Course Description
In communication studies, the scholarly endeavor of rhetorical criticism has transformed from (primarily) the study of public address—analyses of ‘virtuous people (especially men) speaking well’—to the study of the myriad ways that multiple publics are addressed and constituted through multiple modalities. In this seminar, we investigate this disciplinary transformation and arrive at state-of-the-art methods of rhetorical criticism. Through engagement with specific methods and approaches of criticism (such as close textual analysis, feminist criticism, ideological criticism, ideographic criticism, queer of color critique, and postcolonial criticism) and through engagement with key concepts and analytics used to assess social movements, public memory, and visual rhetoric, we will strive to assess the value of different methods and approaches; clarify the relations among rhetorical theories, methods, and criticism; identify recurrent topoi (such as context, audience, and modes of address) in the theory and practice of rhetorical criticism; practice and refine our skills as rhetorical critics; and position ourselves in relation to ongoing scholarly conversations about criticism. Our explorations will be framed by key questions: What constitutes a rhetorical text? What do rhetorical texts do? What constitutes a rhetorical critic? What do critics do? What does rhetorical criticism produce? What should be the outcomes of rhetorical criticism?

Those who are registered with the Disability Resource Center and who would benefit from accommodations in order to achieve course goals should notify me during the first two weeks of the semester. I will gladly work with you to accommodate your needs.

Assigned Readings
The assigned readings for the course will be delivered in four ways—handouts, a URL address, ASU Libraries Course Reserves, and ASU Libraries online databases. Readings delivered via the latter two media will be coded with CR (Course Reserves) or ONL (online databases) in the list of readings on pages 3-5 of this syllabus. To proceed directly to course reserves, point your browser to http://library.lib.asu.edu/screens/reserves.html. To assist your search for readings via online databases, I have provided full reference information for all assigned readings on pages 6-9 of this syllabus.

Statement of Teaching Philosophy
I think of teaching in ecological terms, meaning that I value interdependence—the ways in which we influence each other in and out of the classroom—and contingency—the ways in which unpredictable events provide unforeseen possibilities for learning and growth.

On Decorum, or Propriety
Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and others developed and advanced the rhetorical concept of “decorum,” or the practices and norms of what is appropriate to the speaker, subject, audience, and occasion. While we may find ourselves exposing the ideological biases of decorum at various points
during the semester and while we will craft our own norms of decorum, I believe that we should agree to some basic rules of decorum in the conduct of our class.

- **Attendance.** In honor of our scholarly interdependence as participants in a graduate seminar, please commit to diligent, perfect attendance. I would appreciate notification of a necessary absence involving a serious illness or other extenuating circumstances.
- **Respect for learning styles.** Some of us learn best in quiet reflection, others in lively discussion, still others in heightened, performative conflict. Each of these styles (and others) is likely to appear in our seminar, and I ask that each of us be careful (that is, full of care) as we both employ and perceive these styles.
- **Academic honesty.** The rules outlined in the university’s “Student Academic Integrity Policy” [<https://provost.asu.edu/index.php?q=academicintegrity> apply equally to graduate and undergraduate students. With regard to graduate students, a salient concern about academic honesty involves “double-dipping,” or turning in the same or very similar work for credit in different courses. You are permitted to extend previous work that you have done on materials pertaining to this course; however, please notify me if you choose to extend previous work, and please indicate how you intend to craft a unique project for this course.

**Assignments**

200pts  1) **Critical Essay.** Writing is a process. Writing well requires careful attention and diligent effort at multiple stages in the process. In a series of writing events, you will present the results of your semester-long engagement with course-related material. The critical essay should strive to summarize, apply, extend, and/or critique concepts and issues relevant to rhetorical criticism. The essay should arrive in three different stages of development:

- **25pts**  a) Proposal with preliminary bibliography (2-3 pages; 20 sources minimum)
- **75pts**  b) Advanced draft (12-15 pages, not including cover page, abstract, endnotes, and references; 20 sources minimum)
- **100pts**  c) Final manuscript (25-30 pages, not including cover page, abstract, endnotes, and references; 25 sources minimum). For the final manuscript, you should strive to create a manuscript that has a high potential for being accepted to a regional or national communication (or allied field) conference or a manuscript that you could submit to a journal that publishes rhetorical criticism.

100pts  2) **Short papers.** Several times during the semester, each of you will be called upon to craft short essays.

- **50pts**  a) Method Preview: Toward the beginning of the semester, we all might benefit from brief summaries of the different methods and approaches that we will study throughout the semester and that are available to you as you design your Critical Essay project. To that end, the method preview paper asks you to craft a summary of a specific method or approach to rhetorical criticism. In the paper, you should answer the following: Who are the key figures who crafted, significantly contributed to, and currently employ this method? How does this method proceed? What are the major warrants or justifications for this approach? What are the goals or outcomes of this method? And, in your view, what are two-to-three advantages of this method? This paper should fall between 5-6 pages (not including cover page, abstract, endnotes, and references).
- **20pts**  b) Peer Critique: To facilitate the process of writing the Critical Essay, each seminar participant will offer a written critique of a peer’s advanced draft. This critique should demonstrate your careful reading of your peer’s advanced draft, and comments should be directed toward both content and expression. This paper should fall between 3-4 pages (not including cover page, abstract, endnotes, and references).
- **30pts**  c) Practicing Criticism: Three times during the semester, each of you will be asked to craft and submit one-page papers in which you practice criticism through the encounter of a specific approach/method with a common text—Martin Luther King, Jr.’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail.” For each encounter, please respond to the following prompts: Based on the assigned readings, isolate what you think are three distinct principles or “rules” or critical “norms” of this approach/method.
Then, indicate how—specifically—you would proceed in your effort to connect this approach/method to this text. That is, what would you do first? What would you do next? Then what? Finally, what might this method/approach uniquely or distinctly illuminate about this text? Specify two distinct illuminations.

**100pts** 3) Participation. For participation, I will measure the quantity and quality of your engagement with course materials. In this course, your participation should take two distinct forms:

**75pts** a) Commentary about course materials in and/or out of class: During class, your commentary can take the form of responses to questions, question-posing, syntheses and analyses of course materials, and summaries of current events. Outside of class, commentary can take the form of electronic communications (private emails and public postings to Blackboard discussion boards), phone calls, and office visits about course-related materials.

**25pts** b) Leadership of discussion: Each member of the seminar will be asked to choose one assigned reading for which to lead discussion. The discussion should range between 20-30 minutes. In preparation for discussion, the leader should post in a Blackboard discussion board four discussion questions by 6pm on the Monday before the reading is assigned.

**Grading**

Generally in this seminar, “excellent” work earns “A”-range grades, “good” work earns “B”-range grades, and “unsatisfactory” work earns “C”-range grades or lower. More specifically, I employ the following grading scale:

- **A+** = 99-100% (396-400 pts)
- **A** = 93-98.9% (372-395.5 pts)
- **A-** = 90-92.9% (360-371.5 pts)
- **B+** = 87-89.9% (348-359.5 pts)
- **B** = 83-86.9% (332-347.5 pts)
- **B-** = 80-82.9% (320-331.5 pts)
- **C+** = 77-79.9% (308-319.5 pts)
- **C** = 70-76.9% (280-307.5 pts)
- **C-** = 67-69.9% (260-279.5 pts)
- **D** = 60-69.9% (240-279.5 pts)
- **E** = 0-59.9% (0-239.5 pts)

**Schedule of Topics, Readings, and Events**

**August 27**  
**Readings:**  
Wichelns, “The Literary Criticism of Oratory,” 27-60 (CR)  
Wrage, “Public Address,” 451-457 (ONL)  
Stewart, “Historical Survey,” 1-31 (CR)  

**September 3**  
**Readings:**  
Darsey, “Must We all Be Rhetorical Theorists,” 164-181 (ONL)  
Jasinski, “The Status of Theory and Method,” 249-270 (ONL)  
Zdenek, “Charting a Course Between,” 188-211 (ONL)  
Allen, “Heavy Lies the Editor’s Fingers,” 354-58 (handout)  
Brummett, “Double Birds,” 364-69 (handout)  
Palczewski, “What is ‘Good Criticism’?,” 385-91 (handout)  
Jordan, Olson, and Goldzwig, “Continuing,” 392-402 (handout)

**September 10**  
**Due: Method Preview**
September 17  Close Textual Analysis
Readings:
Leff, “Things Made by Words,” 223-231 (ONL)
Leff and Utley, “Instrumental and Constitutive Rhetoric,” 37-52 (ONL)
Watson, “The Issue is Justice,” 1-22 (ONL)
Johnson, “Martin Luther King Jr’s,” 1-25 (ONL)
Due: Critical Essay Proposal

September 24  Social Movement Criticism
Readings:
Cox and Foust, “Social Movement Rhetoric,” 605-627 (CR)
Stewart, “The Evolution of a Revolution,” 429-446 (ONL)
Enck-Wanzer, “Trashing the System,” 174-201 (ONL)
Endres and Senda-Cook, “Location Matters,” 257-282 (ONL)

October 1  Feminist Criticism
Readings:
Ramsey, “Addressing Issues of Context,” 352-376 (ONL)
Zittlow Rogness and Foust, “Beyond Rights and Virtues,” 148-167 (ONL)
Palczewski, “Bodies, Borders, and Letters,” 1-16 (ONL)
Carrillo Rowe, “Subject to Power,” 12-35 (ONL)
Landau, “Reproducing and Transgressing Masculinity,” 178-203 (ONL)

October 8  Ideological Criticism
Readings:
Wander, “The Third Persona,” 197-216 (ONL)
Crowley, “Reflections on an Argument,” 450-465 (ONL)
Dicochea, “Chicana Critical Rhetoric,” 77-92 (ONL)
Brouwer and Hess, “Making Sense of ‘God Hates Fags’,,” 69-90 (ONL)
Middleton, Senda-Cook, and Endres, “Articulating,” 386-406 (ONL)

October 15  No Class Meeting. Fall Break Observed.

October 22  Writing and Publishing Rhetorical Criticism
Due: Advanced Draft of Critical Essay

October 29  Ideographic Criticism
Readings:
McGee, “The ‘Ideograph’,,” 1-16 (ONL)
Delgado, “Chicano Movement Rhetoric,” 446-455 (ONL)
Palczewski, “The Male Madonna,” 365-394 (ONL)
Ewalt, “A Colonialist Celebration of National <Heritage>,” 367-385 (ONL)
Due: Peer Critique
November 5  Queer of Color Critique
Readings:
Ferguson, “Introduction: Queer of Color Critique,” 1-29 (CR)
Villarejo, “Tarrying with the Normative,” 69-84 (ONL)
Driskill, “Doubleweaving Two-Spirit Critiques,” 69-92 (ONL)
Chávez, “Coming Out as Coalitional Gesture?,” 79-111 (handout)

November 12  Postcolonial Criticism
Readings:
Campbell, “Cultural Challenges to Rhetorical Criticism,” 358-361 (ONL)
Shome, “Postcolonial Interventions,” 40-59 (ONL)
Garlough, “Transfiguring Criminality,” 253-278 (ONL)
Ayotte and Husain, “Securing Afghan Women,” 112-133 (ONL)
Enck-Wanzler, “Decolonizing Imaginaries,” 1-23 (ONL)


November 26  Public Memory Criticism
Readings:
Blair, Dickinson, and Ott, “Rhetoric/Memory/Place,” 1-54 (CR)
Biesecker, “Remembering World War II,” 393-409 (ONL)
Dickinson, Ott, and Aoki, “Spaces of Remembering,” 27-47 (ONL)

December 3  Visual Rhetorical Criticism
Readings:
Olson, Finnegan, and Hope, “Visual Rhetoric,” 1-14 (CR)
Blair, Jeppeson, and Pucci, Jr., “Public Memorializing,” 263-288 (ONL)
Cloud, “To Veil the Threat,” 285-306 (ONL)
Cram, “‘Angie was Our Sister’,” 411-438 (ONL)

December 10  Final Exam Meeting Period (6-7.50pm)
Due: Critical Essay
Full Reference Information for COM 607 Readings

**Historical Survey of Issues in Rhetorical Criticism (27 August 2013)**


**Challenges in Contemporary Rhetorical Criticism (3 September 2013)**


**Close Textual Analysis (17 September 2013)**


**Social Movement Criticism (24 September 2013)**


**Feminist Criticism (1 October 2013)**


Carrillo Rowe, A. (2009). Subject to power—feminism without victims. *Women’s Studies in Communication, 32*(1), 12-35. (ONL)

Ideological Criticism (8 October 2013)


Ideographic Analysis (29 October 2013)


Queer of Color Critique (5 November 2013)


Postcolonial Criticism (12 November 2013)


Public Memory Criticism (26 November 2013)


Visual Rhetorical Criticism (3 December 2013)

