THE RHETORICAL COMPLEXITY OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS: A METHOD AND APPLICATION

One of the more hopeful signs emanating from universities today is the deterioration in the isolation of various disciplines. The cross-fertilization of rhetoric and sociology is a particularly fruitful manifestation of this phenomenon. Sociology studies the forms of interaction in human collectivity. Rhetoric, on the other hand, studies the role of language in creating these forms. Thus sociology points rhetoricians toward arenas of rhetoric, and rhetoric points sociologists toward the development of forms.

In this paper I want to work at the junction of sociology and rhetoric. Rhetoricians have long been interested in social movements, sociologists perhaps less so. Yet the rhetoricians interest has been not so much in the movement itself but in its effect on society as a whole. I intend in this paper to study the rhetoric of social movements from the perspective
of the sociology of collectivities. Systems Analysis will be my primary tool.

I begin with the assumption that a social movement must in some sense be organized. This assumption suggests the use of organizational theory to view the movement as a social system. From a systems perspective the movement is a dynamic, expanding and contracting, always changing organization.

Leland Griffin, who has authored the major works in movement studies in rhetoric, recognizes the dynamic nature of movements in his initial article on the methods of criticism in historical movements. He writes, "the historical movement, looked upon as a sustained process of social influence, is dynamic, and has its beginning, its progression and its termination." There is inevitably a problem in viewing dynamic phenomena because our tools of analysis are by and large static. The quotation above is an excellent example of the problem. The three segment analysis leads to characterization of the rhetoric of the segments, and this characterization violates the "dynamic" assumption that Griffin recognizes. Systems analysis claims that by concentrating on the operation of the system rather than the constituents of the system, the system
can be viewed from a new dynamic perspective.

Herbert Simons also has recognized the dynamic nature of the social movement. He argues that social movements have many rhetorical requirements, satisfaction of which may be contradictory. Simons also begins with organizational theory but not necessarily systemic theory. The most telling restriction on Simons' study is that he is concerned with "a leader-centered conception of persuasion in social movements." To concentrate on the leader and his rhetoric is to ignore important nonleadership rhetoric and movements with no strong viable leadership.

This paper expands Simons' conception of movement study. Its primary focus is on the relationship between the rhetoric and the social characteristics of the movement. I will necessarily deal with leadership and leadership decisions but only auxiliary to the primary purpose—the study of the rhetoric. My application of organizational theory will be systemic.

In the rest of the paper I want to explain a method for an organizational history of a movement based on general systems theory, then explain a method for rhetorical analysis based on the organizational
history, and finally look at the events at Columbia University in the spring of 1968 as an application of the method.

A Systemic Perspective on Organizational History

General systems theory was developed as a method centered in no specific field but general to scientific study, and is useful in viewing phenomena from the atom to the universe and from the dyad to the world community. To understand a system the investigator studies three elements. First are the components: What are the system's constituent parts? Second are the attributes: What are the characteristics of these components? Third and most important are the relationships: How do the components within the system interact with each other and with the environment?

While other methods study individual components and their characteristics, by centering on relationships systems study focuses on the interaction among elements. This means that the system is defined in terms of the actions within it, and the investigator studies the dynamics of the interaction patterns.

In the particular case of organizations people are the most important components, and to view an
organization from a systems perspective the investigator looks at the activity patterns that define the relationships between the people. E.H. Schein defines an organization as "the rational coordination of the activities of a number of people for the achievement of some common, explicit purpose or goal, through division of labor and function and through a hierarchy of authority and responsibility." A systems analyst recognizes the essence of a movement not in its members nor in its beliefs, but rather in its activities to command energy and redirect the energy toward its purpose. Paradoxically, the purpose toward which a movement is formed is not its most important goal, at least not if importance is to be judged by where the most energy is expended. A movement devotes far more energy in working toward its continued existence and growth.

The energy in a movement is channeled into five functions. The first is the input function. To work toward its goals and at the same time grow, an organization must acquire the commitment of energy, either indirectly through money or directly through participation. In social movements this requires that the movement attract people from the environment and
identify them with the movement. For many social organizations monetary reward serves to identify the member with the organization but in movements more than any other type of organization, rhetoric must achieve the identification. When new funds or members are needed the movement must respond with rhetoric that identifies the sources of energy with the movement.

The second function is output. Just as movements attract energy from the environment, they in turn attempt to effect change in the environment. Again, rhetoric is the major tool that social movements have to achieve this function, and so their major output is rhetoric designed to influence change within society.

The third function is maintenance. The assumption that a movement is an open system implies that the natural tendency of the movement is toward disorganization. If ignored the relationships will deteriorate and people will go their own way. Friction inevitably develops because of the diverse backgrounds of the members and when friction occurs the movement must be able to remove it or disintegrate. Thus the movement has as one of its primary goals, the transformation of energy to perpetuate its organization.
In performing the maintenance function, rhetoric continues the identification to keep the movement together and the activity patterns to bring stability to the relationships.

The fourth function is adaptation. The open system assumption also implies that a movement is quite dependent on its relationships with the environment. The continuous change in the environment naturally affects the people in a movement and the changes outside and inside the movement require continual revision of the procedures of the movement. The capability to attract energy and the effectiveness of the persuasive campaign depend on recognizing the changes and creating strategies to take advantage of them.

The final function is managerial. A movement must coordinate its activities and this requires a decision making structure. This structure allows redirection of the movement.

These functions provide the framework for a social history of an organization. At different times different functions will be most important and the organization's history plots the change in functional needs.
An organization's history begins as a number of people come together and commit themselves to sacrificing individual action for interaction and coordinated group activity, then out of this commitment must develop group norms recognized and accepted by the members. These norms serve the dual function of providing stability in coordination of activity and celebrating the movement's existence as a movement.

When the process of norm development is completed, the movement has stability, a "steady state," and is mature. But to continue to function, it must import energy, influence the environment, maintain the norms, adjust to changes, and correct its failures. Thus in describing the history of a mature movement the five functions are useful tools.

When applied, the method described in this section illuminates the broad characteristics of a movement as a social collectivity. It focuses on the changing nature of a social movement as the movement interacts with general society. Finally, it emphasizes the multiplicity of influences rhetoric has on social organizations such as social movements.
The Rhetorical Role in Organizational History

"Rhetoric is everything to a movement." That statement may be an exaggeration but not much of one. Systems theorists distinguish social systems from scientific systems by the substitution of rhetorical bonds in the former for physical bonds in the latter. Communication is, therefore, responsible for the structure of the social organization, and changes in the structure are rhetorical changes.

In the last section I outlined a method for describing the organizational history of a movement. This history is created by rhetoric's influence. At each juncture the movement is recreated or redirected by the rhetoric. A rhetorical study traces this influence.

A rhetorical study of these moments of opportunity is not simply a valueless description, however. Every movement has goals some of which flow from its ideology and some from its need to perpetuate itself and grow as an organization. Rhetoric may redirect the movement toward achievement or failure, and a rhetorical study will describe the precise and threat of these opportunities and rhetoric's influence on their outcome.
As noted earlier, most studies of the rhetoric of social movements have personified the movement, treated the rhetoric as extended discourse, and evaluated the strategies in terms of ideological goals. In this study I want to concentrate on the organizational goals. Within this context the organizational history developed from the five functions provides a central method for assessing rhetorical opportunities.

Using this method for rhetorical analysis of the movement has certain implications on procedure. First, the critic must recognize the potential for continuous change in the rhetorical situation. From their inception to their disintegration movements grow, contract, and change as their environments change. Crises and opportunities may occur at any moment that alter the balance among the functional needs of the movement and, therefore, the rhetorical problem. The critic must recognize the dynamic nature of social movements and account for the changes.

Secondly, the situation of the moment determines the relative importance of various functions in the movement's history. For example, input is a movement's greatest initial need, but later some dramatic new push may be planned that also requires a fresh rush of input.
At either time the situation requires rhetoric that attracts energy and marshals it for contribution to the movement. At other times a change in the movement's environment may make adjustment to the change the dominant requirement. The situation determines the problem or opportunity and so the critic must have an understanding of the situation.

Thirdly, the critic must recognize the possibility of multiple goals and multiple audiences. A rhetorical message is more properly viewed as a response to the movement's collective condition than a response to an isolated functional need. In attempting to satisfy the collective need, the message frequently fulfills more than one functional need.

Similarly, any message normally reaches more than one audience. Rhetoric intended, for example, for an internal need may also reach the environment and harm the relationship between the movement and society. The selection of goal and audience for the speech is a strategic choice that itself must be evaluated.

The rhetorical analysis of the movement from the perspective delineated here begins with the organizational history. Then the critic studies the influence of rhetoric in recreating and redirecting the movement.
In the next section I use this method to analyze the Columbia University student movement of 1968. First, I look at the ideology of the movement since the (ideology is a major source of rhetorical material), then I take some periods from the organizational history of the Columbia movement, look at their rhetorical demands and assess the influence rhetoric had on the later history.

The Influence of Rhetoric on the Columbia Student Movement

An outdoor protest demonstration scheduled on Tuesday, April 23, 1968, grew into the occupation of four buildings on campus and the Low Library office of the President of the University, Grayson Kirk. For seven days the students continued the occupation, organizing communes in the buildings and a leadership group to publicize their position. Meanwhile the administration, unwilling to clear the buildings waited for the faculty to talk the students into leaving.

Finally, after seven days, the administration called New York City police onto campus and in an action marked by widespread violence, the police cleared the buildings. The violence of the police
action, felt by bystanders, faculty, students, administrators, and newsmen as well as the occupants of the buildings, had a dramatic impact on the students and faculty of Columbia. 8

Ideology of the Columbia Movement

Hans Toch defines "ideology" as "a set of related beliefs held by a group of persons. . . . [The ideology] points down the road along which the social movement is moving, and specifies the principles and objectives that guide its journey." 9 Ideology is important to rhetorical analysis of movements because themes from the ideology are so frequently sources of rhetorical substance. These themes may be the basis of appeals to members, their celebration may help maintain stability, and their substance may explain changes in the environment or in the movement.

The radical ideology at Columbia can be traced back to two underlying sources. 10 The first is the political philosophy—the pervasiveness of imperialism in the present structure of Western Civilization. The radicals lashed out against the manifestation of this imperialism that they saw throughout the social structure.

The radical explanation of Vietnam and racism
began with the exploitation of imperialism. The radicals attacked the military structure that enforced imperialism and made Vietnam not only possible but probable. Racism, they argued, sprang from the imperialistic attitude of one race toward the other.

The radicals saw the power structure as an intricate network of interlocking relationships that directed the imperialistic society. Thus all authority was suspect of involvement. It was easy for any power source to be implicated and become the target of the radical charges.

The second underlying source of radical philosophy was the brotherhood of man. At base it was an egalitarian philosophy. Status differentiation was denied and spurned at every turn within the brotherhood. The brotherhood shared responsibility and work. The individual was recognized more for what he was than what he contributed in work.

This philosophy transformed decision making into participatory democracy. Each issue went to the brotherhood for decision. Here was full discussion and all received a vote. The decisions that affected one's life were made by him through participatory democracy.
These two concepts were to appear again and again as important sources of radical response to rhetorical opportunities.

The Initial Commitment to the Movement

The Columbia crisis began with a rally of about five hundred students called by the leaders of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Student Afro-American Society (SAS). The rally was hardly a simple SDS affair, however. Before the leaders was the manpower for mass social action at Columbia if the participants could be fused by protest. Previous rallies had been held at Columbia without any real development of a movement beyond the limited SDS membership. The emergence of the movement depended on the development of a common commitment to action and a commitment to common action.

The common commitment to action grew from the connecting of local issues with national issues. The radical ideology of interlocking leadership relationships focused attention on the presence of the broader issues in the campus demands. The effect of this was that whether the community believed the imperialistic explanation or not, the relationship between the two
levels was established and the two major issues of the crisis were surrogates for major national problems.

The first demand, that Columbia disaffiliate from the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA), a defense research group, was tied to Vietnam and militarism. Mark Rudd, SDS chairman, said, "We're here because of the university's bullshit with IDA. After we demand an end to affiliation with IDA, they keep doing research to kill people in Vietnam and Harlem."11 Bill Sales of the SAS told a rally that by opposing the Columbia administration "you strike a blow for the Vietnamese people."12 Another SDS leader, defending the disruption of university activities, argued, "The real 'interference' began with coercive actions by a minority of Trustees who had interfered in the lives of the people of Vietnam."13 The Cox Commission concluded that IDA became a "symbol for all the intense antagonisms to the Vietnam War."14

The second demand was an end to the construction of the gymnasium in Morningside Park. The location of the gym in Harlem park land and its design with separate facilities for white students and black community had transformed it into a symbol of racism. One SAS leader said, "What would you do if somebody
came and took your property? Took your property as they're doing in Morningside with this gym?" The whites also supported the charge. Mark Reed said in Hamilton Hall early in the rally, "We're here because the University steals land from black people, because we want them to stop building that gym."  

These issues attracted students because they gave students frustrated by an inability to effect national policy the opportunity to strike out at Vietnam and racism by opposing local issues in which they could hope to have an effect.

The local issues also allowed solidification of the movement around a definite common devil figure—the Columbia administration. "What's at issue here is politics—the politics of this university," SDS leader Ted Gold offered. The gym was being built because the administration overrode faculty and student objections, affiliated with IDA through administration doubletalk.

While the administration provided the devil figure, in order to convert the opposition to the administration into commitment to action the protesters needed to believe that their efforts would be rewarded. The reinforcement of success was a prominent
part of the rhetoric of the radical leaders. "The administration building has been closed down by us," Mark Rudd explains when relaying word that Low Library was locked. To interpret Vice-President Truman's offer to meet students in McMillan Theatre, Rudd argues, "After we've gone to the son of a bitch a million times and he hasn't responded to us, now he asks to meet us in McMillan. Our force has brought him down." Later at the gym site, Rudd illustrates the group's power by ordering the administration to get busy and secure the release of an arrested demonstrator. "Go or we'll shut the site down," he warned. The issues gave the students a reason to be involved, the emphasis on the administration as a devil figure gave their involvement a focus, and the power over the administration gave them hope of success if they participated.

Not to be overlooked as an important attraction of the movement even though it is less rhetoric than a stage for the rhetoric was the frenzied action of the demonstration. The charge toward Low Library, the tearing down of the fence at the gym site, the yelling of the rally, all committed the demonstrators to action in support of the movement. The action lent an emotional pitch to the rally and prepared the protesters for the
charge into Hamilton Hall.

Development of the Organizational Structure

As the demonstrators moved into the lobby of Hamilton Hall, the nature of the movement changed. The manpower was gathered and now the major task was to develop stability as a base for the movement's permanence.

Before the demonstrators entered Hamilton Hall their failure to organize was obvious. At one time half the rally was at the sundial in front of Lov Library and half at the gym site. They both decided to join the other and met halfway. The SDS leaders were the most obvious source of leadership but they were continually apologizing for the lack of organization. The SDS' leadership style called for presentation of alternatives and group decision on each issue but anytime this was tried someone would rise out of the crowd, usurp leadership for the moment, and move the crowd toward the gym site with the SDS leaders trying to catch up. At one point the black SAS leaders were prepared to take over and organize the rally but they did not do so.

The need to develop patterns that would preserve
the movement, the maintenance function, and the need to develop focused direction, the managerial function, presented particular problems. Up until now the movement had depended a great deal on the unifying power of frenzied activity. But as the protesters moved into Hamilton Hall they were, for the first time, confined by walls, a naturally settling condition, and the need to develop stability in the movement tended to threaten the excitement that was the earlier attraction.

The radicals attempted to continue the excitement at a more subdued tone by a ritual singing and chanting. Primarily, however, they attempted to transfer the focus of the movement into Hamilton Hall by establishing their hostage, Dean Henry Coleman, as the surrogate for the administration. "Now we've got the man where we want him," Rudd observed. Rudd reiterated the administration's sins and its relationship with Vietnam, racism, and political repression. Then he concluded, "It's clear we can't leave this place until most of our demands are met... We can stay for a while... We've got to put pressure on these guys to change Columbia University." 21

The demonstrators had a new purpose to hold them
to the movement—they were to block Coleman’s exit. Rudd reinforced this purpose and increased the intensity of the situation with one of his responsive interviews.

- I just want to ask people, is this a demonstration, incidentally?
- YES!
- I want to ask people, are we disrupting the university’s function?
- YES!
- Is the university disrupting people all over the world?
- YES!
- Are we going to stay here until all of our demands are met?
- YES!
- No deans leave this building?
- YES!

The crowd’s answers of “yes” built into a crescendo and then such rituals ended with the chanting of slogans.

As the demonstrators continued to chant and sing songs, the leadership turned to developing an organization to make the decisions in the movement. Rudd proposed a list of leaders and the crowd voted approval.

Again, however, the attempt to organize the movement threatened its unity. The rational tone of the leadership proposal diminished the excitement of the demonstration and people began to drift from the building. SAS leader Bill Sales quickly shouted, “Hey, look, people! Now if you want to get a whole lot of people strung up today, just drift out of here and
you'll fuck up good... Can you white people tie up Columbia? Can you beat these administrators like those guys at Howard beat those cats down there?"23 The crowd responded to his question with a loud "Yes!"

Sales then promised food, blankets and other provisions would be gathered to secure the building. A SDS leader rose and began speaking to the administration's sins and the demonstrators shouted support. The common purpose had failed to hold the group together in the less-charged atmosphere, but the combination of threat, challenge, and promise of provisions along with the developing ritual established their unity.

The work of organization now began in earnest. The steering committee met, made plans for a long stay, drew up a list of demands, and after an hour took the six demands to the group in the lobby. "We propose that we stay until these demands are met,"24 Rudd said, and then asked for a show of hands of those that would commit themselves to staying. He then formed committees to get fans, food, and blankets.

Rudd had taken control and begun to organize the group. Students continued to argue the wisdom of keeping the Dean hostage but those in favor prevailed and as the night wore on, students began to bed down in
In the hours in Hamilton Hall the norms to give the demonstration continuity had been established. Rituals were developed to declare unity. A list of demands had been drafted to give the movement focus. The management norm of participatory democracy had been established and accepted by the demonstrators. Maybe more importantly, the promise of provisions had transformed the movement from an "outdoor movement" to a "building movement"—a movement with a territorial base and a commitment to establishing a living style within the territory. During those hours in Hamilton the students had been held together while the nature of the group changed from a frenzied mob to a stable social movement.

Stability During the Occupation

The movement soon expanded from Hamilton into four other buildings. During the next seven days the major functional needs were output and maintenance. The radicals were satisfied with the number of people in the buildings, in fact the buildings were near capacity, so they worried little about input. The buildings were relatively isolated from the outside world and most of the activity outside the buildings
was waiting for the completion of negotiations so the adaptive function was of little importance. The major tasks were convincing the community that the movement's ideology was valid, and maintaining the stability of the movement in the buildings.

Since the output and maintenance functions offered no particular problem of contradiction, success in this rhetorical task was fairly easy. For one thing the internal and external rhetoric of the movement was consistent. The demands were the focus of the organization in the movement and the refusal to compromise them in negotiations with the administration kept the demands powerful unifying devices.

Another of the reasons for the lack of friction between the two functions and the holding power of the movement was that inside the buildings a new life style grew that acted out the radical ideology. Thus the ideology proliferated to the outside world was consistent with the life style in the buildings.25

Provisions were provided in each building and work details were established as needed. The work was a cooperative effort. Bedding and medical supplies and services were provided as well as food. Perhaps most importantly, most of the day was spent in discussion
and participatory democracy. Thus the rituals established in Hamilton were continued, and since they symbolized the salient ideology they reinforced the radical position.

The other force holding the students to their position was their feeling of power. The possession of territory symbolized their power and they now controlled even the nerve center of the University—the office of the President. In addition, the failure of the administration to act against them and the increasingly bold statements by the SGC student leadership reflected a sense of power.

In the first day of the crisis a threat of police action had emptied Low Library and even the leaders had fled. But as the showdown with the administration neared seven days later even the threat of arrest and/or injury could not induce those in the buildings to leave.

Disintegration following the "Bust"

The critical moment of the Columbia crisis was the police "bust." The bloody clearing of the buildings marked both danger and opportunity for the movement. It robbed the movement of its territorial base that was so important to the identity. It put the students back
into the community and destroyed the communes. But at
the same time it alienated the campus community from
the administration, producing large numbers of
dissidents from which to mold a broader movement.

The first important need at the time was to
incorporate the new mass into the movement and turn
their energies to the movement's tasks. At the same
time, however, the norms developed to hold those already
in the movement to it were in shambles after the "bust."
The amnesty demand appeared to have failed. The
territorial base and isolation provided by the buildings
was gone and with them the rituals and life style. At
the time it appeared the administration had reestablished
its power and the movement had failed. If it were to
survive, the movement faced serious problems of
adjustment.

Having to serve the input, maintenance, and
adaptive functions concurrently created special
problems. The large increase in membership, from about
one thousand to six thousand, practically required a
reconstituting of the movement, yet the old members
had to feel the continuity with the movement as it had
been. In addition, the new members were by and large
more moderate than those in the buildings leading to
problems in adjusting to the audience. The continuity of the movement needed to be insured despite drastic changes resulting from eviction. Given the new membership, the difference in politics, and the loss of the buildings the radicals had to reformulate the movement with a large number of modifications without losing the enthusiasm of the previous members.

The reformulation that did occur drastically changed the focus of the movement. Until this point the leadership had been provided by the SDS and as a result the SDS ideology had dominated. The vast numbers of new personnel had a different “politics” however, and no special concern for the “imperialism” in the situation. They had seen the administration lose its control over the campus and now saw a chance to establish for the first time a student voice at Columbia. To turn this energy into the movement the SDS ideology needed to establish a rationale for student power and tie this issue with the radical issues.

The opportunity to accomplish the change occurred on May 1 at a meeting of the strikers in Vollman Auditorium. The SDS leadership recognized the need. "The original six demands are no longer sufficient," Dave Gilbert told the group, "in addition to winning
political demands, we must begin to create a new University. But as Mark Rudd began to speak the chance slipped away.

Rudd first reviewed the occupation and offered the strike as proof of the victory of the "bust."

This brought cheers. He then made his argument for continued demands. "Let's be extremely clear on what we're demanding and let's be clear in why we're doing all this. I think it's clear to the seven hundred people who were busted and those who were beat up and those who witnessed it. We're doing this in order to create a human society and to fight exploitation of man by man and we think that this University was an example of this exploitation." Rudd had chosen to place the strike in a broader context than student power and had, in fact, ignored the issue of student power. Jerry Avorn observed, "The thrust of Rudd's argument was clear: he was trying to persuade the more moderate students to join the strike on his terms and not seek to change the nature. With the prospect of an influx of liberals onto the new Strike Coordinating Committee, Rudd and the other leaders were faced with the dilemma of rejecting this new support in the interest of preserving the purity of the radical movement or
accepting the moderates in the interests of building a mass movement."29

Another SDS leader, Tony Papert, took the microphone and tried to focus on the power relationships on campus, but Rudd began speaking again. At this, objection began to be heard from the audience to Rudd's "hogging" of the microphone. The audience urged selection of a steering committee. Rudd responded, "But you can't select a steering committee until you've discussed the politics behind the strike."30 He then proposed that support for the six demands of the occupation be a basis for participation in the steering committee.

Rudd had never really wedded the student power and the imperialism issues. His concern was broader than the campus and he failed to make clear how the two issues complemented each other. He was followed to the platform by moderate spokesmen who proposed that to insure broad representation only support for the strike be required for membership on the steering committee. They also suggested that the strike focus narrowly on resignation of the administration, getting the police off campus, and restructuring the university power structure.
The SDS agreed to the latter plan and the chance to establish the radical ideology and its link to student power had passed. The leadership of the movement had passed into a more moderate structure. Two weeks later the radicals and the moderate students would separate into two groups and the hopes for a broader movement were dashed.

Part of the reason for the SDS position was to maintain the dedication of the core developed during the occupation. A sellout to student power would be a severe digression for those students who had commited themselves to the more idealistic goals of the occupation. The SDS needed to maintain the loyalty of the communes despite the loss of territory, their apparent inability to win amnesty, and the decline of participatory democracy during the strike.

The radical search for the ritual to maintain the old core of the movement failed. Rallies were held but rallies seem to require escalating excitement that could not be maintained day after day. Those who had been in the buildings formed communes but these did not have the same meaning out in the world where the life style of the buildings could not be maintained. The liberation classes offered an alternative but they
included the faculty and new members of the movement and soon turned their attention to academic subjects. In short, there was no form of ritual remaining and without it the old structure of the movement died even as the broader structure of the movement failed to maintain the old principles.

As a purveyor of radical ideology at Columbia the movement was dead.

**Conclusion**

The investigator learns from systems analysis that his perception is heavily stamped on his study and that the selection process inherent in the investigation limits the scope of the study. This is certainly true of my study of Columbia. I could have studied other segments of the movement's time line or I could have dealt with those studied in more depth. In fact my isolating the organizational goals from the ideological goals in studying the movement is probably a very significant restriction. These choices become necessary, however, to subjects with the scope of a social movement.

This problem is instructive of the nature of movements as well as the nature of the method. The movement is a tremendously complex phenomenon.
Because it is a social phenomenon rhetoric is pervasive in its existence. Any message has many different meanings depending on whom it reaches and/or the context within which they place it. The complexity of relationships within a movement makes the complexity of rhetorical influence inevitable.

Social movements are tremendously rich settings for rhetoric. The virtue of the method of this study is that it helps the rhetorician realize the richness and begin exploration of it.
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# A Classification of Rhetorical Functions in Social Movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Goal within Movement</th>
<th>Reacts to</th>
<th>Intended to</th>
<th>Urging Intended Audience to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Externally:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Input</td>
<td>To attract energy to the movement</td>
<td>Need for increased energy to survive</td>
<td>Non-members in the environment</td>
<td>Devote labors (and money) to movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acceptive</td>
<td>To prevent societal sanctions on the movement</td>
<td>Hostility to movement in the society</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Accept the movement as a legitimate activity within the society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Output</td>
<td>To disseminate the movement’s rhetoric and bring pressure to bear</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Accept the goals of the movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Management</td>
<td>To direct the movement</td>
<td>Decisions on the direction of the movement</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Carry out these tasks useful to the movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintenance</td>
<td>To keep the movement together</td>
<td>Internal friction</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Continue to work together to advance the movements goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adaptive</td>
<td>To change the movement</td>
<td>Feedback that a subsystem is ineffective</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Make changes to adjust to the feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Production</td>
<td>To produce the rhetorical output of the movement</td>
<td>Feedback from the environment</td>
<td>Influence the environment</td>
<td>External function goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Katz and Kahn, *The Social Psychology of Organizations*