

University of Denver

Digital Commons @ DU

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

1-1-2011

Taking a Deep Breath: The Rhetorical Construction of Solidarity in the American Labor Movement

William O'Shannon Murphy
University of Denver

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd>



Part of the [Labor History Commons](#), [Labor Relations Commons](#), and the [Public Relations and Advertising Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

O'Shannon Murphy, William, "Taking a Deep Breath: The Rhetorical Construction of Solidarity in the American Labor Movement" (2011). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 464.
<https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd/464>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu, dig-commons@du.edu.

Taking a Deep Breadth: The Rhetorical Construction of Solidarity in the American Labor Movement

Abstract

This dissertation explores the rhetorical fragments in three case studies of the American Labor Movement constituting movement members in solidarity. Using Kenneth Burke's discussion of rhetorical substance, this project explores the possibilities for developing deep and broad forms of solidarity within the American Labor Movement. Rhetorical fragments of the Industrial Workers of the World, the United Farm Workers, and contingent faculty unionization efforts are explored.

I argue Burke's ideas of substance and identification provide a powerful lens through which we can examine the solidary practices of social movements. Through the examination of the case studies mentioned, I demonstrate that solidarity was constructed using different points of identification for workers involved in the movement. These points of identification sometimes worked to the benefit and sometimes to the detriment of the movements described.

Document Type

Dissertation

Degree Name

Ph.D.

Department

Human Communications

First Advisor

Christina R. Foust, Ph.D.

Second Advisor

Bernadette Calafell

Third Advisor

Daniel J. Lair

Keywords

Burke, Critical, Industrial Workers of the World, Labor, Rhetoric, United Farm Workers

Subject Categories

Communication | Labor History | Labor Relations | Public Relations and Advertising

Publication Statement

Copyright is held by the author. User is responsible for all copyright compliance.

TAKING A DEEP BREADTH: THE RHETORICAL CONSTRUCTION OF
SOLIDARITY IN THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT

A Dissertation

Presented to
the Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Denver

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
William O'Shannon Murphy

August 2011

Advisor: Christina R. Foust

©Copyright by William O'Shannon Murphy 2011
All Rights Reserved

Author: William O'Shannon Murphy
Title: TAKING A DEEP BREADTH: THE RHETORICAL CONSTRUCTION OF
SOLIDARITY IN THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT
Advisor: Christina R. Foust
Degree Date: August 2011

Abstract

This dissertation explores the rhetorical fragments in three case studies of the American Labor Movement constituting movement members in solidarity. Using Kenneth Burke's discussion of rhetorical substance, this project explores the possibilities for developing deep and broad forms of solidarity within the American Labor Movement. Rhetorical fragments of the Industrial Workers of the World, the United Farm Workers, and contingent faculty unionization efforts are explored.

I argue Burke's ideas of substance and identification provide a powerful lens through which we can examine the solidary practices of social movements. Through the examination of the case studies mentioned, I demonstrate that solidarity was constructed using different points of identification for workers involved in the movement. These points of identification sometimes worked to the benefit and sometimes to the detriment of the movements described.

Acknowledgements

As with any undertaking of this magnitude, the work here was not done in isolation but with the patient, careful, and loving support of many people for whom my gratitude is boundless. Particularly, I thank Dr. Christina R. Foust, who provided constant support, thoughtful criticism, and patience as she guided me through the writing process. Without Dr. Foust's hard work, guidance, and editorial assistance this work would not be possible. Committee members Drs. Dan Lair and Bernadette Calafell shared great ideas and literature, and pushed my thinking in stronger directions. Dr. Linda Bensel-Meyers graciously stepped in to chair this dissertation and also offered useful ideas during the defense. Thank you to the entire Communication faculty at DU for the many life lessons.

Closer to home, without the love and support of numerous friends and family I could not have succeeded. Maranda Murphy pushed me, supported me, loved me, and believed in me. I owe my success to her. Tim Murphy was the inspiration for this work, and I can only hope it makes him proud. This work is dedicated to Audrey Murphy, who has motivated me to pursue my education to its fullest. I strive daily to meet the expectations of Edwin Van Murphy, whose memory is always in my thoughts. Thank you to both my extended family and Maranda's family for all your support. Numerous friends have kept me on track, particularly Dr. Amy Zsohar, who pushed me through the writing process every Sunday. I am further indebted to Dr. Jennifer Huynh Thi Anh Morrison, Dr. Rich Jones, Dr. Karen Lollar, Dr. Katia Campbell, Dr. David Kottenstette, Jacqueline Kirby, Dr. Tim Casey, Brett Feddersen, Robb and Tara Yeager, and so many other people. I am grateful for your support and friendship.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction	1
Solidarity: Theoretical Considerations	10
Solidarity as Identification: A Burkean Perspective	21
Methodological Considerations	30
Overview of the Dissertation	37
Chapter Two: The IWW and Industrial Solidarity	41
Burke’s Dialectical and Geometric Substance.....	42
Geometric Substance within the IWW	45
Dialectical Substance in the IWW	52
Transcending Familial Substance	64
The Limits of Geometric Substance	72
In Retrospect	77
Chapter 3: Familial and Directional Substance in the United Farm Workers	79
Familial Substance in the United Farm Workers.....	85
Dialectical Substance in the United Farm Workers.....	109
Issues of Solidarity.....	117
In Retrospect	120
Chapter 4: Rhetorical Substance in Adjunct Faculty Organization	123
Geometric Substance among Adjunct Faculty.....	130
Dialectical and Directional Substance of Adjunct Faculty	147
In Retrospect	158
Chapter 5: Taking a Deep Breath.....	163
Burke’s Paradox of Substance and its Meaning for Solidarity.....	164
Rhetorical Substance of the IWW, the UFW, and Adjunct Faculty Unionization Efforts.....	167
Industrial workers of the world.....	167
United farm workers.	172
Adjunct faculty unionization.....	176
Social Movement Scholarship	181
A new materialism.	182
Essentialism.	187
Conclusion	193
References.....	196
Appendix A.....	208

Chapter One: Introduction

Scholarship on the American Labor Movement frequently suggests the movement is on the decline (Greenhouse, 2009). This decline is seen in numerous arenas, from the declining real wage of American employees to the failure of unionization efforts (Greenhouse, 2009; Jeter, 2009; Shipler, 2005). Numerous efforts have been made to explain this decline. Some attribute the decline to the increasing power of corporations, the lack of legal protections, or the enforcement of existing legal protections for the American worker¹ (Bosquet, 2008; Ross, 2009). Others suggest the loss of a supportive political climate has contributed to the decline, illustrated by President Reagan's firing of air traffic controllers. Still others point to the presence of corruption in the union movement as the cause for failure (Fraser, 2001; Ross, 2009). Finally, scholars have attributed the decline to globalization, which allows corporations to export jobs and import threats to the American worker (Jeter, 2009).

Regardless of the reason, the American worker's quality of life is on the decline. Workers find it increasingly difficult to make ends meet (Greenhouse, 2009). Greenhouse (2009) notes that the number of Americans living in poverty jumped by 15 percent from

¹ The term "worker" is problematic. As will be shown throughout the dissertation, who counts as a "worker" is often contested within the American Labor Movement. For purposes of the introduction, I am using the term broadly to refer to both wage and salaried employees, white and blue collar. However, who is considered a worker within the American Labor Movement certainly reflects the rhetorical construction of solidarity within the movement.

2000-2006. He adds, “A once sturdy structure of solid wages, pensions, health insurance, and job security is being dismantled brick by brick” (p. 38). Even white collar workers find their positions and their pay grade threatened (Fraser, 2001).

The plight of the American wage laborer is hardly a new story. Laborers have fought for recognition as democratic citizens and as human beings, improved living conditions, and improved working conditions since the colonization of North America (Jones, 1999). While this struggle is hardly new, it is also hardly over. Contemporary laborers are faced with many of the same struggles, though the drive through history changed the contours of those struggles. While we encounter workers in the United States every day, we are often oblivious to their everyday struggle for survival. We do not, in our brief interactions with workers, see their inability to get quality health care, their fight to survive despite earning wages far below their contributions, their struggles to participate in the democratic system, to get quality day care for their children, or even to find time to enjoy their lives through recreation.

Shipler (2004) describes the plight of the American worker as largely invisible. This invisibility occurs in many ways. Shipler argues welfare reform in 1996 led to millions of workers finding jobs through work mandates. The number of people on the welfare rolls has decreased as a result; however, once people leave those rolls, we fail to see that they still must struggle for survival: simply getting a job does not lift one out of poverty (p. 4). By the same token, even how poverty is defined is a point of contestation. Workers who are not officially considered impoverished still do not necessarily make enough money to survive (Shipler, 2004).

Ehrenreich (2001) provides a rich illustration of Shipler's point. She took a series of low income jobs across the country to create a thick description of the everyday challenges faced by American workers. She discovered that workers endure long, difficult hours for pay that forces workers to make sacrifices simply to have food and shelter. The work is hard on bodies and soft on reward. Workers receive little respect for their contributions. Many work multiple jobs to make sure their bills get paid. For Ehrenreich, however, poverty was a choice. In the end, Ehrenreich had the opportunity to return to her middle-class existence. This choice was highlighted when Ehrenreich attempted to work as a server and maid at the same time. In the end, she wrote, "I leave. I don't walk out, I just leave. I don't finish my side work, or pick up my credit card tips, if any, at the cash register ... And the surprising thing is that you can walk out without permission" (p. 48). The ability of Ehrenreich to walk out without permission is not a luxury afforded to millions of American workers. To leave a job is to risk the loss of shelter, health care, dental care, and other necessities that people in the middle and upper classes often take for granted. Workers also run the risk of becoming blacklisted, and being forced to move away from their family and social support systems.

Corporations increase their profit margins on the backs of American workers. Jeter (2009) notes, "Corporate profits account for a larger portion of world income than at any time in the postwar period, while wages have plummeted to their smallest share since the beginning of the Great Depression" (p. xi). Additionally, corporations cut corners on safety standards, decrease health and retirement benefits, and ship jobs overseas.

While at work, workers are producing more for less. Workers are losing pay compared to the profits they generate. They are losing free time to let their bodies and minds recuperate from the trials of work. The gap between the wealthiest Americans and the poorest is steadily increasing. The hours Americans spend working has steadily increased with the rise of capitalism (Schor, 1992). Schor (1992) notes, “the market system has a structural imperative to exploit labor: those who do not succeed in raising hours of work or accelerating the pace of production may very well be driven out of business by their competitors” (p. 50). Schor’s point is broader than the typical “blue-collar” worker. Workers of all classes are steadily putting in more hours. Workers in the United States are generally working longer hours than 50 years ago. Schor notes that even workers that don’t work long hours at work come home to put in long hours fulfilling familial and household responsibilities. The implication for Schor is that workers in the United States are steadily losing their leisure time: time that is invaluable to their physical and psychological well being.

While it is clear that U.S. workers are faced with numerous trials, workers outside of the U.S. face these same types of problems, “in spades.” With the advent of globalization, workers throughout the world are faced with increasing struggles to survive. The problem is magnified on the global scale as structural adjustment programs force developing countries into the global marketplace and cause particular hardships on workers in those countries. The rise of free trade agreements brings jobs to developing countries, but the jobs they bring are particularly exploitative. Ross (2009) notes:

Trade deregulation has brought down barriers to the movement of capital and jobs, but it has not freed up movement of people in pursuit of a better livelihood. The upshot is that work is allowed to circulate around the globe with impunity, but workers themselves are not – in fact, many are criminalized if they cross borders. (p. 15)

Jeter (2009) discusses the effects of economic deregulation and globalization on the working people in the world. He notes, for instance, that the population of sub-Saharan Africa represents more than 10 percent of the world's population, but only two percent of global trade. Alone, that statistic might not seem so damning, but Jeter adds the percent of global trade represented by sub-Saharan Africa is declining. To put the impact of free market globalization in context, Jeter writes:

With more cash spanning the globe faster than ever, 1.5 billion people now live on the equivalent of less than \$1 per day. Half the world's population – 3 billion people – survive on only twice that, or about 25 cents less than each cow in the European Union receives per day in government subsidies ... Globalization's architects found their own boogeyman – inflation – and used it to bludgeon the poor and the working class in the same manner. (p. xii-xix)

In the United States, these issues play out as corporations threaten to export jobs to countries where the cost of labor is cheaper, and succeed in decreasing the wages and benefits of local workers. Local workers further feel threatened by the influx of immigrants willing to work for less pay. What results is a sort of race to the bottom, as workers compete against each other for jobs in an effort that drives down their collective wages and conditions, and ultimately decreases their sense of worth. In order to create jobs, workers must be willing to work for less (Greenhouse, 2009; Ross, 2009). Globally, the workers that are most willing to bear the brunt of corporate oppression are the ones that can earn corporate jobs.

When workers do attempt to challenge their conditions, they are faced with a variety of obstacles (Scott, 2005; Wilson, 1996). For instance, aggressive union-busting efforts by corporations are supported by the repressive power of the state (Fantasia, 1988). The threat of unionization within an organization often prompts organizations to hire companies designed to destroy the possibility of a union. Furthermore, corporations threaten to close shop or relocate to prevent unionization efforts.

The above discussion makes clear that workers both within and outside the United States face numerous obstacles. These obstacles have posed serious challenges to the ability of workers to survive and assert their value. The American Labor Movement's biggest tool for combating these challenges has long been considered collective action. If, as Marx suggests, the drive of history is for workers to eventually overthrow the capitalist system, then collective action is key to igniting history's impulse. The fundamental way in which our existence is understood within Marx's materialist perspective is class antagonism between workers and owners. The fundamental experiences and goals of workers and owners are different, leading to a struggle between classes. Collective action often is expressed through unions. Unionization functions as a representative of the successes and failures of workers to improve their quality of life through collective action. In other words, the success of unions reflects the success of the labor movement.

Reams of evidence demonstrate that successful unions improve workers' quality of life. According to Greenhouse (2008) "Unions raise workers' wages by 20 percent on average, and when health coverage and other benefits are added, they increase total compensation by 28 percent" (p. 242). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS)

(2011) the median income of union workers was \$917 per week, compared with \$717 for nonunion workers. Union workers have seen a wage increase of 26 percent in the period between 2000 and 2010, according to the BLS, compared with 24 percent for nonunion workers. Wages are not the only measure of the importance of unions. Budd (2005) writes, “jobs that are represented by a union have total expenditures on nonmandatory benefit items that are 25- to 50-percent higher than similar nonunion jobs.” Drawing on the BLS Current Population Survey published in 2002, Budd further notes that unionized workers are 16.4 percent more likely to be covered by an employer-provided health insurance plan than nonunion workers and 18.8 percent more likely to participate in a retirement plan.

While unions have the potential to improve the quality of life of workers, they have become less effective over the years. According to the BLS (2009), the percentage of union members in the workplace decreased from 20.1 percent in 1983 to 12.3 percent in 2009. In 2010, the number decreased to 11.9 percent (2011). In 2010, the number of union workers declined by 612,000, meaning that since 2008, the number of wage and salary workers belonging to unions has declined by 1.38 million workers. While unions might not be the only way to combat the exigencies facing workers, workers are also showing less antagonistic activity in terms of work stoppages represented by strikes or lockouts. The BLS reports 20,419 days of idleness due to work stoppages in 2000, compared to only 124 in 2009 and only five in 2010. While some might attribute this to worker satisfaction, the number of work-related suicides is on the rise: the BLS reported the highest occupational suicide rates in 2008 since the bureau began keeping the data in

1992². Given the exigencies discussed above, the American Labor Movement seems to be failing to protect workers in the United States.

Furthermore, efforts to build solidarity within the American Labor Movement as represented by unionization and collective action are under attack. For instance, in union elections, Bronfennbrenner (2009) notes, “employers threatened to close the plant in 57% of elections, discharged workers in 34%, and threatened to cut wages and benefits in 47% of elections.” Bronfennbrenner further argues that corporations faced with the possibility of unionization force workers to attend one-on-one anti-union educational campaigns with supervisors, threaten and intimidate workers, and use a variety of punitive tactics to challenge potential collective action of workers:

Although the use of management consultants, captive audience meetings, and supervisor one-on-ones has remained fairly constant, there has been an increase in more coercive and retaliatory tactics (“sticks”) such as plant closing threats and actual plant closings, discharges, harassment and other discipline, surveillance, and alteration of benefits and conditions. At the same time, employers are less likely to offer “carrots,” as we see a gradual decrease in tactics such as granting of unscheduled raises, positive personnel changes, promises of improvement, bribes and special favors, social events, and employee involvement programs.

In the context of these attacks on labor, Schor (1992) suggests labor appears to be giving up the fight. She argues, “labor abandoned the cause because it was losing.” As a result, Schor notes a steady increase in the amount of work Americans participate in coupled with a steady decline in leisure. This discussion suggests corporations have been successful in convincing workers collective action is not worthwhile. Given the decline of union membership and collective action mentioned above, and the continued

² In 2008, the BLS reported 251 work-related suicides, a 28 percent increase over 2006.

exigencies facing them, it is striking that workers do not appear to be challenging their place within the capitalist system successfully (if not challenging the capitalist system itself successfully).

While the exigencies discussed above reflect the material concerns of workers in a dialectic with the capitalist class, in the spirit of arguments by Aune (2001), Cloud (2005; 2008) and Macek (2006), those material concerns reflect a communication problem. That problem lies in asserting the rhetorical substance of the movement, constituting workers in solidarity. I argue that at the heart of the American Labor Movement's apparent inability to promote change is the ability of the movement to rhetorically construct solidarity; to get workers to see each other as sharing a common substance on which they can act together. As I explore in this dissertation, solidarity is a thoroughly rhetorical practice rooted in appeals to the rhetorical substance of members of the American Labor Movement. As such, I trace development of solidarity within the American Labor Movement by exploring the rhetorical fragments of the movement that constitute members in solidarity.

To do so, the following questions guide the dissertation: How does solidarity operate as a rhetorical practice? How has, and does, the rhetorical operation of solidarity contributed to the success or failure of the labor movement in the U.S. across time? What are the implications of solidarity for the creation and maintenance of social movements more generally? In what follows, I outline this dissertation project. I begin with a description of different theoretical perspectives on the notion of solidarity, starting with its etymology and concluding with a Burkean perspective of solidarity. Second, I discuss

methodological considerations, concentrating upon how I might isolate and examine solidarity as rhetorical practice. I conclude by outlining the remaining chapters of the dissertation.

Solidarity: Theoretical Considerations

Scholars have pointed to the practice of using “solidarity” within academic writing and movement literature while lacking a conceptual framework for understanding exactly what solidarity is. For instance, Bayertz (1999) notes:

(Solidarity) is familiar in an everyday sense, and yet it has remained a foreign body; its dimensions and weight cannot be overlooked and yet it is bulky ... Its popularity has maybe even increased as a result of its unexplained theoretical status: the more unclear its prerequisites and implications are, the more freely it is seemingly employed. This has enabled appealing to solidarity – as well as complaining about its disappearance – to become a ritual linguistic sport, in which hardly anybody would choose to be offside. (p. vii)

In the communication field, solidarity is frequently taken for granted; its disappearance is decried, but the term itself lacks the conceptual clarity necessary to know what is being lost. Work from communication scholars on the history of the labor movement in the United States reveals implicit assumptions about the operation of solidarity. For instance, the work of Stewart (1991) on the Knights of Labor reveals an implicit assumption that solidarity operates within a union framework. Specifically, Stewart notes that the internal rhetoric of the union organization differs from its external rhetoric, providing different functions. The internal rhetoric is directed at the members of the organization providing for the “saints and sinners” that constitute the solidarity of the organization.

Tonn (1996) engaged a study of Mother Jones, arguing that Jones employed the trope of the militant mother to maintain solidarity among coal workers in the late 1800s and early 1900s. This piece explores the importance of the family as a basis of solidarity, as people look to family structures as a support system and as a source of discipline. This work is important because it highlights the variety of ways through which solidarity can operate. Work on Cesar Chavez by Hammerback & Jensen (1998) highlights the everyday struggle of solidarity building, the influence of rhetoric on solidarity, and the importance of cultural considerations when looking at solidarity. They argue “rhetors would attempt to change perceptions by creating positive terms around which Mexican Americans could unite and by identifying common enemies as a way of building solidarity” (p. 25). Invoking the Burkean vocabulary of identification that I discuss later, Hammerbeck & Jensen view solidarity as radically reconstituting the identity of movement members through appealing to their substance.

Other communication scholars have critiqued the implicit assumptions concerning solidarity. For instance, Arneson (1998) challenges Stewart, suggesting “Within labor history, an older tradition influenced by industrial relations scholarship emphasized institutional union structures and paid little attention to rank-and-file workers of any race” (p. 146). Yet, our concerns over the disciplinary usage of solidarity may be taken further. Communication studies does not explore the conceptual richness of the term solidarity, nor acknowledge the full rhetorical scope of the practice of solidarity.

This conceptual richness is revealed by turning to scholarship outside the communication field. Starr (2000) suggests solidarity can develop in opposition to a

particular identity. As such, solidarity is less a matter of common experience and more a matter of opposition to a common enemy. Naming the enemy is key to developing solidarity, in short. Hearn (2008) explains various layers of solidarity to enrich our understanding of the concept. For instance, solidarity can be conceived as a base of connection between members of a particular union in a particular shop, as a set of relationships between multiple unions, and as a basis of relationship with the government, as well as a tool of government. Brodtkin & Strathmann (2004) discuss solidarity as an effort to win workers over: “if union organizers are to win hearts and minds and strengthen solidarity they must engage workers in a program of mutually reinforcing actions to challenge employer intimidation and build understandings” (p. 3). Scholars in other disciplines affirm that solidarity can operate on many levels, though those levels have yet to be fully explored in the communication literature.

Before reflecting upon the rich possibilities of a rhetorical view of solidarity, it is helpful to draw definitional boundaries around the term. There are two basic definitions or types of solidarity. The first is to refer to “labor solidarity,” in which the meaning of solidarity is taken for granted to refer to simply collective action and the interdependence of workers. Take, for example, the recent work of Pensky (2008), in which labor solidarity is described as “understood as intersubjective cohesion of union members – mutual aid and support during strikes or in times of contentious labor-management negotiations, for instance – remains a core concept of the labor union movement in the developed world to this day” (p. 9). While Pensky’s description of historical labor solidarity is accurate, it is also reductionist. Labor solidarity certainly involves mutual

aid, support, and intersubjectivity, but is also a powerful point of identification and consubstantiality, to use a Burkean term which I elaborate later. Furthermore, Pensky's view limits the idea of labor solidarity to a specific work-experience understanding of identification the labor movement has not been limited to historically. In other words, while work-experience is certainly one way in which workers identify with each other, they also identify in a myriad of other ways including based on their cultural affiliations and across different experiences. Wildt (1999) runs into a similar problem. She writes, "In its historically most efficacious use, namely in the context of the working-class movement, the word had a clear and specific sense; it referred to the engagement and mutual support in the struggle against injustice" (p. 216). Yet, as some cases in the American Labor Movement demonstrate, solidarity is not always clear or specific, even in concrete uses. For instance, the United Farm Workers expand solidarity to include worker's cultural and spatially based solidarity (as migrant workers), as well as attempting to establish solidarity outside of the worker experience to include consumers through boycotting.

The second type of solidarity is broadly a "human solidarity." From this perspective, we engage in solidaristic behavior as a means of expressing our humanity. The end of solidarity is a strong sense of identification with our fellow human beings. Traditionally, this notion of solidarity has been viewed within an essentialist lens. That is to say, it arises from a belief that human beings share essential characteristics by virtue of their humanity; and we have a moral obligation to act in solidarity with our fellow human beings by virtue of our common nature. This view has been well critiqued, as the

discussion of the work of Richard Rorty highlights later in the chapter. If, however, we examine solidarity as rhetorical practice, then solidarity cannot come from essential human characteristics, but rather from the meaning imbued by linguistic, discursive choices.

To better understand the non-essential nature of solidarity, we may consider its history, which reveals some changes across time and culture. Etymologically, the word “solidarity” is rooted in the word “solid,” which in 1391 meant “firm, dense, compact” or “whole, entire.” In 1765, the French coined the term “solidaire,” meaning “interdependent, complete, or entire.” The first usage of the term “solidarite,” from which we derive “solidarity,” was in 1841, a French term meaning “mutual responsibility” (Harper, 2001). Metz (1999) explains the origin of solidarity in French society:

The term solidarity has its linguistic roots in the legal world, in the category of group liability ... French legal terminology adopted this category and called it ‘solidite.’ After the Great Revolution broke out, the idea of mutual liability was politicized, gradually becoming the actual term ‘solidarite,’ which was sometimes used colloquially to denote ‘fraternite’ (p. 191).

That solidarity comes to be used colloquially to denote fraternity is interesting, not only because fraternity was part of the triumvirate battle cry during the French Revolution (“Equality, Liberty, Fraternity”), but because fraternity implies a substantive, genealogical origin for the French (which will be discussed momentarily). Though solidarity and fraternity are interchangeable in early contexts, as Wildt (1999) concludes, the words have significant differences found “in the descriptive assumptions that were emphasized by economists and sociologists when talking of ‘solidarity,’ particularly when they were borrowing from biology” (p. 213). In other words, the meaning of

solidarity moves beyond the mutual obligations generated through biology into a broader realm in which obligations are constructed rhetorically.

The history of solidarity is also marked by the transition of a legal, political notion of solidarity to solidarity as a moral construct. By following this transition, we arrive at the need to distinguish broad and deep types of solidarity—one of the major goals of the present project. Initially, some scholars trace the notion of mutual obligation within the idea of solidarity to contract law in early Roman society (Pensky, 2008). Such a view transitioned to the more ethical act of sacrificing individual interest in order to qualify as an act of solidarity. Khushf (1999) accounts for this shift by elaborating four motivational structures for defining solidarity, including a prudential, a virtuous, a social sanction, and a legal sanction framework. The prudential framework involves the suspension of individual short-term self interest for the sake of long term community interests. Within the virtuous framework, the individual feels a bond to community, driving the individual to act on the basis of the interests and needs of others. The social sanction involves the individual sacrificing self interest as a result of the threat of social sanction. The community thus polices the practice of solidarity. Finally, legal sanction framework uses the force of civil and criminal law to enforce communal norms. The legal framework might suggest a more superficial construct, whereas the prudential and virtuous constructs provide room for a deeper solidarity rooted in the identifications of individuals.

For the first two frameworks, we see a sacrifice of self interest largely because an individual feels some sort of identification with the interests and needs of the community.

In this sense, solidarity is a positive practice, where individual self identity is tied to community identity. In the second two, solidarity is practice through a fear of the consequences of not acting solidarily. Solidarity thus becomes a negative or reactionary practice where the individual practices solidarity through a sort of cost-benefit analysis.

The idea of identifying with the interests of the community speaks directly to the notion of depth and breadth. A broad solidarity might be achieved through sanction; however because that solidarity does not have the force of identification, the depth of solidarity can be sacrificed. As Thome (1999) writes, “Freely chosen commitments may also be more intense than those forced upon the individual by tradition and milieu” (p. 119).³

Bierhoff & Kupper (1999) offer some potential forms solidarity might take given the continuum of individual to community interest. At an intrapersonal level, solidarity could take the form of social value and orientations based on common interests, while taking the form of existential guilt and social responsibility based on more altruistic motives. At the interpersonal level, solidarity takes the form of cooperation and egoism when interests are shared, while it takes the form of empathy when concerned with the interests of others. From a positional perspective, collectivism and fraternalistic impulses dominate those concerned with common interests and values such as equality and justice ring true for those who are other-centered. Lastly, at an ideological level, reciprocity rules

³ Thome distinguishes between altruistic forms of solidarity and reciprocal ones. Without going into too much detail, I would note that the reciprocal solidarity raises the question of free-riding, as much sociological theory has raised. Reciprocal solidarity might be necessary to avoid the problem of individuals benefitting from solidary practices without participating in the solidary process. At the same time, this would suggest that solidarity operates within the context of self interest, with an end in mind, but outside the scope of identification.

in the common interest realm, while principlism favors the other-centered. As levels of analysis, Bierhoff & Kupper see these as multiple ways in which we can examine the operation of solidarity. Gobel & Pankoke (1999) critique the idea of solidarity as arising from social proximity, especially in modern society. I would argue solidarity rooted in individual interests, reflected by guilt and social responsibility, reflects a broad, but not deep solidarity. An “other-centered” solidarity requires identification with the other: it requires seeing the other in relatively the same terms as the self.

From these roots, it is easy to see the complexity of solidarity as a theoretical construct. Solidarity is something firm and complete, but also rooted in interdependence and collective responsibility. Furthermore, solidarity has numerous dimensions that can characterize it in terms of depth and breadth. Durkheim, in particular, tackles the idea of depth in his distinctions between “mechanical” and “organic” solidarity.

For Durkheim, solidarity is characteristic within the evolution of society. Within early societies, what Durkheim terms a “mechanical” solidarity is present, while later societies see the rise of “organic”⁴ solidarity characteristic of the increasing division of labor. Mechanical solidarity is rooted in similarity, or likeness, of people. Durkheim offers the examples of familial relationships. Mechanical solidarity is similar to Burke’s notion of familial substance (detailed below) in which the basis of similarity and obligation is rooted in a common derivation, or perceived derivation, between members of a particular social group. According to Durkheim, this type of solidarity is weak in that

⁴ Gramsci distinguishes between the traditional and organic intellectual. However, the uses of the term “organic” have quite different meanings.

it lacks the basis on which strong relationships are forged. To put in simple terms, while some might share genes with their siblings, that does not mean that they are anything like their siblings in terms of their social behaviors, values, desires, or goals. As Bellah (1973) argues, mechanical solidarity must be maintained through coercive or repressive actions, otherwise the solidarity will begin to slacken. While one might be born into obligation to one's family that sense of obligation is not enough to sustain a deep solidarity.⁵ Instead, a broad solidarity develops through the common, but weak linkages between individuals.

Industrial societies, by contrast, are characterized by organic solidarity that arises from the division of labor. These societies “are constituted, not by a repetition of similar, homogenous segments, but by a system of different organs each of which has a special role, and are themselves formed of differentiated parts” (Durkheim, 1973, p. 69). The prevalent metaphor of bodily organs is instructive of Durkheim's notion of organic solidarity. Individuals function as the various organs of society, the heart, liver, or lungs; each of which performs a particular function vital to society and on which society relies for its survival. As society becomes increasingly differentiated, the ties that bind, solidarity, become even stronger. Society develops new organs necessary to its survival. These organs perform vital functions on which society has come to rely. As we become differentiated, we become more specialized, making the functions we perform for society more vital. Deep solidarity is thus required as a result of the interdependence of individuals.

⁵ In Chapter Three, I challenge this perspective by suggesting a shared familial substance provides the basis for constituting workers in a deep solidarity.

Organic solidarity involves recognition of the interdependence of society's individuals. Division of duties means that we must rely on each other for our success. This interdependence creates a sense of duty and a bond between individuals. For Durkheim (1973), this solidarity is stronger than the mechanical solidarity resulting from kinship relationships because "the individual is not sufficient unto himself, it is from society that he receives everything necessary to him, as it is for society that he works. Thus is formed a very strong sentiment of the state of dependence in which he finds himself" (p. 112). Interdependence requires deep solidarity because without it the organism will die.

While Durkheim might suggest a natural evolution of society toward a more organic solidarity, especially as the division of labor becomes greater, Rorty (1989) would reject any such notion of a natural drive. Rorty's project begins with the insistence that we cannot conceive of solidarity outside of contingency. Contingency, in this case, refers to our existence within particular contexts rather than through a natural, essential substance. Solidarity, for Rorty, is not a reflection of our "essential humanity" or anything that lies within our "core self." However, despite contingency, Rorty argues we can still have a moral obligation to feel social solidarity. For Rorty, "our sense of solidarity is strongest when those with whom solidarity is expressed are thought of as 'one of us,' where us means something smaller and more local than the human race" (p. 191). Who we feel a sense of solidarity toward is a function of which similarities and dissimilarities with others we view as salient, which Rorty suggests is a matter of a "historically contingent final vocabulary" (p. 192). Solidarity "is thought of as the ability

to see more and more traditional differences as unimportant when compared with similarities ... the ability to think of people wildly different from ourselves as included in the range of ‘us’” (p. 192). To the extent that solidarity represents a rhetorical choice amongst participants, a practical difficulty arises between creating a substantively thick solidarity while not sacrificing the ultimate goal of a broad human solidarity. The American Labor Movement has demonstrated this difficulty.

As I have suggested above, solidarity can take numerous forms. The conceptual richness of the terms warrants consideration within the communication discipline, as solidarity is a major resource of rhetoric—but more importantly because solidarity is constituted through rhetorical practice. A mere dialectical view of solidarity is inadequate for understanding that conceptual richness, nor for examining how solidarity contributes to the successes and failures of a movement.

Solidarity as it has played out in the American Labor Movement is a question of breadth and depth. The question of breadth relates to its completeness. To have solidarity requires being complete, but what constitutes complete? In an intuitive sense, completeness must require an encompassing breadth. In practice, the American Labor Movement has had differing views on what constitutes an encompassing breadth, or even its necessity. The notion of compactness, however, brings the question of depth to the fore. To be solid means to be packed tightly, to be close. Density is a question of depth, particularly the depth of the collective associations made within the American Labor Movement.

Often, as the dissertation project will show, the notions of solidarity as deep and wide come into conflict. Members of the American Labor Movement worry that the effort to create completeness requires a sacrifice of compactness and vice-versa. The big question facing the American Labor Movement is: Is it possible to take a deep breadth? What would taking a deep breadth require in the rhetorical construction of solidarity? As I have alluded to above, identification and the rhetorical substance of movement members provide an important conceptual tool for understanding how the American Labor Movement constitutes individuals within broad and deep forms of solidarity.

Solidarity as Identification: A Burkean Perspective

The etymology of the term solidarity places it in close proximity to a theoretical notion that has been debated within the communication field, that of substance. In one sense, solidarity is “dense” or “compact.” In this sense, solidarity refers to the internal qualities of an object that give it depth. On the other hand solidarity is “complete,” suggesting a broader scope for solidarity and invoking its extrinsic qualities. For Burke, substance involves identifying with both the intrinsic and extrinsic qualities of an item.

One could suggest that the question of solidarity is a question about what gives the American Labor Movement its substance. Burke provides a typology of substance that allows examination of different ways in which solidarity can be rhetorically constructed. These types of substance might be powerful tools on which the American Labor Movement might build solidarity. To develop this vein, I turn to the work of Kenneth Burke and discuss how his use of the term substance relates to the construct of solidarity.

Burke's (1962) definition of substance is akin to a way in which solidarity could be understood, "Literally a person's or a thing's substance would be something that stands beneath or supports a person or thing" (p. 22). To say that something has a substance is to define that thing, to discuss what is intrinsic to it as well as what is extrinsic (p. 23). Solidarity can be viewed in a similar way. To say that solidarity is what makes a thing solid is to suggest that solidarity is what gives a thing its substance. In terms of the American Labor Movement, solidarity defines what is internal, intrinsic, to a particular movement, as well as what is external. Solidarity, then, is key to defining the meaning of the movement, or its substance.

According to Burke, there are different types of substance, which can be viewed as different ways of identifying what lies beneath, or holds together the American Labor Movement. The first type of substance is contextual, which emphasizes location or placement (p. 24); second, substance can be familial, which emphasizes its derivation (p. 25). Substance can also be directional, emphasizing motion, or dialectical, set in opposition to "the other" (pp. 31-34).

If we follow the etymological notion of solidarity as compact and entire, it is that compactness and entirety that gives the American Labor Movement its substance. Burke's typologies of substance, then, provide us with different perspectives through which substance can be viewed. Does solidarity come from location, derivation, direction, or dialectical opposition?

The first position would suggest that solidarity comes from its contextual placement. Solidarity, then, would arise from particular contextual, historically situated

relations. Workers' placement within a particular social milieu would determine whether to engage in particular solidarity practices. Solidarity would take different forms based on its placement. Burke terms this form of substance "geometric." Geometric substance allows individuals to see each other in similar terms, identifying with one another, based on a shared contextual circumstance. In other words, one might identify with another based on shared scenic characteristics. As I show in Chapter Two, the shared geometric substance alive within the context of industry constitutes individuals as consubstantial, allowing for a broad solidarity.

The second perspective emphasizes derivation. From this perspective, which Burke terms familial substance, solidarity can be viewed as derived from something pre-existing. A daughter can be said to have the same substance as a mother, for instance, because they are made from the same stuff. We can rely on the ancestor to pass her substance to her descendents. To take this view within the context of the American Labor Movement, solidarity could be based on a common, shared derivation. In other words, the members of the Labor Movement are held together by a common ancestry. Considering Durkheim's perspective, this type of substance is more closely aligned with the thin mechanical solidarity. Solidarity, in this sense, does not arise from contractual obligation but a state of being. The substance of the movement comes from the common identity of being a worker, passed through the generations. As the dissertation project reveals in Chapter 3, however, emphasizing a common derivation as a point of solidarity can be a powerful tool for advancing a movement.

Solidarity could be said to develop within Burke's third perspective on substance, that is, from motion. Motion implies a direction toward something⁶. In this sense, solidarity may develop from a common goal. Within the American Labor Movement, the movement would gain its substance through a desire to move toward particular goals: higher wages, health benefits, safety protocols, and similar goals. Movements occur with an end goal in mind; this goal drives the movement forward and provides the piece for holding the movement together.

Substance can be formed for the purpose of a projected end. This idea is consistent with the literature on solidarity. Engelhardt (1991) writes: "In appeals to solidarity ... there is a realization that, if all participants act together with full dedication, they can realize their interests over against those with whom they are bargaining" (p. 297). People practice solidarity in order to realize a particular interest. This idea is consistent with Burke's idea of directional substance. In other words, a projected end represents the movement toward something. This end, however, is constructed rhetorically. Part of the success of the movement, then, is contingent upon its members articulating a common direction for the movement to travel.

The fourth view of substance or dialectical view is most clearly demonstrated through the Marxist perspective on the division of labor in society, a perspective that is adamantly defended by scholars such as Dana Cloud. According to Burke, "the dialectical considers things in terms not of *some* other, but of *the* other" (p. 33).

⁶ This notion of motion should be distinguished from Burke's discussion of action versus motion. In that discussion, Burke conceptualizes motion as a passive activity, whereas action represents human motive because it is not passive.

Individuals define themselves in terms of their “agon” or antagonist. The meaning of an individual is thus derived by placing that individual on the same ground as its opposite. This perspective would suggest that members of the American Labor Movement define themselves in opposition to the other, and that such opposition is what holds the movement together. As such, owners and workers are dialectically opposed. Workers band together in solidarity because they can view a common enemy in owners. The solidarity practices of workers are shaped in opposition to the ownership class. This opposition is seen within the American Labor Movement as it takes the form of collective action such as strikes and boycotts, or through legal and political battles such as the current battle taking place regarding the Employee Free Choice Act. What constitutes the antagonist, however, is rhetorically constructed. For instance, an examination of contingent faculty members might reveal that traditional distinctions between owner and laborer are difficult to sustain as faculty members serve management functions. However, Starr suggests naming the enemy can be a powerful tool for building a movement. In fact, Bowers and Ochs (1971) highlight the various relationships between antagonist and what they term “control.” Dialectic becomes a way of knowing oneself through defining what one is not. Movements become a struggle between what members of the movement are against the backdrop of what they are not. The rhetorical construction of these substances provide for identification. They allow individuals to see each other as sharing the same substance, providing the backbone of solidary relations.

In his *Rhetoric of Motives*, Kenneth Burke articulates a perspective on rhetoric that challenges the traditional notion of rhetoric as persuasion, substituting the idea of

rhetoric as identification. The processes through which identification is created affords an important way in which rhetorical processes can be viewed, but also the ways in which rhetoric functions within social movements. Identification provides the means for solidarity to develop within a movement.

Burke's view of rhetoric as identification is closely akin to the views of solidarity that have been introduced by Rorty and Durkheim mentioned above. If, as Rorty suggests, solidarity is about recognizing more and more people as members of the category of "us" as opposed to the category of "them," then identification is the method through which solidarity occurs. For Burke, identification is treating others as sharing the same substance as us. Indeed, Burke frequently uses the term "identification" as interchangeable with the concept of "consubstantiality." Consubstantiality is viewing another's substance as akin to one's own. Solidarity, then, is the result of consubstantiality, or identification.

Consubstantiality, identification, is created rhetorically. That is to say, one may or may not actually "be" consubstantial with another, but we deploy rhetoric as a resource to articulate common substance, to bring others to identify their substance with our own. Adopting a rhetorical perspective on solidarity entails examining and identifying those resources of identification.

The rhetorical symbols deployed and the points of identification used within the labor movement affect the potential success or failure of the movement. The point at which workers' identifications can be viewed as consubstantial with other workers' identifications contributes to the value of the labor movement. If the labor movement

fails to speak to the workers' ambitions, their sympathies will not be enough to sustain the movement.

For Burke, these different perspectives on what stands beneath a thing create an ambiguity or paradox of substance. Burke introduces the notion of "dual substances," which allow the critic to question how the different types of substance interact. Working through the ambiguities of substance could be key to understanding the challenges for building a deep and broad solidarity, as well as potential combinations for strengthening solidarity within the movement. Furthermore, varying combinations of substance could allow the adaptation of solidarity to suit the conditions created by particular contingent relationships.

The ambiguous notions of substance create a paradox because substance is defined both by its internal and external qualities. Working through these ambiguities creates a "major resource for rhetoric" (Burke, 1962, p. 51), through which constructing individuals in solidarity involves articulating a common substance among multiple potential substantive identifications individuals might have. An example of this, taken from Burke, is to examine the individual and the collective motive:

The paradox may be implicit in any term for a *collective* motivation, such as a concept of class, nation, the "general will," and the like. Technically, it becomes a "pure" motive when matched against some individual locus of motivation. And it may be the *negation* of an individual motive. Yet despite this position as dialectical antithesis of the individual motive, the collective motive may be treated as the source or principle from which the individual motive is familiarly, or "substantially" derived in a "like begets like" manner. That is, to derive the individual motive from the collective motive would be like deriving the personal principle familiarly from the "super-personal" principle would be the *other* of the personal. (p. 37).

As such, an individual can be motivated by different, sometimes conflicting, substances. One might be collectively motivated from a directional substance, yet individually motivated within a familial substance. Rhetoric distinguishes between the substances that constitute the motives of individuals.

To put this idea in perspective, workers within the American Labor Movement could be viewed as motivated by the collectivity from which they derive. So, collectively an individual might be motivated by the desire to preserve the jobs of all the workers in a plant. Individually, however, a worker might be motivated by the desire to preserve his job at the present salary. These two motivations can work at cross purposes, as maintaining one's individual salary may be mutually exclusive with maintaining collective jobs. The paradox arises as the individual is motivated by conflicting, "dual substances."

Rhetoric plays an important role here, according to Burke. Appeals to a person's substance function as a rhetorical resource, a linguistic sign reflecting the nature of the motive more than the nature of the world:

To call a man a friend or brother is to proclaim him consubstantial with oneself, one's values or purposes. To call a man a bastard is to attack him by attacking his whole line, his "authorship," his "principle" or "motive" (as expressed in terms of the familial). An epithet assigns substance doubly, for in stating the character of the object it at the same time contains an implicit program of action with regard to the object, thus serving as a motive (p. 57).

The process of substantiation referred to by Burke is a rhetorical process that attempts to define the substance of what a person is, what that person is not, and the course of action that can be taken in relation to that person. Viewing solidarity as a rhetorical practice of substantiation means the practice functions to define what is internal and external to the

movement and the courses of action available to the movement. Solidarity thus functions as a rhetorical practice of both inclusion and exclusion—it defines the motives of the movement.

The Burkean perspective I advance might help contribute to contemporary research in social movements by introducing various ways rhetoric is used to constitute the individuals in solidarity through processes of substantiation. Durham (1980) notes:

Substantiation, consciousness of reality, occurs at the point of contact between the finite (vocabulary) and the infinite (the world around). Substance is consciousness as it is enacted in the way people use symbols. Burke's discussion of substance is largely an effort to resolve consciousness into its modes and to provide a tool, at once analytic and synoptic, for treating symbolic action. (p. 355)

To the extent that substance is enacted through the use of symbols, the way in which symbols are used in the process of substantiation exposes the motives of human action and the consciousness, or way of understanding reality, present in human action. By examining the function of the rhetoric of solidarity within the labor movement, we come to a greater understanding of symbolic action within the movement.⁷

As a result of this project, I argue that Burke's ideas of substance and identification provide a powerful lens through which we can examine the solidary practices of social movements. Through the examination of the case studies to be

⁷ Burke was certainly interested in the process of identification as it relates to the American Labor Movement. In his speech to the American Writers' Congress, "Revolutionary Symbolism in America," Kenneth Burke argues the symbol of "the worker" ought to be replaced with the symbol of "the people" (Burke, 1935). In comparing the two, Burke argues that "the worker" is not a symbol that individuals easily identify with because it speaks to individuals' "sympathies" but not their "ambitions" (p. 89). As such, the term "worker" speaks to the class-based oppression an individual might face, but does not connect to broader cultural values of which the worker is a part. The "people" is more broadly inclusive, allowing individuals to find more points of inclusion with each other and more accurately engage "the entire range of our interests" (p. 94).

introduced, I demonstrate that solidarity was constructed using different points of identification for workers involved in the movement. These points of identification sometimes worked to the benefit and sometimes to the detriment of the movements described.

Methodological Considerations

For the dissertation project, I examine the rhetorical construction of solidarity in the American Labor Movement using three case studies reflecting different historical periods of the American Labor Movement. The three case studies I examine are: 1) the struggles of the Industrial Workers of the World in the early 1900s, 2) the struggles of the United Farm Workers of America from the 1960s to early 1980s, and 3) the current unionizing efforts of contingent academic workers. These case studies provide unique contexts through which solidarity can be viewed, speaking to the contingency of the development of solidarity in rhetorical practice, as well as some common threads through which that contingency may be viewed. By detailing each case study, I hope to demonstrate the tensions created between trying to establish deep and broad solidarity. Furthermore, this project examines tensions between the collective and the individual, between workers' identity as workers and their identities as members of other social groups. It also underscores the value of conceiving of solidarity through a Burkean lens, as a multifaceted, rhetorical construct.

The following questions guided my research practice:

1. How is solidarity constructed rhetorically by people who identify as labor movement participants in each case study?

2. How does the rhetorical construction of solidarity shape the development of the labor movement in each case study?
3. How is the rhetorical construction of solidarity in each case shaped by the unique context in which it occurs?
4. What are the implications of the rhetorical construction of solidarity within the American Labor Movement for the success and failure of social movements more generally?

The first question allows us to see how solidarity plays out in rhetorical practice and whether those constructions cohere with current theoretical perspectives about solidarity. The second question explores the relationship between solidarity and the development of social movements. This allows a richer understanding of social movement theory. The third question speaks to the contingency of solidarity, and allows an examination of how context can help shape the contours of a movement. Finally, the last question speaks to the political purpose of studying movements, whether the study of solidarity can serve a critical rhetorical function.

I tackle these questions through a critical rhetorical analysis of each of the case studies using Burke's discussion of identification as the lens through which the case studies are analyzed. I collected and analyzed rhetorical artifacts within these movements with an eye to how these artifacts can help answer the research questions, while viewing the role of the critic as a rhetor seeking to expose the underlying power structures operating within the American Labor Movement. In particular, I examined speeches made within the movements, major founding documents, pamphlets, videos, comics,

songs and major writings produced by self-identified members of the movements. I viewed these items with an eye toward how members of the movements perceived other potential members, the basis on which they were able to realize the importance of participating within the movement, and the rhetorical processes of inclusion and exclusion within the movement.

This approach to locating and interpreting texts is consistent with McGee's view of the role of the rhetorician in criticism and McKerrow's critical rhetoric. McGee (1990) argues that due to the fragmentary nature of American culture, interpretation has become the purview of speakers and writers, while text construction has become the purview of audiences, readers, and critics (p. 274). This idea flips on its head traditional notions of rhetoric in which speakers construct texts which are fair game for the interpretation of readers and critics. A critical rhetoric recognizes that the purview of text construction lies with audiences. In McGee's terms, this means that rhetorical criticism "is a vehicle for doing rhetoric" (p. 276). Rhetorical criticism does not function as traditionally conceived, it is not the art of explicating canonical rhetorical texts, but rather it serves to create rhetorical texts. As such, we cannot view texts as something existing outside of the reader, but rather as constructions of the reader.

The reader constructs texts through piecing together what McGee calls rhetorical "fragments." The process of piecing together fragments serves to create meaning. Texts are always a product of the situatedness of the audience. The audience brings context to the text. Leff (1992) points out that "critical rhetoric reminds adherents of close reading that questions of power and social circumstance always enter into the texts they study"

(p. 226). What is important for our purposes is that how we understand the text defined through the “adjectival” (McGee 1990, p. 274) critical rhetoric is different from the perspective of rhetorical criticism.

My data collection method was to examine a broad range of rhetorical fragments within each case study. While this method may have some limitations, it does provide some unique insights into the operation of social movements. Within each case study, I examined hundreds of documents ranging from the official publications of the movement, the minutes of conventions, videos, pamphlets, buttons, brochures, interviews, newspaper coverage, blogs, and songs. My goal was to generate both a quantitatively and qualitatively rich source of documents designed to get a broad understanding of how solidarity was conceived within each case study. The use of rhetorical fragments, rather than a closed source of documents, is advantageous for three reasons. First, it allowed me to experience the rhetoric of the movements as a potential member of the movement might. In other words, members within each of the case studies would not have experienced each of the rhetorical encounters generated by the movement as a whole, but likely would have experienced different rhetorical efforts at different points in time. Second, it allows for examining a broader range of rhetorical documents meaning that, as researcher, I could be open to changing possibilities and shifting meanings of solidarity within the movements. In many instances, the discovery of a particular rhetorical fragment directed me toward new fragments that I otherwise might not have discovered. Third, it allowed me to examine rhetorical fragments that function in contradiction to

each other, which provides for a richer understanding of the rhetorical operation of solidarity within the movements.

Critical rhetoric implies that the critic is an actor, a doer, a creator (whereas traditional rhetorical criticism implies the critic is an interpreter). McGee calls for rethinking the way we associate the terms “rhetorical” and “criticism” in a way that centralizes rhetoric as a master term, rather than its adjectival form which reduces it to merely a genre of discourse. To discuss “critical rhetoric” rather than “rhetorical criticism” is to place emphasis on the performative function of rhetoric (McGee 1990). A rhetorical text, from this perspective, cannot be viewed as a completed, holistic discourse, but rather must be viewed within the larger context of which it is a part:

By contrast, with rhetoric as a master term, we begin by noticing that rhetors make discourses from scraps and pieces of evidence. Critical rhetoric does not begin with a finished text in need of interpretation; rather, texts are understood to be larger than the apparently finished discourse that presents itself as transparent. The apparently finished discourse is in fact a dense reconstruction of all the bits of other discourses from which it was made. It is fashioned from what we can call “fragments.” (p. 279).

The fragment, according to McGee, functions as “a featured part of an arrangement that includes all facts, events, texts, and stylized expressions deemed useful in explaining its influence and exposing its meaning” (p. 279). Performing fragmentary criticism has the advantage (and challenge) of offering the critic flexibility in locating texts for critical analysis.

McKerrow (1989) outlines a program for a critical rhetoric which expands McGee’s justification for emphasizing criticism as an act, and supports my own orientation in this project. Critical rhetoric is an approach to criticism that highlights the

rhetorical nature of acts of criticism. In other words, the criticism of rhetoric is also rhetorical. McKerrow suggests the benefit of rhetorically orienting oneself to rhetoric using an approach grounded in critical theory. Such an orientation involves several commitments that scholars can make, which ultimately should “serve to identify the possibilities of future action available to the participants” (p. 115).

Critical rhetoric generally involves a two-fold commitment to rhetorical practice: a commitment to the “critique of domination” and to the “critique of freedom.” The critique of domination, according to McKerrow, directs criticism toward “an analysis of discourse as it contributes to the interests of the ruling class, and as it empowers the ruled to present their interests in a forceful and compelling manner” (p. 116). Drawing from the work of Foucault, Horkheimer, Adorno, and Habermas, McKerrow views rhetoric as always situated within relations of power. Power attempts to create a sense of “ideological unity” (p. 116). The practice of criticism can help to expose the rhetorical nature of these attempts to create a sense of unity. As such, criticism exposes the often taken-for-granted operations of power in discourse.

A critique of freedom focuses on articulating the possibilities present within a discourse. A critique of freedom involves examining discourse as it is manifested materially in its current context, “by producing a description of ‘what is,’ unfettered by predetermined notions of what ‘should be,’ the critic is in a position to posit the possibilities of freedom” (p. 123). A critique of freedom is a permanent and perpetual critique that seeks to decenter current power relations and open space for freedom, without asserting a particular telos that would foreclose possibility.

Within McKerrow's critique of freedom is the question: How can we determine the effectiveness of resistance from within the postmodern condition? Ono & Sloop (1992) offer a way out of this problematic. They argue that a critical rhetoric must be oriented toward some sort of telos in order to be useful. Telos, in their view, is not a permanent end state, but rather "represents the moment when a person's pen is put to paper purposively, when ideas become words and when will becomes action" (p. 48). Ono & Sloop note that the practice of rhetoric is driven toward some "anticipated end" (p. 57). In other words, we engage in the act of critique for a particular reason, something we hope to get out of it, "a critical rhetoric without commitment could never attempt to reach such a goal, because it would necessarily be too busy attempting to self-criticize to be able to change present conditions" (p. 54). That a rhetorician approaches critique from a standpoint implies a telos.

To consider a telos, however, is not to suggest that the anticipated telos is what will happen. In addition, to consider a telos is not to suggest that the telos anticipated is what ought to happen. As Ono & Sloop understand telos, it is contingent, shifting, and never fully realized. Telos is subject to critique. What is important in considering telos, then, is not necessarily its accomplishment but an acknowledgement of the various directions critique can take us. To consider telos is to consider the potential ends available and to examine the consequences those ends might have, for instance, on marginalized groups. Considering that telos gives the critic firmer ground on which to stand, while recognizing the contingency of that ground. I envision the telos of this project in terms of what it can contribute to the American Labor Movement. Assuming

that solidarity is necessary to challenge injustice, this project can help by offering different rhetorical constructions of solidarity that will enable workers to improve their living conditions. Not only should this project reveal the multiple points of identification available to workers, but also how these points of identification enable and constrain the success of social movements when they are paired together. Furthermore, this analysis speaks to the situated contexts in which social movements are carried out, allowing for flexibility within the development of a movement.

Overview of the Dissertation

The case studies proposed are useful because they fall outside the scope of what scholars might consider the traditional labor movement trajectory. For instance, as I consider in Chapter Two, the development of the Wobblies is often ignored by history in favor of the examining the rise of the AFL-CIO. However, an examination of the Wobblies reveals a broader understanding of solidarity than that of the Gompers-led AFL. The AFL of the time considered solidarity in the context of work experience. In other words, the AFL eschewed the possibility of an identity-based solidarity that the Wobblies embraced. While the AFL would distinguish between different types of work, the Wobblies would consider the experience of work to be a common binding factor.

In particular, I argue the Industrial Workers of the World rhetorically constructs a geometric and dialectical substance. I advance four claims. First, the IWW created a broad solidarity by defining the geometric scene in which workers were placed. Second, the IWW refined this solidarity by appealing to the dialectical tensions between workers and their agons. Third, other potential points of identification were downplayed within

the movement for the sake of maintaining this broad solidarity. Fourth, conflicts over what constituted both the geometric and dialectical substance of workers contributed to problems within the IWW.

The United Farm Workers Movement of the 1960s (which forms the basis of Chapter Three) is quite different from the unionism of Hoffa's Teamsters. At first glance, we see an identity and worker-based solidarity rooted in the cultural experience of migrant farm work. However, a deeper analysis reveals a broader understanding of solidarity in terms of American consumerism. Part of the success of the Delano Grape Strike arises from attempting to achieve an emotionally-charged solidarity with the American consumer. This case study opens the door to thinking about solidarity as a more open system, operating both inside and outside of the labor movement itself.

My argument includes four claims. First, the United Farm Workers can be distinguished from the IWW by its appeals to the derivational substance of workers. Second, the United Farm Workers supplemented the derivational substance of the workers with appeals to a directional substance. The derivational and directional substance of workers contributed to a deep solidarity. Third, the United Farm Workers expanded their solidarity to include consumers and volunteers using directional substance, creating a broader though not deep solidarity. Finally, the substantive identifications of the workers enabled solidarity within the United Farm Workers, but also created problems during the later years of the organization.

Adjunct faculty organization—the case study forming Chapter Four—strays much farther from traditional modes of unionism or solidarity. In many ways, the unionism of

white-collar workers is the new strategy for the major unions (such as the AFL-CIO) as a means of revitalizing the labor movement. Adjunct faculty members well represent the role of contingent, temporary, and mobile employment structures scholars argue are taking hold. However, as a form of unionism, they offer the opportunity to think outside the norm of traditional modes of solidarity. They allow us to rethink, for instance, distinctions between management labor and manual labor.

In this chapter, I offer three arguments. First, contingent faculty members are increasingly constituted through a common geometric substance. Second, the dialectical and directional substance of these workers is ill-defined and sometimes contradictory. Third, solidarity is difficult to develop when the rhetorical substance of adjunct faculty unionization efforts lacks cohesion. Of the three case studies examined, the case of adjunct faculty unionization efforts represents the greatest difficulty of cultivating solidarity within a contingent work environment.

All of these cases allow us to tackle the driving question of breadth and depth, which I take up in the Conclusion (Chapter Five): Can a broad solidarity be developed without sacrificing depth? These studies also allow us to serve a political function, centering the role of rhetorician. This dissertation would ideally examine the potential for the future success of the American Labor Movement and develop a broader human solidarity (despite contingency); as well as expose the political forces at work in preventing the success of the movement and create opportunities for exposing the relations of power at work in the development of solidarity.

Ideally, this project will provide a tool for the American Labor Movement to work through the exigencies it faces in contemporary society. The decline of the labor movement suggests a renewed need to understand the possibilities for constituting individuals in solidarity. The Burkean perspective I offer provides a way to discuss how the rhetorical substance of a movement enables particular constructions of solidarity within that movement. As such, McKerrow's vision of a critique of freedom and domination can be possible. As I detail how each case study reflects a different rhetorical substance, I consider the possibilities and drawbacks for a deep and broad solidarity. As the labor movement declines, the need to understand the rhetorical choices made within the movement are important for offering the movement renewed hope.

Chapter Two: The IWW and Industrial Solidarity

The Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) met at its founding convention in 1905. The purpose of the convention was to form an organization that could challenge the capitalist class more effectively than previous organizations. In part, the organization formed out of perceived wrongs committed by previous organizations such as the American Federation of Labor (AFL) and the Knights of Labor—both of these organizational efforts failed to generate gains by workers, or even undermined the efforts of rank-and-file workers. The IWW grew in membership over the years, but by the 1920s had suffered multiple schisms and lost its broad appeal. However, the efforts of this organization set the stage for future developments within the American Labor Movement, most notably as a precursor to the Congress of Industrial Organizations; it also provided new approaches to labor agitation for future generations.

The organization sought to develop a form of solidarity suitable to the times. In Burkean terms, the IWW developed a solidarity rooted in dialectical oppositions to the perceived agons of the labor movement, at the same time that they created a solidarity reflecting the geometric substance of workers within the United States. In doing so, the IWW attempted to create a broad solidarity in the hopes that the organization might someday generate a general strike that would cripple the capitalist class and lead to a new order of worker control. However, this broad solidarity broke down in part because of its

rhetorical treatment of the substance of workers sacrificed the depth of solidarity required to sustain the movement. In order to demonstrate the successes and failures of solidarity within the IWW, I examine the rhetorical construction of solidarity within the organization. I argue the IWW constitutes workers within the movement as sharing a dialectical and geometric substance, creating a broad solidarity. I first discuss the concepts of dialectical and geometric substance as proffered by Kenneth Burke. Second, I examine the rhetorical fragments of the IWW with an eye to how solidarity in the IWW is conceived. Third, I point to challenges faced within the IWW and how they reveal the limits of rhetorically defining solidarity in terms of geometric substance. Specifically, I argue the IWW created a broad solidarity by constituting workers within an industrial geometric substance. However, conflicts over the extent of this substance hindered the depth of solidarity possible within the movement.

Burke's Dialectical and Geometric Substance

Dialectical substance, according to Burke (1962) in *Grammar of Motives*, “considers things in terms of not *some* other, but of *the* other” (p. 33). Of the four forms of substance discussed by Burke⁸, dialectical substance is the most inclusive. In other words, the other three forms of substance are all considered “special cases” of dialectical substance (p. 33). Dialectical substance refers to the relationship between both what something is and what it is not, for “the word substance, used to designate what a thing is, derives from a word designated something that a thing is not” (p. 23). In terms of

⁸ These substances include dialectical, familial, geometric, and directional.

dialectical substance, individuals identify who they are over and against an antagonist that represents what the individual does not wish to be.

Burke offers two examples of these antagonisms: Christianity and Being. In the case of Christianity, defining what constitutes an angel requires an understanding of what the devil is. To be a Christian means to define oneself *against* something. The devil represents for Burke that agon through which Christian identity might assert itself. In the case of Being, in order to understand ourselves as Beings means that we must also conceive of Not Being. Not Being functions as the dialectical opposite of Being. (p. 34). Being and Not Being form a dialectic, however as opposed to the Christianity dialectic, it is a scenic dialectic. In other words, the scene is the ground on which the dialectical opposition operates. In other words, Being represents placement within the contextual field of existence, highlighting Being as part of a geometric scene. I discuss geometric substance in more detail below.

Before I do so, however, one final point should be made regarding dialectical substance: Dialectical oppositions operate together. In other words, a dialectic contains both what something is and its opposite. As Burke notes, “it was dialectically necessary that the devil should be an angel for were he of any less noble substance, the Christian agonist would to that degree have fallen short of thoroughness in imagining a common ground on which the two great conflicting motives, good and evil, can join battle” (p. 34). Not only does definition of a thing require its opposite—but the opposite quality or thing becomes inherent in the identity of its opposite quality or thing. Paradoxically, while the two are opposites, they also constitute each other. A positive assertion of identity,

therefore, requires an understanding of one's opposite. The two converge on a common ground. The extent to which an individual is constituted, for instance, is tied to the extent to which the individual's opposite is defined.

As noted above, dialectical substance subsumes other forms of substance. One of these substances is what Burke terms "geometric" or "contextual." Geometric substance is "an object placed in its setting, existing both in itself and as part of its background. Participation in a context" (p. 29). Burke further describes the geometric as "positional" or as a "definition by location" (p. 26). In this case, one's substance derives from the context in which one participates. The context thus drives the motivations of actors. A related term that Burke devotes more attention to is that of "scene." The scene represents the context through which human motivation might be derived. Individual actions arise as a natural consequence of the scene in which the individual is placed. In discussing Marxism, Burke describes how this substance operates within the scene or context of industrialization: "insofar as the world becomes industrialized under capitalism, workers everywhere share the same social motives, since they all have the same 'factory situation' in common. This is the scene that shapes the workers' acts, and their nature as agents in conformity with it" (p. 45). As will be seen in this chapter, the scene dominates the IWW attempts to define the solidarity of the organization. Geometric and dialectical substance play a vital role in how this organization constitutes the solidarity of its members.

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to an analysis of rhetorical fragments within the IWW with an eye to how the organization sought to constitute solidarity. In particular, I examine the minutes of the founding convention of the IWW, which include

the manifesto, the constitution and the debates which lead to the creation of each. In addition, I look at the songs in the IWW Little Red Songbook, pamphlets and other materials related to the movement, autobiographies of IWW members, IWW songs, interviews and newspaper articles written about the movement. These rhetorical fragments create an image of solidarity within the IWW centered on a dialectical and geometric understanding of identification within the movement. Through the analysis, I advance four claims. First, the IWW created a broad solidarity by defining the geometric scene in which workers were placed. Second, the IWW refined this solidarity by appealing to the dialectical tensions between workers and their agons. Third, other potential points of identification were downplayed within the movement for the sake of maintaining this broad solidarity. Fourth, conflicts over what constituted both the geometric and dialectical substance of workers contributed to problems within the IWW. I conclude the chapter by suggesting the IWW constituted a broad solidarity geometrically, but that geometric substance created problems for developing deep solidarity.

Geometric Substance within the IWW

The IWW created solidarity primarily through appealing to the geometric substance of workers. In part, this geometric substance is reflected in the name of the organization. By calling the IWW an “Industrial”⁹ organization, the IWW defined the

⁹ The term “industrial” tends to have two different meanings. On the one hand, “industrial” refers to the contextual field within which workers toil. This is the meaning used when attempting to achieve solidarity between all members of the working class. On the other hand, “industrial” refers to the type of work employees engage in, for instance the timber industry. While workers may be part of a specific industry, the basis of solidarity lies in their placement within the over-arching industrial context in which they labor.

scene of workers as industrial. As noted above, the placement of workers within a capitalist system constituted the key point of solidarity for workers within the IWW. Defining workers broadly as members of this context helped constitute the workers as part of a broad solidarity.

Frequently, the fragments examined refer to the IWW as “The One Big Union” or “OBU.” The OBU represents a broad solidarity for members of the IWW. This solidarity was ideally to encompass all workers of the world. Solidarity was based on a class consciousness that transcended issues of race, culture, gender, skill, or trade. In other words, the one common characteristic that all workers shared, their capacity as producers, was the basis of solidarity. Their capacity as producers is reflected through shared substance as part of the industrial scene. This rhetoric is apparent in an interview with IWW member Fred Thompson:

What does *we* mean when one speaks of a union? The AF of L pattern was to think of *we* as metal polishers. Later, many of the CIO unions that filed as industrial unions actually included people working in one plant who happened to practice unionism together. For them, *we* meant the workers in this one place. A union has to be on guard against plant consciousness and craft consciousness, as opposed to class consciousness. Sometimes they even include management in the *we* referring to a plant or industry. The IWW was very clear in stating *we* meant everyone that worked. (Thompson, 1985, p. 218)

Note how Thompson works to expand the industrial scene, beyond particular plants or even stations on an assembly line. Solidarity, to function effectively, needed to reach every worker. As such, a person’s status as worker was the most important point of identification. What being a worker meant was being a part of an *industrial* scene, holding the geometric substance of worker. The scene extended beyond one place to everyone placed within the context of producer reflecting the desire for a broad solidarity.

In the place of craft-based solidarity, the IWW created an industrial form of solidarity. Industrial solidarity, as conceived, attempts to create a big tent under which all who fall under the category of worker can identify. This “big tent” model of solidarity is explained in a pamphlet written by IWW member William Trautmann (1911) entitled “One Big Union.” In the pamphlet, Trautmann articulates reasons behind industrial based unionization. In the first place, industrial unionization most accurately reflects the social relations created by the advent of industrialization. Just as owners consolidated their power, workers must also consolidate theirs: “the most advanced and highly developed industrial system of production is bound to find its counterpart in a similarly perfected organization of the working class on the industrial field.” In the second place, industrial unionization allows for the solidarity of all members of the working class: “One obligation for all. A union man once and in one industry; a union man always and in all industries. Universal transfers, universal emblem. All workers of one industry in one union; all unions of workers in one big labor alliance the world over.” The industrial field represents the context in which workers substance is constituted; placement in industry is the entry requirement for solidarity.

This model of unionization reflects a belief that the ultimate point of identification for workers is their status as workers, which derives from their placement in a broad industrial scene. At the same time, on a practical level, the IWW’s rhetoric also suggests that more elementary forms of solidarity between specific types of workers can develop. While the members attending the IWW founding convention appear to be united in their belief that industrial unionism is the best method for achieving solidarity across different

types of work, debate within the convention reflects a concern about how that solidarity can take place in practice, given the various points of worker identification possible. In other words, IWW members are concerned with creating a broad solidarity inclusive of all workers, while not sacrificing the depth of solidarity needed to achieve specific goals within the movement. However, as is shown later in this chapter, conflicts over defining the geometric field shaping substance hindered the development of a deep solidarity.

In terms of a broad solidarity, the IWW advocated universal transfers. This meant that once a member of one union in one industry, a worker could transfer that union membership to another union without incurring additional costs. This was certainly a cost savings to the worker: under the AFL model workers would have to pay additional initiation and membership fees for every union transferred to. However, on a more rhetorical level, this enabled individual workers to broadly identify with other workers within the movement, because they were always initially a member of the working class movement without interference with regard to their particular industry or craft.

The way in which those industries are defined, however, matter for creating a deeper solidarity, as debates between members at the founding convention reveal. On the seventh day of the convention, the Constitution Committee reported a plan for the organization of the IWW into 13 divisions, presumably to reflect particular categories of industries in which workers might be members. These divisions included:

Division 1 shall be composed of all persons working in the following industries: Clerks, salesmen, tobacco, packing houses, flour mills, sugar refineries, dairies, bakeries and kindred industries.

Division 2. Brewery, wine and distillery workers.

Division 3. Floriculture, stock and general farming.

Division 4. Mining, milling, smelting and refining coal, ores, metals, salt and iron.

Division 5. Steam railway, electric railway, marine, shipping and teaming.

Division 6. All building employes.

Division 7. All textile industrial employes.

Division 8. All leather industrial workers.

Division 9. All wood working employes excepting those engaged in building departments.

Division 10. All metal industrial employes.

Division 11. All glass and pottery employes.

Division 12. All paper mills, chemical, rubber, broom, brush and jewelry industries.

Division 13. Parks, highways, municipal, postal service, telegraph, telephone, schools and educational institutions, amusements, sanitary, printing, hotel, restaurant and laundry employes (sic). (Industrial Workers of the World, 1969 , pp. 299-300)

Two days of debate took place over these divisions, concerning, for instance potential jurisdictional battles, the arbitrariness of the divisions, whether more or fewer divisions were needed, and the extent to which centralized control of the union was necessary.

Delegate Coates led the charge against the proposal, noting:

I want to call your attention to the fact that the fundamental principle underlying this organization says that when one part of this industry strikes, the entire industry strikes; and just as soon as we begin to take out the printers for a remedy of the conditions in the line of publication in whatever field it may be in that branch of industry, we are practically forced, by bringing these other people into their section, or rather, into their international union, to take out the restaurant employes, the laundry employes, the musicians and the various other ten or twelve or fifteen separate industries grouped under this thirteenth head. I think we are going purely crazy as far as the practical feature of lining these people into an organization is concerned. (p. 301)

This concern suggests that the deployment of solidarity, in an instrumental sense, should be related to the specific industry affected. However, what constitutes the industry defines the limits of solidarity regarding particular conflicts. The concern, then, is two-fold. First, the concern brings the question of sacrifice to the fore. Should a worker who is not directly implicated by a particular, context-driven conflict be required to act in solidarity with workers who are implicated? The tension between a worker's self-interest and that of the collective workers' movement is revealed. Second, how should workers identify with each other? Can a worker whose craft is laundry be expected to identify with a worker in the printing business? The point at which solidarity occurs is revealed as a porous boundary. In a broad sense, solidarity can be expected between all workers as workers, but in a deep sense it cannot be expected in terms of workers' more immediate points of identification. In other words, the very need to create industrial divisions within the organization suggest that broad geometric substance is not enough to bind workers together broadly. In order to create greater depth of solidarity the constitutive scene had to be narrowed; or additional types of substantial connection had to be drawn rhetorically.

The geometric scene of the IWW was constructed rhetorically to conceive IWW members as workers in a broad industrial scene, laboring under "One Big Tent." At the same time, the IWW's scenic rhetoric constituted industrial workers as members of the oppressed class. In part, this was done by eschewing the signing of labor contracts. In a pamphlet published by the Educational Bureau of the IWW circa 1917, the IWW lays out the argument against contracts. In the first place, the pamphlet creates a link between the conditions of chattel slavery and those of wage slavery: "Under the old chattel slavery

system, overseers lashed the slaves to their tasks. When wage slavery came into existence the slave master was still there, in the shape of the straw-boss, but the lash had become an invisible one, the threat of discharge.” This sets up the industrial scene to appear similar to that under slavery, enabling workers to identify with their oppression using analogical reasoning. In the second place, the pamphlet argues that worker identification must be with fellow workers and that contracts represent allegiance to the masters of capitalism: “When the worker goes into business with the boss, he is abandoning his position as a wage worker, where he has at least a chance to quit the job if things aren’t going right, and he ties himself up in a business deal where the practiced, trained trickery of the employer has every opportunity to cheat him.” Here, the geometric substance of the workers creates a dialectical distinction between workers and bosses. Joining with the boss means abandoning a worker’s identity as a wage worker. This decision enables the employer to cheat the worker, while the worker “abandons the weapons of his class” without escaping the industrial system under which he labors: “he does not free himself from the disadvantages of the working class.” In addition, the worker sells out the rest of the workers subject to their geometric positioning within the system by working harder than necessary, decreasing the need for workers, and thus creating a surplus of labor while driving down wages. Contracts tie workers to these conditions because they force workers to give up the strike and the boycott as weapons available within this scene.

Consistent with Burke’s reading of Marx, the IWW constituted workers as driven by contextual, or geometric, solidarity. Placement within the broad scene of industry was important for constituted workers as sharing a common substance, which was the means

for building a broad solidarity. However, geometric substance was not enough to maintain that solidarity. Rhetorical appeals to the dialectical substance of the workers help to refine the substantive identifications of workers. The next section examines the dialectical substance of the IWW.

Dialectical Substance in the IWW

As noted above, dialectical substance is that substance through which protagonists can affirm their identity in relation to what they are not. In other words, the characteristics they hold in esteem differ from the characteristics held in esteem by their agonist. Within the IWW, two groups represent the dialectical opposite of the IWW members: members of the capitalist class and class traitors. IWW members define themselves by challenging the capitalist class, as well as degrading those who do not adhere to the industrial credo of organization. In this section, I highlight these dialectical oppositions, arguing that they serve to define the boundaries of the geometric substance.

The rhetorical fragments of the IWW draw a sharp distinction between the class of employers and that of employees. This distinction is sharply drawn as the basis of the organization at its founding convention. Indeed the preamble to the IWW constitution, developed as an outgrowth of the manifesto, opens:

The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found among millions of working people, and the few who make up the employing class have all the good things of life. Between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the toilers come together on the political as well as on the industrial field, and take and hold that which they produce by their labor, through an economic organization of the working class without affiliation with any political party (World, 1965). Through the preamble, the IWW creates a clean break between its membership, representing the employees, and the employing class. That they have “nothing in common” means they must be polar opposites, clearly a dialectical relationship.

Furthermore, IWW members must struggle within their geometric field of placement: the industrial field. Finally, the preamble gives a hint of what some of the characteristic distinctions are between employers and employees. Employers have the good things in life. Employees go hungry. Employers are few. Employees are many. Clear dichotomies between the two classes are set up. The last portion of the preamble, demanding an “economic organization of the working class without affiliation with any political party” was the subject of intense debate within the IWW both at the founding convention and over the years, and is discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

That these two classes have “nothing in common” forestalls any possibility of collaboration. The struggle metaphor suggests that these two classes are diametrically opposed (however, the distinction between these two classes is a fine one, as a debate over a Credentials Committee report illuminates later in this chapter). The dialectical line between the two allows for an essentialist view of workers and employers, forestalling solidarity with individuals that might traverse the boundary between the two. In other words, the dialectic creates an “Us versus Them” mentality that does not allow for a porous identity traversing the two fields.

The worker was distinct from the employer in that the worker added value to the material world through the production process, while the owner controlled the materials of production. Again, this reflects the geometric substance of the worker in terms of placement within the overarching system of industry. While the IWW claimed to accept all workers into its fold, that does not mean the IWW didn’t engage in any exclusionary practices. Indeed, certain types of applicants were rejected from membership to the IWW and others were the subject of intense debate. I turn first to a debate regarding a report by the Credentials Committee at the founding convention to examine the distinction made between IWW members between solidarity and sympathy. After, I offer a discussion of

the IWW perception of “class collaborators” and “labor fakirs” which reveals the second dialectical substance used to shore the identification of IWW members.

Credentials committees were important ideological bodies throughout the labor movement. They were the front line of defense against potentially undesirable elements having a voice in the movement. The history of the American Labor Movement is replete with examples of credentials committees denying the credentials of delegates at labor movement conventions, including the AFL’s denial of outspoken Socialist delegates like Daniel DeLeon (see Foner, 1975). By denying certain potential members, labor movement organizations could police the boundaries of their organization.

In the case of the IWW founding convention, the Credentials Committee met with potential delegates to examine their paperwork and made a recommendation to the full delegation as to whether delegates ought to be given a seat. The full delegation then voted to approve the recommendation or initiated debate to deny a particular delegate a seat. By rule, the delegates either represented a particular union, in which case they would receive votes proportional to the number of workers they represented after providing proper paperwork, or they represented themselves as individual workers, in which case they were given one vote.

On the second day of the founding convention, the Credentials Committee recommended the seating of C.B. Boudin, an attorney from New York, as a fraternal delegate. The recommendation stirred up debate among the delegation which is revealing of how the IWW conceived of the difference between solidarity and sympathy. This debate also demonstrates the ways in which the IWW invoked a dialectical solidarity.

Delegate Saunders objected to the seating of Boudin on the ground that an attorney might be a friend of labor, but could not be considered a worker:

I believe the first lesson should be taught by the working class of America proving themselves to be able to successfully inaugurate a movement—and I suppose it will be teaching for the first time in the history of America that a trades union shall be composed of workingmen or wage earners (applause) and that we are ready and that we may be ready at any time to accept assistance from any ‘friends of labor’—but from the outside. (Applause). (Industrial Workers of the World, 1969 , p. 66)

Saunders further argued that seating an attorney would open the door to seating other attorneys not favorable to labor interests. Delegate Lilian Forberg concurred with Saunders, arguing that attorneys only know how to support the capitalist class, further labeling them “parasites.” Another delegate defended the attorney, noting that he wrote for international labor papers, had a union brother, and sympathized with the labor movement.

Socialist labor leader Daniel DeLeon took the floor and argued that, regardless of Boudin’s personal character, he should not be admitted because a precedent would be set that other undesirable people could be admitted to the organization, including policemen and detectives. DeLeon argued with a rather violent metaphor: “I consider that a lawyer is a parasite upon parasites, and that as we are opposed to parasitism we must decapitate the lawyer from our ranks” (Industrial Workers of the World, 1969 , p. 68). DeLeon, as well as other delegates, further argued that if Boudin was a true friend to labor, then he would voluntarily withdraw from consideration. The delegation eventually voted to exclude Boudin from the proceedings.

This rhetorical fragment has much to say about the way solidarity was conceived within the IWW. In the first place, the debate reflects the desire to set hard rules between the working class and the capitalist class. An individual's occupational role was enough to discredit that individual from brotherhood within the IWW, regardless of any sympathy or action taken in favor of the movement. Being an attorney was enough to disqualify one from participation in the IWW. The dialectical substance in this case serves to rigidly define the extent of the geometric substance of workers. At the same time, an individual could be seen as having sympathy with the movement if through consistent action the individual assisted the movement; however that person could still not be considered a solidary member of the movement. Insisting on solidarity was not enough to have substantive solidarity. This clearly reflects the dialectical substance of the movement in that an individual's placement within the class field is enough to disqualify that individual from solidarity placement within the movement. By applying the parasite metaphor to the attorney as a category, the IWW gives the attorney the identity of the enemy Other. No amount of debate can challenge the substance of attorney as capitalist, regardless of individual sympathies.

The metaphor of the parasite is a powerful one frequently used in the late 19th and early 20th century to refer to the capitalist class. The metaphor implies members of the capitalist class live off the labor of others, sucking their life away. The metaphor functions as a descriptive analogy of the capitalist class. On a denotative level, the metaphor suggests the capitalist class live by feeding off of others. This fit with the standard argument made by IWW members that owners profited from the exploitation of

the working class. Owners fed off the profits generated from the material production of the working class. At a connotative level, parasites are nasty little creatures that conjure up bad images. As such, capitalists can be portrayed both as exploitative and as undesirable within the same metaphor. The image of the parasite is demonstrated in Jim Seymour's poem "The Dishwasher":

You leeches who live off the fat of the land/
You overfed parasites, look at my hand/
You laugh at it now, it is blistered and coarse/
But such are the hands quite familiar with force/
And such are the hands that have furnished your drink/
The hands of the slaves who are learning to think/
And hands that have fed you can crush you as well/
And cast your damned carcasses clear into hell! (Seymour, 1965, p. 79)

The parasite is the image of excess: it takes more than it needs and destroys the bounty of nature. The resentment of the parasite is clear in the poem, the dehumanizing language lending itself toward justifying the use of force to crush it. The parasite feeds off of the employee, again reflecting the dialectical substance of the IWW: workers represent the producing animal that provides for the thieving capitalist parasite.¹⁰

The employing class represents the primary dialectical opposition through which IWW members identify themselves. As noted above, this dialectical relationship creates a dichotomy where members of the IWW occupy one side of the stream, while the employing class represents the other. This means the IWW needed to make sense of workers that did not share the ideology of the organization. In other words, on what side of the stream do workers fall, when they fail to join the IWW? As pawns of the employing class, these workers share employers' dialectical substance.

¹⁰ Interestingly, both a parasite and organism need each other for survival. In the sense, the dialectical opposition serves to buttress the identities of the workers and the employing class.

The tropes of the “class collaborator” and “labor fakir” were frequently used throughout the IWW founding convention. These terms might easily refer to the supporters of trade unionism, as represented by the AFL. On the third day of the convention, Trautmann issued an indictment of the AFL as a reason the IWW decided to issue the manifesto, a version of which later become the preamble to the IWW constitution, and convention call. The indictment argued that the AFL trade union movement was working in collusion with the capitalist class, pointing to the relationship between the leaders of the AFL and the National Civic Federation. The failure of the AFL, Trautmann charged, was due to “presumed agreement of interests between the capitalist class and the working class, the general trend of their official administration is more or less consciously in the direction of capitalist supremacy with all its evils and the corruption which marks its sway” (Industrial Workers of the World, 1969 , p. 119). By way of evidence, Trautmann pointed to the AFL involvement in the Pullman Strike in 1894¹¹ and the strike of the Western Federation of Miners in Coeur D’Alene, Idaho,¹² as examples of selling out the American Labor Movement to the capitalist class. Such policies by the AFL represent a consistent policy of collaboration with the capitalist class and serve as the backdrop for the IWW manifesto and as justification for the opening words of the IWW preamble, that the working class has nothing in common with the

¹¹ For a discussion of AFL involvement in the Pullman Strike, see Appendix A.

¹² The Western Federation of Miners engaged in a protracted strike in Coeur D’Alene against subsidiaries of the Standard Oil Trust in 1899. Gompers was reported as supporting trusts, despite the poor working conditions of the Rocky Mountain workers. He refused to mobilize the AFL in favor of the workers, and some speculated he was interested in destroying the Western Federation of Miners (Foner 1975). When the IWW convened in 1905, by far the largest portion of its membership base came from members of the Western Federation of Miners, whose spokesperson was Big Bill Haywood.

capitalist class.¹³ By portraying the AFL as class collaborators, the IWW asserts its identity by negation. The IWW represents the true interests of the working class, while the AFL only pretends to do so while harboring real affiliation with the employing class. The dialectical substance of the IWW is secured by rhetorically setting itself apart from the AFL. By working in collusion with the employing class, the AFL shares the substance of that class.

The American Federation of Labor in the late 1800s, under the leadership of Samuel Gompers, maintained itself as a strict craft-based union. Gompers steadfastly refused to allow the organization of unskilled workers in the AFL. A number of factors affected this decision, from the influence of the Catholic Church, the perceived lessons learned from the collapse of the Knights of Labor¹⁴, and a belief system that capitalists and workers could have common interests. Continual attempts to limit the power of the socialist influence in the AFL further encouraged the organization to circle its wagons around craft unionism. The IWW, perceiving the choices of the AFL to be a mistake, was

¹³ These words would have likely played well to the unskilled workers as part of the IWW target audience. The AFL was well known for advancing its business agenda above the interests of workers. Foner, in The Policies and Practices of the American Federation of Labor 1900-1905, details various practices by the AFL leadership that would lead to the charge of class collaboration. The AFL was known for refusing to support strikes, importing scab labor, and wining and dining with the key capitalists of the day. Gompers, Foner notes, was quite fond of the fame he received while meeting with corporate giants like Morgan and Rockefeller, and receiving praise for his involvement in supporting the corporations as a member of the National Civic Federation.

¹⁴ Foner (1975) notes several mistakes made by Knights of Labor leader Terrence Powderly that contributed to a decline in membership of 100,000 in 1890. Among these are Powderly's authoritarian hand ignoring the rank-and-file, allowing bosses membership into Knights of Labor locals, and making free land the centerpiece of the Knights of Labor platform. Powderly's refusal to support unionism and strike actions of the rank-and-file, and public denouncement of such action, influenced the IWW perspective on leadership's role within unionism and the importance of the rank-and-file voice within its organization.

created to offer a different form of organization that would allow workers to effectively challenge the power of the corporate giants.

As such, the IWW manifesto (Industrial Workers of the World, 1965) challenges the usefulness of craft-based solidarity. Several accusations are made against craft-based solidarity including: that the separation of crafts “renders industrial and financial solidarity impossible,” craft jealousy leads to trade monopolies, craft divisions create political ignorance (meaning that workers divide against each other at the ballot box), craft unions help capitalists create monopolies, class divisions prevent the development of class consciousness and falsely suggest that workers and employers can exist in harmony. Craft-based solidarity, for the IWW, represents a misreading of workers geometric substance. Furthermore, it narrows the scope through which a broad solidarity is possible. From these words, the IWW sets forth what solidarity should not be. Solidarity should not be a collaboration between capitalists and workers. Solidarity should not be a division between different types of workers. Solidarity should not be apolitical. To the extent the AFL embodies a faulty interpretation of the dialectical relationship between the employing and employee classes, the AFL works to sustain the employing class. As such, the AFL stands in dialectic opposition to the IWW.

The rhetorical fragments of the IWW also dialectically distinguish the organization from workers who do not participate in the movement. These workers are represented as class collaborators because they undermine the goals of the IWW. As pawns of the employing class, they are too naïve to understand the industrial scene in which they are placed, leading them to betray their class. The IWW portrays these

workers as capable of bridging the dialectical divide, if only they understood their scenic placement within the industrial context.

Mr. Block represents the worker who either lacks the knowledge of industrial unionism that would entice him to join the labor movement as represented by the IWW, or lacks the intelligence to distinguish why industrial unionism is important. He sits outside the labor movement, both as a threat to the solidarity of the movement and as a potential convert. The character of Mr. Block appears in the literature of the IWW, including pamphlets, as well as in the editorial cartoons of the movement.

In “A Job and Political Bunk” by IWW member Ernest Reibe (Riebe, 1920), Mr. Block’s ignorance is described. He is said to be happy with simply having a job, while not realizing the precariousness of his position. Mr. Block is a “working animal” that “accepts degradation with a satisfied grin ... Give to a Block the privilege to slave and he is in heaven.” Mr. Block is also naïve; he is easily fooled by the politician: “If a spellbinder wishes to make a special hit he calls Mr. Block an intelligent sovereign citizen. The dunce almost croaks; he’s tickled to death at this.” Once, the election is over, Block discovers that he has been fooled, but is quickly caught up again in the next election cycle. This fragment demonstrates that Mr. Block does not understand his geometric substance. In other words, he is swept by the tide of his context, without the critical awareness to understand how that context works to shape his identity. In particular, Mr. Block identifies with a political, rather than industrial scene. As such, he is caught within a field that cannot support his interests because it does not represent his true substance.

The comic strip “Mr. Block He Goes Harvesting” (Reibe, 2005) tells a similar story. In the panel, a plaid-shirted Block is examining a notice for harvest help. In the second, Block gets on a train to ride to the Dakotas. While on the train, the third panel reveals IWW members informing Block that “Those high wage stories are published to swamp the labor market of the West in order to reduce wages.” Block is encouraged to “Join the IWW and help to overthrow the system of exploitation.” Block ignores the advice, arguing “I am a patriot and I object to anarchism in this box car.” The lesson of the strip is revealed in the final four panels in which a law enforcement officer informs Block no jobs are available and orders him out of town. When Block is unable to secure passage out of town, the officer beats him with a bat. In this fragment, Block denied his geometric substance, which enabled his oppression by representatives of the employing class. He essentially chose the employing class as his point of solidarity, not realizing the class only seeks to exploit him. Furthermore, in calling himself a “patriot,” Block identifies within a political rather than industrial substance. That Block ignores the false “high wage stories” suggests he fails to identify with the primary feature of the industrial field, which is an economic field.

As a caricature, Mr. Block is an effective tool for inspiring identification with the Wobbly movement. Mr. Block represents the antithesis of a progressive worker, who understands solidarity. He is perpetually punished for his naivety, whether through the violence of the state supporting corporate interests, or through his exploitation by the capitalist class. As an educational tool, Block functions as a foil for the working class. He can be made to represent any ideology rejected by the IWW. Individual workers who

hold the same sorts of objections to the IWW as Mr. Block would find themselves identifying with the unflattering caricature of someone who is naïve and easily taken advantage of. The reader of these comic strips and stories would learn that political action is fruitless compared to direct economic action, that there is nothing in common between workers and capitalists, and that the IWW's industrial form of organization represents the best hope for the future of the working class. More importantly, however, the character of Block constitutes the dialectical identity of IWW members. As the primary consumers of the rhetorical fragments, IWW readers are encouraged to see themselves as the opposite of Mr. Block. Their identity is constituted in dialectical opposition to Block's characteristics. They are not naïve. They understand the context that constitutes their identity as workers. They refuse to be exploited or taken advantage of.

The image of the worker who lacks the intellectual capacity to join the movement is common in the IWW literature. This image plays to the workers' sympathies, asking them to disidentify with the trope by joining in solidarity with the IWW. The joke "How He Made it NonUnion" encapsulates this idea. A man walks into a butcher shop looking for a calf's head, but informs the butcher that he doesn't want the meat if it comes from a union. The butcher informs the man he can make the meat nonunion and goes to the back. When the butcher returns with the "nonunion" meat, the customer asks how he turned it nonunion. The butcher replies, "I simply took the brains out of it" (1965, p. 87). Any intelligent person would want to join be a member of the IWW. To not identify with one's status as a worker, and by proxy a revolutionary, is to defy reason. As the IWW's rhetoric establishes, the dialectical instinct toward class antagonism is innate.

So far, I have highlighted the interplay of dialectical and geometric substance as the primary means of constituting solidarity within the IWW. These two forms of Burkean substance work together to define what IWW members are, against the backdrop of what they are not; as well as define the motives of the IWW members relative to their placement within a contextual scene. In addition to generating solidarity through these forms of substance, the IWW also downplayed other potential forms of identification between members. In particular, familial substance was rejected within the rhetorical fragments of the IWW as a legitimate means of identification. In the next section, I highlight the ways the IWW rejects or downplays familial substance as a legitimate means of identification for IWW members.

Transcending Familial Substance

In terms of a broad solidarity, dialectical and geometric substance work together to bring all members of the working class under a common umbrella. The rhetorical fragments of the IWW demonstrate how these substances work together to constitute the identity of workers in solidarity. However, the fragments also reveal recognition that other forms of solidarity are possible—notably, familial substance. These fragments downplay the importance of familial substance, allowing the IWW to transcend potential differences within the movement and maintain its broad solidarity.

Familial substance, in Burkean terms, stresses “the common ancestry” of workers (p. 29). To the extent that workers share some founder in common, they can be said to share familial substance. This substance can extend to include culture, national, and social identifications to the extent that workers substance derives from their history.

Rather than constituting individuals based on placement or location, as in geometric substance, familial substance constitutes individuals through authorship. This substance will take on greater import in the next chapter. For now, however, it is important to note the ways in which potential familial identifications are rejected by the rhetorical fragments of the IWW.

The desire for One Big Union was a divergence from previous craft based unions. The AFL, for instance, initially attempted to transcend racial politics with its unionization efforts by requiring its locals to include members of different races, including blacks. In practice, however, the AFL failed to live up to its creed, particularly in the South, and slowly declined to enforce those parts of its constitution. What resulted were racially segregated unions. The IWW was more demanding in its efforts to avoid racially segregated unionization and to maintain a broad identification based on worker interests—especially their placement within the industrial scene:

As far as blacks were concerned, things were rough. To my knowing, the IWW was the only union, at that time, accepting black workers freely. They advocated just one thing: solidarity... Solidarity was the main thing. That sank in with a lot of us. It paid off and it's paying off today. You see, the IWW was something for the working man. It didn't make any difference who you was, what kind of work you did. They wanted to organize *all* the working people. (Fair, 1985, pp. 183-184)

Women were also included in the movement. Some of the most outspoken members of the movement were women, including Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Mother Jones. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, in particular, was quite famous for her treatise on sabotage and vocal disagreements with Big Bill Haywood over the direction of the IWW. What is key here, however, is the IWW viewed excluding workers based on other

identifications as detrimental to the goals of the movement. Accepting all workers as equals was key to developing the solidarity necessary to achieve the goals of the movement. In order to adhere to this broad solidarity, familial identifications were downplayed by the IWW.

What was important in the IWW was not the cultural, national, or gender identity of the members. Worker solidarity based on industrial unionism would transcend any differences those identifications would tend toward. In other words, the geometric substance of the workers transcended their familial substance. A satirical play by Walter Smith highlights this transcendence. Called “Their Court and Our Classes,” the play critiqued the judicial process as it played out after the massacre of Wobblies entering Everett, Washington, on the ship *Verona*. The play featured Wobbly members on trial in a kangaroo court setting. The character of the prosecutor asks a Wobbly witness to recite the Declaration of Independence. The Wobbly responds by reciting the preamble to the IWW constitution, “The working class and the employing class have nothing in common...” When the prosecutor asks the Wobbly what his nationality is, the Wobbly declares “IWW” (Smith, 1965, p. 118). This play is instructive of the IWW’s rhetorical efforts to foster identification with the organization that transcends other points of identification. What is important is not the United States Declaration of Independence, which represents a nationalist identification, but rather the IWW Constitution, which lays out the tenets of industrial solidarity. The witness trades national for industrial scene, reflecting the geometric substance of the IWW.

The rhetoric of the IWW consistently educates members to not discriminate against potential members based on their race or nationality. Those who would discriminate are represented as ignorant or antithetical to class interests. Consider, for instance, the character of Scissor Bill. Scissor Bill is a character represented in the IWW literature and comics who captures the ignorance of workers who do not identify with the IWW. Scissor Bill (like Mr. Block) represents the ignorant nonunion man. He is a simple patriot, as the song “Scissor Bill” by IWW bard and martyr Joe Hill, reflects:

And Scissor Bill he says: “This country must be freed/From Niggers, Japs and Dutchmen and the gol darn Swede.”/He says that every cop would be a native son/If it wasn’t for the Irishman, the son-of-a-gun./Scissor Bill, the “foreigners” is cussin’/Scissor Bill, he says “I hate a Coon”/Scissor Bill is down on everybody/The Hottentots, the bushmen and the man in the moon. (Hill, 1965, p. 136)

The hero of the song (the narrator), contextualizes Scissor Bill’s beliefs by encouraging disidentification. The narrator notes, “If Scissor Bill is going to Heaven, I’ll go to Hell ... Scissor Bill gets his reward in Heaven ... but he’ll get it in the neck” (p. 136). By deriding Scissor Bill, the narrator is encouraging the listener to reject the nationalist ideology held by Scissor Bill; and to adopt a dialectical substance, positioning himself or herself against Scissor Bill’s familial substance. Further, what is important is the worker’s geometric, not familial substance, which creates a broader solidarity.¹⁵

¹⁵ The use of song was an important rhetorical technique within the IWW for creating a broad solidarity. Writing about the 1912 Lawrence Textile Strike, Rey Stannard Baker wrote, “It is the first strike I ever saw which sang. I shall not soon forget the curious lift, the strange sudden fire of the mingled nationalities at the strike meetings when they broke into the universal language of song” (p. 158). Songs were important to the development of the IWW because they represented a universal language which enabled the IWW to bridge the gap between worker differences. Differences in nationality, ethnicity, and gender were rendered obsolete through song.

In order for the One Big Union to succeed, argued Wobbly members, the union had to transcend the differences between its members. To do so meant eventually workers could rely on each other to carry forth a general strike (carried out by all workers, across all jobs in a community) that would overthrow the capitalist system. This strategy was articulated by Big Bill Haywood in his essay, *The General Strike*:

The Socialists believe in the general strike. They also believe in the organization of industrial forces after the general strike is successful. So, on this great force of the working class I believe we can agree that we should unite into one great organization – big enough to take in the children that are now working; big enough to take in the black man, the white man; big enough to take in all nationalities – an organization that will be strong enough to obliterate state boundaries, to obliterate national boundaries, and one that will become the great industrial force of the working class of the world. (Haywood, 1965, p. 49)

Such a broad solidarity trickled to the rank-and-file membership of the IWW. Members accepted the idea that a general strike was only a tool available when solidarity was defined broadly. As Bruce Phillips noted in an interview conducted as part of an oral history of the IWW:

The IWW has always believed that there is an essential solidarity in the entire working class and that anyone who works for wages, whether a college professor or a ditch digger, is in the working class. We advocate that all the skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled workers of the world band together in one giant, humongous union, the OBU, the “One Big Union.” Instead of having a hundred little strikes settled, you could have a general strike that could take the system apart and then put it back together so that it made more sense. (Phillips, 1985, p. 27)

For members of the IWW, solidarity had to be based on the worker’s status as workers. Recognizing other points of identification, the IWW members attempted to transcend those potential differences by defining their substance in terms of a united identification. Working for wages is the primary point of identification; the specific identifications relative to individual (college professor or ditch digger) were only important to the extent

that they represent the broader field of work. Transcending localized identities allowed for the use of the general strike as a tool.

Perhaps a more difficult familial point of identification to transcend was that of religion. IWW members generally derided religion. This derision of religion was seen through conflict between the IWW and the Salvation Army, which IWW literature frequently refers to as the “starvation army,” over use of the streets for the exercise of free speech. Perhaps drawing on Socialist influence within the movement, which, as Marx wrote, thought of religion as “the opiate of the masses,” the Wobblies seemed to believe that religion was antithetical to the working person’s ability to take direct action. Religion bred apathy, which was antithetical to the solidarity being constructed by the IWW.

The Outcast’s Prayer, which appeared in the *Industrial Worker* in 1921, speaks to the IWW’s rhetorical attempts to eschew familial substance. In the poem, a working person prays for protection from the Lord against greedy, excessive bosses. The poem ends with a reply from Jesus that encapsulates the belief that the worker must stand outside of religion:

I’ve heard your prayer, O Scissor-bill/It sounds like hokum and goulash and swill/You say that you pray and work like a mule/You’re not a worker but Henry Ford’s tool./You thank me for working 12 hours a day/Why blame it on me—I never made you that way/You scoff at the rebel and lynch him ‘till dead/But I was an outcast and they called me a “Red.”/You call me Christ Jesus with intelligence dim/But I was a Rebel called Jerusalem Slim./And my brothers: the outcast, the rebel and the tramp/And not the religious, the scab or the scamp/And of all creatures both filthy and drab/The lowest of all is the thing called scab./So pray thou no longer for power or pelf—I cannot help him who won’t help himself! (1965, p. 86)

The poem reveals a sort of love-hate relationship with religion as a point of identification for the movement. It suggests that prayers will not help the working person achieve liberation from the oppression of the capitalist class. People must protect themselves rather than apathetically wait for divine intervention. Yet, the poem leaves open the possibility for religious identification to aid solidarity, so long as religion is part of the geometric and dialectical substance of the IWW. Indeed, Jesus is cast as a rebel who desires for workers to help themselves.

The IWW literature further recognizes that spirituality is important to its members. Many of the songs appearing in the Little Red Songbook are rewritten spiritual hymns, such as “Hallelujah, I’m a Bum” set to the tune of “Revive Us Again.” These hymns would have been quite useful because most members could be expected to understand the music. Learning the words to the songs would be simple. In terms of solidarity, while the IWW recognized the potential religious, familial, substance of the workers, by changing the words of the songs that substance is displaced in favor of the more scenic geometric and dialectical substance of workers.

The idea of leadership also plays a role in understanding the rejection of familial substance as a point of identification of the workers. In one sense, a movement might be viewed as emanating from the substance of the leader. In other words, by identifying with the leader of a movement, the substance of movement members is derived. Substance emanating from leadership is familial to the extent that workers see themselves in terms of their leader. As I demonstrate in the next chapter, this familial substance is quite

important to the United Farm Workers. However, the IWW downplays leadership as a form of identification.

Perhaps as a reaction to the strong leader-centered organizations represented by the AFL and Knights of Labor, or perhaps reflecting a stronger commitment to the rank-and-file, the rhetoric of the IWW reflects a concern with downplaying the role of its leaders in the organization. While the IWW certainly had figures like Big Bill Haywood and Eugene Debs among its membership, members of the IWW saw themselves as on equal footing with those larger-than-life characters. Descriptions of the attempted landing of the *Verona* in Everett, Washington, demonstrate the aversion of the IWW to a leader-driven solidarity.¹⁶ The Wobbly workers were greeted by Sheriff McRae and numerous armed men. Refusing to allow the ship to land, McRae called out, asking who the Wobbly leader was. Walker Smith, IWW member and pamphleteer, recounts the answer, “Immediate and unmistakable was the answer from every IWW: ‘We are all leaders!’” (Smith, *The Voyage of the Verona*, 1965, p. 108). The idea that everybody could be a leader was an expression of the solidarity of the movement, but also suggests that IWW members saw each other as equally answerable for the movement. Leaders represent the authorship, or familial substance of a movement, to the extent that leaders define the movement. By eschewing leaders, the IWW rejected leadership as a familial substance.

¹⁶ On November 5, 1916, IWW members journeyed from Seattle to Everett, Washington, to engage in a free speech fight. When cities like Everett passed laws to prevent street speaking, IWW members would travel to the towns and intentionally violate the law with the intent of getting arrested. In this case, the Everett sheriff greeted the workers prior to the *Verona*'s docking with several armed men and refused to let the ship into port. While accounts conflict over how shots were fired, numerous shots rang from the port into the *Verona*. The trapped Wobblies were forced to dodge the bullets and many jumped from the ship into the ocean during the 10-15 minutes of gunfire. At least four Wobblies were killed and six went missing, likely drowned (Foner 1965).

Without leadership, solidarity meant equals sticking together, relying on each other to achieve a common goal. Roger Baldwin notes during an interview:

They had this sense of united action, of solidarity. They acted as a unit. The IWW was an amazing fraternity of very poorly organized working class men. They really had no center, no national office, no leadership. It ran on the voluntary instincts of people sticking together and using their power of quitting a job. (Baldwin, 1985, p. 150)

The language choice of Baldwin is interesting. The men were “poorly organized” yet they “acted as a unit.” Solidarity, as described by Baldwin, was an instinct of the workers, presumably derived from their shared substance in an industrial scene against a capitalist enemy.

In terms of Burkean, leadership represents familial substance. By not claiming a leader, the IWW rejected the familial-based solidarity of workers in favor of their status within their context as “working class” men. Quitting a job meant a rejection of their contextual placement within the industrial system. Throughout this chapter, I have shown how IWW members have rhetorically constructed their substance, as well as the rhetorical substance downplayed within the movement. The last section of this chapter looks to problems this idea of solidarity played within the movement.

The Limits of Geometric Substance

Appealing to the geometric substance of workers within the industrial context was one rhetorical device for constituting IWW members as solidary partners. This substance enabled the IWW to create a broad solidarity, one that would encompass all members of the working class. The dialectical substance of the IWW defined the limits of the geometric substance, but also enabled workers to define themselves against what they

were not. Each form of substance enabled the development of solidarity within the organization. However, by emphasizing the scenic placement of workers within the industrial context, a few problems were created for the movement as well. Indeed, the IWW suffered two schisms as a result of struggles over how solidarity ought to be defined within the organization. These problems centered around a struggle over how the contextual scene of workers was defined. The schisms took place in 1906 and 1908 and largely centered on whether the IWW ought to be constituted as an economic organization only, or both a political and economic organization. Furthermore, Socialist Party members fled the organization once it was clear the IWW defined its substance from an economic, but not political, lens.

One of the largest debates between members of the IWW was the question of whether political or direct action was the most effective means of achieving the class goals of the IWW. Numerous scholars (Brissenden 1920, Foner 1965, Dray 2010) have tied declines in IWW membership to divisions over this question, noting two major schisms in the organization's history. While this debate took place within the IWW, interestingly most of the literature distributed by the organization appears to be settled on the issue. That is to say the rhetoric of the organization largely made the argument that direct action was the driving force behind the movement.

Indeed, many of the organization's policies were designed in such a way to enable strong, effective direct action. For instance, the organization did not believe in signing contracts with employers. Contracts meant that workers could not engage in a general strike because contracts would expire at different times for different parts of an industry.

The IWW saw this as one of the key weaknesses of the AFL, arguing that contracts were a hindrance to solidarity. Without contracts, workers could strike at any time for higher wages or working conditions and maintain the element of surprise relative to employers. In his 1911 pamphlet “The General Strike,” Big Bill Haywood makes the argument for the necessity of direct action within the movement:

There are vote-getters and politicians who waste their time coming into a community where 90 percent of the men have no vote, where the women are disfranchised 100 percent and where the boys and girls under age, of course, are not enfranchised. Still they speak to these people about the power of the ballot, and they never mention a thing about the power of the general strike. They seem to lack the foresight, the penetration to interpret political power. (Haywood, 1965, p. 45)

Haywood critiques the AFL, arguing that the organization lacks the foresight to understand the general strike as a tool. Contracts and craft protectionism prevent the use of the general strike to force capitalists to meet the demands of labor as a class. As such, while the AFL might protect jobs, the IWW is necessary for a broad solidarity protecting the broad interests of the working class. In part, Haywood’s critique suggests the AFL is misinterpreting the scene of action. In other words, the general strike operates within the economic scene and thus represents the substantive power of the workers. Concentrating on the political field takes workers away from the source of their power.

Echoing Haywood, former IWW present Vincent St. John argues that the only means of achieving the goals of the labor movement is through economic, not political action:

A little investigation will prove to any worker that while the workers are divided on the industrial field it is not possible to unite them on any other field to advance a working class program. Further investigation will prove that with the working class divided on the industrial field, unity anywhere else—if it could be brought

about – would be without results. The workers would be without power to enforce any demands. The proposition, then, is to lay all stress in our agitation upon the essential point, that is upon the places of production, where the working class must unite in sufficient numbers before it will have the power to make itself felt anywhere else. (St. John, 1965, p. 43)

The debate over political and economic action has interesting implications for solidarity within movement. On the one hand, the debate reflects disagreement over the methods for achieving the telos of the movement, and whether the long-term or short-term objectives of the movement were more important. On the other hand, it points to the question of identification. How do workers most likely see themselves, as economic beings or as political beings? If workers see themselves in economic terms, then they would be more likely to identify with the IWW as an economic rather than political organization.

These questions point to disagreement about what the contextual scene means for the movement. The fragments above constitute the scene as an economic scene. Solidarity is built at the point of production, within an industrial, not political, field. Direct action is designed to challenge the industrial field; resistance functions to challenge the economic interests of employers. Within such a scene, political action is untenable, in large part because IWW members are constituted outside of the political field. Political action is the tool of the enemy, not the tool of the IWW. IWW member Helen Keller describes how political action is viewed while discussing why she joined the IWW:

I became an IWW because I found out the Socialist party was too slow. It is sinking into the political bog. It is almost, if not quite, impossible for the party to keep its revolutionary character so long as it occupies a place under the

government and seeks office under it. The government does not stand for the interests the Socialist party is supposed to represent. (Bindley, 1916)

Here again is a description of political action in terms of the scene in which it takes place. Political action is in a “bog.” To take political action places one “under the government.” Moreover, political action takes power from the worker and puts it in the hands of deceivers. A 1916 cartoon published in *Solidarity* shows a worker approaching a ballot box, which is set up like a travelling show. The box is labelled “The Great Hocus Pocus Game” and is controlled by a tuxedo clad man with a dollar sign on his shirt. The marionettes popping up from the box proclaim: “Vote your power into my hands. I’ll do your fighting for you. Vote and be saved.” Rejecting this message, the worker holds a rolled up paper with the headline “Demands legislated in the union hall.” This cartoon reflects the argument against political action. Such action confines the worker to the scene defined by the industrialist. It takes agency from the hands of workers and allows for their continued exploitation.

As noted above, the conflict between direct and political action led to two schisms within the IWW. The conflict affected not only the IWW, but also the Socialist Party. In 1908, the organization was divided in two, with the DeLeonite, or Socialist faction, taking up headquarters in Detroit, while the St. John-Trautmann-Haywood faction stayed in Chicago (Brissenden 1920). The Socialists advocated both political and economic action as points of identification within the movement, while the Chicago group rejected any political action. The Socialist Party went so far as to expel Trautmann and other members for advocating direct economic action (Foner 1965). In addition, the strained relationship between the IWW and the Socialist Party led to bitter disputes over whether

the goals of the labor movement could best be achieved by “boring from within” or “boring from without” (Foner 1965). In other words, Socialists argued the IWW ought not abandon the old labor unions represented by the AFL, but should work within the organization to create change. The IWW, at least the Chicago faction, thought working outside of the established unions, which had sold out labor politically, was the better route to achieving change. All of these issues reflect contention about the nature of the geometric context in which workers derive their substance as workers.

In Retrospect

This chapter has sought to explain the way Burkean substance can be used to explain the rhetorical construction of solidarity within the IWW. As was shown, the IWW rhetorically utilized its perception of workers’ geometric substance to build solidarity within the movement. This geometric substance enabled workers to identify with each other as members of the same scene, enabling solidarity within the movement. The solidarity constructed was a broad solidarity, emphasizing the contextual similarities of workers and their dialectical substance as different from the employing class. Other potential forms of substantive identification were downplayed in the movement to generate that broad solidarity.

This broad solidarity required clear dialectical division between the employing and working classes. This meant drawing distinct, essentialist lines between classes. This meant that potential allies to the organization were sometimes dialectically constructed as agons to the movement, preventing solidary relations. Furthermore, downplaying familial identifications may have hurt the movement in the long run, as essentialist

understandings of workers could not be sustained. For example, Foner (1965) notes the refusal of IWW workers to recognize nationalist identifications led to brutal government suppression during World War II that contributed to the fall of the IWW.

In Chapter 3, I examine the United Farm Workers organization, which built its solidarity largely through constructing the familial substance of workers, as well as appealing to workers' directional substance. These workers constituted a deep, rather than broad solidarity, though attempts to generate a broader solidarity were made.

Chapter 3: Familial and Directional Substance in the United Farm Workers

While the rhetorical fragments of the IWW constituted a dialectical and geometric substance tending toward a broad solidarity, Burke introduces two other forms of substance which can create identification between workers and motivate human action. These forms of substance are derivational, or familial, and directional substance. These forms of substance are found in the rhetorical fragments of a more recent movement, that of the United Farm Workers (UFW). While the IWW created a broad solidarity, the UFW primarily developed a localized and deep solidarity. In other words, the goal of the UFW was not the overthrow of the capitalist system by uniting all workers, but rather achieving dignity for the groups of workers laboring in agricultural fields.

The UFW was created in Delano in 1962 by Cesar Chavez. The organization was created as a result of Chavez's involvement in another labor organization called the Community Service Organization (CSO). Chavez was recruited into the CSO in 1952 by Fred Ross, who recognized in Chavez a passion for organization (Ferriss, 1997). By 1958, Chavez had worked his way up to executive director of the organization. In the 10 years Chavez engaged in organizational efforts with the CSO, he repeatedly attempted to get the organization to unite farm workers in California. As a farm worker himself, Chavez felt an affinity for these workers. However, his requests for the CSO to include farm workers were rebuffed, leading Chavez to quit the organization in 1962. Chavez

moved to Delano and started what is now called the United Farm Workers.¹⁷ Over the next 20 years, members of this organization would band together in solidarity to challenge the might of growers in California, Kansas, and Texas, among others. They engaged in strike actions against giant agricultural organizations such as DiGiorgio and Schenley. To do so, the organization rhetorically created a deep solidarity through appealing to, and constituting, the workers' familial and directional substance.

The Delano Grape Strike was the first major collective action engaged in by the UFW. Initially, Chavez moved to Delano with his family after quitting the Community Service Organization (CSO) with the intent of using the skills he acquired in the CSO to organize farm workers. The family moved to Delano in 1962 and began work organizing fieldworkers with the help of Dolores Huerta, intent on creating a social movement: "Rather than a traditional union, he envisioned a social movement – a crusade he later called '*el movimiento*' – that would inspire farm workers, the poorest of America's laborers, to organize themselves and change their lives" (Feriss & Sandoval, 1997, p. 65). Meister (1977) describes this effort as a grassroots campaign that appealed to the Mexican-American identifications of the workers: Chavez did "not march among them preaching the virtues of Samuel Gompers and trying to organize them as if they were so many Anglo plumbers. He trie[d] to build from within – to let his people organize themselves in their own way."

¹⁷ At the time, the organization was known as the National Farm Workers Association. For the sake of consistency, I refer to the organization as the United Farm Workers throughout.

Chavez waited patiently for the opportunity to engage in collective action, feeling that action should not be taken until the workers were ready. When Filipino workers, members of the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, went out on strike and sought solidarity from the UFW, Chavez did not yet feel the workers were ready for a strike, but the opportunity could not be overlooked. The rank-and-file members of the UFW were ready to strike, so Chavez heeded their wishes. The strike was to be one of the longest in American history.

In the 1970s, the UFW faced an external threat in the form of the Teamsters Union. The Teamsters waited until UFW contracts expired, then promptly signed “sweetheart” deals with growers. These sweetheart deals scaled back many of the concessions that had been won by the farm workers, from reducing wages to eliminating hiring halls¹⁸. Workers left the fields on strike, demanding they be represented by a union they had freely chosen, not one that had usurped their voice.

In the 1980s, the union engaged in a lengthy grape boycott in an attempt to eliminate dangerous pesticide use employed by growers. The UFW took the boycott to major retailers in the United States and Canada, as well as directly to consumers through documentary films such as *The Wrath of Grapes*. As such, the UFW built a sometimes successful movement that is still in the public eye today. This organization provides a fruitful case study for how substantiation contributes to the development of deep and broad forms of solidarity.

¹⁸ Hiring halls were places where growers would go to hire members of the UFW. Contracts with growers sometimes required hired workers come from these places.

In this chapter, I trace the contours of the derivational and directional substance found in the rhetorical fragments of the UFW. I begin with an overview of these two forms of substance as discussed by Kenneth Burke in *A Grammar of Motives*. Throughout my analysis, I develop four claims. First, the UFW can be distinguished from the IWW by appealing to the derivational substance of workers. Second, the UFW supplemented the derivational substance of the workers by appealing to their directional substance. The derivational and directional substance of workers contributed to a deep solidarity. Third, the UFW expanded their solidarity to include consumers and volunteers using directional substance, creating a broader, though not deeper, solidarity. Finally, the substantive identifications of the workers enabled solidarity within the UFW, but also created problems during the later years of the organization.

Burke's Familial and Directional Substance

As noted in the last chapter, geometric substance emphasizes placement of workers within a particular contextual scene. Dialectical substance is the overarching substance that operates within each of the other forms of substance discussed by Burke: enabling individuals to define themselves in terms of what they are not. The United Farm Workers provide a useful case study for examining two other forms of substance discussed by Burke, those of familial and directional substance.

Familial substance, according to Burke (1962), “stresses common ancestry in the strictly biological sense, as literal descent from maternal or paternal sources” (p. 29). The concept, however, operates more broadly for Burke to include the “spiritualized” notion of family, which includes people sharing the same nationality or beliefs. Burke notes,

“Most often, in such cases, there is the notion of some founder shared in common, or some covenant or constitution or historical act from which the consubstantiality of the group is derived” (p. 29). The familial substance of individuals thus refers to the common ancestry through which the characteristics of the individuals are derived.

Directional substance stresses “the sense of motivation from within” (p. 31). As opposed to familial substance, in which one might ask the question “Where are you from?” directional substance posits “Where are you going?” (p. 31). The directional, according to Burke (1962), is “embedded in the very word ‘motivation’” (p. 32). Sometimes, Burke notes, the directional represents “motivation from within” (p. 31). In this sense, direction represents a human drive for “locomotion” (p. 31). Burke identifies four forms directional substance might take. These include “motion as motive,” “movement as motive,” “emotion as motive,” and “moment as motive.” According to Burke, “Doctrines that reduce mental states to materialistic terms treat motion as motive. When an individual’s acts are referred to some larger curve, we get movement as motive” (p. 32). Within each form of directional substance, individuals’ substance is defined by where they are going, which can be either purposive or accidental. In terms of motion as motive, the material prescribes the course of action the individual must take. One could be said to be “going through the motions,” meaning one follows through with the requirements of her/his material condition. In this instance, the individual is moving directionally, though not purposively. One could also become a part of a general movement, as in joining a cause, in which that person’s substance is derived by following the direction of the movement. Movement as motive is often related to “enlistment in a

cause” which relates to “reason, motive, inducement” (p. 32). A cause thus provides the reason driving an individual to act. Situating the “driving force of human action in human passion” treats emotion as motive (p. 32). For instance, one might be say to be “moved.” Internal motivation situated within emotion drives the individual’s substance. Finally, in treating “moment as motive,” “such moments are directional in that, being led up to and away from, they summarize the foregoing and seminally contain the subsequent” (p. 32). One can imagine, for instance, the key moment in which the direction of one’s life is determined: Such a moment represents the substance on which that individual’s life is defined.

Both familial and directional substance play key roles in how solidarity is constituted within the UFW. To advance this argument, the rest of the chapter turns to analyzing the place of familial and directional substance within the organization. As in the previous chapter, I examined hundreds of rhetorical fragments created by the United Farm Workers. Some of these included editions of the UFW magazine *El Malcriado*,¹⁹ cartoons and songs of the organization, pamphlets, buttons, posters, the speeches of Cesar Chavez and writings by members of the UFW. These fragments create a vision of the UFW constituting solidarity primarily through appealing to the familial and directional substance of potential allies. Particularly, the UFW appealed to a broad familial substance at the level of humanity, as well as a deeper substance at the level of culture and leadership. Directional substance contributed at times to a deep solidarity, as members

¹⁹ *El Malcriado* translates to the “ill-behaved one,” specifically drawing allusion to an ill-behaved child.

saw themselves within the cause, at other times to a broad solidarity through moving those outside the organization's familial substance to act in solidarity.

Familial Substance in the United Farm Workers

Solidarity within the UFW was primarily built through the derivational, or familial, substance of the workers. This meant treating workers rhetorically as if they were part of a broad familial unit with shared ancestral roots. The UFW appealed to familial substance in different ways. First, they used individuals' status as humans as a point of familial solidarity. Second, they appealed to the familial substance of workers as part of a cultural group sharing Latino/a ancestry. The shared ancestry of this cultural group rhetorically constituted members of the UFW in solidarity. Third, the rhetorical fragments used the spiritual ancestry of the workers to constitute solidarity within the movement. The UFW also tied the derivational substance of the workers to a common leader in Cesar Chavez. As representative of the organization, members could be said to rhetorically derive their substance from that of their charismatic leader, in the same way that children derive characteristics substantially from parents.

The family metaphor was a strong and conscious tactic for building solidarity within the movement:

I think that is probably what is wrong with the trade union movement as it stands now. It is not community-based; it is not family-based. It is wrapped up in the heads, in the hands, and in the minds of some professionals. That is not what the union movement was made to be. It was made to be part of the community. As soon as it gets away from that, it is going to fail; it is going to get stale; it is going to get dry; and people are not going to come to the meetings. They are not going to plan anything because it is no longer part of life. It has disassociated itself from the heart of life, which is the family. (Drake, 1979)

As seen here, the family becomes the glue which holds the movement together, but also provides the motivation necessary for members of the movement to act in solidarity. To the extent that the members of the movement identify with each other as sharing a common familial substance, they are more likely to sacrifice for each other.

For the UFW, that sense of family is rooted in the derivational substance of humanity. In other words, the organization frequently speaks to the obligations of family as an indication of the humanness of individuals. This message is repeatedly emphasized by Chavez. In a 1972 speech, Chavez (2008) argues: “I am convinced that the truest act of courage, the strongest act of manliness is to sacrifice ourselves for others in a totally nonviolent struggle for justice. To be a man is to suffer for others. God help us to be men!” (p. 135). By acting in solidarity, workers acknowledge their common familial substance as derived from humanity, and, by extension, the source of humanity: God.²⁰ Sacrifice and suffering affirm the humanity of workers.

The derivational substance of movement members often contributes to a deep solidarity as noted above. However, when the derivational substance is referred to humanity, the fragments invite a broader solidarity. In other words, workers are able to see each other as derived from the same source, despite differences among them. In a 1967 speech, Chavez (2008b) notes “And we say that to help someone help themselves we have to look at him as a human being. And we cannot romanticize his race or his poverty if we are really going to deal with the problem and to help him as a human

²⁰ The use of spirituality as an extension of familial substance is covered in more detail later in this chapter.

being” (p. 31). Individuals’ status as human beings transcends their race or material conditions.

The guilt of the consumer was tactically used to encourage consumers to act in the interests of the workers, moving the consumers toward a shared familial substance with farm workers. Rhetorical appeals to the derivational substance of workers focused on their status as human beings. The UFW encouraged consumers to take responsibility for past treatment of the workers in order to promote this form of solidarity:

That was really the key—understanding that we are all responsible for the suffering of our brothers and sisters. Ultimately that developed into the fact that if you eat you are one of our constituency because we are going to boycott something you eat. So you have to organize all of humankind in the United States in order to win. You better plan on doing that for any battle you have coming down the pipe, whether it is J. P. Stephens workers or woodcutters in Mississippi or whatever. You better understand that poor workers in this society are where they are because way up here in Providence, we left them there. Or way back there in the 30s we wrote them out of the Wagner Act. We did something that locked them into that situation, so it’s all of our responsibility. Cesar was very good at going out and dragging the whole American public into the fray. (Drake, Jim Drake 1962–197)

Such appeals could lend toward a broad solidarity. As members of humanity, the fragments construct consumers as sharing the familial substance of workers, enabling a broad solidarity.

Stressing the derivational nature of identification within the UFW movement, workers see each other as family. By constituting workers within a common familial substance, workers were more likely to sacrifice for one another. This sense of duty and sacrifice is echoed in an essay by UFW member Susan Samuels Drake:

Consciously or not, Cesar encouraged coworkers to relate like family. The world’s citizens were his family. Until I met him, I thought I was the only one who felt so sensitively about the world community. And because permanent staff

and volunteers sensed a kind of familial tie with Cesar, we stayed loyal and involved through the more-than-12-hour days at the office.

Interestingly, working within the family metaphor for Samuels meant increased loyalty, but also a willingness to put more work into the movement. Strong familial identification prompts strong loyal action. Writing of Mother Jones, Tonn (1996) notes the potential influences constituting members within a familial substance might have on union members: “she defines membership in the union family, outlines its relationship to the larger world, and provides ground rules for its preservation, including the expectation that individual interests be subordinated to the needs of the group” (p. 419). Feeling a familial tie to Chavez contributes to a deeper solidarity by defining the roles of movement members and giving them something to sacrifice for.

While appealing to the humanity of workers constituted a derivational substance enabling a broad solidarity, the UFW also created a deep solidarity by appealing to the cultural, derivational substance of workers. Asserting that workers are the descendents of a common cultural background, originating from the same source, worked rhetorically to build a deep solidarity in the organization. As with other forms of solidarity, the UFW’s cultural derivational substance was rhetorically constructed. In fact, the substance of the workers was policed with rhetoric that suggested workers who betrayed the organization shed their cultural status (their derivational substance). In other words, standing in solidarity with the farm workers indicated an acceptance of the familial substance that constituted workers.

The Mexican culture was a key point of identification for the UFW. In part this meant using cultural symbols to appeal to the worker. The symbol of the eagle set across

the upside down Aztec pyramid, known as the Thunderbird, became one such symbol of Mexican culture that served as the flag of the movement. *El Malcriado* was the primary written advertising tool for the movement, invoking the image of an ill-behaved child. The magazine was published every other week in both Spanish and English. Representations of the worker were also Mexican representations, including the image of Don Sotaco.

The UFW's rhetoric as also filled with references to, and images of, important historical figures representing Mexican culture, thus creating a sense of familial substance. These cultural icons included Emiliano Zapata, Adelita, and Muchachito. The rhetorical fragments tell the story of these heroes, then draw substantial connections between them and farm workers. Of Emiliano Zapata, *El Malcriado* writes:

Today, here in the San Joaquin Valley of California, in February 1966 men of valor confront the enemy, and they sometimes win, and they sometimes lose. Men go on strike because they dare to fight, to resist until the very end. They are the sons of Emiliano Zapata. But there are others. Every time a man turns his back on the truth, every time a man tells lies or uses deceit to help himself, every time he sells out his brothers, every time he shows himself to be a coward, Zapata is killed once again by the hand of a traitor. (Emiliano Zapata, 1966, p. 2)

Those who display valor are thus the *sons* of Zapata. Those who turn their back on that heritage are not only traitors to the cause, but murderers of Zapata (because they kill his legacy). By refusing to join the UFW, one denies one's cultural heritage, in effect performing violence against that which allowed one to exist. As the "sons of Zapata," workers derive their substance familiarly from the hero. Denying that substance means workers deny their own substance, doing violence against Zapata and themselves.

Appealing to the cultural heritage as a point of identification allowed members of the movement to name themselves, to give a positive assertion of identity outside of the discourse of the growers and dominant media:

We are the children of Muchachito²¹, and whether they call us “Mex,” “Flip,” “Nigger,” “Okie” doesn’t matter. To the white ranchers we are the faceless, nameless, hopeless people who do the work, and live poor, ignorant, and quiet, that’s all... This year, perhaps, in the midst of our struggle, at the height of our strength, we will give a name to the sick Indian child who has waited so long. (The Children of "Muchachito", 1966, p. 2)

The derivational substance of the workers enabled them to name themselves, to no longer see through the lens provided by the growers. The source of the workers’ substance further works to expand the people with whom solidarity can be developed, allowing the organization to bridge potential cultural differences through a common derivational substance. In naming the child, workers name themselves as sharing a common substance.

The rhetoric of the movement attempted to tie being Mexican with membership in the movement. To be a good, true, or authentic Mexican meant that one must identify with the movement. Here, for the most part, one’s identity as “Mexican” is rhetorically constructed. Indeed, when Mexicans do not join the movement, they are viewed with shame as this letter to the editor of *El Malcriado* demonstrates:

Dear Editor:

This morning I learned that a group of strike-breakers was breaking the strike on the Martin Ranch near Earlimart. What shame I felt when I found out they were

²¹ Muchachito refers to a story about an Indian boy who grew up without a name. The name was given to Muchachito as he was dying.

Mexicans – and even more, when I learned that they were from here in my own town of Visalia!

I assure you that I would die a thousand times before betraying my fellow farm workers. I hope the Valdivia repents of the evil he is doing before he is drowned by his conscience. I pledge my full cooperation to all the strikers.

Viva La Causa
Pedro Flores Guia (Guia, 1965, p. 11)

Refusing to join the movement is more than a betrayal of class, it is a race betrayal. This contrasts with the notion of betrayal seen in the IWW. Within the IWW, betrayal occurred at the class level as a denial of the geometric substance of workers. The UFW treated such betrayal as a denial of the workers' familial substance.

Such a race betrayal saw frequent condemnation in the pages of the UFW's paper. One story in Issue 24 tells of four people that denounced the Delano Grape Strike. The paper writes, "None of them are farm workers. It is our shame that all of them are Mexicans. We respectfully ask that they do not refer to themselves in the future as Mexicans, because we do not wish to dishonor our people" (New Fraud: Growers say Mexican Groups Support Them, 1965, p. 4). The repeated message is that one can only call oneself a Mexican if s/he identifies with the plight of the farm worker and believes in the cause of the strike. Additionally, to be a Mexican means to share in both the faults and successes of fellow Mexicans. As such, the actions of one member of the family reflect on all members of the family. The shameful action of one Mexican brings shame to all by virtue of their shared familial substance.

The cultural identity asserted within the UFW was also a spiritual assertion. That is to say, to be a member of the movement meant endorsing particular religious values

and beliefs within the movement. Whereas the IWW worked hard to divorce or reframe religion in the industrial unionist movement, the UFW embraced religion and actively incorporated religious rituals within the movement.

Religion was one element constituting the familial substance of the farm workers. Richardson (1968) notes the place religion occupies in shaping the familial substance of movement members:

How can he explain religion's dominance in his movement, the penchant for hearing mass in the city parks and in fields and beside picket lines, this strange willingness to fast for nonviolence and to pray in public? How can all of that be fitted in with prevailing notions of trade unions, and what they are like, and of churches and what they are about? How can it be explained in a society where religion *is* used, where it is brought out of the churches to be used at fund-raising dinners and political conventions? Cesar doesn't explain. Challenged on the point, asked to justify to the skeptical the presence of religion in his movement, he only says, "They don't understand our people. Religion is a part of our people."

This passage reveals that religion was less a tool of the movement, but more an assertion of the familial substance of its members. Religion thus shaped the way in which movement members identified with each other and with their cause. Interestingly, Issue 36 of *El Malcriado* (The Children of "Muchachito," 1966) describes Delano, the birthplace of the farm worker movement, as "the cradle of Christianity."

The most obvious religious ritual in the movement was the *peregracion* undertaken from Delano to Sacramento. The 300-mile pilgrimage started in Delano and ended at the cathedral in Sacramento. Marchers carried the Virgin of Guadalupe on their shoulders throughout the trip and timed the conclusion of the trip for Easter. Again, one's spirituality or status as an authentic Christian was tied to one's participation in the movement, "Farm workers are revolutionaries as are all true Christians" (Farm Workers

Pilgrimage, 1966). The march was billed as one of reflection and penance, “so that the justice of their cause will be purified of all lesser motivations” (Farm Workers Pilgrimage, 1966). Marchers reflected on their own sins in carrying out the movement, but also prayed for forgiveness of the growers for their actions. The *peregrinacion* was described in the Plan of Delano “as a witness to the suffering we have seen for generations:”

The Penance we accept symbolizes the suffering we shall have in order to bring justice to these same towns, to this same valley. The Pilgrimage we make symbolizes the long historical road we have travelled in this Valley alone, and the long road we have yet to travel, with much penance, in order to bring about the Revolution we need... (The Plan of Delano, 1966, p. 12)

The followers of the movement are rhetorically constructed as religious converts, their mission as an extension of Christ’s mission. As Nelson notes:

Meanwhile the roving bands of pickets continue to scour the fields, huge groups roam the countryside, ranging in number from twenty to a hundred pickets. It is a proud sight to come upon them with their great banner waving behind in the breeze, like armies of the Lord converting the misguided to the path of right thinking; and it is even a prouder sight to see their converts come streaming out of the fields to join them and be welcomed by the embrace of truth and salvation.(p. 71)

The imagery here resembles that of Christian crusaders headed to battle to challenge Saladin. They are a religious “army” in seek of the converts. The way of the strike is the way of “truth and salvation.” In contrast with the IWW, the farm workers appropriate Christianity as a source of consubstantiality, rather than attempting to reframe Christianity within a different substantive frame.

Such rituals reflect the derivational substance of workers, leading to God as a source of the familial substance of workers. Burke (1962) notes, “The stress upon the

informative nature of beginnings can in turn lead us to treat christenings, inaugurations, and the like as aspects of familial substance” (p. 30). The *peregranacion* is a ritual that reflects the familial substance of the workers in the same way that a christening announces the substance of individuals as familially derived from the founder, from God.

The UFW even extended its appeals to spiritual values to consumers, with whom the UFW sought to generate support for a boycott of table grapes. Boycott literature demonstrates these spiritual appeals, as the story of Moses is used to justify the actions of the farm workers and generate support:

God called a strike once. When the Lord led Israel out of Egypt, He halted the system of labor that built Pharoah’s pyramids. And when the Children of Israel were led into the new land, their prophets commanded a just life and decent wages for the worker’s in the fields. And all this was done in God’s name... The essence of Judeo-Christian charity is helping others to help themselves, and this is what the farm workers are asking of you... This is when your faith is put to the test. It’s not an easy thing to do, taking abstract principles and putting them into practice. But if you believe that we are all our brother’s keepers, then this is the time to prove it.

Attempting to generate solidarity based on a moral stance had practical implications for the movement. The primary tactic of the UFW was nonviolence. The practice of nonviolence was taught to every potential movement leader. Chavez himself sometimes approached picketers for whom violence might be tempting and reminded them of the nonviolent goals of the movement. His ultimate commitment to nonviolence is revealed in his fasts, which were conducted in part to keep movement members committed to the nonviolent tactics of the movement (see below).

Nonviolence creates greater identification with the movement through a shared moral substance. As Nelson (1966) notes, “we have seen with our own eyes that non-

violence not only is moral but that it works, we have seen the growers' own violence backfire upon them with disastrous effects, and we know that our approach is the only correct one" (p. 73). The nonviolence of the workers created a stark contrast with the violence of the growers, who employed numerous violent tactics ranging from attempting to run over picketers, to spraying picketers with chemicals, to physical attacks on strikers. Often when those tactics were employed, workers in the fields decided to join the striking workers. The mistreatment of picketers would also help generate sympathy with the general public, who held power as consumers over the growers. The rituals used to sustain nonviolence, such as the fast, call to mind the derivational substance of workers, extended to consumers. To the extent that individuals' substance is found in their spirituality, the characteristics they embody reflect that constitution. In other words, individuals can be expected to derive their behaviors from those of their familial source.

At times, the UFW challenged the religious substance of the growers, suggesting their behavior denied their religious substance. *El Malcriado* articulates this in a conflict with the Christian Brothers winery in 1967. The editorial (United Farm Workers, 1967) begins by asserting, "The farm workers striking for a decent living and social justice are a religious people." Then the article notes the farm workers are "confused" because they were being forced into a national boycott of Christian Brothers. The bulk of the article makes an argument for how religious substance was defined by three popes and why the Christian Brothers failed to live up to that substance in their treatment of farm workers.

So far, I have demonstrated how the familial substance of the UFW is rhetorically created to generate solidarity among members and across a broader spectrum of the

public by appealing to the cultural and spiritual foundations of individuals. As such, the derivational source of workers' substance has been found in the individuals' status as humans sharing particular cultural and religious foundations. One final construction of familial substance is found in the personage of Cesar Chavez himself. In their constructions of Chavez as the founder of the movement, the UFW held him as a source of the familial substance of workers. In other words, Chavez represents the substance of workers and stands as the representative through which workers constituted their own sense of substance for themselves and the movement.

UFW members were conscious that Cesar Chavez was the leader of the movement. Members within the movement looked to Chavez for guidance, as well as to lend the movement symbolic credibility. *El Malcriado* Number 33 notes the motivations behind the *peregranacion*, arguing that religious, cultural, and movement-driven motivations were present; but also that people came because Chavez was the leader, "a handsome, funny gentleman whom they talked about almost as if he were holy" (Hoppe, 1966, p. 3). By referring to Chavez as potentially "holy," he is constructed as a sort of religious leader in the tradition of Moses and Jesus Christ. As such, Chavez can be expected to constitute the familial substance of workers to the extent he reflects the substance derived from God.

The rhetoric suggests that having a leader is part of the victory plan of the movement. Having a leader gives the workers somebody to rally behind who will protect their interests:

It is simple. If one worker demanded more money, the grower would fire him and hire another man, a little more hungry, to work for the low wage. But if hundreds of workers get together behind one leader the leader can say “We will all quit and no one will pick your crop until you pay a decent wage.” There would be no harvest without the workers to pick the crop. The growers depend on us, and this is our strength. Working together so that all will benefit, this is our strategy, this is a union. (What is a Union?, 1965, p. 13)

The leader thus functions as the voice of the movement, as the representative of the collective will of the individuals. The strength is in the unity of the movement represented by the leader. The leader functions effectively as the voice of the movement through sharing the familial substance of movement members. The leader is also the rhetorical representation of the obligations engendered by that substance. In sharing one voice, the leader and the movement members share one substance. The choices of the movement members derive from those of the leader.

Through identification with Chavez, the workers received guidance through *La Causa*, as well as spiritual guidance. This is demonstrated through Chavez’s commitment to nonviolent action. Chavez went on a series of hunger strikes, the longest lasting 25 days, demonstrating his commitment to nonviolence, demonstrating his hold over the movement, and teaching a spiritual lesson to the workers. In the first case, the fasts showed workers the strength of his conviction to nonviolent action with the desire of that conviction spreading to the rest of the workers. In the second, he assumed the symbolic role of movement leader, taking a symbolic action that the workers were not expected to reciprocate. Third, the fasts provided spiritual guidance through physically demonstrating the value of self sacrifice. As such, the fasts cemented Chavez as the founder of the movement, the fount from which the substance of workers was derived. By taking on the

role of teacher, movement members could better understand the familial substance they held.

Ultimately, the fasts demonstrated the solidarity of Chavez with the farm workers.

In a speech March 10, 1968, given as part of a mass breaking the 25-day fast, Chavez discusses the symbolic significance of the fast:

The fast has had different meanings for different people. Some of you may still wonder about its meaning and importance. It was not intended as a pressure against any growers. For that reason we have suspended negotiations and arbitration proceedings and relaxed the militant picketing and boycotting of the strike during this period. I undertook the fast because my heart was filled with grief and pain for the sufferings of farm workers. The fast was first for me and then for all of us in this union. It was a fast for nonviolence and call to sacrifice. When we are really honest with ourselves we must admit that our lives are all that really belong to us. So it is how we use our lives that determines what kind of men we are. It is my deepest belief that only by giving our lives do we find life. I am convinced that the truest act of courage, the strongest act of manliness is to sacrifice ourselves for others in a totally nonviolent struggle for justice. To be a man is to suffer for others. God help us to be men!

In this brief speech, Chavez provides a clear sense of his understanding of solidarity within the movement. Solidarity is sacrificing for others. One's identity is tied to this notion of self-sacrifice: it is key to becoming human. Such self-sacrifice brings an individual closer to the pain of the collective group. Through doing so, the leader becomes substantial with the workers. The fasts enable a creative assertion of the substance of the UFW. In other words, the fast allows Chavez to assert the identity of the movement. Support for the fast represents the consubstantiality of workers with Chavez as the movement leader.

This view of Chavez as the leader representative of the movement is revealed in the writings of movement members. Francisco Garcia introduced a "corrido" or ballad

expressing his view of the strike in Salinas and the role of Chavez as leader of the movement. Garcia wrote:

It was in the year of '70/Already everyone knows/That the struggle was won/By our great Cesar Chavez/The leader who always fights/For equal rights./It is in famous Delano/Where this cause began./This was a few years ago,/But the time came/That he should be victorious/The triumph has already been one./To the cry of "Long Live Chavez!" /All of the people become heartened/Upon initiating a march/In the Salinas Valley/To the struggle for the rights/Of our people who were sold out./Upon hearing the news/The neighboring towns also/Joined the farm workers/Especially the Latinos/But there were people of all races/Boys and girls marching. (Garcia, 1970, p. 9)

Interestingly, Chavez is given the credit for the triumphs of the farm workers. The success of the movement is invested in the man, as is the spread of the movement to the neighboring towns.²² Furthermore, that people of all races joined suggests a broader familial substance rooted in Chavez as leader of the movement. Chavez becomes the rallying point, the source of the substance of the movement. Chavez is seen as the leader of the movement by virtue of the example he sets as well. Organizer Barbara Ortiz notes:

Cesar asked so much of us, but it was impossible to turn him down because no matter how hard we worked, he worked harder. He pushed himself more and demanded more of himself than he did of others. And whenever he smiled, gave you that look, and reminded you how important the mission, no matter how tired you were, you couldn't say no to the opportunity or the challenge of the moment. (Ortiz)

By working alongside the other workers, even putting in harder work, Chavez spawns identification with the movement and himself as the representative of the movement. The

²² Sowards (2010) discusses the gendered implications of portrayals of Chavez as leader of the movement. Writing of the rhetoric of Dolores Huerta, Sowards suggests within scholarship Chavez sometimes receives credit for work done by Huerta within the movement. Constituting Chavez as the singular movement leader further reflects patriarchal tendencies within the movement. Sowards argues, "In short, Mexican-American women were socially prohibited or discouraged from challenging men's authority, participating in leadership roles, pursuing higher education, and acting or speaking outside of the home" (p. 229). Despite this, women like Huerta were outspoken and influential members of the movement.

value of the movement is seen through the commitment of the leadership to it. The inability to refuse the mission of the leader reflects identification of members with its leaders.

In order to create solidarity, union organizers, even the leadership, needed to rhetorically construct themselves as the same as the workers they were trying to organize.

One method for doing so was to accept a common pay rate for organization efforts:

Learning that a UFW volunteer earned just five bucks a week plus room and board was a big deal for me. What can you buy for five bucks? One reason for the five-buck-a-week plan was to eliminate jealousy among the volunteers about pay; this was a system that was used to weed out the opportunists who might want to take advantage of the union and the farm workers. Also in those days, there really was not enough money coming into the union as dues to warrant any substantial wages for anybody. The union was operated strictly on donations from the general public. During that time, even Cesar was on the five-bucks-a-week plan. (Huerta)

This pay scale meant that both workers and organizers were on the same pay scale, allowing them to see each other as equals. The leader was not above the worker. Rather the leader represented the common familial substance shared with workers. The leader, through self-sacrifice, inhabits the substance workers identify with, building the values of the familial substance they share.

Thus far, I have highlighted the rhetorical construction of familial substance within the UFW. This substance has operated to create both deep and broad solidarity within the UFW. Broad solidarity derives from the common humanity of workers, as well as points of identification that can reach broader audiences such as a shared spiritual substance. Deep solidarity operates when workers can see themselves as substantially similar in terms of a common culture, spiritual influences, and identification with the leader of the organization. The familial substance demonstrated within these fragments is

quite important. However, of equal importance is the directional substance articulated within the movement. The rhetorical fragments of the UFW also work to constitute workers as part of a movement or cause. Creating this common cause constituted these workers in solidarity.

Directional Substance in the United Farm Workers

As noted earlier in the chapter, directional substance treats human motives in terms of where one is going. When individual motives are either accidentally or purposefully directed, then they might be said to have directional substance. Motion, movement, emotion, and moment each play a role in the directional substance of individuals, such that their substance becomes part of a larger curve. Directional substance contributes to a broad solidarity by constituting members together across subjectivities. The strength of identification with the movement could contribute to a deeper solidarity. The rhetorical fragments of the UFW established a common direction for members of the organization. This direction was reflected in the slogans that dominated the rhetoric of the organization, including appeals to *La Huelga*, *La Causa*, and *El Movimiento*.²³ More than simply giving workers a direction, however, the UFW constituted workers as substantial with the direction of the organization. In other words, workers *became* the directional substance appealed to within the organization. The identity of the workers was defined directionally within the movement.

From the early stages of the UFW, farm workers were constituted as members of a movement. Issues of *El Malcriado* teach farm workers what their responsibilities are

²³ Translated as “The Strike,” “The Cause,” and “The Movement.”

relative to their status as a movement, specifically highlighting the necessity of sacrifice and unity:

What is a movement? It is when there are enough people with one idea so that their actions are together like a huge wave of water which nothing can stop. It is when a group of people begin to care enough so that they are willing to make sacrifices. (What is a Movement?, 1965, p. 19)

Making sacrifices thus enabled members within the movement to operate as one, an unstoppable force of nature. The movement, according to this fragment, is the people. The people share a common substance represented by a common ideal. The ideal drives the direction of the movement; the people become the directional substance of the movement. The idea of movement members moving as an unstoppable wave of water suggests the members are constituted directionally as one consubstantial force. Issue 26 of *El Malcriado* gives a deeper sense of what the movement should look like to the worker:

What is the movement? It is a direct person-to-person response to injustice. It is an immediate courageous reaction against lies and dishonesty. It is the idea that a man's dignity is more important than anything else. It is the hope that because of our struggle now, our children's lives will have meaning tomorrow. (Because of Our Struggle Now, 1965, p. 2)

The movement is forward looking; it works for a better tomorrow. However, the movement also looks to the past. The past enables the worker to see what the lack of movement has cost, largely dignity, and what it requires from the worker: courageous action. As such, the movement is the direction from the past of the worker to the future. The movement is constituted by the actions of the people within the movement, their shared sense of direction toward tomorrow.

The feeling of being a part of a movement creates strong identification for the workers. The movement itself creates a feeling of being a part of something bigger than oneself, of contributing to the shaping of the future. In Burkean terms, the movement functions as motive. The directional substance of workers is shaped within the larger curve of the movement's cause. This powerful feeling of identification with the movement is articulated in Eugene Nelson's (1966) book Huelga, a book that was heavily advertised in the early stages of the UFW movement. The power of being a part of a movement is described:

We sweep through the warm early morning countryside—eight-thirty by now—and there is a very good feeling in the air, a feeling of vast surging movement, of healthy ferment like the ferment of grapes, a heady wine of victory mingled with visions of a bright new future for all these people. Other people back there in the town are just getting to work, and we already have set giant wheels of progress in motion, have tampered with the ancient bogged-down mechanism of the whole valley, removed broken parts, oiled its bearings, begun the vast overhaul job that had to be done. We pass more Huelga signs, more people streaming out of a field, exchange more shouts of victory, and: this is something new in strikes we suddenly realize as our mobile striking force moves along— we are in on something like a revolution in the farm labor movement. (p. 12)

In being swept up within the momentum of the strike, setting the “wheels of progress in motion,” workers become a part of the direction of the movement. They become a surge, a “striking force,” identified with the possibility of the future. The directional substance of the workers is integral to their identity with the movement. The victory shouts speak further to the passions of members, moving them from emotion and tying their substance to the articulation of a moment.

In embodying directional substance, the workers do more than act in a particular direction. Rather, they become. They become the direction of the movement. In other

words, the direction of the movement defines its members; they are where they go. The rhetorical fragments of the UFW constitute the workers as the directional substance of the movement, particularly with regard to the strike action of workers. Indeed, striking workers were sometimes referred to a “Huelgistas,” reflecting that they not only engaged in strikes, but also that they became the strike.

Huelga was a primary symbol for the movement, sometimes functioning as a battle cry, but also as a representation of the workers. In fact, the FBI file on Cesar Chavez included the accusation that Huelga had a more revolutionary meaning than “strike.” In a memorandum discussing the investigation of possible communist activities within the UFW (and particularly of vice-president Dolores Huerta), which was dated October 15, 1965, the broader meaning of “Huelga” is postulated:

(Name omitted) related the picture of Delores Huerta ... The picture shows Delores Huerta holding up a sign “Huelga.” (Name omitted) stated he has been told the word “Huelga” means “strike” but Chavez told him it means more to the Mexican farm workers. (Name omitted) said one individual told him the word means “revolt” to some Mexicans. (Bureau translator (Name omitted) advises the word “Huelga” means “strike” or “to leave the place vacant” or “to get out.” (Jones, 1965)

The memo reveals uneasiness with the term “Huelga” as a powerful point of identification for the farm workers, not unlike “jihad” today.²⁴ This memo also suggests that Huelga has multiple meanings, many of which relate to the directional substance of the UFW.

²⁴ In other words, from the perspective of the FBI, representing what Bowers & Ochs (1971) call “control,” the term “Huelga” becomes a rhetorical device for constituting workers as dangerous. Like the term “jihad” today, the meaning of “Huelga” for movement members is perverted, giving it more revolutionary meaning.

The term encapsulates not only the action of the strike, but also the power of the movement. It represents the identity of the workers within the movement: “The Huelga is a huge social movement involving the respect of a whole race of people... The Huelga has become everybody’s business. That is why it is winning” (United Farm Workers, 1965). The Huelga thus represents the directional substance of workers. The Huelga constitutes the direction of United Farm Workers. However, it is also more meaningful because it constitutes the substance of the workers.

Indeed the workers are encouraged to see themselves in the Huelga, as *El Malcriado* No. 34 states: “We are the strike” (Violence, 1966, p. 8). Picketers hold signs stating “I picket, therefore I am” (Nelson, 1966, p. 17). In that assertion lies the substantive identification of the movement. To become the strike is to be consubstantial with it. Workers become the action they are taking. As such, their substance becomes referred to the larger curve represented by the movement. Huelga represents the direction of the movement, in becoming that direction workers’ substance is constituted directionally.

David Havens (Havens) wrote of the strength of the cause itself to generate the solidarity of potential members:

Life has taught us that the one factor that always proves successful is finding individuals who are committed to a cause. You can’t train them; you can only spot them and turn them loose. Largely self-selected and self-motivated, they need only to be pointed in the right direction. They will make it happen.

Huelga functions to provide that cause for workers, offering them the right direction. The cause constitutes the commitment of the movement members. Individuals committed to a cause are so because their substance is tied to the cause. In becoming consubstantial with

the cause, workers inhabit their directional substance. Nelson (1966) notes that Huelga comes to stand as a symbol for the solidarity of the movement:

When the strike began last September “Huelga” meant only that: “Strike.” But something has happened along the way; “Huelga” has come to mean something more than “Strike”; it has come to mean cooperation, brotherhood, Love. The brotherly love of men working for a single high ideal; the healthy self-love of men fulfilling the dictates of their consciences. In Delano a new spirit is emerging, a spirit that may sweep over the earth, the spirit of brother-help-brother instead of dog-eat-dog. The growers or no one else can resist the spirit. (p. 99)

Huelga represents the fraternity of the movement, the spirit of self-sacrifice shared by movement members. Huelga thus represents the substantive, directional, point of identification for members of the movement. The spirit of “brother-help-brother” denotes a familial substance, which, when tied to the directional substance of the movement creates deeper solidary identification.

The direction of La Causa toward justice for farm workers attracted people to the movement, who may not have shared the derivational substance of the workers. This included people who were not farm workers and often did not even speak Spanish. Solidarity with these individuals was tied to a commitment to the direction of the movement. Volunteer Donna Kornberg recounts her participation in the UFW organization:

Most of the *gusanos*²⁵ spoke no English, and most of the non-farm worker volunteers spoke no Spanish, so, looking back, our role was pretty much limited to attracting attention and making up numbers to look as if there were more strikers than there were. It was exciting at first, but after a few weekends, it became fairly routine and tedious. We continued, however, as we believed that *La Causa*, once successful (and we had no doubt of its ultimate success) would establish justice for hard-working farm workers. (Kornberg)

²⁵ Gusano is a derogatory term used to refer to strike-breakers meaning “worm.”

As a non-Spanish speaking volunteer, Kornberg lacked the derivational substance of workers. However, the direction toward justice held volunteers like Kornberg in solidarity with members of the UFW. Belief in the ultimate direction of the movement allowed for a broader solidarity than a derivational solidarity tied to the cultural and spiritual roots of the farm workers. The movement toward justice constituted workers and non-workers together, bridging differences within the familial substance of the individuals. Workers and non-workers could thus see each other in similar terms because they shared common cause.

As noted earlier, emotion functions as a motive of directional substance. The appeal to justice for farm workers helped to constitute volunteers who did not share the geometric substance of the workers. Sandy Sample embodies this direction from emotion: “I was naive, eager, and ripe to become impassioned, so when Chris interviewed me and invited me to join in ministry with farm workers for the summer, I jumped at the chance” (Sample). That Sample was looking “to become impassioned” demonstrates the movement toward emotion constitutes the substance of Sample, driving her to act in solidarity with the farm workers. Sample further notes that as an “Anglo” from the middle class, the words of Chavez “fed my emerging passion.” The emerging passion enables Sample to constitute herself as part of the movement.

The UFW tried to create allegiances with people outside of the immediate farm worker context. Organizers were sent across the United States and in to Canada to encourage consumers to boycott table grapes. These consumers did not share the geometric substance of workers, living outside the context of the farm workers, though

they might have shared some derivational substance from the spiritual perspective.

Primarily, however, consumers were constructed as outsiders to the UFW.

The rhetoric of the movement indicates that while consumers were seen as an integral part of the success of the movement, they did not share the deep derivational substance of the farm workers. Largely, the strategy of the UFW was not to encourage the American public to see themselves as members of the movement itself. As one advertisement directed toward consumers notes, “They don’t want you to build their union for them; this they have already done themselves.” Thus, to join the boycott was to act in sympathy with the farm workers without having to share the derivational substance of the UFW.

Rather, the UFW attempted to get consumers to identify with the directional substance of the farm workers, thus encouraging consumers to see the injustice represented by the living and working conditions of the farm workers. They note a variety of conditions, including the use of labor contractors, “man-killing pesticides,” and the lack of medical benefits. They note growers signing sweetheart deals with the Teamsters union without an open election of the farm workers. These appeals are designed to spark the indignation of the consumer and generate support. As one advertisement pleads, “If you are sickened by this attempt to return farm workers to the status of cattle, then the worker’s cause is not lost.” This substance is directional from the perspective of emotion as direction. To be sickened is to be moved. Recognizing this directional substance provides the means for solidarity with workers. Such an attempt to

generate identification with the dehumanization of the farm worker allows consumers outside of the movement to still recognize its importance.

As I have demonstrated, familial and directional substance was constructed through the rhetorical fragments of the UFW. These forms of substance constituted sometimes deep and sometimes broad solidarity within the organization, allowing the farm workers to see themselves in terms of each other and sacrifice for each other, while also drawing allies to the movement. The familial, directional, and geometric substance of movement members, as noted in Chapter 2, are often constructed within a dialectical substance. That is to say, the dialectical substance of movement members is informed and shaped by the other forms of substance which Burke discussed. As such, it is important to examine the way in which the dialectical substance of the UFW is framed.

Dialectical Substance in the United Farm Workers

The dialectical substance of the UFW is framed within the directional and familial substance of the organization. The farm workers still construct members of the movement against those outside of the movement. In doing so, the UFW also attempt to rhetorically show how those outside of the organization lack the familial and directional substance of the movement members. As discussed earlier in the chapter, familial substance occurs at a few different levels: the level of humanity, the level of the cultural and spiritual, and the level of the leader. As such, dialectical oppositions within the organization place nonmembers outside of these substances. The dialectical substance of workers is thus subordinated to, or rather shaped by, the familial and derivational substance of members.

In some ways, this differs from the IWW in which the dialectical substance of members shapes their geometric substance.

One way in which the rhetorical fragments construct nonmembers as lacking in familial substance is to deny their humanity. Nonmembers are dehumanized, thus placing them outside the scope of solidarity. Frequently, the UFW drew from past rhetorical artifacts to support their movement. For instance, the “scab” remains a key symbol of the farm worker movement, as it was used by the IWW and other groups historically. Jack London’s “Definition of a Scab” was frequently distributed and read aloud during the movement, both in English and Spanish. London’s prose labels the strikebreaker the “awful substance” left over after God made the rattlesnake, the toad, and the vampire: “a strikebreaker is a two-legged animal with a cork-screw soul, a water-logged brain, and a combination backbone made of jelly and glue. Where others have hearts, he carries a tumor of rotten principles” (Definition of a Scab, 1965, p. 11). Such a description of the strikebreaker is frequent in the rhetoric of the movement, the reading of which even led to the arrest of Reverend Dave Havens.²⁶ This description functions to dehumanize the strike-breaker. The description not only considers the strike-breaker as an animal or vampire, but also suggests the strike-breaker lacks human qualities, such as backbone or heart. Invoking this prose thus creates a dialectic between the worker and the strike-breaker.

²⁶ Havens wrote of the arrest, “The arresting policeman wanted to arrest the Jack London fellow also, but became resigned when I told him Jack London was dead. We were harassed, but we persisted and grew.”

Strike-breakers are also described as lacking the spiritual substance of the workers. More than that, the strike-breaker betrays the spiritual values of the worker. The strikebreaker is a Judas Iscariot, a traitor, an individual who denies her/his derivational substance, or identity. Within the UFW, the strike-breaker is named, in Spanish, an *esquirol*. *Esquiroles* deny their familial substance.

As betrayers of the movement, the *esquirol* is publically shamed. Pictures of *esquirols* dot the pages of *El Malcriado*, replete with captions that demand their shame. Indeed, one issue even included a “Name that scab” contest, offering a cash prize to readers who could identify a pictured scab (Name that Scab, 1965). The magazine describes the scab as representative of what the movement is not:

A “scab” is to his trade what a traitor is to his country. He is the first to take advantage of any benefit secured by united action, and never contribute: anything toward its achievement. He is used during a struggle to defeat his fellow-workmen, and though coddled for the time being by his employer he serves, when peace is restored he is cast out, shunned by his employer, his fellow-workmen, and the whole human family. (Scab, 1965, p. 6)

The scab plays both sides of the conflict between worker and grower. He capitalizes on gains of workers who demonstrate their consubstantiality, but fails to take action to assist in their efforts. He is willing to sacrifice the long-term goals of the movement for the sake of short-term gains. As such, the scab sells out his family. The scab betrays the familial substance of the worker, losing out on the benefits a familial consubstantiality can provide, leaving the scab ostracized by both the employer and the worker.

Nelson’s *Huelga* tells the story of Maximo Martinez, an *esquirol* who refused to leave the fields. Approached by Nelson, the Martinez spouse informs him that they

cannot leave the fields because they are in debt and cannot afford to do so. Nelson's pleadings fall on deaf ears, so Nelson threatens to organize a picket at the Martinez house. The strikers do, drawing nearly 1,000 people to the strike-breaker's neighborhood, with picketers holding signs indicating "A scab lives here." This sort of public shaming of the strikebreaker, directly labeling the strikebreaker as a betrayer, was common within the UFW.

The UFW substance is also constituted in contrast with that of growers. Don Sotaco, his counterpart Don Coyote, and the grower represent the dialectical substance within the United Farm Workers. The portrayal of these characters reveals much about how the movement saw its own identifications. Don Sotaco is similar to the character of Mr. Block discussed in the previous chapter. Both characters are approached by the ownership class asking for the workers to betray others. Both are treated by the ownership class as easily deceived or simple, as workers that can be won over with flattery and ignored after the owners' gains are secure. However, Sotaco differs from Mr. Block in that Sotaco does not fall for the flattery of the boss. Sotaco, a representative of farm worker identity, thus functions differently. Rather than functioning as the foil against which the worker is set, Sotaco functions as the representative of the worker that the worker might aspire to. Sotaco further humanizes the worker, representing the squalid conditions under which he must labor.

Sotaco is set in contrast against Don Coyote. Don Coyote represents the image of the labor contractor representing the interests of the grower, who perpetually takes advantage of the worker. While Don Coyote always believes he is both generous to the

worker and also of more importance than the worker, Sotaco lets the reader know that Coyote's perceptions do not reflect reality. In one comic, Coyote tells Sotaco: "You really are very smart. You work for whatever wage I pay you. You never make any problems for me and you never forget to bring me a little present. Of course, I do my part for you. I protect you with a little steady work – a little cheaper wage – but you have steady work" (Zermeno, Sotaco y Coyote). This discussion provides a sense of the UFW perception of growers' attitudes. The grower views the value of the worker, represented as his intelligence, through loyalty to the grower. This means a willingness to accept any demands of the grower passively. As with the IWW, this dialectical opposition constructs members of the UFW as victims of the growers' greed.

Furthermore, the extent of the grower's need for loyalty to the work is only represented by providing steady work without regard to the conditions under which that work takes place. Sotaco, whose comments are almost always represented outside the hearing of the grower, provides the contrasting perspective of the worker. Sotaco comments: "Coyote, if you say I'm smart, then it must be true and there is an association that will show me the way to repay you for your generosity" (Zermeno, Sotaco y Coyote). Through this, Sotaco reveals plans to join with the UFW. In another cartoon, the image of the bloated grower is juxtaposed with the small Sotaco looking up forlornly in tattered clothing. The grower informs Sotaco that someday he will be in the grower's position and then he will "know what it is like to have real problems" (Zermeno, Don Sotaco). The reader is called to question what the grower's "real problems" are, as his image of excess so sharply deviates from the image of poverty represented by Sotaco.

Sotaco does not fail to stand up to the grower. He functions as encouragement to the worker to see the world as he does. In contrast to the IWW dialectic, the UFW representations are more localized and concrete. The image of the fat capitalist is more abstract than that of the grower. As such, the UFW representations indicate a more specific dialectic rooted in localized conditions. Sotaco thus represents the derivational substance of the farm worker. The grower cannot participate from the framework of that substance from the other side of the dialectic.

As another comic shows, Sotaco is not afraid to join the movement. He is shown playing a carnival game in which a hammer is used to thrust a projectile toward a bell. In this case, the hammer is labeled “Huelga” and the projectile is represented by the grower (Zermeno, *Sotaco Rings the Huelga Bell*). As such, the strike becomes the vehicle through which the excess of the grower might be challenged. More importantly, however, the Huelga represents the dialectical opposite of the interests of the grower. In other words, the directional substance of Huelga contrasts with the substantive interests of growers.

The image of the grower is used to create animosity from the worker. While the image remains consistent as a bloated man with excessive sun glasses and fancy western attire, he is often given the voice of real growers that are the subject of the strike. One comic displays the image of the grower sitting at a table playing chess. Don Sotaco is represented as one of the pawns on the chess board. The grower proclaims, “I feel that workers should be given just as much attention as fertilization, purchasing, or insect control” (Zermeno). The subtext then claims that these words were not made up for the

sake of the comic, but rather are a direct quotation from grower spokesman Al Ocilia. By dehumanizing the farm worker, the grower is constituted as inhumane. This creates a dialectical opposition to farm workers, whose substance partially lies in their humanity.

Various images were used to represent those people who denied their derivational substance for personal gain. These included the bracero, the wetback, and the straw boss.²⁷ Of the straw boss, *El Malcriado* writes:

In exchange for a few dollars and a chance to drive the boss' pickup, some farm workers will sell their soul to the devil. Sometimes all that is necessary is a five dollar bill to make one of these men forget that they had ever been a worker. This is nothing new. The straw boss has been with us for a long time. Once he was one of us, a poor farm worker like us. Since then, maybe because he thought he was a little better than us, he sold out at the first chance... The straw boss has traded his identity with the people for the power and the pride which comes from being on the side of the rich ones. Some of them want to have both. But it is not possible. You are either with the working people or against them. (Straw Boss, 1965, p. 4)

This description demands a forced choice between a worker's cultural identity and the worker's self-interest. The straw boss cannot have it both ways. Once the workers choose self interest, then they have traded in their identity, cheaply. They have rejected their familial substance. Rejecting their familial substance places the straw boss outside the

²⁷ The bracero and the wetback refer to workers imported from Mexico to replace striking workers. Bracero means "manual laborer." In 1942, the United States reached an agreement with Mexico that allowed for the importation of temporary contract workers from Mexico to the United States. While designed to alleviate worker shortages in the U.S., the program was also used to replace striking workers. Wetback refers to illegal immigrants coming to the United States for work. The straw boss represents workers who are promoted to positions of authority over their fellow workers.

The use of terms such as "wetback," a term repeatedly used by Chavez to refer to undocumented workers, further represents a history of internalized racism. Discussing the rhetoric of Proposition 187, for instance, Delgado (1998) argues a "rhetoric of victimage" pits members within a community against each other. Delgado writes, "Such forms of 'historical amnesia' created antipathy among different factions within Black and Latino communities who had forgotten their own legacies of victimization" (p. 257). As an anti-immigration measure, the rhetoric of Proposition 187 discussed by Delgado speaks directly to the potential for racialized divisions within a community though a familial substance could potentially be shared. Additionally, Delgado suggests framing the issue of immigration within a legal rhetorical framework constructs immigrant workers as foreign enemies, which hinders development of solidarity.

identifications of the UFW, creating a dialectical tension between the worker and the straw boss. Derivational substance in this sense is more than the race of the straw boss, but rather that individual's consciousness of the familial in constituting the individual's substance. For solidarity to occur, the worker must reject self-interest and own the familial substance asserted by the farm workers.

Rather than view the differing cultural affiliations of the workers as a weakness, the UFW sought to treat culture as its strength:

Our color or our language or our job have kept us apart. And the people who are profiting from our separateness are determined to keep it that way. It is a fact that in San Francisco the growers associations keep an office full of people busy writing propaganda about how all farm workers are all winos, bums, incompetents. There is money in the advancement of these lies... The dignity of the farm worker shows itself in many ways. This year and in the years to come, it will be shown by the man who will fight when he is insulted. (Dignity of the Farm Worker, 1967, p. 18)

Appealing to the dignity of the farm worker, as well as the willingness of the farm worker to fight when insulted, transcends the cultural distinctions within the movement. Even more than a source of pride, the culture of the farm workers was a source of the workers' moral identity. Culture as a source of the derivational substance of the workers places the workers in dialectical opposition to the growers. As in the IWW, the UFW construct themselves as victims dialectically opposed to those with economic power. However, in this case, the source of the dialectical opposition stems from the familial substance of the workers.

The directional substance constituted the UFW in solidarity to the extent that they could identify with the motion of the movement. Workers saw themselves as the cause they took to improve their conditions. This further enabled the farm workers to make

broader connections with the larger public: connections with people interested in social justice and the other movements of the time, as well as consumers. The dialectical substance of the workers was shaped by their directional and familial substance. However, the familial and directional substance of the workers also generated problems for solidarity within the movement. The last section of this chapter speaks to some of these issues.

Issues of Solidarity

Problems arising from the rhetorical construction of solidarity within the UFW largely stemmed from the construction of familial substance. Two particular problems arose: First, was the problem of identification with members of the movement who did not share its familial substance. Second, was the problem of maintaining the substance of the movement in its leadership.

In the first case, familial substance made it difficult for members outside of the local community, Mexican culture, or Christian spirituality, to deeply identify with the movement. This is reflected in the fragments of volunteers assisting the farm workers.

Kornberg notes the feeling of being an outsider to the movement:

I was an outsider. I took this very much for granted. My background was not Mexican, Filipino, farm worker, or even working class. I was made to feel—and at the time absorbed the attitude entirely—that as a middle-class *gringo*, I was there as an outsider to support the others. In a sense, I was a member of the oppressor race who was making atonement for its sins. That may or may not have been how others saw me. At the time I was unaware of the importance of cultural differences and their effects on thought and communication. Our differing cultural backgrounds could well have led us to see things differently from each other.
(Kornberg)

While this passage certainly speaks to the need for members not sharing the cultural substance of the movement to be self-reflexive in their relationships, defining volunteers as outsiders made solidary relations more difficult. Kornberg continues by noting she “never felt a part of the group” and moralizes, “Looking back, however, I find it sad that that there was so little kindness—if not appreciation—shown by Cesar, the NFWA, and the Teatro toward those of us who had left behind our normal lives to devote ourselves to the farm workers’ cause” (Kornberg). As noted with consumers earlier, the movement cast the role of those in sympathy with the movement as outsiders playing a support role in the movement. This stifles identification with the workers. As such, the deep solidarity created between workers who share familial substance hinders the broad solidarity with allies to the organization.

Furthermore, the rhetorical construction of the derivational substance of workers sometimes made it difficult for outsiders to see the value of the movement. Kornberg continues:

In later years, when Cesar grew away from us and toward Catholic piety, I—and perhaps others—felt sad and abandoned. First, because we had lost a friend, whose charm had dissipated into solemn religiosity and who no longer seemed to care anything about us; and second, because we still believed that religion was the “opiate of the masses” and not in any way a force for progress. (Kornberg)

This fragment suggests a tension between the familial and directional substance of the movement. In other words, holding steadfast to the familial substance of the movement causes allies to perceive the directional substance of the movement has been sacrificed. The two forms of substance worked against each other, not allowing the movement to achieve a deep and broad solidarity. Indeed, the shallowness of this solidarity is reflected

in the fragments of organization leaders, such as Gilbert Padilla. Padilla notes a suspicion of volunteers in the organization:

Cesar had become very suspicious of volunteers, whom he blamed for the defeat of this proposition. Cesar voiced many times to me that he felt there were people in the union who were out to destroy the union and working against us. I recall one evening in La Paz when we were walking to our homes he told me that our union was “full of Communists who came to destroy the union... Thereafter, many volunteers were purged as a way of “cleaning house” of people who were thought to be “suspicious” or disloyal to the union. Many volunteers left the union during this time. (Padilla)

This suspicion reflects the lack of a deep solidarity between movement members sharing the familial substance of the movement and allies to the movement who shared only its directional substance. Volunteers could be expunged from the movement because they lacked the deep familial solidarity of the organization members. The suspicion of disloyalty reflects the boundaries of familial substance, in that, while volunteers are included directionally, a literal reading of their familial substance places them in dialectical opposition to the movement.

The idea of the leader losing touch with the movement is not unique to those outside the familial substance of the movement. In order to sustain familial substance, the leader in whom the familial substance of the movement is vested must maintain rhetorical control over the substance. When movement members fail to see the leader as representative of the familial substance of the movement, then problems can arise. Padilla provides a narrative of his resignation from the UFW. The narrative notes a change of direction in Chavez’s leadership. Addressing concerns with Chavez led to a demand for Padilla’s resignation:

Cesar refused to acknowledge that there were problems. I wanted the union to continue to be worker-focused, service our contracts, administer the medical and pension plans, and provide services that workers needed. I brought these issues up at our October board meeting, voicing my concern over the philosophical change in direction that Cesar was taking... Dolores told me that I should resign from the union because I was talking to other board members about the direction that Cesar was taking the union. Dolores made vicious—and unfounded—allegations against me. Dolores made this vicious attack with Cesar’s blessing—he sat quietly, did not intervene, and said nothing. (Padilla)

Taking the organization in a new direction means straying from the familial substance constructed through the course of the movement. For movements with strong leaders, if movement members no longer see themselves in terms of the movement leader, sustaining solidarity becomes more difficult.

In Retrospect

In this chapter, I have shown how the UFW constructed solidarity through rhetorical appeals to individuals’ familial and directional substance. Familial substance constituted broad solidarity at the level of humanity, but tended toward a deeper solidarity when taken at the cultural, spiritual and leadership level. Importantly, the familial substance of individuals must appeal to different sources. In other words, while everyone shares the source of humanity (unless they betray the workers), not everyone shares the cultural or spiritual familial substance. Furthermore, when appealing to familial substance, the source or representative of that substance must remain identifiable as a leader by movement members.

In terms of directional substance, I have argued that the movement becomes a source of identification for movement members and allies. More than simply adopting the directional vision of the movement, members see themselves as that direction: they

become the cause itself. This substance enabled the UFW to bring allies into the movement, specifically through volunteers that shared in the directional substance of the movement, as well as through moving the passions of consumers. This directional substance allowed for a broader solidarity, including consumers and volunteers. However, the familial substance sometimes conflicted with the directional substance, hindering the depth of solidarity. In other words, rhetorically constituting movement members within a deep familial substance sometimes created suspicion of those sharing merely directional substance.

These forms of solidarity contrast sharply with the IWW discussed in Chapter 2. The IWW relied on geometric substance primarily, as well as through broadly drawn dialectical substance. The IWW rejected notions of familial substance, which may have contributed to an inability to create a deep, lasting solidarity. The familial substance appealed to by the United Farm Workers enabled the farm workers to draw from a host of cultural and spiritual symbols to create identification between workers and across social groups. However, these constructions also sacrificed the breadth of the movement, as allies not sharing the familial substance of the movement felt treated as outsiders to the organization.

Having examined the operation of the different forms of substance offered by Burke within the IWW and the UFW, I turn to contemporary attempts to generate solidarity in the context of adjunct faculty unionization. I explore the substance of adjunct faculty solidarity in Chapter 4, specifically noting how the difficulty of defining substance within the movement lends to a difficulty of constituting solidarity. In the case

of the UFW, clear dialectical divisions could be drawn between the worker of the employer. The same is the case with the IWW. In the case of adjunct faculty, however, the lines are not nearly so distinct.

Chapter 4: Rhetorical Substance in Adjunct Faculty Organization

The discussion in Chapters Two and Three has focused on two labor organizations in the United States that have more-or-less clearly defined dialectics between the members of the organization and their agonists. The grower, the employer, the scab, and the straw boss have been relatively easy to define. Furthermore, the substance of movement members in the case of the IWW and the United Farm Workers has been identifiable. In the case of adjunct faculty organization, however, the substance of movement members is much more fragmentary. Drawing distinctions between the agon and the movement member is more complicated, at least according to movement members. In this difficulty lies the challenge of constituting movement members as having a shared rhetorical substance on which solidarity can be built. As a young movement, perhaps the rhetorical substance of members has yet to be fleshed out. Similarly, the contingent nature of movement members might contribute to the challenge of developing a common rhetorical substance. In either case, the success of the movement may depend on creating a rhetorical substance that allows for deeper and broader solidarity.

To contextualize the tenuous relationship between faculty organization and traditional class politics, I open with a discussion of early efforts to unionize academic

workers. Early attempts to unionize within the academy were met with resistance, particularly from faculty members who saw unions as violent and unnecessary within the academy. Part of this problematic reflects a view of faculty members as “white collar” workers, engaged in a type of work experience that was not conducive to unionization. As DeCew (2003) notes, “Most faculty members (prior to the mid-1960s) viewed themselves as professionals with a social status incompatible with trade unions that they associated with manufacturing and manual labor” (p. 12).

Economic constraints in the 1970s contributed to an increased interest in faculty unionization: “There were more individuals with Ph.D.’s available for faculty positions, fewer job openings, and thus more supply than demand in the profession” (DeCew 2003, p. 22). In addition to economics, faculty members were also concerned about issues related to tenure and academic freedom. Coupled with more permissive state legislation allowing for collective bargaining with university faculty members, as well as the success of collective bargaining by elementary and secondary school teachers, unionization among university faculty members became more attractive.

In 1980, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a landmark decision that changed the contours of unionization efforts in the United States academy. The case, *National Labor Relations Board v. Yeshiva*, was a major blow against unionization efforts in private universities and had a ripple effect on some public institutions. Writing for the majority, Justice Lewis Powell²⁸ argued that full-time faculty members at Yeshiva University

²⁸ Prior to his confirmation to the Supreme Court, Powell wrote a memorandum encouraging an assault on universities in the culture war as a threat to the enterprise system. The memo was not published until well after Powell’s confirmation.

engaged in enough faculty governance to make them “managerial” employees which were ineligible for protection by the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). The decision had a chilling effect on faculty unionization efforts, but also speaks to the historical distinction between managerial workers and rank-and-file workers that has played out, and is playing out, within the broader American Labor Movement. Faculty members sit on the cusp between the administrative and rank-and-file.

Public university workers are not governed by the NLRA, so were not covered by the *Yeshiva* decision. State legislatures set the guidelines regarding public faculty collective bargaining rights. However, the decision certainly impacted the willingness of legislatures to bargain with public faculty members, affecting their ability to unionize. Ultimately, attempts at faculty organization take place within an unsupportive legal climate, similar to those of the IWW and UFW discussed in previous chapters. While efforts to organize full-time faculty are often difficult, those problems are compounded in the case of adjunct faculty. Increased use of adjunct faculty in higher education represents a shift from the university as an institution committed to the public good, to the university as a corporate institution.

While historically the university has been considered more of an insulated institution serving the public good rather than corporate interests, that image has declined over several years. Bosquet (2008) argues that increasing corporatization of the university has fundamentally changed the way in which it operates. University administrations are increasingly seeing their roles in terms of market economics, thinking of students as consumers and faculty members as providing a market-based service. Universities are

becoming increasingly profit-driven, with potential changes to the labor practices and organizational culture therein.

Reflecting broader corporate trends, universities work to reduce costs through the casualization²⁹ of their workforces. Bosquet (2008) claims that there exists “reams of evidence attesting that what institutions really [want] was to accumulate capital and conserve labor costs by casualizing faculty positions by any means available: early retirement, expanded graduate programs, outsourcing, distance education, deskilling, and the like” (p. 18). Institutions of higher education are increasingly replacing their full-time and tenured or tenure track lines with lower-cost contingent workers (e.g., graduate teaching assistant, adjunct, and term lecturer positions). The lower cost of these workers is tied in part to the lower wages paid to them and the cost savings from not providing benefits in terms of health care and retirement; but also in terms of the ease with which these workers can be hired and fired. Contingent academic workers, therefore, represent the broader corporate trend toward creating a “just-in-time” workforce that can meet short-term corporate needs and be dispatched when those needs decline. The use of disposable workers in the academy is vividly portrayed by Bosquet (2008): “They know they are not merely treated like waste, but, in fact, are the actual shit of the system – being churned toward the outside: not merely disposable labor but labor that must be disposed of for the system to work” (p. 27).

²⁹ Casualization refers to the practice of offering workers jobs on more of an occasional basis rather than full time contracts. In the academy, this plays out as tenure-track or full-time lines are replaced by one-year and even semester-to-semester contracts.

The use of contingent academic labor is on the rise. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (2007) reports more than 50 percent of faculty members on college campuses are part-time employees. The number is even higher in community colleges.³⁰ These contingent faculty members often face unique challenges in the work place. As Bosquet (2008) notes, contingent faculty members are the “road warriors” of academe. Often, they travel long distances between the different colleges and universities they teach at. Contingent faculty members sometimes teach eight and even nine courses at different institutions in order to make ends meet. DeCew (2003) puts the stress of part-time faculty work in perspective, arguing:

Part-time faculty often have larger classes and higher enrollments (common in introductory courses) than their full-time colleagues, and thus have a heavier grading burden and more demands on their time for extra help and office hours. In some cases, part-timers teach the same courses repeatedly, leaving them more susceptible to boredom and burnout ... some part-time faculty teach year round, depriving them of the summer off for research and rejuvenation that most full-time faculty enjoy. (p. 78)

The increased use of adjunct faculty within the academy warrants an examination of how these faculty members constitute solidarity. Like the IWW and UFW, these workers face a challenging legal environment. Unlike the previous case studies, however, these workers straddle the boundary between white-collar and blue-collar workers. Furthermore, the trend of increased casualization of labor in the academy lends toward a non-industrial, yet highly geometric form of substance.

³⁰ Approximately 64 percent according to the National Center for Education Statistics (National Center for Education Statistics, 1998)

Finally, the increased use of adjunct faculty creates tension with full-time, tenure stream faculty members. Institutions such as the AAUP and the National Education Association (NEA) claim to advocate for both adjunct and full-time interests. However, the two sometimes have conflicting interests. For instance, the more adjunct faculty fill full-time lines, the less political power full-time faculty members have to improve their working conditions. Tenure and academic freedom are at risk through the casualization of academic labor. At the same time, there is potential for building solidarity between full-time and contingent academic workers. That potential is not realized.

In this chapter, I examine the way the rhetorical substance of adjunct faculty members is defined within the context of unionization efforts and how that substance contributes to the building of solidarity within the movement. I offer three claims. First, adjunct faculty members are constituted through a common geometric substance. Second, the dialectical and directional substance of these workers is ill-defined and sometimes contradictory. Third, solidarity is difficult to develop when the rhetorical substance of adjunct faculty unionization efforts lacks cohesion. Of the three case studies examined, the case of adjunct faculty unionization efforts represents the greatest difficulty of cultivating solidarity within a contingent work environment. Before I turn to the primary argument of the chapter, I return to Kenneth Burke and review his notions of geometric, directional and dialectical substance.

As noted in Chapter Two, geometric substance is “an object placed in its setting, existing both in itself and as part of its background. Participation in a context” (p. 29). Other terms Burke uses to refer to the geometric are “positional” or “definition by

location” (p. 26). In the case of geometric substance, the placement of individuals within a particular context constitutes the way in which those individuals foster identification. The context functions as the guiding principle through which individuals see themselves. Directional substance, discussed more thoroughly in Chapter 3, posits the question “Where are you going?” (p. 31). Individual motivation is directed, or reflects movement from one position to another. Sometimes that movement is purposeful, sometimes accidental. The direction, however, becomes the primary locus of motivation and identification within the individual. Finally, dialectical substance represents the identification of individuals by what they are not. This substance can be found within the other forms of substance discussed and typically involves creating an agon that possesses the characteristics an individual rejects.

As I demonstrate in this chapter, adjunct faculty unionization efforts construct such faculty members within a geometric substance, while the dialectical and directional substance of the movement is ill-defined. Solidarity is difficult to obtain within this context. As such, deep and broad solidarity are hindered within the movement. I advance this argument by examining the Web site materials of the Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor (COCAL), adjunctnation.org, the last 10 years of issues of the *Adjunct Advocate* e-magazine, the New Faculty Majority organization, adjunct comments to Web articles relating to contingent academic workers, blogs by adjunct faculty members, and materials related to contingent academic labor posted by the AAUP and NEA. Through these materials, I hope to offer a broad, fragmentary view of the rhetorical substance created within adjunct faculty unionization efforts.

Geometric Substance among Adjunct Faculty

As noted in Chapter Two, the field within which solidarity develops functions to constitute laborers in relationship to each other, as well as against those not seen as workers. In the context of the IWW, workers defined themselves as part of the industrial scene. This scene articulated laborers as particular types of workers set against other types; ie. Industrial workers as opposed to craft workers. In the case of adjunct faculty, the academic market represents the dominant scene within which the identifications of workers are created. In other words, the academic market defines the rhetorical substance of academic workers. Several characteristics define the contingent environment, one of which is the corporatization of the academy.

In 2002, the Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor (COCAL) issued its Montreal Declaration at the fifth COCAL conference. The declaration called for collective action amongst contingent faculty members. This declaration highlights the construction of worker solidarity within contingency:

In the name of increased corporatization, scarce resources, competition between institutions and a flexible labor market, our working conditions have degenerated. This is why, across North America, we have chose union and collective action... We, contingent faculty from across North America meeting in Montreal this October 5, 2002, are committed to our movement's common struggle to end the exploitation generated by contingency. (Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor, 2010)

Contingency, as shown here, is the source of the exploitation of workers. This contingency is created through market practices such as corporatization and competition. Workers are defined by this experience of exploitation: they become contingent workers. Contingency is the geometric substance which generates the identifications of workers.

The NEA action plan for contingent academic workers opens with the stories of five academic workers at different institutions and the trials they face. These trials include the inability to find a tenure-track position, lack of benefits such as health care coverage, cuts in pay, the lack of a voice in curriculum planning, and an inability to renew contracts from semester-to-semester. The document then asks: “What do the people in the situations above have in common? They are workers trying to survive in a world of increasing contingency” (National Education Association, 2007). “Contingency” is the term used which constitutes the scene under which academic workers labor. As such, the term encompasses the geometric conditions of academic workers. When workers are constituted as “contingent,” they are rhetorically constructed within the geometric substance encompassed by the worldly context of contingency. Contingency shapes the scene in which academic workers work. The NEA notes, “Contingency is relentlessly taking over higher education. The consequences of this restructuring are enormous and profound. Higher education institutions are increasingly adopting a corporate model of operation, with market demand dictating program decisions and employers hiring employees on fixed or limited-term contracts” (p. 4). That market conditions dictate decisions suggests the market context dictates the substance of workers. As contingency takes over higher education institutions, it becomes the dominant force in shaping the context from which academic workers draw their identifications.

While contingency is the dominant framework for creating identification for academic workers, the extent to which the term applies is ambiguous. In other words, in

the movement, ambiguity exists over who should be considered a contingent worker. A broadly defined contingent worker could contribute to a broader solidarity. However, a narrowly defined contingency might lend toward a deeper solidarity. In other words, a broadly defined scene (or condition) of contingency may constitute workers within a shared substance. However, within specific institutional contexts, the experience of contingency may differ from its broad experience, enabling a deeper solidarity. Workers who share the geometric substance of contingency can be rhetorically constituted as internal or external to the movement.

For some, the notion of contingency extends beyond adjunct faculty, but includes a broad range of faculty members. Benjamin (2003) argues:

The distinguishing characteristic of *contingent appointments* is the tenuous connection between the institution and the appointee because of the brief term of each appointment; in other words, part-time faculty appointments are usually for a single academic term and non-tenure-track appointments for a single academic year, even in the case of those faculty who have held previous appointments. Further, contingent appointments normally provide, often explicitly, that the position carries no right to any expectation of reappointment. (p. 2)

In this case, both adjunct faculty and full-time faculty off the tenure track could be considered contingent workers. Graduate teaching assistants might also be considered contingent workers; workers with whom a broad solidarity is possible. The length of the employment contract is the instrument for defining whether a worker is contingent, as well as the right to expect reappointment.

Being a contingent worker does not necessarily mean the worker is temporary. Rather, the worker is *perceived* as temporary. Rhetorically constituting one's substance as contingent reflects the potential and actual harm of the contextual system within which

workers are placed. However, this does not mean the workers' efforts are actually fleeting. The Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW) underscores this point. The organization notes in an issue brief that contingent faculty members "are committed educators who often serve institutions for significant periods of time" (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2010). Noting that one-third of contingent faculty members in the humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences have taught in the same institution for longer than six years and one-fifth longer than 10 years, CAW argues that "These faculty members effectively function as permanent members of the staff at their colleges and universities, yet institutions often perpetuate outdated personnel and compensation policies that assume non-tenure-track faculty members are short-term employees who will make up only a small proportion of the faculty." As such, the notion of contingency does not preclude considering faculty members as permanent members of a faculty, but rhetorically constructs them as temporary.

Defining academic workers as contingent places them outside of the academic system. In one sense, this means the system includes administration, bureaucrats, and full-time workers, but excludes adjunct workers. Calabrese (2001) notes one way in which adjunct faculty might be excluded: "In any case, it's difficult to imagine academic environments where the imbalance in social structure looms so large a picnic luncheon can be given for full-time faculty and staff only. Yet Barbara Wilson Hahn (2001) describes just such a happening in 'Adjunct Apartheid' (p. 61)." In this case, the exclusion of adjunct faculty members is a feature of the environment. Constructing these workers as contingent justifies this exclusion. Adjunct faculty are constructed within the

market system as temporary workers, tourists within the academic marketplace. To work from outside of the marketplace means these workers have no right to access the benefits of non-contingent workers. For instance, the Chicago branch of the Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor reported efforts of East-West University to break unionization efforts through firing all adjunct faculty members at the university.

Reprinting a letter from the local adjunct faculty group, the Chicago COCAL reported:

The United Adjunct Faculty Association (UAFA) at East-West University (EWU) withdrew its petition to vote for a union. In a letter addressed one day before EWU administration received the National Labor Relations Board collective bargaining petition notice for adjuncts, Chancellor M. Wasiullah Khan informed all department chairs, full-time faculty, part-time faculty and staff that “no contract will be renewed this year effective the forthcoming summer session and the academic year beginning with Fall quarter 2010.” The letter went on to point out that no department chair, full-time faculty, part-time faculty or staff member would be hired back “without first meeting with the Chancellor.”³¹ (Chicago Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor, 2010)

That the administration of East-West University would threaten to fire all adjunct faculty members reflects the temporary and fleeting nature of their work. The choice to threaten all contingent workers rather than just adjunct faculty reflects fear of a broad solidarity of different workers. The threat of loss thus represents the geometric substance constituting contingent academic workers.

Perhaps the biggest struggle faced by adjunct workers generally is their status as contingent workers. This status operates rhetorically and practically. In other words, the rhetoric of contingency within the academy enables the treatment of adjunct workers as

³¹ Chicago COCAL posted an update in which the top five adjunct advocates won a hearing with the National Labor Relations Board leading to the reinstatement of their position, 80 percent back pay, and for-cause protection against retaliation.

less important to the educational mission of the academic institutions they are a part of. As noted earlier, the Lesko blog demonstrates that adjunct workers are often wrongly treated as nomadic workers and not valuable colleagues with stakes in academic decision-making. As argued in the *Adjunct Advocate*, “Adjuncts are not temporary faculty members, but rather necessary members of any department’s teaching staff.” However, treating adjunct faculty members as temporary means that they are excluded from curricular decisions within academic institutions. The adjunct is an outsider to the institution:

A quantum of energy is so tiny that it can only describe the behavior of the innards of an atom. That is, quantum mechanics, the branch of physics that Planck began in 1900, operates only at the subatomic level, just as the adjunct lives only in the sub-academic realm. She is neither listed in a college catalog nor invited to faculty social gatherings. Students cannot track her down at her office because she hasn’t one. She sits on no committees and has no voice in university governance. (Cumo, 2000)

So long as administrators, students, and full-time faculty deny the corporate context of which they are a part; and so long as adjuncts may be sequestered as contingent workers in a corporate scene; adjunct instructors may be excluded from the university context. Contingent workers are thus included within a market scene, but excluded from an institutional scene.

The adjunct is also expendable. Constructed through the geometric substance of contingency constitutes the worker as temporary. A temporary worker that exists outside

of an institution is easily fired.³² The story of an adjunct professor at Northern Idaho

College underscores this point:

Alright, let's start at the very beginning: it seems that an adjunct at Northern Idaho College got the sack. She'd taught for more than six years, was nominated for the Part-time Faculty of the Year Award, and one day opened an email from her boss that said she wasn't getting any more classes. Why? Well, I think you know the answer to that question. Who the hell knows why! She had a "Special Appointment" one-semester-only contract, and it ended. No one at the college would explain what had happened, and when Jessica Bryan, an English instructor, filed a grievance, the administration claimed that, under the auspices of her contract, she had no right to a "review." (Nelson, 2011)

Parsing out these sorts of rhetorical appeals, which are common with the fragments reviewed, suggests a few common features. First, the adjuncts have little to no control over their environment. They are denied the right of "review." They can be fired without legitimate cause (and the sympathetic stories often emphasize the lack of cause in these decisions, or the arbitrariness of the decisions). They are portrayed as model faculty members, who often win faculty awards. One other important feature is common: these adjuncts have been faculty members in their institutions for a significant amount of time. In the above instance, the "sacked" faculty member was an institutional member for more than six years. However, the rhetorical fragments include narratives of faculty members losing their jobs after much longer periods of time:

Not a shock, of course. Adjuncts get booted every semester at some colleges. However, this was the real deal. They were sacked for real. According to the article, "Dr. Jeffrey L. Wilson, acting chair of the philosophy department, isolated poor evaluations as the primary reason for the decision." Ok. A couple of duds tossed out of the Garden of Eden that is Loyola Marymount University's Department of Philosophy.

³² Later in this chapter I will discuss the idea of scab labor in the academic context, pointing to how the ability to replace academic workers constrains the development of solidarity within the movement.

Just one little, tiny, teeny, weenie problem. BOTH had been teaching for 21 years at the college without a hitch. That's 21 years, yes. **Two DECADES plus a year.** It gets better: Dr. Jeanne Curry has cancer. The good Catholics at Marymount Loyola fired an employee with cancer who'd taught there for two decades after she got poor teaching evals. **once.** (H., 2011)

Note the emphases added by the author on the amount of time these faculty members served as faculty prior to losing their jobs. This timeframe is juxtaposed against the reason for the firing, a single set of poor teaching evaluations. The worker's cancer is included as an additional means of building sympathy for the worker. A contingent geometric scene renders time irrelevant to the institution. In other words, working for a long period of time cannot overcome the scene of contingency.

While adjunct faculty members are often represented as fired for no cause, they are also represented as at risk for offenses that put the quality of education at risk. This forces adjunct faculty members to engage in practices that decrease the quality of students' education to avoid the risk of losing their position. The source of these practices is often teaching evaluations. The September/October 2000 edition of the *Adjunct Advocate* underscores this point:

The vast majority of part-time faculty are mere mortals, of course. They've not been dipped into the River Styx by the sea goddess Thetis. For those women and men, a round of poor student evaluations can be just as lethal as the poisoned arrow Achilles took in the tendon. As a result, as long as administrators rely primarily on student evaluations as the reemployment benchmark, part-time faculty will be forced to resort to pandering, pizza and donuts as protection against the poisoned arrow of bad teaching evaluations. (Cumo, Student Evaluations: What Do They Mean and What Can You Do to Improve Them?, 2000)

The above is a rather violent metaphor for the role student evaluations play in the tenure of adjunct faculty members. The reader is asked to identify with the context of adjunct

faculty members as one which could mean the literal death of the faculty member (student evaluations are “lethal”). The risk of evaluations turning lethal is compounded as they are used as the primary method for measuring teacher effectiveness. To combat the risk of this contingency, adjunct faculty members lose their agency over bad choices: They are forced to pander to students offering bribes in the form of food so students will not poison the careers of their instructors. Making students happy becomes more important than educating students: “‘If students come to my office, I have to make sure they walk out happy,’ (Robert S. Owen) said. ‘The student in college is being treated as a customer in a retail environment, and I have to worry about customer complaints’” (Cummo, *Student Evaluations: What Do They Mean and What Can You Do to Improve Them?*, 2000). Notice the lack of agency adjunct professors have over their professional lives. Their decisions are shaped by the environment, which forces them to act in a particular way. Pandering to students is represented as the only way through which adjunct faculty members can salvage their jobs.

These fragments reveal the geometric substance of adjunct faculty members as victims of the academic market. Drozdowski (2005) writes: “Welcome to the new age of Universities, Inc., when knowledge is a commodity to be packaged and marketed, professors seek only opportunities for personal financial gain, and institutions sell their brands and intellectual capital to the highest bidders. Unbridled capitalism and the lure of the market economy rule, while the education of students suffers. Universities, Inc., you see, values profits, not prophets.” The market not only defines the lives of adjunct faculty members, but shapes the way in which they can assert their identity within it. The

contextual status of adjunct faculty members as victims of their environment constitutes the substance of workers and their potential for solidarity.

Adjunct advocates' rhetoric underscores this victimization by comparing their geometric substance to other movements. This allows adjunct workers to see themselves in terms of disenfranchised workers generally, but also to see their struggle as tied to the course of progression toward a more egalitarian society. In particular, the context of adjunct workers is often compared to South African apartheid, United States' slavery, or the Jim Crow South. One commenter to an article in *Inside Higher Ed*, for instance, argues, "I recommend that you review Dr. King's 'Letter from a Birmingham Jail' as he speaks about, first, the four ways to assess just and unjust law (in this case, policy), and second, how it feels to be invisible as a human being, how it corrupts the soul and can so easily become internalized as no more than one's just deserts" (Edelhaus, 2009). Another comment to a different article on *Inside Higher Ed* notes, "I have been an adjunct for about 10 years. One of the tenured faculty who I respect put it succinctly during my second year when he said 'Well, George, how do you like being a plantation slave?'" (George, 2009). Numerous references in the fragments allude to burning down the plantation, or combating the plantation politics of the academy. The July/August 2008 edition of the *Adjunct Advocate* refers to segregation when drawing a comparison to adjunct workers. Referring to administrators, the e-zine argues, "ex-administrators who get religion about how adjuncts are treated are like segregationist politicians who finally admit that, well, integration ain't that bad after all and hell, integration could actually help things" (Thinker, 2008). Such references try to create an image of adjunct workers

as intentionally exploited within a backward civil society. By suggesting the context in which adjuncts currently work are similar to the unjust contexts of the past, these workers are constituted within a geometric substance that defines their identity in terms of victimization by larger systemic forces.] These forces are geometric because they stress placement. In Burkean terms, they represent the “positional” placement of workers. Positionally, these workers’ substance is constituted within a segregated environment.

In addition to the systemic contextual factors shaping the identifications of workers are the localized contexts in which they work. The local contexts in which faculty members teach shape their substantive identifications. In other words, the individual context of the faculty member shapes that faculty member’s geometric substance. The freeway and the classroom each represent scenes which define the geometric substance of adjunct faculty workers. Each of these scenes reflects the contingent context in which academic workers labor.

The freeway is one scene through which the geometric substance of contingent academic laborers is constructed. One trope that represents this substance is the “Freeway Flyer.”³³ The “Freeway Flyer” represents the adjunct that bounces from school to school trying to sketch out a living by teaching in multiple places. These adjuncts often lack a sense of home. They are often treated as outsiders to the institutions where they work, despite the fact that adjuncts are tackling greater proportions of the teaching load than individual faculty members. A blog by Helene Matheny argues, “The truth is that most adjuncts are still treated as ‘outsiders,’ and worse still, Freeway Flyers are even more on

³³ The term “Roads Scholar” is also sometimes used.

the outer perimeter of this phenomenon.” Matheny comes to this conclusion by suggesting adjunct faculty members are often excluded from curricular decisions, despite being the closest to students: “adjunct faculty are almost never considered for planning or development of course material, when they often are the most in touch with what and how their students are learning.”

In another blog, Jenny Ortiz notes the Freeway Flyer is not given as much credence as full-time faculty members. Telling the story of a student who solicited a letter of recommendation from her, but then had to get another letter from a full-time faculty member because hers was not as well-received, Ortiz bemoans, “After a semester of teaching six classes and getting to know more than 100 students on three different campuses, I’ve come to understand and know what a good student is. A full-time faculty member may have a desk and mug at a permanent campus address, but does that make her/his opinion more expert than mine?” As such, appeals to the Freeway Flyer often derive from the Flyers’ inability to have a voice within the academy.

Interestingly, the label of Flyer is both owned and rejected by adjunct faculty members. *Adjunct Advocate* editor P.D. Lesko (2000) encourages readers to challenge the image of the Freeway Flyer:

Our mission is to help those in higher education understand why temporary faculty need to be taken very seriously as teaching professionals. Temporary faculty are neither “gypsies” nor “flyers.” They are colleagues, potential Fulbright scholars, academics who would benefit from some much-needed accentuation of the positive.

Again, Lesko is speaking to the notion that academic workers who bounce from school to school are often treated as tourists within the academy. This tourist status means these

workers are not considered as serious academics. To dispel the myth of the gypsy or flyer is to suggest that these workers play an important role in the academy despite their nomadic existence.

The nomadic context of the freeway relates to the feeling of contingency expressed by adjunct advocates. While I have pointed to the geometric substance of adjunct faculty members in terms of the academic marketplace and their localized substance as Freeway Flyers, the role of adjuncts within the classroom also shapes their geometric substance. In other words, the fragments suggest adjuncts identify as teachers. While adjuncts do make the argument that they contribute to academic institutions through research and service, the fragments primarily construct the place of adjuncts as within the classroom. The Adjunct Nation Web site contributes to this role by offering advice for adjunct instructors, including a mentoring blog, suggestions for potential textbooks, and forums for sharing advice about teaching. The teacher identity is buffered by the geometric substance of contingency discussed above. In other words, the classroom is a place of identification for adjunct faculty, but is also defined by contingency.

In some cases, the classroom scene is the one place in the academy where adjunct faculty members feel at home. Rhetorical fragments attest to the classroom as the motivating scene for the choice to become a member of the academy. “When he and his wife divorced, he poured the passion of his grief into his teaching, and the combination of increased experience and devotion to the task began to bear fruit. Soon, the classroom was alive, with students on the edges of their seats and laughing at his jokes—

really getting the material in spite of the poverty of their educational backgrounds. Something special was happening” (Rich, 2006). The classroom is a special place where adjunct faculty can engage with their students and receive affirmation. The classroom is also a site of freedom, “While my attendance at meetings and interactions with colleagues is risky business, I do have much more freedom in the classroom. In the classroom, I have the opportunity to introduce outside material which exposes the students to more than the standard indoctrination received from virtually all text books” (Y, 2008) Furthermore, the classroom constitutes the value of adjunct faculty. Fears of poor teaching take form through approaching the classroom: “I even bring my own white board markers, as there is no horror greater than standing in a chilly classroom at 7:30 a.m. on the first day of the semester with no writing implements” (Mazur-Stommen, 2005). As representative of the geometric substance of adjunct faculty, the classroom combine with a directional substance related to the rewards of teaching: “Most adjunct instructors are motivated by the intrinsic rewards of teaching, and their perceived investment in self-esteem and professional prestige is high. Many have developed significant instructional skills in their career and/or community lives” (Lyons, 2001). In some ways, these somewhat romantic constructions of the classroom may serve as an antidote to the corporatized classroom which uses indoctrinating text books, and the corporatized university which restricts faculty freedom through administrative events like meetings.

As such, the classroom is constituted as the site where adjunct faculty realize their value, “Finally, we have Foreman’s conclusion: ‘As adjuncts, we must find our intrinsic

value in the classroom, and universities continue to count on that to be enough to keep us coming back semester after semester. And if not, oh well — my own situation proves that adjuncts are replaceable on short notice.’ No epiphany here, just the same old conclusion that it is what it is, and there’s nothing to be done” (Thinker, 2008) However, as the second part of the above quote indicates, the classroom is not insulated from the pressures of the larger contingent environment. Adjuncts are reminded that, even in the classroom, they are expendable. Institutional pressures intrude on the classroom:

And so a month ago, weary and disillusioned, I officially resigned from my position as an adjunct professor. More and more, I found myself going into the classroom asking myself, “What’s the point?” Under heavy pressure from the administrators, I have bent the rules to the point where they practically don’t exist anymore. I pass along students who are lazy, unmotivated, and have no business being in my classroom in the first place. I bow to the whims of the customer, granting any wish or desire, because everyone knows in business, the customer is always right. (Lasesco, 2007)

In this sense, the market system discussed above constitutes faculty members as a service-provider and students as consumers. Because the customer is always right, the adjunct sacrifices the teacher-identity for the sake of preserving the service-provider identity.

Furthermore, the classroom scene is not immune to the expendability that defines the adjunct within the context of contingency. The *Adjunct Advocate* recounts the story of an adjunct who was a model teacher in the classroom, as they are usually represented, who spent extra time outside the classroom assisting a deaf student. As a result, the faculty member grew tired and fell asleep in the faculty lounge. Seeing this, an administrator fired the faculty member:

Afterwards, he was exhausted, but still had more to do. He had to research to finish the Ph.D., or he would never get anywhere. So he retreated to the adjunct lounge, always second-class accommodations, to read. He made it for two hours, but then his eyelids involuntarily drooped, and he dozed off. An administrator peered through the tiny rectangular aperture of the door, and caught him. Like any good hall monitor, she ratted him out. His dedication? Forget about it. His desire to teach the deaf girl? Forget about it. The long, tedious nights at the convenience store? Forget about that, too. He was done. That was all. (Rich, 2006)

The metaphor of the administrator as “hall monitor” is interesting here. Rather than monitoring students, however, the hall monitor rats out the instructor. The broader locale of the institution overrides the geometric substance generated within the classroom.

To this point, I have pointed to the geometric substance of academic workers within a context of contingency. Contingency is the dominant experience through which academic workers’ identities are constituted: Contingency infiltrates the scenes of the freeway and the classroom. This geometric substance has the potential for deep and broad developments of solidarity, but also comes with problems.

Contingency can provide a basis for the development of identification between academic workers. Whether the solidarity developed is broad depends on the extent of the contingent environment. In other words, the fact of contingency provides a substantive basis for solidarity. However, who rhetorically shares that fact reflects whether solidarity can be built. Organizations such as COCAL reflect a broad solidarity as networks are developed not only with U.S. workers, but also workers in Canada and Latin America. However, this solidarity also relies on a common experience of contingency. Fragments often describe contingency as it occurs in specific institutions, suggesting that each institution is shaped by contingency in unique ways. The very term contingency connotes

difference. These differences can hinder a deep as well as broad solidarity, as workers find it difficult to find similarities to identify with.

Rhetorically constituting workers as contingent has an important drawback in terms of who controls the rhetoric. The fragments reviewed seem to suggest adjunct faculty explain how contingency reflects an exploitative work environment. They suggest, for instance, declining standards in the classroom, low pay, no benefits, nomadic existence and invisibility. However, the fragments do not assert a positive identity of contingency. In other words, adjunct faculty are constituted rhetorically as contingent, but being contingent lacks positive connotations. To identify oneself as contingent, in this sense, is like saying, "I am who I am, but I don't really like that person." Furthermore, adjunct workers are then constituted by the contextual forces they reject. Adjunct workers thus inhabit the substance of a temporary, fleeting, ineffectual nomad, justifying the rhetoric of the context constituting them as such. Workers can thus describe their substance, but cannot transcend it. As such, workers can describe their victimization, but cannot overcome it. To put this in perspective, the geometric substance of the IWW as industrial gave workers a place to rally around and be proud of. However, a geometric substance of contingent does not allow for that pride.

Another form of substance is needed to move beyond this problem. However, other forms of substance fail to provide adjunct faculty with a strong base for identification. Largely, rhetorically constituting workers within other substances results in too much of a divided substance for solidarity to flourish. In the next section, I

highlight the difficulty of accounting for the dialectical and directional substance of academic workers.

Dialectical and Directional Substance of Adjunct Faculty

As the first portion of this chapter has argued, the contingent context in which academic workers labor shapes their identifications. To the extent that workers share contingency in common, the potential for a broad solidarity is created. As Burke notes, the geometric substance of an individual contributes to the dialectical understanding of the individual. In other words, if the academic worker's substance is constituted as contingent, then the obvious dialectical opposition would be the worker who is not contingent. In this sense, one would expect the full-time tenured worker to fall outside of the substantive identifications possible with the adjunct worker. Furthermore, one would expect that administrative workers, as representative of the contextual academic scene exploiting adjunct faculty, would also be set in dialectical opposition to adjunct faculty. In some respects, these dialectical oppositions hold true. However, part of the problem of adjunct faculty unionization efforts lies in attempts to define the agon: to determine with whom adjunct workers stand in dialectical opposition. This section explores some of that difficulty, as it relates to my analysis of solidarity within this element of the labor movement.

Adjunct faculty members are positioned in relationship to administrators, full-time faculty members, tenured or tenure-track faculty members, and students. The naming of any of these groups as an enemy is shaped by the context in which the adjunct faculty members work. As such, these groups might be criticized within the fragments,

but full-blown condemnation is tempered with other situations in which alliances are forged. In other words, workers in each of these relationships are integrated within the context such that naming any group as the dialectical opposite of the adjunct is difficult. As such, creating a dialectical opposition with any of these groups is often constrained by the geometric substance of workers. I begin by looking at the relationship between adjunct faculty members and full-time faculty members.

Many of the fragments examined show a distaste for treatment of adjunct faculty members by full-time faculty members. This distaste is two-fold. First, adjunct advocates suggest full-time faculty members do not acknowledge adjuncts as equals. Second, adjunct advocates argue full-time faculty members refuse to participate in solidary actions that would benefit part-time faculty members. As such, tension is created between full-time faculty members and adjunct faculty. However, whether this tension is born of a dialectical opposition reflecting different placement within academic institutions is an unsettled question. In other words, full-time faculty members might be considered dialectically opposed to adjuncts; however, because they share similar rhetorical scenes (the classroom, if not the academy), they might also be potential allies.

Full-time faculty members are sometimes portrayed as traitors to the movement. They fulfill the function of scab discussed in Chapters Two and Three; or, more specifically, the caricature of the straw boss. Cartoons in the *Adjunct Advocate* underscore such portrayals. One such cartoon by Matthew Henry Hall (Hall, 2011) shows the image of a book with a picture of a faculty member and the devil on the cover. The title of the book is: "I've sold my soul to Satan and I've never felt better," and the book

publisher is noted as “Sell Out Publishers.” What the faculty member sold out for was “\$29,000 a year with benefits and a renewable contract.” As a note to adjuncts, the faculty member states, “I sleep great at night. Thanks.” This cartoon clearly places the full-time faculty member in dialectical opposition to the adjunct. As noted in Chapter Three, such a portrayal represents the denial of the substance of the academic worker.

This opposition is also reflected in the treatment of adjunct faculty members by full-time faculty and by organizations designed to serve both full-time and part-time faculty interests. Organizations such as the AAUP are constructed as ignorant of, or apathetic to, the needs of adjunct faculty. In other words, full-time faculty members hold down the advancement of adjunct faculty members. Numerous fragments attest that the AAUP works for the primary interest of full-time workers, often subverting part-time organizational efforts in the process. One story in the *Adjunct Advocate* (Adjunct Issues Unresolved at Webster U, 2007) tells of a part-time, award-winning faculty member who was dismissed after six years. The woman was denied the right to review and was not given a reason why her contract was renewed. This story is juxtaposed with the story of another woman who was fired under similar circumstances. The difference between the two women is that the second was married to a tenured faculty member and was supported by the AAUP, but the first was not.

Adjunct Nation implies that the first woman needed a job more because the second made a higher rate of pay than the typical adjunct and was supported by a tenured faculty member. The e-zine then suggests these stories reflect a broad disinterest of the AAUP in protecting the rights of adjunct faculty members, in comparison to full-time

faculty members: “No doubt AAUP officials used the Think Method, because the Good Lord knows AAUP officials haven’t actually organized part-time faculty into affiliated locals in any great numbers within recent memory, and nothing short of, say, sanction (with teeth) was going to get those administrators to capitulate” (Nelson C. , 2011). These stories reflect a general disinterest, on the part of tenure-stream faculty, in the needs of adjunct workers. In a comic by the *Adjunct Advocate* (Hall, Union Headquarters, 2011), a union official is shown relaxing on a beach. The official talks into a telephone: “Tell the adjuncts all of us here at union headquarters are outraged by your administration’s pay policy. Oh yes, and could you remind them their dues should arrive no later than the first of every month?” This comic provides another example of the perception of apathy toward part-time workers, as well as their betrayal. The function of the union official is to advocate for adjunct interests; however, the official only pays lip service to the function while, presumably, vacationing with dues paid by adjunct faculty members. As such, while a shared substance with full-time faculty members might be possible, the dialectical opposition of their interests prevents that solidarity from developing. By not supporting the interests of adjunct faculty members, full-time, tenure-stream employees and their representatives are presented as damaging to the movement.

The trope of the scab discussed in Chapters Two and Three is more difficult to identify in this context. Indeed, adjunct faculty are sometimes portrayed as the traitors to the labor movement because they sell their labor too cheaply. From the adjunct perspective, full-time faculty members betray the movement by not supporting the interests of adjunct faculty. However, the perspective of full-time workers suggests they

are the real representatives of the movement and adjunct faculty are the detriment. For instance, adjunct workers express disinterest for the needs of full-time workers. In a survey conducted on the Adjunct Nation Web site (Adjunct Nation, 2011), site visitors are asked how likely they would be to cross a picket line of full-time faculty members on strike. Of the 313 participants, 137 said they would cross a full-time picket line, approximately 47 percent of participants. These results suggest a tension between full and part-time academic workers as well as give credence to the perception that adjunct faculty members are dialectically opposed to the interests of full-time faculty.

The tension is also reflected in the communication between adjunct and full-time faculty members. Specifically, some full-time faculty members respond to adjunct appeals with derision. Indeed, one faculty member even went so far as to accuse adjunct faculty of functioning as soldiers for exploitation. T.R.M., in the comment section to an article posted on *Inside Higher Education*, asks a series of questions implying that adjunct faculty members are not as qualified as full-time faculty: “Have you taken at least three credit-bearing graduate-level courses in composition/rhetoric?” He also questions the work level of adjunct faculty, questioning whether they go to conferences. T.R.M. concludes by arguing that any adjunct who answers no to any of his questions is in league with the exploiters: “you are not exploited. You are the foot soldiers of the exploiters” (T.R.M., 2009). T.R.M.’s argument suggests that adjuncts might be viewed as the scab labor or esquiroles similar to those discussed in the previous chapters. T.R.M.’s logic suggests adjuncts undercut the interests of full-time faculty members. The threat of cheap labor that adjuncts provide hinders the collective action of full-time faculty members. As

such, adjunct faculty members are treated as the dialectical opposite shaping the identifications of full-time workers.

Not surprisingly, then, tension is often highlighted between adjunct and full-time faculty workers. These tensions are real; however, they are also highly contextual. When viewing the issues between adjunct and full-time faculty workers with a national systemic lens, then, the dialectical tensions between the two types of workers feel irreversible. However, numerous other articles and blogs show that these tensions are often resolved at the local level, leading to solidary relations between the different workers. For instance, the May/June 2000 issue of the *Adjunct Advocate* notes attempts by Sierra College to bridge the gap between full and part-time academic workers:

Occasionally, there is friction on some campuses between full- and part-time faculty. The diverse and separate needs of full-time, and part-time faculty often forces them to form separate organizations. Instructors at Sierra College in Rocklin, however, are looking for the middle ground. Part-time faculty members in the booming Sacramento area campus are integrating the ranks of the full-time association... And, while both full-time and part-time faculty members on the governing council acknowledge there is still much to do to get the new organization off the ground, they are aiming for a fall election. "Once this happens, then we will truly be a unified group. We want to be one unit," Cassell said. (Longmont, 2000)

The desire to be "one unit," the aim of solidarity, shows the interests of full and part-time faculty members do not necessarily have to be opposed. The fragment acknowledges that friction sometimes takes place between full and part-time workers. However, within the particular context of Sacramento, that potential dialectic is being transcended as both full and part-time workers are integrated within one advocacy organization. In this case, then, the broad context is transcended by the local context. Thus, the contextual situation plays

a role in shaping the development of solidarity among academic workers. Local contexts shape the geometric substance of adjunct and full-time workers uniquely.

Academic administrators are constructed as the clearest dialectical agons of adjunct faculty unionization efforts. In some instances, full-time faculty members are portrayed as in cahoots with academic administrators against adjunct faculty interests. For instance, in a comic by Mathew Henry Hall (Hall, *What Do Adjuncts Really Want?*, 2011), administrators join with one full-time faculty member to form a “What do Adjuncts Really Want” committee.³⁴ Once the committee is formed, it meets to drink wine, but fails to include the adjunct voice. The committee then meets with similar committees from other institutions with the same result. Eventually, a survey is created to ask adjunct faculty what they want, but the survey is not anonymous so nobody fills it out. The committee concludes that more data is needed. In this case, the full-time faculty member is joining with the administration to dismiss the real concerns adjuncts might have.

In other fragments, full-time faculty members are seen as a solidary resource for joining against abusive administrations. On the *Inside Higher Ed* Web site, numerous individuals respond to an article by Maria Maisto, who is serving as the president of the recently created New Faculty Majority, a national organization dedicated to the interests of contingent and part-time faculty members. Powertoparttimers urges the “plantation” to

³⁴ That only one full-time faculty member is included on the committee is interesting, suggesting the administration only wants to pay lip-service to faculty interests in the first place.

be burned down, arguing that full-time and part-time workers should join together to combat the policies of administrators:

We have to start looking at this issue with full-on class consciousness. Let's stop this quibbling between full-timers/part-timers and those who have "quit" academia/those who haven't. While we are doing all this quibbling (divide and conquer) the CEOs and college executives are getting richer every year. Why? Because the money is moving UP to the administration. The money is moving UP to corporate partnerships. This is a class issue, plain and simple... We need to connect these interests as a part of a UNITED labor movement. We need to band together and burn down the plantation. (Powertopartimers, 2010)

This animosity toward administrators is shared by other readers of the article. For instance, vfichera (2009) compares coverage of the founding of the New Faculty Majority organization by *Inside Higher Ed* and *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Arguing that the coverage by *Inside Higher Ed* is more comprehensive and allows the voice of adjuncts to be heard more directly, vfichera accuses *The Chronicle of Higher Education* of catering to the interests of administrators: "The Chronicle of Higher Education knows very well that its most cherished and courted audience, higher education administration, might not approve." Through this, we get a sense of direct opposition between the interests of adjunct faculty members and administrators.

The dialectical opposition between administrators and adjunct faculty members is also seen in the comics of the movement. In one strip, a piñata resembling a dean is seen hanging from a noose. The character in the comic explains the piñata holds the prize of a one-year appointment inside. The comic is suggestive of violence toward representatives of the administration. Another shows two instructors in the adjunct faculty lounge. One instructor says, "So, I answer the door and there's three little tricker or treaters, a Frankenstein, a Darth Vader, and a Dick Cheney, and I said,

‘For a second I thought you were college administrators’” (Hall, Papier Mache Pinata, 2011). The comparison of college administrators with people perceived as villains demonstrates a clear dialectic between adjunct faculty and administrators³⁵. It appears that adjunct faculty may be attempting to constitute a dialectical solidarity with tenure-stream faculty, against the administrative enemy.

The dialectical tensions between adjunct faculty members and full-time faculty or administrators are tough to define, largely because the geometric substance of workers overrides that dialectic. In other words, full-time faculty members face contingency in the form of the increased casualization of the workforce mentioned above. Full-time lines are increasingly replaced by part-time lines. Even administrators feel the squeeze of casualization through the creation of “headless universities,” institutions that decrease the administrative role.³⁶ That administrators are constructed as the primary agon of adjunct faculty may actually hinder a broader solidarity, because it forces adjunct faculty to see administrators as enemies rather than potential allies. Furthermore, this dialectical opposition fails to recognize the potential shared context of contingency shared between adjunct faculty and administrators. However, as representatives of the corporate academy, administrators are constituted as dialectically opposed to adjunct faculty. This makes solidarity difficult as the friends and enemies of the movement cannot be easily identified. More

³⁵ The Darth Vader and Frankenstein metaphors are especially interesting considering that they hold the potential for good, but chose villainy.

³⁶ My alma-mater, for instance, eliminated all deans from the institution and divested the role of the dean to department chairs.

importantly, solidarity is difficult because adjunct faculty members lack a common assertion of their substance. This problem also plays out when the directional substance of adjunct faculty members is considered.

As noted in Chapter Three, the directional substance of workers can contribute to a broad solidarity to the extent movement members see themselves as a part of the movement's direction. In other words, one substantively becomes the cause or movement. In the case of adjunct faculty unionization efforts, the directional substance of workers is lacking. While adjunct workers do assert potential directions the movement can take, the ambiguity of those directions prevents the development of a directional substance.

One of the concerns expressed by adjunct faculty workers is the lack of will to engage in directional movement towards a goal. Responding to an article on *Inside Higher Ed* about the formation of a national-level organization to give voice to adjuncts called the National Coalition for Adjunct Equity, readers expressed skepticism about the direction of the movement. For instance, PissPoorProf asks the question "Are you going to just discuss or do something?" (PissPoorProf, 2009). Barry Edwards (2009) suggests adjuncts are too afraid to assume a direction for the movement:

The problem is there is only one real power contingents have, and it's given to us by the very forces that created this mess. The power we have is in our numbers. With something like 70% of faculty nation-wide now being contingent, we have the power to close down colleges if we have the organization and the will. And while there are a very few contingent locals that have had success in organizing their members, most locals (like one of my locals in Oregon, yes I am a 'freeway flyer') won't even talk about the "S-word" (strike).

Edwards thus argues that while contingents have the potential for a broad solidarity rooted in the numbers of potential movement members, that solidarity suffers from the unwillingness of workers to assume a directional solidarity, or a commitment to action.

In other instances, the fragments suggest that direction is possible, but the wrong direction is taken. Lesko (2009) argues:

Now that faculty off the tenure-track comprise 70 percent of the nation's 1.3 million college faculty, AFT and AAUP leaders have finally come to the conclusion something must be done. It's just that the "something" has nothing to do with actually ameliorating the systemic problems of poor institutional support, shoddy hiring practices, low pay, lack of benefits and true job security. (Lesko, 2009)

Part of the problem of lack of direction stems from the various identities of adjunct faculty workers. As noted above, the freeway flyer represents a type of worker that uses work at multiple institutions to etch out a living. The Adjunct-By-Choice represents a contrast to the flyer: This adjunct may be teaching for the reward of it, or as a supplement to another full-time job, or as a way of enjoying retirement. The needs of this adjunct are quite different from those of the flyer. Furthermore, adjuncts have varying levels of responsibility within institutions. Some perform committee work, do research, and provide service to the community, while others primarily teach. These factors contribute to the ambiguity of the movement, making a directional substance difficult to identify. When a firm dialectical opposition is established, as in the case of the administrator, the opportunity to build solidarity based on a shared geometric substance is lost. Ultimately, the divided substance of adjunct faculty members hinders both broad and deep constructions of solidarity.

In Retrospect

In this chapter, I have attempted to demonstrate how the geometric substance of adjunct faculty members is the primary basis of identification for these workers. This is the substance on which the solidary relations of workers might be built. However, the dialectical and directional substance of these workers is ill-defined, making it difficult to build a broad or deep solidarity within the movement. Furthermore, the substance of workers as contingent makes finding points of solidarity within the movement difficult.

The notion of contingency constrains workers in a couple of ways. First, constituting the substance of workers as contingent enables workers to be viewed as invisible. This invisibility is reflected in representations of adjunct faculty members. Chris Cumo, for instance, discusses sexual trysts between faculty members and students, examining works that have chronicled the issue. His argument is despite numerous examples of bad sexual conduct by faculty members, none of those representations include adjunct faculty members. Referring to representations of adjunct faculty in film, stories, and academic publications, such as the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, one adjunct faculty member notes the invisibility of adjuncts:

Not a single tale in “Love and Lust on Faculty Row,” *The Lecherous Professor*, or the articles in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* mentions an adjunct. Does the human libido run at differential rates: on full throttle in academic superstars and not at all in adjuncts?... Adjuncts have the same urges and have committed the same deeds as the *bêtes noires* of academe. We have neither status nor power (what prepubescent child has either?) and thus no reason for inclusion in books or articles that, after all, are not really about sex but about abuse of power. Adjuncts lust after better teaching schedules and office space, not undergraduates. (Cumo, Love and Lust on Faculty Row, 2000)

Since it is likely not true that only full-time faculty members engage in sexual acts with students, yet only full-time faculty members are represented as doing so, then adjunct faculty members have been rendered invisible. Suggesting that adjunct faculty members have neither “status nor power” means that adjunct faculty are not deemed important enough to matter, even if they might engage in untoward behavior. In other words, adjunct faculty are not seen as equals to full-time faculty members.

Invisibility is created through a number of institutional practices. Some of these range from not providing office space to adjunct faculty members to leaving adjuncts out of faculty meetings. Lydia Edelhaus describes this invisibility in a comment to an article posted on the *Inside Higher Ed* Web site:

Snubbing at the academy is not a matter of academic preparation; it is most definitely a class issue. My PhD compared more than favorably to existing tenured department heads’ Master’s degrees, and that was the case for many of the rest of us as well... But as far as they were concerned, adjunct faculty were more or less invisible. (Edelhaus, 2009)

This rendering of adjunct faculty as invisible also extends to the collection of data by the Department of Education, argues the Adjunct Nation Web site. Citing a study by Cross and Goldenberg, a blog on the Adjunct Nation Web site suggests that universities routinely lie or invent numbers when asked “How many non-tenured faculty teach on your campus?” The result, the e-zine argues, is a division between full-time and part-time faculty members:

AAUP’s *raison d’etre* these days is the salvation of tenure through the vilification of “fast food faculty” based, in no small part, on the “documented” growth-in-numbers tracked by Department of Education faculty surveys. Cross and Goldenberg conclude that political strategies, such as the AAUP’s, are based on the “fictitious precision” of the data used to document increases in the number of non-tenured faculty. The Department of Education posed a simple question: How

many non-tenured faculty teach on your campus? Instead of figuring out how to answer the question accurately and honestly, college administrators “fudged” their results. (Research Built on a House of Cards, 2011)

Through fudging numbers, adjunct faculty can then be represented as a threat to the institution of tenure and, as such, a threat to the livelihood of full-time faculty members. Furthermore, the inaccuracy of the numbers contributes to a lack of knowledge about the true impact of adjunct faculty members in the academy, rendering them invisible.

As discussed earlier, to identify as a contingent worker constitutes the worker as a temporary, fleeting member of academic institutions. In terms of solidarity, when workers are rendered invisible solidarity is difficult to develop. Workers cannot identify with each other if they cannot see each other. As such, a localized solidarity develops, but not a broad solidarity.

A related problem occurs when trying to identify who is included and excluded from the movement. Many workers share the contingency of the academic market. However, to the extent adjunct faculty members see themselves as *the representatives* of contingency, the potential to build bridges with tenure-track faculty members (and even administrators, students, and the broader public) is lost. Instead, the conversation degenerates into a “who-does-the-most-work” battle rather than a shared understanding of the forces of contingency.

Ultimately, the difficulty of adjunct faculty unionization efforts lies in their constitution within a geometric substance, while lacking other forms of substance which may be used to create solidarity. A directional substance that workers could

identify with would help generate goals and a *telos* for the movement. A clearly defined dialectical substance could help workers understand what they are fighting against, as well as better articulate who they are as a movement. While not discussed earlier in this chapter, familial substance is completely missing from the fragments examined. A familial substance might create a common ground on which workers can identify. The geometric substance of the workers creates a common sense of victimhood, but constrains adjunct faculty members from moving beyond that victimization to more productive expressions of solidarity for the movement.

Furthermore, constituting workers within a contingent geometric substance is problematic because the rhetoric of contingency is imposed on the workers. As such, workers inhabit the negative qualities of the rhetorical substance, without recourse for transcending that substance (leaving the scene, as it were). Those outside the movement appropriate the meaning of contingency, preventing identification between workers. This substance also constitutes workers as different from one another, making solidarity more difficult. As Bosquet (2008) notes, contingent academic workers comprise “a group whose precarious position is overwhelmingly designed to disable solidarity, face-to-face encounters, and the emergence of a common sense of culture and communal interest” (p. 14). Rethinking a substance outside of contingency may be necessary to enable solidarity within the movement. Finally, in some senses this substance is defined narrowly as in only academic workers without full-time contracts are constituted as contingent. A broader understanding of the nature of contingency might allow for solidary bridges across institutional roles.

In the final chapter, I turn to discuss the way the different forms of Burkean substance found in the rhetorical fragments of the American Labor Movement shape solidarity within the movement. I highlight the ways the substances discussed have enabled the constitution of workers in similar terms, thus building solidarity within the movement. Further, I point to how solidarity within the movement has been constrained by the development of these forms of substance, as well as the difficulty of identifying solidarity when the substance of the movement is lacking.

Chapter 5: Taking a Deep Breadth

In Chapter One, I posited the problem of taking a deep breadth in building solidarity within the American Labor Movement. This problem speaks to the desire for having solidarity within the movement that allows for a broad solidarity that is the basis of collective action: providing the numbers that can give strength to a movement. At the same time, a deep solidarity is necessary; one in which movement members can identify with each other at a level where self sacrifice is possible for the sake of the entire movement. Many of the problems within the American Labor Movement have stemmed from the ambiguity of trying to create both a deep and broad solidarity. Moreover, the case studies examined in this dissertation offer insight into the tensions between a deep and broad solidarity, as well as their possibility, through articulating the rhetorical substance constituting members within each movement. The substantive identifications of movement members underlie their potential for solidarity. In other words, in order for movement members to see each other as similar, they were constituted as sharing a common substance.

In this chapter, I discuss what this dissertation's case studies reveal about how the rhetorical substance of a movement can constitute movement members in solidarity with one another; and how that level of solidarity contributes to the potential success or failure

of the movement. I begin by reviewing the rhetorical substance constituting members within each case study, positing the implications that substance had for solidarity within each case study, and what can be learned regarding the success of the American Labor Movement. I then turn to discuss rhetorical scholarship on the study of social movements and how this project contributes to the understanding of solidarity within movement studies. Before delving into the crux of my argument, however, I would like to review Kenneth Burke's discussion of substance, as well as introduce Burke's discussion of the paradox of substance as a lens for seeing the relationship between deep and broad solidarity within the American Labor Movement.

Burke's Paradox of Substance and its Meaning for Solidarity

According to Burke, the paradox of substance results from an understanding of the multiple ways in which meaning of substance is defined. In Burke's (1962) language:

The word is often used to designate what some thing or agent intrinsically *is*, as *per* these meanings in Webster's: "the most important element in any existence; the characteristic and essential components of anything; the main part; essential import; purport." Yet etymologically "substance" is a scenic word. Literally, a person's or a thing's sub-stance would be something that stands beneath or supports the person or thing. (pp. 21-22)

In terms of movement studies, therefore, substance refers intrinsically to that which makes the movement. In other words, substance is that essential element that makes a movement what it is. However, substance is also derived from outside the movement. In the scenic sense, substance is external to the movement, specifically underneath.

Substance is the ground of the movement; it is what gives the movement a place to stand:

... the word "substance," used to designate what a thing *is*, derives from a word designating something that a thing *is not*. That is, though used to designate

something *within* the thing, *intrinsic* to it, the word etymologically refers to something *outside* the thing, *extrinsic* to it. (Burke, 1962, p. 23)

Substance, thus, both reflects what something is and what something is not. In both cases, substance constitutes our understanding of the thing in its place.

The concept of solidarity is similar to that of substance. In Chapter One, I outlined the different ways in which the term “solidarity” has been used by various theorists. In some cases, solidarity has been used to refer to the ground on which movements stand. In other words, solidarity is external to the movements and cultivated as the basis of action and motives within the movement. In another sense, solidarity is understood as seeing fellow human beings in similar terms. In other words, humans share a common, intrinsic substance which enables us to understand each other as human beings. Solidarity is both what shapes and grounds the movement.

Ultimately, however, substance is, as Burke (1962) notes, “a major resource of rhetoric” (p. 51). The process of substantiation is a rhetorical process used to constitute the solidarity of a movement. This process involves identifying what is a part of the movement, as well as what falls outside of the movement. The rhetorical construction of solidarity creates the consubstantial relations of individuals within a movement, as well as those outside:

To call a man a friend or brother is to proclaim him consubstantial with oneself, one’s values or purposes. To call a man a bastard is to attack him by attacking his whole line, his “authorship,” his “principle” or “motive.” ... An epithet assigns substance doubly, for in stating the character of the object it at the same time contains an implicit program of action with regard to the object, thus serving as motive. (Burke, 1962, p. 57)

The different types of substance Burke refers to are encapsulated by this quotation. One's authorship is an expression of one's familial substance, one's principle a reflection of the geometric substance, and one's motive that of directional substance. These assertions of substance are rhetorical statements of what makes individuals consubstantial, constituting them as solidary members of a movement. The rhetoric creates the identity and points of identification within a movement, as well as define the course of action possible within the movement. To assert one's substance in familial terms creates the way in which movement members identify with each other (as sharing a common authorship), but also the course of action possible within the movement: to dialectically define those outside of the movement as not sharing the same authorship or as having a different authorship. To define the substance of a movement geometrically, or contextually, means the context of the movement become the basis of solidary identifications, but also the point challenged by the movement: the basis of the motivations within the movement.

As such, identifying the rhetorical substance of the American Labor Movement is useful for understanding the constitution of solidarity within the movement, and the way the exercise of that form of solidarity contributes to the successes and failures of the movement. The constitution of individuals in solidarity, as consubstantial, provides a lens through which a movement can be critically examined. The three case studies I have offered, those of the Industrial Workers of the World, the United Farm Workers, and adjunct faculty unionization efforts, provide an opportunity to see how different forms of substance constitute movement members in solidarity. The case studies also provide an opportunity to see how changing historical circumstances contribute to the rhetorical

construction of solidarity within the American Labor Movement. I now review the different constitutions of rhetorical substance within each case study with an eye to the challenges and opportunities these substances afforded the case studies.

Rhetorical Substance of the IWW, the UFW, and Adjunct Faculty Unionization Efforts

Industrial workers of the world. Members of the IWW were primarily constituted through a shared geometric and dialectical substance. This geometric and dialectical substance constituted a broad solidarity for members of the IWW; however, conflicts about the extent of the IWW's substance ultimately hindered the full potential of the movement. In Chapter Two, I advanced four claims about the construction of solidarity within the IWW. First, the IWW created a broad solidarity by defining the geometric scene in which workers were placed. Second, the IWW refined this solidarity by appealing to the dialectical tensions between workers and their agons. Third, other potential points of identification were downplayed within the movement for the sake of maintaining this broad solidarity. Fourth, conflicts over what constituted both the geometric and dialectical substance of workers contributed to problems within the IWW. A brief review of each of these claims is in order.

In the first place, a broad solidarity was constituted within the IWW through rhetorically constructing the substance of movement members in terms of geometric substance. In particular, the geometric substance of workers was constituted as members of the industrial field. "Industrial" was the broad term used to define workers as sharing a particular contextual situation. To the extent that workers could identify with their shared status as industrial workers, those workers were able to see themselves as consubstantial.

Defining workers as “industrial” enabled a broader solidarity than was previously possible. Prior to the formation of the IWW, workers identified primarily within craft traditions. In other words, workers identified with the artistry of creating a product. The geometric scene of workers was confined to the spaces in which the workers’ crafts were carried out. Defining workers as industrial, rather than craft, broadened the scene in which identifications between workers was possible. In doing so, a broader solidarity became possible as well. As such, the rhetorical fragments within the IWW reflected the desire to create “One Big Union” of all workers the world over, a feat only possible if workers were constituted within a broader geometric substance. In other words, the rhetorical fragments needed to constitute workers as members of the same industrial condition to provide the identification necessary to achieve solidarity within the organization.

Second, the IWW constituted members within a dialectical substance. By defining workers against what they are not, organization members could develop a deeper solidarity. This solidarity enabled workers to name an enemy, in the form of owners who stood outside the contextual conditions defined by the geometric substance of workers; it also allowed workers to assert the values and principles of the movement members in order to constitute them in solidarity. While naming the enemies of the movement, the dialectical substance of movement members also created the rhetorical conditions necessary to define the boundaries of solidarity within the movement. Workers that did not fall under the rhetorically constructed definition of “industrial,” such as lawyers, could be dialectically defined as outside of the movement.

Furthermore, the dialectical constitution of movement members combined with their understanding of their geometric substance provided a rhetorical basis for constituting workers who did not see themselves as part of the movement. In other words, strike-breakers could be seen as traitors to the movement precisely because they failed to understand their geometric substance, forcing them to be dialectically constituted as enemies of the movement. Movement traitors were such because they lacked the intellectual capacity to understand the contextual relationships that defined their substance. Reform of these workers was possible if they could be educated that the dialectical relationships they were constituted by forced them to adopt virtues and principles falling outside of the positive identity defined by their “true” substance.

The IWW further recognized that potential movement members could see themselves in terms of other forms of substance. For instance, workers could identify within a familial substance rather than a geometric one. To constitute movement members in solidarity, those other forms of substance required rejection. As noted in Chapter Two, maintaining a broad solidarity based on the geometric substance of industry required a rhetorical rejection of the potential familial substance of workers. In this sense, a broad solidarity forced the sacrifice of the potentially deep solidarity that might have been possible if members were constituted as sharing a different form of Burkean substance. As such, other forms of substance were downplayed by the IWW as unimportant to the solidarity of the movement. Culture, gender, and religion were portrayed within the IWW as antithetical to the substance of the movement, often treated with derision as a point of identification. In part, this contributed to an essentialist view

of members, not allowing for differences within the movement as a potential resource for solidarity, which I discuss in more detail later in this section.

Constituting the rhetorical substance of IWW members in geometric and dialectical terms enabled a broad solidarity, and to some extent a deeper solidarity. However, identification with these forms of substance also created problems for the movement. In terms of dialectical substance, potential allies to the movement were lost, hindering the goal of a broad solidarity. In terms of geometric substance, conflicts over the nature of the contextual scene in terms of its constitution and extent hindered the development of a deep solidarity. I will focus my time here on the second problem.

According to Foner (1965), the height of IWW membership occurred in 1912, with 18,387 members (p. 462)³⁷. Membership steadily declined moving toward 1920. While several reasons were posited for the decline of the IWW, a couple stand out for their relationship to solidarity. These were, according to Foner, the loss of Socialist Labor Party as a key part of the IWW membership base, and the prevalence of too many “isms” in the organization. As noted in Chapter Two, the IWW suffered two schisms. The first took place in 1906, with a faction of members, including Daniel DeLeon and William Trautmann, ousting the IWW president. The president was accused of misusing IWW funds.

After the ouster, conflict broke out between the factions over the role political action ought to play in the organization, nearly leading to a second schism. The preamble to the IWW constitution reads that a struggle must continue “on the political as well as

³⁷ Though Foner notes these numbers were likely inflated by the IWW.

the industrial field.” Trautmann sought to have the word “political” struck from the preamble. DeLeon opposed. A compromise was reached, leaving “political” in the preamble, but members passed a resolution that stated the IWW would not make political endorsements. This conflict represents a rhetorical struggle to define the geometric substance of the movement. Interestingly, both parties sought to define the “field” in which the organization’s identity was composed, a clear battle over the geometric substance of the organization.

While a second fissure was avoided in 1906, it was not so at the fourth IWW convention in 1908. Interestingly, the conflict of 1906 led to a decline in Socialist IWW members. The Western Federation of Miners withdrew from the organization, leading to a mass exodus of Socialist Labor Party members. The organization was thus left primarily to those members who articulated their geometric substance as an economic substance within the industrial field. The conflict between the Socialist Party and the industrialist faction of the IWW continued throughout its existence and is partially responsible for later declines in membership.

Foner further notes the presence of too many “isms” contributing to IWW decline. The problem was that too many disparate ideological positions were represented by the organization³⁸. In other words, the organization failed to adequately define its substance and the broad solidarity of the “One Big Union” would not allow for deep solidarity to develop.

³⁸ He provides the examples of anarchism and socialism, arguing the IWW had become “a clearinghouse for ism peddlers.”

So, within the early American Labor Movement we see the difficulty of creating a broad and deep solidarity, in taking a deep breadth. In the 1960s, another labor organization faced similar challenges in defining the substance of its movement. That organization was the United Farm Workers. In facing this challenge, UFW members took a different approach to rhetorically constituting its members in solidarity.

United farm workers. The UFW rhetorically defined the substance of movement members in terms of familial and directional solidarity. As dialectical substance encompasses the other forms of substance discussed in this dissertation, it is also present in the rhetorical fragments of the UFW. However, the dialectical substance of the movement is constituted in terms of the familial and directional substance of the UFW. The familial substance of UFW members enabled the organization to build a deeper solidarity than the IWW, one in which workers could see themselves as sharing common authorship. The directional substance allowed for a broader solidarity. Of the three case studies discussed, the UFW was likely the most successful in bridging the tensions between a deep and broad solidarity, though those tensions did sometimes create problems for the movement.

In Chapter 3, I offered four claims that warrant review and discussion here. First, I argued the UFW can be distinguished from the IWW by appealing to the derivational, or familial, substance of workers. Second, the UFW supplemented the derivational substance of the workers by appealing to their directional substance. The derivational and directional substance of workers contributed to a deep solidarity. Third, the UFW expanded their solidarity to include consumers and volunteers using directional

substance, creating a broader, though not deep, solidarity. Finally, the substantive identifications of the workers enabled solidarity within the UFW, but also created problems during the later years of the organization.

The UFW primarily constituted workers in solidarity by rhetorically appealing to their familial substance. This familial substance took a variety of forms. In some cases, the UFW appealed to the common cultural ancestry of workers, enabling them to identify with each other through the common spirit of cultural icons. In others, the workers identified with each other in terms of the founder of the movement, Cesar Chavez. These rhetorical fragments demonstrated a deeper solidarity between workers than that found in the IWW. However, familial substance also contributed to a broader solidarity by constituting movement members in spiritual and humanistic consubstantiality, appealing to a divine source as the ancestral roots of the movement. Familial substance thus enabled both a deep and broad solidarity to form within the UFW.

Additionally, the rhetorical fragments of the UFW suggested the directional substance of movement members contributed to deep and broad notions of solidarity. The directional substance of the UFW constituted members as part of a movement for social change. Movement members were encouraged to identify with the movement itself, as the substance of the movement. Referring to the movement as *La Causa* or *La Huelga*, UFW members not only saw themselves as engaging in a directional action, but as consubstantial with that action. Participating in the strike was more than an action, it was a substantive identification. To join the strike meant *becoming* *La Huelga*.

This directional substance enabled the UFW to build a broader solidarity with members that lacked the derivational or familial substance of the movement. For instance, the movement was able to build solidary bridges with consumers by moving them through their passions. Fragments speaking to consumers' interests in social justice and describing the plight of migrant farm workers enabled consumers to see themselves within the goals of the movement. Furthermore, individuals joined the movement who did not share the familial substance of the farm workers because they could identify with the directional substance of the movement.

As with the IWW, the substantive identifications of movement members faced challenges, revealing the potential pitfalls of the rhetorical construction of solidarity through appeals to the substance of movement members. In particular, the familial substance of the UFW could only work so long as movement members could see themselves in terms of the identified authors of the movement. Once the author of the movement (Chavez) was perceived as changing substance, transforming the consubstantial identifications of movement members was placed in jeopardy. Furthermore, familial substance could mean sacrificing a broad solidarity in favor of a deep solidarity to the extent that the familial substance is defined in limiting terms.

The late 1970s and early 1980s showed the difficulty of maintaining the familial substance of movement members as the primary point of identification. Hammerback & Jensen (1998) note, "Chavez found a source of hope in his theme of the union as family" (p. 114). The familial served as the substance of the UFW, with Chavez as its author. The authors credit Chavez with engineering a "70 percent increase in real wages from 1964-

1980, pension plans, disability insurance, health care benefits, and the creation of a credit union” (p. 6). Indeed, the successes of this movement show the best combination of a deep and broad solidarity of the three case studies in this project.

However, examining the decline of the movement in the 1980s reveals the difficulties of maintaining the familial substance of the movement. Hammerback & Jensen (1998) note:

Factionalization within the union and Chavez’s inability to make the transition from advocate to bureaucrat internally weakened the United Farm Workers; the union lost most of its contracts and saw its membership further decline; the mass media, a long-time ally, now openly criticized Chavez for causing the UFW’s internal problems. (p. 156)

As discussed in Chapter Three, a familial relationship stems from sharing substance with a common source. To the extent Chavez was seen as this source, his failures as a leader limited the solidarity of the movement. Once workers could no longer identify with Chavez as representative of the substance of the movement, the membership rolls declined. The representative of the movement holds the substance of the membership together in a familial configuration.

In the case of the IWW and the UFW, identifying the substance of the movement was much easier than that of the final case study. In part, this simplicity could be attributed to the location of workers within a common space and context. Additionally, these two organizations might be developed over time and the solidarity of the movements was tested through strikes and other confrontations with their dialectical opposition. In the case of a young movement like that of adjunct faculty unionization, the substance of movement members is difficult to articulate. As such, neither a deep nor

broad solidarity has developed. I now turn to discuss how the substance of adjunct faculty has been defined and the challenges that currently face this movement.

Adjunct faculty unionization. Efforts to organize adjunct faculty members suffer from an inconsistent and ambiguous constitution of the movement's substance. As discussed in Chapter Four, part of the difficulty of organizing adjunct faculty stems from the changing nature of the academy and beliefs about the role of faculty members both within the academy and as members of the working class. Adjunct faculty members straddle rhetorical boundaries between the working class and white-collar labor, defying traditional conceptions of class politics in which individuals who engage in management-type activities are defined as outsiders to laborers. The education level of these workers might also contribute to a lack of interest in solidarity with manual laborers. At the same time, these workers face many of the same day-to-day struggles of the working class: the desire for adequate pay, health care, retirement benefits, and workplace safety.

Consequently, adjunct faculty unionization efforts are fragmented. Several organizations proclaim to represent the voice of adjunct faculty, ranging from local to national organizations. Some organizations, such as the AAUP, advocate for adjunct rights at the same time as they attempt to fight for the rights of full-time and tenured faculty members. Other organizations, such as COCAL and the New Faculty Majority, advocate more specifically for the rights of workers facing contingent working and market conditions. Furthermore, adjunct faculty members view their individual substance in a variety of ways.

As such, the paradox of substance looms large within the context of adjunct faculty unionization efforts. In Burkean terms, adjunct faculty members might be said to be motivated by dual substances representing collective and individual motivations. Burke (1962) offers the example of the soldier whose collective motivation is to kill the enemies of his country, while his individual motive reflects distaste for killing his enemies (p. 37). The conflict of these substances is difficult to transcend, particularly in a way that could animate a movement. In terms of adjunct faculty, individual faculty members are motivated by their situated conditions, goals, aspirations and the like; motivations which conflict with the motivations of a collective class of faculty workers. The individual motives hold stronger when potential collective motives lack strong substantive identification.

The challenges of solidarity within these efforts should be exposed first through a review of the major claims I offered in Chapter Four, which reveal the ambiguities of substance discussed by Burke. To begin, I argued adjunct faculty members are constituted through a common geometric substance. Second, the dialectical and directional substance of these workers is ill-defined and sometimes contradictory. Third, solidarity is difficult to develop when the rhetorical substance of adjunct faculty unionization efforts lacks cohesion. This case study thus reveals the difficulty of developing a deep and broad solidarity, but also its possibilities—particularly within a post-industrial economic context. Furthermore, to the extent this case study represents broader developing global trends, the study is especially important for thinking about

how to conceive solidarity within contemporary society. It may also matter more to readers, many of whom are located within the academy.

First, adjunct faculty unionization efforts identify workers within a contingent geometric substance. The substance of workers reflects that workers are constituted by market forces that drive their identity. This contingency shapes workers' identifications in a variety of ways. One such way is through constructing academic workers nomadic, fleeting members of academic institutions. The image of the "Freeway Flyer" or "gypsy" suggests that workers do not see themselves as members of individual institutions, nor perhaps even the "academy" as a discrete, situated institution; but rather as members of a broader system in which the academy functions. The shared contingency of workers within this system serves as the basis of solidarity: it is the means through which academic workers see themselves as the same as other workers. Often, these workers are not actually temporary in the sense they work at individual institutions for long periods of time. However, the possibility they can lose their position within the system without recourse constitutes their contingency.

Furthermore, the system renders these workers invisible. They are becoming the silent majority of workers within the academy, lacking status and power as a result of their representations within the system as fleeting. As such, the workers construct themselves as victims of the contextual forces that shape their identifications. As victims of the system, the potential for a broad solidarity is created (to the extent that workers can see they have the status of victims in common).

Second, the potential for this solidarity is short-changed when academic workers attempt to define their dialectical and directional substance. Rhetorically articulating these substances is difficult. One reason for this difficulty stems from the geometric substance of contingency. While workers share placement within a contingent context, the experience of that contingency varies. This creates a challenge for building both broad and deep solidarity. The challenge for creating broad solidarity is seen in the relationship between adjunct faculty workers and full-time workers. While full time workers may share elements of contingency with adjunct faculty workers, they are dialectically constructed as enemies to adjunct faculty interests. Furthermore, adjunct faculty workers, from the perspective of full-time workers, contribute to the contingency of other workers with a willingness to work for less. For instance, adjunct faculty workers could be viewed as the *esquiroles* of the academy. They are cheap labor imported into the academy as a means of undercutting the quality of life of full-time workers.

Furthermore, adjunct faculty members assert their place within the academy in a variety of ways. For some, the experience of contingency is a matter of piecing together a living by flying between various institutions. For others, contingency is a choice as is reflected by the image of the adjunct-by-choice. In other words, these workers join their respective institutions for different reasons, making a deep solidarity more difficult to develop. The Adjunct-By-Choice may share some elements of contingency with the Freeway Flyer, but other elements may seem less important. Consequently, while both are contingent workers, the way they define their substance in terms of that contingency varies.

Finally, these workers suffer from a lack of directional substance. Workers lack consensus over what the direction of the movement ought to be. As noted in Chapter Four, part of this lack of direction might result from the fear created by the contingent status of workers. In other words, solidary action is avoided out of fear of reprisal (e.g., the administration dismissing several workers from their positions). In this sense, the geometric substance of workers defeats their ability to see other substances that may shape their identifications. However, other rhetorical fragments suggest that direction is possible, but the wrong direction is being taken. In other words, disagreement exists over what steps should be taken to overcome the contingency of the workers. Either way, workers cannot see themselves in terms of that direction, hindering the development of either a deep or broad solidarity.

The difficulty of developing solidarity through a common rhetorical substance is demonstrated through the number of organizations designed to assist adjunct faculty unionization efforts. Some of these organizations advocate solely for contingent workers, while others advocate for all faculty workers. While having a number of overlapping organizations is useful, what adjunct faculty members lack is a common assertion of substance: a common voice. The contradictory, yet overlapping substance of workers prevents deep and broad solidarity from developing.

To this point, I have reviewed how Burke's notion of rhetorical substance can illuminate the building of solidarity within a social movement, particularly as it applies to the American Labor Movement. The different forms of substance constitute movement members in a variety of ways, allowing them to see each other in the same terms.

However, the way the substance of the movement is articulated, or conflicts about the substance of the movement also can hinder the development of solidarity. I now turn to how this research contributes to scholarly discussions about social movements.

Social Movement Scholarship

Solidarity as a concept is incredibly important in the context of social movements. As noted in Chapter One, solidarity is a term that is often deployed without any real sense of what it is or how it operates. Yet, social movements often work from the assumption that the success of the movement is contingent on solidarity. I have argued throughout this dissertation that solidarity is tied to the rhetorical substance of movement members. Seeing others as akin to oneself such that one is willing to sacrifice for the other relies on a common assertion of substance. In other words, individuals must see each other as consubstantial in order for solidarity to develop. As such, the rhetorical construction of solidarity, taking a deep breath, is contingent on the articulation of common substance within a movement. The rhetorical process of consubstantiation must speak to the variety of substances on which solidarity might be built, as well as provide a consistent view of a movement's substance. Movements without substance, therefore, lack the ground which gives the movement a place to stand.

With this in mind, I turn to some key scholarly discussions on the role of solidarity. I first discuss the role of materialism in movement studies, arguing for a compromise between the perspectives of Ron Greene and Dana Cloud over how materialism should be conceived. Second, I turn to Marxist critiques of essentialism and

discuss how a Burkean perspective provides opportunities for transcending essential notions of the working class allowing for deep and broad solidarity.

A new materialism. In this dissertation, I have argued the substance of movement members is used as a rhetorical appeal to build solidarity within the movement. Earlier in this chapter, I introduced the idea of the “paradox of substance,” which suggests individuals’ substance represents both what is intrinsic and extrinsic to them. As such, substance could be said to be the material make-up of individuals, as well as something that stands outside of them. The debate between Ron Greene and Dana Cloud over the potential for rethinking materialism speaks to this paradox. On the one hand, a person’s substance might be said to arise from the material conditions that shape that person. On the other hand, a person’s substance might stand outside of those material conditions. In this section, I discuss the contours of this debate and suggest how examining the role of substance in the context of solidarity might offer a compromise between the two positions. I begin with a review of Greene’s call for a new materialism.

Greene (1998) suggests a materialist rhetoric should place more emphasis on how rhetoric functions as a technology of deliberation. As such, critics should focus on “how rhetorical practices create the conditions of possibility for a governing apparatus to judge and program reality” (p. 22). Greene’s problem with the traditional conception of materiality (as defended by Cloud) is that it limits our understanding of materiality to a base-superstructure model, a structuralist model. This perspective is limiting, according to Greene, because it does not account for the complexity of everyday practice (especially in advanced post-industrial capitalism). Furthermore, this materialism is limiting because

it forces us to view rhetoric as an instrumental mode of persuasion and limits our ability to see rhetoric as a mode of identification. Seeing rhetoric as a mode of identification is important because solidarity cannot operate without an understanding of the rhetorical points of identification within a movement.

Cloud has repeatedly attempted to discredit a more discursive view of materialism. Cloud (2006) challenges Greene, accusing him of ignoring the fact that “change happens”: “The recognition of the actual interests of the culturally diverse and discursively creative working class in a world still divided into classes is no more and no less than the ability to make practical judgments, on the basis of which there might be an actual, organized, systematic, and powerful attempt to change the world” (p. 68). I take Cloud as attempting to argue that a dialectical relationship between the working class and the ownership class drives human agency. Cloud views this dialectical opposition as an ongoing, material struggle. The potential for collective action and the ability of the oppressed to rise up and fight for change is driven by its material opposition to the ownership class.

Indeed, Cloud (2006) accuses poststructuralist or cultural studies theorists (after Althusser) of ignoring material existence (p. 65). From this articulation, Cloud (2006) repeatedly suggests that approaching issues of labor from a discursive perspective precludes theorists from grounding their analysis in real working class interests: “In this formulation, the kind of social antagonism described by Marx between existing working and ruling classes must become a discursive articulation of forces on the basis of contingent, constructed identities with no fundamental basis in reality” (pp. 66-67). As

such, Cloud shares the Marxist assumption that ideology is rooted in materiality and cannot exist independent of that materiality, which is fundamental to life.

Cloud seems to find the contingent, cultural, or discursive approach to be particularly damning largely because it does not acknowledge the basic exploitative relationship between classes. Acknowledging these fundamental structural inequalities is the key to agency. Cheney (Cloud & Cheney, 2006) interprets the situation as such: Cloud “would position most or all of these efforts as inherently limited in scope because of their operation within a system that is at its base exploitative” (p. 503). Cloud clearly sees agency within a structural lens justified what appear to Cloud as materially real antagonisms between objectively real classes.

These points are further raised in a direct response to Greene by Cloud, Macek and Aune (2006). In this piece, the authors argue that Greene’s criticism of Marxism does not fully comprehend Marxist epistemology and obscures the complexity of the historical, materialist position; that he does not understand the trajectory of world capitalism; and that he does not offer a normative criteria for agency within his new materialist approach (p. 72). At some point, the authors contend, the discursive construction of reality must butt against the “brute material reality of exploitation and human suffering” (p. 74). These arguments reflect the assumption that discourse exists outside of material reality and, as such, discourse cannot solve real material problems.

A third problem offered by Cloud concerns the articulation of multiple modes of identification that extend beyond class antagonisms. Poststructuralist approaches, in Cloud’s (2006) estimation, de-center class struggles for the sake of an anarchistic and ill-

defined identity politics. At the heart of Cloud's argument is the desire to bring the multitudinous, diverse people together within a common struggle. Without a materialist notion of identity (defined for Cloud by dialectics), humans lose agency necessary to combat exploitation.

The perspectives exemplified by Cloud and Greene represent common arguments between structuralist and poststructuralist positions on materiality. Indeed, the allegiance between Cloud's perspective and Marx's work are quite clear, as are the affinities between the work of Greene and that of Foucault. Interestingly, both sides tend to hedge their bets. Cloud is willing to acknowledge that discourse sometimes has material effects. Meanwhile, it would be difficult for Greene to deny the material existence of exploitation, nor has he tried. The question, then, is a matter of degree.

The difficulty I find in this debate surrounds the idea that materiality is simply a matter of the exploitive conditions existing within class antagonisms. In other words, while exploitation occurs at the class level, that exploitation stretches across multiple points of identity. Class is one of a number of identifications exploited within the capitalist realm. As discussed earlier, a dialectical understanding of solidary practices limits the ability of the labor movement to bridge the gap between potential other alliances, as well as contributes to fissures within the movement. Cloud assumes individuals see their substance as primarily an economic one, which does not even hold true for people fighting within a labor movement. For instance, while the UFW struggles against economic exploitation, the primary point of identification for building the movement was appealing to the derivational substance of the workers. The multitudinous,

diverse identifications of individuals combating exploitation can actually become a resource for building the solidarity necessary to fight exploitation.

To a certain degree, the scholarly conversation here represents a false choice between a traditional materialist understanding of the labor movement and other potential points of identification. For instance, a derivational notion of solidarity does not preclude rhetorical appeals to the material conditions of exploitation. One can identify both dialectically in opposition to an exploiter, while also having a positive assertion of identity that is derivationally or geometrically defined.

The discussion of Burkean substance offered in this dissertation provides a resource for mediating between Greene and his critics. Substance allows the critic to recognize the material conditions shaping the world, at an intrinsic level, while also allowing for the critic to understand the role language plays in shaping understanding of that material world at an extrinsic level. As Durham (1980) notes, “Substantiation, consciousness of reality, occurs at the point of contact between the finite (vocabulary) and the infinite (the world around). Substance is consciousness as it is enacted in the way people use symbols” (p. 355). As such, rhetoric mediates between our interpretation of the material world and the intrinsic impact the world has on us.

The ambiguities of substance in the relationship to human motivation provide a key role for rhetoric to play. Harte (1977) argues, “Since the notion of substance is founded on a paradox, the concept of ‘consubstantiality’ or identification, which is predicted on it, is likewise paradoxical and conducive to rhetorical exercise” (p. 65). As I have demonstrated throughout this dissertation, more important than the actual material

conditions of workers is the rhetorical construction of our understandings of those conditions. Identification is possible when the rhetor bridges the gap between the material world and its interpretation through rhetorically constituting the substance of individuals. From this base, solidarity becomes possible as rhetoric constitutes individuals as like each other.

Greene's call for a new materialism reflects scholarly conversations about essentialist class politics. Marx has been criticized to varying degrees for relying on an essentialist understanding of class relations. The problem of an essentialist class politics is starkly illustrated with the IWW in Chapter One. Particularly, the identification of all workers under the umbrella of "industrial," as well as the stark dialectic between workers and employers prevented movement members from articulating difference within the movement without hindering solidarity. As such, there has been a renewed interest in rethinking Marxism within a more postmodern lens that recognizes a politics of difference, as well as the contingency created through processes of globalization. I turn now to a brief discussion of these ideas.

Essentialism. Numerous scholars including Rorty (1989; 1999), Spivak (1987), and Deleuze and Guattari (1987) have offered anti-essentialist positions. In terms of solidarity, denying or glossing over various subject positions individuals can hold can prove damaging to a movement. Often, difference is necessary to understand the development of solidarity within a movement. For instance, Roediger (1991; 2005) offers a thorough analysis of how race shapes our understanding of the development of solidarity within the American Labor Movement. Specifically, Roediger argues that

immigrant workers had to undergo a process of whitening in order to be seen as solidary partners with “native” workers. As each new immigrant group sought employment, they were first treated as outsiders until they were constituted within an essentialized white identity. As such, essentialist readings of class force people with difference to erase that difference in order to fit in.

Others have argued difference provides the best means for creating a deep solidarity. Mohanty (2003) claims:

In knowing differences and particularities, we can better see the connections and commonalities because no border or boundary is ever complete or rigidly determining. The challenge is to see how differences allow us to explain the connections and border crossings better and more accurately, how specifying difference allows us to theorize universal concerns more fully. (p. 226)

For Mohanty (2003), “common differences can form the basis of a deep solidarity” (p. 225). Difference strengthens solidarity to the extent that difference is shared. In other words, the conditions of experiencing difference is a resource for solidarity. Furthermore, communities of difference allow for a clearer view of the systems shaping individuals; as Mohanty notes the oppressed have the clearest view of hegemonic systems.

At the same time, too much difference does not leave room for solidarity because it does not allow individuals to see commonalities with each other—it can stretch solidarity too thin. The problem lies in striking a balance between the two. As Parker (2005) notes, “Of course, that project is fraught with risk: if too aleatory, postmodern Marxism is likely to be thought insufficiently materialist; if too materialist, insufficiently aleatory. A very fine line, indeed” (p. 15). In other words, balance is needed between a materialist understanding of class and one that understands difference and contingency.

Bakan (2008) posits room for a broad solidarity if Marx's philosophy is taken holistically, rather than simply from the production-accumulation binary. Particularly, Bakan notes Marx's ideas of alienation and oppression can build alliances in ways that focusing on exploitation cannot. As such, solidarity becomes possible across dialectical differences.

Additionally, some calls have challenged the dialectical understanding of class arising from a materialist perspective. Charusheela (2005) argues that a postmodern revisiting of Marx should include non-binary understandings of class politics. In other words, simple binaries between workers and employees are no longer tenable, especially when the distinctions between the two are no longer as clear cut as seemed in the early 1900s. By de-centering the binary between workers and capitalists, new avenues for building solidarity open.

This research project contributes to the above conversation in a variety of ways. First, as Chapter Two demonstrates, an essentialist solidarity built on the geometric substance of workers suppresses differences between workers. The rhetorical substance of a movement must allow individuals to see each other in the same terms in spite of or even because of their differences. Chapter Four, by contrast, shows how solidarity built on an undefined or overly localized substance can damage a deep and broad solidarity. Each chapter has suggested that the dialectical substance of movement members is shaped by other forms of identification. Furthermore, Chapter Four illustrates the dialectic between employees and owners does not fit within a contingent systemic

environment. Finally, by constituting individuals through multiple substances, there is greater potential for both a deep and broad solidarity.

At the same time, each of these forms of substance is useful for building movement solidarity. To say, for instance, dialectical substance should not always be the point of identification for workers is not to say that dialectical substance does not contribute to solidarity. As Amory Starr (2000) articulates, naming the enemy is often a powerful strategy for building a social movement. To the extent that people can name a common enemy, it is through that enemy that they find common ground. Common ground becomes the basis for collective action. Perhaps this is the “security blanket” that dialectical materialism engenders. So long as capitalists can be named as an enemy, solidarity can be built; change can be viewed (if not actually enacted). However, just because we can name an enemy does not mean that the thing named is necessarily our natural enemy. In fact, the act of naming the enemy can quite literally create the enemy as enemy. So while naming the enemy is one strategy for building resistance, that does not preclude other possible strategies and it may not be the most appropriate strategy given the material and rhetorical context.

Treating the ownership class as necessarily opposed to the working class is also dangerous. The relationship between owners and workers is not determined, it is the result of interpretation. Consider, for instance, the co-op movement in the United States. This movement, often exemplified by the Knights of Labor, attempted to redefine the relationship between labor and ownership by creating a class of laboring owners. In this case, the antagonistic relationship between owners and laborers was diminished. We see

attempts to diminish the antagonistic relationship between owners and workers today through benefit programs such as profit sharing. Workers, then, become invested in the capitalistic system, rather than opposed to it. Two classes of people, laborer and owner, thus are not naturally antagonistic, nor should they always be antagonistic.

Further, the logic of capitalism dictates a dependent relationship between workers and owners. By having a vested interest in the productivity of the company, workers often take a vested interest in themselves. The profit of the company means a great potential for the worker to profit. Workers often identify quite strongly with their employer, and that identification is not simply the result of a false consciousness but can be the result of the mutual dependency fostered in that context.

Of course, Aune (2001) may respond to this discussion by pointing out that capitalism rests on an argument that dictates that there must be winners and losers, which means that an agonistic relationship must exist between classes. Indeed, Aune (2001) critiqued Deirdre McCloskey, arguing that McCloskey's "attempt. . . to preempt an assault on the rhetoric of the market by redefining 'rhetoric' as the conditions of 'good talk' and 'effective scholarly conversation' ignores the agonistic nature of rhetoric and the political implications of scholarly economic argument" (p. 39). To say rhetoric is agonistic, however, is not the same thing as to say it is a dialectical antagonism. Rather, people have multiple points of identification which represent divergent and convergent interests.

In an era of globalization, we need a flexible strategy for the contemporary labor movement. Globalization brings new challenges for activism (Greene, 2003). People

from across the globe are situated differently. In the most obvious sense, they are situated differently in space and time. The conditions of exploitation are similar and different. Contemporary labor activism must find ways to bring itself together to achieve specific goals, while recognizing that not everyone will have the same goals. Contemporary activism should also have the ability to disband and rearticulate in different ways that will confound a structural response to activism. Short term solidarity is every bit as necessary as long term solidarity. Naming an enemy is a useful endeavor, but our enemies will not always be our enemies, nor are they natural enemies.

Indeed, Spivak (1987) offers the idea of “strategic essentialism” to describe one way in which subaltern groups might exercise solidarity. The idea of strategic essentialism rests first on understanding that individuals do not share essential, or natural, characteristics. However, individuals can still operate strategically as if they had an essential identity: creating bridges across differences that enable identification. To the extent substance represents what is outside the individual, the extrinsic, strategic essentialism could be a valuable tool for building solidarity. However, overreliance on essentialism as a strategy can hinder solidarity in the long run.

Rhetorical scholarship can contribute to revitalizing materialism by thinking beyond the structuralist approach, yet recognizing the limits of post-structuralism. In particular, rhetorical studies can help to find points of identification between disparate people. Rhetorical studies can help identify when it is most effective to articulate certain identities while foregoing others. Rhetorical studies can take on the poststructural project of permanent critique, forcing domination to perpetually justify itself. As such, rhetoric

should be viewed as a mode of persuasion, but also as a mode of identification. Burke provides a vocabulary for beginning those thoughts.

Conclusion

In the first chapter, I highlighted many of the challenges today's workers are facing in building solidarity. In many ways, these challenges are magnified within a contingent and globalized society. Furthermore, labor appears to be fighting a losing battle. The academy is under attack, evidenced by legislators in Florida seeking to eliminate tenure, and the governor in Wisconsin looking to erode collective bargaining rights. Migrant farm workers still face many of the same challenges they faced in the 1960s, including the importation of cheaper labor and the back-breaking conditions in which they work. Industry is often rendered invisible, replaced by the more ethereal notion of a knowledge-based economy. New technologies and globalization contribute to a race to the bottom for the world's wages, while working conditions for many factory laborers continue to be deplorable.

New communication technologies such as the Internet have made it easier for people to access institutions. These technologies offer possibilities for the development of an international based solidarity. At the same time, the division of people across the globe means that people have vastly different experiences. Many workers experience sweatshop labor and work in conditions that are reminiscent of colonial America working conditions. While the new communication technologies have made solidarity easier to establish in some ways, they also raise concerns about the depth of solidarity that can be established. As the labor movement works with a greater deal of anonymity than in years

past, the question of how to establish a meaningful solidarity comes more to the fore. Levesque & Murray (2002) note that globalization is a process that has changed the rules within which labor can operate: “Unions are invited to internalize a new set of competitive norms, thereby reducing the legitimacy of arguments not framed in terms of organizational or national competitiveness” (p. 42). According to Levesque & Murray (2002), this means unions must adapt to new roles of “cross border alliances of unions and social groups in building international solidarity” (p. 42).

Through all of this, examining how workers are constituted in solidarity through appeals to their rhetorical substance becomes critical. I have sought to offer a critical rhetorical approach to solidarity using a Burkean lens to examine fragments of the American Labor Movement. A movement’s substance is constituted in a variety of ways. Depending on the context, the rhetorical substance of the movement can create problems. However, it can also create possibility for resistance and building a stronger labor movement. In the context of contingency, articulating a rhetorical substance for the movement is critical.

In Chapter One, I highlighted numerous issues facing the American Labor Movement. The exigencies I discussed suggest the American Labor Movement is struggling. While I do not claim to solve for the problems of the movement, I do suggest the way solidarity is understood can shape the options available to it. If the American Labor Movement is to be successful, members should be cognizant of the rhetorical practices that shape its members in solidarity. Ultimately, the rhetorical practices shaping

the substance of movement members may be critical to the ability of the movement to take a deep breadth.

References

- Adjunct Issues Unresolved at Webster U. (2007, July/August). *Adjunct Advocate* .
- Adjunct Nation. (2011). Adjunct Poll. Retrieved April 30, 2011, from Adjunct Nation:
<http://www.adjunctnation.com/archive/vote/past/>
- American Association of University Professors. (2007). Trends in Faculty Status 1975-2007. Retrieved April 20, 2011, from American Association of University Professors : <http://www.aaup2.org/research/TrendsinFacultyStatus2007.pdf>
- Arneson, E. (1998). Up From Exclusion: Black and White Workers, Race, and the State of Labor History. *Reviews in American History* , 26 (1), 146-174.
- Aune, J. (2001). *Selling the Free Market: The Rhetoric of Economic Correctness*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Bakan, A. (2008). Marxism and AntiRacism: Rethinking the Politics of Difference. *Rethinking Marxism* , 20 (2), 238-256.
- Baldwin, R. (1985). Civil Liberties for All. In S. Bird, D. Georgakas, & D. Shaffer (Eds.), *Solidarity Forever: An oral history of the IWW* (p. 150). Chicago: Lake View Press.
- Bayertz, K. (1999). *Solidarity*. (K. Bayertz, Ed.) Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Because of Our Struggle Now. (1965, December 22). *El Malcriado* , 1 (26), p. 2.
- Bellah, R. (1973). Introduction. In E. Durkheim, *On Morality and Society* (p. xxiii). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Benjamin, E. (2003). Contingent Instructional Staff in Undergraduate Learning. *New Directions for Higher Education* , 2.
- Bierhoff, H. & Kupper, B. (1999). Social Psychology of Solidarity. In K. Bayertz (Ed.), *Solidarity* (pp. 133-156). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bindley, B. (1916, January 15). Why I Became an IWW. *New York Tribune* .
- Bosquet, M. (2008). *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low Wage Nation*. New York: New York University Press.
- Bowers, J. & Ochs, D. (1971). *The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control*. Reading: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.

- Brissenden, P. (1920). *History of the IWW*. New York: Columbia University.
- Brodkin, K. & Strathmann, C. (2004). The Struggle for Hearts and Minds: Organization, Ideology, and Emotion. *Labor Studies Journal* , 29 (3), 1-24.
- Brofenbrenner, K. (2009, May 20). No Holds Barred: The Intensification of Employer Opposition to Organizing. Economic Policy Institute Briefing Paper #235.
- Budd, J. (2005, June 29). United States Department of Labor. Retrieved May 1, 2011, from The Effect of Unions on Employee Benefits: Recent Results from the Employer Costs for Employee Compensation Data:
<http://www.bls.gov/opub/cwc/cm20050616ar01p1.htm>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2009, August). United States Department of Labor. Retrieved May 15, 2011, from Occupational Suicides: Census of Fatal Occupational Injuries: <http://www.bls.gov/iif/oshwc/cfoi/osar0010.pdf>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2011, January 21). United States Department of Labor. Retrieved May 1, 2011, from Union Members Summary:
<http://www.bls.gov/news.release/union2.nr0.htm>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2011, February 8). United States Department of Labor. Retrieved May 17, 2011, from Work Stoppages Summary:
<http://www.bls.gov/news.release/wkstp.nr0.htm>
- Burke, K. (1962). A Grammar of Motives. In K. Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (p. 22). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burke, K. (1935). Revolutionary Symbolism in America. In H. Hart (Ed.), *American Writers' Congress* (pp. 87-94). New York: International Publishers.
- Calabrese, D. (2001, September/October). Review of "Ghosts in the Classroom". *Adjunct Advocate* .
- Charusheela, S. (2005). Class Analysis and Politics: Pushing the Boundaries. *Rethinking Marxism* , 17 (1), 19-27.
- Chavez, C. (2008). Recapping the Mission. In I. Stavans (Ed.), *Cesar Chavez: An Organizer's Tale* (pp. 27-39). New York: Penguin Books.
- Chavez, C. (2008). To be a man is to suffer for others. In I. Stavans (Ed.), *Cesar Chavez: An Organizer's Tale* (pp. 134-135). New York: Penguin Books.

- Chicago Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor. (2010, December 23). Retrieved April 24, 2011, from Chicago Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor:
<http://www.chicagococal.org/>
- Cloud, D. & Cheney, G. (2006). Doing Democracy, Engaging the Material: Employee Participation and Labor Activity in an Age of Globalization. *Management Communication Quarterly* (19), 501-539.
- Cloud, D. (2006). Change Happens: Materialist Dialectics and Communication Studies. In D. Cloud, S. Macek, & L. & Artz (Eds.), *Marxism and Communication Studies* (pp. 53-71). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Cloud, D., Macek, S., & Aune, J. (2006). The Limbo of Ethical Simulacra. *Philosophy and Rhetoric* , 39 (2), 72-86.
- Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor. (2010, August 25). Retrieved April 30, 2011, from The Montreal Doctrine: <http://cocalinternational.org/aboutus.html>
- Coalition on the Academic Workforce. (2010). One Faculty Serving All Students. Coalition on the Academic Workforce.
- Cumo, C. (2000, September/October). Love and Lust on Faculty Row. *Adjunct Advocate* .
- Cumo, C. (2000, September/October). Student Evaluations: What Do They Mean and What Can You Do to Improve Them? *Adjunct Advocate* .
- Cumo, C. (2000, May/June). The Quantum Mechanical Adjunct. *Adjunct Advocate* .
- Decew, J. (2003). *Unionization in the Academy: Visions and Realities*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Definition of a Scab. (1965). *El Malcriado* (22), p. 11.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. (B. Massumi, Trans.) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Delgado, F. (1998). The Trials and Tribulations of Racialized Critical Rhetorical Theory: Understanding the Rhetorical Ambiguities of Proposition 187. *Communication Theory*, 8(3), pp. 245-270.
- Dignity of the Farm Worker. (1967, January 13). *El Malcriado* (54), p. 18.

- Drake, J. (n.d.). Jim Drake 1962–197. Retrieved April 17, 2011, from United Farm Workers Documentation Project:
http://www.farmworkermovement.us/media/oral_history/Drake_Jim.pdf
- Drake, J. (1979, March 24). Lessons from the UFW March 23-24, 1979. Retrieved April 10, 2011, from Farmworker Movement Documentation Project:
http://www.farmworkermovement.us/media/oral_history/Drake_Jim.pdf
- Drake, S. (n.d.). Farm Workers Documentation Project. Retrieved May 17, 2011, from Susan Samuels Drake 1962-1973:
http://farmworkermovement.com/essays/essays/003%20Drake_Susan.pdf
- Dray, P. (2010). *There is Power in a Union*. New York: Doubleday.
- Drozdowski, M. (2005, May/June). Whither the University's Soul? *Adjunct Advocate* .
- Durham, W. (1980). Kenneth Burke's Concept of Substance. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* , 66, 351-64.
- Durkheim, E. (1973). *On Morality and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Edelhaus, L. (2009, September 10). Reply to Jim. Retrieved 17 2011, May, from Inside Higher Ed: <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2009/09/10/maisto>
- Edwards, B. (2009, February 24). The One Power We have as Contingents. Retrieved May 2, 2011, from Inside Higher Education:
<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/02/20/adjuncts#Comments>
- Ehrenreich, B. (2001). *Nickel and Dimed: On (Not) Getting By in America*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.
- Emiliano Zapata. (1966, February 12). *El Malcriado* , p. 2.
- Engelhardt, T. (1991). *Solidarity: Postmodern Perspectives*. In K. S. Bayertz (Ed.), *Solidarity*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Fair, J. (1985). *On the Waterfronts*. In S. Bird, D. Georgakas, & D. Shaffer (Eds.), *Solidarity Forever: An oral history of the IWW* (pp. 183-184). Chicago: Lake View Press.
- Fantasia, R. (1988). *Cultures of Solidarity: Consciousness, Action and Contemporary American Workers*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Farm Workers Pilgrimage. (1966, March 17). *El Malcriado* , p. 4.

- Ferriss, S. & Sandoval, M. (1997). *The Fight in the Fields: Cesar Chavez and the Farmworkers Movement*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Foner, P. (1975). *History of the Labor Movement in the United States: From the Founding of the AFL to the Emergence of American Imperialism*. New York: International Publishers.
- Foner, P. (1965). *History of the Labor Movement in the United States: The Industrial Workers of the World, 1905-1917*. New York: International Publishers.
- Fraser, J. (2001). *White Collar Sweatshops: The Deterioration of Work and Its Rewards in Corporate America*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Garcia, F. (1970, September 15). *El Corrido de Salinas*. *El Malcriado* , 9.
- George, A. (2009, February 23). *Adjunct Status*. Retrieved May 17, 2011, from Inside Higher Ed:
<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/focus/adjuncts/activism/adjuncts2>
- Gobel, A. & Pankoke, A. (1999). *Bonds and Bounds of Solidarity*. In K. Bayertz (Ed.), *Solidarity* (pp. 173-187). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Green, R. (1998). *Another Materialist Rhetoric*. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* (15), 21-41.
- Greene, R. (2003). *John Dewey's Eloquent Citizen: Communication, Judgment and Postmodern Capitalism*. *Argumentation and Advocacy* , 39, 189-200.
- Greenhouse, S. (2009). *The Big Squeeze: Tough Times for the American Worker*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Guia, P. (1965). *Dear Editor*. *El Malcriado* , 1 (18), p. 11.
- H.J. (2011). *Part Time Thoughts*. Retrieved April 30, 2011, from Adjunct Nation :
<http://www.adjunctnation.com/blogs/part-time-thoughts/?p=5>
- Hahn, B. (2001). *Adjunct Apartheid*. In M. Dubson (Ed.), *Ghosts in the Classroom*. Boston: Camelback Books.
- Hall, M. (2011). *Cartoon Time*. Retrieved April 30, 2011, from Adjunct Nation:
<http://www.adjunctnation.com/magazine/cartoon/24/>
- Hall, M. (2011). *Papier Mache Pinata*. Retrieved April 30, 2011 , from Adjunct Nation:
<http://www.adjunctnation.com/magazine/cartoon/18/>

- Hall, M. (2011). Union Headquarters. Retrieved April 30, 2011, from Adjunct Nation: <http://www.adjunctnation.com/magazine/cartoon/29/>
- Hall, M. (2011). What Do Adjuncts Really Want? Retrieved April 30, 2011, from Adjunct Nation: <http://www.adjunctnation.com/magazine/cartoon/25/>
- Hammerback, J. & Jensen, R. (1998). *The Rhetorical Career of Cesar Chavez*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press.
- Harper, D. (2001, November). Online Etymology Dictionary. Retrieved April 21, 2009, from <http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?search=solidarity&searchmode=none>
- Harte, T. (1977). The Concept of Identification in the Rhetorical Theories of Kenneth Burke and Eric Hoffer. *Sign of the Bull* , 7 (2), 64-69.
- Havens, D. (n.d.). Farm Workers Documentation Project. Retrieved May 17, 2011, from David Havens 1963-1966: http://farmworkermovement.com/essays/essays/001%20Havens_David.pdf
- Haywood, B. (1965). The General Strike. In J. Kornbluh (Ed.), *Rebel Voices: An IWW Anthology* (p. 49). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Hearn, M. Developing a Critical Discourse: Michel Foucault and the Cult of Solidarity. *Critical Discourse Studies* , 5 (1), 21-34.
- Hill, J. (1965). Scissor Bill. In J. Kornbluh (Ed.), *Rebel Voices: An IWW Anthology* (p. 136). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Hoppe, A. (1966, April 6). The Valley and the Marchers. *El Malcriado* , p. 3.
- (1965). How He Made It Nonunion. In J. Kornbluh (Ed.), *Rebel Voices: An IWW Anthology* (p. 87). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Huerta, R. (n.d.). Rey Huerta 1968-1975. Retrieved April 17, 2011, from United Farm Workers Documentation Project: http://farmworkermovement.com/essays/essays/053%20Huerta_Rey.pdf
- Industrial Workers of the World. (ca. 1917). *Contract Work*. Chicago: Educational Bureau of the IWW.
- Industrial Workers of the World. (1965). Manifesto. In J. Kornbluh (Ed.), *Rebel Voices: An IWW Anthology* (pp. 7-11). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

- Industrial Workers of the World. (1969). The Founding Convention of the IWW. New York: Merit Publishers.
- Jeter, J. (2009). Flat Broke in the Free Market. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Jones, J. (1999). A Social History of the Laboring Classes. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
- Jones, M. (1965, October 15). Communist Infiltration of the National Farm Workers Association.
- Khushf, G. (1999). Solidarity as a Moral and Political Concept. In K. Bayertz (Ed.), *Solidarity* (pp. 57-79). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kornberg, D. (n.d.). Donna Haber Kornberg 1965–1968, 1970–1975. Retrieved April 17, 2011, from United Farm Workers Documentation Project: Donna Haber Kornberg 1965–1968, 1970–1975
- Lasesco, A. (2007, January/February). Eulogy of an Adjunct Career. *Adjunct Advocate* .
- Leff, M. (1992). Things Made by Words: Reflections of Textual Criticism. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* , 78, 223-231.
- Lesko, P. (2000, May/June). Accentuate the Positive.
- Lesko, P. (2009, January 19). Adjuncts Front and Center? Retrieved May 2, 2011, from Inside Higher Education: <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2009/01/19/street#Comments>
- Levesque, M. & Murray, G. (2002). Local versus Global: Activating Local Union Power in the Global Economy. *Labor Studies Journal* , 27 (3), 39-65.
- Longmont, J. (2000, May/June). P/T & F/T Faculty Teamwork. *Adjunct Advocate* .
- Lyons, R. (2001, January/February). Developing Adjunct Faculty. *Adjunct Advocate* .
- Maisto, M. (2009, September 10). The Adjunct's Moment of Truth. Retrieved May 17, 2011, from Inside Higher Ed: <http://www.adjunctnation.com/archive/magazine/article/159/>
- Matheny, H. (2011, February 16). I Just Don't Get No Respect! Bridging the Gap Between Fuzzy Slippers and Elbow Patches. Retrieved May 11, 2011, from Adjunct Nation: <http://www.adjunctnation.com/blogs/freeway-flyer/?s=%22outer+perimeter%22&Submit=Search>

- Mazur-Stommen, S. (2005, July/August). Why Do I Do It? Good Question! Adjunct Advocate .
- McKerrow, R. (1989). Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis. In C. Burghardt (Ed.), Readings in Rhetorical Criticism (pp. 114-138). State College: Strata Publishing.
- Meister, D. (1977). A Long Time Coming: The Struggle to Unionize America's Farm Workers. New York: MacMillan Publishing.
- Metz, K. (1999). Solidarity and History: Institutions and Social Concepts of Solidarity in 19th Century Western Europe. In K. Bayertz (Ed.), Solidarity (pp. 191-207). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Mohanty, C. (2003). Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Name that Scab. (1965). El Malcriado .
- National Education Association. (2007). The NEA and Contingent Academic Workers in Higher Education: NBI 2004-60 Action Plan. National Education Association.
- National Labor Relations Board v. Yeshiva University, 444 U.S. 672 (United States Supreme Court February 20, 1980).
- Nelson, C. (2011). Part Time Thoughts: Dr. Cary Nelson a.k.a. Professor Harold Hill. Retrieved April 30, 2011, from Adjunct Nation:
<http://www.adjunctnation.com/blogs/part-time-thoughts/?p=77>
- Nelson, E. (1966). Huelga: The First 100 Days of the Great Delano Grape Strike. Delano: Farm Worker Press.
- New Fraud: Growers say Mexican Groups Support Them. (1965). El Malcriado , 1 (24), p. 4.
- Ono, K. & Sloop, J. (1992). Commitment to a Telos – A Sustained Critical Rhetoric. Communication Monographs , 59, 48-60.
- Ortiz, B. (n.d.). Barbara Macri-Ortiz 1969-1990. Retrieved April 17, 2011, from United Farm Workers Documentation Project:
http://farmworkermovement.com/essays/essays/068%20Macri%20Ortiz_Barbara.pdf

- Ortiz, J. (2011, January 10). When Letters of Recommendation Written by Freeway Flyers are Discounted. Retrieved May 17, 2011, from Adjunct Nation : <http://www.adjunctnation.com/blogs/freeway-flyer/?s=%22may+have+a+desk%22&Submit=Search>
- Padilla, G. (n.d.). Gilbert Padilla 1962 - 1980. Retrieved April 17, 2011, from United Farm Workers Documentation Project: http://farmworkermovement.com/essays/essays/005%20Padilla_Gilbert.pdf
- Parker, A. (2005). The Other of Class. *Rethinking Marxism* , 17 (1), 15-18.
- Pensky, M. (2008). *The Ends of Solidarity*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Phillips, B. (1985). Fanning the Flames. In S. Bird, D. Georgakas, & D. Shaffer (Eds.), *Solidarity Forever: An Oral History of the IWW* (p. 27). Chicago: Lake View Press.
- PissPoorProf. (2009, February 20). Adjuncts Get Smart. Retrieved May 2, 2011, from Inside Higher Education: <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/02/20/adjuncts#Comments>
- Powertoparttimers. (2010, September 10). The Adjunct's Moment of Truth. Retrieved April 30, 2011, from Inside Higher Education: <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2009/09/10/maisto>
- Reibe, E. (2005). Mr. Block: He Goes Harvesting. In *Wobblies! A Graphic History of the Industrial Workers of the World* (p. 286). London: Verso.
- Research Built on a House of Cards. (2011, January 18). Retrieved May 17, 2011, from Adjunct Nation: <http://www.adjunctnation.com/blogs/part-time-thoughts/?p=171>
- Rich, D. (2006, November/December). Ivory Tower. *Adjunct Advocate* .
- Richardson, L. (1968, October 1). *Prebyterian Life*. Retrieved May 15, 2011, from United Farm Workers Documentation Project: <http://farmworkermovement.org/essays/essays/presbyterian.pdf>
- Riebe, E. (1920). A Job and Political Bunk. In J. Rowan, *The IWW in the Lumber Industry*. Seattle: Lumber Workers Industrial Union #500.
- Roediger, D. (1991). *The Wages of Whiteness*. New York: Verso.
- Roediger, D. (2005). *Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White*. New York: Basic Books.

- Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rorty, R. (1999). *Philosophy and Social Hope*. London: Penguin Books.
- Ross, A. (2009). *Nice Work If You Can Get It: Life and Labor in Precarious Times*. New York: New York University Press.
- Sample, S. (n.d.). *Sandy Clark Sample 1962-1967*. Retrieved April 17, 2011, from United Farm Workers Documentation Project:
http://farmworkermovement.com/essays/essays/002%20Sample_Sandy_Clark.pdf
- Scab. (1965). *El Malcriado* (23), p. 6.
- Schor. (1992). *The Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure*. New York: Basic Books.
- Scott, J. & Leonhardt, D. (2005). *Shadowy Lines That Still Divide*. In B. Keller, *Class Matters* (pp. 1-27). New York: The New York Times Company.
- Seymour, J. (1965). *The Dishwasher*. In J. Kornbluh (Ed.), *Rebel Voices: An IWW Anthology* (pp. 77-78). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Shipler, D. (2005). *The Working Poor: Invisible in America*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Smith, W. (1965). *The Voyage of the Verona*. In J. Kornbluh (Ed.), *Rebel Voices: An IWW Anthology* (p. 108). Ann Arbor: Michigan.
- Smith, W. (1965). *Their Court and Our Class*. In J. Kornbluh (Ed.), *Rebel Voices: An IWW Anthology* (p. 118). Ann Arbor: Michigan.
- Sowards, S. (2010). *Rhetorical Agency as Haciendo Caras and Differential Consciousness Through Lens of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class: An Examination of Dolores Huerta's Rhetoric*. *Communication Theory*, (20). pp. 223-247
- Spivak, G. (1987). *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York and London: Methuen.
- St. John, V. (1965). *Political Parties and the IWW*. In J. Kornbluh (Ed.), *Rebel Voices: An IWW Anthology* (p. 43). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

- Starr, A. (2000). *Naming the Enemy: Anti-Corporate Movements Confront Globalization*. New York: Pluto Press.
- Statistics, B. o. (2010, January 22). United States Department of Labor. Retrieved May 1, 2011, from Union Members-2009:
http://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/union2_01222010.pdf
- Stewart, C. (1991). The Internal Rhetoric of the Knights of Labor. *Communication Studies* , 42 (1), 67-82.
- Straw Boss. (1965). *El Malcriado* , 1 (18), p. 4.
- T.R.M. (2009, September 10). Questions for Adjuncts Teaching Composition. Retrieved April 30, 2011, from Inside Higher Education:
<http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2009/09/10/maisto>
- The Children of "Muchachito". (1966, May 19). *El Malcriado* , p. 2.
- (1965). The Outcast's Prayer. In J. Kornbluh (Ed.), *Rebel Voices: An IWW Anthology* (p. 86). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- The Plan of Delano. (1966, March 17). *El Malcriado* , p. 12=13.
- Thinker, P.-T. (2008, July/August). The Administrator-Adjunct Experience: Gag me with a Briefcase. *Adjunct Advocate* .
- Thome, H. (1999). Solidarity: Theoretical Perspectives for Empirical Research. In K. Bayertz (Ed.), *Solidarity* (pp. 101-131). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Thompson, F. (1985). A Better World. In S. Bird, D. Georgakas, & D. Shaffer (Eds.), *Solidarity Forever: An oral history of the IWW* (pp. 214-221). Chicago: Lake View Press.
- Tonn, M. (1996). Militant Motherhood: Labor's Mary Harris 'Mother Jones'. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* , 82, 1-21.
- Trautmann, W. (1911). *One Big Union*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company.
- United Farm Workers. (1967). Christian Brothers Hear: Wine-making Order Forgets the Church Lessons of Justice. *El Malcriado* (56), 9.
- United Farm Workers. (1965). Everybody's Business. *El Malcriado* (24), 2.

- vfichera. (2009, September 10). Balancing the Books. Retrieved April 30, 2011, from Inside Higher Education:
<http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2009/09/10/maisto>
- Violence. (1966, April 21). El Malcriado , p. 8.
- What is a Movement? (1965). El Malcriado , 1 (19), p. 2.
- What is a Union? (1965). El Malcriado , 1 (23), p. 13.
- Wildt, A. (1999). Solidarity: Its History and Contemporary Definition. In K. Bayertz (Ed.), Solidarity (pp. 209-220). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Wilson, W. (1996). When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor. New York: Vintage Books.
- World, I. W. (1965). Preamble (1905). In K. Joyce (Ed.), Rebel Voices An IWW Anthology (p. 12). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Y, P. (2008, May/June). Don't Cut-And-Run on Campus Either. Adjunct Advocate .
- Zermeno, A. (n.d.). Don Sotaco. Retrieved April 17, 2011, from United Farm Workers Documentation Project:
<http://www.farmworkermovement.us/gallery/displayimage.php?album=646&pos=20>
- Zermeno, A. (n.d.). Pawn Don Sotaco. Retrieved April 17, 2011, from United Farm Workers Documentation Project:
<http://www.farmworkermovement.us/gallery/displayimage.php?album=646&pos=58>
- Zermeno, A. (n.d.). Sotaco Rings the Huelga Bell. Retrieved April 17, 2011, from United Farm Workers Documentation Project:
<http://www.farmworkermovement.us/gallery/displayimage.php?album=646&pos=23>
- Zermeno, A. (n.d.). Sotaco y Coyote. Retrieved April 17, 2011, from United Farm Workers Documentation Project:
<http://www.farmworkermovement.us/gallery/displayimage.php?album=646&pos=19>

Appendix A

The Pullman Strike of 1894

The struggle between craft unionism and industrial unionism is perhaps most clearly demonstrated by the Pullman Railroad Strike of 1894. In 1893, Eugene Debs formed the American Railway Union, a union designed to unite railroad workers across crafts: “its unification across all crafts was meant to break the tradition of solitary railway brotherhoods that had long complicated effective worker representation and better equip rail workers to meet the expanding power of the major railroads” (Dray 2010, p. 192). Previous railroad strikes had met failure because the strikes only united workers in a particular craft. For instance, workers on the railroad lines would face difficulty in achieving solidarity with engineers, who were paid at a higher rate and did not see a need for solidarity with other types of workers. The American Railway Union was an attempt to transcend these craft differences, organizing workers along industrial lines. In other words, the American Railway Union sought to unite workers across the entire railway industry, regardless of the specific specialties of individual railway workers. As seen in Chapter 2, this attempt would have a profound impact on the industrial based ideology of the Industrial Workers of the World.

Pullman workers were unique in that they produced the fine rail cars of George Pullman. These rail cars were designed to increase the luxury of passengers traveling long distances by rail. Pullman invented not only the luxury cars, but also dining and sleeping cars, transforming the rail experience. These cars were add-ons to the typical transcontinental railcars. As such, builders of the Pullman cars were not considered rail

workers (the cars were built in shops), “but because there was a short railroad track at the Pullman shops south of Chicago, they were deemed eligible for membership in the American Railway Union” (p. 192).

According to Dray, Pullman saw a social responsibility to meet workers’ needs while also operating within a conservative economic model with regard to the company. This took shape through providing company housing to workers, charging rents that ensured 7-10 percent profit to the company. The rents were automatically deducted from the workers paychecks. As Pullman became wealthier, he began to leave more of the day-to-day operations of the company to his foreman and management team. In the early 1890s, recessive economic conditions caused Pullman to reduce worker wages. However, rents remained high based on his belief that he must ensure profits equivalent to going market housing rates. What this meant for workers was that their take-home pay declined. When workers attempted to address their grievances with Pullman, he expressed a receptive attitude and promised no retaliation against workers. However, three of the leading worker spokesmen were fired within days of meeting with Pullman, prompting workers to feel they had been betrayed and spurring on the subsequent strike. By May 11, “all but 10 percent of Pullman’s 3,800 workers had walked out” (Dray 2010, p. 195).

The American Railway Union intervened, offering to arbitrate between workers and Pullman. When Pullman refused, Debs threatened to take the railway switchmen off the job. Pullman again refused to listen to worker demands and, on June 21, the ARU convention voted that its switchmen members would not handle Pullman cars after June 26 unless Pullman agreed to arbitration. Pullman again refused, as is noted in the June 23,

1894, edition of the New York Times: “Officials of the company declare they will hear no proposals for arbitration from the American Railway Union. They feel little concern over the threat” (p. 1). As the strike began, the big railroads rushed to support Pullman by refusing to remove his cars from their trains, while unions of carpenters, mechanics and others sympathetic to the Pullman workers joined in support of the strike. The result was an industry wide strike pitting the mass of railroad workers, both skilled and unskilled, against the large railroad tycoons. By June 29, reported the New York Times, nearly 40,000 rail workers were out on strike. On June 30, the paper called the strike the greatest in history and predicted that 200,000 men would be off the job in Chicago alone. Citing the General Manager’s Association, an organization representing business interests, the Times noted that the “Panhandle, Santa Fe, Baltimore and Ohio, Chicago and Erie, Chicago and Eastern Illinois, Grand Truck, Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, Chicago and Great Western, Northern Pacific, Illinois Central, Rock Island, Monon, Fort Wayne, Wabash, and Michigan Central are all more or less crippled by the strike” (New York Times, July 1, 1894, p. 1). The Knights of Labor threw their support behind the strike, issuing an order to boycott the businesses of every person who patronized the Pullman Palace Car Company or rode in a Pullman car.

The ideological struggle between craft unionism and industrial unionism is set forth in stark terms during the Pullman strike. As the largest scale industrial strike in the United States at the time, the Pullman strike represented both the power and the danger of widespread industrial solidarity. The strike crossed craft lines, lines between skilled and unskilled workers, and united workers from geographic regions across the Western

United States. Breaking the strike required some ingenious maneuvering by the railroad barons and captains of industry, but, perhaps more importantly, state support through the use of court injunctions and military might. Such actions by the state reveal the fear of the state in allowing worker organization to succeed, a reaction to the crippling effects of the strike on industry.

However, a more important barrier faced by labor was the withholding of solidarity by representatives of the American Federation of Labor. The choice by Gompers to not help the ARU strikers certainly affected the outcome of the strike, turning what could have been a full-blown class war into ultimate defeat for the striking railway workers.³⁹ At an emergency conference at Chicago's Briggs House hotel, Gompers was informed by local AFL affiliates that they were ready to join any strike action once Gompers gave the go-ahead: "Had the order for it emanated from the conference, there's little doubt a general strike on a national scale would have been attempted" (Dray, 2010, pp. 206-7). However, believing the cause to be lost, Gompers withheld support for the strike:

"Gompers['] opposition to the general strike, nonetheless, became to some critics part of a larger pattern of compromise, even betrayal, unforgivable to many in the left wing of the movement. It was known that Gompers had questioned the ARU's wisdom in rushing into so major an undertaking as a national rail boycott so soon after its own founding, and rumored that as he had boarded a train to attend the Briggs House meeting he had told an aide, 'I am going to the funeral of the ARU'" (Dray, 2010, pp. 207-8).

³⁹ While the striking workers were defeated, Foner suggests they learned valuable lessons from the strike, including the need for broad solidarity. Additionally, workers discovered the significance of the link between government and corporations.

Withholding support for strike actions taken by industrial unionists was a common choice by Gompers, reflecting the antagonism between craft and industrial unionism. Gompers' choice reflected an ideological division between industrial and craft unionists, particularly related to beliefs about the antagonistic relationship between the worker and ownership classes and the type of workers for whom solidary action was necessary and/or reasonable.