

“THERE IS A PLACE SET FOR YOU AT OUR TABLE, IF YOU WILL CHOOSE TO
JOIN US”: AN INVITATIONAL RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF STARHAWK’S
THE FIFTH SACRED THING

A Thesis
by
VICTORIA I LOZANO

Submitted to the Graduate School
at Appalachian State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

August 2013
Department of English

“THERE IS A PLACE SET FOR YOU AT OUR TABLE, IF YOU WILL CHOOSE TO
JOIN US”: AN INVITATIONAL RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF STARHAWK’S
THE FIFTH SACRED THING

A Thesis
by
VICTORIA I LOZANO
August 2013

APPROVED BY:

Georgia Rhoades
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

Donna Lillian
Member, Thesis Committee

Kathryn Kirkpatrick
Member, Thesis Committee

Jim Fogelquist
Chairperson, Department of English

Edelma D. Huntley
Dean, Cratis Williams Graduate School

Copyright by Victoria I Lozano 2013
All Rights Reserved

Abstract

“THERE IS A PLACE SET FOR YOU AT OUR TABLE, IF YOU WILL CHOOSE TO JOIN US”: AN INVITATIONAL RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF STARHAWK’S
THE FIFTH SACRED THING

Victoria I Lozano
B.A., Coastal Carolina University
M.A., Appalachian State University

Chairperson: Georgia Rhoades

Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Cindy L. Griffin’s definition of Invitational Rhetoric is restricted when the rhetorical space does not adhere to the feminist principles of equality, immanent value, and self-determination, which undergird the Invitational Rhetorical theory. This alternative feminist rhetoric encourages transformation through dialogue and non-coercive speech acts. The success of this alternative rhetoric as a dialogue can occur when the rhetorical space is identified within the paradigm of constructed potentiality. The paradigm of constricted potentiality does not provide a space for Invitational Rhetoric; therefore, to engage in that rhetoric one must use Invitational Rhetorical tactics. Starhawk’s *The Fifth Sacred Thing* enacts Invitational Rhetoric and Invitational Rhetorical tactics to explore each paradigm represented in the novel through the rhetorical actions of the characters of Maya, Bird, and Madrone.

Acknowledgments

I am honored to have shared my time and experience with Dr. Georgia Rhoades, Dr. Donna Lillian, and Dr. Kathryn Kirkpatrick. Each of these women led me to different threads of feminism. I thank my wonderful cohort who encouraged me and pushed me to new limits. Lastly, but most emotionally, I thank my mother, sister, brother, brother-in-law, nephew, niece, my roommate Allie, and my dog Jethro. You all provided the laughs and shoulders necessary to get me through this stage in my life.

Dedication

I dedicate this to my mother, Antonia. She is the perfect example of strength and commitment. I also dedicate this to the feminists who have shaped my life. Feminism is in all of us; it is time to enact it rhetorically.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iv
Acknowledgments.....	v
Dedication.....	vi
Chapter 1.....	1
Chapter 2.....	19
Chapter 3.....	48
Works Cited.....	73
Vita.....	80

Chapter 1

We need to know the writing of the past, and know it differently than we have ever known it; not to pass on a tradition but to break its hold over us.

--Adrienne Rich, 1972

Feminist rhetoricians expanded the field of rhetoric by uncovering forgotten voices and anthologizing important women's voices. Recovery and reconstruction are methodologies used to establish women's presence within the rhetorical field. As scholarship began to grow in the late 1980s and early 1990s, feminist rhetoricians focused on producing texts that viewed women as alternative users of rhetoric. Amidst this inquiry, communication scholars Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Cindy L. Griffin proposed an alternative rhetoric entitled invitational rhetoric. Invitational rhetoric is a rhetorical style that is grounded in the three feminist principles of equality, immanent value, and self-determination ("Beyond Persuasion" 4) and functions best in a rhetorical space situated in freedom, openness, and safety ("Beyond Persuasion" 10-11). Invitational rhetoric viewed the rhetorical field through a feminist lens that focused on the three feminist principles in contrast to the predominant patriarchal lens that favored persuasion, conversion and conquest. The research and growth in the feminist rhetorical field has provided the groundwork for invitational rhetoric to survive.

In the 1970s Annette Kolodny and Karlyn Kohrs Campbell criticized the traditional canon due to its lack of female rhetors. This criticism led to scholarship integrating, recovering and reconstructing women's rhetoric. I will provide the context of feminist historiography and an overview of feminist historiographers who published feminist

rhetorical anthologies. These anthologies started to identify popular female rhetors who were influential in their time. In the mid 1990s, scholarship encouraged feminist rhetoricians to view the success of women rhetors in contrast to the traditional definition of success. The traditional definition of success was one who was able to dominate a conversation through persuasion. A group of feminist rhetoricians and communication theorists speculated an alternative and inclusive rhetoric that did not adhere to the traditional definition of success: invitational rhetoric.

In 2002 scholar Hui Wu positioned feminist historiography as a lens of criticism which “only asks questions about rhetoric that appear interesting to men from within the rhetorical experiences that are characteristic of men” (84). Wu explained that due to patriarchal “biases,” feminist historiographers can “put traditional methodology to the test by asking further questions with women’s experiences in mind” (84). Wu coupled feminist concepts of the personal-as-political with feminist methodology and defended the historical insertion of women by stating,

In its political sense, returning history to women is returning the rights of property ownership to women who traditionally had no rights to material and intellectual inheritance, thus returning their human rights to them. From both semantic and political viewpoints, women’s history inevitably challenges the way the content of history has been constructed. (85)

When silenced marginalized voices begin to talk, they add new perspectives to the conversation. New perspectives unmask the limitations or assumptions of constructed histories. Feminist historiographers have positioned the importance of women’s voices by representing them in historical context.

One-way to re-present women was to define their rhetorical success by how they navigated through a rhetorical situation. Another way was to identify the limitations of traditional rhetorical success and create an alternate space for women to speak without the limitations of traditional success. Whichever the approach, there was a weight of responsibility to reposition silenced women in the limelight. As Wu suggested in the previous passage, when feminist rhetoricians recovered women, they were “returning rights of property ownership” (85) to women and supporting continuous enactment of these rights too. As historiographers restored voice to the voice-less, space was created for other feminist rhetoricians to cultivate alternative forms of communication.

Feminist Historiography: The Inclusion of Women Speakers

In 1973 Karlyn Kohrs Campbell published an article “The Rhetoric of Women’s Liberation: An Oxymoron” in which she analyzed speech material from the 2nd wave feminism of the 1960s. In this article, Campbell highlighted various rhetorical tactics such as consciousness-raising, which “involves meetings of small, leaderless groups in which each person is encouraged to express her personal feelings and experiences” (79), and personal transformation which states that “analysis must move from personal experience and feeling to illuminate a common condition that all women experience and share” (81). These examples were alternate forms of rhetorical acts that were useful to confront “intense moral conflict” (78). Campbell defined feminist rhetoric as a specialized lens, which added alternate rhetorical styles to the traditional rhetorical field (84-85). However, in order for consciousness-raising and personal transformation to be successful the historiographers had to judge success beyond the parameters of traditional rhetoric. This judgment was redefined as the rhetorical field became more inclusive to feminist rhetorical tactics.

In 1989 Campbell published an anthology of female rhetors from the first women's rights movement entitled *Man Cannot Speak for Her*. In this anthology, Campbell defined rhetoric as a configuration of symbols that were successful when their rhetorical space was understood (2). Her companion anthology showcased speeches and writings of early feminist rhetors such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Sojourner Truth, Susan B. Anthony, Anna H. Shaw, and Carrie Chapman Catt. Her methodology for choosing these women was guided by three principles: choosing women who spoke in favor of women's rights among men (8), choosing women who were nationally known because there was more evidence of success given their rhetorical situation (8), and supplying a list of women speakers to argue that they were a part of "symbolization in all its variety and to identify touchstones that illustrate peaks of human symbolic creativity" (9).

Campbell's contribution to the field was her definition of rhetorical success for women speakers. She posited that without understanding the rhetorical situation, women speakers were "treated as artifacts from which excerpts can be drawn rather than artistic works that must be seen whole in order to be understood and appreciated" (1). She further noted that success could be identified as "skillful responses to the problems they confronted" (3). Therefore, the recovered and revalued voices were limited by the rhetorical situation because of their gender. This analysis supported the research of how women moved beyond the limitations of their gender within rhetorical situations in order to be heard.

This groundbreaking two-volume anthology did not escape criticism from feminist rhetoricians who were critical of the methodology that Campbell used to situate her research. In 1992 feminist scholar Barbara Biesecker wrote, "Coming to Terms with Recent Attempts

to Write Women into the History of Rhetoric” which spawned controversy between her and Campbell. Biesecker worried that Campbell’s research enacted an affirmative action move, which perpetuated “tokenism” of gender in the field. Biesecker stated,

[T]he danger in taking an affirmative action approach to the history of Rhetoric is that while we may have managed to insert some women into the canon (and, again, this is no small thing), we will have not yet begun to challenge the underlying logic of canon formation and the uses to which it has been put that have written the rhetorical contributions of collective women into oblivion. (144)

This caution validated her other concern that “the mere accumulation of texts does not guarantee that [rhetoricians’] ways of knowing will change when the grounds for [women’s] inclusion, and, likewise, [rhetoricians’] way of deciphering them, remain the same” (145). Biesecker was concerned that if we only continued to find and anthologize women’s voices then we were not achieving the answers to why and how women were neglected in the first place.

In 1993, Campbell responded to Biesecker’s critique in her article “Biesecker Cannot Speak for Her Either.” Campbell accused Biesecker of ad hominem, and responded with more ad hominem, that Biesecker reflected “women who are willing to attack other women who attempt to change the status quo” (154). Campbell contested Biesecker’s accusations of “tokenism” arguing that the field of women rhetors had yet to be finished. Feminist rhetoric had to focus on the individual speaker because women were shunned from public discourse, and therefore, had no collective voice to be theorized unlike men. In conclusion, the argument between Biesecker and Campbell reflected the controversial ground feminist

rhetoricians were walking. Despite Biesecker's criticism, Campbell's anthology opened the door for feminist rhetoricians to dedicate more anthologies to female speakers and writers in order to broaden the field of rhetoric.

In 1995, Andrea Lunsford published her anthology *Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition*. Lunsford's anthology was "not a history of women rhetoricians, or women orators, or women writers. It is instead a glimmer of possibilities, an array of glances—an enthymeme" (ix). This outlook on her methodology reconciled the stigma of "tokenism" and the fear of essentialism. Lunsford's collection followed the lead of feminist rhetorician Annette Kolodny's students' desire to incorporate women speakers into the canon (4). Lunsford's methodology of research was

[N]ot [an] attempt to redefine a 'new' rhetoric but rather to interrupt the seamless narrative usually told about the rhetorical tradition and to open up possibilities for multiple rhetorics, rhetorics that would not name and valorize one traditional, competitive, agonistic, and linear mode of rhetorical discourse but would rather incorporate other, often dangerous moves: breaking silence; naming in personal terms; employing dialogics; recognizing and using the power of conversation; moving centripetally towards connections ; and valuing—indeed insisting upon—collaboration.(6)

Lunsford also posited that women's rhetoric concentrated on "understanding, exploration, connection, and conversation" (6). This analysis echoed Campbell's definition of success and added the discovered tropes were acts of resistance that women had to use to be heard. Lunsford's addition invited a feminist perspective to expand the definition of rhetoric.

Lunsford's anthology represented women using feminist rhetorical acts as a chance to alter the conception of women in history and thus expand the field of rhetoric to include these alternate acts as success.

That same year, 1995, Shirley Wilson Logan published her book of African and ethnic female rhetors *With Pen and Voice: A critical Anthology of Nineteenth-Century African-American Women*. This anthology sought to “contribute to the restoration by presenting the rhetorical responses of black women who spoke and wrote as preambles to action” (xi). She recovered works of Sojourner Truth, Frances Ellen Watkins Harper, Anna Julia Haywood Cooper, Ida B. Wells, Fannie Barrier Williams, and Victoria Earle Matthews. Logan expanded the definition of her methodology of recovery in her 1999 book “*We are Coming*”: *The Persuasive Discourse of Nineteenth Century Black Women*. The purpose of this second book was to “identify common practices across rhetorical acts that were molded and constrained by prevailing conventions and traditions” (xiv). Through her research, Logan observed that African American women and marginalized ethnic group “speakers were the embodiment of their messages—whether the message was abolishment of slavery, support for black women, or recognition of racial autonomy. They authenticated their arguments; the messenger was the message” (22). Logan's anthology paralleled Campbell's intent of supplying women speeches to enrich the understanding of women's rhetorical situations. Logan also defined rhetorical success as the way women's voices confronted problems instead of how well they altered the environment, which is indicative of traditional methods.

Molly Meijer Wertheimer's 1997 anthology, *Listening to Their Voices: The Rhetorical Activities of Historical Women*, concentrated on identifying alternate rhetorical moves found throughout world history and did not concentrate solely on American women

such as Campbell or Logan. Wertheimer's methodology reflected Lunsford's sentiments that "large portions of historical populations and significant kinds of suatory activities have been left out of account" (3). Therefore, there needed to be a more inclusive analysis of rhetoric that moved beyond the American boundary. Wertheimer's criticism was considered in Wu's 2002 article "Historical Studies of Rhetorical Women Here and There: Methodological Challenges to Dominant Interpretive Frameworks," which raised awareness of the "challenges from women of marginal status," stating that third world feminist recovery is usually "limited to the study of the deceased" (90). Wu called for "living women" to be translated and analyzed because "this kind of research is informative, consequential, and indispensable to women's rhetorical history construction in general and to larger interpretive frameworks" (91). Scholar Jane Donawerth enacted this call for world rhetors in her 2002 anthology *Rhetorical Theory by Women before 1900*, which will be discussed later in this section.

Wertheimer's final chapter in the anthology, Diane Miller's "The Future of Feminist Rhetorical Criticism" (359-380), exposed opposing views of methodological choices to recover women's voices. One view was to recover women "alongside their male counterparts in traditional accounts" (3). The other view was to recover by favoring "the identification of oppressive forces that have kept women quiet" (3). In the chapter, Miller addressed the contention between the views by including literary theorist Elaine Showalter's opinion that inserting women amongst traditional patriarchal texts "[represented] only an evolutionary phase" (qtd. in Miller 360). The limitation of continuing this insertion of women was that it

deepened the “dependence on the very texts it [sought] to undermine” (360). Therefore, inserting women still perpetuated patriarchal frameworks unless we create a new space for feminist rhetoric to occur without patriarchal judgment or influence.

Miller offered Showalter’s term “gynocentrism” (361) as an answer to the controversy of recovering women rhetors from an patriarchal lens. Gynocentrism, in the voice of Showalter, addressed “‘the essential question of difference’ between women and men, masculinity and femininity” (361). Gynocentrism provided a space for women to concentrate on the gender construction of women. This thought is similar to Lunsford’s anthology, which called for women speakers to be defined through a feminist perspective. Feminist rhetoric’s break from the term gynocentrism occurred when each field—feminist rhetoric and literary criticism—redefined their discourse community. Miller identified this split as feminist rhetorician’s future of reconstruction and re-vision of history. To “read one’s exclusion from a text while simultaneously rereading the possibilities of one’s *inclusion*” (her emphasis 366) would create a discourse community of future inquiry via a gynocentric lens or feminist perspective. Miller defined that feminist rhetoric was “not only the opportunity for critique but the potential for reinvention that [provided] the impetus for a feminist engagement with the texts of the rhetorical tradition” (371). This “reinvention” is similar to feminist rhetoricians who advocated reconstruction and is specifically addressed further in the “feminist reconstruction” section.

In 1998, Carol Mattingly’s anthology *Well-Tempered Women: Nineteenth Century Temperance Rhetoric* identified Temperance women speakers as the most successful speakers of their time because “Temperance women connected theory to practice, and made the connection both important and comprehensible to the general populace through speeches,

fiction, and even dress” (2). Temperance women understood their rhetorical limitation and used writing, due to its less public appeal, to gain credibility and “move toward oral, public delivery” (7). Mattingly’s analysis suggested that temperance women were aware of their social barriers and were successful in their persuasion because they strategically navigated around the barriers. Once they gained momentum by way of written communication they were able to move safely into the public speaking arena. This strategy was reminiscent of Campbell’s 1973 article “The Rhetoric of Women’s Liberation: An Oxymoron” that identified “consciousness raising” as a feminist rhetorical move. In the 1960s, silenced women informed people of inequalities through the rhetorical act of “consciousness raising” instead of engaging in persuasive arguments. Since this term was not used until after the Temperance movement it would be difficult to label the temperance women speakers as such, but there were similarities between the movements in relation to this term.

The anthologies of rhetoric published in the mid to late 1990s focused on recovering voices alongside the traditional canon. Joy Ritchie and Kate Ronald’s 2001 book, *Available Means: An Anthology of Women’s Rhetoric(s)*, shook the rhetorical field because Ritchie and Ronald collected women rhetors and labeled them as rhetorical theorists. Ritchie and Ronald understood that their anthology “[ran] the risk of ‘canonizing’” (xx). However, Ritchie and Ronald hoped that the conversation of women and rhetoric would continue to “. . . unsettle homogenizing tendencies that recreate[d] traditional, exclusive rhetorical frameworks” (xx). They included women who were of historical significance such as Aspasia and Marjorie Kempe, women who “advance[d] the cause for women’s rights to public participation” (xx), and women who “redefine[d] traditional notions of invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery” (xx). Lastly, and most differently from other anthologies previously published

(Campbell; Lunsford; Logan; Wertheimer; Mattingly; Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg; Mattingly), Ritchie and Ronald chose women rhetors who challenged the traditional definition of public rhetorical space such as Audre Lorde's rhetoric, which was grounded by experiential knowledge of her battle with breast cancer (xxi). Including these different styles, Ritchie and Ronald provided an exhaustive textbook for students to study and understand the historical exclusion of women in the traditional field of rhetoric.

From this collection Ritchie and Ronald made several discoveries: Women's desire to speak for themselves, to create language to support their opinions and differences as active agents in oppressive rhetorical spaces, and to keep personal experience "... attached to theorizing rather than creating an abstract set of prescriptions disconnected from the contexts or stripped of the exigencies of everyday life" (xxvii). This anthology asked readers to "reconceptualize" theory and "read women's rhetoric as theory" (xxvii). In so doing, the readers understood that women's rhetoric was about the "praxis" as a "central feature of women's rhetorical stance" (xxvii). This was a critical contribution to feminist reconstruction, which will be discussed in the next section.

A year after this declarative anthology, in 2002, Jane Donawerth's *Rhetorical Theory by Women before 1900* anthology focused on women's rhetoric internationally before 1900. "Contrary to [her] expectation" (ix) Donawerth and several graduate students discovered many voices that were beyond "a narrow selection of Britons or Americans" (ix). Donawerth's collection concentrated on providing a feminist perspective alongside rhetorical theory and portrayed conversation as a successful mode of communication. Donawerth's main argument emphasized women's "conversation as a model for other forms of communication" (xxxix). She believed that due to women's exclusion from the traditional

education of rhetoric, “many women theorists [did] not even treat argument or persuasion” (xv). Therefore, Donawerth encouraged the field of rhetoric to include the broader term of “communication.” To use this inclusive term increased the value of “conversation as a model for public as well as private discourse, collaboration with the audience in the creation of meaning, and dialogic forms for teaching and reflecting about rhetoric” (xv). Donawerth suggested that rhetoric include all forms of communication in order to create a more inclusive space for women rhetors.

Overall in her anthology, Donawerth discovered women’s rhetoric resisted persuasion due to poor education in traditional rhetoric. She suggested the use of “communication” as an alternative way to view rhetoric to encompass the resistance she discovered. To read Donawerth’s discoveries and suggestions alongside Ritchie and Ronald’s discussion of women’s rhetoric connecting praxis, added new vocabulary and criticism to feminist rhetorical discourse. This vocabulary and criticism opened the discourse community further to perceive feminist rhetoric as its own entity.

In 2012, Donawerth pushed the boundary of this rhetorical concept in her anthology *Conversation Rhetoric: The Rise and Fall of a Women’s Tradition 1600-1900*. In this book Donawerth concentrated on the rhetorical moves within British and American women speakers. Her methodology provided a “revisionist, feminist, critical or ‘constructionist’ history of women’s rhetorical theory” (9) that viewed women speakers through a feminist perspective. Donawerth’s anthology enacted Lunsford, Miller, and Ritchie and Ronald’s call for a feminist criticism of women’s rhetoric.

New and Old Methodology

Despite their differences in methodologies, Campbell, Lunsford, Wertheimer, Ritchie and Ronald, and Donawerth discussed, in their respective anthologies, that women speakers conducted alternate rhetorical moves that were deemed unsuccessful by the traditional rhetorical definition of persuasion. Donawerth was the most specific to identify the difference between women speakers when she stated, “women theorists do not even treat argument or persuasion” (xv). Her use of the word “theorists” was important to note because it encouraged a connection between rhetoric and theory, specifically feminist theory. Feminist revisionists encouraged re-conceptions of rhetoric in order to include more voices. The inclusion would induce interpretive changes of social events that would expose the limitation or exclusion of gender and/or marginalized ethnic groups within the rhetorical field.

In viewing the anthologies we can see different frameworks of recovery limited by time, ethnicity, and geography. Scholar Cheryl Glenn called for a “remapping” of rhetorical content in order to include more voices and understand the exclusion of voices. Glenn concentrated mostly on the inclusion of Aspasia as depicted in her 1994 article “Sex, Lies, and Manuscript: Refiguring Aspasia in the History of Rhetoric.” Her article inspired others to look at other coexisting women rhetors including C. Jan Swearingen’s essay “A Lover’s Discourse: Diotima, Logos, and Desire.” In this essay, Swearingen referred to the devalued female Greek philosophers and rhetors such as Diotima or Aspasia due to their rhetorical content of love and relationships. These facets of human capacity were considered subordinate to the preferred content of “spiritual and philosophical procreation, the

engendering of knowledge, and the bringing of ideas into being” (28). In conversation with Glenn and Swearingen are Susan Jarrat and Rory Ong’s 1995 article “Aspasia: Rhetoric, Gender, and Colonial Ideology.”

Collectively, these scholars (Glenn; Swearingen; Jarrat and Ong) wrote to locate the epistemic roots of women’s exclusion from the traditional rhetorical canon. This methodology of reverting to the epistemic roots of various attitudes that promote dominant ideology was a feminist move and further explored in Lorraine Code’s 1995 book *Rhetorical Spaces: Essays on Gendered Location*. An argument against this revision methodology was the danger of subjective truths that contradicted historical findings. Xin Lu Gale’s 2000 article “Historical Studies and Postmodernism: Rereading Aspasia of Miletus” depicted this argument because of her fear of essentialist construction and biased interpretation of women rhetors in history. Gale stated, “all women do not belong to the same community, all women are not feminists, all feminist are not women, and even all feminists do not belong to the same community” (450). Feminist rhetoricians flirted with exclusion reminiscent of patriarchy when there was a continued focus of women as gendered rhetors.

Gale accused Glenn, Jarrat and Ong of biased research that failed to provide an “objective truth” regarding the recovered women. That same year, 2000, Patricia Bizzell defended the revision work of Glenn, Jarrat and Ong in her article “Feminist Methods of Research in the History of Rhetoric: What Difference Do They Make?” Bizzell situated Gale’s argument as a misinterpretation of “objective truth” arguing that due to postmodernism lens there were no more objective truths (9). Bizzell deduced Gale’s contention was with Glenn’s, Jarrat, and Ong’s presentation of recovery that looked as if they were after objective truths (9). Bizzell attributed Gale’s misinterpretation of Glenn, Jarrat,

and Ong's eschewal of traditional methodology to "the role of emotion in feminist historiography" (10). This accusation and observation was relative to Wu's observation that feminist researchers act as agents to transform dominant research practices in order to expand the field of rhetoric.

There were also connections to Campbell, Lunsford, Logan, and Miller's perception of feminist rhetoric. Emotional presence in feminist historiography was reminiscent of Campbell's 1973 observation that personal transformation was a 2nd wave feminism rhetorical tactic. Emotional presence was also reminiscent of Lunsford's rhetorical analysis of women using personal experience to formulate arguments. Logan asserted that African American women's success was due to the literal embodiment of the message they were projecting thereby having an emotional attachment to their message. Miller echoed these sentiments: "For it is ultimately not only the opportunity for critique but the potential for reinvention that provides the impetus for a feminist engagement with the texts of the rhetorical tradition" (*Listening to Their Voices* 371). Bizzell stated that feminist rhetoricians have altered traditional research methods in order to "adopt radically new methods . . . most particularly in bringing in the person of the research, her body, her emotions, and dare one say, her soul, in the work" (123). These identified differences of methodology were important to theorize feminist rhetoric because it forced feminist scholars to see how these new methods altered the perception of the rhetorical field.

It also provided a space for communication theorists Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin to create their alternative rhetoric of invitational rhetoric, which was grounded in the three feminist principles and is successful when viewed through a feminist lens. These theorists worked individually and collaboratively to construct the framework of invitational

rhetoric as feminist rhetoric. This kind of feminist discourse could not be judged through a traditional lens because the discourse eschewed the traditional definition of rhetorical success by persuasion. Instead, the success of invitational rhetoric was defined by the identified feminist principles of equality, immanent value, and self-determination in a space of freedom, openness, and safety.

Opening the Rhetorical Field to Introduce a New Rhetoric

In 1991 Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss published *Women Speak: The Eloquence of Women's Lives*, which showcased women's discourse as an isolated subject. *Women Speak* addressed eight assumptions of valued discourse. These eight assumptions defined a successful rhetor as noteworthy, historically important, and usually only male. Other assumptions were the importance of individual speeches that were given in public arenas because "speechmaking is the most significant form of communication" (2). Significant texts are "finished" texts, and "suitable frameworks for assessing communication are derived from male perspectives" (2). Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss appreciated feminist historiographers for their implementation and recovery of women rhetors, but like Biesecker, they were concerned with the methodology of historiographers' recovery. Their concern was that feminist historiographers such as Campbell, Logan, and Mattingly recovered women according to some of these eight assumptions. Therefore, Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss created an anthology of alternative discourse that did not follow those assumptions. *Women Speak* offered new content to the rhetorical field that included forty-four different women rhetors divided into different activities such as architecture, graffiti, and rituals through a woman's experiential lens.

In 1999, Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin published *Feminist Rhetorical Theories* as a means to explore and connect the threads of feminism, theory, and rhetoric. They defined Feminism as a “vital, engaging, and exciting perspective from which to view virtually every facet of life” (3). The multi-faceted definition of feminism applied to the individual “opens up choices and possibilities and speaks to the very nature of feminism” because it was an “evolving process that necessarily changes as conditions in the world change and as feminists develop new understandings” (3). They provided individual narratives which all concluded with the commitment to enact feminist values listed as “self-determination, immanent value, affirmation, mutuality, and care” in order to “eliminate oppression, domination, and hierarchy in all of their manifestations” (5). For Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss and Griffin, the concept of feminism was not just theoretical, but a lifestyle that altered their perceptions of themselves, others, and constructed the reality they live in (5).

They firmly believed that rhetoric had the capability of change “because it can and does create reality” (7). They defined rhetoric as a series of symbols that should be used to “to understand how people construct the worlds in which they live and how those worlds make sense to them” (7) not as a persuasive tool. Then they defined theory as “a way to organize, describe, name, or explain phenomena . . . we do not believe that there is only one theory that correctly describes or captures any particular situation or activity” (8). They considered theory something humans did on a daily basis and were not restrained by a collective few who were considered experts in their field (8). The combination of feminism, rhetoric, and theory was necessary to address social injustices and recreate a reality that best reflected feminist values.

They chose to provide nine different women: Cheris Kramarae, bell hooks, Gloria Anzaldua, Mary Daly, Starhawk, Paula Gunn Allen, Trinh Minh-ha, Sally Miller Gearhart, and Sonia Johnson, who represented various “positions on feminism that [derived] from standpoints that vary across race, ethnicity, and class, as well as, sexual, political orientations” (10). Overall, the anthology was dedicated to inquiries of change and resistance through feminist rhetors. Each of the exhibited women posited something different for realms of feminism, but they consistently questioned their surroundings and theorized and speculated new origins through the platform of rhetoric.

Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss and Griffin’s contribution to the feminist rhetorical field was depicted in their “goal of feminist scholarship is the eradication of the ideology of domination that permeates Western Culture. In this view, feminism is used to reconceptualize and reconstruct rhetorical concepts and theories that contribute to the ideology of domination” (*Feminist Rhetorical Theories* 28). Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss and Griffin expanded their research of feminist rhetoric through the criticisms of feminism, rhetoric, and communication. The integration of these fields of study best reflected the definition and cultivation of invitational rhetoric as a way to reframe our use of symbols and therefore create a new perspective of our social selves. In the next chapter a discussion of their theoretical premise of invitational rhetoric is further explored.

Chapter 2

For the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house.

--Audre Lorde, 1979

A brief explanation of invitational rhetoric is that it is a dialogue in which two rhetors engage without intent-to-change or persuade the other. It is a rhetoric that positions the speaker and audience as equal and valued. The purpose of the dialogue is to offer information to provide further understanding of the rhetor's viewpoints, to invite each other into each of their perspective. Each rhetor must be willing to engage with the other's perspective judgment free. This creates a safe space for the rhetors to truly engage with their offering. Once all parties accept the situational conditions—safety, freedom, and value—and they embody their message with the three feminist principles—self-determination, immanent value, and equality—then optimal communication is reached, which serves the paradigm of constructed potentiality. This paradigm is a space where alternative rhetoric is judged as successful without the constraints of patriarchal assumptions (K. Foss and S. Foss, *Women Speak 2*) or traditional methodologies of persuasion. The paradigm of constructed potentiality provides the most appropriate rhetorical space for invitational rhetoric to occur because this space supports the feminist principles. The outcomes of this invitational dialogue are a deeper understanding of each other and/or a self-determined transformation. Rhetorical tactics like re-sourcement, reframement, and enfoldment (which is often linked to transformation) are used when the rhetorical situation is compromised by failure to adhere to the feminist principles or the concepts of equality, freedom, and safety. These rhetorical

tactics are used to maneuver through a rhetorical space that is found within the paradigm of constricted potentiality, which is representative of the traditional patriarchal framework and perpetuates rhetorical success through persuasion.

Invitational rhetoric is an integration of rhetoric, feminism, and communication. Coined by communication theorists Sonja K. Foss and Griffin, invitational rhetoric was offered to the academic community in 1995 in their article “Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for an Invitational Rhetoric.” In the proposal, Sonja K. Foss and Griffin define persuasion as “a desire for control and domination, for the act of changing another establishes the power of the change agent over that other” and that act of changing through persuasion, “devalues the lives and perspectives of those others” (3). Their proposal of invitational rhetoric as an alternate form of communication provided a “. . . rhetoric built on the principles of equality, immanent value, and self-determination rather than on the attempt to control others through persuasive strategies designed to effect change” (5). “Beyond Persuasion” was a landmark article that answered feminist rhetorician’s call (Donawerth; Lunsford) for an alternative rhetoric situated in a feminist frame.

In the 1999 anthology, *Feminist Rhetorical Theories*, S. Foss, K. Foss, and Griffin combined rhetoric and theory to enact feminist realities by interweaving the definitions of feminism, rhetoric, and theory. From feminism they extracted three feminist theoretical principles—equality, immanent value, and self-determination—which valued women’s experience, provided a voice for marginalized groups of people, and “establishes and legitimates a value system that privileges mutuality, respect, caring, power-with, interconnection, and immanent value” (5). They perceive rhetoric through a feminist frame and define it as “. . . any kind of human symbol use that functions in any realm . . .” (7).

They view theory through the same lens and define it as “. . . an effort to understand and account for something and the way it functions in the world” (8) through experiential knowledge. The integrated definitions provided a feminist framework to ground invitational rhetoric as an alternative form of feminist rhetoric eschewing traditional rhetorical boundaries.

An example of rhetorical criticism grounded in patriarchy was Kenneth Burke’s 1969 book, *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Burke defined rhetoric as a dialogue “grounded in opinion” and “*contrasted in truth*” (his emphasis 54). Therefore, the traditional dialogue was defined by two rhetors trying to sway one orator from their opinions of the Truth (54). This was synonymous with Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss’s definition of conversion and conquest rhetoric found in their 2003 book, *Inviting Transformation: Presentational Speaking for a Changing World* (4-5). These types of rhetorics are privileged over alternate forms because they were “an inherent part of many of the most cherished American political, legislative, and judicial systems” (5). Due to this privilege, many rhetoricians have been limited and/or marginalized from the field of study such as the women recovered in Lunsford’s, Donawerth’s, and Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin’s anthologies whose rhetorical skills are not considered successful alongside traditional rhetoric. Moreover, the patriarchal bias suppressed alternative rhetoric identification of success because it did not meet the traditional requirements of persuasion.

In this chapter I will elaborate on the definition of invitational rhetoric by exploring the call for an alternate rhetoric by feminist scholars; then, I will discuss foundational texts and concepts that encouraged Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin to propose

invitational rhetoric as an alternative rhetoric. I will review scholars who have successfully applied invitational rhetoric to various rhetorical situations and conclude by applying invitational rhetoric to Starhawk's *The Fifth Sacred Thing*.

Call for a New Rhetoric

In 1973, feminist rhetorician Karlyn Kohrs Campbell wrote a foundational article "The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron," which argued for women's liberation communication to be a separate rhetorical genre. Campbell argued that women's liberation communication practice eschewed traditional persuasion and acted as "'anti-rhetorical'" (78). She explained traditional rhetorical success was dependent on the "submissiveness and passivity" (78) of an audience, which was antithetical to "the fundamental goal of feminist advocacy—self-determination" (78). Moreover, Campbell posited that "anti-rhetorical" discourse was "characterized by the use of confrontative, non-adjustive strategies designed to 'violate the reality structure'" (81). This violation opened discussion and awareness to the limitations of gender roles and gender stereotypes found in traditional rhetoric.

"Anti-rhetorical" tactics of the 1960s women's liberation movement, as defined by Campbell, were consciousness raising, confrontation through attack metaphor, symbolic reversal, personal testimony, dialogue, self-revelation, self-criticism, and self-persuasion (81-82). Campbell explained, "the feminist analysis presume[d] that it [was] the social structure and the definition of the female role that generate[d] the problems that individual women experience[d] in their personal lives" (81). The feminist movement increased in success by asking women to speak experientially because it was "the only effective response to the

sensation of being threatened existentially” (83). This perspective valued experiential knowledge as Truth. Campbell argued that women’s language of the movement was resistant to patriarchal labels and encouraged dialogue, collaboration, and participatory action.

Three years later, in 1976, ecofeminist activist and rhetorician Sally Miller Gearhart wrote, “Womanpower: Energy Re-Sourcement,” which offered an alternative feminist rhetorical move: Re-sourcement. Gearhart defined re-sourcement as a spiritual movement, “the energy of receptivity, the energy of the listening ear, of the open meadow, of the expansive embrace” (198). She essentialized the act of re-sourcement by applying it only to women. Gearhart explained that the current social climate worked with a “power-over” relationship, which constructed a victor/victim dichotomy (196). This dichotomy fed stereotypes and labeled women as subordinate or unable to establish dominance, which in turn created a constricted relationship (this is further expanded in Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss article of constricted and constructed potentialities discussed later in the chapter). Gearhart stated that the victor/victim dichotomy “[was] the alienation of the individual from her internal energy source” and the only way women could regain that source was through the “absence of competitiveness and power-over activity” (196). An example of this displaced energy as an oppressive force was the laws that oppress women’s rights to their body (198).

Gearhart suggested that women’s “giving is a *presence*, an *offering*, an *opening*, a *surrounding*, a *listening*, a *vulnerability*, a *trust*” (her emphasis 198); therefore, it was devalued or silenced, manipulated, or extorted when the presence of patriarchal power-over was practiced. In 1979, Gearhart pushed criticism further in her article “The Womanization of Rhetoric.” This article addressed the troubling circumstances of teaching rhetoric as

persuasion without considering any other form of communication. Gearhart took a critical look at the functional differences of persuasion as “change and intent-to-change” (195). For Gearhart, educators focused on persuasion with “intent-to change” too much. In doing so, Gearhart believed the continuous value of persuasion with “intent-to-change” turned into an “act of violence” (195). To perpetuate the rhetoric was to perpetuate the “conversion/conquest mentality” which was “void of respect and openness, it [made] even the informative lecture into an oppressive act” (195). For Gearhart the “intent-to-change” mode of rhetoric was most relative to the “conquest model” (196) that allowed humans to physically alter the natural state:

Our history is a combination of conquest and conversion. We conquered trees and converted them into a house, taking pride in having accomplished a difficult task. We conquered rivers and streams and converted them into lakes, marveling in ourselves at the improvement we made on nature [...] We did not ask permission of trees, river, moon...They were the conquered. We were the conqueror. The more ‘fight’ they gave the more difficult the task, the more exhilarating was the contest and the more arrogant we became at winning over them. (196-197)

Here, Gearhart argues that the conquest/conversion rhetoric perpetuates an anthropocentric mentality. Interconnecting language with constructing reality was synchronous with Gearhart’s belief that relationships were built from communication (196). Alongside building relationship, Gearhart called readers’ attention to inner-energies, which, with or without our knowing, “react in measurable ways to objects or people generating high energy. We are

constantly being changed by each other” (196). Therefore, by finding alternate forms of communication we could begin building relationships again while respecting and honoring energy forces in each other and other sentient/non-sentient beings (196).

For Gearhart, “Feminism is at the very least the rejection of the conquest/conversion model of interaction and the development of new forms of relationship which allow for wholeness in the individual and differences among people and entities” (200). Gearhart’s call to redirect and critique the definition of traditional rhetoric, to expand it to encompass all communication, much like Donawerth’s position, provided a space for communication theorists Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin to propose and construct invitational rhetoric.

The brief definition of invitational rhetoric was similar to Gearhart’s offering of re-sourcement in her 1979, “The Womanization of Rhetoric” article. Gearhart described a “learning circumstance” (198) that focused on “mutual generation of energy for purposes of growth” (198). This circumstance could act as a dialogue where two speakers could agree on a set of terms: Speaking without intent-to-change each other; recognizing differences in perspective, but understanding these differences are equally valid in accordance with experiential knowledge; understanding that language is a series of symbols that can be misinterpreted, therefore, commitment to time and energy in deciphering the symbols is valued; lastly, having each speaker “yield her/his position entirely to the other(s)” (199). The description of this “learning circumstance” is similar to the undergirding principles of equality, immanent value, and self-determination found in invitational rhetoric. The concept

of yielding was associated with the transformational aspect of invitational rhetoric too. As this essay explored the growth of invitational rhetoric, it was easy to see that Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin looked to Gearhart for inspiration.

After Gearhart's 1979 essay, there was a decade or so of scholarship focused on the recovery of women in the rhetorical field. Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss's book in 1991, *Women Speak: the Eloquence of Women's Lives*, redirected the conversation from recovery back to alternative modes of communication. They added to the conversation set by Campbell and Gearhart identifying eight assumptions of valued discourse. Therefore, they chose women who could not be recognized by these assumptions and delineated from the traditional account of success. An example of this delineation was Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss's response to the assumption of noteworthiness by expanding "the scope of significant women communicators beyond those active in moments or involved in political activities by privileging ordinariness over noteworthiness" (5). By doing this, Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss directly addressed marginalized and devalued voices in confrontation to traditional success. This rhetorical move is reminiscent of Campbell's definition of the "anti-rhetorical" as "confrontative" (Campbell, "The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation" 81).

Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss's 1991 anthology, *Women Speak*, fits within the anthologies of other feminist historiographers because they are also expanding the definition of success. Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss appreciated feminist historiographers for their implementation and recovery of women rhetors, but like Biesecker, they were concerned with the methodology of their recovery. They criticized the methodology of those reclaiming women (Campbell; Logan; Wertheimer; Mattingly; Donawerth; Ritchie and Ronald) because

it reflected the eight assumptions, but replaced male with female. Therefore, *Women Speak* represented an anthology of women that were antithetical to the assumptions that are typically associated with traditional forms of rhetorical success.

Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin appreciated Andrea Lunsford's 1995 *Reclaiming Rhetorica* anthology because she called for reconstructing rhetoric through a feminist lens (Lunsford; Jarrat; Glenn; Swearingen). Lunsford explained the traditional method "never recognized forms, strategies, and goals used by many women as 'rhetorical'" (6); therefore, they were not valued in the field of rhetoric. Lunsford provided a list of rhetorical moves that delineated the traditional narrative of successful rhetoric:

[B]reaking the silence; naming in personal terms; employing dialogics; recognizing and using the power of conversation; moving centripetally towards connections; and valuing—indeed insisting upon—collaboration. The characteristic tropes for a reclaimed Rhetorica include, therefore, not only definition, division, and synecdoche, but also metonymy, metaphor, and consubstantiality; its characteristic and principal aim is not deception or conquest... but understanding, exploration, connection, and conversation. (6)

Identifying these various styles and features extracted from Campbell, Gearhart and Lunsford complicated and compromised definitions of success by strengthening marginalized and degraded forms of communication. The more voices accrued, the more evidence of the limitation of traditional patriarchal models of rhetorical success.

Campbell's argument to isolate and research women's liberation communication opened the field of rhetoric to view women's rhetorical strategies as acts of resistance. Gearhart's critique of traditional rhetoric as violent acts, her alignment of rhetoric with

spiritualism, and her support of speech acts grounded in equality, as well as understanding and yielding, were foundational to creating a space for alternative rhetorics to be explored. To read Campbell and Gearhart alongside Lunsford's thorough identification of women's alternative rhetorical tactics for success provided much room for growth and inquisition into the field of feminist rhetoric, and called for an alternative form of communication grounded in feminism in opposition to traditional rhetoric. Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin's proposal of invitational rhetoric heeded the call. The next section will expand the foundations and definitions of invitational rhetoric. The scholarship I use will remain close to Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin's written work of invitational rhetoric because they are the source of its creation and they are the main suppliers of this subject. I also want to stay as close to their point of view as possible in order to provide a concrete analysis of their vision of rhetoric.

Foundations and Extended Definition

In 1992, Sonja K. Foss and Griffin wrote, "A Feminist Perspective on Rhetorical Theory: Toward a Clarification of Boundaries," which contrasted two rhetoricians, Kenneth Burke and Starhawk. The purpose of this article was to remind scholars that "[t]heories possess ideological hegemony, delimiting the territory of study, suggesting what seems natural and reasonable, and thus controlling how we think about an area of study such as rhetoric" (330). To support this claim, Sonja K. Foss and Griffin use Starhawk's alternative rhetoric of inherent value. This rhetoric is grounded in the spirit of the Goddess who interconnects humans and nature. The rhetoric is successful when immanent value is understood between speaker and audience. Three rhetorical moves within this rhetoric are "mystery, ritual, and power-with" (333). In contrast, Burke's rhetorical criticism reflects the

patriarchal lens, which focuses on persuasion and materialism. This essay was important because it was published prior to Sonja K. Foss and Griffin's proposal for invitational rhetoric. By publishing this article contrasting Starhawk and Burke, Sonja K. Foss and Griffin encouraged further speculation of the limitations of traditional rhetoric by identifying a voided space and astutely filling it with invitational rhetoric.

In 1995, the same year as Lunsford's anthology, Sonja K. Foss and Griffin proposed an alternative rhetorical theory in their article "Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for an Invitational Rhetoric," which complemented and complicated the conversations, criticisms, and suggestions presented by Campbell, Gearhart, and Lunsford. Within the article Sonja K. Foss and Griffin provide context, strategies, and defined a rhetorical space for invitational rhetoric to be successful. Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin expanded the research of alternate rhetorics in their 1999 anthology *Feminist Rhetorical Theories* (a companion text of readings was printed in 2006) and later, in 2003, Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss dedicated a book, *Inviting Transformation: Presentational Speaking for a Changing World*, exploring the rhetorical scheme of invitational rhetoric.

Invitational Rhetoric

Sonja K. Foss and Griffin's 1995 essay emphasizes the "acknowledgment of the patriarchal bias that undergirds most theories of rhetoric is growing more steadily in the communication discipline" (2). Therefore, they proposed to contribute "non-patriarchal forms of communication" (2) to expand the scope of the feminist rhetorical field and "[enhance] the discipline's ability to explain diverse communicative phenomena successfully" (3). They supported Gearhart's perspective of language being used to coerce as

a way to exert power-over, which structures a hierarchal value between speaker and audience (3). Sonja K. Foss and Griffin argued that patriarchal language of power-over produced an environment of domination that reinforced a hierarchal value system, which was then imposed on different groups of people (3). In order to alter this system there must be another way to frame our language and argumentative style: Invitational rhetoric.

Sonja K. Foss and Griffin stated that invitational rhetoric reflected feminist principles of “equality, immanent value, and self-determination” (4). Embodying these principles and enacting the commitment of activism ensured that equality was built into relationships. They theorized a cultural shift could begin toward a reality absent of domination and hierarchy by grounding alternative communication in these feminist principles. Within the proposal, Sonja K. Foss and Griffin defined invitational rhetoric as

an invitation to understanding as a means to create a relationship rooted in equality, immanent value, and self-determination. Invitational rhetoric constitutes an invitation to the audience to enter the rhetor’s world and to see it as the rhetor does Ultimately, though, the result of invitational rhetoric is not just an understanding of an issue. Because of the nonhierarchical, nonjudgmental, nonadversarial framework established for the interaction, an understanding of the participants themselves occurs, an understanding that engenders appreciation, value, and a sense of equality. (5)

Acts of offering information or enacting re-sourcement are characteristics of invitational rhetoric. Sonja K. Foss and Griffin contextualized their use of re-sourcement as “disengagement from the frame-work, system or principles embedded in the precipitating

message and the creative development of a response so that the issue is framed differently” (9). This act of reframing through re-sourcement gave agency to the speaker engaged with invitational rhetoric if the other speaker, or audience, is reacting negatively or compromising the rhetorical situation. Re-sourcement allows the speaker to navigate through the situation while maintaining the principles it represents.

An example of a successful act of re-sourcement was illustrated in their proposal: At the National Book Award, Adrienne Rich, Alice Walker, and Audre Lorde accepted an award together even though it was intended just for Adrienne Rich (S. Foss and Griffin “Beyond Persuasion” 13). Together the women stated that they received the award in honor of all women writers stifled by patriarchal systems. Sonja K. Foss and Griffin explained that this statement was an offering of their perspective, but it was not spoken argumentatively, nor was it intended to make an argument with anyone in the audience. Sonja K. Foss and Griffin explained that Rich, Walker, and Lorde “illustrate[d] re-sourcement as a form of offering in that the women communicated their differences with the hierarchal, competitive framework established by the National Book Awards simply by not communicating within the terms of that framework” (“Beyond Persuasion” 13). Their proposal concluded that invitational rhetoric was framed to contrast as well as challenge the nature and functionality of traditional rhetoric (“Beyond Persuasion” 16). They were aware that invitational rhetoric was not intended for every situation such as situations that require instantaneous change. Invitational rhetoric opens conversations to begin the process of solution. Sonja K. Foss and Griffin believed invitational rhetoric “presents an alternative feminist vision rooted in affirmation and respect and thus shows how an alternative looks and works” (“Beyond Persuasion” 17) within a traditional society.

Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss's 2003 book, *Inviting Transformation*, served more as a textbook for communication courses, but was the first published piece that provided an extensive view of what and how invitational rhetoric worked in various rhetorical situations. Other representations of invitational rhetoric were found in Andrea Lunsford and John Ruszkiewicz's 5th edition textbook *Everything is an Argument* and the 9th edition of *Theories of Human Communication* edited by Stephen W. Littlejohn and Karen A. Foss.

Within *Inviting Transformation*, Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss depicted five "modes of rhetoric" where each mode is separate category of rhetoric: conquest, conversion, advisory, benevolent, and invitational (4). Then rhetoric was defined as "the study of how humans use symbols to communicate" (4; Meyer 3). They suggested that the use of symbols through language constructed reality. They agreed with linguist Deborah Tannen, who suggested, "when we think we are using language, language is using us" (qtd. in *Inviting Transformation* 8). Therefore, we are active agents who construct reality by the language and symbols that we choose to use and how we choose to use them. Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss posited that conquest and conversion rhetoric were valued more than other modes, and in so doing, "we create and experience a particular kind of world" (7) that "generally is adversarial and contentious" (8) due to its relation to power-over relationships and victor/victim dichotomy (Gearhart, "The Womanization of Rhetoric" 196).

Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss pushed conversation further suggesting that the labels we put on others and ourselves also challenge our reality. The examples they provided were negative political advertisements, road rage, harassment, and ranting and raving with hate speech (8-9). These kinds of "free speech" create a reality of "negative emotions because conquest and conversion rhetoric often produce feelings of inadequacy, pain,

humiliation, guilt, embarrassment, or angry submission for some and feelings of superiority and domination for others” (9). Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss also stipulated that adversarial realities were crucibles for more conflict and controversy, but more importantly those modes of rhetoric “shut down opportunities of transformation” (9) which was antithetical to the outcome of invitational rhetoric.

There are multiple goals and outcomes for using invitational rhetoric with an overarching theme to create an environment where understanding could be achieved by yielding beliefs. Yielding meant a will to sincerely “shift in perspective that [resulted] from consideration of another’s views” (14). To yield provided room for deeper understanding and therefore room for self-determined transformation. Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss posited that the transformation was accomplished once five assumptions are understood about invitational rhetoric. The first was to assume every speaker was there to stretch their understanding of each other’s perspectives; the second was to believe equality between speaker and audience; the third was to value every participant in the conversation; the fourth was to transform, or change, as a choice from within, and, lastly, people were to “yield” (Gearhart, “The Womanization of Rhetoric” 199) during the conversation.

Synonymous with transformation was Gearhart’s suggestion of “enfoldment” (K. Foss, S. Foss, and Griffin, *Feminist Rhetorical Theories* 278). Since Gearhart, and Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin worked toward parallel goals, it was not surprising to see their theoretical frameworks complement and interconnect. Enfoldment has four assumptions, which are critical in accomplishing its outcome of internal decision to change. The assumptions were that the rhetors’ goals were not to persuade, that change only occurred in the individual engaged in the dialogue, that by using language you created reality and

therefore changed society, lastly, the belief that “the world is not evil” (K. Foss, S. Foss, and Griffin, *Feminist Rhetorical Theories* 280). In newer criticism, there was a move to use Gearhart’s enfoldment in conjunction with re-sourcement because it shared similar assumptions like in Merle Kindred’s chapter “Invitational Rhetoric: Alternative Rhetorical Strategy as Ecofeminist Practice for Transformation of Perception and Use of Energy in the Residential Built Environment from the Keweenaw to Kerla” in the book *Ecofeminism and Rhetoric: Critical Perspectives on Sex, Technology, and Discourse* edited by Douglas A. Vakoch. Kindred’s house worked as a rhetor in a dialogue between the house and the visitors. This dialogue created a space of freedom, safety, and openness, which allowed the visitors to embody the feminist principles in relationship to the house. She used re-sourcement alongside enfoldment to describe the audience’s interaction with the rhetor, her house.

Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss were aware that invitational rhetoric was not for all occasions and that some rhetorical situations required other modes of communication. Their primary concern was the prolific education and application of conquest and conversion rhetoric, which limited the potential outcomes of communication because it was exclusive to these alternate cultural communications (*Inviting Transformation* 17). Therefore, the function of alternative rhetoric was to open conversation by equalizing the value of those participating in the dialogue, which in turn alleviated any bias toward a dominant viewpoint. Domination was only successful when there was a submissive counterpart; therefore, equalizing the situation compromised this power-over approach.

Criticism of, or hesitancy to use, invitational rhetoric derived from its “hands-off approach to problems you see in the world” (*Inviting Transformation* 17). Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss saw the challenge and posited five options to address real world problems with this kind of rhetoric. First, they suggest the use of rhetoric when the audience is actively seeking information about an issue. Second, is to use invitational rhetoric to understand the epistemology of “distasteful” (17) discourse in order to learn how to alter situations that promote it. Third, is to use invitational rhetoric to re-create the reality a person wants instead of resisting the current reality. Fourth, is to embody the change you want to see, and, fifth, is to “reframe your understanding of the problem” (18). These assumptions portrayed invitational rhetoric as an embodied rhetoric that allows language to be used as well as let it use us.

Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss theorized, “when you talk about what you do not want, you create more of it in your reality. By communicating about it and bestowing your belief on it, you reinforce it as reality, you strengthen it, you become its accomplice, and it remains a part of your life experience” (19). They extended this theory to a metaphor of walking through a buffet. In the buffet line you chose what you want and leave the other items for other people if they wish. But you do not protest the items in the buffet that you don’t want. They connected the buffet metaphor to how one chose communication that focused “on what you want in the world instead of demanding that the things you do not want be banished or removed” (19). To commit to this action the speaker understood that “you [did] not need to make others’ views line up with yours in order for you to be happy” (20). This is different than the limited environment of conversion and conquest rhetoric,

which relies on persuasion to align the audience with their perspective. It also requires an alternate view of success because it does not follow the eight assumptions nor does it advocate for subordination like the victor/victim dichotomy found in traditional rhetoric.

Criticism

Two years after the proposal for invitational rhetoric, Celeste Michelle Condit wrote, “In Praise of Eloquent Diversity: Gender and Rhetoric as Public Persuasion,” criticizing the foundational feminist perspective of the theory. Condit believed that the theory perpetuated binaries through “dichotomy feminism,” which “portray[ed] male and female activities and ways of being as radically separate from one another” (382), thus creating essentialism. The dichotomy continued to align men with public and persuasive thinking. In doing this, Condit stated “dichotomy feminists (albeit unintentionally) encourage women not to see themselves as public speakers for the future. They thus encourage a future much like the past,” (383) where men could still be superior because of their association with the public realm. Condit proposed a gender diversity lens that viewed gender as socially constructed, and was an option to “dismantle traditional gender dimorphism without leaving persons identity-less” (385). Condit suggested an eschewal of essentialist ideology that narrowed identities and limited perspectives (387). Instead, she identified that some forms of traditional rhetoric were labeled more feminine than others. The men who performed these feminized rhetorics were not aligned with the patriarchal ideology. Therefore, the invitational rhetoric proposal needed to reconsider its gender dichotomy, or affiliation with the gendered feminist stance to provide an accurate account of what made invitational rhetoric specifically feminist rhetoric.

Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin responded to Condit's criticism within the same year, 1997, in their essay "Transforming Rhetoric Through Feminist Reconstruction: A Response to the Gender Diversity Perspective." They addressed Condit's concern of essentialism and feminist dichotomy by stating that their rhetorical scholarship "[focused] on creating a society in which gender is de-emphasized and where certain qualities that are likely to produce equality and mutuality—cooperation, self-determination, and immanent value, for example—are implemented" (119). Although they appreciated Condit's criticism, they recognized a weakness in her argument due to their definition of patriarchy lacking the separation of the system from the masculine gender.

They clarified their stance by defining "patriarchy as a system of power relations that [privileged] and [accorded] power to the white, heterosexual male; anyone who [did] not fit this category [was] devalued in this system" (121-122) including men who were not viewed as powerful such as gay men or men of color. Further, it was through the patriarchal, not masculine system, that biases were constructed which "[pervaded] the rhetorical tradition, one that [excluded] a number of perspectives" (122). Therefore, the theory did not propose to encourage this emphasis in gender. Instead, it called for the use of language in a way that created new realities where these limitations and exclusions in patriarchy were devalued. They also posited that "because feminists were the first to question and challenge the hegemony of communication theory and practice, [they wanted] to honor that history by using the term *feminist* . . ." (their emphasis 133). They concluded their defense by clarifying invitational rhetoric through a feminist lens:

[F]eminist carries with it the commitment to a political position—the commitment to disrupt and transform the ideology of oppression—that the term gender does not. In addition, because feminists were among the first to question and challenge hegemony of communication theory and practice, we want to honor that history by using the term feminist that they originally used for themselves and their work. (132-133).

In response to the argument of Condit and Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss, Kathleen J. Ryan and Elizabeth J. Natalle in the article “Fusing Horizons: Standpoint Hermeneutics and Invitational Rhetoric” provided an option to strengthen the enactment of invitational rhetoric through the philosophical support of Standpoint Theory. The integration of philosophy and rhetoric strengthened invitational rhetoric’s goal of self-determined transformation through the choice of the individual. Standpoint theory addressed oppression by linking situational knowledge with cultural limitations (75-76). The integration of standpoint theory and invitational rhetoric reaffirmed the rhetorical goal “to confront power relations” (82). In conclusion, Ryan and Natalle suggested that the integration of these theories could clarify the “‘you’re not me’ in communication with others. [They] cannot underscore enough how such a seemingly obvious conclusion is missing from much of the communication [they had] observed . . .” (83). Their association of standpoint theory to deconstruct the public/private communication dichotomy could be a solution to Condit’s criticism of the feminist dichotomy. If the integration of standpoint theory and invitational rhetoric could dismantle the public/private dichotomy then it had the potential to disable the male/female dichotomy.

The synthesis of different theories to support and strengthen invitational rhetoric prevailed over the past ten years. Jennifer E. Bone, Cindy L. Griffin, and TM Linda Scholz's 2008 article "Beyond Traditional Conceptualizations of Rhetoric: Invitational Rhetoric and a Move Toward Civility" explored the synthesis of civil theory and invitational rhetoric. They argued to partner these theories could encourage discussion towards a more ethical communication and could provide a way to deflect heightened social climate due to conflicted cultural differences (434). In opposition, Lozano-Reich and Cloud's essay, "The Uncivil Tongue: Invitational Rhetoric and the Problem of Inequality" in 2009, suggested that an "invitational paradigm grounded in civility [was] not only antithetical to the goals of invitational rhetoric, but also in combating systems of oppression" (223). They were concerned with the partnership because there were times when persuasion is necessary to induce change. Both of these criticisms came from viewing of invitational rhetoric through a patriarchal—constricted and limited—lens.

Bone, Griffin, and Scholz believe that invitational rhetoric addressed cultural misunderstanding, and Lozano-Reich and Cloud believed that invitational rhetoric was ineffective because it increased cultural awareness, but it did not stimulate change, which was critical during dangerous disruptive situations. They each used invitational rhetoric without assuming the feminist principles as the rhetorical premise. As a response to this misunderstanding, as well as the other threads of criticism, Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss wrote an article in 2011 entitled "Constricted and Constructed Potentiality: An Inquiry into Paradigms of Change." This article clarified the intended use of invitational rhetoric and its application to situations.

The article addressed the criticism surrounding the function and implication of invitational rhetoric. This article was infused with more communication theory than rhetorical theory due to what Campbell explained as the “infancy” of feminist rhetorical theory in the field of communication (“Rhetorical Feminism” 11), but for the sake of parallelism I will interpret these paradigms through a rhetorical lens.

Within Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss’s article “Constricted and Constructed Potentiality: An Inquiry into Paradigms of Change,” they identified two opposing paradigms: the paradigm of constricted potentiality and the paradigm of constructed potentiality. The constricted potentiality with its limited focus on materialism was associated with our current social situation. The constructed potentiality focused on interconnection and inclusivity, which reflected the kind of society produced by practicing invitational rhetoric and supported feminist perspectives.

The paradigm of constricted potentiality induced change through persuasion by manipulating the limitations of material in a society (211). Due to these finite material measures, speakers “specify exactly how a desired change should be accomplished” (209), thus imposing and planning rhetorical moves to accomplish the desired outcome. Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss described the movements of speech focused “externally Because [the speakers were] trying to make the material world match their own personal desires, they must secure participation of others in their vision for the world” (209). In doing this they accomplished change in the material world, but this change did not always mirror or “guarantee” the internal or emotional condition within the person (210-211). Constricted

potentiality perpetuated the power-over rhetoric and deepened the victor/victim dichotomy through the limitation of materials, which could create a dependency and therefore negate the characteristic of self-determination.

Alternatively, the authors suggested that the paradigm of constructed potentiality described a dialogue as a frame of speech acts that de-emphasized “representative democracy” that values traditional rhetorical roles, and instead, placed emphasis on “participatory democracy, which emphasizes the value of multiple perspectives, identification of connections among differing positions” (213). This alternate paradigm valued internal information as the premise for self-change, or transformation. These traits echoed the rhetorical space needed to enact invitational rhetoric successfully, which relied on dialogue grounded in the three feminist principles, and created an environment of freedom, safety, and openness. This parallel between invitational rhetoric and the constructed potentiality encourages speakers to create alternate realities that eschew the limited paradigm of constricted potentiality.

Deconstructing these two paradigms, the authors were able to support and defend invitational rhetoric. As they theorized more about invitational rhetoric, they discovered that “although invitational rhetoric is not designed to change others, it does involve the kind of change that results from understanding another person better” (“Constructed and Constricted Potentiality” 212). Therefore, the articulation of an alternative paradigm allowed for the definition of communication to expand and included the concept of change as an application to both internal and external circumstances instead of the external-focused limitation of persuasion. This final piece of criticism provided a lens to view invitational rhetoric without the constraints of the constricted paradigm, which limited its success. Invitational rhetoric’s

position in the constructive paradigm was more successful because the constructed potentiality reflected the feminist principles, which were a necessary premise to enact the dialogue. Providing these contrasting paradigms, Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss changed the way we view communication and challenge the constricted paradigm that has “trained or [is our preferred]” (207) scope of perception.

Analysis of Invitational Rhetoric Un/Success

Invitational rhetoric is grounded in three feminist principles with the goal to provide an environment that is free, safe, and open to offer a better understanding of perspectives, which may or may not instigate transformation. A successful dialogue occurs when participants actively engaged with the values of self-determination, immanent value, and equality. Further the rhetorical space, which enacts the dialogue, must also reflect those ideas too. For example, if a space was within the paradigm of constructed potentiality then invitational rhetoric could emerge seamlessly because the space and the rhetors involved would engage in dialogue with the understood premise of the feminist principles. If the space reflected the paradigm of constricted potentiality then the feminist premise could not be assumed. Therefore, there must be a conversation about the feminist principles before a true dialogue can occur within the constricted potentiality. Instead, rhetors used rhetorical tactics like re-sourcement or reframing in order to maneuver through the limited space.

Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss believe that language influences our reality; therefore, reality influences our language, and vice versa. This was why they wrote about rhetorical tactics such as reframing which gave speakers an option to alter their reality through a new lens of language. For example, in their book *Inviting Transformation*, they provided a scenario of a person frustrated with the duties of an administrative office. The

frustration turned into hate speech about the administration, which created a negative environment and bestowed incompetency on the people working in the administrative roles. Reframing called for a different perspective, a more positive, constructive, perspective. Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss suggested the person reframe the administration as understaffed, underpaid, and pressured by a higher power to do their job correctly. In reframing this situation, the speaker was able to alter the language, and the reality, to potentially help the employees get the support they needed to change for the better. If people reframe their thoughts more positively and constructively then it reflects onto their reality and vice versa.

The problems with the implementation of invitational rhetoric versus other forms of rhetoric, like conversion or conquest, are the particularities of the intent of the speaker or writer. In traditional rhetoric one could argue a subject without any personal investment. Traditional rhetoric did not have to include private reflection. The success of persuasive arguments was if the speaker achieved their goal of domination with recognition of submission of the other. There did not have to be a personal adherence to the message, only a victory in swaying the other speaker. This was not true for invitational rhetoric.

To provide a successful use of invitational rhetoric the orator/speaker/rhetor needed to embody the feminist principles. They must actively participate in a constructive reality that sought to build relationships and open room for understanding in order to incite personal transformation. Campbell's identification of consciousness raising in the women's liberation movement is an example of the successful use of invitational rhetoric because the women sought to equalize woman to woman. Consciousness raising opened conversation allowing opinions to be offered. Afterward the woman determined the choice to transform or

“change”. Campbell’s connection between consciousness raising and self-determination was reflected in an essay “Cutting Loose” by Sally Kempton in Campbell’s article “The Rhetoric of Women’s Liberation: An Oxymoron”. Kempton stated that

And I always wonder whether it is possible to define myself as a feminist revolutionary and still remain in any sense a wife. There are moments when I still worry that he will leave me, that he will come to need a woman less preoccupied with her own rights, and when I worry about that I also fear that no man will ever love me again, that no man could ever love a woman who is angry. (qtd in Campbell 80)

This personal account offered her audience various perspectives and sought understanding through self-reflection. It also suggested that her decision to embody feminism and through association the feminist principles of equality, immanent value, and self-determination, she was enacted the invitational rhetorical method without the attempt to persuade or convince her audience.

Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin showcased self-determinism when they provided the readings of Sonia Johnson (*Readings in Feminist Rhetorical Theory* 282). Johnson spoke within a rhetorical space structured by the feminist principles too. She offered her story and journey to create a deeper understanding of her choices. Potentially this could open others to talk about their choices, or think critically about their lack of choices. These offerings were successful uses of invitational rhetoric because they were conversations grounded in the philosophical premise of the feminist principles. Also, since they were each in written communication, the reader has the freedom, safety, and openness to leave the text whenever they want.

In opposition to these successes were works by Barbara Warnick and Elizabeth A. Petre who analyzed texts, but forgot that their rhetorical space was not representative of the feminist principles. Warnick's chapter "Masculinizing the Feminine: Inviting Women Online ca. 1997" in her 2002 book *Critical Literacy in a Digital Era: Technology, Rhetoric, and Public Interest* argued that *Cosmopolitan* magazine "offered" women information about the internet and then "invited" them to use it as a form of invitational rhetoric (75). This could not be true due to the rhetorical space of the magazine and its audience. *Cosmopolitan* magazine was known to be a persuasive magazine that offered women ways to change, not from self-determination, but through advertisement and pressure. When *Cosmopolitan* "offered" information about the Internet, there was no way to identify the intention of the speaker or the reader, nor was there a conversation about the feminist premise. Therefore the situation was compromised because it was assumed that the inherently persuasive magazine was trying to persuade women to use the Internet through the façade of invitational material.

Elizabeth A. Petre's 2007 article "Understanding Epideictic Purposes as Invitational Rhetoric in Women's Political Convention Speeches" displaced invitational rhetoric too. She began her essay evaluating scholars' skepticism of invitational rhetoric and concluded, "although we may never know the complete reasons, we must not forget that this way of conceiving rhetoric is a *proposal*" (21). Therefore, the interpretation of invitational rhetoric could be challenged and changed (which Petre did) to suggest "how invitational rhetoric becomes a manifest in a particular communicative situation" (21).

She argued a series of epideictic speeches given by prominent women speakers in the 2004 political conventions were "particularly suited to have invitational rhetorical qualities because of its emphasis on creating community with the audience" (21). Petre was right to

speculate about the meaning since it was only a *proposal*, but to read “Beyond Persuasion” in conjunction with Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss’s article “Constricted and Constructed Potentiality”, and Ryan and Natalie’s Standpoint theory, suggests that invitational rhetoric was a deeper concept than just an alternative rhetoric. The success and stability of invitational rhetoric was attached to the feminist principles and its correlation to creating reality through language. And even though these epideictic speeches were meant to create a community, the rhetorical space is completely compromised due to the surrounding political climates. Petre’s choice of rhetors may want to be inclusive, but they could not be equal or valued in relation to their audience because of their political affiliation.

Conclusions and Methodology

If scholarship began to move invitational rhetoric out of the parameters defined by the proposal in 1995, then the potential to change reality through the use of language would be compromised. This deflated the power of invitational rhetoric as an alternate rhetoric that offered a different perspective on using language and viewing how language uses us. Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin have written over ten years of scholarship rooting their belief in social change through rhetorical action. To extract their proposal outside those parameters of change could alter the purpose of invitational rhetoric as an alternative rhetoric for change. In doing so the rhetoric could not be successful in achieving its goal of deeper understanding, enfoldment, or transformation. Nor could it successfully establish a free, safe, and open place.

Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin’s sister rhetorician Starhawk was important in explaining the success of invitational rhetoric through her novel *The Fifth Sacred Thing*. This fictional/speculative feminist utopian novel provided great examples of invitational

dialogue and tactics, which were grounded in the feminist principles. The moments of invitational rhetoric as a dialogue are found within a paradigm of constructed potentiality. The moments of invitational rhetorical tactics are found within the paradigm of constricted potentiality. These moments clarify the purpose of invitational rhetoric as well as showcase the effectiveness of using language in such a way.

Chapter 3

We wanted to love freely and without barriers. We had to remake the world in order to do it.

--Maya, *The Fifth Sacred Thing*

The literary criticism of Starhawk's *The Fifth Sacred Thing* discusses her use of mysticism and/or paganism alongside the feminist and Goddess movement as hopeful activism (Haran; Mebane-Cruz and Wiener; Fancourt; Coleman and Ferreday; Kraemer). Most scholarship perceives Starhawk's novel as an example of how we need to establish relationships with ourselves and the Earth (Klassen; Sanati, Hatamian, and Mahadi). The scholarship of this novel is recent (starting in 2002) with growing publications usually found in the *Pomegranate*, a new peer-reviewed journal dedicated to Paganism and published out of Colorado State, and the *Journal of Cultural Research*, which is an international journal published in Lancaster University that focuses on cultural practices in such domains as "the sacred" (SCImago Journal). There has been no rhetorical criticism on Starhawk's novel, but there has been scholarly conversation around Starhawk's rhetorical theories of inherent value and domination by Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin.

Sonja K. Foss and Griffin's 1992 article "A Feminist Perspective on Rhetorical Theory: Toward a Clarification of Boundaries" assesses Starhawk's rhetoric of inherent value and rhetoric of domination as successful alternative forms of communication in contrast to Kenneth Burke's traditional rhetoric of persuasion. Sonja K. Foss and Griffin utilize Starhawk's rhetoric to exemplify the limitations of Burke's rhetoric, which is

grounded in patriarchal bias. Sonja K. Foss and Griffin choose Starhawk's work for this analysis because her rhetorical theory is representative of feminist perspectives to contrast traditional rhetoric (331).

Sonja K. Foss and Griffin explain Starhawk's rhetoric of inherent value as a focus on "power-with" relationships in opposition to "power-over [which] derives from a consciousness of estrangement" that allows for speakers to see the world as an object and not as subject (336). Starhawk's rhetorics are grounded in her perception of patriarchal and goddess-centered communication. For Starhawk, "In the patriarchal world, rhetors are grounded in self-hate and estrangement. In the world of the Goddess, in contrast, rhetors function from the life-affirming position of power-from-within" (K. Foss, S. Foss, and Griffin, *Feminist Rhetorical Theories* 171). She offers different rhetorical moves within each world that perpetuate the framework of each world. However, the rhetorical moves found within the Goddess world "consist of mystery, ritual and power-with, options that perpetuate the values of Goddess system and assist rhetors in the creation and maintenance of the world in which they wish to live" (K. Foss, S. Foss, and Griffin, *Feminist Rhetorical Theories* 173). Therefore, the rhetoric found within the Goddess movement is more flexible, provides creativity, and eliminates the limitations presented by the patriarchal world: "These consist of the five roles of the Judge, the Censor, the Conqueror, The Master and Servant, and the Orderer" (K. Foss, S. Foss, and Griffin, *Feminist Rhetorical Theories* 173; S. Foss and Griffin, "Feminist Perspective on Rhetorical Theory" 336). These roles serve finite positions, which limit rhetorical expression and expansion by perpetuating power-over relationships and the victor/victim dichotomy.

Karen A. Foss's, Sonja K. Foss's, and Griffin's criticisms focus on Starhawk due to the alignment of their conversation with invitational rhetoric and paradigm of constructed potentiality. Just as the field of rhetoric was expanded by Wayne C. Booth's argument to analyze literature rhetorically as well as speech material, Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin are expanding the rhetorical field by grounding alternative rhetoric in feminist principles to identify patriarchal bias. These scholars are also proposing a closer look into paradigms that alter and influence how we perceive and use rhetoric. To extract invitational rhetoric from Starhawk's *The Fifth Sacred Thing*, I will identify the paradigms of potentiality. Then I will explain how invitational rhetoric is used within the paradigms through the characters of Maya, Bird, and Madrone.

Invitational rhetoric is often misinterpreted due to its basic rhetorical function of offering information or creating an inviting environment in order to equalize the value within the room. This interpretation does not always represent the feminist principles, which undergird the rhetorical movement. The real challenge of identifying invitational rhetoric is representing the feminist principles, which are the ontological roots of the rhetoric. Starhawk's novel identifies the embodiment of these principles through the North's adherence to the four sacred elements:

We say that there are four sacred things, and the fifth is spirit. And when you live in right relation to the four, you gain the power to contact the fifth. The four are earth, wind, fire, and water. They live in the four directions, north, south, east, and west. No one can own them or put a price on them. To live in right relation is to preserve them and protect them, never to waste them, always to share what we have of them and to return all we take from them to

the cycles of regeneration. Together they form the magic circle, which is the circle of life. And the understanding of that circle is the beginning of all healing. (265-266)

These are the words of the main character Madrone who is representative of the Northern community, and they reflect the feminist principles of equality, immanent value, and self-determination which I will discuss later. Since we can establish the feminist principles in the society, we can extract examples of invitational rhetoric to show what it should or should not look like.

Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin state that the goal of invitational rhetoric is transformation through a dialogue that provides an in-depth interaction with different perspectives. In order for this transformation to be successful, the space must be safe, free, and valued. Therefore, an environment representative of the paradigm of constructed potentiality is more likely to enact this rhetoric and value it more so than any other. Since the characters of the novel are not always situated in the North, which is representative of the paradigm of constructed potentiality, these conditions cannot always be met. Therefore, the rhetors have opportunities to use invitational rhetorical tactics to maneuver through these situations, concentrating on re-sourcement and reframement. For this final chapter I will summarize the novel and extract examples of invitational rhetoric through the characters of Maya, Bird, Littlejohn, Hijohn, and Madrone. To strengthen my analysis I will define the paradigm of constricted and constructed potentiality to show how invitational rhetoric is used differently in each rhetorical space.

Constricted versus Constructed Paradigm of Potentiality

Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss suggest that change happens when there is a shift in comfort in a society (“Constricted and Constructed Potentiality” 206). Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss argue that to address the shift in comfort within a paradigm of constricted potentiality is limiting because the rhetoric of persuasion focuses on altering only the external materials. The rhetoric of persuasion does not address the internal characteristics that are driving the problem (“Constricted and Constructed Potentiality” 211). Therefore, the options for successful change are limited because the external is changing without the balance of the internal. In relation to the novel, the South is representative of a constricted potentiality and the North is representative of a constructed potentiality.

The South views change within the paradigm of constricted potentiality; therefore, communication between the two paradigms (constricted and constructed) results in miscommunication. Those who function within the paradigm of constricted potentiality are “change agents who choose to privilege the material in the symbolic-material equation” thus “the components available for generating change are those that exist or are already present in tangible form, they are fixed, limited, and capable of being depleted” (“Constricted and Constructed Potentiality” 208). Therefore, invitational rhetorical tactics such as re-sourcement and reframing are used to maneuver through the paradigm of constricted potentiality. These tactics provide a rhetorical space for different paradigms to engage in discussion. However, when invitational rhetoric engages with an audience of the paradigm of constricted potentiality it is usually labeled as “illogical or absurd” because the rhetoric “derives from a different paradigm from the one in which they have been trained or prefer to

operate” (“Constricted and Constructed Potentiality” 207). Therefore, the rhetors from the South usually reject the dialogue offered through invitational rhetoric.

Alternatively, the paradigm of constructed potentiality focuses on the opposite, “in which the symbolic is valued over the material” (“Constricted and Constructed Potentiality” 210). The change agents in this paradigm have unlimited solutions “Because of the nature of symbolicity Individuals never run out of ways to configure and construct figures” (“Constricted and Constructed Potentiality” 211). As abundant symbols emerge diverse amounts of interpretation occurs. The concept of interpretation is important in constructed potentiality because the surplus of symbols provide deeper, clearer, and broader understandings that can be reached (“Constricted and Constructed Potentiality” 214). Since invitational rhetoric’s outcome is to reach transformation through understanding this rhetoric works seamlessly within the paradigm of constructed potentiality. The North uses invitational rhetoric within the paradigm of constructed potentiality to approach problems; thus, their engagement with invitational rhetoric can be identified.

Summary and Cast of Characters

Starhawk’s vision for a more passionate and interconnected world is portrayed through her epic feminist eco-utopian novel, *The Fifth Sacred Thing*. This novel is set in California around the year 2048. The northern part of the state, specifically the San Francisco area, is identified as an eco-utopian village where inhabitants engage in rituals and practice witchcraft. Their community meets at gatherings called the Full Council to decide how to use and share the four sacred things: earth, wind, fire, and water. The group is a representative of different guilds within the city, but the main Defense Council is a group of older women who make decisions guided by the Goddess spirit and dreams.

The south, specifically the Los Angeles area (within the novel the name is City of Angels), is led by an oppressive materialist regime known as the Stewards. Before the rebellion of 2028 that split the North and the South, the Stewards declared martial law and took away food, water, and medicine to create dependency and submission from the people. The Stewards are financially supported by a religious zealous group, the Millennialists, who believed that Jesus came back in 1999 but left the remaining people to combat sin through any means necessary (i.e. violence against any who do not believe in their theology). The Stewards control the Southern population through the manipulation of material goods and by enforcing the constrictive moral code of the Millennialists.

The people of the North are aware that the Stewards of the South are going to invade them soon. In order to stay true to their feminist and non-violent values, the Northern people devise a nonviolent protest as their main defense against the Stewards. This nonviolent act is reflective of the message that they embody every day, based on the four sacred things—earth, wind, fire, and water— which need to be shared to keep the relationship of humans and the earth in balance. The fifth sacred thing is the spirit that dwells within the earth and us, which interconnects our feelings and grounds our beliefs and faiths in nature. The story concludes with a victorious ending for the North, but not without strong resistance and violence from the Stewards.

The key characters who will help define my argument are Maya, Madrone, and Bird. Maya is the eldest in town, almost hundred years old. She consults with past spirits to help guide Madrone and Bird to aid in their destinies. Maya has memories of life before and after the rebellion of 2028. She believes wholeheartedly in rituals and traditions that encourage people to explore as well as remember their roots. Her adopted granddaughter, Madrone, is a

healer and speaker of the healer's guild. She heals people by connecting their *ch'i* energy alongside doctors who use technology and modern medicine. It is the combination of all three which helps heal people. Lastly, Bird is one of Madrone's lovers and friends. His story begins trapped in a prison in the South where he befriends fellow inmates Littlejohn and Hijohn. It is through his relationships with Littlejohn and Hijohn that Bird is able to build enough strength to engage in witchcraft in order to break them all free from prison.

These characters play vital roles in the final confrontation between the Stewards and the northern community. Maya is able to help save Bird when they capture him during the final invasion of the Stewards against the North. Bird's purpose is to educate and warn the Northern community of the violent ways of the South. Madrone has to seek medicine from the city in the South because Defense Council believes that the new illness in their community is representative of a biological war tactic from the Stewards. As Madrone travels she is able to teach others to become healers as well as learn new healing powers with various other rebel groups that live outside the Southern city. For example, when Madrone visits the people in the mountain she learns from "The Melissa" that bees are a source of protection and healing through community. She learns to call on the power of the bee community to strengthen her healing ability.

The North and Invitational Rhetoric

Maya is introduced climbing the side of a mountain to enact a ritual by visiting the four statues that represent the four sacred things. As she gazes over the beauty of the mountain she remembers the Beatles singing their song "All you need is love." Even though the song was an instant hit and brought the message of love and peace, it was not successful because it "wasn't all we needed" (Starhawk 2). Maya states, "We wanted to love freely and

without barriers. We had to remake the world in order to do it” (2). Her choice to “remake” the world is profound in understanding the paradigm of constricted potentiality that Maya was living in before the rebellion in '28.

After the scene of Maya looking onto the landscape, the reader is quickly directed to a scene of a woman dying at childbirth. Madrone is working very hard on the mother's *ch'i* energy while other doctors help by dispensing medicine and using technology to sustain the struggling mother's vitals. The mother's death is the introduction to the infection that is killing the people of their village and is eventually labeled as an act of war from the Stewards. As the woman dies Madrone asks if she was read her last rites and urges her spirit to safety. This scene is representative of different ideologies converging into one equal space: eastern medicine, witchcraft, western medicine, and Catholicism.

The representation of all these ideologies depicts a society that is cooperative and works together despite their differing perspectives. They each enact their own cultures and languages, but they are all grounded in the knowledge and respect of the four sacred things. During the festival of the Day of the Reaper (this celebrates the dry season which brings fire to the land due to lack of rain) Maya gives a speech reinstating the agreement the community has with each other and the spirit of nature:

We hope for a harvest, we pray for rain, but nothing is certain. We say that the harvest will only be abundant if the crops are shared, that the rains will not come unless water is conserved and shared and respected. We believe we can continue to live and thrive only if we care for one another. This is the age of the Reaper, when we inherit five thousand years of postponed results, the fruits of our callousness toward the earth and towards other human beings.

But at last we have come to understand that we are part of the earth, part of the air, the fire, and the water, as we are part of one another. (17)

As Maya continues to make speeches in support of their beliefs she is participating in the paradigm of constructed potentiality by associating the material world (the rain) with the belief that their actions correlate (symbolically) with the material world. The North's central vision of respecting, sharing, and caring are emulated through their actions and through their speech acts. When they meet together to make a decision everyone is represented, but people have the choice to participate individually if they wish. This can be argued as representative of the feminist principle of self-determination since everyone in the group has the freedom to engage with the community decisions.

Animals symbolically represent the four sacred things such as the coyote mask that “sat in the South as the trickster guardian of fire, of the energy of systems” (45). The northern community uses this because “many people felt that nothing could truly be decided when the Four Sacred Things were not present After seemingly interminable argument, they had one of those unlooked-for bursts of collective creativity, or perhaps madness, and established this ritual where masked representatives for each of the sacred elements sat in trance in Council, channeling the Voices of wind, fire, water, and earth.” (46). This process showcases equality within the group and value beyond the human perception, which is reflective of them living within a paradigm of constructed potentiality. This paradigm allows for their language to be spoken through the feminist principles to create a successful invitational rhetorical space.

Maya's voice is respected in the Full Council because she can speak with memories from times before the eco-utopia is created:

We old women have learned from our history and its mistakes. Many of you are too young to remember the wealth of the old society, the incredible resources, the power of technology, the firepower of its weaponry, the sheer abundance of things, so many that they could be shamelessly squandered and wasted. . . . But the greatest waste was war. [She remembers] how we watched in frustration as all of that wealth, so many lives of blooming young men and women, all of our ingenuity and resources were poured down the hole of war after war. (239)

Her memories serve as reassurance to the community's lifestyle to uphold the four sacred things in order to keep a healthy balance in relationship between humans and earth. Maya offers the speech in front of the guild leaders, the symbolic representations of the four sacred things, and others in the community who gathered at the Full Council. Maya's contribution to the conversation of the community's defense is to use invitational rhetoric as an act of resistance to the Stewards. She suggests, "Suppose nobody in the city obeys the invaders, or helps them, or gives them information? Suppose as well say to the soldiers when they come in, is: 'There is a place set for you at our table, if you will choose to join us?'" (235). Maya is using invitational rhetoric to engage with an opposing paradigm, to invite them into their nonviolent and feminist paradigm of constructed potentiality. Since a dialogue cannot occur due to the difference in principles, an invitation can encourage an alternate conversation or a change to happen.

To offer the Steward's militia the invitation, "There is a place set for you at our table, if you will choose to join us?" (235), instead of succumbing to the antagonistic moves of the Steward's army, the Northerners represent their ideology and feminist principles by engaging in invitational rhetoric. The invitation to sit "at our table" is the most prominent evidence of invitational rhetoric. It identifies the people's refusal to adhere to the traditional rhetorical orders of the soldiers. They refuse to participate in a conversation grounded in coercion and persuasion. They offer a seat to their table to showcase the community's belief in equality, immanent value, and self-determination.

The Northern community agrees to use nonviolence because Lily Fong of the Defense Council reminds the Full Council that "wars are not fought just with guts, or even with weapons. They are struggles of consciousness" (236). Wars are struggles with external materials and internal consciousness. As S. Foss and K. Foss state, the paradigm of constricted potentiality focuses on external change neglecting the internal consciousness ("Constructed and Constricted Potentiality" 212). Since the Northerners are grounded in the paradigm of constructed potentiality the community focuses on balancing the external and internal. Lily posits further "Consciousness moves to a rhythm. . . . When disparate consciousnesses meet, they become more alike, just as two clocks beating to different rhythms set down next to each other will entrain" (237). This means "the invaders, coming into proximity with us, will become more like us in spite of themselves" (237). The more they repeat the invitation, the more the disrupted consciousness of the soldiers will shift as long as the Northerners develop "the art of remaining who they truly are" (237). Therefore, the refrain line becomes an invitational rhetorical tactic of re-sourcement.

The definition of re-sourcement is the creation of a new space by drawing from a different energy source (Gearhart, “Womanpower” 196). The message derives from the new energy source and offers an alternative rhetorical perspective “by not communicating within the terms of [the Steward’s] framework” (S. Foss and Griffin, “Beyond Persuasion” 13). The refrain line derives energy from their united agreement to the “Declaration of the Four Sacred Things” (240). As people speak the refrain they are giving energy to each other and their audience as well as pulling energy from the collective, which reaffirms and reassures their position.

In a private conversation with Bird, Lily says “meeting force with force produces nothing but what is already known and planned for and expected. It’s what has already been done, over and over, for thousands of years” (285). Bird responds that force does work, but he is speaking out of fear of the “drive of power-over and domination” (238). Lily allows space for this fear and reassures Bird that “if we proceed with our plans, not to repeat the same acts [of force or violence] but to do something different, a different outcome will happen.... Suffering, undoubtedly. Miracles, maybe. Change” (286). Regardless of their choice to act violently or non-violently, change is going to happen for their community. The choice to enact invitational rhetoric gives an option for the community to construct the reality that they wish for themselves and the soldiers.

Bird worries about the nonviolent tactic because the Stewards are known for their violence. Lily sees this as an opportunity to disrupt the Stewards’ consciousness to instigate change because when force is met with force the space becomes limited and restrained to the victor/victim dichotomy, which is reflective of constricted potentiality. The nonviolent rhetoric is an act of re-sourcement within the invitational rhetorical tool box and shows the

contrasting principles of each paradigm. The invitational phrase is a necessary act of re-sourcement because the Northerners are entering a rhetorical space of constricted potentiality, so they must use invitational rhetorical tactics to navigate the space. Madrone enacts this tactic when she moves deeper into the South and meets more characters who have internalized the rhetorical space of the constricted potentiality (which is further discussed in the fifth section).

An example of the refrain line as re-sourcement is when General Alexander of the Stewards confronts Robert, Lan, and Bird, who act as leaders of the community. As the General approaches each person, he/she offers the General the refrain line. The General rejects the invitation and shoots Robert, then Lan. Bird is next in line and “oddly enough he wasn’t afraid any longer. There was nothing more he had to do, except stand there and, when his turn came, say one phrase” (334). As the General looks to Bird, a whirl of children line up in between Bird and the General to offer the refrain line too.

The children repeat the refrain line. The General passes off the shooting responsibility to the lower ranked officer as a challenge for the officer to shoot the children to prove his loyalty to the Stewards. As the officer aims the gun at the children, “there was a loud noise and the officer crumpled, a dark bleeding hole through the back of his neck. Somewhere down the line, a soldier threw down his gun and began running wildly away from the open space around the reservoir. Others ran after him, while the crowd surged between the fleeing man and his pursuers” (336). If the Northerners choose to use a different rhetorical tactic the scene would have turned out very differently. To recall Lily’s words, when force meets force the results are limited and end the same way. If Robert, Lan, and Bird engage in traditional rhetoric, the General has power-over the community. There is opportunity for violent

struggle, which fuels the traditional opposing force. However, because the Northerners use invitational rhetoric to create an alternative outcome that is not limited by death, they illuminate an alternative outcome. The soldier chooses to rebel because he knows the energy force of the Northerners' refrain does not match the violent force of the South; therefore, the acts of violence are not acknowledged in the northern community.

Paradigm of Constricted Potentiality

The Stewards of the South represent the paradigm of constricted potentiality because they focus on external change to manipulate the South's population in order to gain control. The Stewards are hierarchal in power and do not value opinions that differ from the Millennialists. The Stewards take advantage of consumerism by placing monetary value on materials instead of symbolic value, which would be representative of the paradigm of constructed potentiality. The people of the South are unable to speak against the Stewards due to the limited rhetorical space. If people attempt to speak out they are killed, subjected to jail time, or restricted from material things necessary to live such as food and water. This exclusivity is best represented in the prayer that is taught to the community in and outside the walls of the prison:

In memory of Jesus Christ, who returned to earth only to repudiate the world for its sins, we abhor the earth, the Devil's playground, and the flesh, Satan's instrument. We abhor the false prophets and the false gods, those who lie with promises of salvation and those who tempt us to wallow in the worship of demons, whether they be called Goddesses, Saints, Lucifer, or the so-called Virgin Mary. For we know that our Lord never lowered Himself to take on loathly flesh, but was, is, and ever shall be pure spirit. Amen. (29)

This sentiment is obviously antithetical to the North's social construction. The internalization of this rhetoric produces exclusivity to diverse perspectives due to hatred of anything outside their perspective. Thus, their speech acts are not grounded in feminist principles because that would encourage inclusivity and value beyond their beliefs.

An example of the oppressive materialism in the Steward's community is offered through a conversation between Bird, Littlejohn, and Hijohn. Within this conversation Bird tells Littlejohn and Hijohn that no one owns the water where he lives in the North. Littlejohn doesn't understand, "somebody's got to own it Somebody always does" (72). Bird explains that the Four Sacred Things must be shared to keep the relationship balanced between earth and humans. Littlejohn's understanding of the Four Sacred Things is their monetary value, not symbolic, "because if your life depended on it, you've got to have it. You'll pay any price for it. You'll steal or lie or kill to get it" (72). Hijohn clarifies Littlejohn's materialist perspective, saying, "The Stewards control the water supplies; that's how they took control of the government in '28 You've got to work for the Stewards and obey the Millennialist Purities, or you can't even buy water and you lose your right to eat" (72). This statement reflects the limited outcome of a situation determined solely on material value within the paradigm of constricted potentiality.

The internalized limitation of the paradigm is further depicted in another conversation between Bird and Littlejohn after they separate from Hijohn. Bird offers to take Littlejohn back with him to his free home in the North. Littlejohn refuses, saying, "We come from different worlds. You're a real Witch. You've got powers. Me, the only thing I really know about magic is it makes you fair game for every demonfucker who takes it into his head to kill you. When you get back with your own kind, you won't want to hang around me" (87).

Littlejohn cannot conceive or imagine a different world despite Bird's attempt to share the freedom of the North with him: "Littlejohn, when I say my family, I mean all my lovers and all their lovers and kids and ex-lovers and everyone—and half of them are faggots, at least half of the time. We consider it a word to be proud of" (87). This attempt to clarify is rejected by Littlejohn because he views communication from a different paradigm than Bird's paradigm. Littlejohn's point of view is representative of the constricted potentiality, which materially attacks those who do not fit into their vision of moral beings. Bird is representative of the constructed potentiality, which believes in equality, value, and self-determination. Therefore, invitational rhetoric as a dialogue between Bird and Littlejohn cannot successfully exist because they do not embody the same principles.

If the first speaker embodies the feminist principles of equality, immanent value, and self-determination, but the second does not, then there can be no true dialogue. Invitational rhetorical tactics can be used to maneuver through the conversation, and there can be an offering of information, but if the second speaker is unaware that she/he is viewed equally or that she/he is valued or has the ability to leave, then the message can be misinterpreted. The second speaker may view the first speaker as trying to persuade or alter them, when in fact the first speaker is trying to offer an alternate perspective without, what Gearhart calls, "intent-to-change" ("The Womanization of Rhetoric" 196). Without the identification of the feminist principles between each speaker, there is opportunity for miscommunication. Littlejohn is resistant to Bird's idea because he is unwilling to listen and understand. Bird is aware of Littlejohn's resistance and stops talking because he knows that if he continues it will be a form of persuasion, which is not representative of the desired outcome of invitational rhetoric.

Invitational Rhetorical Tactics

Invitational rhetoric provides opportunity for people to engage with ideas without feeling pressured to accept the ideas. Invitational rhetorical dialogue is most successful when the speakers embody the feminist principles. It is also successful when viewed through the perspective of constructed potentiality. If there is a situation in which the first speaker is speaking to those who do not embody the feminist principles or is situated within a constricted paradigm, then the first speaker can use invitational rhetorical tactics to maneuver the situation. Such tactics are re-sourcement and reframing. Just as the Northerners offer a seat at their table, they are refusing to speak within the parameters of the Steward's "power-over" rhetoric. Therefore, they choose another energy source, to create a new rhetorical space, to enact speech acts that are representative of their embodied feminist principles.

Madrone offers examples of re-sourcement and reframing when she travels south to help the Monster people, the Hill people, and the City people. It is her destiny to do so because she is a healer. On her journey she teaches others healing rituals and learns a few new ones. Her movement throughout the book is representative of her moving throughout the two paradigms. It is through the transition of paradigms that we can explore rhetorical tactics of re-sourcement and reframing that ground Madrone in the feminist principles.

When Madrone reaches the City of Angels led by Hijohn from the Mountain people, they pass a factory busy with workers. Hijohn tells Madrone that the payment for the workers is some money and access to a half-gallon of water (292). This is troublesome to Madrone because the half-gallon is not enough to healthily sustain a person in the heat of the factory or of the city. Hijohn and a few other Mountain people encourage the workers to create a union to fight for better treatment, but "...people are scared The pay is shit, but it's better than

being out on the streets with no job at all—and no water. No, we got to tear it all down, root it out, and start fresh....” (292). Hijohn’s acceptance that there is no way to rework materials within a paradigm of constricted potentiality is encouragement to Madrone. It reaffirms that there needs to be a paradigmatic shift, which can begin through the use of invitational rhetoric.

As Madrone moves further from her home, she is continually asked to share her story of the North. Madrone begins her description with the free-flowing streams “...and everybody has enough to eat and drink. Every child goes to school” (296). She continues to share her descriptions of the North, offering her words as an act of re-sourcement. Since the listeners are not reflective of the feminist principles, Madrone must speak through this rhetorical tactic to open their minds to construct the North as a place of existence. As she continues to offer details of the North, people begin to gather around her. As Gearhart and Foss, Foss, and Griffin suggest, re-sourcement is a way to draw energy from a new place as an option which “allows for the enactment of new values, new ways of understanding, and new ways of viewing reality because it constitutes a redemption of female values and life-generating force” (Foss, Foss, and Griffin, *Feminist Rhetorical Theories* 270-274). In this case, Madrone gives people an alternate way of existing.

Madrone’s language builds a vision, which Katy, Hijohn’s wife and caretaker of an abandoned town within the City of Angels, wants desperately to create, but does not know how. She defends Madrone’s message

. . . we’ve got to know that things can be different, that they *are* different somewhere. That’s the only thing that really sets us apart from the street gangs—the vision . . . you’re living, walking proof that this isn’t the only way

things can ever be. All you have to do is walk into a room, and we can by the set of your head on your shoulders and the way you move in your body that you come from somewhere else. (305)

Katy's defense is important because her words are an energy source for Madrone. Katy reminds Madrone that the southern people are in need of a new perspective to continue their resistance to the Stewards. When Madrone gives her descriptions she creates a reality antithetical to the Southerners' current situation. As Madrone offers her vision she is invigorating their energy to stay committed to resisting the Stewards' force.

Katy and Madrone engage in an invitational rhetorical dialogue as they offer each other's stories about their pasts. Katy offers her story of resistance because she wants to "begin to build something, to show people how things could be different" (306). Katy is referring to creating another eco-utopia like Madrone's home. The conversation deepens as Madrone confesses that she wishes she could kill and be satisfied like the other gangs who rebel against the Stewards. Katy's reaction reminds Madrone that violence is not the answer because it was through non-violence that San Francisco was able to create a new home based on feminist principles of equality, immanent value, and self-determination. Madrone is grateful for her reminder and the conversation ends with their sharing a tortilla. This act of sharing is symbolic of transformation, or enfoldment, which is synonymous to gaining a deeper understanding. Katy is able to deepen her understanding of how a new world can be created, and Madrone is reminded that non-violence is still the only way to enact the feminist principles that premise her rhetoric.

After the conversation Katy goes to sleep, but Madrone feels invigorated. Her energy is renewed and her sense of purpose is recharged. As an example of invitational rhetorical dialogue, Katy and Madrone are able to deepen their understandings of each other's perspectives as well as learn from each other. They were able to engage in this rhetoric because Katy proved to support the same ideology as Madrone. Even though Katy may not embody them at the moment, she is encouraged by Madrone to seek those principles for herself. Madrone's energy is restored through this interaction because it is constructive and therefore hopeful because it reflects the constructed potentiality, which moves beyond the levels of materialism to create unlimited symbols of solutions.

As Madrone's presence continues in the City of Angels, her beliefs and core structure are continuously challenged. After a raid of the town, a small girl, who Madrone names "Poppy," is kidnapped. To find Poppy, Madrone follows The Angels. The Angels are a rebel group of blond, blue-eyed people who survived a childhood of sexual slavery. Even though the Millennialists preach anti-sex messages they have exceptions because "it's not fornication if it's one with the soulless—conveniently defined as anyone who isn't a good enough Millennialist" (304). So they encourage the breeding of children who are specifically told that they are soulless, and then they are sold as sex toys to people with power and money. The Angels that survive this childhood seek revenge and go on killing raids, stealing children or burning down houses (304). This group leads Madrone to a "pink mansion" where they know Poppy is located.

As they enter the house Madrone sees Poppy "crumpled in a corner like a discarded doll" (364) and a man tied with a "gag tied tightly over his mouth" (364) under the foot of one of the Angel's leaders, Rafe. Madrone is in shock at the scene before her. Rafe tells her

that she is able to kill the man in revenge for Poppy. Although this is tempting, Madrone knows that she cannot partake in the violence that was used against Poppy. To illuminate this cycle of violence, Madrone conducts an invitational rhetorical move of reframing. Reframement is offering different or new perspectives to provide different constructive choices (K. Foss and S. Foss, *Inviting Transformation* 21). She states, “killing him won’t bring [Poppy] back.... We become what we do. If we do these things, how do we become something better than what he is? How can we build something together?” (366). The Angels reject her act of reframing as they confess that they do not want to work with anyone to build anything (366). The scene ends with sirens sounding in the background with everyone scattering, leaving Madrone alone and lost in the mansion.

Even though her reframing fails, she uses this rhetorical tactic as an alternative move to maintain her personal beliefs as well as refraining from using other traditional methods of rhetoric that may encourage them to enact violence on her. The Angels are feared for their nonchalant ability to kill and torture. Therefore, to address them in a provoking or antagonistic way would have put her in danger. Madrone’s choice to use reframing allows her to maintain her nonviolent view instead of succumbing to their wishes out of fear of agitating them. She reframes the situation so that the Angels can see that their actions perpetuate a cycle that is never-ending and inhibits growth.

The Angels’ logic is easy to defend given the society that breeds them for sex and labels them as soulless. They serve as a reminder that we are what we create through language. This is why Madrone’s use of alternative rhetoric fails, because their traditional construction of language labels the Angels as unequal and devalues them in comparison to others in society; therefore, they internalize the message. This is reminiscent of Littlejohn’s

rejection of Bird's proposal. They are so entrenched within a constricted paradigm and materialism that they cannot conceive language that creates an alternative to their current situation.

Conclusion

Maya, Bird, and Madrone enact various forms of invitational rhetoric. They are able to do so because they embody the necessary feminist principles in order for their rhetorical situation to be true. S. Foss and Griffin's "Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for Invitational Rhetoric" brings awareness to the overwhelming privilege of argument over any other form of communication. Just as Gearhart laments in 1973, this constant favoring of argument transforms rhetoric into something more invasive, "an act of violence" ("The Womanization of Rhetoric" 195). When there is no victory then there is continued argument or resentment. If there is a victory then it is not due to self-choice, but the end result of persuasion and inevitable submission.

The language we are using in reference to argument is reflective in our actions as well as speech acts. Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss state, "You create your world through your communication choices, and what you see in the world can be changed with a shift in those choices" (*Inviting Transformation* 21). This shift is exemplified when Madrone uses the invitational rhetorical tactic of reframing when she is with the Angels in the mansion. She chooses to let the language reframe the situation to provide further insight into why she is refusing to act violently against the perverted man. She is aware that if she is to act violently then she will have to speak to it too. If she chooses to use persuasion then she will not be honest or truthful with the Angels. She wants them to understand her position against violence so they can transform independently, not momentarily persuade them. If Madrone

had chosen another rhetorical path, it would not project the feminist principles she embodies. Her choice to use invitational rhetorics is reflective of the paradigm of constructed potentiality of her home life.

Bird's failure to engage with Littlejohn proves the importance of identifying paradigmatic space alongside rhetorical moves. In "Constricted and Constructed Potentiality: An Inquiry into Paradigms of Change" Karen A. Foss and Sonja K. Foss express their fear of educators' acculturation to the limiting paradigm of constricted potentiality. Therefore, educators cannot expand or give "equal footing" to alternative suggestions until an alternative paradigm is defined: "Because we believe that more options exist for accomplishing change than those offered in the paradigm of constricted potentiality, we seek to expand the communicative toolbox for understanding and strategizing how change happens" (206). If we perceive ourselves as change agents then there has to be criticism surrounding the change that is happening as a result of the speech acts reaffirming the change. The relationship between invitational rhetoric and the paradigm of constructed potentiality eliminates the limitations of constricted potentiality as the invitational rhetorical acts open space through the support of the constructed potentiality.

We need more examples of the kinds of communication which enable the paradigm of constructed potentiality. Karen A. Foss, Sonja K. Foss, and Griffin provide framework for alternative rhetorics through their foundational text *Feminist Rhetorical Theories* and readings to accompany these rhetorics. Their proposal for invitational rhetoric expands into various conversations (Lozano-Reich and Cloud; Bone, Griffin, and Scholz; Condit; Ryan and Natalie; Campbell), but there seems to be a lack of examples of *how* to use this rhetoric in correlation to the paradigm of constructed potentiality. I believe a paradigmatic shift can

occur as educators begin to focus less on traditional rhetoric and provide space for alternative rhetoric, as more examples of invitational rhetoric are identified. This rhetorical enactment is shown through the characters of Maya, Madrone, and Bird. They each use invitational rhetoric to provide alternate perceptions such as Maya's invitation, and Madrone's repetition of the descriptions of the North and Bird's offering to Littlejohn. These characters give examples of invitational rhetoric within a paradigm of constricted and constructed potentiality. Each character pursues his or her destiny without fear because they each use rhetoric to reflect their reality and their beliefs in a non-traditional non-persuasive way.

The continuation to extract invitational rhetoric from multiple sources strengthens the field of feminist rhetoric. Feminist rhetoric provides insight to voices that outside the hegemony. The diversity of views encourages the feminist principles of equality, immanent value, and self-determination. The homogeneity of traditional rhetoric limits viewpoints and perpetuates structures that continue to silence marginalized voices because they are not valued in the conversation. Invitational rhetoric is a way to address the traditional structures rhetorically and recreate a world which supports the feminist principles.

Works Cited

- Biesecker, Barbara. "Coming to Terms with the Recent Attempts to Write Women into the History of Rhetoric." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 25.2 (1992): 140-161. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 March 2013.
- Bizzell, Patricia. "Feminist Methods of Research in the History of Rhetoric: What Difference Do They Make?" *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 30.4 (2000): 5-17. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 March 2013.
- Bone, Jennifer Emerling, Cindy L. Griffin, and TM Linda Scholz. "Beyond Traditional Conceptualizations of Rhetoric: Invitational Rhetoric and a Move Toward Civility." *Western Journal of Communication* 72.4 (2008): 434-462. *Communication and Mass Media Complete*. Web. 18 April 2013.
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983. Print.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1969. Print.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs, ed. *Man Cannot Speak For Her*. 2 vols. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1989. Print.
- . "Biesecker Cannot Speak for Her Either." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 26.2 (1993): 153-159. *Communication and Mass Media Complete*. Web. 25 March 2013.
- . "The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 54 (1973): 74-86. *Communication and Mass Media Complete*. Web. 25 March 2013.
- . "Rhetorical Feminism." *Rhetoric Review* 20.1 (2001): 9. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 20 April 2013.

- Code, Lorraine. *Rhetorical Spaces: Essays on Gendered Locations*. New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- Coleman, Rebecca and Debra Ferreday. "Introduction: Hope and Feminist Theory." *Journal of Cultural Research* 14.4 (2010): 313-321. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 20 April 2013.
- Condit, Celeste Michelle. "In Praise of Eloquent Diversity: Gender and Rhetoric as Public Persuasion." *Women's Studies in Communication* 20.2 (1997): 91-116. Print.
- Donawerth, Jane, ed. *Rhetorical Theory by Women before 1900*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002. Print.
- . *Conversation Rhetoric: The Rise and Fall of a Women's Tradition 1600-1900*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2012. Print.
- Fancourt, Donna. "Accessing Utopia through Altered States of Consciousness: Three Feminist Utopian Novels." *Utopian Studies* 13.1 (2002): 94-113. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 15 April 2013.
- Foss, Karen A. and Sonja K. Foss. *Women Speak: The Eloquence of Women's Lives*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, 1991. Print.
- . *Inviting Transformation: Presentational Speaking for a Changing World*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, 2003. Print.
- . "Constricted and Constructed Potentiality: An Inquiry into Paradigms of Change." *Western Journal of Communication* 75.2 (2011): 205-238. *Communication and Mass Media Complete*. Web. 25 April 2013.

Foss, Karen A., Sonja K. Foss, and Cindy L. Griffin. *Feminist Rhetorical Theories*. Long Grove: Waveland Press, 1999. Print.

---. *Readings in Feminist Rhetorical Theory*. Long Grove: Waveland Press, 2004. Print.

---. "Transforming Rhetoric Through Feminist Reconstruction: A Response to the Gender Diversity Perspective." *Women's Studies in Communication* 20.2: 117-136. Print.

Foss, Sonja and Cindy L. Griffin. "Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for an Invitational Rhetoric." *Communication Monographs* 62.1 (1995): 2-18. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 November 2012.

---. "A Feminist Perspective on Rhetorical Theory: Toward a Clarification of Boundaries." *Western Journal of Communication* 56.4 (1992): 330-349. *Communication and Mass Media Complete*. Web. 20 April 2013.

Gale, Xin Lu. "Historical Studies and Postmodernism: Rereading Aspasia of Miletus." *College English* 62.3 (2000): 361-386. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 April 2013.

Gearhart, Sally Miller. "Womanpower: Energy Re-Sourcement" *The Politics of Women's Spirituality: Essays on the Rise of Spiritual Power within the Feminist Movement*. Ed. Charlene Spretnak. New York: Anchor Books, 1982. Print. 194-206.

---. "The Womanization of Rhetoric." *Women Studies International Quarterly* 2 (1979): 195-201. Print.

Glenn, Cheryl. "Remapping Rhetorical Territory." *Rhetoric Review* 13.2 (1995): 287-303. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 March 2013.

---. "Locating Aspasia on the Rhetorical Map." *Listening to their Voices: The Rhetorical Activities of Historical Women*. Ed. Molly Meijer Wertheimer. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1997. Print. 19-41.

- . "Sex, Lies, and Manuscript: Refiguring Aspasia in the History of Rhetoric." *College Composition and Communication* 45.2 (1994): 180-199. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 March 2013.
- Haran, Joan. "Redefining Hope as Praxis." *Cultural Research* 14.4 (2010): 393-408. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 March 2013.
- Jarrat, Susan and Rory Ong. "Aspasia: Rhetoric, Gender, and Colonial Ideology." *Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition*. Ed. Andrea Lunsford. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1995. Print. 9-24.
- Kindred, Merle. "Invitational Rhetoric: Alternative Rhetorical Strategy as Ecofeminist Practice for Transformation of Perception and Use of Energy in the Residential Built Environment from the Keweenaw to Kerala." *Ecofeminism and Rhetoric: Critical Perspectives on Sex, Technology, and Discourse*. Ed. Douglas A. Vakoch. New York: Berghahn Books, 2011. Print.
- Klassen, Chris. "The Goddess and/as the Cyborg: Nature and Technology in Feminist Witchcraft." *Pomegranate* 7.2 (2005): 173-193. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 20 April 2013.
- . "The Colonial Mythology of Feminist Witchcraft." *Pomegranate* 6.1 (2004): 70-85. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 20 April 2013.
- Kraemer, Christine Hoff. "Contemporary Paganism, Utopian Reading Communities, and Sacred Nonmonogomy: The Religious Impact of Heinlein's and Starhawk's Fiction." *Pomegranate* 13.1 (2011): 52-76. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 20 April 2013.
- Littlejohn, Stephen W. and Karen A. Foss. *Theories of Human Communication*. 9th Ed. Belmont: Thomson and Wadsworth, 2008. Print.

- Logan, Shirley Wilson. *With Pen and Voice: A Critical Anthology of Nineteenth-Century African American Women*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1995. Print.
- . *"We are Coming": The Persuasive Discourse of Nineteenth Century Black Women*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1999. Print.
- Lozano-Reich, Nina M. and Dana L. Cloud. "The Uncivil Tongue: Invitational Rhetoric and the Problem of Inequality." *Western Journal of Communication* 73.2 (2009): 220-226. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 20 April 2013.
- Lorde, Audre. "The Master's Tools will Never Dismantle the Master's House." *Sister Outsider: Essay and Speeches*. Berkeley: Crossing Press, 2007. Print. 110-114.
- Lunsford, Andrea, ed. *Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1995. Print.
- Lunsford, Andrea, John J. Ruszkiewicz, and Keith Walters, eds. *Everything is an Argument*. 5th ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2010. Print.
- Mattingly, Carol. *Well-Tempered Women: Nineteenth Century Temperance Rhetoric*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1998. Print.
- Mebane-Cruz, Anjana and Margaret Wiener. "Imaging 'The Good Reality': Communities of Healing in Two Works of Utopian Fiction." *Contemporary Justice Review* 8.3 (2005): 307-320. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 20 April 2013.
- Meyer, Michaela. "Women Speak(ing): Forty Years of Feminist Contributions to Rhetoric and an Agenda for Feminist Rhetorical Studies." *Communication Quarterly* 55.1 (2007): 1-17. *Communication and Mass Media Complete*. Web. 20 April 2013.

- Miller, Diane Helen. "The Future of Feminist Rhetorical Criticism." *Listening to Their Voices: The Rhetorical Activities of Historical Women*. Ed. Molly Meijer Wertheimer. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1997. Print. 359-380.
- Petre, Elizabeth A. "Understanding Epideictic Purpose as Invitational Rhetoric in Women's Political Convention Speeches." *Kaleidoscope* 6 (2007): 21-37. *Communication and Mass Media Complete*. Web. 20 April 2013.
- Ryan, Kathleen J. and Elizabeth J. Natalle. "Fusing Horizons: Standpoint Hermeneutics and Invitational Rhetoric." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 31.2 (2001): 69-90. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 April 2013.
- Ritchie, Joy and Kate Ronald, eds. *Available Means: An Anthology of Women's Rhetoric(s)*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2001. Print.
- Rich, Adrienne. "When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-vision." *College English* 34.1 (1972): 18-30. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 April 2013.
- Sanati, Fahimeh, Hessamaldin Nejati Hatamian, and Tengku Sepora Tengku Mahadi. "An Analysis of the Ecofeminist Viewpoint on Industrialization and Environmental Degradation in Starhawk's *The Fifth Sacred Thing*." *Journal of Sustainable Development* 4.4 (2011): 86-90. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 March 2013.
- SCImago Journal and Country Rank. *Journal for Cultural Research*. SJCR, 2013. Web. 28 April 2013.
- Starhawk. *The Fifth Sacred Thing*. New York: Bantam Books, 1994. Print.

- Swearingen, Jan C. "A Lover's Discourse: Diotima, Logos, and Desire." *Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition*. Ed. Andrea Lunsford. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1995. Print. 25-51.
- Warnick, Barbara. "Masculinizing the Feminine: Inviting Women Online ca. 1997" *Critical Literacy in a Digital Era: Technology, Rhetoric, and Public Interest*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002. Print. 59-80.
- Wertheimer, Molly Meijer, ed. *Listening to Their Voices: The Rhetorical Activities of Historical Women*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1997. Print.
- Wu, Hui. "Historical Studies of Rhetorical Women here and there: Methodological Challenges to Dominant Interpretive Frameworks." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32.1 (2002): 81-97. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 April 2013.

Vita

Victoria I. Lozano was born in Patterson, New Jersey, but grew up in Surfside Beach, South Carolina. She graduated from Coastal Carolina University in May 2008 where she focused on writing poetry. After she was awarded her Bachelor of Arts degree in English she continued to write for various magazines and newspapers, and then moved to Boone, NC in January of 2009 with intent to enter the English M.A. program at Appalachian State University. In the fall of 2011, she accepted a seat in the English Master's program as planned. Her main area of concentration was women's voices and experiences in literature. The M.A. was awarded in August 2013 alongside a certificate in Rhetoric and Composition, and a certificate in Women Studies. In August 2013, Ms. Lozano will begin her teaching career at Appalachian State University teaching 1st and 2nd year composition courses. She hopes to attend a PhD program with a concentration on feminist rhetoric.