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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM OF MANAGING COMPETING IDENTITIES WITHIN CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

At the onset of the women's movement, media images typifying women as sex symbols and housewives were rejected and questions regarding public images were beginning to be raised. This movement had faith in common interests and experiences of women, but also had differences of a general nature on the causes of subordination, and of a specific nature over issues such as the Equal Rights Amendment. As factions of the movement developed, the National Women's Organization (NWO) became the umbrella institution for the movement. The NWO, among other tasks, was faced then with finding a means of enabling constituencies within the movement to develop their own identities while balancing them with that of the overall movement.

Much the same can be said for the civil rights movement in the United States of the 1950's and 1960's. As such diverse figures as Martin Luther King, Jr. and Malcolm X took to the pulpit and the streets, debates on tactics created a schism within the movement. Black community groups were replaced by the "Big four" (NAACP, SCLC, SNCC and CORE). Thus, while African-Americans searched for ways to create positive images, efforts had to be made to manage identities within the movement. Such "identity crises"
within social movements are recognized historically, socially and politically as problematic; yet, constituting identity and managing it is very much a rhetorical enterprise as this project will illustrate.

In the struggle to create an effective identity, an identity powerful enough to compel action from alienated citizens, social movements represent the central problem of locating and motivating "the public." Constituencies of social movements come to see themselves as publics and must create and manage identities for themselves. Understanding "the public" and its role in society has challenged scholars for years in a variety of fields of study. From the colonial times of American forefathers like Jefferson to contemporary times of political activists like Alinsky, what role the citizenry should play in social intervention and how to politicize or mobilize "the public" are recurring themes. Traditionally, American political discourses symbolize the affirmation of the democratic process and offer a model of social power the positions the individual with access to such power. Challenging such a representation of democracy, political philosophers warn that the public sphere is in decline.

John Dewey, focusing on what conditions promote or obstruct the organization of the public that he described as "eclipsed," though he believed in its overall potential. He attributed this eclipse to a number of factors including technocratic means of public decision-making, the rise of a class of social "experts," a dichotomy between the individual and the collective, and poor conditions of public debate (Dewey 1927).

Like Dewey, Walter Lippmann questioned the very existence of the public and described it as a "phantom." He indicated that the lack of
time for participation, lack of specific information on involvement, and lack of interest in citizen participation in general all contributed to the decline of the public sphere (Lippmann 1927).

As he forwarded his model of communication action, Jurgen Habermas provided an extensive historical overview of the structural transformation of the public sphere including how institutions relieve individuals of social duties, the role of public opinion, and how ideas are legitimated. Like the others, he identified apathy, technocratic definitions of politics, the rise of a class of experts, and the commercialization of culture as contributing factors to the decline of the public sphere (Habermas 1989).

These scholars have variously indicated that the "the public" is in a state of crisis and have implied that transformation is needed so as to revitalize or empower the public sphere. Social movements are one means of creating "publics" and attempt to revitalize the public sphere.

That the creation of identity out of competing and conflicting interests seems to be a perennial concern of publics in general and of social movements in particular suggests the central research problem: Once constituted, how do social movement constituencies manage their identities and what is the impact of this effort on the identity of the overall movement?

For the purposes of this study, the term "movement" will refer in a general manner to the overarching effort put forth in concert by various social movement organizations. The term "constituency" will refer to the political tone or aspirations of various social movement organizations as they are placed along the political spectrum from
conservative to moderate to radical. Constituencies can also be described in reference to their particular target audiences. Obviously each social movement organization or constituency does not address the entire movement with each and every rhetorical message. In many cases, they seek to persuade a particular, like-minded audience. In a hierarchal manner, individual social movements comprise constituencies which, in turn, comprise the movement as a whole.

Maurice Charland's theory of constitutive rhetorics will provide the point of entry and the contemporary American environmental movement will be taken as a case study. Rhetorical criticism of mass-mediated and movement-produced media featuring social movement activism will provide generalizable results so as to gain a better understanding of how this communication process operates.

Further, the overarching research question may be divided into four tasks that will help guide the project: 1) to illustrate how the reconstitutive rhetorics of social movements function to manage competing identities within the mass media, 2) to illustrate how reconstitutive rhetorics of social movements function to manage competing identities in movement-produced media, 3) to analyze the differences and similarities in how these identities are reconstituted, and 4) to interpret the implications of such a comparison for understanding the identity management function.

Continuing the Effort to Define Social Movements within Rhetorical Scholarship

To a certain degree, the political turbulence of the Sixties caught scholars off guard, and the effort to understand social movements and
activists continues decades later. As a contribution to this effort, the significance of this project is twofold. First, the problem of how to define "social movement," a problem that has perplexed rhetorical theorists for quite some time, will be explored and clarified. Second, the project extends Charland's work on constitutive rhetorics by, first, focusing on reconstitutive rhetorics that he indirectly identified but does not study, and second, by repositioning the theory within the functional perspective of social movement studies. This repositioning enables an analysis of a function of rhetoric within social movements that has thus far been largely ignored, the identity management function. The theoretical underpinnings of these claims follow.

Definitions of "social movement" in the field of rhetorical theory and criticism generally range from historical to sociological to rhetorical. Some of the earliest attempts by rhetoric scholars at defining movements focused on the widening domain of rhetorical artifacts and cycles of change in movements. Leland Griffin urged scholars to examine "a multiplicity of speakers, speeches, audiences, and occasions" (Griffin 1952). His conceptualization of social movements as historical phenomena comprised of a series of discrete stages from which scholars should isolate the rhetorical elements dominated rhetorical scholarship for years to come (Griffin 1951 and 1964).

In the Seventies, Herbert Simons turned from Griffin's historical emphasis to sociology. Simons and others wished to move away from historical definitions and neo-Aristotelian methods of analysis to provide a broader framework for the study of social movements and to integrate the various elements operating within them. Simons's
definition of movements took sides on the institutionalization issue by defining a social movement as an "uninstitutionalized collectivity that mobilize for action to implement a program for the reconstitution of social norms or values" (Simons 1970).

Added to this debate then was the call for definitions of movements, not historically or sociologically, but rather rhetorically. Robert Cathcart's definition featuring the "dialectical enjoinment in the moral arena," represents this point of view (Cathcart 1972 and 1978). Calling forth the issue of confrontation, Cathcart discussed historical and sociological definitions of movements as vague and argued that a rhetorical perspective would treat rhetoric as confrontational, not managerial and would take languaging strategies as its data.

This shift in emphasis opened up the field considerably, but was not without its critics. On the issue of confrontation, Randall Lake stated in his study of Native American protest: "by making confrontation the consummatory purpose of a movement, Cathcart's description appears overly restrictive." He argued that the Native American protest would have to be judged a failure if this was the defining element yet the rhetoric, in his analysis, was successful in that it provoked a spiritual rebirth of Indian culture (Lake 1983).

On the issue of substance, Michael McGee criticized Cathcart's proposed shift in emphasis by arguing: "the critical problem for theorists is determining whether 'social movement' is directly or inferentially in human experience. If a thing is directly in experience, it is a 'phenomenon;' if it is inferentially in experience, it is an interpretation of a 'set of meanings'" (McGee 1980). McGee saw the
position of Cathcart and others on social movements as the former and took the latter position for himself. He argued that "theories of things 'out there'" are prescriptive and less useful for the task of studying social movements. He stated: "The mistake is treating the meaning as if it were itself a phenomenon" (McGee 1980). He defined movements as meaning, not matter of fact phenomenon and argued that what "moves" society, as in "social movement," is argumentation. To him, movements are more shifts in meaning than organizations, leaders, mailing lists, or media events. (McGee 1980).

Defining social movements and perspectives from which to study them has sparked a heated debate among rhetorical scholars, one that has yet to arrive at a definitive answer. Some scholars argue on behalf of studying movements historically by identifying stages of protest and extrapolating rhetorical elements. Trying to replace historical efforts, other scholars took a more social-scientific approach by studying the structural nature of movements. Trying to replace these definitions, still others argued for a purely rhetorical definition by examining the differences in the nature of rhetoric itself and whether movements are phenomena or meaning. Some theorists presume that social movements, and other key issues in rhetorical studies such as audience or personae already exist; they are "extra-rhetorical." At the other end of the spectrum, some theorists do not make this presumption and therefore investigate how what appears to be a given is really rhetorically constituted as ideology.

Following in McGee's footsteps, Maurice Charland chose to investigate the distinct line of thought which sees social movements as
meaning, not phenomenon. Charland set out to develop a theory of ideological discourse, a theory that examines how discourse presents itself as always pointing to these givens. Charland claimed that the very existence of social subjects such as social movements, audience, personae, etc. is a rhetorical effect -- a product of discourse (Charland 1987). Again following in McGee's footsteps, Charland emphasized that this ideological fiction becomes historically material.

Charland drew directly upon Kenneth Burke's well established concept of identification, particularly the point that the audience does not exist somehow prior and apart from the rhetorical exchange. From Burke's perspective, the audience actually participates in the discourse: "in being identified with B, A is 'substantially one' with a person other than himself. Yet at the same time he remains unique . . . thus he is both joined and separate . . ." (Burke 1950). This perspective enabled Charland to see audiences as embodying discourse.

Charland also drew upon Louis Althusser's conceptualization of "the subject" and how it is "interpellated." Interpellation is the process of "inscribing subjects into ideology" or making them political through a process of identification in rhetorical narratives that "always already" presume the subject is constituted (Charland 1987). Charland wished to "show the degree to which collective identities forming the basis of rhetorical appeals themselves depend upon rhetoric" (Charland 1987). In short, Charland asked rhetorical scholars to consider the "textual nature of social being" including how it is created and its implications. In simple terms, when rhetors and the audience enter into a rhetorical situation -- a situation in which meaning can be assigned -- an initial
effort to name, among other aspects, the relationship between rhetors and audiences must be made. This relationship is not neutral; the power to define, name, constitute or assign meaning at the ideological level comes into play. Once hailed, the audience can: 1) refuse the hail by ignoring the rhetor thus making the situation non-rhetorical, 2) respond to the hail as such, 3) respond to the hail with the goal of reconstituting meaning through various rhetorical transactions.

Charland's work can be seen as an attempt at defining social movements. His study of Quebec's fight to gain sovereignty enabled him to advance his theory of constitutive rhetorics that detailed how a movement was initially constituted through rhetoric. This task involved a two step process: 1) successful interpellation and 2) necessitating action. In order to justify the constitution of a new state, the Mouvement Sourverainete-Association (MSA) attempted to create a new identity for a different political subject, the Quebecois. This new position arose from juxtaposing Canadien francais with the Quebec resident and voter. Eventually, Quebecois became completely antithetical to Canadien francais. To be hailed as Quebecois or as a Canadien francais, brought forth two different ideologies.

Quoting Burke, Charland acknowledged that new subjects can encounter "recalcitrance," the power to name or rename is not always successful. To resolve these experienced contradictions, Charland argued that constitutive rhetorics must offer new subject positions (Charland 1987). This explanation seems to imply that everytime a contradiction arises, an entirely new political subject must be called into being. However, rhetoric can function in ways to manage positions as
well as initially constitute them. Discursive positions can be altered, too. A slight extension of Charland's line of thinking reveals how discourse can reconstitute political subjects as well as constitute them. These reconstitutive rhetorics are the entry point for the current project.

Reconstitutive rhetorics are discourses that rework the meanings of previous messages and are designed to alter existing discursive positions. For example, at the beginning of this chapter, attempts to alter stereotypical images of women and African-Americans were described. Though Charland indirectly identified reconstitutive rhetorics, his application failed to illustrate them. The movement he studied was simply a two dimensional issue, to vote "oui" or "non" for sovereignty. To better understand the reconstitutive potential of rhetorics, and to relate this to the work on social movements in rhetorical studies more effectively, a more complex movement, one with a well-developed history and factions is needed. The environmental movement provides a strong case study.

Managing identities is an ongoing process that involves, not constitutive rhetorics to bring into being entirely new discursive positions, but rather reconstitutive rhetorics. This project will try to capture the complexity of reconstitutive rhetorics in social movements to illustrate the fact that a variety of identities are interpellated throughout the life of the movement. Within constituencies, one social movement organization hails others to constitute or reconstitute constituency identities. Constituencies hail other constituencies inviting and sometimes forcing a rhetorical response that reconstitutes identity. Occasionally, constituencies hail the movement as a whole as well. The
historically important concept of audience in rhetorical theory and criticism must come into play here. The social movement organizations which comprise constituencies do not base their rhetorical appeals on pure conjecture; they know which audiences to target. Social movements are not univocal; they are multivocal. At times the interpellation process is successful, and at other times it fails. Just as the rhetorical effort becomes problematic when it fails to address the intended audience, it also becomes problematic when the interpretation process fails. Identities will remain the same or decay or another attempt to reconstitute them will be made.

From this review, it can be seen that the problem of how to define a social movement is unresolved for students of rhetoric. As scholars in the field of rhetorical studies turned their attention from historical and sociological definitions to uniquely rhetorical ones, they did not fully take advantage of advances in areas of study outside their own. Moreover, these efforts help to uncover one assumption about organization that still underlies most rhetorical scholarship: to a large extent, work to date still has a propensity to view movements as one cohesive yet uninstitutionalized mass entity confronting "the establishment." The nature of this "phenomenon" is conceptualized as a univocal, homogeneous effort. This view is incorrect.

Continuing the Effort to Define Social Movements in Sociology and Political Science

Over the years, a mix of theoretical and empirical objectives characterized the study of social movements across both sociology and
political science. Classical theories that initially dominated the field, such as collective behavior, rising expectations, deprivation, status inconsistency, mass society, and others proved inadequate (See for example: Kornhauser 1959; Broom 1959; Smelser 1962; and others). The emphasis on the irrationality of activists and the difference between ordinary political activity and movement behavior proved to be a false dichotomy.

Political perspectives gradually replaced the classical socio-psychological perspectives of social movements. From the new political perspectives emerged, most notably, the resource mobilization model that depicted social movements as the means by which powerless groups of activists attempt to mobilize political strength and gain necessary resources (See for example: McCarthy and Zald 1973 and 1977; Jenkins and Perrow 1977; and others). Mobilization here is a process by which groups secure collective control over needed resources. This model was also found deficient in that the conceptualization of "elites versus the masses" did not acknowledge the capacity of insurgency on the part of excluded groups (McAdam 1982).

More recently, the political process model of social movements provided an alternative to previous perspectives by depicting insurgency as a product of the interplay between both internal and external factors. By analyzing political opportunities, organizational strength, and the presence of shared cognitions among movement activists as well as other elements, an understanding of the movement as a process, not a series of discrete stages, is gained (McAdam 1982).
Mobilization potential, as J. Craig Jenkins later acknowledged, is now recognized to be determined by organizational capacity. As Sidney Tarrow explained, it is frequently assumed that mobilization capacity is the most potent factor. Now, it is believed that the interrelationship between solidarity (collective identity), organization and leadership is the key factor (Tarrow 1982). Important for the goals of this project, Tarrow continued by emphasizing how less obvious dimensions of organization such as internal stratification, degree of centralization and internal factionalism, require close attention.

This change in perspective on mobilization and organization enabled a reconceptualization of social movements. Classical models of social movement organizations as comprised of indigenous leadership, a volunteer staff, and mass participation were replaced with the professional social movement organizations model comprised of outside leadership, a paid staff, and constituencies. (Jenkins 1983). This change in perspective lends further credence to arguments that social movements are institutionalized.

Some scholars, such as Charles Stewart, mention the factional nature of movements but seldom pursue this concern (Stewart 1980). Also, much of rhetorical scholarship of movements still has "mobilization" as the key word, not organization. One exception worth noting is Ralph Smith and Russell Windes's argument forwarded in 1976 that organization in social movements does not occur naturally, rather it occurs through discourse. In their view, institutionalization is a distinct characterization. Making the connection between discourse and organization was an important effort (Smith and Windes 1976).
This project will incorporate this scholarship by illustrating how competing identities of movement factions is an organizational concern. A social movement’s perception of its identity both influences and is influenced by its organizational structure and its mobilizational capacity is influenced in turn. Interpellating the movement’s identity as a political subject, an organization, goes hand in hand with necessitating action, its mobilizational capacity. Sociology is trying to bridge internal and external factors. Collective identity, an “internal factor,” is rhetorically constituted and reconstituted through the process of interpellation. Collective identity influences how social movements organize and therefore influences mobilizational capacity or “necessitating action in the material world.”

For this project, movements rhetorically defined are symbolic transformations in the ideological state of political subjects who, through various rhetorical transactions, come to share and manage a collective identity in the social world that is consequential for their actions in the material world. This collectivity is perceived by other political subjects as apart from normative collective behavior. Whether they are confrontational or not, institutionalized or not, such a collective seeks to reconstitute meanings and to affect the status quo.

Taking a Functional Approach to Studying General Rhetorical Element of Social Movements

The research question and objectives outlined in the first section of this chapter specify that one particular function of rhetoric, identity management, will be analyzed. This function refers to the
veritable balancing act of creating and maintaining constituency identities within an overall movement. The role of rhetoric in this balancing act is yet to be explored. Rhetoric performs a variety of functions in social movements as it will soon be seen. Although a variety of approaches are available, arguments on behalf of taking a functional approach to the study of social movement rhetoric appear in several key essays (See for example: Simons 1970; Gregg 1971; Stewart 1980; Turner 1980). However, the task of identifying these various rhetorical functions is not yet complete.

A number of studies discuss functions of rhetoric in social movements in a general way. For example, Simons identified three goals social movements must reach. One of these goals included rhetorical requirements (functions) including adoption of ideologies and overcoming resistance (Simons 1970). McGee also stressed: "analysis of rhetorical documents should not turn inward to an appreciation of persuasive, manipulative technique, but outward to functions of rhetoric" (McGee 1975). Like others, Stewart identified primary rhetorical functions. Useful for this project is the suggestion under "sustaining the movement," to examine the question: "How are essential functions performed by differing factions within the social movement?" (Stewart 1980, 1983, 1991).

Taking a Functional Approach to Studying Rhetoric and Identity in Social Movements

A number of studies discuss functions very much related to that of identity management. For example, Richard Gregg detailed the
ego-function. He cautioned that protest discourses are not always aimed at the establishment; sometimes they are aimed at the protesters themselves as a means of self-persuasion that he called the ego-function. Rhetoric here serves to distance adversaries, gain symbolic control, gain adversary attention and force counter-reaction (Gregg 1971). The function of identity management is rooted in Gregg's exploration of the ego function, but differs from it in that the identity management function focuses on rhetoric's ability to manage differing and changing egos. Gregg did not directly account for the fact that movements involve numerous egos or identities and that managing them is yet another task that involves rhetoric.

Another related example is Dale Leathers's examination of the function of in-group maintenance in the John Birch Society (Leathers 1972). In-group maintenance, like Gregg's ego function, is self directed. Leathers expanded upon how rhetoric functions to maintain a sense of "groupness." Again, there are several groups simultaneously trying to accomplish this task at any given time as part of the same movement.

A last example of the functional approach is Kathleen Turner's work that further developed Gregg's scholarship. She examined the feminist movement of the Sixties in an effort to understand the relationship between social movements, ego-building, and the mass media. Turner claimed: "the most common grievance of the 60's was one of identity" (Turner 1980). The deficient media images of women became an exigency for the women's liberation movement that responded with ego-building rhetoric, first in the mass media and then, because of mass media distortion, in their own media. She argued that
the inability to reconcile conflicting demands of ego-defense and media access resulted in development of alternative means of communication (Turner 1980). She continued: "The attempts to correct deficient images created even more negative images for groups seeking social change" (Turner 1980). As it will be seen in the following chapters, the environmental movement responded to deficient images in both the mass media and its own media and this effort, as Turner would predict, was contradictory.

Naturally a mass movement will try to access the mass media to obtain its goals, in this case, to manage its public identity. Obviously the problem of mass media access Turner identified still exists today, but the alternative media that she saw as a fledgling enterprise have evolved into an extensive publishing venture. Alternative media studies, such as Turner's, have only recently received significant scholarly attention. This project will contribute to a more complete understanding of the role of these media in social movements. Now that these alternative channels are more fully developed, mass media and movement-produced media should be taken together to get a more complete picture of the various functions of rhetoric in social movements, including the identity management function.

Taking the Environmental Movement as a Case Study

Mass and movement-produced media messages on environmental activism were chosen for this study for a variety of reasons. As indicated in the brief critique of Charland's work, a
movement with an extended history and well developed constituencies was needed. The environmental movement fulfills this requirement. A brief historical overview of ecological movements will help to illustrate this point.

An examination of environmental history reveals what could be identified as three separate movements, each with their own rival schools of thought. The conservation movement, rooted in the public health concerns of the 1800's, reconstituted human beings from conquerers of nature to stewards of nature. While most schools of thought grounded themselves in materialism wishing to conserve "natural resources," other schools of thought took a more aesthetic approach, such as that of the Transcendalists who saw spiritual truth and moral law in nature.

The 1900's brought the progressive era of politics, and what could be distinguished as the preservationist movement developed out of opposition to the conservationists. Sportsmen and wilderness societies urged government to intervene on behalf of the citizenry against the destructive maneuvers of "Big Business," particularly cattleranchers and oil tycoons. Basking in the American myth of frontierism, preservationists still wanted to preserve nature solely for humankind's benefit. On the other hand, rooted in the aesthetic concerns of the previous movement, Muir and others became the "voice of wilderness," they proclaimed, for wilderness' sake.

The second half of the Twentieth Century reconceptualized the environmental movement by linking it to the general activism of the Sixties. As part of the deeper political unrest of the times, teach-ins,
rallies and protests brought forth the first all-encompassing attempt at environmentalism by the federal government in the shape of the National Environmental Protection Act, as well as other acts that followed (Nash 1976). Important to note is the fact that clear lines of demarcation between these movements cannot be drawn; however, key historical events, differing tactics and strategies and primary areas of concern can be distinguished.

This project will focus on the activist organizations and the media because much of the success of the environmental movement has been due to the ability of environmental organizations to influence public opinion in both mass and movement-produced media, and because the media play a great role in awareness and practice.

It should be noted at this time that work within the field of rhetoric that focuses upon environmental messages is limited (See: Brown and Crable 1973; Crable and Vibbert 1983; Farrell and Goodnight 1981; Nimmo and Combs 1982; and Oravec 1981, 1982, 1984). Work within environmental communication, on the other hand, is extensive. Most of this work focuses on mass media with only a few essays examining movement-produced media. (Rubin and Sachs 1973; Seller and Jones 1973; Bowman 1978; Schoenfeld 1982; Olien, Donahue and Tichenor 1984 and 1989; Fortner 1985 and 1988; and others).

The Sample of Artifacts

The proposed project is qualitative, both descriptive and evaluative. This study seeks to examine and evaluate how
constituencies are interpellated as political subjects through the process of identification in rhetorical artifacts and the influence of this effort on the identity of the movement as a whole. This analysis will illustrate how what is called the "environmental movement" is presented as a mass phenomenon that "always already" exists. Yet this social movement did not come into being out of nothingness; it is complex. The environmental movement is comprised of constituencies, particular audiences that are politically similar, and these constituencies are in turn comprised of social movement organizations that also share close positions on the political spectrum. Through the rhetorical process of identification, these social movement organizations and constituencies are interpellated as political subjects -- particular audiences with particular identities.

It is important to note at this early stage that assumptions about the rhetorical message operating in a mechanistic fashion with a direct impact on the audience's knowledge, attitudes or behavior, perceived in exactly the same way by all receivers are not being made here. In fact, impact of the message on the audience is not the issue; how the rhetors construct the message to fulfill the identity management function is the issue.

The rhetorical artifacts to be examined are a sampling of both mass and movement-produced media. As Turner's study illustrated, both are required since these are two of the primary arenas in which movements manage their identities. Due to the timeliness of this topic, data is readily available. Decisions regarding what materials should be included in the data set are naturally based upon the research question
and general objectives outlined at the start of this document. The mass media sampling includes a network television segment (PrimeTime Live's "Earth First . . . Or Last?"), a national new magazine article (Newsweek's "Trying to Take Back the Planet"), a local newspaper feature (Columbus Dispatch's "On the March,"), an entertainment magazine article (Rolling Stone's "Coming Back to Earth: A Look at Earth Day 1990") and a national newspaper article (Washington Post's "From Fringe to Political Mainstream: Environmentalists Set Policy Agenda") that all focus upon environmental activism. Each of the mass media artifacts represent the voices of at least two of the three constituencies examined in this study -- most represent all three. The parameters for this portion of the sample are drawn in this manner so that a variety of rhetorical texts and voices are included.

The movement-produced media sampling includes publications by three environmental groups: Earth First!, The National Audubon Society and The Natural Resources Defense Council. Earth First! identifies itself as a "radical environmentalist movement" (Earth First! 1990). The Natural Resources Defense Council is "The movement's largest and most aggressive legal advocate . . . its large staff of scientists and lawyers is often called for advice in shaping legislation in Congress" (Weisskopf 1990). Between the radical Earth First! and the conservative Natural Resources Defense Council is the National Audubon Society that "traditionally focuses on preservation of wildlife and natural resources and has a reputation for being politically moderate" (Weisskopf 1990). Placed upon the political spectrum, Earth First! is clearly on the left, Natural Resources Defense Council on the right and
Placing these social movement organizations along the political spectrum serves to make this project more manageable and provides a clearer vision of the various target audiences. The mainstream, represented here by the Natural Resources Defense Council, recruits "Earth Advocates" to send contributions and write letters to their representatives. According to the Washington Post, the average income of NRDC members is $68,000 and eighty-five percent have at least a bachelor's degree (April 19, 1990). This highly affluent and educated target audience of the mainstream is the segment of the American population with charity dollars to spare, and the willingness and education to understand environmental problems.

As for the grassroots, specific demographics are hard to develop since such a wide variety of individuals are recruited. The National Audubon Society, for example, has well over a half million members. Additionally, these members are divided hierarchically into local, regional and national chapters each with their own personalities and priorities. Throughout the NAS newsletters, NAS features the diversity of membership opinion and expertise.

The radical constituency, here represented by Earth First!, is more militant and are educated in terms of biocentric philosophy and
deep ecology. Membership is highest in the West, but it is increasing steadily on the east coast. A coordinated study of the demographics of this constituency's national, regional and local chapters has yet to be conducted. Of note, however, is the fact that "Many mainstream environmentalists, impatient with their own leadership, are now defecting to radical ranks" (Foote 1990). Knowing this, E! seeks to develop this source of potential members.

While each organization publishes a variety of materials, this project will use newsletters for its sample. Newsletters fit the research question and goals more clearly than other publications since they are more likely to discuss activism and are the one type of publications all three organizations produce. To make the sample manageable, issues within a six-month time frame of Earth Week will be used dating February to July, 1990. More specifically, direct quotes or attributed statements of movement spokespersons in the mass media and articles on activism in the newsletters will be investigated. Clearly, thousands of rhetorical artifacts are available for this study. Selections had to be limited to make the project manageable. What is more important than the scientific or technical representativeness of the sample is that each selection directly bears upon the research question. The question of how these data will be treated will now be discussed.

**Rhetorical Criticism as Method**

Rhetorical criticism has undergone significant changes since its inception thus producing a variety of critical systems each with its own
perspective on the nature, substance and standards of rhetoric. Rhetorical criticism seeks to explain how and why messages function as they do. Rhetorical criticism is not a predictable process; there is no uniform, standardized method or absolute, finite standard of evaluation. As Walter Fisher described: "[criticism] is not the arbitrary imposition of a formula complete with static equations . . . Certainly criticism is judgmental . . . it is a creative process" (Fisher 1969). The tools available to the critic include: observation, analysis, interpretation and evaluation; however, again there is no standard way in that the critic uses these tools. As Edwin Black stated in his highly regarded work, *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method* : "critical method is too personally expressive to be systematized." He continued: "it is neither possible nor desirable for criticism to be a fixed system, for critical techniques to be objectified, for critics to be interchangeable for purposes of replication, or for rhetorical criticism to serve as the handmaiden of quasi-scientific theory" (Black 1965). Method fulfills the role of a guide, not a set of steps to take in a cookie-cutter fashion.

Michael Leff defended this position against complaints that it is radically subjective by stressing that critical objects do not interpret themselves, critics always assign meaning. Black himself strongly emphasized that criteria for evaluation must be.

The relationship between the critic and the object of study is a delicate one, one that is the subject of heated discussion. This project will side with scholars such as Rosenfield who have argued on behalf of a concentration on "appreciation" rather than "objectivity". Such appreciation is guided by theory. Rhetorical theory and criticism are
closely and dynamically related; theory is an important part of the critic's experience and naturally informs criticism (Leff, 1980).

Charland's two-step process of analysis will be used to evaluate the success or failure of the interpellation process and necessitating action, image problems facing the movement as a whole and its constituencies in turn are identified. Constraints within which constituencies must operate as they attempt to manage these problems are then specified. Rhetorical devices used in response to these problems are then examined so as to understand how constituencies employ reconstitutive rhetorics to discursively reposition themselves or rename their identities. Whether or not appeals for action are actually forwarded is then determined.

Organization of the Document

Since Chapter One has outlined the nature of the problem, chapters Two and Three will offer a solution to the proposed problem. The research question, four objectives and elements outlined above will guide the rhetorical criticism of the mass media data in Chapter Two. Chapter Three will then do the same for the movement-produced media sample. Chapter four will first compare and contrast the mass and movement-produced media findings to reveal the relationship between the two. The final chapter will then discuss the significance of these findings and will end by summarizing and evaluating the project and by identifying areas of future research.
CHAPTER II
IDENTITY MANAGEMENT, SOCIAL MOVEMENTS,
AND THE MASS MEDIA

The Interrelationship Between Social Movements and the Mass Media

In 1990, the twentieth anniversary of the original Earth Day became known as "Earth Week" and bore little resemblance to its predecessor. A professional staff orchestrating a multi-million dollar extravaganza spreading across 140 countries and 3,600 American communities replaced the skeleton staff organizing teach-ins on an operating budget of $125,000 twenty years ago (Strom 1990). Earth Day 1990 became a catalyst for the "greening" of everything from first grade classrooms to corporate boardrooms. Industry even joined in the celebration with the rebirth of environmental advertising by those companies that gave the world agent orange and oil spills, a move that was referred to by some as the "corporate buyout of Earth Day." Photo opportunities, such as President Bush planting a tree, enticed government officials to join the festivities. By the time Earth Day 1990 approached, seventy-six percent of Americans considered themselves to be "environmentalists" according to Gallup pollsters
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(Wald 1990). From politicians to Greenpeace members, from chemical company CEO's to teachers, all marched, for at least a day, under the banner of environmentalism.

Coverage of the week-long celebration by the mass media was extensive and presented a unique opportunity for the environmental movement to again establish itself as a mass movement. In an unusual change of pace, a social movement was trying to make the most of, yet survive, a commercial onslaught of attention instead of actively courting the mass media for a fifteen second news blip. In this regard, Earth Day 1990 was by far the exception, not the rule. With all eyes on Earth Day, PBS launched a ten part series, "The Race to Save the Planet"; Captain Planet joined Bugs Bunny and the Teenage Mutant Ninja Turtles in the cartoon line-up; Jimmy Buffet released his song, "We Have Not Been Very Good Tenants;" and scores of nature and activism publications filled bookstore shelves ranging from Our Earth, Ourselves to 50 Simple Things You Can Do to Save the Earth to Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching. Thoreau, Muir, Leopold and the other literary forefathers of today's movement, had they been alive at the time, may very well have been pleasantly surprised by the environmental fervor that gripped the television, newspaper, magazine, and just about every other mass media industry, at the time.

The information explosion which was Earth Day 1990 made "CFC's" and the "greenhouse effect" common household words and prompted a spectacular rise in public concern about the planet. The extensive media coverage of this event, before during and after the
legislation, clean-up efforts, and to a lesser degree, the environmental movement itself. Although gaining media access is very important to movements, this is not only an issue of quantity, but quality as well. Earth Day 1990 media coverage presented deficient images of the environmental movement. In an effort to improve these images, movement spokespersons responded with reconstitutive rhetorics. These responses are the data for this research.

Social movements seek access to the mass media for the purpose of identity management due to the simple fact that they are concerned about public perceptions and know that the mainstream mass media serve as legitimating forces for both defining and acting upon such perceptions. Because of the inherent complexities of both the movement and the mass media, this endeavor is extremely challenging. This chapter is dedicated to developing an understanding of this particular rhetorical challenge that faces social movements. By taking the project's main research question and its first objective together, the question posed for this chapter becomes: Once constituted, how do social movement constituencies manage their identities via the mass media and what is the impact of this effort on the identity of the movement as a whole? Before developing an answer, a review of literature related to this particular question and a description of the procedure to be used are both in order.

Since perceptions of social movements are inextricably linked to media coverage, many communication scholars exploring social
movements examine the nature of the relationship between movements and the mass media. Many of these studies examine this relationship from the perspective of the media. For example, it has been found that, in their quest for publicity, social movements must frame messages in such a manner as to increase the likelihood of gaining mass media coverage. J. Craig Jenkins explained: "News must be 'novel' and 'interesting'. Movements must therefore walk the fine line between outlandishness (that alienates third parties but secures coverage) and conventionality (that may be persuasive but is ignored by the media) " (Jenkins 1983). Similarly, Todd Gitlin reminded scholars that social movements must "organize symbolic events deliberately to attract the media spotlight" (Gitlin 1980). He explained: "political movements feel called upon to rely on large-scale communication in order to matter; . . . but in the process they become 'newsworthy' only by submitting to the implicit rules of newsmaking . . . The processed image then tends to become 'the movement' . . . ." (Gitlin 1980).

Important to note for this project on identity management is how it is from messages manipulated to gain media access that social movements come to at least a partial understanding of their own identities as a public. In his study of the Students for a Democratic Society movement, Gitlin explained: "To some extent the movement even recognized itself through mass-mediated images" (Gitlin 1980), and Jenkins concurred: " . . . mass media coverage is decisive in informing elite and mass publics about movement actions as well as in forming the morale and self-image of movement activists . . . "(Jenkins
Although movement activists get information about their cause from sources outside the mass media as well, this coverage does influence the movement's self-identity and prompts rhetorical responses. Activists know the power of public opinion and the importance of the mass media in this country for influencing that opinion. Therefore, these messages are an important source of information for this project on reconstitutive rhetorics.

Another example directly related to the overall goals of this project is how, in the mass media, radical factions of social movements are marginalized or interpellated as oppositional in relation to the rest of the social movement. Gitlin explained: "the standard journalistic frames persist in marginalizing the most radical aspects of movements ..." (Gitlin 1980). Also in his discussion of factions, he explained: "The media not only helped produce and characterize this sharp break ... they proceeded to play it up; in so doing, they magnified its importance -- both to the outside world and inside the organization" (Gitlin 1980). Thus messages are manipulated through radicalization and opposition by the mass media which, in turn, act as impediments to the creation of identity across factions within the movement or even the recognition of a common cause.

Numerous examples of studies examining the impact of media coverage on social movements exist. While this perspective is intriguing, it is somewhat one-sided in that it gives the impression that social movements are situated in an essentially powerless position and that the mass media are all-powerful. When mediated images do not suit the social movement's agenda, the movement is
compelled to respond rhetorically. In this manner, they participate in the defining of reality and the acting upon it. One of the few examples of studies working from this perspective includes Kathleen Turner's work on how the feminist movement responded to poorly defined mediated identities, specifically negative stereotypes of women, by creating their own channels of communication (Turner 1980). The point is that social movements do respond and are responding in an increasingly adept manner. The nature of the relationship between social movements and mass media have changed. As Gitlin summarized: "For their different reasons, the media and the movement needed each other. The media needed stories, preferring the dramatic; the movement needed publicity for recruitment, for support, and for political effect. Each could be useful to the other; each had effects, intended and unintended, on each other" (Gitlin 1980).

Gitlin's remark points to the need to examine the other half of the equation, rhetorical practices from the perspective of the social movement activists and how they interpellate the constituencies and the movement rather than the perspective of the media. To this end, the environmental movement will be taken as a case study and messages produced within a six-month period of Earth Day 1990, ranging from February to July, will be examined. In specific, the data are direct quotes or attributed statements of environmental movement activists within mass media sources, including a television news program, national newspaper, national news magazine, national entertainment magazine and local newspaper. These sources will
permit an analysis of how constituencies manage their public identities and how this influences the identity of the overall movement in the mass media.

These five selections were made from materials gathered in a systematic search of mass media sources. Local and national evening news programs the week of Earth Day were taped and reviewed and *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* were scanned. *The Reader's Guide to Periodicals* was searched for magazine articles under the headings: "Earth Day," "environmental movement," "Natural Resources Defense Council," "National Audubon Society," and "Earth First!". Only pieces focusing on environmental activism and the movement published in the mainstream mass media February and July of 1990 were considered.

For, as much as anything else, Earth Day was a major media event. According to *Time* magazine, the environmental movement is "one of the boldest and most tenacious political movements of the Twentieth Century" (Painton 1990). As such, Earth Week presented both obstacles and opportunities for identity management within the environmental movement. After briefly outlining why the environmental movement needed to respond rhetorically to mediated images, this chapter will examine and evaluate this effort using Maurice Charland's theory of constitutive rhetorics as a guide. This theory will permit an examination of how the various constituencies attempted to reconstitute their identities or redefine themselves as publics, and how this may have influenced the collectivized political subject commonly called "the environmental movement." Specifically,
a better understanding of how reconstitutive rhetorics function to manage identities by hailing particular audiences, of what the constraints on social movement responses are, and of how these constraints bind social movements to certain responses over others will be gained.

Public Identity Management Problems Facing the Mainstream, Grassroots, and Radical Constituencies

Identity problems in need of management occur both at the movement and constituency levels. Each rhetorical artifact was carefully scanned for discussions of image problems facing the movement as a whole as identified by media or movement staff. Not every artifact named every identity problem; they were taken cumulatively. Each rhetorical artifact was then carefully scanned for discussions of image problems facing the constituencies that comprise the overall movement. Oftentimes, as it will soon be seen, managing problems at one level, complicated management at the other level.

As one constituency, the mainstream, or "Big Ten" as it is nick-named, consists of groups such as the National Resources Defense Council, National Wildlife Federation, Sierra Club and others. What is often referred to as an "old boys network" in other arenas may be appropriate to use here, too, since many members of one organization's Board of Directors serve on those of the other organizations as well. This constituency works to overcome charges of elitism and "limousine environmentalism" that abound in both the mass and movement-produced media, yet maintain an image of being
a major player or of being a serious party to environmental negotiation.

The grassroots constituency works to reposition itself in a more powerful and prominent place by trying to overcome the image of "NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) patrols" stereotyped as being single-issue minded. This constituency sets out to create an identity for the grassroots as politically sophisticated and viable.

The radical constituency is misconstrued as throwbacks from the Sixties, hippies in beads and tie-dyed tee-shirts, armed and ready for monkeywrenching. Obviously this was not and is not necessarily the case. Many members of the radical constituency are ex-mainstream environmentalists (Foote, 1990). For example, even the most radical groups, such as Earth First!, include a contingent of government environmental scientists. Additionally, monkeywrenching may be used in isolated occasions, but is by no means the norm despite the fact that, as Gitlin also warned, the mass media persist in spotlighting radical factions. As Priscilla Painton noted: "Eco-guerrilla groups may have grabbed headlines . . . But it is the law-abiding citizens . . . who are giving the nation's environmental movement its daily, stubborn edge" (Painton 1990), or as Nature Conservancy president John Sawhill stated, there has been a "gradual 'mainstreaming' of environmental activism" (Wald 1990).

The radical constituency also represents a division with a division. Some members of this constituency argue in favor of monkeywrenching and others argue against it causing a schism among
the radical ranks. For example, at a rally at which several Earth Firsters in favor of monkeywrenching were arrested, a member opposing these tactics emphasized: "You've already made your point. If you get arrested here right now, you're going to blow it! You're going to alienate people who are basically trying to agree with you. You understand?" (PrimeTime Live 1990). Here, various elements of the radical faction perceived and wished to respond to identity problems differently. Consequently, the stereotype of violent ecoteurs and the interfactional disputes diminished their viability as a substantial and active part of the overall movement. Knowing this, radicals worked to reposition themselves in the mass media from being "jail junkies" to "reluctant warriors" with direction, purpose and potential.

Thus it can be seen that the environmental movement, like any other movement, is not completely centralized and bureaucratic any more than it is completely decentralized and informal. The environmental movement is comprised of multiple coexisting social movement organizations that, in concert, comprise specific constituencies. These constituencies become rhetorical publics and coalition building among these constituencies would help at the movement level, but would diminish the distinctiveness of each and make targeting these audiences difficult. As it will soon be seen, most constituencies were not willing to make such a sacrifice.

Moreover, as Gitlin warned, divisions within the movement are "played up." As described earlier, constituencies are divided along the political spectrum with the mainstream constituency placed on the
conservative right, the moderate grassroots in the middle, and the radical factions on the far left. The mass media's treatment of these divisions are sometimes over-dramatized.

Public Identity Management Problems Facing The Environmental Movement

Taken together, these identity problems facing each constituency become a problem for the movement as a whole. Internal factionalization is to be expected and can be either useful or detrimental to a movement's cause. In this case, as it will soon be seen, the media sensationalized the factionalism. As described in the first chapter, the capacity to mobilize publics is directly influenced by organization. So if constituencies are interpellated in such a manner that deficient images of organizational capacity are presented, it may negatively affect mobilization potential or ability to address intended audiences.

The appearance of disorganization and dissension is featured by media staff in all of the rhetorical artifacts. Examples include: "Radical environmentalists' militancy brings them into direct conflict with the mainstream movement. More moderate groups deplore their tactics. The radicals, meanwhile, denounce the established environmental groups (referred to as the Big Ten) for their willingness to bargain with the enemy. . . . The deal outraged militants and prompted defections from within the Big Ten" (Foote 1990); "These 'take it to the street' tactics are infuriating more than loggers. They've become a thorn in the side of many mainstream environmental
groups" (Prime Time Live 1990); "An undercurrent of disdain toward mainstream environmental groups, such as the Sierra Club and the National Wildlife Federation, runs through Hayes's rhetoric" (Gabriel 1990); or "But in recent years, an increasingly discernible distinction has developed within the environmental movement between these groups, based mainly in Washington and active on the federal level, and thousands of local organizations formed in response to specific threats, like toxic dumps" (Weisskopf 1990). Every one of the mass media artifacts prominently featured and dramatized the schism among constituencies and interpellated the movement as uncooperative. When media staff magnified factions as rivalries, whether they existed or not, this depicted a deficient public image of the overall movement as unorganized and uncooperative in fighting for a common cause which may diminish the potential to mobilize intended audiences.

Movement spokespersons recognized these deficient public images as an exigency in this manner and consistently responded to the mass media's charges that the environmental movement lacks unity. To gain the necessary media coverage, the movement had to respond to the hail -- how it was interpellated -- negative as it may have been, in hopes of articulating an improved image and turning a potential rhetorical failure into an opportunity. Examples include a historical discussion of "political types versus the lifestyle types" and the emphasis on how the environmental movement "must once again become a mass movement" (Rolling Stone). Various other attempts at justifying diversity will be analyzed in detail in the following sections.
The second identity management problem facing the movement as a whole is rooted in the mainstream constituency's primary problem. As one of the most prominent constituencies, the mainstream's image of being coopted or too closely aligned with "the establishment" filtered through to the movement as a whole. As one activist in The Washington Post stated: "To be effective, the environmental movement needs to keep its distance from government officials. Praise them when they deserve it, but always keep your independence. That's what keeps the movement credible to the public."

The third identity management problem at the movement level is appearing substantive, not trendy or outrageous or too image conscious. For example, in Newsweek: "Their forebears are the earnest hippies who, 20 years ago, emerged from the first celebration of Earth Day with plans to do some recycling, switch to non-phosphate detergent and donate $25 a year to the Sierra Club... [they] have turned to outrageous - and sometimes illegal - tactics in their war against 'greedheads'" (Foote 1990). One could argue that the Sixties image of activists has backlashed against activists of the Nineties. As another example, concerns about theatricality were raised in Rollingstone: "The emphasis on star turns and theatrics has some environmentalists frankly worried. They do not want to see Earth Day 1990 degenerate into a springtime skipalong... But will the slickness of the marketing effort create only a media event and turn off potential converts?"
A last example of an identity management problem facing the environmental movement as a whole is its image as a white, middle-class movement. The foundation for this image dates back to the original Earth Day. In 1970, Barry Commoner, a major spokesperson for the movement then and now, indicated that "blacks are the special victims of pollution... The ghetto dweller not only works in a polluted environment, he lives in it. And in the ghetto, he confronts added environmental problems" (Commoner 1968). Minorities, according to Commoner, resent being asked to consume less when "in the United States, the per capita consumption of blacks is much lower than that of whites, such observations are not likely to arouse enthusiasm of blacks" (Commoner 1968).

Twenty years later, certain constituencies of today's movement are still trying to cope with the racist and sexist nature of environmental degradation to involve minorities in environmental affairs. They seek to rework the movement's image and change it from being white and middle-class to being culturally diverse. Earth Day planners in Rolling Stone summarized this concern: "The demographics of the environmental movement stink. It's white, it's middle class, it's highly educated." The author of the magazine article also indicated: "Earth Day planners hope to reach out to constituencies that aren't currently involved in the environmental movement, including organized labor, religious groups, minorities and the poor.... In the next few weeks, Jesse Jackson will tour the country to urge support for Earth Day in minority communities, where environmentalism is seen as a luxury."
By their very nature, social movements are reconstitutive in that they question the old and offer the new. The movement was interpellated in a negative manner, but spokespersons chose to answer the hail, such as it may have been, to gain the necessary media coverage and the possibility of reconstituting identities. The environmental movement, as a maintenance measure, must respond rhetorically to reposition itself. Social movement constituencies recognized the fact that, to a certain degree, misconceptions prevail today and feel the need to manage their identities. All-in-all, the environmental movement needed to present itself as a viable effort, that social change on behalf of the environment is possible, and that activism can play an important role in making that possibility a reality. The following discussion illustrates attempts at reconstituting these identities in this manner.

**Responding Rhetorically Via the Mass Media**

When environmental activists attempt to overcome identity problems by articulating new identities in mass and movement-produced rhetorical artifacts, they are participating in the discourse that addresses them throughout the interpellation process. As indicated in the first chapter, interpellation is the ongoing process in which "the public," in this case environmental publics such as mainstream, grassroots and radical, are constituted and reconstituted, hailed such as they are, and made to seem extra-rhetorical. For the
The social movement does not enter into the relationship with the media on equal terms. The balance of wills tips in favor of the media. The argument that social movements are equally powerful to the mass media on their own grounds is not being made here. In reality, even how activists respond is influenced by the mass media. If the premise that the mass media influence public perceptions is accepted, it follows that rhetorical responses to these images are also influenced by the mass media. As David Berg summarized, since perceptions of society are expanded by the mass media "they often play a primary role in shaping the character of rhetorical responses" (Berg 1972). He indicated that there are two kinds of rhetorical responses: 1) those that are a reaction to a defective media-created reality, and 2) those that are a reaction to the knowledge that mass media have reality-creating potential (Berg 1972). Environmental movement
activists, knowing the potential influence of the mass media and feeling the need to manage their public identity, responded to the mass media in both ways specified by Berg.

Secondly, the various constituencies of the social movement did not perceive the mediated image in exactly the same manner. Further, they did not respond rhetorically in the same manner. This makes management of constituency identity a difficult rhetorical challenge, especially in the arena of the mass media that is designed in a manner better able to respond to a single voice rather than a plurality of voices.

Also, the format of the mass media, whether television, magazine or newspaper, placed limits on movement spokespersons. As indicated in the first section of this chapter, the media's penchant for the dramatic plays up the divisions between constituencies. A sense of conflict is manifested and presented as an obstacle to success. Constituencies are limited to two choices then: play up the split to forward their own agenda or to downplay the division and stress unity. Naturally these efforts take up limited air time and column inches that could have been spent on a discussion of issues and plans for improvement. Here, instead of the environment being the focus of concern, environmentalism is. When the activists themselves become the news, valuable opportunities to put forth agendas are lost.

Furthermore, both the social movement and the mass media operate with different agendas in mind. The media need high ratings
representing a strong readership or viewership to entice advertisers and their dollars. Accomplishing this task often involves dramatizing, and at times, over-dramatizing coverage. In general, agendas at both the movement and constituency level include items such as gaining economic and political strongholds or increasing membership. At times these agendas are complementary and, at other times, they are contradictory.

Other constraints include the fact that responses to identity problems include information on the constituencies' perceptions of "the public" as willing and able, apathetic, etc. These perceptions of possible target audiences influence what actions or role "the public" is asked to take in environmentalism.

Anytime social movements attempt to accelerate or slow social change, the burden of proof is on them, there is a presumed order, a belief in the status quo. These restrictions bind or constrain rhetorical responses and orient constituencies toward certain responses over others to maintain narrative continuity. In short, features such as the forcefulness or the nature of appeals are all influenced by a host of factors such as these. Trying to successfully depict a plurality of voices in a harmonious way is difficult.

In addition to these constraints in general, situation specific constraints exist based on factors such as political climate, environmental issue, or availability of scientific information. Moreover, constituencies also have constraints specific to them based on considerations such as public expectations, reputation or budget. Within these constraints, movement activists relied upon four primary
techniques to sustain the movement and maintain rhetorical momentum within the mass media.

*Objectification*

By criticizing other institutions, a constituency can improve its own public identity through comparison. Naming the enemy or opponent is a common means of rhetorical adaptation which creates a sense of unity and can operate on a variety of different levels. In his study of Black revolutionary rhetoric, Arthur Smith identified four rhetorical strategies used in the movement: vilification, objectification, legitimation and mythification (Smith 1969). Two of these means are employed in the discourse sampled for this project.

Beginning with objectification, it calls attention to the opposition in an effort to realign power structures, however, the opponent is ill-defined (Smith 1969). As previously stated, government and industry are traditionally labeled the enemy, "the establishment." Occasionally agencies like the EPA or Department of the Interior are named, or industries like oil or logging companies are named, but this is done in broad generalizations.

The Earth Day 1990 celebration became a situation-specific constraint. Targeting a particular enemy became quite difficult since even the most staunch politicians and profit-motivated corporate leaders were "going green." For this reason, as Smith would say, the enemy remained ill-defined as "industry groups," "the traditional system," "official Washington," *etc*
Targeting both government and industry in general as enemies, a Natural Resources Defense Council lawyer stated in *Rolling Stone*:

"The environment isn't a cheap vote anymore. Even the good guys are very sensitive to the pressure that can be laid on them by the various industry groups, which are there with a vengeance." In *The Washington Post*, a different NRDC member stated: "To be effective, the environmental movement needs to keep its distance from government officials." Another stated: "The squeaky wheel gets the grease, and we weren't getting the grease through the traditional system" (Weisskopf 1990).

Each of these statements is an attempt to distance what is commonly referred to as "the establishment." Instead of naming a Bush or a Sununu or a Mobil or an Exxon, vague terms such as "traditional system" or "industry groups" were used. The NRDC tried to appear independent of these institutions or to set itself apart from "the establishment" in general by objectifying it. This device was appropriate for the task of creating an autonomous identity, its primary image problem in the mass media, since it enabled the conservative constituency to point the finger at "the establishment" yet not alienate the political and industrial leaders it needs to work with on a regular basis. One very important constituency-specific constraint was how the NRDC could not afford to make real enemies out of the images of ill-defined enemies it created in the mass media. To do so would have diminished its political standing on Capitol Hill.

In this manner, objectification was a safe and prudent rhetorical device to employ in the interpellation process. The NRDC interpellated
its identity as an independent entity through objectification. Naming ill-defined enemies in "the establishment" helped to fend off accusations launched by other constituencies regarding cooptation and made the NRDC look independent of the sources it was criticizing. Furthermore, since the mainstream's prominence made its primary identity problem for the movement as a whole, the mainstream's use of this device in its reconstitutive rhetoric indirectly helped to confront a movement-level problem as well.

The grassroots also objectified "the establishment." In a *Rolling Stone* interview, Dennis Hayes of the grassroots group Earth Day 1990 said: "We were in a trajectory through the Seventies that would have put us in terrific shape. . . . Then after ten years of robust success, we ran into the Reagan revolution. And it just devastated us." He continued: "the number one issue for the movement today is global warming. . . . which has so far generated much talk and little action in official Washington."

By making government and industry look incompetent, the grassroots made themselves look knowledgeable and necessary in comparison. Since the government was unwilling to confront environmental problems, the grassroots would have to become involved. The grassroots, in trying to confront its primary identity problem, offered an image of itself as politically sophisticated and involved.

Objectification was also used against other constituencies by the grassroots. Downgrading the mainstream in a *Newsweek* article, one
grassroots activist explained: "I think we've go so many more people out there who are willing to do things, and yet there are fewer groups that are actually asking anything of these people other than to send a check. With groups like us nipping at their heels, the mainstream groups are going to take stronger positions." Essentially, grassroots groups, tired of taking a back seat to mainstream groups and of being treated as "mom and pop" operations, worked to depict themselves as if they could do battle with the heavyweight mainstream groups. In the *Washington Post*, one activist argued: "People at the grassroots level live these fights. The Big 10 groups fight them in intellectual terms." She continued: "Group-of-Ten environmentalists share the social class, educational backgrounds and values of officials in industry and government... They work on issues of control - how much poison a community can drink, how many people can die from a particular process. It's the same mentality as government and industry" (Foote 1990). Another activist argued in the same source: "The big conservation groups make deals, saying that waste has to go somewhere, but they don't have to live with it" (Foote 1990).

Knowing the mass media's penchant for the dramatic, the grassroots consistently downgraded the mainstream in this sample. This drama enabled the grassroots to make themselves appear more competent and effective in comparison, but did so in a very general way. The other constituencies did not downgrade each other in the mass media. While the fact that the grassroots objectified the mainstream added fuel to the fire for the mass media's attempt to dramatize internal dissensions, had other, more drastic rhetorical
techniques been used, matters could have been made worse. Objectification did stifle the interpellation process at the movement level in that the identity management problem of internal factionalism was further manifested rather than overcome. Here, NAS's partial gain was the movement's loss.

More interesting is the fact that the enemy is ill-defined for a good reason. The task of finding specific enemies is harder for the environmental movement than other movements. Black activists could oppose Whites. Feminist activists could oppose men. But, the environmental movement is constrained by the situation. Since everyone contributes to environmental degradation -- though be it some more than others -- and since the traditional culprits, government and industry, are no longer an easy target due to environmental advertising and other public relations efforts, environmental activists are left opposing an ill-defined enemy.

In sum, format, constituency and situation-specific constraints influenced the rhetorical responses. At the constituency level, both NAS and NRDC objectified "the establishment" to manage their separate identities. This also cultivated autonomy and therefore did influence identity management at the movement level in a positive way. However, NAS's objectification of another constituency cancelled this gain out by further developing the problem of internal factionalization. The radicals appeared less oppositional and did not engage in objectification.

At the movement level, since opposition to "the establishment" was becoming increasingly difficult to justify via the mass media, and
since constituencies were competing for media attention, the attempt to manage the problems of internal factionalism, lack of cultural diversity and substantiveness with the use of objectification did not successfully advance the interpellation process. In fact, while it partially enabled constituencies to deal with their own identity problems, and did present the movement as autonomous, it cost the movement a united front.

*Legitimation*

Although the subject of rhetor intentionality brings to mind a heated debate within the field of rhetorical theory and criticism -- a dilemma rooted in the adversity to intentionality in literary criticism -- this project takes rhetoric as a practical art and will examine the underlying motivation using the rhetorical technique of legitimation.

To begin, to legitimate the use of conservative tactics called into question by the grassroots, the mainstream turned the tables by questioning the tactics used by the radicals at the opposite extreme. This maneuver shifts the spotlight of scrutiny from NRDC to EF! and enabled NRDC to take the offensive instead of being defensive. Because of a constituency-specific constraint -- the conservative mainstream must fulfill its reputation by responding in a measured, conservative manner -- that suits its affluent, highly educated, socially powerful audience. The mainstream chose to make the most of the status quo and to depict the radicals as a threat to that status quo. In a *PrimeTime Live* interview, a Sierra Club spokesperson responded to
a question about Earth First!'s take-it-to-the-streets tactics and the adverse effects of them on conservative environmental efforts as follows: "A backlash is possible, particularly if violence occurs. And it's difficult to prevent violence." Conservative efforts are legitimated as safe, secure and nonviolent in comparison. Later, responding to an accusation that the mainstream had gone soft on the old-growth forest issue, he replied: "I don't think it's possible with the use of demonstrations to actually slow down the logging cut." The implication forwarded here is that demonstrations such as those of EF! are not effective and thus other measures must be relied upon.

Here the mainstream, legitimized its approach to environmentalism by delegitimizing another constituency. This, maneuver combined with constituency interrelationships framed as a state of dissension by the mass media, forced a rhetorical response from the radical constituency. This response primarily employed two techniques: legitimation and martyrdom.

Drawing from literature in rhetorical theory and criticism, Robert Scott examined legitimation by analyzing the rhetoric of Black Power and concluded that despite its threatening nature, it could still be interpreted as consistent with democratic culture; it was not so much a recommendation of violence as a justification of it. A key word in this justification is defense, including self-defense, and a constant theme within the justification is the search for new identity (Scott 1968). Of particular concern for this project, Scott claimed that the mass media filter messages in such a way that audiences are more likely to hear calls to arms than explanations. Likewise, Arthur Smith explained
that rhetors answer opponents in a refutative manner. In his analysis: "the Black revolutionist seeks to explain, vindicate and justify the activists involved in the movement" (Smith 1969).

The argument that the intent of the radical constituency of the environmental movement, under fire from movement moderates, sought to explain, vindicate and justify their tactics through the use of a variety of support will now be forwarded. Using emotional proof, Earth Firstlers explained: "We feel like there are insane people who are consciously destroying our earth and we are compelled to fight back," and "...we feel like cornered animals," (Foote 1990), and "You develop for all living organisms the affection you have for your relatives and you don't have any choice but to be as effective as you can against people who are at war with your family," and "We don't think that it is extreme. This is our home" (PrimeTime Live 1990).

These references to family and home downplayed the radical image of "eco-guerrillas," its primary identity problem, and replaced it with an identity easier for the public and as potential members of their target audience to relate to. Certainly these common homespun American values manifest identification between this constituency and "the public" more easily than images of Earth Firstlers dressed in chipmunk suits attending sessions of Congress or spiking redwood trees. Earth Firstl's rhetoric was constrained by its perceptions of "the public." Offering a new set of traditional values to replace the old threatening ones evoked a different emotional response that could then be used to pave the way for acceptance.
Employing logical proofs, Earth Firstlers cited statistics and studies: "At the current rate of cut, the ancient forest could be gone within five years," and "We think it's extreme to cut down 98 percent of old growth forests . . ." (PrimeTime Live 1990), and, in another interview "The more you study ecology, the more radical you become" (Foote 1990). Here radicals structured arguments to make them look commonsensical and logical, not prone to violence or extremism. In their argument, they reacted in a perfectly logical manner to an illogical situation of mass destruction.

Proofs based on credibility were also offered: "We feel that we cannot injure or threaten human beings," and "I've been living in California for over twenty years. It's more like twenty-five years. And I do know what's going on, here" (PrimeTime Live 1990), and "Illegal action is not necessary to be an active contributor . . ." (Foote 1990). Radical members of the movement discussed their policy of non-violence, their experience in ecological matters and respect for the law to gain respect themselves. Consequently, a new image of the radicals complete with a sense of integrity, experience and individual choice, was offered to replace the old terrorist image. These proofs served as a source of legitimation, and forwarded the interpellation process by directly confronting the radical constituency's primary identity problem to make it appear less threatening.

These responses were constrained in a number of ways. The situation influences the radicals' responses in that they need to appear non-threatening in the mass media interviews. As the next chapter will reveal, other situations bring quite another type of response.
Responses were also constrained by the radicals' perceptions of the public wanting less controversial or risky environmentalism. These responses were also constrained by the differing agendas of the mass media and the constituency. On one hand, the mass media wanted to dramatize the radical effort, possibly to gain better ratings. On the other hand, the radicals did not want to help advance this agenda because their top agenda item was to appear non-threatening. At no time in the mass media sample did the radical constituency attempt to manage their identity by recommending violence; they knew they had the burden of proof and justified tactics with proofs based on emotion, credibility and logic. This tactic was considerably more useful for creating an image of "reluctant warriors" than, say another means, such as objectification. As Scott warned, much of the articles and interviews were spent describing illegal or violent acts and much less on explanation or legitimation of the acts as symbolic. And, again as Scott indicated, this effort is put forth as a rhetorical response to an "identity crisis" to deal with the lack of professionalism identity problem.

In sum, at the constituency level, the grassroots were in a good position in that their identity was not challenged and therefore legitimation was not necessary. The mainstream, beginning to feel the pressure from both the other constituencies, indirectly legitimated its tactics. Earth First!, most under fire and with the most work to do in managing its identity, relied heavily upon legitimation and did not offer a call to arms to overcome its terrorist "eco-guerrilla" image. These rhetorical responses were constrained by differing agendas,
perceptions of the audiences and situation and constituency-specific constraints as well. Legitimation was useful to confront identity management problems at the constituency level but did not have much effect on movement level problems.

*Martyrning*

As previously indicated, the mediated image of the radical constituency of the environmental movement is one of terrorist "eco-guerrillas." Being depicted as terrorists is an exigency for the radical constituency because the image of terrorists, in general, strikes fear in the hearts of most Americans, from airline personnel to governments presidents. While fear and violent intimidation maybe a productive means of motivation in other arenas, it is not well-suited for the radical constituency's attempt to rearticulate its public identity in the mass media. Simply stated, terrorists are not easy for most Americans to relate to and would be difficult to create an audience from. The radicals' understanding of this public perception constrained their responses as did the media's desire to dramatize their efforts. Therefore, in addition to legitimation, much of the reconstitutive rhetoric employed the martyrdom theme to target audiences. By depicting themselves as marytrs, not terrorists, the radical constituency, knowing they had the burden of proof, sought to turn the tables and potentially be better received in the mass media.

Martyrdom, as a rhetorical device, is well-integrated into the fabric of American history and folklore. In her examination of the
abolitionist movement, Hazel Wolf noted: "By the third decade of the Nineteenth Century the martyr concept was a revered American tradition. On patriotic holidays, speakers emphasized persecution as a major force . . . the signers of the Declaration of Independence acknowledged their willingness for martyrdom . . ." (Wolf 1952).

In his examination of Eugene Debs' radical arguments, James Darsey detailed how discourses based on Old Testament prophecy and martyrdom contributed to Debs' legendary status. Debs' presented himself as a model of virtue for others to emulate by illustrating his kinship to earlier radicals and his commitment to sacred principles (Darsey 1988). In this work, martyrdom is taken to be the ultimate sacrifice to duty, a "means of making public and visible the private, personal submission to the call; reflecting the nature of charisma, it is the perfect irrational act" (Darsey 1988).

Kurt Ritter, in his work on the American Revolution, argued that the ethos of "the American people" was symbolically created and became a durable and adaptable ideology throughout American history. One means by which this was accomplished is the martyr concept that functions as a moral drama or crusade in which the "clash between good and evil" can be used rhetorically as a political weapon against the oppressor. He argued that there are three requirements the rhetor must fulfill if the martyr technique is to be effective: 1) offer an interpretation of an event which depicts it as a moral crusade, 2) devise ways in which this exploitation can be used to support the rhetor's effort and to diminish the opponent's, and 3) provide a means by which the audience can relive the event rhetorically thus making it
part of their collective memory (Ritter 1978).

Earth First!’s moral crusade is primarily an effort to protect biodiversity in old-growth redwood forests against the perceived economic greed of the logging industry. Monkeywrenching incidents, including pouring sand in engines of heavy equipment, spiking trees and roadblocks, have led to numerous heated quarrels between industry representatives and Earth First! Loggers argued: “Our company position is Earth First! are terrorists, and we don’t negotiate with terrorists” (Foote 1990). To reconstitute their identity within the mass media at the movement level, Earth Firstlers depicted themselves as victims and the logging industry as oppressors.

There are two primary martyr narratives. The first martyr is Dave Foreman, one of the founders of the radical group Earth First! who’s permanent leg injury, incurred from being dragged one-hundred yards by a timber truck, makes him a well-known and charismatic spokesperson for the group. In *Newsweek*, the tale of Foreman’s arrest, along with three other members, by the FBI on charges of conspiring to cut power lines to three nuclear plants and trial complete with 1,500 hours of secret recordings is shared. Or, arguing on behalf of monkeywrenching and in support of Foreman preceeding his trial, one Earth Firstler stated in *Newsweek*: “But Dave Foreman’s crime is that he wants to protect 4 billion years of evolution. I’m proud to be associated with that sort of criminal element.” Such a claim drew upon the symbolicity of civil disobedience as a political source of symbolic power in this country, from Boston harbors to southern Woolworth lunch counters.
Foreman's arrests and prison sentences, like those of Debs, represented how the "willingness to suffer is the most compelling evidence" to use in making one's case (Darsey 1988). Foreman's public display of sacrifice made him a virtuous example for others to emulate.

Judi Bari and Darryl Cherney are also martyrs. These two members of a California based Earth First! group were injured in a car bomb accident in Oakland. At an Earth First! rally against Lousiana Pacific, Cherney was introduced as a guest speaker as follows: "He bombed in Oakland, but he's a big hit up here - Darryl Cherney!" (PrimeTime Live 1990). In a PrimeTime Live interview, the two Earth Firstiers emphasized from their hospital beds: "We're more than innocent, we're victims. . . . Judy and I know that there were a lot of people who didn't like us. We'd been receiving death threats for a long time." Cherney continued: "Judi sits in her hospital bed, wondering if the cross hair of some assassin's rifle scope are not honed in on some environmental activist with the blessings of the Oakland police department and the Federal Bureau of Investigation." Bari and Cherney publicly displayed their willingness to even withstand physical injury for the cause. Their dedication to moral principles, like Debs' dedication to sacred principles of the Old Testament, illustrated their virtuous superiority over the FBI and police to their audiences.

Throughout the series of demonstrations called "Redwood Summer," the discussion of violence, both by and against Earth Firstiers, was a common theme. As Ritter would predict, the group offered an interpretation of the car bombing and arrest events as
moral crusades: save the ancient forests against greedy loggers and corrupt government officials; they are the terrorists and we are the victims of their violence. Earth First! also devised ways to use these events to forward their arguments to their audiences, both in the mainstream and movement-produced media. Arguments on behalf of wilderness and biodiversity and against the "logging frenzy," gained a renewed momentum as Foreman, Bari and Cherney relayed narratives of FBI harassment, secret recordings and the like. Both of these events became part of the collective memory of the their audiences. Earth First!ers enabled these audiences to relive the incidents in the months which followed. As the spotted owl controversy developed, as stories of one logger's crippling accident with a spiked tree crossed the airways, and as the ballot initiative called "Forests Forever" brought further coverage, Earth First!ers responded with the martyr narratives as described above to gain sympathy and support from their perceived audience.

Like legitimation, martyrdom was a strategic choice for the radical constituency in that it helped to overcome constraints brought on by the differing agendas of the constituency and the mass media and the radicals' perceptions of publics. Presenting radical activists from jail cells and hospital beds as martyrs neutralized the discourse and made the constituency appear less threatening in the mass media. More so than other tactics such as objectification, this rhetorical devise was useful for identity management at the constituency level in its response to being addressed as terrorists. The radicals found it
difficult to get their message out due to the fact that the media wanted to spotlight the intrigue of sabotage, violence and conflict, and hailed them as such.

This device was used exclusively by the radicals. The mainstream and grassroots did not need to employ this technique because they were interpellated as conservative or moderate. In fact, despite the use of the martyr theme on the part of the radicals, the other constituencies continued to distance themselves from the radicals. Martyrdom did not influence the identity of the movement as a whole.

_Languaging Strategies_

In his work, "Presidential Motives for War," Robert Ivie illustrated how the American vocabulary of war was a source of public persuasion that historically has moved the country from anti-war to pro-war (Ivie 1974). Examining the vocabulary of environmental movement constituencies is also useful for understanding motives and how the interpellation process operates. The rhetoric employed in the contemporary environmental movement is ripe with languaging strategies that strive to develop a bond between the movement and Mother Nature. These strategies place the movement in a more "natural setting." Even the constituency references, "mainstreaming" and "grassroots," though commonly used in other contexts, seemed particularly fitting for the environmental movement. A new vocabulary of movement jargon
also exemplified this trend. The prefix "eco-" added to just about any other word constitutes much of this vocabulary including: "eco-thug," "eco-guerrilla," "ecotage," "ecodefense," and "eco-enthusiasm." Much of this jargon found its way into messages focusing on the radical constituency. Another portion of this vocabulary popularized the color green, especially in discussions of politics and environmentalism including: the "greening" of politics, the "green vote," "greenheads," and the "Big Green" (California ballot initiative).

Examining self-references as a language strategy is also very useful to illustrate how constituency-specific constraints came into play. The disparity among the constituencies is reflected by the fact that the term "movement" itself is seldom used by activists. In fact, only three of the selections use the term: once in the national newspaper, three times in the television news program and six times in the music entertainment magazine. Over half of the time, participants tend to speak in terms of their own experiences within their own organization, for example as an "Auduboner." Instead of speaking as a member of the movement, participants refer to themselves in organization-specific or constituency-specific terms such as "big conservation groups," "grassroots groups," "activist groups," "environmental groups," "mainstream groups," "community groups," etc to create their audiences. Interestingly enough, the term "radical" is never used by movement activists in the mass media despite the fact that it is such a point of controversy. As one activist explained in a Newsweek article: "'Radical' is a very sensitive word among these people . . . " The mainstream shares a similar though
complementary concern in another article in The Washington Post.
"Charges of elitism and 'limousine environmentalism' touch a sensitive nerve . . . ."

Surprisingly, a common root metaphor is missing from this environmental movement vocabulary, such as "communism-as-cancer," identified in Edwin Black's analysis of the rhetoric of the Radical Right, or "spaceship Earth" so much a recurrent feature in the rhetoric of the early environmental movement in the Seventies. Made famous by Buckminster Fuller in his book, Operating Manual for Spaceship Earth, and coinciding with the first publicized photographs of Earth from space in 1969, this metaphor historically represents the growing awareness on the part of the American public of the true meaning of a global perspective. As Hans Magnus Enzensberger summarized: "The central ideological theme of the ecological debate as it is at present conducted - it is perhaps at its very heart - is the metaphor of 'spaceship Earth'" (Enzensberger 1977).

Taking such metaphors as stylistic tokens, Black argued that there is a connection between rhetorical style and outlook (Black 1970). However, not once in this data sample, by either movement activists or others, does this once common token reappear. A specific turning point at which time the use of this metaphor stopped cannot be identified; it simply faded away. If Black is correct, it follows that the discontinuance of the metaphor "spaceship Earth" reflects a possible change in outlook. Examining this gradual change may lead to a better understanding of today's environmental movement.
Upon closer examination, the "spaceship Earth" metaphor may have suited the early movement but for several reasons does not suit the agenda of today's movement. A spaceship is a technological wonder of phenomenal proportions, and while technology of the same massive scale was once offered as a panacea for all environmental problems, skepticism of technology grew over the years to come and is more characteristic of today's movement.

Also, more recent arguments forwarded at the twentieth anniversary of Earth Day tried to embrace minorities and their relationship to environmental degradation. These issues were naturally discussed by the civil rights minded at the time of the first Earth Day, but those discussions focused more on how to keep the civil rights and environmental movements compatible. The true connections between exploitation of races and exploitation of natural resources were just beginning to be understood. The "spaceship Earth" metaphor implies two incorrect assumptions in this regard, that there is room on board for all -- despite obvious problems such as overpopulation and landfills, and that there is no difference between first class and coach -- despite the obvious differences between first and third world resources and capabilities.

Last, another difference between the early and recent efforts in environmentalism reflected in this metaphor is how earlier outlooks saw humankind "in domination of" nature while the present outlook reflects the aspiration of living "in harmony with" nature. The metaphor of "spaceship Earth" implies the ability to engineer, steer and master controls and of having a clear sense of direction, which are
now questioned in various degrees. Taken together, these three key difference illustrate that a new root metaphor for today's environmental movement, one to replace "spaceship Earth," is needed. Upon close examination of the selected rhetorical artifacts in this data sample, such a new common root metaphor is missing; this may signal that a common outlook shared among constituencies is also missing.

In sum, movement vocabulary contributes to developing a certain identity and reflects constituency-specific constraints. Discontinuing the use of the "spaceship Earth" metaphor represents an important change in perspective. In both mass and movement-produced media, the movement is in need of a replacement to reflect a common outlook. At the constituency level, each used languaging strategies to manage their identities and while this may work at this level, it only manifested the movement's problems of internal factionalization.

Taken together, these four rhetorical devices represent attempts to reconstitute identity within the mass media and within all the constraints the media place upon social movement rhetoric as well as situation and constituency-specific constraints. Oftentimes, the movement's identity was negatively affected. These attempts at identity management will now be evaluated using the theory of constitutive rhetorics as a guide.

Implications

Earth Day 1990 was of strategic importance for the contemporary environmental movement. This was the time to re-establish itself
once again as a mass movement. Ironically, activists had an oil company -- EXXON after the catastrophic Prince William Sound oil spill -- to thank for providing the requisite public awareness and support of environmental problems and improvement. Ironically, activists had a Republican from Texas -- George Bush claiming to be "the environmental president" -- to thank for providing the requisite political momentum. A prime opportunity for revitalizing the environmental movement was in the making, an opportunity that was unlikely to present itself again before the close of the Twentieth Century. Earth Day 1990 was a symbolic event explicitly designed for making the most of this opportunity. Analysis of the coverage shortly before and after this event reveals how competing constituencies manage their identities via the mass media and the impact of this on the identity of the overall movement.

The fact that such an immense and deeply varied effort as the environmental movement recognized the importance of media coverage, found ways to gain it, analyzed its public images and attempted to reorient those images is remarkable in and of itself. The movement's "skillfull orchestration of the media," a compliment from The Washington Post, clearly illustrated its ability to influence public opinion about issues as well as its own identity. However, some attempts at rhetorically repositioning the movement were more fitting than others. The techniques of objectification, legitimation, martyrdom and languaging strategies addressed some of the identity problems, but not all.
To begin, early in this chapter, the review of literature contributed by scholars such as Jenkins, Gitlin, Berg and others forwarded several conclusions which hold true for this case study as well. The movement, as predicted, kicked off the nineties with a large-scale media event to capture the nation's and the world's attention. The movement needed the media to get "the environmental decade" off the ground and the media needed the movement to get that day's headlines. The media proceeded to marginalize the radicals as terrorist "eco-guerrillas" and the differences between constituencies were magnified.

Charland would say that core themes about environmentalism and the movement were questioned. The existence of the "environmental movement," interpellated such as it was, was made to look natural and necessary despite the fact that it owes its existence to the discourse that articulated it. Charland specified that collective political subjects must be "called into being" or repositioned through interpellation and necessitating action. Successful reconstitutive rhetorics alter discursive positions and provide a means of resolving, in this case, identity management problems and offering, in this case, different identities. Having detailed how constituencies and the movement were interpellated and the need for reconstituting the movement's identity and having reviewed various techniques and attempts made at this repositioning in this sample of rhetorical artifacts, it is now possible to more thoroughly evaluate this effort using Charland's two step process.
The movement was forced to respond rhetorically to the media's magnification of differences among constituencies. The ill-defined opposition, combined with organization-specific self-references and the lack of a unifying root metaphor, suggests that constituencies were unable to articulate a vision of the movement that would successfully integrate the competing constituencies. The technique of objectification used at the constituency level to downgrade the mainstream did not help the first identity problem, internal factionalism. The point that constituencies did not wish to alienate or directly challenge the existing power structure in the mass media can also be made. Overall, the attempt to interpellate the movement as a unified front was unsuccessful because each constituency's efforts at rhetorical repositioning cancelled out the efforts of other constituencies.

Little attention was paid to the problem of cultural diversity either. Apparently constituencies felt that, of the specified problems at the movement level, internal factionalism was potentially the most damaging. The effort to interpellate a different perspective was not made nor was a means of resolving this problem developed.

As for the third identity management problem specified in the second section of this chapter, the misconception of the movement as lacking substance, activists did not reorient the rhetoric sufficiently to clearly illustrate the professionalization and maturation of environmental groups. Though languaging strategies were used to a small degree to present the movement as "expert," how they have learned from past successes and failures, could have been used as a
source of credibility through legitimation, yet this rhetorical opportunity was missed. Additionally, the Earth Day hoopla, though it made the movement appear "slick with substance," and culturally diverse since it involved communities nationwide and worldwide, backfired in that it further manifested the problem of autonomy by focusing on electoral politics and mass media coverage.

However, the use of objectification on the part of the grassroots and mainstream was a strategic rhetorical choice for the autonomy problem. The radical constituency really did not need to contribute to this effort since it is already interpellated as alien or oppositional to government and industry.

The reconstitutive rhetorics employed in these efforts are perhaps better reflected in the individual agendas of each constituency. For the mainstream, their rhetoric must set them apart from the "establishment" so as not to look coopted, yet not alienate it. The mainstream successfully reconstituted its identity by opting, not to justify claims of elitism through defensive responses, but instead to distance itself from "the establishment" through objectification and legitimation. However, in so doing, the mainstream was still interpellated as a class of experts which may help it in the political arena and for the overall movement, but it distances citizens as potential audience members. Their languaging strategies also served to distance citizens. The discourse of the mainstream is a surrogate discourse, claiming to represent the public as much as elected officials or legal counsel. Essentially, they relieved the citizenry of its social responsibility and perhaps its social power. Professionalism can
become too much of a good thing and NRDC seemed to overcompensate. The mainstream used the least number of rhetorical devices to respond since its identity problem was less challenging than those of the other constituencies.

The grassroots, since they must counteract the image of narrow-visioned single issue "NIMBY patrols," stayed away from discussing any one particular concern, oftentimes overcompensating by not discussing issues at all. Also, in trying to dethrone the mainstream, the grassroots denounced it through objectification yet was careful enough in their phrasing not to be automatically associated with the radicals as a repercussion of being anti-mainstream. Through objectification and languaging strategies, the grassroots successfully created a discursive position for itself as a contender in the political battle; it showed that the grassroots can work and that it has a clear understanding of the in's and out's of environmentalism.

For the radical constituency, rhetoric was bound to discussing feelings and tactics, not issues. Since so much of their coverage is spent justifying past actions, little room or time was left for discussing issues or future courses of action. The radical constituency neutralized its discourse through martyrdom and legitimation to enable audiences to relate better to its cause and downplayed internal schisms. Switching public attention from their tactics to the motivation of the mainstream was a strategic attempt at identity management at the constituency level. Since its problems were most challenging, the radical constituency employed the most varied rhetorical devices.
All in all, the radical constituency interpellated the grassroots and mainstream in a manner that permitted them to be more demanding yet appear reasonable and moderate in comparison. The grassroots "nip[ped] at the heels" of the mainstream to keep it from getting too comfortable with government and industry officials. The mainstream used "the system" to get important environmental laws on the books. Diversity makes the movement less likely to be coopted as David Brower once argued: "if we all got together and became one efficient organization, Exxon could buy us with petty cash" (Foote 1990). Diversity also gives a wide range of citizens a wide range of organizations to identify with and match their talents and interests to, offering "something for everyone."

By answering the hails of the media, and the other constituencies, each constituency sought the opportunity to redefining that identity and tried to replace the old with the new by realigning power relations within the movement. These attempts were moderately successful at the constituency level, but identity management at the movement level was adversely affected. At the most practical level, this could be explained by the fact that the environmental organizations that comprise these constituencies are in competition with one another, not only for media access, but for membership and the dollars these memberships represent. Both media coverage and money are symbols of power. With only so many charity dollars to go around, the hundreds of different environmentally-focused non-profit organizations must compete with one another simply to cover operating costs.
Interpellation was not completely successful in these initial attempts at the time of Earth Day 1990. Once hailed in a deficient manner, constituencies responded in order to gain media coverage and the possibility of redefining those negative images, but their efforts were not always successful and many of the identity problems were not directly confronted. It follows that the basis for appealing to action by addressing their publics directly is lacking, too. Necessitating action was problematic in that, of the attributed statements and direct quotes referring to movement activism, only three action items were placed on the movement's agenda: "the environmental movement needs to keep its distance from government officials," "We've got to start embracing some of the other issues, to build a coalition, broaden the agenda and once again become the movement," and "our movement needs to be [diversified]." Even obvious goals such as "cleaning the environment" or "educating the public" are not made. At the constituency level, goals included: "creating a climate for change," "to protect four billion years of evolution," "our focus is government action," "not only to win the damage suit . . . but to convince people across the city that South Side pollution affects everybody," "We have to stop reacting and start acting," and "We seek equal fight for all species."

Close examination of these agenda items at both the movement and constituency levels reveals a troublesome conclusion: no specific action steps, as Charland would say, are necessitated for the audience. Instead, these agenda items are cast as broad generalizations. Charland emphasized that, unless specific actions are offered, these
rhetorics cannot be successful. This observation was thoroughly supported in Raymie McKerrow's criticism of the antimasonic movement that attributed the decline of the movement to the fact that its strategies did "not tell the community what the resulting policies or actions should be. While it confirms a particular ideology, it does not provide solutions to specific social issues. It does not, in and of itself, constitute a positive case..." (McKerrow 1989). At this point, McKerrow's conclusions about the failure of antimasonic rhetoric could likewise be applied to that of the environmental movement.

In addition to efforts on the part of rhetorical theorists and critics in this area, other scholars have arrived at similar conclusions. For at least two decades, action has been a focus of environmental education. David Hawkins and Dennis Vinton summarized: "Above all, environmental education is oriented toward the development of values that are translated, ultimately, into action..." (Hawkins and Vinton 1973). Previously the inference operating throughout the field was that awareness led to effective citizenship responsibilities; this was found to be not necessarily the case. According to William Stapp, and many others, information aimed directly at environmental action strategies is needed (Stapp 1978). These scholars emphasized that audiences are more likely to become involved in environmental efforts if they are aware, not only of the problems, but of how they can have a direct impact on decision-makers or the problems. Likewise, Harold Hungerford and R. Peyton argued that developing an awareness of environmental issues, and one could say of the environmental movement itself, is insufficient if the goal is to
persuade people to commit and to act upon an environmental ethic. These scholars set out to develop a three part model of environmental action that identified and defined categories, levels and constraints on action (Hungerford and Peyton 1977). Essentially these scholars suggested that informing audiences of problems is altogether different than informing them of courses of action to take in solving them.

Much the same difference exists between persuading an audience to accept the general goals of a social movement and persuading an audience to agree on specific actions to be taken. There is an implicit acceptance and endorsement of the status quo or that change should occur within existing institutions. If the mass media are not the place for these suggestions, then references to other vehicles should be made -- though this is less direct and potentially less effective. This situation could easily be characterized by Dewey, Lippman, Habermas and others as indicative of the crisis in the public sphere. The poor conditions of public debate, lack of specific information on participation, class of social experts, etc., all relieved audiences of public duties.

In the case of the environmental movement at the twentieth anniversary of Earth Day, public opinion polls clearly illustrated a concern for the environment and acceptance of the general goal of environmental improvement. The time was right for putting forth a course of action, and perhaps a social critique by environmental movement activists. Such a critique did not make the airwaves or printing presses, but as Charland explained, interpellation and
necessitating action, whether completely successful or not, "positions the collective subject in the material world." The grassroots is in a position that it must follow through by working on a variety of issues, with diverse sources yet not be associated with the mainstream. The radical constituency is in a position that it must neutralize its message for public consumption, limit the number of ecotage incidents, and cover up internal squabbles. The mainstream will maintain its position as lawyer and researcher and try not to appear too close to "the establishment."

All-in-all, the environmentalism made a strong showing in the Earth Day mass media blitz, if not in quality than in quantity. Though the movement was interpellated in a manner that brought forth negative images, constituencies answered the hails to gain coverage and a chance to rework those negative images. The price paid for this coverage was to risk failure of reconstitutive rhetorics. Environmentalists identified and responded to identity management problems through a variety of rhetorical strategies. While they did not significantly ameliorate problems at the movement level, they did have better luck at constituency level. Efforts must be put forth to overcome movement level problems since they left an impression of organizational incapacity. As the literature reviewed in Chapter One emphasized, this severely threatens mobilizational capacity. Reconstituting these identities to overcome the lack of cultural diversity, substantiveness, autonomy and internal factionalism would improve audience impressions of organizational and mobilizational
capacity. At this point, however, the movement was found to be reactive, not proactive.

In sum, this study of rhetorical artifacts illustrated how activists attempted to respond to crises in the collective identity of the movement and at the constituency-level by employing reconstitutive rhetorics. This portion of the project has identified general constraints, specific identity problems at both the movement and constituency levels, and described strategies used to manage these identity problems through reconstitutive rhetorics. This reflective analysis clearly reveals that multiple coexisting factions use rhetoric differently to manage their identities. Treating movements as homogeneous efforts hides the rhetorical richness and should be avoided. Also, rhetoric fulfills a variety of tasks in social movements and one important function not examined until now is how movements must strive to manage competing identities rhetorically.
CHAPTER III

IDENTITY MANAGEMENT, RECONSTITUTIVE RHETORICS,
AND MOVEMENT-PRODUCED MEDIA

The Role of Movement-Produced Media

Mass media are not the only arena in which social movements attempt to manage their public identities. Movements employ reconstitutive rhetorics in their own publications as well. Most movement organizations operate publication offices that produce annual reports, newsletters, public service announcements, books, videos and more. Naturally the quality and quantity of these publications vary according to annual budgets and staff size, but many of the mainstream publications could hold their own in a comparison to those of the Fortune 500 companies and many of the readerships total in the hundreds of thousands. These publications are an important source of data for understanding how reconstitutive rhetorics function and for understanding the factional and institutional nature of movements. Taking the primary research question and second objective together, the research question for this chapter becomes: Once constituted, how do competing constituencies within social movements manage their
identities in movement-produced media and how does this influence the identity of the overall movement?

The data sample for this portion of the project is comprised of movement-produced newsletters collected through annual membership. Specifically, articles focusing upon environmental activism will be used. Newsletters were chosen since they are more likely to discuss environmental activism and because they are the one type of publication that each of the three organizations represented in this study produce. They are an authentic depiction of the movement's power to respond on their own grounds to mainstream media and in setting their own agendas. As indicated in the first chapter, discourses from three different organizations, ranging from centralized and bureaucratic to decentralized and informal, represent particular constituencies of the environmental movement: the Natural Resources Defense Council represents the conservative mainstream, the National Audubon Society represents the politically moderate grassroots, and Earth First! represents the radical faction. A description of these coexisting organizations and their newsletters, as well as related theoretical literature, follows.

Founded in 1970, the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) has a reported membership of 130,000 people and an operating budget of $16 million. With offices in New York City, Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Los Angeles and Honolulu, the staff of 150 persons focuses its efforts on scientific research and legislation. The Board of Trustees includes graduates from Brown, Columbia, Harvard, Princeton, Stanford, Yale, etc. (Weisskopf 1990; Petulla 1987; and NRDC July/Aug., 1990).
The name of NRDC’s newsletter is *Newsline*. This twelve-page document is printed on white 8” x 11” paper five times per year. The subhead is "The power of law, science, and people in defense of the environment." Each issue regularly prints photographs, articles, editorials, side bars, and features including: "Inside NRDC," "Members' Bulletin Board," "Updates," and "Publications." Occasionally letters-to-the-editor are included. In the three newsletters published within the six-month time frame of this study, four articles discussed activism. Selections include: "Wanted: Volunteers to Run NRDC Booths on Earth Day" (NRDC March/April, 1990), "Members Run 400 NRDC Booths on Earth Day," "One Last Chance to Strengthen the Clean Air Act" (NRDC May/June, 1990), and "Adversaries: A Love Story" (NRDC July/Aug., 1990).

The National Audubon Society (NAS), as one of the oldest groups in "the Big Ten," has a membership of 580,000 people and one of the largest operating budgets of $35 million. Working primarily through educational efforts, this organization began as a small group of women protesting Florida bird slaughters. Today, the organization describes itself as moderate and has expanded its agenda to include conservation efforts on behalf of wetlands, old-growth forests, the Artic National Wildlife Refuge and clean air. Headquarters are located in both New York city and Washington, D. C. with nine other field offices and numerous local, grassroots groups working throughout the nation (Weisskopf 1990 and NAS Jan./Feb., 1990).

The National Audubon Society's newsletter, *Audubon Activist*, is printed bimonthly on sixteen pages of newsprint folded in half. While
its does not have a subhead, it regularly publishes articles, side bars, cartoons, sketches and photographs, and regular features including two editorials, "Field Notes," and "Conservation Issue Updates." Usually each issue focuses upon one "action priority," such as wetlands or global warming. Selections from the three newsletters published in the six-month time frame include: "Earth Day Will Kick Off a New Day of Activism" (NAS Jan./Feb., 1990), "A Single Day: A Commitment for Life," "Earth Day: 20 Years Ago, The Birth of A Movement ... Today, A Time to Meet the Challenges of a New Decade," "What's in a Name?" "Letter of the Month Club: An Audubon Idea for a Better World" (NAS March/April, 1990), and "Audubon Action Alerts: A Grassroots Call to Arms" (NAS May/June, 1990).

Founded in 1980, Earth First! (EFl) insists on its exclamation point, insists that it "is not an organization, but a movement," and insists that it has no members, leaders or headquarters. The annual budget is $60,000. "Membership" is estimated to be between 500 and 50,000 - these figures represent a distinction: 500 active members, 50,000 subscribers and supporters. Based on beliefs in biocentrism and deep ecology, the "organization's" slogan is "No Compromise in Defense of Mother Nature," and its emblem is a green clenched fist. Earth First! divides itself into various entities including local groups, the Direct Action Fund, the Foundation, the Rendevous, the Journal Wilderness Preserves and Task Forces. Task forces include: Rainforest Action Group, Grizzly Bear Task Force, Biodiversity Project, Overgrazing Task Force, Preserve Appalachian Wilderness (PAW), Wolf Action Network and ORV Task Force (EFl May, 1990 and undated pamphlet).
The *Earth First! Journal* is published eight times a year on pagan holidays. This forty-page newsprint document is folded in half, and, during the six-month time frame, the subhead changed from "The Radical Environmental Journal," to "In Defense of Wilderness and Biodiversity." Significant portions of this journal are comprised of reader contributions which may be submitted typed, printed, on Macintosh computer disks, or via the computer network, Econet. Each issue includes an editorial entitled, "Ramblings," letters to the editors, chapter updates called "Tribal Lore," the EF! Directory for local, national, and international addresses, EF! Bulletins, cartoons, sketches and photographs, book reviews, advertisements called "Trinkets and Snake Oil," and regular features including "Roadkill," "Greenfire," and "Dear Ned Ludd." Eight articles on activism from the four newsletters published in the six-month time frame include: "Social Ecology and Deep Ecology Meet," "The Politics of Environmental Compromise," "Radical Environmentalism: Carrying on a Venerable Tradition" (EF! Feb., 1990), "Earth Day, EF! and the Ecology Movement" (EF! March, 1990), "Freedom Riders Needed to Save the Forest," "How the Journal Works" (EF! May, 1990), "Redwood Summer Goes On!" and "Response to Violence" (EF! June, 1990).

Among other movement-produced publications, these newsletters are recognized carriers of plans and policies, attitudes and viewpoints much the same as in-house organs of non-profit organizations and businesses. Harry Levinson emphasized the importance of examining such publications in any thorough investigation of how organizations function when he explained that in-house organs are "newsy" yet
blantly political (Levison 1972). George Cheney's study of the rhetoric of identification in organizational communication also supports this claim (Cheney 1983). Much the same can be said of the publications of social movement organizations.

Developing such channels of communication is a response to both the quantity and quality of mass media coverage of social movements. Due to the difficulty of gaining media access and the oftentimes distorted depictions of themselves and their efforts as described in the previous chapter, movement activists develop and expand upon their own vehicles of communication. In her study of the women's liberation movement, Kathleen Turner explained: "The shift in emphasis from mass to a select audience led to a plethora of books, journals, newspapers, newsletters and short essays . . . " (Turner 1980). This prolific press has as one of its primary goals the function of identity management through constitutive and reconstitutive rhetorics. In part, it represents what Joseph Petulla has described as the general maturation of environmental groups (Petulla 1987), and also illustrates a degree of institutionalization on the part of the movement.

As in other fields, most studies in environmental communication of activist discourse focus on mass media coverage in newspapers, television nature programs and mass magazines including those which are nature oriented such as *Field & Stream* and *Outdoor Life* (See for example: Sellers and Jones 1973-74; Forter and Lyon 1985; Belak 1972; McGrechy 1988-89 , and others). There are a few exceptions which examine environmental publications or compare them to mass media sources -- though none work with newsletters. For example, in
John Hoestrey and James Bowman's study of the National Audubon Society's and the Sierra Club's magazines, they found that Sierra Club was aggressive in expressing its opinion on issues and political action and that the National Audubon Society reported more objectively and was becoming more politically oriented (Hoestrey and Bowman 1975-76).

Studies of select samples of activists show that the majority cite conservation groups as the primary source of environmental information (Ostman and Parker 1986-87). Similarly, M. Forrest, in one of the few random sample direct comparisons between environmental activists and non-activists, found a strong positive relationship between activism and use of environmental publications (Forrest 1976). Mark Larson's study of how activist and non-active publics in a random sample used media found both groups to use newspapers and television most, contradicting the assumption that activists would use specialized media rather than mass media for environmental information; however, his findings from a select sample of activists differ in that they cited specialized sources more often as their primary source (Larson 1980). By far, more of these studies examine the use or impact of and problems faced by these sources than their content.

This reflective analysis will contribute to a better understanding of the role these sources play in the environmental movement. Specifically, how reconstitutive rhetorics are employed in these sources for the purpose of identity management will be examined. To that end, this rhetorical criticism will take a functional approach and will use the theory of constitutive rhetorics as a guide. After detailing the identity
management problems and constraints facing the movement, the following section will discuss how the movement responded in its own publications to these problems. This effort will then be evaluated and the implications of this criticism will be discussed in the closing section.

Internal Identity Management Problems
Facing the Environmental Movement

Many of the identity management problems facing the environmental movement are based upon what activists perceive to be a general skepticism on the part of the public and decision-makers. This skepticism took root in the Reagan years with the Gorush/Watt scandals at the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of the Interior. In an effort to revitalize and sustain the movement in the Nineties, reconstitutive rhetorics were employed to transform skepticism into perceptions of viability. The environmental movement must depict degradation as a serious threat as well as depict itself as a viable means of confronting that threat. To do so, a number of identity management problems had to be confronted. The depiction of these identity problems differ from the mass media to the movement-produced media. An attempt was made in both arenas to downplay problems. No new problems are identified in the movement-produced media, though this may have been a good forum for discussions of common concerns.

Only three of the problems identified in the mass media sample are also found in the movement-produced media: autonomy, internal factionalism, and lack of cultural diversity. Interestingly enough, only
spokespersons from the radical constituency identify problems at the movement level: "the environmental movement itself becomes an entrenched political interest, carving for itself a comfortable niche in the prevailing power structure, it will become irrelevant and lose sight of its mission"; "The question of racism is central to ecological concerns, argued Haughton, yet there is very little black participation in the ecology movement, and there is an obvious split between social and ecological issues . . ."; and "the movement has turned that tree into paper, and the paper is turning into a cloud of confetti, a million little issues that go wherever the wind blows them, annoying and shapeless" (Feb., 1990 and March, 1990). The NRDC and NAS never specify problems facing the movement as a whole.

**Internal Identity Management Problems Facing the Mainstream, Grassroots, and Radical Constituencies**

Although identity management problems are not clearly or consistently articulated at the movement level, they are addressed more directly at the constituency level. The NRDC's major challenge was again to assure its audience of members that conservativism is the most effective means of social change. This is similar to the problem identified in the mass media and is again made an issue due to accusations cast by the grassroots and radicals.

As for the moderate grassroots, two primary identity problems need to be addressed. First, as indicated in the previous chapter, grassroots organizations wish to develop the impression that they focus on a variety of concerns, not single issue campaigns and are politically
sophisticated. National Audubon Society follows suit in that it wants to overcome its historical roots as being stereotyped as a group of birdwatchers. While birdwatching is still an important aspect, NAS sets out to reconstitute this image, to further develop it by embracing other environmental issues.

Secondly, similar to the conservative mainstream but not previously mentioned in the mass media, the grassroots constituency feels the need to justify its moderate style of environmentalism and to make it seem enjoyable, not burdensome for its members. Throughout newsletters, readers are typically asked to write letters to their congresspersons or the president. Though writing a letter may not constitute full-fledged activism in the eyes of some people, even these suggestions are described as burdensome by readers. In fact, NAS received complaints from their audience of readers about the vast number of requests for letterwriting. In response, NAS changed several editorial policies making suggested actions less numerous. National Audubon Society had to make less demanding suggestions and present environmentalism as fun and enjoyable, yet make these smaller contributions still look worthwhile and grassroots efforts as fruitful.

Trying to address two audiences simultaneously, the radical constituency's primary problem was internal factionalism regarding issues of confrontation. One faction of EFl worked to reconstitute its identity from being terrorist "eco-guerrillas" and "jail junkies" -- threatening images to many people including their own members -- to "reluctant warriors" and "passive resisters." Also, EFl is based upon
philosophical and spiritual principles foreign to most people. There was an effort put forth to balance its spiritual side with a dose of pragmaticism. Essentially, EFI wanted to become a movement to which the general public and potential members can relate to on a personal basis, to decide as an audience that EFI is the mainstream ecology movement. Taken together, these changes would make for a palatable image for others to relate to.

On the other hand, Earth Firstlers became even more divided because of the extensive government, industry and media attention. EFI went from being, as they put it, "the new kids on the block" in the environmental movement to being a reference point representing other "organizations" in the radical constituency. After the FBI investigations and imprisonments, the other faction wanted to work more within "the system." One faction became concerned that "repression" and scare tactics would frighten Earth Firstlers into submission and therefore diminish its effectiveness. They claimed that EFI was compromising its hard-nosed tactics and becoming bureaucratic in the process. Efforts had to be made to illustrate that EFI can be decentralized yet organized and as radical as it was before the crack-down yet non-threatening.

In light of being hailed in these ways, constituencies were forced to respond as a maintenance measure. Responding would provide an opportunity to reposition themselves through reconstitutive rhetorics. The following discussion illustrates the intricacies of these responses within movement-produced media.
Environmental movement spokespersons participate in the discourse that addresses them by articulating new identities. As they attempt to overcome identity management problems, a number of rhetorical devices are used in the interpellation process. Environmental "publics," such as mainstream, grassroots, or radical, are made to seem "extra-rhetorical." To this end, these rhetorics operate in five primary ways. Before discussing these rhetorics, it is essential to acknowledge that there are obstacles to articulation.

Throughout the movement-produced newsletters the staff writers, as organizational spokespersons, acknowledged the existence of a variety of constraints placed upon their plans for environmentalism including the growing complexity of problems, economic costs, movement dissension, media treatment, and violence. One type of constraint seldom addressed is that on rhetorical responses to identity management problems in their own media. These responses are restricted in movement-produced media just as they are in the mass media; however, because constituencies have the power to operate their own presses, these restrictions are obviously of a different nature. As non-profit institutions, movement publishers need not worry about corporate management policies or advertising pressures. Also important to note is the fact that these publications are acquired through membership. Readers have sought this information on their own accord. However, there are some restrictions placed upon these reconstitutive rhetorics or
obstacles to overcome and they operate at both the movement and constituency levels.

At the movement level, despite the fact that these communications are initially sought out, they are still only one part of a much larger media context. A deluge of information confronts each person each day as a member of various audiences. Environmental communications are only one part of the media context and therefore compete for attention in this arena just as they do for mass media attention. To get and keep this attention, information is often sped up, overdramatized and oversimplified because environmental problems do not lend themselves well to coverage due to scientific complexity and gradual nature.

Moreover, due to limited staff and monetary resources, publications are produced less frequently than most mass media sources. If a major event such as a natural disaster or important bill passes through Congress, the "news" is no longer new by the time it arrives in member mailboxes. Again, ways must be found to energize this information.

Furthermore, movement-produced publications are selective in their coverage of environmentalism. Obviously social movement organizations need to present themselves in the best possible manner to their audience of supporters to keep that support; there is a public relations effort underway in these publications which involves identity management. Oftentimes setbacks are downplayed and discussion of issues is limited to terms of the organization's role - what Audubon is
doing about the Artic Refuge or what NRDC proposes for the Clean Air bill. The "big picture" is missing or distorted.

Constituency-specific constraints include aspects such as working within the current philosophy and agenda, meeting member and administrative expectations, and limited budgets. Of course there are situation-specific constraints, too. Within these constraints and obstacles in mind, movement activists rely upon five primary techniques to manage their identities. Attention is now directed to these devices.

*Objectification and Vilification*

As explained in the second chapter, objectification is a common rhetorical adaptation that creates unity by naming an ill-defined enemy (Smith 1969). In the mainstream's movement-produced publications, objectification is used only against the radical constituency, not against "the establishment" as in the mass media. The NRDC is constrained by the fact that it cannot argue against radical and grassroots accusations in a confrontational manner and still appear professional. In its own sources, the mainstream needs to depict its workings with government and industry leaders in a positive light, not downgrade it and because a mass audience will not be reading the newsletter, only its own audience, NRDC can afford to indirectly acknowledge the role of the radicals without giving it credence in public. In an article, "Adversaries: A Love Story," NRDC discussed a report it commissioned. The article explained that this report determined that compromising and negotiation were more effective than the use of adversarial methods alone. This study
was designed to respond to accusations made by the radical constituency that the mainstream was working too closely with government and industry. This constituency must respond conservatively, a manner to which its audience would be accustomed. Making the radicals appear unreasonable, though not naming names, NRDC emphasized that despite the fact that "'Negotiate' for some environmentalists conjures up deals with the devil, inappropriate compromise or outright capitulation on fundamental issues," it was necessary and effective (NRDC July/Aug., 1990). Essentially the mainstream does not want to change what it does, how it does it, or what it stands for; it need only reconstitute how these aspects are perceived. From their perspective, conservatism is a sign of strength, not a weakness since it accesses important political arenas. The NRDC simply wished to maintain its status and did so by objectifying the constituencies that launched accusations at it.

The grassroots also responded to the radical constituency's tactics through objectification. Though not mentioned by name, the following quote from a sidebar called, "What's in a Name?" clearly referred to groups such as Earth First!: "You don't have to throw yourself in front of a bulldozer to be an activist. Chaining yourself to a tree isn't necessary either" (NAS May/April, 1990). The NAS stressed that any action, no matter how small, constituted activism and that all members are "Tough Birds" no matter what form their actions take. Essentially this maneuver was an attempt to make moderate tactics look effective yet fun. The NAS is constrained by its own selectivity, it policy of discussing environmentalism solely from its own perspective. A discussion of internal factionalism and the role of the radical constituency would not
fit within these parameters. While asking less of its members, NAS had to present these efforts as substantial.

Groups such as Earth First! had upped the ante through their radical tactics and other constituencies were forced to respond to justify their current ways. Noteworthy is the fact that neither the mainstream nor grassroots used objectification as a rhetorical defense against other ill-defined targets such as government or industry, only against this movement constituency. This would seem to indicate that the radical constituency has been successful enough in interpellating its identity that its accusations warrant responses from other constituencies to reassure their audience members that the radicals are misinformed.

Though bearing the brunt of objectification, the radical constituency was able to retort and manage its own identity through objectification. Unlike the other constituencies, however, the radicals launched their attack against government and industry, not against other constituencies of the movement, at least by objectifying them. The situation-specific constraints operating in the mass media no longer came into play in their own medium. When referring to government, Earth First! used terms reminiscent of the European Left such as: "oppressors," "authors of state repression," "technocratic elite," "those powers that would destroy the Earth," "ruling minority" (EF! June, 1990). Stopping just shy of "proletariat" and "bourgeoisie," this terminology, through historical and political association, contributed to the radical's identity as "radicals." The legal system is seen in the same light: "much of this powerlessness is due to the relentless efforts of an elite, aggressive and authoritarian government backed by a corrupt legal
system," and "we need to challenge the hypocrisy of a legal system that is exemplified by the Orwellian Department of Justice and the FBI" (EF! May, 1990). At yet other times, the enemy is even more ill-defined: "It is us against them. The enemies of wilderness are also the enemies of freedom and democracy" (EF! May, 1990).

Living up to their name, the radicals are the only constituency that objectified the more traditional enemies, industry and government. Though this rhetorical device would not be fitting for the mass media since EF! sought to overcome its oppositional image of terrorist "eco-guerillas," it was fitting for movement-produced media to assure its audiences that it was not compromising its position.

Very similar to objectification is vilification. The only difference is that vilification targets a specific opponent. Vilification is also similar to affirmation by negation. In her analysis of the women's liberation movement, Brenda Hancock explained how radical feminists named the enemy "angrily negating the identity of males" to develop the pro-woman line of argument. She emphasized: "to negate society or capitalism was not enough; the negation of men became imperative" (Smith 1969; Hancock 1972). Why? Because it gave women the power to define their own identity and to unify them in a common cause.

Vilification is used less often than objectification and then only by the grassroots and radical constituencies and not at all by the mainstream because of the constituency-specific constraints described earlier. The grassroots aimed directly at the federal government: "Sometimes we have to rally or forces and fight back against President Carter's ill-fated Energy Mobilization Board initiative of 1978, or
President Reagan's 'sage brush rebellion' of the early 1980's . . . (NAS May/June, 1990) or "When James Carson was nominated for a high level natural resources post in the administration last fall, environmentalists across the country issued a collective groan of dismay . . . [and] defeated the confirmation of this 'James Watt' clone . . ." (NAS May/June, 1990).

The NAS's identity is made to look favorable by spotlighting federal government mistakes and its effective responses to prevent repercussions. Unlike their mass media discourses, the grassroots do not take on the mainstream in this data sample. The NAS seemed to be more concerned with unity among constituencies and therefore chose not to employ this more drastic rhetorical device against other constituencies.

Earth First!, in addition to objectification, used vilification against government as the grassroots did: "One thing that the Reagan administration taught us is that the lunatic fringe can become the mainstream" (EF! March, 1990), or in a letter from David Brower published in the Earth First! Journal: "Thank George Bush for saying he's an environmentalist, and thank him once again when he becomes one" (EF! Feb., 1990). Industry is also directly faulted: "There is a conspiracy. They have names like EXXON, DuPont and Lousiana-Pacific" (EF! Feb., 1990), and "Lousiana Pacific, Georgia Pacific, MASSAM/PL and Simpson are the major problems in this area" (EF! May, 1990). Again, vilification is more suitable in this arena since EF! is not so much concerned with neutralizing its discourse for a broader audience as with maintaining its hard-nosed image. Here EFI's rhetoric is less constrained than it was in the mass media since its perceptions of the public as in
need of less threatening environmentalism no longer comes into play when addressing their own specific audiences. Earth First! still takes on "the establishment," but violence is not mentioned. This maneuver is very much akin to Robert Scott's analysis of the conservative voice in radical rhetoric (Scott 1973). Scott argues that denouncing any hypocritical behavior on the part of dominant groups is an obvious means of justifying the radical's cause: "Dwelling on the hypocrisy of the dominant society, the radical is quite apt to sound the conservative voice" (Scott 1973). Earth First! depicts government, industry and even the mainstream environmental constituency as opposed to common American values such as democracy and freedom and claim greater purity of motivation based on being true to these values.

Interestingly enough, the other direction the radical constituency goes with vilification is toward other environmental movement constituencies, in particular, and as one may have guessed, the mainstream. Though objectification was not employed by the radicals against other constituencies in either data sample, only against the them, radicals lived up to their image by using the more intense vilification in this sample. This change in strategy represents a complete reversal from the mass media efforts in which the radicals were most careful not to take on other constituencies. In the mass media, the radicals wanted to appear non-threatening so that the general public could relate to their efforts. Being non-confrontational called for not confronting other constituencies as well as not confronting "the establishment." However, in their own medium, the radicals could afford to rhetorically "take on"
the other constituencies. This maneuver added enough drama to differentiate it from other sources in the larger media context.

There are countless examples of vilification in a scathing letter printed by David Brower on the topic of the Sierra Club and its recent environmental compromises such as: "The Club is so eager to appear reasonable that it goes soft, undercuts the strong grassroots efforts of chapters, groups and other organizations . . .," he continued: "The Club folded on the proposed Mammoth Pass Highway," and "The Club folded on the superb Jeffrey pine forest," and "The Sierra Club compromised enough to lose its best antinuclear group," etc (EF! Feb., 1990). A different EF! writer finds a target at the National Wildlife Federation: "Jay Hair, director of the NWF, once said he couldn't tell the difference between destroying a river and destroying a bulldozer. Blessed with a more conventional sense of value, ecoteurs can" (EF! Feb., 1990). Clearly the radicals wish to take on the mainstream. They could not afford to do so in the mass media in front of the larger public. They were constrained because they wanted the public to relate to their efforts and accomplishing this required being non-confrontational. In their own media addressing their own audiences, where overcoming its oppositional image is not so much of a concern and being confrontational would not further damage its identity, the radicals could afford to vilify the mainstream.

All three constituencies attempt to overcome their identity problems by naming enemies, whether in a specific or ill-defined manner. Only the targets and degree of intensity differentiate these constituencies. Throughout the interpellation process, the mainstream
targets the radicals, the grassroots target "the establishment" and the radicals, and the radicals target "the establishment" and the mainstream. Objectification and vilification add drama to the constituencies' rhetoric and therefore helps to overcome the fact that movement-produced media are only a small part of the larger media context and are less frequently published, yet do so in a manner in which they can still speak from their own select perspective. This serves constituency-level problems, but not movement-level problems. Objectification did not help autonomy as it did before. Since enemies of the environmental movement are hard to find because the traditional culprits, including industry and government, have largely reconstituted their own identities through advertising and public relations, divisions between constituencies, as it was in the mass media, were emphasized rather than ameliorated in the movement-produced media. Consequently, instead of unity among constituencies against a common enemy, the movement appears unorganized and potentially unable to mobilize.

_Languaging Strategies_

In this sample, movement spokespersons make more of self-references than they do of prefixes like "eco-" or the imagery of the color green, or root metaphors. As indicated in the previous chapter, constituencies define themselves and distinguish themselves from others through the labels they use as self-references or references to the movement as a whole. The self-references reflect constituencies-specific restraints based on audience and administrative expectations and
reputation. NRDC never used the term "movement" in the discourse sampled in this portion of the study; NAS used the term four times and EFl used it almost fifty times though it distinguished between the "radical environmental movement" and the "mainstream environmental movement." The discourse suggests that NRDC wished to distinguish itself from the movement and that EFl very much wanted to emphasize its role in relationship to the rest of the movement.

The NRDC uses professional titles consistently, such as "staff member," "attorney," "scientists," "defender," and "expert" and they referred to NRDC members as "Earth Advocates." Note how "advocate" is a very moderate, legalistic label suiting a law-based organization and an audience of affluent, highly educated and busy people. References to "environmentalists" or "the environmental movement" were absent. This may indicate that NRDC wishes to set itself apart from the rest of the movement. Additionally, no inclusive pronouns such as "we" or "our" in reference to NRDC staff and the Earth Advocates working together were used. This is further evidence of how NRDC stands apart not only from the rest of the organizations in the movement, but as a class of experts away from their own members as well. Oftentimes NRDC supporters are put in a passive position, they are the receivers of information or are represented, not active. For example NRDC's "Council of 1000 [members giving annual $1,0000 gifts] members are invited to special briefings and lectures on a variety of topics and receive special informational mailings and complimentary copies of NRDC publications," or "The suits are brought on behalf of all NRDC members..." (NRDC, March/April,

The NAS uses labels such as: "activist," "Auduboner," "member," and "environmentalist," and inclusive pronouns are used regularly. Examples include: "We became aware that this movement was something different . . ." (Audubon, March/April 1990) or "The actions we take in the 1990s will be critical to life on our plant," (Audubon, Jan./Feb., 1990). These terms are used for both the headquarters staff and members indeterminately to illustrate how staff, as spokespersons of NAS, work to provide direction and leadership, but in a non-autocratic way.

Earth First!'s self-references are yet more graphic: "eco-warriors," "ecoteurs," "Earth Firstlers" and "eco-activists." Since EF! is completely decentralized and has no hierarchical headquarters or leaders, inclusive pronouns were used consistently. Everyone has the same status so distinctions cannot be made through naming as a rhetorical process. When the *Journal* writers stated their own positions, it was clearly identified since writers routinely stressed that they are not the official representatives of EF!. Examples include: "As the masthead has noted for many years, this publication is an independent voice within the movement . . . and is not the 'official newsletter' of Earth First! . . ." (EF! May, 1990) or ""The *Earth First! Journal* is published by Earth First! Journal, Inc. and is a worker-owned and operated newspaper within the movement. It is not the 'official newsletter' of the Earth First! movement" (EF! March, 1990).
EF! discusses the movement as "the radical environmental movement," distinguishing it from other efforts or organizations as follows: "Earth First! is a movement, not an organization" (EF! May, 1990), "For the individual it will continue to be risky to openly support or participate in the Earth First! movement" (EF! Feb., 1990), and "This radical environmental movement does exist as a marginal voice within the already marginal voice of environmentalism" (Feb., 1990) and Earth First! also emphasized that the term "environmentalist" is not particularly useful for its causes since "... that word's meaning gets broader and weaker everyday . . ." (EF! May, 1990). This languaging strategy clearly reveals that EF!, as part of the larger media context wants to be perceived by its audiences differently than the "mainstream movement."

In addition to distinguishing itself as a "radical movement," Earth First! also commonly uses the word "tribe" as a self-reference as follows: "We are not an organization. We say we are a movement or a tribe . . .," "Its decentralized tribal nature has prevented EF! from being coopted . . ." "The original tribe of zealots has evolved . . .," and "We've not been a single tribe since we hit the national media" (EF! May, 1990). This terminology is an interesting choice since it emphasizes the togetherness of shared experience and consciousness, and strong in-group loyalty as well as conjuring up historical images of the American Indian experience as natives at one with their natural surroundings. The radicals are very conscientious about their names and labels and use them just as conscientiously to manage their identities.
These self-references are an important part of the interpellation process and indicate what image constituencies wish to present internally as well as what type of relationship may exist between headquarters, if any, chapters, members and other groups. For the most part, this device was more successful in managing constituency identities than that of the movement as a whole.

*Martyring*

Here again, Hazel Wolf's, James Darsey's, and Kurt Ritter's work on martyrdom is useful for understanding the radicals' rhetoric. EFIers get information about themselves in the mass media that depicts themselves as passive and nonconfrontational on one hand and violent and terrorist-like on the other hand. In their own media, as part of this larger media context, EFI must balance these two perspectives to satisfy both of its factions. In movement-produced media, the martyrdom concept is heavily relied upon for the benefit of fellow EFIers in two specific cases, the bombing incident described in Chapter Two and the Sierra Club compromise (a deal made with the timber industry and government permitting logging of ancient forests), and in general for all EFIers. The bombing examples included: "... things are different now... we have to make some sort of transition from being the 'new kids on the block' to a recognizable institution. One that can now be singled out as a target for repression" (EFI Feb., 1990), "The recent car bomb attempts on the lives of Darryl Cheney and Judi Bari was the birth wail of a new era in the lives of Earth Firstl ..." "We will increasingly be singled out by the
hired thugs of the ruling minority for harrassment, intimidation, infiltration and arrest" (EF! June, 1990). This rhetoric makes EFlers appear committed to the cause and willing to withstand adversity for the sake of the environmental effort.

The martyr concept can also be found throughout discussion of the Sierra Club compromise that became a key point of reference used directly by EF! and indirectly by both the NRDC and NAS. David Brower, a member of Sierra Club for years and spokesman for the environmental movement, ranging from conservative to radical, issued a public letter condemning the compromise and Sierra's latest run of compromises in general. This letter put Brower in the role of martyr as follows: "I was working half time for the Club at $75 a month," "I did a Paul Revere act... and the wilderness is still there," and "The board scolded me for sending Phil Hyde and Paul Brooks to the Yukon... The board scolded me for spending $3,500... The board also scolded be for helping David Sive..." (EF! Feb., 1990). Brower's rhetoric, as an ex-Sierra Club official, expressed a sense of sacrifice to duty, "a means of making public and visible the private, personal submission" so that the current Sierra Club president would see how Brower was more virtuous than he since he compromises (Darsey 1990).

In addition to these two specific cases, EF! monkeywrenchers in general are martyred throughout the discourse: "But there is another kind of bigotry -- prejudice against environmental activists. Last summer there were three incidents of violence against protestors..." (EF! May, 1990), or "the tree-spiker, laboratory animal liberator and bulldozer wreckers... are society's safety valve, courageous in their
assumption of great personal risk, unwavering in their aversion to violence, and dedicated to life and justice," or "Moreover, the early stages of violence against reformers are abundantly evident," (the murders of Dian Fossey, Fernando Pereira and Chico Mendes are named), or "Some of us are being harassed in our communities, some have even fled to new locations under threat of violence" (EFI Feb., 1990). Again, EFIers are presented as virtuous and willing to make great personal sacrifices based on their convictions.

As Ritter would predict, EFI offered interpretations of the Sierra compromise, car bombing, and bigotry against environmental activists as moral crusades against the oppressor. The fight against bigotry and discrimination is a moral crusade based on civil rights for the Earth and the promise to overcome "speciesism," and on labor union principles to protect timber workers from exploitation by logging companies. The car bomb incident is painted as a moral crusade based on the principles of non-violence and civil disobedience. Lastly, the Sierra compromise is depicted as a moral crusade based on violations of loyalty and support of other environmental organizations. In each case, environmental activists were told they must rise above the violence of the ruling minority by holding fast to their beliefs and risking personal security in the fight for saving the planet from further destruction.

Earth First! then devised ways to use these events to forward arguments supporting radical tactics throughout the speeches and demonstrations that followed. Using references to murdered activists, the Sierra Club compromise as a representative anecdote of Big Ten compromises and the car bombing throughout subsequent publications
of the *Earth First! Journal* enabled readers to relive the events and incorporate them into the collective memory of their audiences. For example, in the June edition of the *Earth First! Journal* an article detailing preparations for Redwood Summer rallies began with a description of the "horror, shock and rage in reaction to the bombing and subsequent attempted frame-up of Judi Bari and Darryl Cherney" to motivate and mobilize participation.

This rhetorical device was useful once again for managing this constituency's identity in that it provided a means of responding to sensationalized mass mediated images after it was interpellated as such yet still provided enough drama to set the radical publications apart from the rest of the larger media context and to overcome the time that had passed. The faction of the radical movement most concerned about the use of violence spoke in terms of self-defense and those that did use violence or sought to justify its use were able to do so in a manner that did not alienate the other faction. Again, however, this device has more potential at the movement level than is being cultivated.

*Legitimation*

All three constituencies used the technique of legitimation to reconstitute their identities in movement-produced media. This legitimation of tactics is based upon a variety of the traditional rhetorical proofs. It is important to reiterate at this time that legitimation of constituency philosophy and tactics is not necessarily delegitimation of
another constituency. Such rhetorical techniques include objectification and vilification that were discussed earlier in this chapter.

On very few occasions will the mainstream dignify grassroots or radical accusations regarding its alliances with government and industry. However, as mentioned briefly earlier in this chapter, NRDC found with its commissioned report that "negotiation and other collaborative processes can be used to create a tougher, more effective advocate, especially in environmental issues, than one who uses only adversarial methods" (NRDC July/Aug., 1990). The article, "Adversaries: A Love Story," offered the report as a logical proof. Organized in a question/answer format, this interview discussed how the NRDC staff has received guidelines on when and how to use negotiation. The fact that three of the first four question/answers justify negotiation (Questions: Is negotiation always a substitute for another strategy?; What are some of the benefits of negotiation?; and When is negotiation not appropriate?) and that the preface to the article presented the study as a response to environmentalists who use "adversarial methods only" made the interview appear defensive.

In addition to logical proofs such as commissioned studies, NRDC relied upon ethos that of itself and organizations with which it worked. NRDC's staff titles -- "senior staff attorney," "clean air specialist," "NRDC scientist," etc, its sidebars that detailed individual staff credentials and highlight organizations it has worked with, including CFC manufacturers, the World Bank and the Department of the Treasury, all exemplified ethos as proof.
In sum, NRDC relied upon *ethos* and *logos* as proof for legitimizing their efforts. The NRDC's rhetoric was constrained by the fact that they could not complement these proofs with emotional appeals since, as working professionals, this would be not appropriate in the eyes of their high status, professional audience. NRDC explained, vindicated and justified its conservative tactics through commissioned reports, association with the Earth Day fanfare, professional titles and important associates.

The National Audubon Society relied upon all three of the classical rhetorical proofs to legitimate varied levels of commitment. Activism here ranged from making cookies for a bake sale to picketing. Pathetic appeals drew upon both positive and negative emotions. To motivate commitment, fear is manifested through statements such as; "... our green Earth faces threats of a magnitude not foreseen even twenty years ago" (NAS May/April, 1990), and "People realize that the decade of the 1990s is going to be the last chance for the environment" (NAS Jan./Feb., 1990). Positive emotions are also appealed to: "By making activism enjoyable and easy, Thorn Creek Audubon has given its members a sense of power and success" (NAS May/April, 1990), and "But Earth Day ignited all the latent passion and energy Americans feel for their land... they had cared all along" (NAS May/April 1990). Pathetical appeals are an important means of stimulating conviction that is especially effective when contrasting positive and negative emotions. Being unrealistically upbeat would have hurt NAS's credibility. Relying on purely negative emotions in a "gloom and doom" way would only have created a dispondent audience. This type of proof suits the task of fostering
support for environmental efforts, especially when used in conjunction with logical proof.

Appeals to *ethos* were based upon NAS credibility as a whole, not on individual members; keeping the appeal general and applicable to a broader base of people with different levels of commitment. Examples included: "Almost overnight, we had become not only credible and acceptable but powerful" (NAS May/April 1990), and "National Audubon's membership doubled between 1970 and 1980... our chapter network has expanded; so has the skill of our political staff, matching the expertise of our science and education staffs" (NAS May/April, 1990). Several personal accounts of the original Earth Day also painted a picture of Auduboners as experienced first-hand in environmentalism. Efforts were also made to spotlight the effectiveness of chapters nationwide no matter what their strategies; four of the six articles in the NAS newslwetters featured efforts of specific chapters as key examples of environmentalism.

Close examination of NAS's rhetoric reveals that *pathos* and *ethos* are relied upon more heavily than *logos*. One of the few examples of logical proof offered in the sample can be found in an article titled, "Letter of the Month Club' An Audubon Idea for a Better World." A chapter chairman detailed and argued on behalf of a typology of eight different activities matching member talents, time and level of commitment to projects (NAS May/April, 1990).

Logical appeals were also made through association with Earth Day. Several articles on Earth Day appeared in two of the three issues. They stated: "The first Earth Day, on April 22, 1970, transformed the
nation... it turned out to be a fulcrum for historic change" (NAS, May/April 1990), and "[Earth Day] was a key and a catalyst" (NAS May/April, 1990), or "The increased awareness sparked by the first Earth Day in 1970 led to the passage of the country's major environmental laws" (NAS, Jan./Feb., 1990). At its most basic level, the argument is: Earth Day was of historic social importance, NAS was directly and centrally involved, therefore, NAS must be socially important. Evidence of this involvement is clearly detailed in four articles of the six articles featuring activism. The NAS offered phone hot lines as sources of information, the *Earth Day Resources Packet* was produced for members as well as the *Earth Day Citizen Action Guide*. Chapter-by-chapter plans for celebrating Earth Day 1990 were also detailed throughout the articles.

The limited use of logical appeals may indicate that NAS is more concerned about its credibility and membership morale than discussing issues in detail. This is not surprising since its primary identity problem was finding a means of making activism look fun and less demanding yet still be effective.

Like NAS, EFl draws upon *ethos, pathos* and *logos* to interpellate its new image. Logical appeals are developed primarily to justify radical tactics. The article, "An Appraisal of Monkeywrenching," offered a cost benefit analysis of monkeywrenching in terms of a return on investment: "... ecotage in the US today is probably costing government and industry $20 - 25 million annually," the author continued: "The actual cost of an average monkeywrenching incident climbs well over $100,000... the typical monkeywrenching incident
probably cost the ecoteur no more than $100 and a night's sleep, this is a remarkably cost effective . . ." (EF! Feb., 1990). Here a logical case was made for the economic feasibility of controversial tactics. The rhetorical impact of this strategy is that the image of Earth Firstlers becomes that of practical and powerful individuals. They get the most for their effort and know where to hit the enemy where it counts -- in the wallet.

Another example of logical appeals used regularly to justify radical tactics is a variation on the theme of "Radical environmentalism is necessary because mainstream environmentalism is failing." Examples of failed efforts such as the Sierra compromise, the corporate buy out of Earth day, and others were provided.

Ecotage, they argued, is a legitimate means of activism because it makes biodiversity a matter of public interest by personalizing cold scientific calculations and this public interest then leads to the necessary opposition to environmental degradation. More importantly, the argument that ecotage is only part of a much broader campaign was made; this deemphasizes the role of ecotage that other constituencies and the mass media dramatized and that concerned some EFIers.

Pathetic appeals were used with more regularity than logical appeals in identity management. The emotions are of two extremes, humor and fear. First, examples of motivation based on fear included: "There has been a good deal of horror, shock and rage in relation to the bombing . . ." (EF! June, 1990), "because we fear for life on this planet" (EF! May, 1990), "Monkeywrenching is just a form of resistance to ecological terror" (EF! Feb, 1990), or "We are in the midst of the most severe extinction episode in the planet's history" (EF! May, 1990). As
previously indicated, pathetical appeals are an important means of stimulating conviction, especially when contrasting positive and negative emotions. In this case, fear was a primary source of motivation and humor served as comic relief from the severity of the circumstances.

Though NAS and NRDC did not make a practice of using humor as a rhetorical device, EFI strove for it, in fact, being humorous is part of EFI's self-definition; it believes it should make its points "Effectively, peacefully and with warmth and humor" (EFI June, 1990).

In his famous work, *Rules for Radicals*, Saul Alinsky discussed the education of the political organizer and described several qualities he or she must have. Among curiosity, irreverence, and imagination, the organizer must have a sense of humor. Humor, to Alinsky, is a means of maintaining sanity and a key to understanding life. Humor can also be a source of power: "Humor is essential to a successful tactician, for the most potent weapons known to mankind are satire and ridicule" (Alinsky 1971).

The humor of EFI throughout the movement-produced media sample is used to dispel hostility and to debase and ridicule enemies. Examples of satire and ridicule used as political weapons included: "The Forest Service, always on the cutting edge of lethargy . . ." or "The timber industry often avoids reporting sabotage or lies about the cause of the damage so as to keep insurance companies in the dark (their natural element) . . .," or "No longer can the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management act like a band of medieval forestmeisters" (EFI Feb., 1990), or "One thing the Reagan administration taught us is that any
lunatic fringe can become the mainstream by simply being in the right place at the right time" (EF! March, 1990).

Earth First! also uses humor to dispel hostility. In a commentary on the EF! newsletter, in particular the irregularity of the "Dear Ned Ludd" column, a staff writer joked: "Ned kept dragging his feet for so long, we finally sent Igor to have a 'talk' with him" (EF! May, 1990), or in another issue: "Opinions vary from people who think it [the newsletter] has been taken over by militant Aryan Nazi's, that John Davis is from another planet, to people who simply think it isn't as funny or aspiring as it used to be" (EF! Feb., 1990). This use of humor provides a sense of comic relief that suits its audience as well as a potent rhetorical weapon.

Appeals to ethos are also used with regularity and are based upon the philosophy and practice of non-violence. By juxtaposing alleged violence on the part of government and industry with their own non-violence, the radicals hoped to enhance their credibility as follows: "As recognized by Gandhi and others, the proper response to violence is increased and unremitting non-violent resistance" (EF! June, 1990), and "Non-violence will be the password. All activists are required to take non-violence training," and "they [treespikers] do their work with the safety of loggers in mind and with utmost reverence for the forest. They warn authorities . . ." (EF! May 1990), and as a last example, "There is a possibility that pro-timber interest desire violence against protestors in order to discredit a righteous and necessarily non-violent resistance . . ." (EF! May, 1990). This tactic is also in line with Scott's analysis of militant Black Power rhetoric, all these proofs taken together justify violence --
not instigate it -- as Earth Firstlers search for new identity as a movement people can relate to (Scott 1968).

Other efforts to enhance ethos are based on references to mass media coverage including: "We made waves on the media and became a major sub-movement" (EF! March, 1990), and "We are ourselves responsible for the way we are seen by the public. We deliberately shoveled up a tough image of EFI to the mainstream media. Even if its distorted and inflated state, we have accomplished much . . . we are the environmental extremists that everyone now uses as a reference point" (EF! Feb., 1990), and " . . . preparing for a campaign suddenly much more publicized than we ever imagined it could be, Redwood Summer stories are splashed across newspaper and airwaves of the country . . . " (EF! June, 1990). Other examples included: "EF! being the most active and visible expression of ecological resistance . . ." (EF! June, 1990), and " . . . the eyes of the nation are watching us" (EF! May, 1990). Thus, the argument goes, if the radical constituency is important enough to warrant media attention, it must be doing something significant. Obtaining publicity simply for the sake of recognition is a tactic used by other movements as well. For example, in the gay rights movement, Darsey found: "Recognition, in and of itself, became a goal of the movement" (Darsey 1981). Since EFI is one of the youngest members of the environmental movement, publicizing its existence -- its identity -- is an important and necessary first step in identity management.

Other appeals to ethos downplay factional diversity within the constituency and stressed tolerance and decentralization. This constituency, unlike the others, openly and directly acknowledged
divisiveness within: "Over the past year or so, a number of groups and individual activists associated with EF! have distanced themselves from the radical environmental banner, obsensibly over the issue of ecotage" (EF! Feb., 1990), or "Tree spiking has been a recent divisive issue in the movement" (EF! June, 1990). To deemphasize this, radicals stated: "... note that EF! has always been characterized by unity in diversity. We have had remarkably little of the infighting that eventually weakens or destroys most groups ... We are now ten years old ... a decade of tolerance for diversity suggests that ... we can weather the storms ..." (EF! May, 1990), and "Its decentralized tribal nature has prevented EF! from being coopted ... as has happened to mainstream environmental groups to various degrees" (EF! May, 1990).

As a final example, appeals to \textit{ethos} in Earth First! rhetoric developed out of historical references to other social movements and moral crusades. For example, references to the civil rights movement included: "Mississippi Summer in the California Redwoods," and asking for "freedom riders" to save the forest (EF! May, 1990), "Following in the footsteps of the brave Civil Rights activists of the Sixties, ..." (EF! May, 1990), and "Malcolm X spoke of all revolutions as a fight for land, land won by bloodshed. We get the bloodshed but lose the land" (EF! March, 1990). Furthermore, the abolitionist movement is claimed as the historical roots of today's radical environmental movement: "Perhaps the most informative historical precedent for the radical environmentalist and ecoteur is the struggle to end slavery," or "clearly, the radical environmentalist and monkeywrencher is the inheritor of a tradition that includes the Sons of Liberty and the Underground Railroad"
(EFI Feb., 1990). Since Earth First! is one of the newest voices in the environmental movement, it does not have the historical advantage that the other constituencies have. By associating itself with other well-known and righteous efforts, EFI shared in their credibility and used their successes and fame to depict radical efforts in a positive light.

Through the use of *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos* as proofs, constituencies were able to reconstitute their identities in a manner that at least partially overcame the primary identity management problems each one faced. The use of *ethos* enabled movement publishers to hold their own in comparison to other sources in the larger media context. The use of *pathos* enabled the constituencies to earn and keep member attention amidst the competition from other sources in the media context and for coverage of stories that are less than timely due to the infrequent publishing schedule. The use of *logos* gave members information and a perspective not offered by other sources. The NRDC relied mostly upon logical appeals and to a lesser extent, *ethos*. The grassroots relied upon *ethos* and emotional appeals most and less on logical appeals. The radicals used all three forms of proof consistently. However, legitimation was of very little help in overcoming movement-level problems. Only EFI's use of pathetic appeals, specifically humor and ridicule, distanced "the enemy" and therefore helped to create a sense of autonomy.

Taken together, these five rhetorical devices represent attempts to reconstitute identity within movement-produced media. Seldom was what is called the "environmental movement" influenced by these efforts. For identity management to be successful, reconstitutive
rhetorics must adapt discursive positions and necessitate action. The closing section of this chapter will evaluate this effort using Charland's theory as a guide and discuss any implications.

Implications

The "environmental movement," as a collective political subject, appeared as a natural and necessary means of social change. Charland specified that collective political subjects must be "called into being" or repositioned through interpellation and necessitating action. This reflective analysis has thus far identified specific identity management problems of concern in movement-produced media and described the primary rhetorical strategies used to respond to these problems. An examination and evaluation of this two step process is now possible.

As for the first identity management problem specified at the movement level, autonomy, NRDC and NAS did not work to develop a strong sense of independence from "the establishment." In fact, to appear more in the thick of political affairs, they tried to set themselves apart from the oppositional radical constituency and move in line with political leaders. Only Earth First! made an effort to distance "the establishment" through objectification, vilification, legitimation and martyrdom.

The second movement-level identity problem, internal factionalism, was once again a key issue as each constituency attempted to carve out its audience and its place on the political spectrum. Earth First! tried to distance itself from the other constituencies through
languaging strategies and vilification much the same as the other constituencies tried to distance themselves from the radicals. Obviously the use of these rhetorical devices in this way did not help to resolve internal factionalism that was presented as potentially problematic in the mass media and again directly reiterated by the radicals in their own media. Coalition building among constituencies potentially would have diminished the distinctiveness of constituency identities and this was not a sacrifice most constituencies would be willing to make.

As for the last identity problem at this level, the radicals and grassroots appeared most concerned about the lack of cultural diversity. The editor of *Audubon Activist* stated: "The bounds of the environmental movement were redrawn to embrace a broader range of issues and a wider circle of citizens," and she continued: "The organizers of the Event [Earth Day 1990] envision a campaign of global dimensions, involving people all over the world. Its aim is to rally citizens from all walks of life . . ." (NAS May/April, 1990). Though the phrase "white, middle-class" is not used, the goal of drawing upon a wider set of demographics for environmental campaigns is alluded to in a vague, indirect manner. Earth First! followed suit. In an article on a public debate between social ecologists and deep ecologists, a panelist from Harlem Fight Back raised the issue of racism as follows: "The question of racism is central to ecological concerns . . . yet there is very little black participation in the ecology movement, and there is an obvious split between social and ecological issues in modern politics." A panelist from Earth First! responded: " . . . the racial crisis, no less than the ecological crisis, is an indication of the need for a 'new politics' . . . "(EF! Feb. ,
Again the problem was talked about, but specific plans for overcoming it were not developed and presented to its audiences.

All in all, efforts to manage identities amount more to ignoring any problems than confronting them directly. As in the previous chapter, the reconstitutive rhetorics employed in these efforts are better reflected in the individual agendas of each constituency. The NRDC did not address the movement and sought to disassociate itself from it. Its treatment of the radicals through objectification, self-references and legitimation of negotiation and other conservative methods illustrated its identity management efforts at the constituency level. The NRDC used the least number of rhetorical devices and was the least oppositional of all the constituencies. The NAS’s legitimation, objectification, languaging strategies, and vilification all came together to illustrate a broader understanding of environmentalism as well as improve upon the image of its moderate tactics in the eyes of its audiences. The most oppositional, Earth First!’s distancing of other constituencies, government and industry emphasized its hard-nosed approach through self-references and legitimation yet did so in a manner that featured non-violence to please both its audiences. Humor and martyrdom were also used to make it easier for audience members concerned about violence to relate. This was the only constituency to downplay Earth Day, to situate the movement historically, and to acknowledge internal factionalism openly.

Since movement-produced media are more controllable than the mass media, movement spokespersons are naturally more likely to be successful in interpellating their identities. It follows that these
discursive positions provide a basis for appeals to action as in the previous data sample. However, necessitating action does not fare well here either. At the movement level, no action items were placed on the movement's agenda in this sample of discourse.

At the constituency level, NRDC and NAS added very few action items to their agendas. NRDC urged readers to write a letter to their representatives regarding the Clean Air bill and to volunteer to run an Earth Day booth at which information on membership and publications would be made available. A petition for strict clean air laws would be there to sign. The NAS urged members to write Action Alerts (letters to congress), send for information packets and participate in Earth Day and to choose activities that suited member lifestyles and level of commitment. Earth First!, on the other hand, provided an extensive number of specific action items to its agenda, though it did have more room to do so since the newsletters are longer. Earth First! emphasized that Earth Firstlers are different than other so called "environmentalists" in that they "are not simply a person who sends in an annual fee." In a section of the Redwood Summer article called "What You Can Do," three suggestion are made: participate in the California rendevous, provide financial support and organize related community activities nationwide.

David Brower's seven-step fallback position outlined in the Sierra Club letter also provided specific action steps such as job training for displaced loggers and making ancient forests a biosphere reserve. As a last example, an article on Earth Day detailed plans for communities that described picking a target, gathering support, getting information, printing fliers and more and for planning the event for John Muir day,
the day before Earth Day, so as to beat the rush and to force reactions that would then be covered by the Earth Day mass media blitz. Only EF! came close to offering a social critique. While NRDC and NAS recommended signing petitions and writing representatives, EF! organized the Redwood Summer rendezvous and other demonstrations.

As Charland would say, this discourse positioned the constituencies in "the material world," making some choices more viable than others. The NRDC is in a position that it must keep working within the system and to continually show its effectiveness yet fend off accusations of "limousine environmentalism" from other sources. The NAS is in a position that requires it to keep activism fun and enjoyable. EF! is in a position that it must keep after the rest of the movement and stay active, non-violent and tolerant. All but EF! maneuvered within the existing social structures implicitly accepting and embracing the current political process and economic system. Although EF! occasionally stepped out of bounds with law and order, it did so not as a recommendation of violence or illegality, but as a call to social justice.

Close examination of these agenda items at both the movement and constituency levels reveals several conclusions. To begin, the movement-produced media appear to confirm the mass media's depiction of movement divisions. Through objectification, vilification and languaging strategies, the constituencies tend to alienate each other more than deal directly with points of contention. No action items suggested a means by which a dialogue on this common concern could begin, such as a movement-wide newsletter as an open forum as other movements have. Such a newsletter would enable constituencies to at
least partially overcome the constraints of participating in a larger media context, of less frequent publication, and their own select and limited perspectives.

Again, similar to the findings offered in the mass media sample, "activism" itself is ill-defined and more reactive than proactive. Does baking cookies for an organizational fundraiser constitute activism? What is the role of violence? Only one constituency provided information on action steps as environmental education experts and Charland would necessitate. Moreover, providing goals and action steps for audiences is a necessary start, but persuading them to accept the goals is one thing, persuading them to follow through on the action steps is quite another.

The fact that social movement organizations have matured and professionalized may have become too much of a good thing. Movement and constituency spokespersons appear as a "class of experts" as they did in the other sample. The NRDC worked to distance itself from non-mainstream efforts and its Earth Advocates. Essentially, NRDC urged advocates to send in annual dues, and these dues would then hire the services of expert scientists and lawyers who would litigate on their behalf. The NAS made a point of being more inclusive, but admittedly lowered its level of expectations of activists. Earth First!, with its practice of direct action, presented monkeywrenchers as a class all by themselves and stressed that members need to be trained in non-violence techniques.

This finding would likely concern scholars such as Dewey, Sennett, Habermas, Lippmann and others in that this "cult of expertise" distances
citizenry. As described in Chapter One, Dewey argued that the rise of a class of social experts "eclipsed" the public. Lippmann argued that lack of specific information on involvement turned the public into a "phantom." Habermas warned that social institutions and the rise of a class of experts relieved individuals of social duties and further the decline in the public sphere. Charland would argue that the attempted repositioning closed certain possibilities to participate in the collective political project called environmentalism.

The widely varied nature of these newsletters in format and content alike reflect the differences among factions of the environmental movement. As Levinson argued, they are "newsy" yet political. Among the newsy chapter updates, cartoons and editorials, the political agenda for managing identity problems was articulated through reconstitutive rhetorics. Clearly this spectrum of environmental groups illustrated that movements are complex entities. This reflective analysis reveals how factions coexist and use rhetoric to manage identities in different ways. Scholars must define movements in a way that would recognize them for what they are: institutional and factional. Also, social movements owe their existence to the discourse that articulates them. Here environmental publics were reconstituted through the process of interpellation and necessitating action. Though the environmental movement's ability to manage competing identities is not completely successful here, the function of identity management within movements was illustrated.
CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF IMPLICATIONS

This research project has led the field of rhetorical theory and criticism one step further to a more complete understanding of how rhetoric functions in social movements and how to define them. The purpose of this research was to develop a qualitative study which rhetorically analyzed how identity is created out of conflicting interests. How competing constituencies implicitly articulate and manage their identities and the influence of this effort on the identity of the movement as a whole was examined. A case was made for seeing identity management as a rhetorical process, one that employs reconstitutive rhetorics in particular. How these reconstitutive rhetorics fulfill the identity management function was the primary focus of study. Of the various ongoing debates about social movements in rhetorical theory and criticism, this project was aligned with those sides of the debates that see movements as meaning, as institutionalized at times and as nonconfrontational at times. For this project, movements were rhetorically defined as symbolic transformations in the ideological state of political subjects who come to share and manage a collective identity in the social world that is consequential for their actions in the material world. This collectivity, as a complex, factional and multivocal effort, is perceived by other political subjects as different from normal collective
collective behavior and ideology. Whether they are confrontational or nonconfrontational, institutionalized or uninstitutionalized, such a collective seeks to reconstitute meanings and to affect the status quo.

The primary research problem addressed in this project was: Once constituted, how do social movement constituencies manage their identities and what is the impact of this effort on the identity of the overall movement? The problem was then divided into four tasks: 1) to illustrate how reconstitutive rhetorics of social movements function to manage competing identities within the mass media, 2) to illustrate how reconstitutive rhetorics of social movements function to manage competing identities within movement-produced media, 3) to compare and contrast the differences and similarities in how these identities are reconstituted in the mass and movement-produced media, and 4) to interpret the implications of such a comparison for social movement scholarship.

To make this endeavor manageable, Chapter Two focused on the first task. The data used included attributed statements and direct quotes of movement spokespersons in a variety of mass media taken from within six months of Earth Day 1990. Each of these artifacts reflected at least two of the three constituencies represented in this project. Chapter Three focused on the second task and took articles focusing on activism in movement-produced newletters published within six months of Earth Day 1990 as data.

The first portion of this chapter will address the third task by comparing and contrasting the mass and movement-produced data samples. The final portion of this chapter will address the fourth task by
interpreting the implications of these similarities and differences, and will suggest future areas of study.

**A Comparison of Reconstitutive Rhetorics in Mass and Movement-produced Media**

Since its well-established position was publicly challenged as "limousine environmentalism" in the mass media, the mainstream sought to protect its prominence by depicting its efforts as professional and effective, not entrenched or coopted by "the establishment." To this end, the mainstream employed reconstitutive rhetorics to manage its public identity in both the mass media and in its own publications. In the mass media, the mainstream relied primarily on objectification and, to a lesser extent, legitimation and languaging strategies. The mainstream was able to successfully depict itself as a major player in the political arena, and by denouncing an ill-defined enemy within "the establishment," it sought to distance itself to maintain credibility and to ward off accusations of cooptation.

In the movement-produced media, the mainstream published very few articles that discussed activism. This tells the scholar something in and of itself. The mainstream wanted to create the identity, not of a movement of activists, but of an organization of working professionals. Again the rhetorical devices used to do this were primarily objectification, and to a lesser extent, legitimation and languaging strategies.

One key difference does exist in these data samples for the mainstream, however. In the mass media sample, the mainstream
objectified "the establishment" to manage its identity, but in its own publications, it objectified the radical constituency. Turning the tables by focusing upon the tactics of the radical constituency was a useful diversion. To discount the accusation of elitism, the mainstream had to distance "the establishment" publicly in the mass media but do so in a manner that did not alienate the political leaders it must work with everyday. Accusations launched at the mainstream by other constituencies were not dignified with a response in the openness of the mass media, but obviously the pressure was beginning to be felt since responses were made in its own medium. There, under less critical scrutiny, the mainstream could afford to indirectly discount the accusations made in the mass media.

The mainstream offered few if any action items in either the mass or movement-produced media placing its membership in a passive position. As would be suspected, the few suggestions actually forwarded were conservative in nature.

The primary identity management problem facing the grassroots constituency in the mass media was its stereotyped image as NIMBY patrols. The grassroots attempted to rework this image into one of political sophistication or viability. Rhetorical devices that came into play in this endeavor were objectification and languaging strategies. These devices were safe choices and suited the problem. Objectification of the mainstream and "the establishment" and languaging strategies improved the grassroots position by making them look more politically aware and challenging. However, objectification on the part of the
grassroots also promoted the perception of internal factionalism as a problem at the movement level.

In its own publications, the grassroots faced the same problem as it did in the mass media, but also had to face one other: making itself look fun yet productive. The same techniques used in the mass media sample were also used here with the addition of vilification and with a change in targets for objectification. In the mass media, the grassroots objectified "the establishment" and the mainstream, in its own medium, NAS objectified the radical constituency. Vilification added drama to the *Audubon Activist* and vilifying the radicals and their more demanding set of expectations and tactics helped to justify NAS's less demanding expectations and tactics.

Similar to the mainstream, the grassroots launched its criticisms in different directions depending on which media and audiences were engaged. In the mass media, the grassroots took on the mainstream to improve its identity, but in the movement-produced media, it indirectly criticized the radical constituency. Its moderate position made the grassroots less controversial as did its limited number of suggested actions and the fact that these recommendations were well within the existing political structures.

The radical constituency received increased attention from both the mass media and other movement constituencies. The primary identity management problem in the mass media for this constituency was its stereotype as terrorist "ego-guerrillas." To overcome this stereotype in hopes of being easier to relate to, a different image, that of "reluctant warrior," was offered. The radicals chose to employ the
rhetorical devices of legitimation, martyrdom and languaging strategies. These passive, nonconfrontational choices were well-suited for the problem faced in the mass media, since, had oppositional devices such as objectification or vilification been used here, this stereotype would only have been further engrained.

Quite another strategy was used in its own medium. Here, the radicals' identity problem arose out of the divisions within its own faction of the movement. One division of the radical ranks wanted to manifest the terrorist image while the other division wanted to appear hard-nosed and uncompromising yet non-violent. The radical constituency used the widest range of rhetorical devices including objectification, vilification, martyrdom, legitimation and languaging strategies since it had different goals from one media source to the next, since it was depicted as alien to the democratic way of life, and since this constituency is characterized by division within a division.

The key difference between the reconstitutive rhetorics used by the radicals in the mass media were the additional number of oppositional devices used in the latter. The radicals strategically chose non-oppositional devices and traditional American values for the mass media so as to appear less threatening to a broader audience and therefore balance the sensationalism. They chose more oppositional devices for their own medium to assure their audiences that the promise of no-compromise was still intact. Of all the constituencies, the radicals were the only one to offer action recommendations consistently and these suggestions varied in level of intensity, from monkeywrenching to more traditional means similar to the mainstream and grassroots
recommendations. The radicals were also the only one to offer direct commentary on the relationship between this constituency and the overall movement. The other constituencies never discussed their role in the movement as a whole. The radicals made the moderate and conservative tactics of the other constituencies seem less threatening in comparison and provided them with more room within which to politically maneuver.

At the movement level, four primary identity-management problems were identified in the mass movement sample: lack of cultural diversity, substantiveness, autonomy and internal factionalism. In the movement-produced sample, all but substantiveness were specified. The techniques used to confront these problems included the range of objectification, vilification, languaging strategies, legitimation and martyrdom.

In regard to autonomy, in the mass media sample, the constituencies made a point of associating themselves with the movement as a whole and disassociating themselves from "the establishment." This was a useful strategy based on the belief of strength in numbers or in being a part of something larger than yourself -- a mass movement. In contrast, the effort to associate with the political power of a mass movement was lacking in the movement-produced media. Objectification obviously distanced "the establishment," but should not be used against other constituencies to make worse the problem of internal fractionalism. Martyrdom, as it was employed by the radical constituency to face its own identity problem, could have been used at the movement level as well. Showing the
movement's virtue as superior to that of "the establishment" would help to ameliorate the autonomy problem. The same arguments could be made about the movement-produced media coverage as well. The only difference was the addition of vilification, which again, should only be used against enemies outside the movement not against other constituencies.

As for the perception of internal factionalism as a problem, it was actually made worse instead of better in both the mass and movement-produced media. The mainstream completely distanced itself from the movement as a whole and the grassroots seldom associated with it in their own media. Only the radicals made a concerted effort to align themselves with the movement as a whole. Much of this effort, however, was mitigated by languaging strategies with the distinction clearly made between "the mainstream movement" and "the radical environmental movement" throughout its discourse, and by the use of objectification and vilification by the various constituencies in both sources. Inclusive languaging strategies and objectification or vilification of enemies outside the movement would be more useful for identity management at the movement-level. Legitimation could also prove useful for dealing with images of internal factionalism as a movement-level problem as discussed in the following section.

The perception of substantiveness as a problem was identified only in the mass media. Of the different rhetorical devices used in these discourses, legitimation would be most beneficial for confronting this movement-level problem. Emphasizing logical appeals throughout more
detailed discussion of environmental problems and providing action steps would help to improve the image of substantiveness.

Lack of cultural diversity was identified as a movement-level concern in both the mass and movement-produced media yet little to no effort was made to deal with it. Objectification and the martyr concept could provide possible solutions. Objectifying those exploiters of natural resources and showing how they also exploit minorities in the process would be useful, or, with the martyr concept, showing individual minorities as victims of environmental exploitation could gain sympathy and support for the movement as a whole.

As in the mass media sample, most of the identity-management problems specified at the movement level were not confronted directly, and again as before, targeting constituency audiences only made the situation difficult. Rhetorical responses to deficient images were contradictory and attempts to manage constituency identities complicated similar efforts put forth by others. Overall, constituencies were by far more concerned with their own individual identities and audiences than that of the movement as a whole. Apparently there was some foundation for the mass media's characterization of division and conflict within the movement. In fact, the dissension manifested itself in the movement-produced media as well. It was found that the target and intensity of opposition changed from one source to the next with the movement-produced media being more intense than the mass media. Also, little to no effort was made, except by the radical constituency, to articulate with precision, suggestions for environmental activism in either the mass or movement-produced media.
As a general summary, an answer to the research question [Once constituted, how do social movement constituencies manage their identities and what is the impact of this effort on the identity of the movement as a whole?] reveals that, in mass and movement-produced media, coexisting constituencies primarily relied upon the rhetorical techniques of vilification, objectification, martyring, legitimation and languaging strategies. These constituencies focused upon their own identity and all but ignored that of the movement. Their efforts at identity management only indirectly influenced that of the movement and when this did occur, the movement was usually adversely affected. Identity management at one level complicated this function at different levels.

The environmental movement seems to have an identity as a "movement" despite the efforts of activist constituencies. One could speculate that this identity is made to seem extra-rhetorical and persists based upon its historical foundations, or the mass media's unquestioned references to the "environmental movement," or even how people casually engage in discussions of the "environmental movement" existing as such. The activist constituencies could capitalize on these discourses and work with them to further solidify this ideology with their audience and to act upon this ideology as a mass movement in the material world but fail to do so. The power to define the "movement" or to affirm its existence lies elsewhere. Attention is now directed toward a discussion of the implications of this summary.
Significance of Findings

This study began with the fundamental claim that current definitions of social movements in the field of rhetorical studies were lacking and that identity management is an important function that rhetoric fulfills in social movements, but had yet to be explored. The purpose of this analysis was to develop a more complete understanding of these related issues. The remaining portion of this final chapter will discuss the implications of this analysis and offer recommendations for future studies in this area.

As summarized in the literature review of the first chapter, the definition of social movements in rhetorical studies has perplexed scholars for quite some time. Several ongoing debates characterize this effort based on the key issues of orientation, institutionalization, confrontation and substance. To begin, this research project pursued a rhetorical, not sociological or historical, definition of movements. Specifically, how reconstitutive rhetorics function within social movements was the target of study.

Also, the line of thought developed by McGee and others who argued social movements are best studied as changes in meaning, not phenomenon, is followed. This study illustrated how the constituencies labeled "mainstream," "grassroots," and "radical" are abstract social constructs and that their meaning is assigned through rhetorical transactions. Examining these meanings and how they are reconstituted and made to appear as givens is the unique contribution that rhetorical scholars can make. For example, examining environmental discourses
would enable the scholar to chart changes in ideology including what "nature," "environmentalist," or "humankind" means from one point in time to another. Changes in the meaning of the "environmental movement" itself could be charted with such a longitudinal study. This project focused on one specific aspect of such a study by illustrating changes in how constituencies think and talk about themselves, each other and the movement. Upon charges of "limousine environmentalism," the mainstream attempted to reorient its rhetoric to depict itself as professional and independent. The grassroots attempted to transform the NIMBY stereotype into a politically sophisticated identity. The radicals tried to exchange their identity as terrorist eco-guerrillas for one of reluctant warriors.

While Cathcart and others emphasized the confrontational nature of movements, the environmental movement was found to be more nonconfrontational. This offers credence to Randall Lake's position that Cathcart's description is overly restrictive (Lake 1983). Seldom did constituencies directly confront traditional power structures. What confrontation there was existed between constituencies more so than between the movement and "the establishment" in the mass media and the movement-produced media both, and this was primarily focused on the radicals. Overall, enemies were ill-defined.

Lastly, on the issue of institutionalization, this study takes sides with Smith and Windes, rather than Simons and others, claiming social movements can become an institutionalized part of society once made to seem "extra-rhetorical." As argued in sociological scholarship as well, the ability of social movements to mobilize is dependent upon organizational
capacity. Social movement constituencies organize themselves according to their self-images or identities. One of the problems of being a collective is developing and maintaining this collective identity making mobilization possible. Though factionalism had been identified as an important issue to investigate in both rhetorical and sociological scholarship, this analysis was one of the first to examine the varying intensity of rhetoric as it managed the competing identities of these factions. In these ways, this analysis of the environmental movement strengthens one side of the ongoing debates on how to define a social movement over others.

Turning to the second area of significance, a number of scholars have examined a variety of functions rhetoric fulfills in social movements. One of the primary purposes of this project, in addition to clarifying definitions of social movements, was to identify and analyze how rhetoric functions to manage competing identities within social movements. The thrust of the reconstitutive rhetorics found in these data reflect this concern for identity management at both the constituency and movement levels. If movements are to be defined in a manner that reflects their factional nature, identifying and analyzing this particular function of rhetoric is essential. Reconstitutive rhetorics are employed to transform perceptions of movements and must continually function in this capacity if the movement is to adapt to ever-changing political and social climates or to effectively respond to repeated hailings from other players in the environmental movement. In this regard, social movements must continually reorient their rhetoric and reassert their power to define.
In sum, managing identities in this way is a rhetorical transaction consisting of the process of interpellation and necessitating action. The "environmental movement" is taken to be a given or somehow extra-rhetorical throughout these discourses. Constitutive and reconstitutive rhetorics created the collective political subject known as the "environmental movement." The movement owes its existence to the rhetoric that articulates it which was the data for this project.

This interpellation provided a basis for ideological appeals to action, however, a major shortcoming of the reconstitutive rhetorics in this sample is that action was barely necessitated. Only the radical constituency in its own publication consistently necessitated action. Until identity-management problems are confronted more forthrightly and organization is presented more soundly, such mobilizational appeals will remain secondary.

Consequently, constituencies appeared as representatives of "the public" or as Dewey would describe, "social experts." They offered a surrogate discourse on behalf of the public. This discourse affirmed the democratic process yet, as Habermas would describe, relieved individuals of their social duties at the same time. Lack of specific information on involvement, as Lippmann identified, was at the root of this dilemma. The hands-on approach to environmentalism found its way into the mass media in the form of handbooks at Earth Day 1990, and while some environmental groups produced or collaborated on such publications, this approach has only recently and still to a small degree, found its way into social movement newsletters. For this reason, environmental movement discourse must be just as much concerned
with basic citizenship skills as environmental issues. With this in mind, suggestions for the improvement of reconstitutive rhetorics employed in identity management will now be offered.

**Future Reconstitutive Rhetorics**

At the practical level, this analysis of identity-management problems and rhetorical responses to them on the part of the environmental movement reveals a number of possibilities for improving these discourses. First, a strong effort on the part of all constituencies must be made to show diversity in a positive light. These multiple coexisting social movement organizations are not going to agree to address one intended audience or on issues and tactics, and pretending they will for the sake of public credibility is fruitless. When confronted with accusations that diversity inhibits effectiveness, constituencies should respond by showing its attributes. These differences inspire creativity, are a means of preventing cooptation, and are a means of seeing environmental problems more completely. Stressing the commonality of long-term goals, not short-term tactics, would prove useful.

Secondly, more action steps must be specified to personalize the discourse and to involve the intended audience. The numerous how-to handbooks published at Earth Day 1990 move in this direction, but the action-oriented nature of this rhetoric needs to be employed consistently, regardless of medium, thus putting the action back in activism.
As another suggestion, the martyr technique so skillfully used by the radical constituency could be used on a broader base to move the grounds of argumentation from the purely political and scientific to the moral. With so much public attention on issues of public morality, such as prayer in public schools, abortion or private lives of politicians, the way is paved for such a transition. Showing the immorality of the racist and sexist nature of environmental degradation through martyrdom would also rekindle and formulate links between other movements such as the women’s and civil right’s efforts that could prove useful.

As a last suggestion, organizing a movement-wide publication that would serve as an open forum for discussion of cultural diversity, autonomy, factionalism, substantiveness, or other problems as well as for debate on issues and tactics would be extremely beneficial. Here, constituencies could talk to one another instead of about one another and directly address a broader audience.

Limits of the Study

The sheer amount of discourse, authenticity of data, and ever changing nature of the complicated enterprise called a social movement makes studying it truly overwhelming. Scholars can only hope to take a snap-shot view of them at a particular time and place. High turnover rates bring new presidents and editors who, in turn, bring new formats and styles and changes in other internal factors as well. Political climates and other external factors change just as often. Capturing the interplay between internal and external factors is perplexing and forces
artifical parameters to be set. This research project reflects all of these limitations. For example, a variety of mass media sources were used in this project so as to have a sufficient pool of artifacts, but in the movement-produced media sample, only newsletters were considered because the number of sources needed to be limited to make the project manageable. The study might also benefit from a more varied movement-produced media data sample that might include other social movement organizations as well. Also, if timing had been different, data for the time of Earth Day 1990 and one year later may better represent the use of reconstitutive rhetorics in times of limited coverage. For these reasons, the current effort must be continued. Several suggestions for future research in rhetorical studies in general, and of the environmental movement in particular will now be offered.

Suggestions for Future Research

Studies of how other social movements manage competing identities could be compared to this one in order to get a broader understanding of how reconstitutive rhetorics function in this way. A longitudinal study constructed similarly to this one that examines the rhetoric of the conservation movement or the early part of the environmental movement could be compared to the findings of this project in order to determine if different identity problems confront movements over time and if rhetoric functions differently in response to these problems. A more detailed study of a variety of movement-produced media, such as magazines or direct mailings, and
perhaps from organizations of a variety of social movements, would be useful for understanding the role of these media more completely. For example, the Environmental Defense Fund is similar to NRDC, Sierra Club is similar to NAS, and Friends of the Earth is somewhat similar to EF}

Studies of the environmental movement outside the United States are important since environmental problems and the movement itself are both of a global nature. Another suggestion is to examine publications of government and industry instead of only the mass media and movement spokespersons to compare rhetorical strategies of the different key players working together. As a last recommendation, the effort to identify other functions of rhetoric in social movements must also be continued.

**Implications for Rhetorical Studies**

A number of implications for future rhetorical studies can be identified based on this project's findings. First, the effort to define movements rhetorically is advanced and rhetorical scholars conducting social movement studies will have to conceptualize their subject in a manner that reflects the rhetorical richness and complexity of movements more fully.

Second, since another function, that of identity management, was identified and illustrated, the body of knowledge on how rhetoric functions in social movements is expanded and more complete. Taking a functional approach enables rhetoric scholars to avoid overly narrow
studies characterized by the catch phrase, "the rhetoric of ____", and instead to see broader connections.

Third, not defining movements as mass, homogenous, univocal entities is not only more realistic, it also makes studying them more manageable. Seeing movements as relationships based on the power to define or mobilize gives scholars a more natural set of parameters in which to work. Such a relational perspective reflects the diologic, conversational, ongoing aspects of rhetoric in social movements.

Lastly, the concept of the audience is historically central in the study of rhetoric. The general nature of the relationship between rhetors and audiences is further clarified and credence is lent to the argument that audiences do not already exist, they participate in the discourse that address them to constitute or reconstitute their discursive positions.

In a project taking the environmental movement as a case study, it is appropriate to close with a sentiment from "the voice of wilderness." John Muir once lamented, "most people live on the world, not in it." Yet humankind's understanding of the difference between these two positions, of the world and its place in it -- its very meaning -- is a rhetorical effect. A reminder from Charland and others: as social beings "the position one embodies as a subject is a rhetorical effect." The environmental movement's reminder is that both positions are mutually dependent and therefore both are becoming increasingly precarious.
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