ED 200 045   CS 5   723

AUTHOR   Simons, Herbert
TITLE   Requirements, Problems, Strategies Revisited: The
                Rhetoric of Collectivities.
PUB DATE   Apr 81
NOTE   25p. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
                Central States Speech Association (Chicago, IL, April
                9-11 1981).

ABSTRACT

              Designed initially as a way of understanding the
often anomalous rhetoric of movement leaders, the
Requirements-Problems-Strategies (RPS) framework for analyzing the
rhetoric of social movements has been applied in recent years to
analyses of other collective rhetoric and leadership roles in
collectivities. RPS has also been used in conjunction with other
communication theories (particularly K. Burke's pentad) to identify
and account for the patterns of rhetoric unique to particular
movements and the events in the life of a movement. Emphasized by the
RPS approach are the cross pressures and constraints that inhere in
the organizational roles of leaders of collectivities. The studies
used to illustrate RPS include the following: (1) B. W. Meckling's
study of 1960s free clinics and the creation of a theory of the
rhetoric of counterinstitutional movement organizations (CIMOs), (2)
L. M. Griffin's model of the stages of development in a social
movement and the history of a movement's rhetoric, (3) G. Alve's
study of rhetoric during a transitional period in a movement's
history (the Chinese Communists during their United Front period from
1935 to 1942, for example), and (4) K. Reynolds's study of patterns
of rhetorical invention, which focused on the theological rhetoric of
ordained Catholic revolutionaries in Latin America. (RL)

REQUIREMENTS, PROBLEMS, STRATEGIES REVISITED

THE RHETORIC OF COLLECTIVITIES

HERBERT W. SIMONS
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Paper presented at the Central States Speech Association Convention,
Chicago, Illinois, April 10, 1981.

2

REQUIREMENTS, PROBLEMS, STRATEGIES REVISITED:
THE RHETORIC OF COLLECTIVITIES

Over a decade ago, I developed a Requirements-Problems-Strategies (RPS) approach for analyzing the rhetoric of social movements.[1] Its core proposition was that the often anomalous rhetoric of movement leaders could best be understood as a reflection of conflicting rhetorical requirements and unique situational constraints. Since 1970, my colleagues and I have attempted to elaborate and illustrate the RPS approach as applied to particular movements, and also to extend its range of application to other collective rhetorics and other leadership roles.[2] I should like here to summarize the work we have done.

By a collective rhetoric I include any and all persuasive messages issued by or in the name of an organization, organizational unit, or composite of organizations which work together to achieve common objectives. SCA and CSSA are collectivities, and they are also components of a larger collectivity which we might call the speech-communication community. The rhetoric of collectivities is assumed to follow in a general way from the very nature of collectivities. The rhetoric of those who lead collectivities is assumed to reflect in large measure their identification with organizational objectives but also their individual interests. Identifying and accounting for similarities and differences in patterns of rhetoric b. collectivities and by leaders of collectivities is the task we have set out to accomplish.

Th General P. .....

Those who apeak   th ....tivities have rhetorical
requirements differe. rc. ....k strictly for themselves.
By definition, all co. . ... .al-directed, rul--governed
permeable social syst..... . .....   .stems, their mem..rs opera..
consciously and c.llec .ely . ... or more prim..ry missions
and others that m..ght   .tit.. . ... . The business organization
seeks to make profits, .. pc..t.c   ..ign organization to elect
its candidate, the scie.ific . .m.   .to produce and disseminate
scientific achievements .he ....ements to promote its cause.
To secure its primary m..sio. .. . .. ectivity sets up subgoals:
to produce cars efficiently, ...e, or to wrest party nomina-
tions from other politi..l ca..... .

As rule-governed s..ial s..t.ms .ollectivities operate according
to regulative norms. ? .lic. .y or e. .licitly, they permit some
forms of behavior whil... orb. ... ..ers. The rules may be highly
formalized, as in bur... rac. ., or .ishly informal, as in the case
of most social moveme..s . ... may also be flexible or inflexible,
conventional or uncon... ...n.l, pragmatically oriented or reflective
of values considered ....ins.cally desirable.

As permeable soc.. .vst.ms, collectivities exist in, and are
dependent upon, a large.. ...ernal system that is itself divisible
into various parts. The .. siness corporation buys from suppliers,
sells to customers, rec.uit. employ.es from a labor pool, competes
with other companies, i. af.. cted by governmental regulations, and
so on. Likewise, the so.ial .ovements draws supporters from the external
system and is affected by changes in that system.

The foregoing definitional characteristics of collectivities translate into rhetorical requirements for leaders of collectivities. All are required to recruit and commit followers, to promote ideas, goods or services to outsiders, and to react politically to resistance from components of the external system. These tasks require, in turn, that leaders acquire material resources, that they promote favorable images of the collectivity, that they foster organizational discipline and cohesion, and that they serve as exemplars of organizational norms and values. As suggested earlier, leaders are also expected to bring their personal interests and values to bear upon their roles.

The rhetorical problems confronting leaders of collectivities stem from conflicting rhetoric requirements. In all collectivities-- churches, business corporations, movement organizations, nation states-- there are inevitable tensions between goals and rules, between the moral and the political, between members' role requirements and their personal values, between the need for ideological consistency and the need to adapt to new realities, between the need for organizational cohesiveness and the need of individual members to assert their in- dividual and group interests against the interests of other individuals and groups within the organization, and even against the interests of the organization as a whole. Moreover, collectivities, like individuals, have interests in common with external social systems as well as conflicting interests. They may exploit divisions within the external system as well as form coalitions with segments of that system. These are invariant characteristics of life in and between collectivities, and they are reflective of the mixed-motive nature of all ongoing human relationships.[4]

To illustrate these requirements and problems, consider the tasks
incumbent upon the speech communication community. Like any academic
community, its primary goals of teaching, research and service are
dependent on information, talent, money, and other such resources.
These resources must be coordinated effectively for maximum goal
attainment; hence the need for organizations such as university de-
partments and professional associations as well as rules guiding
inquiry and dissemination of knowledge. As a permeable social system,
the community influences, and is in turn influenced by, such external
system aggregates as governmental agencies, foundations, other disci-
plines and university administrations, as well as subsystems within
the community such as individual members, interest groups, and sub-
disciplines. Rhetorically speaking, the speech communication community
as a whole is required to <u>recruit</u> and <u>indoctrinate</u> new members, <u>justify</u>
its claims to special expertise before accrediting agencies, <u>plead</u>
for freedom from political regulations or other such external system
pressures, <u>mould</u> and <u>reinforce</u> the sense of collective identity

among individual members, <u>mediate</u> conflicts among subgroups within the
community, and, in general, <u>legitimate</u> the profession and its activi-
ties before outsiders and insiders. Any analysis of the rhetoric of
collectivities must begin, I think, with indentification of such tasks.

The rhetoric of those who lead academic communities can best be
understood as a tradeoff among conflicting rhetorical requirements.
Despite their commitment to the advancement and dissemination of
knowledge, leaders of speech communication associations and heads

of academic departments of speech ...nication must balance that
requirement against the need for :.- -ical fictions, Moreover,
the myths they promote--of unity, :..--, originality, uniqueness,
responsiveness, progress and puri-y :. motive--may have to be adapted
simultaneously to different audie_=s. There must be a rhetoric for
outsiders and/rhetoric for insile-s, a rhetoric for initiate and another
rhetoric for the privileged, and y=t another rhetoric which rational-
izes seeming inconsistencies amor= these disparate rhetorics. Whatever
rhetorical stategems leaders emplo;, it is certain tht they will create
new problems in the process of ams.liorating old ones.[5]

The Rhetoric of Social Movements

Thusfar my comments about the cross-pressures encountered by
leaders of collectivities have been rather abstract. The exact nature
of these conflicting requirements and the means employed for dealing
with them will depend on a number of factors. Of particular signifi-
cance in our research have been the variables of relative resource
control, public acceptance of the collectivity, rule constraints on
pragmatic decisionmaking, and degree of bureaucratization. It is on
the basis of these variables, we have argued, that social movements
;.hrtor:ic might be expected to exhibit patterns of rhetoric different
from most other collectivities.

Social movements are severely impeded in their efforts at mobil-
izing human and material resources and exerting influence by dint
of their informal compositions, their commitments to inhibiting
regulative rules, and their positions in relation to the larger
society. By comparison to the heads of established institutions,
their leaders can expect minimal external control and maximal external
resistance. And because they are unusually constrained in their
efforts to balance conflicting demands, the limited strategic options
available to them have greater potential to magnify rather than relieve

problems or to generate new problems.

The single greatest obstacle to goal achievement is illegitimacy. Existing outside the larger society's conception of justice and morality, movements threaten and are threatened by the society's sanctions and taboos: its laws, its maxims, its customs governing taste, decorum, manners, and its insignia of authority. Moreover, the confrontative strategies movements are prompted to employ as a result of the problem of illegitimacy often reinforce images of illegitimacy by political authorities and the general public.

Generally speaking, movements are also at a resource disadvantage relative to the institutions they oppose. Movement activity may be discouraged or inhibited by various forms of social control, ranging from control over communication resources to outright suppression of the movement.

Social movements suffer too from the problem of being voluntary, nonbureaucratic collectivities. Whereas most formal organizations can provide selective material incentives for joining, most movements confront the "free rider" problem. Potential beneficiaries may reap the rewards produced without the risks or costs by allowing others to work for them.[8] Dependent as they are on largely voluntary support, movements also encounter greater problems than most established/ institutions in controlling those who do join the movement. At best the movement's leadership controls an organized core of the movement but exerts relatively little control over a relatively larger number of sympathizers on its periphery.[9]

Finally, movements are encumbered by constraints on pragmatic decision-making. This point was highlighted in an analysis which

Cheesbro, Orr and I provided of participation by countercultural and left-oriented movements in the McGovern debacle of 1972.[10]

> In many ways, the sources of a movement's strength
> tend to work against its chances at the polls.
> Toughened by resistance from without, its members
> frequently become uncompromising. Geared to using
> pressure tactics in order to influence persons in
> politically sensitive positions, it frequently
> alienates the mass of people. Compelled to arouse
> its own supporters by in-group appeals, its rhetoric
> is often elitist despite its best intentions; the non-
> verbal elements of dress, demeanor, etc. conveying the
> impression of a small We opposing a very large They.
>
> In general, protestors are not very adept at conventional
> electoral politics. A protest movement is passion and
> moral conviction i.. need of organization and discipline,
> an id and a superego in search of an ego. The supreme
> politician, by contrast, is a quintessential realist
> in search of a cause that will win. Master of his own
> impulses and unencumbered by severe moral scruples, he
> is free to make common cause with his enemies and to
> cast off his devoted friends; to solicit contributions
> where he can find them and promise political influence
> in return.

The foregoing rhetorical requirements and problems provide only crude indicators of what a collectivity will say and do rhetorically. And the constraints I have named offer only a rough index of the differences in rhetorical strategies between, say, a social movement and a political campaign organizatior Beyond extending the RPS approach to collectivities as a whole, we need to put more meat on the RPS skeleton by identifying requirements, problems and patterns of rhetoric generic to particular types and subtypes of collectivities, and to particular roles, functions, occasions and stages of develop-ment. We need also to develop methods for identifying requirements and problems idiosyncratic to particular collectivities and even to events which are unique in the life of a collectivity.

9

Studying Movements and Non-Movements

In analyzing the rhetoric of any given collectivity, my colleagues and I move from the macroscopic to the microscopic; i.e. from the broadly generic to the idiosyncratic. In analyzing a movement's rhetoric, for example, we assume that propositions about collectivities in general, and about movements in general, and about a given type of movement will also apply to the movement in question. But we also take pains to gather information on situational factors unique to the movement. And we look, too, at how acts of rhetoric shape subsequent perceptions of situation.[11] At the most microscopic level, the point at which we examine how rhetoric is adapted to particular events, we assume that there is a "logic" of situation. By this we mean that from a "reading" of the concatenation of factors operating on the collectivity at any given time, some rhetorical options will seem appropriate, others inappropriate. Situations, we assume, impel and constrain rhetorical choices but do not determine them; rhetors are always free to exploit the "resources of ambiguity" in language to structure audience perceptions.[12]

Illustrative of our approach is Mechling's theory of the rhetoric of counterinstitutional movement organizations (CIMOs).[13] As exemplified by the Free Clinic which developed as part of the countercultural movement of the late sixties, CIMOs differ from most protest organizations in that they also provide services akin to those offered by the institutions they oppose. Indeed, the provision of services is partly intended as a model of reformation of the offending institution.

Inherent in all CIMOs, Mechling contended, is a conflict between their ideological requirements and their service requirements. In the face of this conflict, she argued, CIMOs institutionalize and deradicalize at a faster pace than most protest movement organizations. First, the service function requires resources incompatible with being "counter to". Once resources have been invested in services, there is considerable and quite visible loss should these investments be abandoned. On the other hand, anti-institutional ideological stances are relatively easy to "write off". Second, the services rendered may be valued by established sectors of the external system. The CIMO may thus be positively reinforced for provision of these services. Third, the immediacy of the services gives it a sense of preeminence. The service function is adopted as a response to a felt need. To cease meeting that need is counter to the ideological center of the collectivity. "Put simply, while the service function is a component of the anti-institutional stance, the anti-institutional stance is not necessary to the service function".[14]

In looking at the history of a movement's rhetoric we have found Griffin's systemization of Burkean concepts quite helpful, but not his historical model of stages and phases.[15] The model, we believe, is insufficiently attentive to situational variations.[16] For her purposes, Mechling found it useful to distinguish among noninstitutionalized, partially institutionalized, and fully institutionalized stages of development. On to these stages she charted rhetorics of Division, Amelioration and Respectability.

These correspond, in Burkean terms, to frames of rejection, transition and acceptance.

Particularly interesting was the rhetoric of the partially institutionalized stage, for it was at this stage that the conflicts between the CIMO's anti-institutional stance and its service commitments were most visible. Mechling hypothesized that the rhetoric at this stage would be marked by highly ambiguous figures of speech, deniable messages, suppressed premises, qualified generalizations, messages highly tailored to different audiences, and rationalizations for uncertainty and apparent inconsistency.

Shive also focused on a transitional period in a movement's history, one which posed enormous rhetorical problems.[17] Like Mechling, he offered a Burkean analysis within a RPS framework. The object of his attention was Mao Tse-tung's rhetoric during the United Front period (1935-42). During that period, the Communist Chinese maintained a fragile alliance against the Japanese invaders with their bitter enemies, the Kuomintang. In the face of the Japanese invasion, Communist soldiers were forced literally to adopt the insignia of the Kuomintang army. Shive's opening analysis of Mao's rhetorical requirements provides some indication of the problems Mao faced as well:

> (1) As the Party grew in size and diversity, and as
>   they identified goals and practices with the rising
>   tide of patriotic, anti-Japanese sentiment, impor-
>   tant changes had to be made in the intraorganizational
>   symbol system. Socialist principles had to be blended
>   with nationalist sentiments. The purity of the
>   transcendent goals of the movement had to be recon-
>   ciled with the expediency of "unholy" alliances with
>   former enemies. Basic policy itself had to be
>   justified, so that past and present actions did

not appear to contradict one another. A new unity
of perspectives had to be refashioned, and social,
regional and ideological cleavages had to be bridged
by new sets of unifying concepts and symbols. The
ideal image of the Party cadre had to be altered.
In short, the good soldier who changed the insignia
on his hat had to accept, even welcome, his new
institutions for self-identification.

(2)   As the Party addressed a wider range of social and
political audiences, the Communists had to cautiously
adapt their message to the delicate tasks of estab-
lishing truces and fostering cooperation toward a
temporarily common goal. To do this, they had to
establish new sources of authority and legitimacy
as patriotic "loyal opposition", rather than as
revolutionary subverters. They had to gain the
rhetorical upper-hand in calling for unity with the
Kuomintang on their own terms, while at the same time
deterring them from capitulating to the Japanese.
Promises of cooperation had to be mixed, but not
confused, with threats of retaliation for provacative
incidents. Finally, the Communist Chinese entered
a mixed-motive relationship with the Soviet Union
during this period. They increasingly made local
decisions for local reasons, while making them appear
after the fact to conform to the ideological regimen
of Stalin's International.

(3)   The enemy had to be redefined. Over the course of the
period studied, the Kuomintang was gradually trans-
formed from Public Enemy Number One to imperialism's
running dog, to a conditional ally and fellow resis-
tance fighter. In addition, the Japanese menace itself
had to be vividly portrayed. All other grievances had
to be reinterpreted as secondary functions of the
"primary contradiction" between Japanese imperialism
and the Chinese people.[18]

Shive's rhetorical history of the United Front period stands in

sharp contrast to Griffin's model of dialectical enjoinment between

"pro-" and "anti-rhetorics". The politics of coalition and opposition

were immensely more complicated. Even as Mao mobilized peasants,

workers, soldiers, the intelligentsia, party cadre, and even land-

lords, he also played each against the others. In his analysis of

messages addressed to these various audiences, Shive noted numerous

13

inconsistencies, all justified by the overrriding folk metaphor of the
Tao. For Mao, this ancient spiritual-cultural path became the Road
of Revolution, complete with its twists and turns and even switch-
backs over uneven historical terrain. Mao demarcated the "correct
line" that ran through a forest of error to the Left and Right.

One cannot help but observe similar patterns of rhetorical in-
vention in Reynold's study of ideological rhetoric of ordained Catholic
revolutionaries in Latin America.[19] These radical priests and bishops
sought sweeping changes within the Church and in the society at large.
At the same time, they were of the Church and were dependent upon it
for legitimacy, protection, material support and channels of communi-
cation. Said Reynolds, the "logic" of their situation compelled ex-
ploitation of ambiguities in Catholic theology. Like Mao, the lib-
eration theologists of Latin America dialectically transcended dis-
tinctions between the old and the new, the conservative and the pro-
gressive, violence and love, socialism and Catholicism. The "new"
Church being advocated was but a return to the original spirit of
Christianity. The progressives acting to shake off the yoke of
oppression in Latin America were operating in the spirit of the
prophets of the Church and of the people of God who had marched
toward the promised land. Disobedience, even violence, were jus-
tified as acts of love. Although only a small minority of the
Catholic clergy dared to proclaim themselves outright Marxists,
they could observe that Marxism was a useful "tool of Analysis",
and they could cite John XXIII's acknowledgement that there were
positive aspects to socialism. Some priests went so far as to
proclaim that true socialism is Christianity lived in its integrity.

.14

When forced by the instituional Church to resign because of his Marxist activities, Camillo Torres declared, "I took off my soutane to be more truly a priest. We cannot have a supernatural life without charity, and our charity must be efficacious".[20]

As one shifts from the discourse of movement leaders to the discourse of leaders of institutionalized, bureaucratized collectivities, one finds overlapping patterns of rhetoric. It is not surprising, therefore, that observers such as Zarefsky[21] and Hahn and Gonchar[22] should discover rhetorical similarities. But there are also differences.

A case in point is found in Jablonski's study of letters written by American Catholic bishops justifying to Church members the changes in Church doctrine and practices that were an outgrowth of the Second Vatican Council.[23] Jablonski labeled the bishops "institutional innovators" and distinguished their role from "bottom-up" insurgents (i.e Torres) on the one hand, and organizational bureaucrats on the other. In conflict for the bishops was the need to function both as innovators and as guardians of the established order. "Though high in the Church hierarchy and thus vested with considerable power, the bishops encountered massive resistance as the Church implemented its reforms. Many bishops were themselves ambivalent about the proposed changes but were cast as change-agents by dint of their roles".[24]

Like the Latin American prelates studied by Reynolds, the North American bishops had to justify proposed reforms by means of a rhetoric of legitimation. She notes these differences, however, between bottom-up change agents and top-down change agents"

> In bottom-up programs of change, leaders must create
> a rhetoric of discontinuity to establish the legitimacy
> of the collective's grievances as well as the need to
> induce changes from the outside. Whereas insurgent

leaders must call attention to the confrontative and
divisive character of their action, institutional
innovators must defuse potential conflict by pro-
claiming the value of purposeful--and authorized--
institutional change. Indeed, institutional inno-
vators must create a semblance of continuity within
which major alterations in instituional philosophies
and practices may be viewed as attempts to perfect
and to preservate the institutional order.

At the same time, however, institutional innovators
encounter special rhetorical requirements and problems
when confronted with conflicting demands for change.
Sometimes, institutional innovators must temper their
own conservatism in order to embark on programs of
radical change. By the same token, institutional
innovators may need to mediate between superiors who
wish to slow down the course of changes and subordinates
who hope to accelerate it.[25]

Jablonski's reference to "bottom-up" versus "top-down" change

agents is one that Mechling, Schreier and I emphasized in our recent

monograph.[26] The former help to organize grassroots insurgency

efforts within institutions; the latter manage, speak for, or advise

institutions.

As regards insurgent-initiated conflicts, bottom-up change

agents are "actor-oriented"; top-down change agents are "system-

oriented".[27] From an actor orientation these conflicts are

necessary and inevitable consequences of systems that cannot

possibly satisfy the needs of all persons equally or completely.

The focus is on distributive benefits--on maximizing resource

acquisitions from what is considered to be a finite resource pie.

Authorities, moreover, are regarded as partisan and discriminatory.

From a system orientation, insurgent-induced conflicts are

unnecessary, dysfunctional, irrational. What insurgents label as

conflicts are really misunderstandings, differences of opinion,

or problems that can be resolved by recourse to information, expertise, top-down persuasion, or cooperative group problem solving. Treating them as conflicts by behaving combatively is dysfunctional because it interferes with realization of the system's supraordinate interest in providing collective benefits. Insurgents are irrational because they ignore the possibilities for enlarging the resource pie through cooperative efforts and for shrinking the resource pie through their combative efforts. The protests of insurgents are frequently seen as signs of personal pathology. Institutional authorities, by contrast, are rational and nonpartisan. If they are deficient it is in the communication skills necessary to "get through" to the insurgents and those they seek to mobilize.

The distinction between actor-oriented versus system-oriented conflict rhetorics was born home to me in interviews and readings on the subject of public information for the prevention of occupational cancer.[28] The problem of occupational cancer from carcinogens such as asbestos and vinyl chloride is now widely recognized, although it had been downplayed by institutional managers, health and safety officers and government agencies for many years.[29] Top-down change agents have since developed "educational" programs premised on the need for a system-oriented approach. The problem, as they typically view it, is one of getting workers to comply with their health and safety directives. Employee resistance to such devices as air masks is seen as a function of insufficient information and of defense mechanisms such as denial and rationalization. The flow of needed information is assumed to come from superiors to subordinates and from experts to nonexperts.

Contrast this top-do   approach with that of a gressroots
organization known as PHI ..POSH, The Philadelphia Area Project on
Occupational Safety and Health. Leaders of PHILAPOSH stress socio-
logical; institutional analysis (rather than psychological models
of presuasion) as a prelude to effective change efforts. They
maintain that companies are generally more interested in promoting
profits than in protecting the lives of their workers; that they
have been guilty of minimizing, ignoring or suppressing knowledge
about the problem of occupational cancer; that institutional health
and safety officers are "owned" by their companies; that presumptions
of expertise and higher status create barriers to compliance by
workers; and that the s. .ims promoted by top-down change agents
(e.g. air masks) are, a: :est, half measures which forestall adoption
by companies of neede: but more expensive technological safeguards.

As an alternative to top-down change efforts, the leaders of
PHILAPOSH mobilize rank and file workers for confrontations with
their superiors. At consciousness raising meetings sponsored by
PHILAPOSH, workers from different companies come to see that they
have common problems and that they can overcome them only by acting
together. The emphasis at these meetings is on shared expertise.
Complaints by workers are treated as real rather than irrational.
Workers are taught how to monitor the air in their work surroundings
(rather than trusting company experts), to identify health hazards,
to file complaints with OSHA and lawsuits for disability benefits
with the courts. They are also encouraged to press superiors for
:formation about the generic names of the chemicals they work with,
and, should they fail to get satisfactory answers, to press union
grievances or engage in other job actions.

18

Like Free Clinics studied by Mechling, PHILAPOSH is in danger
of becoming institutionalized; it has already muted its more radical
rhetoric to some extent.[50] One virtue of sociological analyses
of the kind provided by the RPS approach is that it can render
shifts in rhetoric of this kind more explicable. Each case study
can also serve as a concrete exemplar of the framework's general
propositions.

Summary and Conclusions

Presented herein has been a review of theory and research
conducted over the past decade utilizing the Requirements-Problems-
Strategies (RPS) framework. Designed initially as a way of under-
standing the often anomalous rhetoric of movement leaders, it has been
applied in recent years in analyses of other collective rhetorics
and of other leadership roles. It has also been used in conjunction
with other theories (usually Burkean) to identify and account for
patterns of rhetoric unique to particular movements or to events
in the life of a movement.

Emphasized by the RPS approach are the crosspressures and
constraints on leaders of collectivities which inhere in their
organizational roles. All leaders must balance goal demands, rule
demands, resource demands, pressures for organizational cohesion
and pressures for autonomy, personal interests and the interests
of the collectivity, the need to gather and provide accurate infor-
mation and the need for image-enhancing rhetorical fictions. De-
pending on the type of collectivities they lead, they are also
constrained in various ways. For example, social movements are
uniquely constrained by dint of their informal composition, their
commitments to ideological strictures on pragmatic decision-making,
and by their noninstitutional status within the larger society.

Counterinstituional movement organizations are additionally con-
strained by having to provide services similar in kind to the
institutions they oppose. Collective rhetorics, it has been
argued, can better be understood from foreknowledge of these cross-
pressures and constraints. They provide at least partial explanations
for genres of rhetoric associated with broad classes of collectivities
(e.g. political campaign organizations, scientific communities) and
also can guide analyses of the rhetoric of particular organizational
leaders.

The discourse of those who lead collectivities is similar in
some respects, different in others. The Marxist insurgent and
the "top-down" American Catholic bishop both justify arguments for
change by appeals to traditional values and beliefs. But, as I
have argued in this paper, there are also vast differences between
the actor-oriented rhetorics of "bottom-up" insurgents and the
system-oriented rhetorics of those who lead or speak for established
institutions.

It is a mark of something more than disciplinary overspeciali-
zation, I think, that our field has not only treated organizational
communications and social movements rhetoric as conceptually distinct,
but has approached the two areas of study in very different ways.
As is reflected in the titles of these subdisciplines, organizational
leaders are regarded as communicators while social movement leaders
are assumed to practice rhetoric--the latter term is somewhat less
flattering. Correspondingly, we have devised principles of
"effective communication" for the leader of formal organizations
but no such body of prescriptions has been devised for movement

leaders. Instead, we subject their discourse to critical analysis, and often to ridicule.

I hope it is clear from this paper that there is merit in joining the study of discourse (whether labeled rhetoric or communication) by leaders of all manner of collectivities under a single conceptual umbrella, and, thence, in identifying and accounting for similarities and differences in patterns of discourse. One possible vehicle for structuring our insights is the RPS approach, but I make no brief for using it to the exclusion of other integrative frameworks. At the level of microscopic analyses of particular events in the life of a collectivity, it surely needs to be supplemented.

1. "Requirements, Problems and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements" QJS, 56 (1970), 1-11.

2. The·distinction between collective rhetorics and the rhetoric of those who lead collectivities will not consistently be maintained in this paper. Strictly speaking, collective rhetorics are anonymous; they come in the form of unauthored circulars, announcements, committee reports, advertisements, etc. It often matters little, however, whether the message is authored by an organizational representative or is anonymous, so long as the former's pronouncements and actions have an official status. It is assumed that these messages largely reflect the interests of the collectivities represented.

3. Note the similarity of the definition to definitions of human organizations. I use the term "collectivity", however, to include groupings of people at various levels of abstraction. Social movements are collectivities typically consisting of one or more core organizations as well as a large number of persons sympathetic to the movement's cause who are organizationally unaffilliated. See, for example, Ralph H. Turner and Lewis Killian, Collective Behavior, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1972), p. 308. Whether the RPS framework can be extended to units as small as a family or friendship group is a question I have not yet explored.

4. For an excellent discussion of mixed-motive conflicts, see Thomas Schelling, The Strategy of Conflict (New York, Galaxy, 1963). Ch. 2.

5. For an analysis of the rhetorical requirements, problems and stategies of scholarly communities, see H.W. Simons, "Are Scientists Rhetors in Disguise? An Analysis of Discursive Processes Within Scientific Communities", in Rhetoric in Transition: Studies in the Nature and Uses of Rhetoric, ed. Eugene E. White (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1980), 115-130.

6. For a discussion of militant, moderate, intermediate and expressive patterns of movement rhetoric, see Herbert W. Simons, Elizabeth W. Mechling and Howard Schrier, "Functions of Communication in Mobilizing for Collective Action from the Bottom Up: The Rhetoric of Social Movements," Handbook of Rhetorical and Communication Theory, ed. Carroll C. Arnold and John W. Bowers (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, in press). (Subsequent references are to Simons, Mechling & Schrier). These are ideal types in the Weberian sense, each with behavioral and ideological sub-dimensions. In actuality, as we point out, movements often vacillate between rhetorical styles and factionalize over issues of rhetorical strategy. Nevertheless, their rhetoric tends to differ from that of institutionalized, bureaucratized collectivities. Movements have little choice but to mobilize on the basis of ideological and normative appeals. They are more prone to employ noninstitutionalized, confrontational pressure tactics. And, too, they are more likely to offer ideological statements which delegitimate existing institutions. Much more precise statements can be offered about genres associated with particular types of movements. See the sections of our chapter on mobilization and external influence.

7. For a fuller discussion of these tactics, see the section on Social Control in Simons, Mechling & Schrier.

8. On the "free rider" problem, see Anthony Oberschall, Social Conflict and Social Movements (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1973), 113-118.

9. Kurt Lang and Gladys Lang, Collective Dynamics (New York: Crowell, 1961), p.495.

10. See Herbert W. Simons, James W. Cheesbro and C. Jack Orr, "A 'Movement' Perspective on the 1972 Presidential Campaign," QJS, 59 (1973), 168-179.

11. On the relation between rhetoric and situation, see the discussion of "Objectivist vs. Interactionist Approaches..." in Simons, Mechling & Schrier.

12. See Kenneth Burke, A Rhetoric Of Motives (Berkeley: University
    of California Press, 1969).

13. Elizabeth W. Mechling, From Paradox to Parody: A Socio-Rhetorical
    Theory of Counter-Institutional Movement Organizations. Un-
    published doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1979.

14. Mechling, p.34.

15. Leland M. Griffin, "A Dramatistic Theory of the Rhetoric of
    Movements," in Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, ed. W.H.
    Rueckert (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969).

16. For a detailed evaluation of Griffin's theory, see Simons,
    Mechling & Schrier.

17. Glenn Shive, Mao-Tse-tung and the Anti-Japanese United Front:
    A Rhetorical Analysis of a Mixed-Motive Conflict, Unpublished
    doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1978.

18. Shive, pp. 5-6.

19. Katherine Reynolds, Rhetorical Requirements, Problems and
    Strategies of Catholic Clerical Revolutionaries in Latin
    America. Unpublished paper, Temple University, 1980.

20. Quoted in Reynolds, p.10.

21. See David Zarefsky, "President Johnson's War on Poverty: The
    Rhetoric of Three 'Establishment' Movements," CM 44 (1977),
    352-373.

22. Dan F. Hahn and Ruth M. Gonchar, "Social Movement Theory: A Dead
    End," Communication Quarterly, 28 (1980), 60 - 64.

23. Carol Jablonski, "Promoting Radical Change in the Roman Catholic
    Church: Rhetorical Requirements, Problems and Strategies of the
    American Bishops," CSSJ, 31 (1980), 'n press.

24. Jablonski, P.

25. Jablonski, p.

26. Simons, Mechling & Schrier: see the introductory section.

27. These terms were initially employed to distinguish theories of conflict, but I have since found them useful in characterizing genres of rhetoric by conflict participants. See Herbert W. Simons, "Persuasion in Social Conflicts: A Critique of Prevailing Conceptions and a Framework for Future Research," Speech Monographs, 39 (1972), 227-247.

28. See Herbert W. Simons, "The How of Message Information," Proceedings of the Symposium on Public Information for the Prevention of Occupational Cancer (Washington: National Academy of Sciences, 1977).

29. See for example Paul Brodeur, Expendable Americans (New York: Viking, 1973).

30. See Margaret di Fulgo, PHILAPOSH: Current Progress and Future Concerns. Paper presented at Undergraduate Honors Conference, Greencastle, Ind., April 3, 1981.

r

25