightner, many of the local chapters informed her that they averaged a phone call per minute after the movie's conclusion. During the course of the movie, the telephone numbers of the respective local chapters were flashed across the screen periodically asking for volunteers and donations.

The local chapter's media coverage is diminishing perhaps because the drunk driving bill which it had sponsored became law, and the group is no longer considered current news. The national organization has as a goal raising the drinking age to twenty-one, an issue which received media coverage in fall of 1983. In Columbus, the local chapter supports the raising of the drinking age, but it did not actively campaign to raise the drinking age. However, Marcella Harmon did do a sixty-second spot for a local radio station at the request of that station in order to give equal time to both sides of the issue. Harmon told radio listeners that

the U.S. Surgeon General has reported that life expectancy has improved over the past seventy-five years for every age group except one, the fifteen to twenty-four year old. American's death rate is higher than it was
twenty years ago, and the leading single cause of death for this age group is drunk driving... We hope that responsible young persons will see Issue One as protection for themselves. Don't be a statistic. MADD urges you to vote yes on Issue One.33

The group who succeeded in putting a referendum on the November ballot was Coalition for 21. The group has not been without controversy. MADD claims that the Coalition for 21 was riding on the reputation of MADD to solicit money and signatures on its initiative campaign. Members of Coalition for 21 would call a person on the telephone and tell him or her that they were campaigning against the drunk driver. According to both Marcella Harmon and Sandy Troutman, several people would call the MADD office every day thinking they had been asked to contribute to MADD.34 In its spring newsletter, MADD printed a "Members Alert!" to warn members that if anyone should ask, they should make it clear that there is no connection between Coalition for 21 and Mothers Against Drunk Drivers. However, the local chapter does endorse "the raising of the drinking age to 21, just because it has proven to greatly correlate with lower incidences of drinking and driving."35

With the 1984 holiday season upon us, the issue of drunk driving and Mothers Against Drunk Driving is bound to make a comeback. A woman who successfully sued the town in which she lives because a police officer failed to detain
a drunk driver who subsequently killed her husband and child was a subject of "60 Minutes" on November 20. "First Camera" featured on November 27 a woman who lost two sons to a teenage drunk driver. The woman's ex-husband has become an active member of Mothers Against Drunk Drivers since the death of their sons. The Columbus Dispatch has featured several stories in November about alcohol abuse and drunk driving.36

Legos. The premises, arguments, and evidence employed by MADD reflects continuity in its thought. The primary goals of MADD are "to reduce the number of deaths and injuries caused by drunk drivers" and "to offer support and services to the victims of drunk drivers." These goals serve as underlying premises which provide the world view that unites the members of MADD. "We are dedicated to bringing victims rights and the issues of drunk driving into the public eye--and keeping them there.38

The movement's philosophy, according to Ehn and Gonchar, determines its specific arguments and argument forms. MADD's philosophy appears to be that driving is a privilege, it can be taken away if it is abused. Members believe that rehabilitation alone is not enough; it must be coupled with punishment in order to deter the drunk driver. The organization claims it is not out for revenge. "Our loved ones are gone, and the only recourse we have left is to try to prevent another tragedy."39
The patterns of evidence indicate that the values the movement advocates center around preservation of the family and individual responsibility. Evidence usually encompasses stories about victims/survivors, lists of statistics, and the inadequate treatment of drunk drivers by "the system." Victim or survivor stories often focus on children and the devastation a family encounters upon the violent and unexpected death of a child. Over and over the innocent young life is juxtaposed against the irresponsibility of the drunk driver and the legislative and judicial systems which fail to demand responsibility on the part of drivers who drink. Statistics are used as powerful weapons against the system when the laws and enforcement are lax and in support of the system when new, stricter laws result in a reduced number of tragedies.

The local chapter of MADD did not meet any resistance when it first began, according to co-founder Sandy Troutman. It was not until the chapter began espousing the virtues of Senate Bill 432 that the group got the reputation of being "radical" women intent on putting all drunk drivers away.40

Hahn and Gonchar refer to the style-logos interaction as utterance of "impossible half-truths and glittering generalities in a calm, rational style."41 Although there is no evidence to suggest that members of MADD have uttered
half-truths and generalities, Sandy Troutman has been accused of being "so calm" considering the circumstances that have affected her life—her two young sons were killed by a drunk driver who subsequently spent no time in jail. She responded to one such inquiry: "I don't like the word calm. I'm trying to put my anger in a good direction through MADD. You need not be a radical to solve things. You've got to find a good channel for your emotions, a constructive channel, and this is how I'm channeling mine." 42

Perhaps the most significant insight from the intertwining of categories comes from the affect of pathos on the logos of the movement. MADD uses sensational examples and dramatic statistics that evoke intense emotional responses. An example of just a fraction of the statistics include:

- Of every 2,000 drunken drivers, only one is arrested (chances of receiving a serious penalty is mathematically insignificant).
- One out of every two Americans will be involved in an alcohol-related auto crash in his or her lifetime.
- On an average weekend night, one out of every ten drivers on the road is drunk. 43
- The leading cause of death for Americans between the ages of 15 and 24 is drunk driving. 44

In a speech before the Ohio Insurance Institute, Sandy Troutman concluded with a quote from editorialist George F. Will. He had discussed the morbid statistics and the nation's outrage but unwillingness to do anything about
the drunk driving problem. He concluded: "When reform comes, it will be due, in large measure, to M.A.D.D.--Mothers Against Drunk Driving. Behind this potent organization stretches a line of tiny coffins and small quadriplegics' wheelchairs. MADD is evidence that there is no political force comparable to the fury generated by injuries done to children." Many of the stories MADD tells are about children because the violent and unexpected death of a child is likely to elicit an overwhelming emotional response.

Because the media is oriented toward the dramatic, a movement must often rely on demonstrations and sloganeering in order to gain the attention of the public through the media. Although locally MADD has not resorted to sloganeering, it has participated in demonstrations. For example, on December 12, 1982, MADD organized a national candlelight vigil held across the United States and Canada. The ceremony took place at 5:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time. In Columbus, members of MADD held their vigil at the State Capitol in memory of the thousands of friends, family members, and others who had been killed or crippled by drunk drivers. The name of each victim was read and a candle was lit for each one. The vigil was held during the National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Week in which MADD members were asked to drive with their lights on to heighten awareness. The vigil also happened to coincide in Columbus with the House Committee's watering
down of the Senate's Omnibus Drunken Driving Bill.46

Pathos. The movement appeals to grief, anger, outrage, and guilt because these emotions are inherent to the belief structure of the movement. A Victim Information Pamphlet devotes two pages to an explanation of the grieving process. Feelings and behavior are described for the initial state of shock and numbness which is followed by searching and yearning, disorientation, and finally reorganization. Victims are encouraged to grieve out in the open. "When people ask how you're doing, don't always say 'Fine.' Let them know how terrible you feel."46

Anger and outrage are the key to mobilizing and maintaining the movement. "MADD says we must fight together to win the battle of the drunk driving epidemic."47 Candy Lightner told members of the Ohio Chapter at the Governor's Traffic Safety Committee to "get involved now. And let people know that you have had enough and you will not tolerate this any longer."48

Guilt is stressed in a record produced by the local chapter titled "One for the Road." The song, done in first person, tells of a man who stops in Joe's bar on a rainy night after work. When he is ready to leave, Joe says, "How about one for the road?" He finally staggers out the door thinking he was still sober, "but I was such a fool." He manages to drive home but "it was morning
before I sobered up and realized I'd killed a kid." He pleads guilty at the trial and gets sentenced to a year, "but I wished they would have taken my life after seeing the look in his mother's eyes." 49

The intertwining of pathos and style is Hahn and Gonchar's first mention of body rhetoric, albeit brief. Apparently body rhetoric, in this sense, is the use of the body to elicit some type of emotional reaction. MADD's primary use of body rhetoric is members' presence in the courtroom. MADD's court monitoring project depends on volunteers to sit in the court of a judge hearing a drunk driving case. Although MADD claims that its presence is not meant to elicit emotion, their presence has been cited as intimidating. 50

Hahn and Gonchar discuss the impact the media have on movements relying heavily on pathetic appeals. "Agitation and dramatic activity heighten excitement and intensity, bringing in converts and reinforcing partisans." 51 The televised movie, "Mothers Against Drunk Drivers, The Candy Lightner Story," was an attempt to communicate the impact of a drunk driving tragedy on the family, the vulnerability of children, and the need for citizen involvement to solve the problem and protect loved ones. 52

On March 13, 1983, three days before Ohio's tough drunk driving law was to take effect, the Columbus Dispatch devoted two full pages to "The Dead, the Drinker, and the
Law." It began by explaining that on January 21, 1982, a Senate Bill designed to discourage drunk drivers was introduced by Senator Michael DeWine (R-Cedarville). Between the time it was proposed and the time it was to take effect, forty seven persons were killed in alcohol-related crashes. The tragic stories of all of the victims were detailed in the newspaper along with the year-long chronology of the drunk driving legislation. The battle for the legislation ended on December 9, 1982, when "Gov. James A. Rhodes signed the bill, with praise for the Columbus Chapter of Mothers Against Drunk Drivers for its perseverance." Newspaper features of drunk driving tragedies aid the movement because they often feature the pathetic appeal. Similarly, television news shows focus on emotion. When Cindi Lamb appeared on "Good Morning America" in December 1982, she brought her daughter with her, so millions of home viewers could see the heartbreak with which she and her daughter must live.

Style. Attitudes can be identified through the recurring images and metaphors in the rhetoric. The images and metaphors MADD employs reflect an endangered society subject to rampant homicide. Epidemic, slaughter, life sentence, and carnage are representative of the terms used to describe the drunk driving problem.

The most frequently used metaphor is "death caused by drunk drivers is the only socially acceptable form of
homicide." This metaphor represents the empathy judges, juries, law makers, and law enforcement officials have for the drunk driver rather than for the victim. An analogy former MADD President Lauren Heis used in a speech before the Ohio House Judiciary Committee was that "a moment's slip in judgment and an eighteen inch drift left of center can sentence someone to a wheelchair for life, with no right of appeal." The use of the phrases "sentence someone," "for life" and "with no right of appeal" make the situation of a wheelchair bound person analogous to a person unfairly convicted and sent to jail for the rest of his or her life with no chance to appeal that conviction. It could also be interpreted to mean that while persons sentenced to jail for life do have a right to appeal in our judicial system, the person crippled for life by the drunk driver is not entitled to the same right. He or she cannot be "freed" by a review of the facts or on the basis of a technicality.

In answer to the question, "What can a victim do?" MADD responds that "only by insisting on personal involve- ment in each step of the proceedings can we be assured that a drunk driver is treated as the vicious public menace he or she really is." In a hearing before a Senate Subcom- mittee on Surface Transportation, Candy Lightner testified that "the majority of citizens who contact us have loved ones innocently slaughtered by repeat offender drunk drivers."
Hahn and Gombar argue that style determines the following and the effectiveness of a movement. If a group is militant, it is likely to see results from power-vulnerables, but at the same time it is likely to intensify the backlash among those who are invulnerable to militant rhetoric. On the other hand, should the group state its case peacefully, it may win adherents among the masses but be ineffective in attracting power-vulnerables. MADD has attempted to remain moderate in its rhetoric in order not to scare off the average American driver who can remember the last time he or she got into a car while under the influence of alcohol and at the same time serve as a constant reminder to elected officials of the horrifying statistics that are unnecessarily allowed to remain unrestrained.

Sandy Troutman states that she and Marcella Harson, the current president of the local chapter, do not possess the expertise to attract a new and energetic membership. "We have very few victims involved in this chapter because we keep it so low-key." Most of the members are "interested and concerned citizens...who send in their check and that's about it." 58

Members of MADD do not participate in what Bowers and Ochs referred to as agitation which involves the use of "extra-discursive means of persuasion." 59 Petition and pronouncement, which are employed by MADD, are strategies within the rhetoric of agitation but are not in themselves
agitation. They must be used along with such strategies as non-violent resistance, escalation/confrontation, or guerilla tactics, which are not the mainstays of MADD.

MADD does not affiliate itself with any political party nor with conservatism or liberalism. But it does remind its audience who sponsored which drunk driving bill, who voted for or against a drunk driving bill, and which judges are complying with drunk driving laws. 60

The way in which Hahn and Gonchar describe the interaction of style and logos does not characterize what has happened with MADD. Hahn and Gonchar claim that the "support of political symbols often seems less related to matters of ideology than to things such as traditions, education, ethnicity, primary group ties, geographical area, or the charisma of a given leader." 61 In the case of drunk driving, there appears to be nothing other than ideological reasons for supporting or opposing a crackdown. All segments of society are equally as likely to be victims. Support of the crackdown appears to be directly related to having been a victim, having known a victim, or wanting to avoid being a victim. It is a very specific issue with relatively clear boundaries.

The relationship between pathos and style poses a dilemma for MADD. If they stress death, pain, grief, and loss, the leaders elicit tears and pity without assuring that the listeners will immediately act. Yet if the leaders
tone down their rhetoric and only make pragmatic suggestions as to what can be done in the future, they are reducing the power of emotional symbols that can fire the will of followers. Thus leaders of MADD must develop a style that will not only "move the passions" as George Campbell would have insisted, but also "influence the will" to act. 62

Cindi Lamb testified on November 6, 1981, in a hearing before a Senate Subcommittee on Courts. She told the Senators about the tragic crash that left her daughter, Laura, a quadriplegic for life at the age of five months. But Lamb was not only soliciting tears; she was seeking tough legislation at the national level to rid the highways of drunk drivers.

I am still scared, and I hurt inside bad, and I want you to know this, not because I want pity or, 'Oh let's feel bad for Cindi,' but because it is a fact and it is happening to so many other people. Today I am still lucky enough to have Laura. She is still alive. There are going to be 70 families today that are just going to die inside because somebody they love is going to be killed today by a drunk driver. I am begging you, and I am pleading with you to move as swiftly as possible on this issue. I strongly feel that some good, tough Federal legislation with some teeth in it is vital in helping to remove drunk drivers from our highways and hopefully saving some lives. 63
Conclusion

In sum this chapter has shown how four traditional categories of analysis can provide insight into Mothers Against Drunk Drivers. By examining who the movement perceives as an ideal member and who is perceived as the enemy, the critic can determine the ethos of the movement. MADD perceives the ideal member to be a law abiding, concerned and responsible citizen who is willing to do something about the drunk driving problem. The enemies are the drunk drivers and the judges and legislators who continue to perpetuate or allow the perpetuation of the problem.

The logos, or premises, arguments and evidence, of the movement center around the primary goals of MADD which are to reduce the number of deaths and injuries caused by drunk drivers and to support the victims. The category most useful in analyzing the rhetoric of MADD is pathos. Among the emotions that MADD stresses are grief, anger, outrage, and guilt. Pathetic appeals are used to elicit fear and pity in all of the rhetorical artifacts of MADD. The style of MADD's rhetoric produces images of tragedy, of innocent victims being slaughtered every day by an epidemic known as the drunk driver. MADD's style in terms of physical action is moderate and always within the boundaries of the law.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As the preceding three chapters demonstrate, general rhetorical models can provide insight into the rhetoric of MADD. Fitzger, Bormann, and the neo-Aristotelian configuration provided by Hahn and Gonchar allow for an analysis of the rhetoric of MADD from three different points of view. The following questions were addressed: (1) Is one model of rhetorical theory sufficient to adequately explain this movement? (2) Would one model of rhetorical theory be adequate to explain a whole series of social movements? (3) What kinds of rhetorical material are available for the study of this contemporary grassroots movement? (4) What kinds of rhetorical strategies does Mothers Against Drunk Drivers employ in seeking to influence the behavior of drivers-in-general, legislators, and law enforcement officials?

Summary

Chapter II (The Rhetorical Situation) addresses the rhetorical situation faced by Mothers Against Drunk Drivers. This chapter applies the criteria of a social
movement as an essential element of the rhetorical situation and discusses the interactive elements of the exigence, the audiences, and the constraints which influenced the situation from 1980 through 1983. The exigence being addressed is the needless loss of life through drunk driving.

The audiences which have the potential to notify the exigence are many. The primary audience consists of those individuals within the American public who are no longer willing to tolerate the drunk driver on the highways. The state and federal legislatures are also a major audience being addressed by the movement because the members of MADD seek to persuade legislators to pass laws that will deter the drinking driver. Another audience consists of members of the judicial sphere who must see that the law is being enforced. Judicial interpretation of the law, however, varies.

The constraints imposed upon the situation include: the prevalence and acceptance of alcohol in American society; different interpretations of the law concerning drunk driving; limited forms of inexpensive public transportation; the growing number of alcohol-related automobile crashes; and a growing public concern about the rights of victims being overshadowed by the rights of the defendant.

Mothers Against Drunk Drivers is a social organization dedicated to working through the system to change the system. MADD is only one of many single-issue movements...
that exist in the early 1980's. Through its unified effort in petitioning the legislatures, monitoring the courts, and raising the public consciousness, MADD is responding in a manner appropriate to the situation.

Chapter III (Rhetorical Vision and Fantasy Theme Analysis) focuses on the fantasy themes employed by Mothers Against Drunk Drivers to create a rhetorical vision as a response to the situation. Perceiving a dramatic rise in drunk driving deaths and injuries and apathy on the part of the public in general, legislators and court personnel, concerned citizens and victims of drunk drivers have created a vision of a safer world; they seek to bring the plight of the victim to the forefront of the nation's consciousness.

The primary fantasy themes essential to the rhetoric of MADD are three in number: (1) drunk driving is the only socially acceptable form of homicide; (2) taking responsibility for one's actions is becoming a forgotten virtue; but (3) through the united efforts of all Americans, thousands of lives can be saved. To chain out the fantasy, the movement creates a consciousness which involves the realization that victims of drunk driving are victims of a crime, rather than an accident. Once consciousness is created, converts are gained by showing people how feasible the solutions are. The consciousness is sustained by stressing the need to change public attitudes, even if
laws have already been passed and judges are taking appropriate judicial action.

Chapter IV (Aristotelian Analysis) focuses on the intertwining of the ethos, logos, pathos, and style of the movement. This chapter analyzes the rhetorical strategies employed by MADD in its speeches and literature. Ethos is based in the virtue of the cause, which is the saving of innocent lives. The ideal member of MADD is one who is active in helping the organization achieve its goals. The enemy is not only the drunk driver, but lenient judges, an indifferent public, and apathetic legislators.

The premises, arguments and evidence, employed by MADD unite the membership. The logic of the movement is that driving is a privilege, not a right; hence as a privilege, it can be taken away if abused. The patterns of evidence indicate the movement values individual responsibility and the preservation of the family. Statistics are used as a powerful weapon to elicit fear as well as outrage.

Pathetic appeals involve grief, anger, and guilt; they serve to mobilize and maintain the movement. It is the pathetic appeal which is most likely to attract the media, and thus MADD has received a great deal of media coverage, both locally and nationally.

The rhetorical style of the movement centers around images of epidemic, tragedy, slaughter, devastation, and destruction. Victim stories are often juxtaposed with
the story of the driver who escapes relatively unscathed in physical harm and in punishment. Members do not participate in any type of nonverbal acts of civil disobedience.

Conclusions

Because of the nature of the study, the conclusions will be divided into two groups, theoretical and substantive. The theoretical conclusions will deal with movement theory. The substantive conclusions will deal specifically with the rhetorical efforts of Mothers Against Drunk Drivers.

The first theoretical conclusion is that a pluralistic approach to the study of a movement yields more information than the single model approach. Of the three models employed, fantasy theory analysis proved to be the most complete for the study of a movement. This model allows for a discussion of how the rhetorical appeals are created and disseminated, who is involved in the movement, what the movement stands for and what it opposes, and what it hopes to achieve. Bitzer's rhetorical situation does not provide sufficient scope for thorough coverage. Since Bitzer perceives the situation as deterministic, there is minimum room to discuss how the rhetorical appeals are developed and what strategies are chosen over others in response to the perceived exigence. In Hahn and Conchar's version of a neo-Aristotelian study, the intertwining of four classical categories is so restrictive that the critic must often
seek specific examples to fit into the categories rather than allow the model to explain the movement.

This author would therefore advocate a pluralistic approach to the study of a social movement. Perhaps Bormann's model would complement the rhetorical situation by adding a sense of the rhetor-creating reality rather than only situation-creating reality for the rhetor. Or Bitzer's model could provide a context for the study of the ethos, logos, pathos, and style employed by movement advocates.

Second, each of the three models allows the critic to treat the rhetorical artifacts differently; the movement appears in different lights. However, any theory of movements must have a sense of growth and a dimension of time. It is not necessary, however, that the theory provide precise chronological stages through which the movement passes. As Sillars notes, a movement does not have a beginning, middle and end until the critic labels a beginning, middle and end. Apparently in rhetorical studies, frequently a movement is not a movement until it is perceived and labeled as such by the critic.† With the models used in this study, there is no campaign that can be perceived, nor is there a sense of progression of strategies employed by the movement. For example, strategies employed in a state prior to legislation being passed will differ from strategies used after the legislation is passed. In any one or more of the models used here,
the critic does not get enough sense of growth or development. There runs the risk of limited movement per se. It is as if one were analyzing a series of still photographs rather than a motion picture.

In order to use the rhetorical situation, this critic chose to set up Chapter Two in segments so that every audience being addressed could be examined separately. Because each audience was treated somewhat chronologically, the segments give the appearance of a time span occurring. However, those boundaries are artificial having been created by this critic for the convenience of study. With the three elements of the rhetorical situation, audience, exigence and constraints, there are no guidelines for addressing separate audiences with the same exigence and different constraints to overcome.

In the fourth chapter focusing on Hahn and Gonchar's modified neo-Aristotelianism, there is no way to examine changes in the ethos, logos, pathos, and style of the movement while staying within the boundaries of the model. The character of MADD has evolved from a modest beginning when Candy Lightner was a one woman crusader to January 1982 when the legislation she fought for was passed by the California legislature and signed by Governor Brown, to March 1983 when the Sacramento Bee reported that MADD had hired an executive director for $75,000 to head its 122 chapters. But Hahn and Gonchar's version does not
allow for style as well as ethical, pathetic, and logical appeals to change when intermediate goals, such as the passage of legislation, are achieved.

Bormann's model is also a limited approach to the study of a movement although not to the extent of the other two being discussed. Bormann's vision is not a changing one nor is the perception of antagonists and protagonists. Although there is a sense of progression in the creation and maintenance of the fantasy themes, there is no movement once the fantasy themes have been channeled out.

The third conclusion is that one all-encompassing model is not enough to cover the wide range of potential movement studies. The type of model advocated by Cathcart and by Bowers and Ochs would not allow for the study of a movement such as MADD. Both of these models require more than the normal discursive means of persuasion for a phenomenon to be classified as a movement. MADD does not advocate nor participate in activities that fall outside the normal decision making channels. MADD falls closer to innovational theory of movements proposed by Smith and Windes because MADD advocates responsible drinking; responsibility is not a new value nor is it one that opposes the existing hierarchy. MADD opposes the existing legislative and judicial systems which are eroding or failing to instill the value of responsibility. However, Smith and Windes' theory would have to be modified because
a literal interpretation of their writings would have the reader believe that MADD is too radical an organization to fit the model. Smith and Windes suggest that there is a dialectic between the movement's purpose and its scene. "The personae are impersonal scenic elements which can be condemned for eroding society's values. These elements are mute, for no spokesmen will arise to refute the condemnations."2 The difficulty stems from the fact that MADD does name names; although the legislative and judicial systems are the enemy, particular legislators and judges as well as drunk drivers are often pointed out. Thus there are legislators, judges, drivers, and alcoholic beverage personnel who rise up to oppose some of the policies advocated by MADD. With a literal interpretation of Smith and Windes' theory, the critic would have to conclude that either MADD is not an innovational movement or that it is an innovational movement but one that has not succeeded because there is a vocal enemy. The more appropriate conclusion would be that the authors' statement that the innovational movement is "a struggle against the representative symbols of a mute perceived evil" be made more flexible.3 In general, MADD criticizes existing institutions and points to their failure in satisfying existing social needs rather than pointing at individuals.
The first substantive conclusion is that there is an abundance of information available to study MADD if one knows where to look for it. To the author’s knowledge, there are no studies of MADD in communication or sociological journals. Much of the information comes from the media. Newspapers concentrate heavily on the drunk driving issue during the holiday seasons, when legislation is being debated or signed into law, and when a local or national celebrity has been involved in an alcohol-related crash. The fact that the Candy Lightner story was the subject of a made for television movie indicates the perceived relevance of the subject. Although drunk driving has received limited press coverage recently, the topic was examined in November 1983 on “Sixty Minutes” as well as “First Camera.”

Other than media coverage, information must be obtained from the local and national chapters. While MADD does distribute some of its printed literature, it is not easily found by the public. The local chapter does keep a supply of literature on hand in its office for anyone who asks for it. The national chapter, as Sandy Troutman mentioned, is a difficult source from which to solicit information. A written request for material by the author yielded a couple of pamphlets about how to discuss drinking with a teenage child and one page of local legislation. A follow up phone call several months later yielded two newsletters, a membership application, and victim information material.
Generally, speeches are not written down or recorded for research purposes. This author was able to get a copy of some speeches only because Sandy Troutman wrote down her own speeches, recorded and transcribed Candy Lightner's speech to the Ohio chapter, and saved the copies of Dr. Matener's letters and speeches that he sent to her. There is very little structure in the organization which is reflected in the way that records are kept.

In general, MADD's approach has been successful because it adequately overcomes the constraints of the situation. Legislators and judges and concerned citizens respond to MADD because MADD makes them feel partially responsible for the tragedy of drunk driving. MADD personalizes the tragedy in two ways. First, members tell a story about a particular person, usually a child, whose young life was wiped out by a repeat offender drunk driver. Second, they put the number of deaths in the most frightening form that they can: One out of every two persons will be involved in an alcohol-related crash in his or her lifetime. Marcelle Harrison, in an interview with the author, cited this statistic and then said, "That means you or me." Although a statistic is a logical appeal, this particular one stimulates an emotional fear response. If every legislator is made to look at the person next to him or her and say, "If it's not him or her, then it is going to be me," serious thought about what to do about the drunk driving problem is likely to ensue.
One of the problems with the movement is that the non-legislative solutions MADD advocates are not widely known by the public. What appears in the newspapers and on television is that drunk driving is illegal. But MADD’s Party Guide and the Cab-Call and REDDI information reach relatively small audiences. MADD meetings attract a small number of people (the anniversary meeting had about sixty-five people present, and that was considered the largest crowd the organization ever attracted), and the local newsletter is sent to only nine hundred persons five times a year. Sandy Troutman stated in an interview with the author that neither she nor Marcella Harmon possess the expertise to recruit new members and to write and design sophisticated literature. The leaders often cite lack of money as a key to organizational shortcomings, but that becomes a circular argument: We do not have enough money to attract a capable leader; without a capable leader fundraising and membership drives are only modestly effective; without fundraising and membership drives, we have no money to attract a capable leader.

Although MADD has been able to affect some legislators as is evidenced by new laws being passed, it is too soon to determine what kind of effect MADD will have on the attitudes of the general public. The stories MADD has in its archives are tragic and touching. The statistics it employs are enlightening and at the same time frightening. MADD has
the potential to change public attitudes if it can attract more attention to itself to strengthen its forces. It cannot afford to wait for the media to come after it; it must make the first move if it is going to remain a viable organization. Perhaps MADD needs to stress more clearly that it is not a teetotalling organization. Although no reasonable person would stand up in favor of drunk driving, one might oppose any action against it because one thinks it will restrict one's privilege to drink. And perhaps the fear of punishment is still higher for the average individual than the fear of being killed or crippled by a drunk driver. A listener told how much time he or she is going to spend in jail might be turned off from supporting the group that is so determined to put him or her in jail. On the other hand, if the listener is made to feel guilty about endangering the lives of others, he or she might take it upon him or herself to change the situation.

During the course of this study, other avenues of potential research have occurred to this author concerning theories of social movements and Mothers Against Drunk Drivers. A critic might want to compare the rhetorical approach of MADD with another movement against drunk driving such as Remove Intoxicated Drivers (RID) which originates in New York. A critic could explore MADD as an innovational movement by employing the theory advocated by Smith and Windes. A critic might also want to conduct a Burkan
analysis using the pentad or applying such concepts as identification and consubstantiality. Because MADD has received minimal scholarly attention, there is a great deal of room for further study.
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INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

What is/was your position with MADD?
Describe your duties and responsibilities with MADD.

Describe the organizational structure of MADD (dues paying structure).

Approximately how many members do you have locally, state-wide, nationally?

Why did you become involved with MADD?

Why, in your opinion, are other individuals attracted to MADD?

Describe the typical MADD member.

How has MADD worked to attract membership? What problems have you encountered attracting and maintaining membership?

Describe the various public audiences MADD is attempting to reach.

What individual or group is responsible for creating the MADD messages?

Who determines the types of rhetorical appeals that will be used?

What kinds of resistance have you encountered from the establishment (local, state, and national)? How are you working to minimize that resistance?

In what ways have you been helped by members of the establishment? Who among the established structure are your supporters?

How have you consciously adapted your rhetoric to meet the needs of various audiences—victims, media, legislators, judges, etc?

What major activities, programs, policies, etc. has MADD engaged in to affect current public policies in the area of drunk driving?
What are MADD's future goals? Within 5 to 10 years, what will MADD have accomplished?

How has MADD evolved and become more sophisticated since its inception?

What conscious attempts have been made to refine the rhetoric?

As a leader of a social movement, what significant challenges have you faced? How have you met these challenges?

What kinds of ethical dilemmas have you encountered in your role as a MADD leader? How did you solve these dilemmas? What kinds of ethical dilemmas has the organization as a whole encountered? How were these dilemmas solved?
Interviewer: Sandra Troutman  
Co-Founder and Former Co-President, Mothers Against Drunk Drivers, Central Ohio Chapter  
Date: September 28, 1983  
Location: Columbus, Ohio

WHAT IS/ WAS YOUR POSITION WITH MADD?

Two years ago, my husband and I co-founded the chapter, and essentially it was known as the Ohio chapter of Mothers Against Drunk Drivers. We were called the Ohio Representatives. My husband and I founded the chapter after meeting with Candy Lightner, founder of National Mothers Against Drunk Drivers, on August 5, 1981. The positions which we now hold, after serving as co-presidents, are that of both serving on the Central Ohio Chapter Board of Directors. I am on the Victim Assistance/Support Group Committee, and I also act as an advisor to the current president on problems which relate to drunk driving because she doesn't have the background that I have. She didn't get into the organization as early as we did. So, if questions come up about how we did things three years ago, I can assist her in that way.

HOW MUCH TIME DO YOU SPEND IN THE ORGANIZATION NOW COMPARED WITH TWO YEARS AGO?

Well, it doesn't compare at all. Now, I would say, at most I put in one hour of telephone time with Marcella at least every day. If they get a call from victim, she'll call me, and I have contact with them. So maybe I put in at most two or three hours a day compared with twelve or more hours every day in the beginning.

DESCRIBE YOUR DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES WITH MADD WHEN YOU WERE PRESIDENT.

When I was president, Bob and I essentially did everything, not solely because we wanted to, but because we didn't have enough people involved. So when we were called upon to do speeches or to meet with the media, it really was just us doing just that. Even after we were in and had the organization going a good five or six months, it was still just us doing the speeches, and some months there were fifteen or more speeches to do. So that was a big responsibility. We met with the media and had all of our contacts through them. We were on many talk shows, even a national talk show on CNN in May of 1982. They invited us to be on their program. They had had a whole week on drunk driving issues. They invited us because my children were killed on Memorial Day weekend. They had contacted the
National organization wanting to know if they knew of anyone who had had a tragedy during that time, and they mentioned us.

We provide emotional support to victims if requested; case being, I wrote a letter to the Goodwin family when they were involved in a drunk driving issue. They never contacted us, but we kept up on the case, and it came to court Monday. That case and went without us being involved. They didn't answer my letter; they completely stayed away from us. But if we are contacted, then we will engage ourselves in the case. We don't arbitrarily go out every time we see something in the paper. I usually write a note and tell them that we are here and that we are concerned, and if they need any help at all to please call us.

DESCRIBE THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF MADD NATIONALLY AND LOCALLY (DUES PAYING, HIERARCHICAL?).

I don't know that much about National now because Marcela has all that information. I know that there really is a hierarchy and it takes days to get any information out of them at all. The board of directors has expanded greatly at the national level, and I'm not familiar with it any longer. Locally, we don't really have a hierarchy. We have a board of directors which consists of five people, and we will be adding more people to it. But now National says we don't have to have an active board of directors. At one time they had ordered that we had to have it, and we had to send then a list of people who were on the board.

Nationally and locally, single memberships are twenty dollars per year and family memberships are forty dollars. Dues and contributions which are sent to our local chapter are deposited in our account here. Quarterly, our treasurer submits a quarterly report and calculates fifty percent of what we received the past three months and submits that amount with his report to National headquarters.

WHAT FUNCTION DOES THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS SERVE LOCALLY?

We try to have a monthly meeting with them to tell them what has come up in the National structure and aprise them of the changes. If we have a fund raiser or an activity that we want to do a couple months down the road, we'll ask their permission. If we have something that we want approval on, we will ask their permission. Such as, six months ago I asked to have cards printed up that we could send to victims, and they approved it. We never got them printed, but they approved it.
APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY MEMBERS DO YOU HAVE LOCALLY, STATE-WIDE AND NATIONALLY?

We have over eight hundred people on our mailing list locally, and I would say perhaps forty to fifty percent of them are members. Most people want to be on the mailing list but will not send their membership in. The economy comes in here greatly. When we first started, the single memberships were ten dollars a year and the family's were twenty five. Well, now they've nearly doubled. The single's are twenty and the family memberships are forty. That makes a big difference to someone who could write a check for ten dollars but would think twice about writing one for twenty.

DO YOU KNOW HOW MANY CHAPTERS AND MEMBERS THERE ARE NATIONALLY?

I do not know how many members; it would take a computer to do that, and I don't know that they have that yet. I know that we're getting a computer in National to take care of things such as this and to send out reminders to people to renew their memberships. As of last week we had 222 chapters in I don't know how many states, perhaps thirty five states. When you think back to two years ago that we were perhaps the twelfth or thirteenth chapter nationwide and perhaps one of the first out of California, we've gone great strides. In Ohio we have eleven chapters, so it's growing.

WHY DID YOU BECOME INVOLVED WITH MADD?

I became involved with MADD after reading about it and seeing it on TV and because it dealt with an issue that was so directly related to my life. I had two young boys who were killed by a drunk driver and felt like there was nothing I could ever do, and it was a lost issue. Therefore I put it behind me and tried to go on. Then when MADD came up, it brought up a lot of memories and things that I felt needed to be done here in Ohio, and I felt finally that I was not the only one who had ever lost a child to a drunk driver. Up until that time, I felt like I was the only one. I didn't know so many people were being killed every day by drunk drivers. I was ignorant to the issue. After being involved with MADD, I know that I'm not alone.

WHY, IN YOUR OPINION, ARE OTHER INDIVIDUALS ATTRACTION TO MADD?

I think the main reason is because they've heard of it, and we've made them aware that drunk drivers are on the road—ten percent of the drivers are legally intoxicated on the weekends. The hours between ten and two are the most deadly hours to be on the road, especially a two lane road. Once we make people aware of these statistics, they don't
want it to happen to them, and they're going to do anything in their power to prevent it from happening to them.

ARE STATISTICS ONE OF YOUR STRONGER RHETORICAL APPEALS?

Yes, we use them to great extents. The other night at the meeting they had poorly drawn cards and things up there. We have good printed material which is handed out at all of our events and speeches. When people have that in front of them and they are national statistics, and then we back them up with our local statistics such as last week's box score which showed that forty-five percent of the traffic-related deaths were caused by a drunk driver, that will make you stop and think.

I can't stand to drive at night. Whether it's in my mind or because I know so much, I have a terrible time. And I don't like Stacy (Sandy and Bob Troutman's daughter) being in a car at night. We had a wreck out here Friday evening--quarter after one in the morning--and I know it had to be alcohol-related. It had to be. And I've yet to see anything in the newspaper about it.

DESCRIBE THE TYPICAL MADD MEMBER.

Typical members, at least the ones in our chapter, are not victims. We have very few victims involved in this chapter because we keep it so low-key, and we don't go out with brim and firestone--or whatever that catchy little phrase is--and be a hell raiser. We haven't developed our chapter that way, and I don't see it going that way. The members that we have are interested and concerned citizens. They have a lot of sympathy for those of us who are victims, and they don't want to become a victim themselves. Therefore, they'll show up at meetings and see what else we've developed. Most of them are very low-key members who send in their check and that's about it. We haven't developed the right procedures to get people involved and that's our very biggest problem.

WHAT WOULD THE IDEAL MEMBER BE LIKE?

An ideal member, one that I could use right now, is somebody that I could call and say, "Mary Jones' mother was killed last night. Could you call her and talk to her to see if she needs anything?" Somebody that we could call and have them to do something. So that's the ideal member we are looking for, somebody who will do something.
HOW HAS MADD WORKED TO ATTRACT MEMBERSHIP? WHAT PROBLEMS HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED ATTRACTION AND MAINTAINING MEMBERSHIP?

We had no problem at all attracting membership in the very beginning because it was something that was in the news constantly. Most of our memberships date back two years ago. Our membership is not coming in at all right now because we're not in the news right now. I think it would be hard to carry on a conversation with anybody in Columbus and have someone not know about MADD, but we're just not current. We're not in the news as often as we once were.

BECAUSE YOU ARE NOT IN THE NEWS NOW, HAVE YOU USED OTHER MEANS TO ATTRACT MEMBERS SUCH AS SOLICITATION RATHER THAN WAITING FOR THEM TO COME TO YOU?

No, not yet because Marcella and I truthfully don't know how to do it other than getting a hold of a computer list somewhere.

DIRECT MAIL?

Yes, direct mail. We had anticipated doing that when we knew that the movie was coming out. As a matter of fact, we had one girl who does direct mail for a local company who said that that would be the best way to handle it. Have it printed and ready to go the day after the movie and say, "Now that you've just watched the movie last night, here's what you can do: Send in your money, volunteer for office work, etc." But it fell through, and we had such a hard time getting a date from NBC on when that movie was going to be shown. First it was going to be shown tomorrow, then next Tuesday, and then next July. There was a lot of difficulty, so we didn't do that. But we need the expertise to follow through with a direct mail appeal. I think it works. I know I feel compelled to send ten dollars to the American Heart Association or the Cancer Society. Maybe I'm a fish.

The one girl who felt like she was going to help us with our fund raising activities in a direct mail advertisement, if you will, felt that we needed to gear all of our strength and energy to Mother's Day. Well that one just gave me a big lump in my throat because Mother's Day was hard enough for me to handle up until Stacy. It was hard enough for me to face that day and then to get a letter which would be mailed the week before that was to pull on the strings of your heart. I had a hard time agreeing with that.
BUT...

I know, that's what it takes. You see, I'm my own worst enemy, I guess.

DESCRIBE THE VARIOUS PUBLIC AUDIENCES MADD IS ATTEMPTING TO REACH.

We're attempting to reach all of society because truly it is a danger to everyone in our society whether you are one day old or eighty three years old. People are killed every day by drunk drivers. So we keep the same message in all of my speeches but gear it to whatever audience I have. Drunk driving knows no age limit; it doesn't discriminate. It's not a black and white issue. It affects all of us. And therefore we have to address everyone, from pre-teen groups to elderly people.

FOR EXAMPLE, HOW WOULD YOU TAILOR A MESSAGE TO A HIGH SCHOOL GROUP?

High school students think they know everything, and it's very hard to get through to them. You have to develop the right way. If you come on board preaching to them, they're going to turn you off, and there goes your whole audience. You get them involved. The most effective way that we did this was when we lived in Dayton. We had a card we showed them where they would sign it and their parents would sign it, and if the kids are going out Saturday night and they know they're going to be drinking, this card guarantees them that they won't get persecuted when they get home. They'll call mom or dad and ask them to pick them up, and they won't ride with one of their friends who has had too much to drink. It gets them involved. When you show these kids statistics that show clearly that they are killing themselves and their best friends and that they are the biggest abuser agewise, I really feel it gets through. But you have to get them involved. And you have to show them things that they'll believe.

When we addressed the judges, we didn't go right at them and shake our fingers. I praised them for the job that they had done, but I went beyond that and asked them if they would do the job that they were appointed to do when they were elected because all judges are elected officials. When I brought up the fact, as Judge O'Farrell did the other night (at the September MADD meeting) about the family plate; a lot of the judges in that room didn't even know that they had that at their discretion. I was amazed, and I've used that in a lot of speeches since then that our own judges didn't even know that they could use that.
I feel very strongly that you do have to tailor each speech to the individual and still get your message across.

WHAT INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP IS RESPONSIBLE FOR CREATING THE MADD MESSAGE?

Locally, we develop our message from whatever information we have from National. We do a lot of research, at least we did a lot of research, into our facts and figures so that they were current and correct.

DOES EACH PERSON WHO GIVES A SPEECH DO HIS/HER OWN RESEARCH?

Well, that's another separate bone to pick. In the beginning, Bob and I were doing speeches and then Lauren (Lauren Heis succeeded the Trustman as chapter president). She has since left the city and was replaced by Marcella Harmon.) came in and got so heavily active in it. The two of us would sit like this and write something down and pick each other's speech apart. And it worked well for us so that we both knew what we were saying. When Marcella came into MADD...I've never heard her give a speech yet, but I'm sure she does a good job. We more or less have written our own speeches through our research at the library or interviewing state officials. The Highway Patrol and Department of Highway Safety people have helped us a lot and have given us a lot of references. So we've developed our own thing here.

Last summer we had a speakers bureau developed. We did a lot of media contacts on that and a lot of P.R. and P.S.A.'s on the radio and TV telling them that we were available. Since then a lot of the people have dropped out of that speakers bureau, so I don't know who is giving speeches now. We gave them no less than fifty pages of reference material that they could use to make up their own speeches. We had a Sunday brunch where we got everybody together and we told them the background because a lot of the people were missing the point on how it was developed.

WHO DECIDES WHAT THE POINT, OR APPEAL, IS GOING TO BE?

Well, I guess we did; we, meaning Marcella and I, just based on what we knew worked. If we left an audience where they were weeping or happy, we knew we either did something right or did something wrong.

WHAT IS IT THAT WORKS?

Last summer I addressed a group of CCL, Child Conservation League. It's women our age or older who have children or who are raising children, and it's a protective-type
organization. They don't want anything to happen to their kids, so they are naturally drawn to MADD because it's an issue that they want to have addressed. I used the record—the MADD record that we have—and because it told about the boys and how this chapter was developed, it had a lot of sympathy, sympathetic factors in it. I think that works if you want to have your audience cry. I don't really want to have them cry.

WHAT DO YOU WANT TO HAVE THEM DO?

I want to have them come up to me after the speech and say, "Here's my name and telephone number. Call me. I want to work in the office." Or, "I want to help." Or, "I'll go sit in a court room for you." I want to have people come up to me and say they'll help.

WHAT KIND OF MESSAGE DO YOU USE TO GET PEOPLE TO DO THAT?

"This is what you can do to help us." If we tell them what we want them to do or what we need, then they will come up. I don't think we need a lot of tears and sympathy. I surely don't need anybody's sympathy. I've had enough, and I've overcome my need. I think that's an important point. I don't need anybody's sympathy now. I need somebody to come up and help us.

WHAT KINDS OF RESISTANCE HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT (LOCAL, STATE, NATIONAL)? HOW ARE YOU WORKING TO MINIMIZE THAT RESISTANCE?

In the beginning we had little or no resistance here in Columbus. Everyone was enthusiastic about the organization; and therefore, they worked along with us. I think our biggest resistance came when Senate Bill 432 was introduced, and people finally realized that this little group—this little core group—was going to do something about their drinking habits. A lot of people felt, and still feel, that we are interfering with their drinking habits. I don't see it that way. I think that we are trying to educate the community to be responsible citizens. If this makes a difference in their drinking habits, thank God. We're not out there trying to tell them how to drink; we're trying to tell them how to drink and drive responsibly. I really feel that that is the only resistance we have now. And now the constitutional rights that everyone refers to, the right that they have to drive, they feel we're infringing on that. It's not a constitutional right anyhow; it's a privilege. It doesn't say anywhere in anybody's state laws that you have a right to drive. It's a privilege, and when you abuse that privilege, then your rights, as you call the, should be taken
away from you. So that's our biggest resistance right there. People think that we are infringing on their right.

WHAT KIND OF RESISTANCE HAS BEEN ENCOUNTERED NATIONALLY?

I would say the same thing because of the presidential commission. Hopefully some legislation will come from it. I would think again that that is going to be our biggest resistance. Also raising the drinking age to twenty-one.

WHAT IS MADD'S POSITION ON RAISING THE DRINKING AGE AND COALITION FOR 21?

Raising the drinking age to twenty-one is a national goal, and it is being addressed by the presidential commission. With Candy being on the commission, we have that as one of our goals. When we have our statistics right here of how the young kids are killing themselves and other people, we can't do anything but vote for the drinking age to be raised to twenty one. And I feel good about it.

As far as Coalition 21 is concerned, we would have helped them in the very beginning, and I think we could have helped them with their petition drive, and they would not have had to go out a second time to get registered voters. We could have been very instrumental in helping them. They came to us for an endorsement. We found out their procedures in solicitations. We found out that they would call you at 10:30 in the morning and come across as belonging to MADD. And people would hang up the phone thinking they had been contacted by MADD. And they would say, "We'll have someone in your neighborhood tonight at 4:00 collecting donations." And they would do just that. And people would call us a couple days later and say, "I just gave you folks a check for ten dollars, and my husband is really mad about it, and now he wants the money back." They were connecting us with them, and they were riding on our shirttails. We objected to that. We did not endorse them, and we went to the press saying that we did not endorse them because we were being inundated with calls from local people saying, "Leave us alone. We've already given to you. We're members of MADD. And we don't want you soliciting anymore." We agreed with their goal, and I still do, but we did not agree with the way they went about soliciting people. So they cut their own throats. And they denied the fact that they were soliciting for money, but we had it on record from people who worked for them and found out what they were doing, and they quit. And then they called us and told us what they were doing.
IN WHAT WAYS HAVE YOU BEEN HELPED BY MEMBERS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT? WHO AMONG THE ESTABLISHED STRUCTURE ARE YOUR SUPPORTERS?

In the beginning everybody in the establishment helped us, i.e., people at State Highway Patrol like Colonel Walsh, and Governor Rhodes certainly helped us. When he appointed the Governor's Task Force, that was certainly a boost for the drunk driving issue here in Ohio. We were appointed--Bob and I--to the Governor's Task Force. We dealt with high level people across the state. Now we don't have that emphasis because we don't need it, I don't think, as much as we did then. Most of the supporters that we had then are now gone, thanks to Celeste coming in. He gave everyone their little pink slips. I have not met with the new people because I haven't had any reason to. Next week is the Governor's Traffic Safety Conference, October 6th. It's open to the public and it will be dealing with the drunk driving issue again. Those people certainly did help us. As far as supporters that we have now, because this is an election year, everybody thinks they're going to support us, and they want us to support them. And we're just not going to do it because MADD is not a political issue, and I won't have it used as such.

DO YOU THINK THE CELESTE ADMINISTRATION WILL BE AS SUPPORTIVE IF THE OPPORTUNITY COMES UP?

If they can use us, they will. We've already had several invitations from people who are up for election.

HOW HAVE YOU CONSCIOUSLY ADAPTED YOUR RHETORIC TO MEET THE NEEDS OF VARIOUS AUDIENCES--VICTIMS, LEGISLATORS, JUDGES, ETC.?

By tailoring the speeches to bring in that specific audience. If you are talking to judges, you want to tell the judges what you want from them to make them responsible people. If you're talking to youth groups, you need to give them something to think about that directly deals with their situations. You can use all the statistics that you want to, but if you don't pattern the speech after that specific group, you're going to lose them. I had a speech last summer to a group, all I knew was their name. I had no idea they were elderly men who were going to fall asleep after I first started speaking. And most of them did. That's kind of hard to deal with, looking at forty people out there and most of them are sleeping. The M.C. of the group said, "Don't take offense, but most of these people sleep." And he said it right in front of them. And after they had lunch, they did; they all fell asleep.
If you can't get your audience involved, then you've lost them. So you have to tailor your message to that specific group. In addressing victims, they need to know they are not alone, that someone cares, that something can be done with their court case if they know how to properly handle the attorneys.

WHAT MAJOR ACTIVITIES, PROGRAMS, POLICIES, ETC. HAS MADD ENGAGED IN TO AFFECT CURRENT PUBLIC POLICIES IN THE AREA OF DRUNK DRIVING?

The major media event was the MADD movie, "MADD, Mothers Against Drunk Drivers," and that had a profound effect on all of America in general. I know that the national office was swamped for a month after that, and locally we were swamped with inquiries from people wanting to know what they could do. So that really did get America involved in the drunk driving issue. By Candy being on the presidential commission and her input on it to look after victims. You see, most of the people are trying to rehabilitate, but no one is looking out for victims. MADD is, and that is one of our major goals, to have people to look after victims. By having her on the commission, she will put in her two-cents worth. Her emphasis is going to be geared toward the victim.

The alcohol awareness week, which this will be the second year for, it will be geared mainly toward the drunk driving issue. That again will bring the public in locally as well as nationally. It's a national week. So those few programs will make the public aware. I don't know that we have any specific policies. I don't believe that we have any at all except to develop programs that fit towards your audience.

WHAT ARE MADD'S FUTURE GOALS? WITHIN FIVE TO TEN YEARS, WHAT WILL MADD HAVE ACCOMPLISHED?

Our most pressing goal is to end the presidential commission which was appointed nearly a year and a half ago. It's in its final rounds right now, and the goals which are developed through that commission will certainly be incorporated into MADD. One that was in the paper just yesterday was having all of the states bring their drinking age up to twenty one and have it a national goal. There are other goals in this commission which will certainly be incorporated into MADD as a national organization.

Within five to ten years, I really don't know how MADD will progress. It seems right now that we're going through a great turmoil with moving the office from
California to Texas and having so many paid employees. It has made the headlines everywhere. It has turned a lot of people against MADD.

DOES COLUMBUS MADD HAVE ANY PLANS FOR BECOMING A PAID LEADERSHIP ORGANIZATION?

We would only hope that we could get someone to underwrite the cost of having a director who would provide leadership for the organization. It's not really a bad thing to have. I think that it should be a paid employee because you put more than fifty or sixty hours a week in if you are the leader of this organization with the phone calls and all the different contacts. I think it should be a paid position.

WHAT ATTEMPTS ARE BEING MADE TO GET THE COST UNDERWRITTEN?

We approached one national organization, and that was one thing that we put at the very top of our list of things that we need and to see if they would underwrite it.

HOW HAS MADD EVOLVED AND BECOME MORE SOPHISTICATED SINCE ITS INCEPTION?

Nationally, MADD was one woman's attempt at getting some sort of results with her local government because of the death of her child. And she generated so much publicity over this and was on every single kind of TV program--talk programs, call-in programs, whatever--to generate interest in this problem. And because she hit so many people at the pit of their stomachs and right in the middle of their very hearts, she was able to get this sympathy and interest generated. We more or less started the same way here in Columbus. It was Bob and I who started it statewide, and it ran out of what was to be Stacy's bedroom for a good six months until Stacy was a real being. It generated more publicity than anything else that has ever happened, at least according to the Dispatch. We generated more cause for concern than anything. It has become so sophisticated in California, first, in that when you called out there, you used to be able to talk to Candy or to talk with one of the people you first started with. Now they don't even know who you are when you call out there. And I mentioned this in one of the Dispatch articles; it's very true. I don't even know who I'm talking to when I call the headquarters anymore because they have so many people working there now. This is good, and it's bad. It's good in that there are so many people willing to put in their time for this cause. It's bad in that it's frustrating that we've grown so much and had so many growing pains in two years that it's going to take a lot
of time to work out these little problems. We feel frustrat­
ted by putting in a telephone call to them, and it takes
days for them to answer us. I think that's a big problem,
and it needs to be worked out quickly before everyone
loses interest. When we call and have a problem which we
think is a real earth shattering problem, and it takes
then three or four days to get back to us, it defeats our
own purpose. A lot of times we need clarity on an issue,
and if we're called by the press on some national issue
and we don't know how to answer them, they lose interest
by the time we get back to them. They don't even know
what the question was. It's a little too sophisticated
right now.

WHAT CONSCIOUS ATTEMPTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO REFINE THE
RHETORIC?

In the beginning when Bob and I first started we were
on TV quite a bit, and it was very shaking for me. I
would have sweaty palms, and they would always get down
to the nitty-gritty of the interview: Why are you involved?
It would shake me to my very shoes to have to talk about
the boys. That's what they wanted, and if they could get
a tear, it was just great for them and their ratings. And
I've overcome that, I think, to a degree except the other
night (at the MADD meeting) I got a little bit emotional
when Marcella was talking about it because it does bring
back the memories all over again. It used to be day in
and day out that was all I thought about, and certainly
time doesn't heal all wounds because the wounds will al­
ways be there. But the emotional appeal that you can drag
from someone boosts the organization.

The gal in Cincinnati who lost an eighteen year old
daughter—that's how June started her chapter—can drag
from someone tears they never thought they could shed.
She's very emotional. I feel like I'm emotional too,
but I can overcome that to a degree. But I guess the
media are still looking for those tears. God only knows
there's a lot of stories in the newspapers every week
about children or adults being killed. Have I answered
the question? They're still looking for someone emotionally
involved, then you've done your job. Have I answered the
question? I still don't think I have.

HOW HAVE YOU IMPROVED YOUR EFFORTS TO GET YOUR MESSAGES
ACROSS? WHO DOES THE RESEARCH AND WHO DECIDES WHAT THE
RHETORICAL STRATEGIES WILL BE?

Let me say this. Marcella has a great point which
I have never used in any of my speeches because it's hers,
but it's so good. At the beginning of her speech, she'll divide her audience and say, "I want half of you to stand. Okay you can sit. I want you people to stand (pointing to the other half). My point is this: One out of every two people in this room will be affected by a drunk driver." That really makes you think because it's a truism. One out of every two people in a gathering will be affected in some way by a drunk driver. And when she has people participating that way, it grabs them right there.

We have a record which tells the story about MADD, and that's very effective in speeches. It tells how the local chapter was started, and it gets people involved. That's a very effective tool. Memberships are our big problem. We don't have the appeal anymore that we did. We've got to get someone, paid or otherwise, to help us with the membership drive.

WHY DON'T YOU HAVE THE APPEAL ANYMORE?

Our mail shows us. When I used to pick up the mail, I couldn't even bring it home. I'd have to take a bag to pick up the mail. Now, if we get mail three times a week, three little lonely envelopes in our mail box, then it may be worth a trip up there.

DO YOU KNOW WHY?

I think a lot of it is attributed to the fact that Senate Bill 492 is now a law; there's not the interest that there was when the MADD movie came out in March. We had more mail than we could handle. We went out with a separate mailing to those new people and tried to get them involved. And then for some reason or another, you send them a letter, you send them a second letter, and when they don't answer, how can you pursue it further?

AS A LEADER OF A SOCIAL MOVEMENT, WHAT SIGNIFICANT CHALLENGES HAVE YOU FACED? HOW HAVE YOU MET THESE CHALLENGES?

When I became involved in MADD, it was the first time that I had ever been involved in anything. Even throughout high school I was the one who sat in the back of the room and didn't get involved in anything at all. And that's generally how my life had been until I had a cause, and I felt so strongly in this cause that I had to become involved. After the boys were killed, I had essentially nothing to live for. My husband had said that he didn't want anything more to do with me. He felt like I had caused the crash even though I hadn't. I was just in the wrong place at the wrong time. He blamed me entirely for it. So it essentially broke up our marriage. I really
didn't have anything to care about. After that when I was remarried, Bob tried to help me as best as he could, but they weren't his children, so there was something missing. Then when we heard about MADD, and we felt like we could both become involved in it, it was a day in and day out challenge with the phone ringing. Once we let everybody know that we wanted to start a MADD chapter here, the media's contacts just didn't stop. It was enlightening to see how our legislators work when we became involved with the bill, how some of them were interested, some of them slept through our testimony. We had to shake them several times verbally to get their interest, and it was certainly an educational process to become that involved in something that directly involved everyone in the state.

As far as a social movement, in the beginning it was amazing how fast we were accepted here in this city and across the state. The challenges were many especially with Bob's career being involved with alcohol. He's in the (bar/restaurant) business to promote liquor, so we almost had a catch-22 where you're damned if you do and damned if you don't. It was very hard sometimes dealing with that except for the fact that Bob can truthfully say that he employed responsible people to work his bar. He was in the business to sell liquor; he was not in the business to put people out on the road after they had been served too much. So I think I can honestly say that we never had anybody leave our lounge if they had had too much to drink. Several times the bartenders would come up to him and say, "I've got someone here I can't control." And they would either give him a room for the night if he was that bad or put him in a taxi or whatever. But I really don't believe they ever sent anyone out on the road. That in itself was a big challenge.

MADD does not have as its goal to abstain from liquor. Bob and I both drink, and I'm sure that a lot of people in our organization do. We never were stupid enough to admit that we don't drink because we do, and there's no reason why we would; that's not the issue. To have a responsible drinker is the issue, and to put them back on the road is the main issue. The V.C.T.U. wanted us to adopt as one of our goals the fact that we don't drink. We couldn't do it; not we personally, but nationally. It's not the issue.

CAN YOU COMMENT ON COURT WATCHING WHICH HAS RECEIVED A LOT OF ATTENTION IN CALIFORNIA.

I think our court watching program is not as strong as it was in the beginning because we had a lot of people interested in what was going on in the courts, so we were
able to tap people to go in, especially to Mayor's Courts at night because a lot of people work. I'll mention one court session that we had in Worthington, and I believe we intimidated the judge right to his very underwear. We had UPI and Associated Press reporters there because he had a repeat offender who had been in his court many times, and he was pretty big in the community. We felt like he was going to let him off again, and so at the request of (deleted), we were in the first three rows of this poor Mayor's court room, and he heard every single case except this one, hoping that we'd all go home. We were there until after midnight when he finally had a break and thought that we would go home at that time, but we didn't. We stayed. And we were finally there, and the Mayor did give him the strongest punishment that he could under his jurisdiction; and then they appealed it, and the case went downtown. He was eventually sent to jail.

I don't think that we here in Columbus have had any problems with court watching. We've made the courts aware that we're there. I think that that's been a bonus for us, and perhaps some of the judges have ruled differently. I know that a case that I attended three months ago, the judge didn't know that I was in the court room, I went up afterwards and congratulated him for sending the woman to prison because I felt that she should have gone there, and he said that he knew his responsibilities and he knew that he did what he had to do. The woman was a social drinker, and she killed two girls. He felt like he did what he had to do ethically. He didn't have any choice. We are making the courts more that we are there. We haven't had any dilemmas here, thank God, in our chapter. I know that they have in California. I know that things other than court monitoring have provided some ethical problems.

WHAT ETHICAL PROBLEMS HAS THE NATIONAL CHAPTER FACED?

We received a letter here in Columbus as did all the chapters from Candy saying that she needed help and that she needed support from us. What she had done was she put all of these people on her board, and then they felt that she had too much authority to do her job. When she would go out of town essentially the whole office would shut down because she would demand that they didn't do anything unless she approved it. The board felt that that was wrong, and so they demanded that they reorganize the organization. And this resulted, to make a very long story short, in many telegrams going to the national board from all the MADD chapters; we sent three from Columbus. The MADD chapter in Cincinnati sent their president out there to express our opinions on her being taken off the board, and that's
essentially what they were going to do. They were going to strip her of all her responsibilities, and essentially there wouldn't be any MADD as we knew it.

Well, several of the MADD chapters went out and demanded that they be heard. They were heard, and as a result of that, I think we now have three MADD chapter presidents on the Board. Some of the old board members have quit because they didn't want to be involved anymore. I feel it's essential that MADD members are a part of the board so that we can stick up for ourselves. The other board members, I don't know if they are paid or not, but a lot of the board members were under this new reorganization. It just made a difference. Nothing that we felt was important was being considered.

WERE YOU IN FAVOR OF CANDY'S DECISION THAT BOARD MEMBERS COULD NOT DECIDE ANYTHING WITHOUT CANDY BEING THERE?

No, and I'll tell you why because I did the same thing here to our chapter. I felt like I was the only one who could pick up the mail; I was the only one who could answer press inquiries; and I got everything so balled up in everything waiting for me to do something that I would have a stack of letters like this to be answered because I wouldn't let anybody else do anything. That's not the right way to run anything. So I know that just on our low level here, Candy was wrong.

I feel very strongly that the organization is not the way it was three years ago. I don't know if that's good or bad. I know that because we could call in and talk to Candy, it made us feel good. It made us feel like someone cared. When we were having trouble with Senate Bill 352, I'd call her at night and say, "Now what are we going to do? What strategy do we use now?" She'd say, "You call a press conference; you do this; you do that." She'd get you so psyched up that the next day you would go and do all these things. And now, I'm sure that if we called out there and had a problem with our bill, they'd say, "We'll call you in a couple days." I don't think that's right. I feel that the organization does not have the same appeal that it did when she was MADD.

ARE YOU REFERRING TO THE LOSS OF THE GRASSROOTS NATURE OF THE ORGANIZATION?

Yes. Again, I don't know if that's good or it's bad. It really is a national organization. I don't go along with their sending out inquiries to people that we have turned in as interested people. We used to make a list of people
who contacted us each week and send it to California. Well, 
you've fed all that information into a computer, so people 
indiscreetly sent that information in. Now, two years 
later, they are being sent letters, and they don't appreci-
ciate it. They'll call us and tell us, "Take us off your 
mailing list. We don't want to know anymore." She's had 
more problems out there than we've had certainly because 
her's in the press still. People are still trying to tear 
her apart. When you're in the game, you've got to play by 
the rules of the press, I guess. And we haven't had that 
problem here.

WE ARE NOW IN A POLITICALLY CONSERVATIVE PERIOD COMPARED 
WITH THE RADICAL SIXTIES AND EARLY SEVENTIES. DO YOU THINK 
THAT MAD AND THE IDEOLOGY BEHIND IT—ADVOCATING VICTIM'S 
RIGHTS AND STRICHER PUNISHMENT FOR CRIMINALS—FIT IN THIS 
CONSERVATIVE TREND?

I think that we fit in, yes. I think that we have 
problems getting our point across that we're not a group 
of radical women out with our soap box wanting to throw 
every accused drunk driver in jail. Every drunk driving 
case has its own particularities. There's always going to 
be something that differentiates one case from another; 
underlying circumstances is what the lawyers call it. I 
think that our calling for punishment in addition to or 
going along with rehabilitation will help the public accept 
us better. We advocate punishment, but we want it also to 
go along with some sort of educational program. Rehabilita-
tion alone is not going to keep drunk drivers off the road. 
You have your repeat offenders that the Dispatch will get 
a hold of every once in a while and list perhaps twelve or 
fifteen or twenty incidents where they were actually picked 
up for drunk driving and let off. Maybe half the time they 
were put in some sort of a two day program or three day 
program. It's not going to help until you throw them in 
jail. There needs to be some kind of punishment to go 
along with it, and I don't think that it's right wing or 
left wing or whatever. I think that society will accept 
it, and sometimes we hear back from families of people who 
have been put in jail, and they thank us for our persever-
ance. It doesn't happen every day, but we have had cases 
where families will call in and say, "Thanks for getting 
involved in the case. I know that when my husband gets out, 
he'll be a better man for it."
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WHAT IS YOUR POSITION WITH MADD?
I am now the president of MADD.

DESCRIBE YOUR DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES WITH MADD.

They are many and varied and change from day to day. I would say recruitment of volunteers, some supervision of volunteers, coordination of the different programs, setting that the different programs go forward—the court watch program, the victim assistance program, the speakers bureau—which fortunately, or you hope, you can turn all these over to a committee chairman; this works in general. But there are always the little places that need to be smoothed out. There are constant changes in personnel because of so many women going back to work and so on and so forth these days. That kind of thing needs to be coordinated.

You need to be sure that the newsletter is sent out when it is supposed to be. Even though we do have a newsletter at the editors, there still has to be coordination with the office because many of these people are not in direct contact with the office. So they don't have at hand the material to put into the newsletter such as we might have in the office. In other words, some of the issues, you have to get material to them, and it really involves more of my time that I think it should. But as an evolving organization, we hope to get those things smoothed out eventually.

I do check with the office volunteers anytime there is one in simply because there can be messages left on the message machine that I need to know about. Sometimes they may not be able to get a hold of me, so it's necessary for me to get a hold of them. The president is the link between the local organization and the national organization. She is responsible for calling the board meetings, presenting the problems to the board because the board chairman has pretty much said, "The agenda is up to you." I guess the overseeing of some of the materials, what will be sent. In other words, the buck stops here.
DESCRIBE THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF MADD LOCALLY AND NATIONALLY.

This is an extremely changing, evolving, growing organization, mainly, I think, because it has grown so tremendously and is really such a young organization. Nationally, we're only three years old. Locally, we're only two years old. When you start with a grassroots organization without professional organizers, without professional people, without hired personnel, you are constantly evolving. The national organization moved their office from California to Texas this year, and we now have a paid professional director who has indeed been in charge of other groups that had to do with social problems, I believe in the health field, but nonetheless has had experience such as this.

There is a national board of directors, and since this is a national organization, it has now been ruled that that is the only board of directors. You are to have a board in the local organization, but that is now an advisory board, and your voting members are your officers at the local level. This has been a very recent development so that I'm not sure that all of our board members know this, that they are now officially designated as an advisory board. It is only because an organization can only have one board of directors, and it is a national organization, so it really is a matter of semantics. I am expecting our board members to be just as active and put in just as much work as they ever have.

HOW WERE THE BOARD MEMBERS SELECTED LOCALLY?

Locally, simply by...usually the president, I think, had asked the person to serve or perhaps other board members making recommendations as to capable people in the community with a divergence of interests. For instance, we have a physician who is a surgeon and since he is an eye surgeon has exposure to drunk driving cases and the mayhem that they may cause; we have a lawyer; we have a man who is in the alcohol treatment area; a couple who are in business; and this sort of thing. So that we have tried to indeed make it a well-rounded board.

HOW MANY BOARD MEMBERS ARE THERE?

Eight members as of now. We hope to be adding to that soon.
DOES THE NATIONAL ORGANIZATION CHOOSE ITS BOARD MEMBERS THE SAME WAY THE LOCAL CHAPTER DOES?

I am not positive how their board members had been chosen. I really can't tell you that. I do know that there is now a representation of the chapters on the national board.

APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY MEMBERS DO YOU HAVE LOCALLY, STATEWIDE, AND NATIONALLY?

I really can't answer that question. Locally, the reason I can't tell you is because in our file we make no particular designation. We keep a record on their individual cards as to whether they have paid their twenty dollar membership or not. However, in that file, there are many, many, many people, in fact, the vast majority of the people in that file have not paid twenty dollars to become an official member. I would certainly like to have every one of them paying their twenty dollars because this is one of our ways of funding, and we have no regular funding. But to me the important part of those cards in that file is that this is a person who has expressed interest in this problem or this organization, and in no way will a person not paying their membership be discriminated against as far as I am concerned. Never will there be any discrimination.

HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE IN THAT FILE?

It just grows every time we send out the newsletter we have more. And I believe they told me yesterday that the count...well it's over nine hundred.

HOW MANY CHAPTERS ARE THERE NATIONWIDE?

This also is changing daily. It's well over two hundred now, in Ohio there are eleven chapters now with, I am sure, nearly that many in the formative stage. But developing a chapter is really quite time consuming, and there's a great deal of work to be done because National now has a process that you go through. They send you a great deal of paper work, and this must be done indeed before you can become a chapter. It's very good because it does assure National that the local chapters know the problem and have done their homework because there is written work that you send back in answer to questions and so forth. So they know that you've been exposed to certain information.

WHY DID YOU BECOME INVOLVED WITH MADD?

When I found out that one out of every two persons in the United States will be involved in an alcohol-related crash in their lifetime, I thought it was time for all of us to be involved. I don't like those odds. My father
was hit in the mid-sixties; I was concerned about this problem long before that. It just seems to me that it has been a very obvious problem for a very long time, but the general public did not wake up to that fact until recently apparently.

WHY, IN YOUR OPINION, ARE OTHER INDIVIDUALS ATTRACTED TO MADD?

I think that the educational programs, information programs that we are giving to people, and the emphasis is the seed for all of us to get involved. I have stated this; the statistic that I just stated is indeed quite a shock. I have had people just in an utter state of disbelief when I have quoted that to them. I have even myself called the United States Department of Highway Safety in order to verify that figure saying, "How does this even mean that the person will be involved?" Because some people say, "Oh, it just means it's someone in their family." Or they know somebody. They can't believe the figure could be that high.

Many people get involved because they have had a first-hand experience with someone in their family, but in our particular chapter, we have fewer victims than other folks, than the general population.

DESCRIBE THE TYPICAL MADD MEMBER.

There is no typical MADD member. MADD members can be men and women; students to senior citizens; those who are parents; those who are not parents; those who are interested from almost an outsider viewpoint saying, "I know this is a good organization. I will do..." And it may be a very minimal involvement. To those people who are spending full-time—more than a full-time job—on the project. There is not a typical MADD member, truly there isn't.

WHAT WOULD AN IDEAL MEMBER BE LIKE?

Now we are getting somewhere. As far as I'm concerned, an ideal member is going to be the one who is indeed willing to put forth some time with the organization on a regular basis, or if they can't do it regularly, using their abilities to help the organization along. One who will talk about the problem to the general community, to their friends, who will get others involved, who's willing to speak up. I do not feel that the ideal one is the one who puts me on the head and says, "What a marvelous organization it is; you do the work." They don't really say that; they don't really mean that. But in essence, that is what
happens. I guess, ideally, also, I would like to say the person who says, "I will make time," and makes it one of their priorities. Because I too could say that I don't have time. I have many other things that I would like to do that I have put aside in order to make this a priority in my life. And believe me, it is my number one priority.

HOW HAS MADD WORKED TO ATTRACT MEMBERSHIP? WHAT PROBLEMS HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED ATTRACTING AND MAINTAINING MEMBERSHIP?

By public information, whether it be by radio and television interviews; with speeches to ever so many groups; by talking with everyone that I see. Or when anyone sees me with MADD literature in my hands or standing in a post office line and sees the return address and says, "Oh, that's a good organization," my first words are, "Come join us; we need you." We certainly have, or at least I have tried to say to everyone of our speakers—I do not know whether it is carried out or not--there are five things that I want you to emphasize about this organization. The first one being that we are an organization of both men and women of all ages, students to senior citizens; that we are not an all volunteer organization, always in need of dedicated volunteers; that we are not a funded organization, we depend entirely upon community support and our memberships for our funding; that we are not an abstinence group, so that we will not be misunderstood. There must have been one more, but I....Okay, let's make it four.

I think it is necessary then that we do let everyone know that we are entirely volunteer though I certainly hope that soon we can afford to have a paid director. I know of no other organization doing what this group is doing for the community without one paid person. It's a very hard way to run a railroad, and it's soon going to become impossible because there are not many people who will put in the time that I have found necessary.

ARE THERE PROBLEMS IN ATTRACTING MEMBERS OR MAINTAINING THE MEMBERSHIP?

The main problem, I think now, is simply that so many people have so many interests and we have a whole working community now, so the woman who used to be the volunteer is now working forty hours a week and probably maintaining a home. Or are they women who have—and again I stress men also, but most men are employed outside the home traditionally—many people have chosen to stay home with young children, and this presents a problem because, one, they do want to spend the time with their children, and two, they can't afford nor find a babysitter in order to do the volunteer work. Expenses are too great. I find it a burden even for
our volunteers to go down and pay for parking for court
watch. My husband and I paid close to six dollars the
other day for our parking alone because of some breaks in
the court programs so that we were going from one place
to another to take care of duties, and it meant that we
couldn't get into one of the all day for $2.50.

DESCRIBE THE VARIOUS PUBLIC AUDIENCES MADD IS ATTEMPTING
TO REACH.

I can't think of a public audience that we are not
trying to reach. We give many speeches to high schools.
We have been asked to grade schools, but we have handled
that with great care, and have not addressed grade schools
feeling that one would have to be extremely careful not to
produce undue fear in that aged child. We certainly have
talked to church groups, to service groups, to...I can't
think of a group that we haven't spoken to. We have spoken
to employee groups at staff meetings. I talked to a group
of staff members the other day in a retirement community.
I simply cannot think of any group that we are not trying
to reach.

WHAT INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP IS RESPONSIBLE FOR CREATING THE
MADD MESSAGES?

I guess it depends on what message needs to be given.
I am hoping, and should today, talk with a man who is in-
volved with professional P.R. people. And I am hoping
that we can get them to work on some of our materials. Our
materials have simply evolved over this last two years.
Almost with every printing, some change is made. The lawyer
on our board has been responsible for some of the material.
I would say the presidents have been probably—that is,
Sandy Troubtz, Lauren Heis, and myself—have been responsi-
ble for a great deal of it. Our office manager did the
bibliography of the periodical information. We do not
have the money to print everything that we would like. And
we would indeed like to have some more professional help,
some professional help to make our materials look better.
So there isn't a designated group or individual.

DOES EACH PERSON WHO GIVES A SPEECH WRITE HIS OR HER OWN
SPEECH?

Yes, they do. And I have some concern about this.
Toastmasters have taken over our speech making. They are
very capable individuals, I'm sure. I think anyone who
makes a speech has their own approach, their own individual
presentation, and their own emphasis of material which
bothers me somewhat in that many of the Toastmasters, and
Toastmistresses of course, are not involved so much with
the organization itself. Though Doug Roberts who is the board member who is responsible for the Toastmasters and Toastmistresses has indeed sent them some fifty pages of material. Now this is made up of our materials and others. But nonetheless, I would like to be sure that each of those people is emphasizing where it is appropriate. And I think it is appropriate with any adult group, not with high school groups. I would hope that they are emphasizing that we are always in need of volunteers. I think indeed that the success of the organization itself has in a way, to an extent, worked against it because people simply feel that we're rolling along, and I don't believe that they know we really need their help even though we tell them.

WHO DETERMINES THE TYPES OF RHETORICAL APPEALS THAT WILL BE USED?

As I've stated, each speaker is responsible for what they say and their emphasis. I have certainly said to them that there are certain things—I have conveyed to the speakers bureau chairman, Carol Ellerman, who is responsible for scheduling and getting speakers to the right place at the right time, and believe me that's quite a task. I have told her that there are certain things I would like to see emphasized. She has been trying toward having a meeting of all those people who are speakers so that some of us in the organization can tell this group what we would like to have emphasized. It's so hard to get a whole group together though.

WHAT IS IT THAT YOU WANT TO HAVE EMPHASIZED?

That we are a group of concerned citizens, both men and women, students to senior citizens; that we are entirely volunteer and in need of a paid director very soon; that we are supported entirely by the community and their gifts and our memberships; we are not funded in any way; that we are not an abstinence group; that we simply want people to use good sense and make other arrangements to get home after drinking unless they have been very careful about the amount of alcohol consumption.

WHAT KINDS OF RESISTANCE HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT (LOCAL, STATE, NATIONAL)? HOW ARE YOU WORKING TO MINIMIZE THAT RESISTANCE?

I would say that if you have seen the movie last March about Candy Lightner's life, she had a great deal of resistance from state legislators when she was trying to get more stringent state laws passed. We had some state legislators who were every bit as resistant as the ones Candy Lightner encountered. I can think of very few people other than at
that level from who we have had resistance. The people perhaps like to spend a great deal of time in the bar. The Ohio Licensed Beverage Association is now pressing a petition very, very, very quietly to reamind the .10 percent provision, so I think other than the obvious areas where we would expect to have resistance--beverage dealers, so on and so forth, taverns--our main resistance would have been at the level of the legislature. I feel indeed that from the results that come from courts, there must be some resistance to our goals although not openly to our organization.

\IN WHAT WAYS HAVE YOU BEEN HELPED BY MEMBERS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT? WHO AMONG THE ESTABLISHED STRUCTURE ARE YOUR SUPPORTERS?

When I think that it is very fair and very important for me to say in order to be fair that we had very supportive legislators in our stand because indeed when S.B. 132 was passed, the public perceived that as MADD's drunk driving bill and it referred to it as often as that. And I had to say this is not MADD's bill; this is Senator DeWine's bill. So there were legislators on both sides of the fence. My surprise, I guess, was that anyone would not want to oppose drunk driving. And of course, when you put it in exactly that way, there is no one who would say they were for it. It's just that the things they were for made it quite clear that they did not want to crack down on the situation or face the problem strongly. But we certainly have had great support from some of the judges, from some of the legislators, from the public in general.

I cannot tell you how much support we had with our petition drive with people on the street almost grabbing the thing out of our hand to sign it. We had business people supporting us. For instance, one bakery put the petitions in their bakery and put up a sign, "Sign our petition for stronger drunk driving laws." And those people told me people came in off the street to sign the petition when they would hear about it who didn't come in to buy baked goods. I honestly think that if a public official running for office would run on the drunk driving issue alone--I mean for strong laws to penalize drunk drivers--they could win. The public is terribly upset about this problem, and we certainly have had far more support than opposition.

HOW HAVE THE MEDIA REACTED?

Oh, the media have been beautifully supportive. Beautifully supportive. They have certain restrictions. They can't write sixty-five days in a row about a particular issue. Certainly there are some papers which are more
supportive and concerned than others. There are some television and radio channels which have been more supportive than others. I would like to give much credit to the media for our successes.

ARE THE MEDIA AS ATTENTIVE TO YOU NOW AS THEY WERE DURING THE TIMT OF SENATE BILL 434?

Well, of course, when one is in the media, one has to have an issue at hand in order to make a story out of it. Certainly if I called any of them and said, "This is a problem," and it is one deserving of that type of time, I have never had any trouble getting through to talk to a media representative. And obviously, everyday operation is not their main interest. There has to be some new, abrasive or some special interest item before it becomes a news item.

HOW IS IT THAT YOU ARE DOING A SPOT ON THE RADIO ENDORSING ISSUE ONE TO RAISE THE DRINKING AGE TO TWENTY ONE?

They called. That really was because the media must give equal time to both sides of an issue that is to be on the ballot. So they already had a representative for the opposition to raising the drinking age, and they simply needed someone to speak on the other side.

HOW HAVE YOU CONSCIOUSLY ADAPTED YOUR RHETORIC TO MEET THE NEEDS OF VARIOUS AUDIENCES—VICTIMS, MEDIA, LEGISLATORS, JUDGES, ETC.?

I think probably the only accommodation I might have made was to victims because some statements might be very difficult for them to handle. One must be extremely careful when talking to a victim particularly if it is a recent victim. I would say that the rhetoric in general, based on my own presentations, is pretty much the same because I emphasize how broad-based the problem is, how we are all equally at risk. Some of us knows when we get into a car whether we are going to make it to our destination, be it home or business. I think it's important that we emphasize what MADD does, what our goals are, what we try to achieve. And very often when I'm speaking to anyone, my best technique is to simply tell them about phone calls. I can cover the gamut in that. And it would be very nice for us to be out of business. And when we having nothing but requests for speakers and requests from students for information, then we'll be out of business. That would be great.
WHAT MAJOR ACTIVITIES, PROGRAMS, POLICIES, ETC. HAS MIDD ENGAGED IN TO AFFECT CURRENT PUBLIC POLICIES IN THE AREA OF DRUNK DRIVING?

When we first found out that Senator DeWine was working on the bill, we had members who testified in both Houses, before committees and before subcommittees. I personally attended every subcommittee hearing, every committee hearing, and every floor vote. We carried on a petition drive statewide. When the bill was in the House Judiciary Committee, it was obviously not going to get out of that committee unless something was done. In fact, that may have been when it was in subcommittee. Our then-President Lauren Heis called a media conference on the Statehouse lawn and made a statement to the media. They wore very cooperative; I think every paper, every TV station, and every radio station was there with a mike in her face. And she said indeed this bill is being held hostage. There was at that point a reply from the full committee then before the legislature adjourned. That was at election time. I am convinced that had Lauren not done that, the bill might very well have died in committee. We have been given credit by many organizations who have been trying to get a bill such as this through with having gotten the bill passed. Not that we did it alone. I do not mean to imply that in the slightest. Apparently we were able to furnish a focal point for public outcry so that the thing was forced into the open. And some legislators, some of the people in law enforcement and judicial branches have indeed credited us with getting the bill passed.

DOES YOUR COURT WATCH PROGRAM AFFECT WHAT IS GOING ON IN THE COURTHOUSE?

A very interesting question. I assume there is no way to truly evaluate a court watch program. How can one ever say what would have happened had one not been there? It's an interesting situation. We do not get to do as much court watching as we would like to simply because people do not have daytime volunteer hours to the extent that we need them. We do have reason to believe, because of information given to us from people within the court system, that our being in a courtroom does have an effect. I wish there were a way to be able to know what difference it makes. I think that we have indeed, when we have met with judges privately after a sentence, been able to make some change. One of our members whose sister has been in a coma since June because of a drunk driver was incensed that that man did not serve his full six month term. We made arrangements for her to meet with the judge, she and her mother. The judge was most apologetic and said, "What would you have done?" As a result of our conversation, that man is to
spend fifteen minutes in the room of her injured sister. We hope that it makes an impression so that person does not drive drunk again.

DO YOU WEAR ANYTHING TO IDENTIFY YOURSELF WHEN YOU ARE IN THE COURTROOM?

Never. We don't ever want to be accused of having tried to sway a case. I've heard of one case, not local but out of state, where a woman wearing a MADD badge knew a woman on the jury, walked over, merely said hello, and the case was thrown out of court. We do not ever want to do anything that would jeopardize a case. We go in; we sit quietly; we take notes. That is it. We know what's going on. Sometimes it's very hard to hear. We try to make a record of the results of the case and attitude of those in charge.

HOW HAVE YOUR ACTIVITIES, PROGRAMS, POLICIES, AFFECTED PUBLIC ATTITUDE?

We have had much support from the public. And I do believe that we have helped to change public attitude. We have had people come up to speakers after a meeting and say, "I really didn't know. I've had friends at parties who drink this much and drive home. I'll never let them do that again." And the particular speaker said to me, "Marcella, that made it all worthwhile. I felt like I was saving lives." I think that we, I hope that we are changing attitudes, perhaps at the high school level. Here again is something that you can't evaluate because we hope that what doesn't happen is the thing that we have affected.

WHAT KINDS OF ACTIVITIES, PROGRAMS, POLICIES HAVE YOU USED TO ACCOMPLISH THIS CHANGE IN ATTITUDE?

Our program is geared now, I would say our main activity is to affect public attitude and to change it toward not driving after drinking to excess. And so our speakers bureau is aimed at this. We have a party guide which we have been including in our information which we pass out at meetings and when we do a mailing and so forth. This has some guidance in it as to how to avoid inebriated guests. It also has some basic information like a cup of coffee does not sober your guests. Don't mistakenly believe that it does.

We include with our mailings information about the Cab-Call program which is a service here—not our program—but nonetheless, one that we wish everyone knew about. Where for fifteen dollars, two cab drivers come, one to take your car home, one takes you home. This is a very helpful
thing though not known as we think it should be. And we hope to get the word out. It's helpful because many people who might realize they are in no shape to drive home don't want to leave their bright, new, shiny Cadillac on a parking lot overnight. We include the REDDI cards. The REDDI card is a program being encouraged by the Ohio Depart-
ment of Highway Safety in coordination with all of the law enforcement agencies in the state. This program encourages you—urges in fact—to call the closest law enforcement agency when you observe someone driving on a street or highway in an erratic manner. Also in that leaflet is a map of the state of Ohio so that you have the State Highway Patrol's phone number for each of the counties.

We have a bibliography of periodical information. This is sent mostly to students when they are doing reports, debates, speeches. We spend many hours on the phone with students or in person giving them information because so much is not written and particularly when they want to know about the WADD program. There's a great deal that isn't written, and this is really the only way to do it. As I indicated I spent many, many, many hours with students. We have a concept sheet which tells about the beginning of our organization in Central Ohio and why it was started. Be-cause a three and a seven year old were killed. We have a volunteer sheet. We hope by sending this—and we sometimes include it in student packets, not because we think they are going to volunteer but because we hope that it shows then the extent of our activities.

We have a newsletter that we send five times a year in which we try to include some very pertinent information and educational material. Our next one will include an agree-
ment card for the parent and child to sign where the child says, "If I am ever in a situation with a car where I or the driver of the car is in no state to drive, I will call you." The parent signs the agreement saying, "I will come after you or send a cab and no argument." There is also information about how to talk with your child about drinking and driving and alcohol. These are specific suggestions as well as we have included this "get your car home safely" card.

We have five settings a year. We have educational speakers. Of course the people who come to our meetings aren't the ones who need a change of attitude. But they can then have some facts and some figures and some informa-
tion so they can talk intelligently to the rest of the community. And I feel that that's helpful.
We have victim assistance information, and this is only sent when people ask for it; we do not go out and hunt for victims. They must indeed come to us and say we would like some help. And we have a larger pamphlet that I had shown you (I'll get it for you). We try to help people over the phone who are victims and talk with them and so forth. But I really feel that we are working in many areas. This is one of the difficult things, trying to run a completely volunteer organization and have so very many activities. It isn't a one-meeting-a-month type organization.

WHAT ARE MADD'S FUTURE GOALS? WITHIN FIVE TO TEN YEARS, WHAT WILL MADD HAVE ACCOMPLISHED?

I hope in five to ten years we're out of business. That we are no longer needed. And that would be my one future goal. That this problem would be so well taken care of that we were just simply...there would be no reason for us to be around. That's unrealistic, but that would be my hope. I guess in five to ten years, I would simply hope that we have reduced the number of deaths and injuries, and that at that time our goal will still be to reduce further—the same as they are now which is to reduce the deaths and injuries on the highway and support the victim. And I'm sure that in five to ten years this will not be completely eradicated, but I hope that then we will be working to reduce whatever the situation is further.

WHAT CONSCIOUS ATTEMPTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO REFINE THE RHETORIC?

I suppose there is certainly daily revisions. In fact, I had just written a letter to National—it's still a rough draft—saying we change, we evaluate, we evolve, we change and we change again almost daily. Any addition of new statistics, of changing statistics. A statistic that I had recently received that the life expectancy of every age group in the United States has increased in the last seventy-five years except for one, the fifteen to twenty-four year old age group. That is lower than it was twenty years ago due to drunk driving deaths. One must include new information about alcoholism, about anything of this sort. It is now that children of alcoholic parents are four times as likely to be alcoholics as the general population. But anything that is more appealing, that's more informative, the chance in the law. For instance, when the law was changed, my goodness, we were sending stuff out to students daily—many times daily—of this is what is happening now. So our job changes daily and our information must change daily.
DO YOU CHANGE THE WAY YOU PRESENT YOUR INFORMATION, YOUR RHETORICAL STRATEGIES?

I guess, when I give a speech, and I can't speak for the other people, but I try almost everything across the board. From being very factual and giving statistics which in themselves are scary. When I sit there and say to you that on one - out of every two persons will be involved, this means you or me. In fact, when I give a speech, the way I now almost always start it is by dividing the group—if it's a decent size group—I divide it in half, and I ask the people on the right side of the room to stand up. Tell them what a good looking group they are. I hope it's not then, and tell them to sit down. Then I ask the people on the other side of the room to stand up. And say I certainly hope it's not you either, you're an equally good looking group, and ask them to sit down. I tell them that I am not extending their morning callisthenics, but that they have just helped me very graphically illustrate one of the nastiest statistics I know. One out of every two persons in the United States will be involved in an alcohol related crash in their lifetime. That means the people on this side of the room or this side of the room. Now this is factual; you can call it a scare tactic if you want to, but we are actually presenting a fact. And as far as I am concerned, it is a most chilling one. So it's scary to me, and I hope it will be to then. I was quoting this kind of statistic to a young man on the phone one time, and he indicated that I was ruining his day, and I said, "Good, I hope enough so that you will come join us. We need you." One hates to be miserable...I can't even think what I want to say. One hates to be so graphic, but it is so true, and people do not know this. It is a frightening statistic.

I use an emotional appeal when I tell people about the calls I receive on the phone because many, many times they are emotional when the father calls and says, "I buried my son yesterday. I don't know what to do."

Or sometimes humor even enters into it in a macabre sort of way. The man who called and said he had been arrested twelve to fourteen times for drunk driving. And this was before the bill was passed, so he said, "The bill should be passed. It should be passed exactly as it was written. There should be no judicial discretion." He was very determined about this, terribly so. And then he proceeded to tell me about his twelve to fourteen arrests. And he had lost count. It's little wonder. He named community after community after community. He said, "All I ever did was pay a couple hundred dollars and walk out." He told me about one time when he had landed in jail, and that was when he couldn't get his lawyer. This was cut
of town, and he couldn't get his lawyer. Someone at the jail said the thing to do was to plead guilty. He went over to the judge. The judge said, "I can't let you plead guilty without your lawyer." He said, "I can't get a hold of him." The judge said, "Go in the other room, use the telephone, and see if you can get him." By this time it was dinnertime, I assume. And the three of them had a three-way conversation, the judge, the lawyer and himself. They had the trial over the phone, he paid his couple hundred dollars and walked out the door. He said, "I will come down and testify in front of that committee." But again this was still anonymous and I couldn't assure him of anonymity. I told him those were open meetings. He said, "Well, hell, everyone at work knows I drink anyway, just as long as there aren't any television cameras." I couldn't assure him of that either. He told me that he would sign for us to get the police records that indeed he had been arrested twelve to fourteen times. Finally, after some three quarters of an hour of his telling me that he had run through a billboard, that it was a wonder he hadn't killed somebody, that he found out he couldn't see when he drinks. And I said, "You sound like a man who has given up drinking." He said, "Hell no! I gave up drinking." And so I assured him that that was all we were asking. How much he drinks is his affair. How much he drives after how much he drinks becomes our affair.

AS A LEADER OF A SOCIAL MOVEMENT, WHAT SIGNIFICANT CHALLENGES HAVE YOU FACED? HOW HAVE YOU MET THESE CHALLENGES?

I guess the challenges we have faced are the ones I just mentioned. Getting a bill through, trying to educate the public, and we've met them simply by the programs that I have suggested, and by putting in hours and hours and hours. People like to say "above and beyond the call of duty." Well, I don't know where the call of duty stops. I would certainly like to get some housework done. I never thought I would say that; I never thought I'd be thrilled to death to have a day to clean house. I guess we met the challenge by becoming completely dedicated and hoping that it is going to make some difference. Again, how can you know how much difference it makes?

WHAT KINDS OF ETHICAL DILEMMAS HAVE YOU ENCOUNTERED IN YOUR ROLE AS A MADD LEADER? HOW DID YOU SOLVE THESE DILEMMAS? WHAT KINDS OF ETHICAL DILEMMAS HAS THE ORGANIZATION AS A WHOLE ENCOUNTERED? HOW WERE THESE DILEMMAS SOLVED?

I can't honestly say that I've had any ethical dilemmas. I've been absolutely convinced that there is a huge need for this program, an overwhelming need for this program. I am convinced, having talked to people who themselves have driven drunk, talked with their wives, that
unless we have a firm and consistent and stern handling of drunken driving that we are not going to improve the situation. I have talked with judges; I have talked with law enforcement people. I am still convinced that this is the only way we are going to handle it other than to change social attitudes. I think we can make laws from here until eternity; we're always going to have some problem until it becomes socially unacceptable to drink to excess. So I suppose that one has unhappy moments when you see a young person, or a mother or a father, or anyone sentenced to a jail term. How can this be anything but a negative experience? One certainly would not choose to have anyone go to jail. However, if their choice is to be in jail or to be bailed up off of the pavement themselves or to have them responsible for sentencing someone else to a hospital bed or a wheelchair for the rest of their life, and an injured person has no right of appeal, then I'd rather see that person have a jail sentence. And this hospital bed or wheelchair can be thrust upon you or anyone you know with only a moment's error in judgment and an eighteen-inch swerve over the center line, and your life has been ended or changed irrevocably.

ARE YOU AWARE OF ANY ETHICAL DILEMMAS THAT THE NATIONAL ORGANIZATION HAS FACED?

Yes, yes, I am. There has been great criticism of National because they accepted a large sum of money—I'm sorry, I don't know how much—from a brewery. And I understand the public's outcry as far as this is concerned. However, realistically, one must realize that that brewery is not going out of business tomorrow or next week or next month or within the next however many years. That money is to be used for educational spots on TV. If indeed we are to say that alcoholic beverages are to be served legally, and if indeed there is a problem with people overindulging, then who better to bear the expense of a public education program about not ever overindulging than the persons who are benefiting from the sale of the beverage. It seems to me that makes good sense.

HOW ABOUT THE COURT WATCHERS IN CALIFORNIA BEING CRITICIZED FOR INTIMIDATING JUDGES?

Why should any judge be intimidated by someone in their courtroom observing? If indeed a judge is intimidated because someone with a definite view about breaking the law is in his court, then my question is not toward the court watcher but toward the ethical make-up of that judge.
DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING TO ADD THAT WASN'T ASKED?

Well, you've really asked quite a lot. How about, "Would anyone like to volunteer? You're welcome." Then I would like all volunteers to follow through with what they tell me they're going to do.

I just can't emphasize enough the community support and the community outcry about this problem. People don't talk to their legislators; people don't talk to their judges. People don't realize that they could and should. I really would like to urge everybody to make their views known in so many areas. They could be effective in writing letters to the editor. Judges don't get a lot of letters. They should not write about a specific case before the verdict is rendered. But they could certainly let a judge know how they feel in general about the drunk driving situation, that they want strong sentencing, that they want consistency, that they want less plea bargaining. And certainly if the sentence in a case does not fit the crime, they should let the judges know. They can talk to all their public officials, state legislators, national legislators, law enforcement officials, public officials, be they mayors, council members, whatever. Individuals can do something, and they shouldn't be discouraged when they meet with resistance because by the time the five hundred person talks to them, so that public official who is resisting, maybe that resistance will begin to be worn away.

We have one man in the town who has put up a billboard on West Broad Street. Did you hear about that? It cost him some eight hundred dollars. And he's put up his own billboard. He had an artist do it. And it shows a man in a wheelchair holding a beer can by a grave. And it says, "A few minutes of foolishness, a lifetime of regret." Who knows if somebody might see that and think about it? So really and truly I would like to say to everybody, "get involved." I really do feel that it's up to each of us to decide that we're going to make a commitment. Don't feel that you have done your share when you call MADD and say, "What have you done about it?" Because my reply to you is going to be, "We are all volunteers. We have no special powers. We are only citizens. How are you going to help us do it?"