

Rhetorical Invention, Leadership, And Dialogue: Dorothy Day's Extemporaneous Encounters

Tracy Ann Stockwell
Marquette University

Recommended Citation

Stockwell, Tracy Ann, "Rhetorical Invention, Leadership, And Dialogue: Dorothy Day's Extemporaneous Encounters" (2013).
Dissertations (2009 -). 286.
https://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu/286

RHETORICAL INVENTION, LEADERSHIP, AND DIALOGUE: DOROTHY DAY'S
EXTEMPORANEOUS ENCOUNTERS

By

Tracy Ann Stockwell, B.A., M.A.

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School,
Marquette University,
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

August 2013

ABSTRACT

RHETORICAL INVENTION, LEADERSHIP, AND DIALOGUE: DOROTHY DAY'S EXTEMPORANEOUS ENCOUNTERS

Tracy Ann Stockwell, B.A., M.A.,

Marquette University, 2013

Dorothy Day, the co-founder and pragmatic leader of The Catholic Worker Movement, delivered extemporaneous speeches from the inception of the movement in 1933 until her death in 1980. Selected digitized, archival copies of her public discourse are analyzed for the first time through a newly developed framework for rhetorical communication and leadership entitled *Encounter Rhetoric*.

A hybrid model synthesizing the theory of invitational rhetoric, transformational leadership theory, and social movement theory is developed and employed to conduct a critical analysis of 17 speeches delivered by Day between 1958 and 1975. This analysis reveals the rhetorical strategies employed by Day as a social movement leader.

The framework is comprised of five constructs: (1.) principled persuasion as an ethical means to communicate and to lead, (2.) unconditional regard for the value of process, mutuality, and voice, (3.) tentativeness in understanding and concluding, (4.) acknowledgment of paradox in perceptions and conditions, and (5.) collaborative action. These constructs inform Dorothy Day's charismatic eloquence and leadership.

Even as a self-admitted apprehensive speaker, Dorothy Day's public discourse reveals The Catholic Worker Movement's communication strategy as well as a discernible format for extemporaneous dialogical exchange. As an analytical framework and as a rubric for communication practitioners and leaders in other settings, encounter rhetoric is offered as a means for dismantling binary positions and potentially providing relief to otherwise marginalized voices and communities.

In addition, the potential relevance of the framework is considered in relation to new and social media, including reflections upon those parties unwilling or unable to respectfully or safely engage in encounters of mutual regard. The usefulness of encounter rhetoric may be further considered as a tool for analyzing the rhetorical acumen of communicators as leaders and leaders as communicators, especially those orators, reluctant or charismatic, who traditionally have not been included as subjects for study in academic scholarship.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Dr. Steven R. Goldzwig, Professor & Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research for the Diederich College of Communication, Marquette University. Dr. Goldzwig has served as my advisor for both my M.A. in Communication Studies with a Specialization in Rhetoric and for my interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Rhetorical Communication and Leadership. His expertise, generosity, and compassion are beyond compare. His commitment to ethical communication is modeled in his teaching, scholarship, and collegial work within our University community and his encouragement to pursue my authentic interests as a non-traditional student, spanning more than a decade, is acknowledged as an immeasurable gift.

I am indebted to my committee, Dr. Sarah Bonewits-Feldner, Associate Professor, Department of Communication Studies, Marquette University; Dr. Johnette (Jay) Lynn Caulfield, Associate Professor & Associate Dean, College of Professional Studies, Marquette University; Dr. Stephen R. Sharkey, Professor of Sociology, Alverno College; and Dr. William J. Thorn, Associate Professor of Journalism, Marquette University. Throughout this process their combined expertise, support, and unwavering dependability has bolstered my resolve to “Keep Calm and Carry On” in the midst of competing demands and moments of self-doubt inherent to doctoral work.

My alma mater and employer, Alverno College, is acknowledged as a treasured community of friends and colleagues, which has nurtured my personal and professional development for more than 20 years. I was granted a sabbatical to complete this work and I am an inaugural benefactor of The Alverno College Doctoral Completion Program.

Any expression of gratitude seems wholly insufficient, however I am committed to upholding the underpinning vision and sentiment that has been extended to me in all of my future endeavors as an expression of my thankfulness.

I wish to acknowledge my students at both Alverno College and Marquette University, whom continuously stand as my referent for dignity and diligence, as well as for the abiding potential of individuals to transform. It is with humility and respect that I bear witness to their learning.

I also extend my heartfelt blessings to the Tertiary Sisters of St. Francis of Mambu, Bafut, Cameroon, (W. Africa), to Catholic Workers, and to all those served by these living saints, respectively. They have renewed my work ethic, commitment to service, and my faith.

There are many cherished friends who have extended such kindness and acceptance, maintaining long-standing belief in my impassioned pursuits. They are the “soul sustenance” expressed in jazz, poetry, prayer, art, and dance.

Foremost, I am profoundly grateful for my family. My beloved husband, partner, and proofreader, Jim, is a consistent source of affirmation grounding our lives. He has withstood a great deal. To my children, Ella, Carmen, and Joe, I can finally answer, “Yes,” to the question, “Are you done, yet Mama?” The Bickel’s, Brewster’s, and Stockwell’s makeup my tribe and enduring support system; to *all* of you, I dedicate this work.

My final acknowledgment is allotted to Dorothy Day. Her lived example is worthy of exaltation and I willingly commit to her proposed “revolution of the heart.”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF FIGURES	
Figure 1. Stockwell, T., 2013, January 27.....	1
Kitchen Table, Saints Francis and Therese Catholic Worker Community, Worcester, Massachusetts	
Figure 2. An Analytical Framework for Rhetorical Communication.....	72
and Leadership: “Encounter Rhetoric”	
PREFACE.....	2
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	14
Introduction.....	14
Background and Biography.....	17
Dorothy May Day ~ November 8, 1897 – November 29, 1980.....	17
Purpose of the Study & Rationale.....	25
Research Objective, Research Goal, & Research Questions.....	28
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REIVEW & THEORETICAL BASE.....	30
Introduction.....	31
Literature Review & Theoretical Base.....	36
Related Scholarship: Dorothy Day’s Rhetorical Appeals and Leadership....	37
Rhetorical Appeals.....	37

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

Leadership.....	40
Theoretical Base for the Encounter Rhetoric Framework.....	44
Invitational Rhetoric.....	45
Transformational Leadership Theory.....	50
Social Movement Theory.....	54
CHAPTER 3: AN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR RHETORICAL	
COMMUNICATION & LEADERSHIP “ENCOUNTER RHETORIC”.....	60
Introduction.....	61
Polarization & Division.....	61
Dorothy Day, Speech Anxiety, and Charisma.....	62
A Framework of and for Dialogue.....	65
Conceptualization & Development.....	67
Summative Overview & Definitions.....	75
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY.....	
Introduction.....	78
Methodological Rationale.....	80
Method of Discourse Selection.....	83

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS & EVALUATION OF	
EXTEMPORANEOUS DISCOURSE.....	94
Introduction.....	94
Principled Persuasion as an Ethical Means to Communicate	
And to Lead.....	98
Unconditional Regard for the Value of Process, Mutuality and Voice.....	103
Tentativeness in Understanding and Concluding.....	108
Acknowledgment of Paradox in Conditions and Perceptions.....	116
Paradoxical Communication.....	117
Paradoxical Conditions.....	121
Collaborative Action.....	129
CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY & CONCLUSION.....	138
Introduction.....	138
Summary.....	139
Limitations.....	140
Implications for Modern Practice.....	144
Potential Use in Other Contexts.....	144

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

Bridging Dialogical Exchange & Dismantling Binaries.....	146
New & Social Media.....	147
Willingness & Valuing an Encounter.....	150
Conclusion “A Lifetime Job”.....	151
BIBLIOGRAPHY & REFERENCES.....	154

Figure 1.



Stockwell, T.
 2013, January 27
 Kitchen Table, Saints Francis and Therese Catholic Worker Community, Worcester,
 Massachusetts.

Round table discussions or kitchen table conversations ground Peter Maurin's conceptualization of The Catholic Worker Program, which includes publishing *The Catholic Worker* newspaper, providing hospitality to the impoverished, living in accordance with the justice and charity of Jesus Christ, and maintaining a commitment to personalism, pacifism, and communitarianism. Co-founded by Maurin and Dorothy Day in 1933, and led by Day until her death in 1980, The Catholic Worker Movement values and endorses voluntary poverty, a decentralized society, and a green revolution. The kitchen table is the hallmark of discursive interactions, extemporaneous discourse, and person-to-person encounters¹.

¹ For further reading on kitchen table political discussion and the politics of hospitality see McCarthy, D. (Ed.) *The heart of Catholic social teaching: Its origins and contemporary significance*. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2009. In particular review: "Through the Needle's Eye: The Catholic Worker Movement and the Challenge of Voluntary Poverty" by Kathy Dow Magnus and "Compassion and Hospitality" by Trudy Conway. (http://assets.bakerpublishinggroup.com/processed/book-resources/files/Excerpt_9781587432484.pdf?1362584606)

PREFACE

“Writing a book (*or a dissertation*) is hard, because you are ‘giving yourself away.’ But if you love, you want to give yourself. You write as you are impelled to write, about man and his problems, his relation to God and his fellows. You write about yourself because in the long run all man’s problems are the same, his human needs of sustenance and love. ‘What is man that Thou art mindful of him?’ the Psalmist asks, and he indicates man’s immense dignity when he says, ‘Thou has made him a little less than the angels²’”(Day, D., 1952, *The Long Loneliness*, p. 10). (*My inclusion*).

This dissertation project is a feminist-identified rhetorical study of Dorothy Day’s extemporaneous speeches and leadership grounded within the principles of the Catholic Worker Movement, which express a “both-and” orientation. In today’s culture we are deeply ingrained in “either-or” debates and struggles. We seem deadlocked in divisive rhetoric and strained relations. Despite these conditions, this study is offered with a degree of hope. “I am convinced she (Dorothy Day) is a saint³ for our time. She exemplifies what’s best in Catholic life, that ability we have to be ‘both-and’ and not ‘either-or’” – Cardinal Timothy M. Dolan, (Otterman, S. 2012, November 26, *The New York Times*, p. A1).

² Throughout the studied discourse Dorothy Day makes use of masculine pronouns, which at times is jarring in the context of a feminist-identified rhetorical study. It is noted that Day used the accepted gender-neutral term of her time. To honor and preserve her spoken words, pronouns are not edited or corrected to reflect current norms, standards, and practice.

³ The U.S. Catholic Bishops advanced the cause for Dorothy Day’s canonization at the 2012 Conference. This is discussed further in Chapter 1. For an overview of the process for canonization (sainthood) see: http://www.catholic.org/national/national_story.php?id=48496; <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/what-we-believe/catechism/catechism-of-the-catholic-church/epub/index.cfm> (paragraph 828); and <http://www.catholiceducation.org/articles/religion/re0136.html>.

I struggle with the public debates pitting healthcare access against religious liberties, but upon reading Cardinal Dolan's quote I stood up and cheered and danced from a convent in Cameroon, West Africa⁴. On a service-learning trip serving Cameroonian Roman Catholic students (an experience to be discussed further within this Preface), reading of Dolan's use of the terms "both-and" and "either-or" affirmed my developing understanding of Dorothy Day. This seemingly advanced my study as I was in the process of trying to operationalize the concept and process of "both-and" in rhetorical communication and leadership settings.

In the tradition of feminist critique, this study seeks "...first to discern and correct the systematic omission of women and, second to correct the sexist and misogynist practices and assumptions associated with specific modes of research" (Roof, J. in Nagy Hesse-Biber, 2007, p. 428). I hope to contribute a new framework that cultivates more authentic public speaking and dialogue, in other words, a framework for analysis and practice that synthesizes a set of communication and leadership principles to guide dialogical exchange. In addition to analyzing Day's public discourse, the framework encourages us to abandon the simple "either-or" and move a bit more eloquently through the complexities of "both-and" for communicators and leaders of various communities, in particular those serving marginalized groups.

⁴ For further reading on the public debate of liberal and conservative interpretations of Dorothy Day's ideological commitments see Otterman's article which summarizes the stances (2012, November 26). My tendency is to rely upon those who knew her, "I think she would be appalled to have her commitment to voluntary poverty and works of mercy and charity in their deepest sense be used as cover for an agenda that I think she would see as part of a war against the poor," said Mr. Ellsberg, a former editor of *The Catholic Worker* newspaper that Ms. Day founded with Peter Maurin in 1933" (Otterman, S. 2012, November 26, *The New York Times*, p. A1). For a sense of Affordable Health Act revisions see: <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/02/us/politics/white-house-proposes-compromise-on-contraception-coverage.html?pagewanted=all>

Within this study an “either-or” orientation is defined as the exchange of opposing positions of an issue, belief or perspective. Likewise, “both-and” positions acknowledge paradoxical conditions and perceptions also revealing points of agreement among real and seemingly contradictory claims. If “either-or” is abandoned for “both-and” the range of options and solutions increase (from 2 to 2 +) and new meanings may be shared among disparate entities (further descriptions of key terms, constructs, and themes are presented in Chapters 3 & 4). Within the feminist tradition, such a project “... represents a moment in which *political necessity* makes analysis relevant...”(Roof, in Nagy Hesse-Biber, 2007, p. 428, *my emphasis*).

This study of Dorothy Day’s extemporaneous speeches constitutes a rhetorical recovery project which highlights a significant woman rhetor of the 20th Century. First, no prior scholarship has fully analyzed Day’s extemporaneous discourse. Second, her discourse is reflective of a unique leadership style that has helped guide The Catholic Worker Movement and it has implications for other social and political leaders. Third, the methodological framework adopted for this study is influenced, in part, by feminist communication theory.

Thus, a focus on Day’s discourse provides the opportunity to make a scholarly contribution to both rhetorical and leadership studies based upon the discursive practices of a powerful and prominent woman leader of a radical social movement⁵.

Within feminist scholarship a researcher’s authority is often established initially with some autobiographical detail and experience and/or the ritual of self-positioning by the author.

⁵ A brief biography of Dorothy Day including the formation of The Catholic Worker Movement is offered in Chapter 2. The newly developed framework is fully described in Chapter 3.

An ethical commitment to disclosing the researcher's world-view and her unavoidable subjectivities is standard. The researcher and the subject matter are regarded as interconnected. To omit personal disclosure negates the opportunity to access the motivations and underpinnings of scholarship and critique (hooks, 2000; Foss & Foss, 1994; Foss, 2009; Roof, 2007). Ethical necessity and enthusiasm for the subject at-hand, then, impel me to describe how I came to study Dorothy Day.

I converted to Roman Catholicism in 2000, moved by a parish community and priest in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The social justice message, the people, and the rituals brought me from a Lutheran to a Roman Catholic religious practice. My parish community, along with many kindnesses extended to me from a rather devout college roommate, to an unsuspecting parish priest ministering to me in the aftermath of a friend's suicide, to Milwaukee's School Sisters of St. Francis of Alverno College who provided a rich intellectual life that astounded a first-generation college student, all moved me to embrace faith. This decision was arduous. The Roman Catholic clerical abuse scandal was unfolding and as a politically liberal feminist I started to feel conflicted. One friend, sharing the same faith practice and political orientation as I flatly stated upon learning of my conversion, "Don't do it." I was pregnant with the first of three children. My husband was raised Roman Catholic and to some it seemed I was merely joining him. My decision was influenced by our mutual desire to raise our family within a religious tradition, but it was also based on a far more deeply personal choice and also one that I have rarely shared until now.

Throughout my conversion, I developed an affinity for saints. Raised within the Lutheran Church, a common critique of the Roman Catholic tradition included veneration of the Blessed Virgin Mary which was perceived as “praying to a false God.” As the most important female icon of Christianity, especially through the Blessed Virgin Mary, I found a spiritual means to embrace motherhood, sacred nurturance, and identify with women within the Roman Catholic Church. St. Therese of Lisieux promoted a daily practice of seeing God in everything we do, including engaging the seemingly mundane activities of daily life and dealing with difficult personalities. Among St. Therese’s many gifts “was carving out a pathway to sanctity for ordinary people, one that side-stepped the ‘rough stairway of perfection’” (O’Connor, 1997, p. 93). St. Therese and Dorothy Day share the ability to serve as examples of women whose lives are firmly grounded within the teachings of Jesus Christ. These teachings help us manage and on better days embrace struggles associated with daily living. In the case of Dorothy Day, however, daily life included attention to social justice issues, galvanized by the Papal Encyclicals to be treated later in Chapter 1 (Anderson, 1982; Day, 1952; Coles, 1987; Forest, 1986; Miller 1987).

Recently, I visited with women who could be described as living saints. In November, 2012, through a joint project between Alverno College and Milwaukee School of Engineering, a small group of students and faculty traveled to Mambu, Bafut, Cameroon to install a computer lab at St. Joseph Comprehensive High School.

The Tertiary Sisters of St. Francis manage the high school, a rehabilitation center, a health clinic, an elementary school, a farm, and a convent serving the community.

The sisters are the sole social service providers for the village and West Africans come to Mambu to receive services. As guests of the convent we bore witness to the sisters' work of educating, feeding, and providing healthcare to many in the region. Prior to my personal experience, I toiled over understanding Dorothy Day's charismatic gifts⁶. She was not a gifted public speaker, and she suffered from speaking anxiety, yet she spoke for nearly 50 years and, as evidenced within the Marquette University Dorothy Day Archives, *something* happened to those whom listened to her. Dorothy Day dedicated her life to providing daily acts of mercy and her actions and testimony had a profound impact upon others. People joined the Catholic Worker Movement, recommitted themselves to the Gospels of Christ, converted to Roman Catholicism, and regained a sense of purpose in supporting labor and pacifist causes.

It was not until I was a guest of the Tertiary Sisters of St. Francis in Cameroon that I understood the expression and experience of charismatic gifts. More should be written of the work of these religious women. Their daily ministry tests their physical, spiritual, emotional, and psychological stamina.

In the midst of many difficulties related to providing daily acts of mercy within the context of a developing community, there is no shortage of tenacity or love. This can be said as well of the citizens of Mambu, Bafut. The praying, singing, drumming, dancing, and acts of kindness and courage are abundant and many dream of leaving this place as soon as possible to pursue economic opportunities, education, access to clean water, healthcare, and a more just government (2012, December 5, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-13146029>).

⁶ The role of charisma within leadership is addressed further in Chapter 3.

For all of the differences between developing and developed nations, the “both-and” paradox, the political and cultural binaries and the joy and harshness of daily life is a shared, complex phenomenon. We can no longer dismiss this condition or regard it as too difficult to address. Our global community awaits a significant and meaningful response.

To further my understanding of Dorothy Day’s charismatic gifts, I traveled to New York and Massachusetts to meet with Catholic Workers whom I knew and worked with her and/or are actively providing daily acts of mercy within Catholic Worker Houses of Hospitality. The hospitality extended to me by Catholic Workers and by their guests was welcoming and generous. The individuals with whom I met were forthright and wholly supportive of my intent to get a better sense of their experience of Day’s presence and of what daily life entails within The Catholic Worker Movement. I met with Jane Sammon, director of Maryhouse and the infamous soup chef, Roger of St. Joseph House in New York. In Worcester, Massachusetts I met with Claire Schaeffer-Duffy, co-director of the Saints Francis and Therese Catholic Worker Community. I shared meals and conversations with Catholic Workers and guests, and stayed overnight at the Saints Francis and Therese Catholic Worker Community. I intentionally met with everyone as informally as possible. I informed them of the purpose and of the scope of my dissertation project and indicated that I wanted to understand what it was like to have been in the presence of Dorothy Day. I did not take notes during the conversations, although I documented my reflections following each interaction. I did not record the conversations as I sought authentic dialogue. I eschewed the formality of audio or video technology, which might have interfered with a human exchange.

My intent was to refine and affirm my understanding of Dorothy Day's charismatic gifts. In my mind and heart, I thought of my trip as a "Getting to know Dorothy" excursion. I began studying Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement in 2008; in preparation for this dissertation project I have spent countless hours reading Dorothy Day's writings, reading about Dorothy Day, watching videos of her, and listening to her recorded voice. My visits far surpassed my expectations. My understanding of Day's experienced presence and legacy has been refined and affirmed in ways previously unanticipated. In particular, Dorothy Day's work and the daily acts of mercy, guided by the Catholic Worker tenets set forth by co-founder Peter Maurin, infused the countless "talks" Dorothy Day made. However, I learned that none of these persuasive activities should be romanticized. As Claire Schaeffer-Duffy told me, "Catholic Workers, all of them, are spent," conveying the difficulty of the commitment lived daily. If the proposed framework for rhetorical communication and leadership to be developed herein is to be at all useful, its idealism must be counterbalanced with a dose of reality: an orientation informed by a lived set of principles is often messy and difficult. This conclusion is offered with humility and gratitude as I witnessed compassion, care, love, steadfast resolve, and joy in the Catholic Worker's ministry to the guests struggling with hunger, unemployment, homelessness, addiction and recovery, mental illness, and various forms of disenfranchisement.

The Catholic Workers I met had differing opinions of Dorothy Day's qualifications as a Saint ranging from her wishes (she once proclaimed, "Don't call me a saint") to her much discussed pre-conversion life, which is addressed later in Chapter 1. The consensus among the many I spoke with was that Dorothy Day was "the real thing."

Those who knew her claim her faith was unequivocally unwavering. “She would consider conceding on something political, for example, but she would never concede on her faith. She was truly devout” (Maryhouse Catholic Worker, personal communication, January 24, 2013). During my visits the tenets of the Catholic Worker Movement were spoken of easily within casual conversation and Dorothy Day remains revered for her consistency in her words and daily actions as remembered by those who worked alongside her.

Through these visits an important supposition of my prior research was corroborated: Dorothy Day was not regarded as a great public speaker. Jane Sammon of Maryhouse told me a story of accompanying Dorothy Day to a labor rights event at Madison Square Garden. Day was to be one of many speakers. Sammon began the story, “You know that she wasn’t a good public speaker? She was terrified!” Just prior to the event Day told Sammon that she felt faint. Sammon said she pleaded with God on that day, “Not on my watch” (personal communication, January 24, 2013)! Instead of speaking from the stage, a microphone was brought to Dorothy at her seat. This lessened Day’s speaking anxiety by relieving her from a podium and platform (J. Sammon, personal communication, January 24, 2013).

The Catholic Worker Movement’s foundational tenets as set forth by Peter Maurin center firmly on living the Gospels of Christ, providing daily acts of mercy, and promoting the practices of pacifism and personalism (these tenets are described further in Chapter 1). The structure of the movement includes the *Catholic Worker* newspaper, houses of hospitality feeding and sheltering the impoverished, farming communities, and round-table discussions. The oral tradition is strong within the movement. Discussions of faith, politics, personal experiences, and of Dorothy Day are shared at the table.

The storytelling exchanges while sipping soup and eating shepherd's pie at Catholic Worker tables were the highlights of my visits. It was during these conversations I heard repeatedly "Dorothy didn't like public speaking!" I argued this is exactly why I am especially intrigued by the prospect of analyzing Dorothy Day's discursive exchanges. Many communicators and leaders struggle with public forums and dialogic exchange. We can learn from Day's spoken word because despite her discomfort she had a profound, lasting impact upon others.

In addition to learning about what it was like to be in the presence of Dorothy Day, I wanted to be put in the presence of Catholic Workers and their guests. My time with them was not unlike my time spent with the Tertiary Sisters of St. Francis and the people of Mambu, Bafut, Cameroon. Surrounded by struggle and plight, there is joy and love in a life of service and dignity among those providing or receiving care. There is purposeful, authentic interconnectedness suffusing these communities. Each person displays mutual regard and honors the immanent value of each individual.

After broadly sharing the framework for rhetorical communication and leadership developed for this dissertation project with Claire Schaeffer-Duffy, I asked her if she felt communities beyond the Catholic Worker Movement could benefit from the communication traditions the movement established. Indeed, could others learn to dismantle binaries and more aptly deal with the "both/and" paradox in a variety of contexts? "Well", she said, "Catholic Workers are ideologues. Do you mean to take love seriously?" I have been asked many questions, but the question of taking love seriously is the one I continue to contemplate.

I wonder how asking individuals within educational, professional, spiritual, community, and familial settings to truly “take love seriously” will be received.

As I consider this I realize my sense of the new framework to be introduced in this dissertation conflates loving one’s neighbor and one’s enemy from such sources as “The Sermon on the Mount” (Matthew 5:1-48, King James Version), bell hooks’ love ethic extended and nurtured within communities (2001), as well as the Buddhist teaching of one’s capacity for love in all encounters developed through intention and practice (Salzberg, 1995). I fear I will be dismissed as a guileless idealist if I make the plea to “take love seriously.” However, it seems clear to me that in establishing mutual regard among disparate entities and coping with the paradox of both/and struggles, we inevitably begin a process that must “take love seriously.” I believe this is what I mean.

The framework of rhetorical communication and leadership to be developed here, then, is meant to encourage discursive norms and communicative behavior that invoke this extraordinary and simultaneously simple exhortation.

I am a Roman Catholic convert, feminist, humanist, and perpetual student of rhetorical communication and leadership. I began formally studying Dorothy Day in 2008. My admiration and interest stems from Dorothy Day’s capacity to appeal to dual audiences, both liberal and conservative. “As someone who was both committed to social justice and loyal to church teachings, Day bridges wings of the contemporary church in a way that few American Catholic figures can” (Otterman, 2012, November 26, p. A1). Most recently, as New York’s Cardinal Timothy M. Dolan advocated for Day’s sainthood before the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, a renewed public debate ensues.

Both conservatives and liberals claim Day for her radical devotion to the poor, gentle anarchism, consistent commitment to pacifism, and to the Gospels of Jesus Christ.

Dorothy Day is presented as a “Saint of Our Time” (Otterman, 2012, November 26, p. A1). Such a proclamation is itself open to controversy. In a divisive and polarized era, the idea evokes controversy as the role of women and women’s rights are of global concern⁷. Finally, some question the very idea of sainthood as Day’s pre-conversion life is often deemed as “bohemian” (Cannon, 2012, November 30; Gibson, 2012, November 14; Golway, 2012, December 7; Muth, 2012, December 24; Otterman, 2012, November 26; Wilson O’Reilly, 2012, November 29; Winters, 2012, December 5; Zaimov, 2012, November 28).

My assertion via this dissertation: There is much to learn from Dorothy Day. Whether one approaches rhetorical communication and leadership from a spiritual or secular perspective, as long as either is grounded within a communitarian ethic, Day’s public discourse sets an example as an extraordinary form of persuasion.

In Chapter 1, which follows, I will outline a general introduction to this dissertation project including a brief biography of Dorothy Day. This will be followed by the research objective, research goal, and research questions guiding this study.

⁷ The global rights of women and girls relating to safety, healthcare, education, economic opportunities, public life, and decision-making are receiving worldwide attention (<http://datatopics.worldbank.org/gender/thematic-data>). For a review of the related issues, systemic efforts, and movements see: U.S. Department of State, Office of Global Women’s Issues, <http://www.state.gov/s/gwi/>; Change: Center for Health and Gender Equity, http://www.genderhealth.org/the_issues/why_women_and_girls/; The United Nations / Global Issues / Women, <http://www.un.org/en/globalissues/women/>; Women for Women International, <http://www.womenforwomen.org/news-women-for-women/women-for-women-critical-issues.php>; Half the Sky Movement: Turning Oppression into Opportunity Worldwide, <http://www.halfttheskymovement.org/pages/movement>.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The most highly regarded public speakers in history, without question, are leaders within specific moments, looking to transform culture, policies, and perspectives through rhetorical acts⁸. Leaders are rhetorical communicators, and their leadership is grounded within ethical schemas conceptualized and promoted via persuasion aimed toward change. Communication and leadership scholarship claim the same individuals as the greatest orators or the most influential leaders. Exemplary men include Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., Mahatma Gandhi, President Abraham Lincoln, and Malcolm X; exemplary women include Susan B. Anthony, Eleanor Roosevelt, Shirley Chisholm, Helen Keller, Margaret Sanger, and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Lunsford, 2010; Ritchie & Ronald, 2001; Northouse, 2007; Zinn, 2005). These disciplines also note the underrepresentation of women within rhetorical and leadership scholarship.

In addition, disciplinary shifts in rhetorical and leadership studies are notable in recent investigations that highlight processes rather than products. Product focused rhetoric and leadership has not dealt well with resolving conflict.

⁸ Definitions of “rhetoric” and “rhetorical criticism” are contested and widely addressed within multiple disciplines. Based upon the literature, following are definitions put forth by this study. The *definition of rhetoric* generally encompasses three propositions: (1.) humans construct rhetoric or persuasion, (2.) symbols serve as the medium for rhetoric, and (3.) communication or sharing meaning or symbols is the purpose for rhetoric. The *purpose of rhetorical criticism* is to reveal rhetorical processes through systematic analysis of acts and artifacts (Bizzell, 2000; Black, 1979; Brummett, 1999; Burke, 1966 & 1969; Ceccarelli, 1998; Foss, 2009, Jamieson, Kathleen Hall, and Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, 1982; Jasinski, 2001).

Those most in need of relief often leave their persuasive encounters with feelings of ambivalence and coercion, if not abandonment (Foss, 2009). Both fields demonstrate a growing literature on the moral or ethical implications of persuasive influence in a variety of settings (Sullivan & Goldzweig, 1995; Northouse, 2007).

This study develops an interdisciplinary framework for rhetorical communication and leadership and applies it to the extemporaneous speeches of Dorothy Day. Thus, the resulting analysis offers a careful examination of a woman rhetor both as a social movement leader and as an orator with a special gift for extemporaneous encounters.

Dorothy Day co-founded the Catholic Worker Movement, the *Catholic Worker* newspaper, and lived among and passionately served the poor. She is recognized for her extensive writing as a journalist and author, as an anarchist, activist, organizer, radical thinker, and Roman Catholic mystic. As alluded to previously, Day has been formally declared a “Servant of God” by the Vatican and her canonization for sainthood progresses. How did Dorothy Day accomplish so much and influence so many? How did she remain steadfast in her faith and social justice commitments, while living in voluntary poverty? How did Day lead a movement as a woman and single mother? How was she able to maintain a seemingly radical worldview that was counter to the norms and standards of her generation? These questions provide the animus for this study.

Dorothy Day's formal public addresses⁹ are few in number. Notable addresses include Day's speeches following the attack on Pearl Harbor before the Liberal-Socialist Alliance in New York City (1941, December 8), at Union Square in support of draft-card burners November 6, 1965, and before the Eucharistic Congress August 6, 1976 (Anderson, 1982). Day delivered numerous extemporaneous speeches, between 1933 and 1980. The transcripts are now housed within The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, at Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.

As proposed by Stephen J. Krupa in *America: The National Catholic Weekly* (2001, August 27), Dorothy Day's life and work reflected feminist concerns, including

The active participation of women in the work force and in the professions; support for working mothers; the importance of community; the intimate connection between diverse social problems like work, gender, class, race, poverty, capitalism, and war; the deep connection between the physical and the spiritual; attention to human experience as an essential component in the search for truth; and a disregard, in practice, for assigned gender roles in work (p. 1).

Dorothy Day did not identify herself as a feminist, however. In its earliest stages, mostly white, middle-class women led the women's movement. By the time the feminist movement caught-up to Day's pioneering activities in its development, it would include the perspectives and experiences of women and men, become racially diversified, and include socio-economic class, among other defining, interconnected characteristics. As these later developments were taking shape, Day was nearing the end of her life (Krupa, 2001, August 27; O'Connor, J.E., 1991).

⁹ A formal public address is defined as a speech delivered from a script.

Dorothy Day's earliest experiences, her conversion to Roman Catholicism, and meeting Peter Maurin, the conceptual architect and co-founder of The Catholic Worker Movement, moved Day to co-found and lead the movement. Day's writing, leadership, and persevering compassion were developed during her early life, preparing her for a vocation. Her extemporaneous discourse cannot be fully understood without an examination of these influences, therefore a brief biography follows as well as a summative overview of the rationale, specific goal, objective, and research questions guiding the study.

Background and Biography

Dorothy May Day ~ November 8, 1897 – November 29, 1980

The day before Dorothy Day's funeral, a secretary working for then Cardinal Archbishop of New York, Terence James Cooke contacted Day's family. His Eminence requested Day's funeral mass be held at 10:00 a.m. instead of 11:00 a.m. due to a previous commitment. Day's daughter, Tamar, scheduled the mass mindful of those preparing food for the guests of St. Joseph's and Maryhouse, the latter time coinciding with the workers' morning break. Colman McCarthy writes of the outcome of this exchange, "The Cardinal's presence would be missed, but with all due respect, feeding the poor came first" (McCarthy, 2005, December 9). Ultimately, Cardinal Cooke attended Day's funeral briefly, offered a prayer and then left. Geoffrey Gneuchs, a Dominican Maryhouse priest presided (McCarthy, 2005, December 5; Riegle, 2003).

This anecdote illuminates Dorothy Day's remarkable influence. The trajectory of her life's vocation included dedication to serving the poor and making the rich and the powerful uncomfortable.

Once heralded by *The New York Times Magazine* as “The Patron Saint Of Paradox,” Day’s life was said to represent a “synthesis of rock-ribbed Catholicism and radical politics” (Elie, 1998, November 8).

Day’s lifestyle, commitments, and devotion as a layperson served as an inspirational example and at times a threat - - perhaps especially to the Roman Catholic Church to which she remained faithful. The uneasy tension between the institutional Church and the radical peace activist and social critic is difficult to fully capture. What is clear is that Dorothy Day lived and died among the poor. Her pine casket was carried from Maryhouse to Nativity Catholic Church in New York City, drawing family, friends, and the poor she served. To the very end, Day challenged the hierarchy of the Catholic Church. Yet her commitment to living the tenets of the Gospels and the message of Christ’s “Sermon on the Mount” was authentic; she lived by example in voluntary poverty. In the process she became a movement leader, a social activist, and a mentor for peace activists around the world (Anderson, 1982; Day, 1952; Coles, 1987; Forest, 1986; Miller, 1987).

Dorothy Day was born November 8, 1897 to John I. and Grace Satterlee Day in Brooklyn, New York. Her early family life was marked by poverty, frequent moves, and without formal religious practice. The third of the five Day children, Dorothy’s religious influences as a child came from neighbors. After moving from California to Chicago in 1906, an Episcopalian family invited the Days to attend the Episcopal Church of Our Savior, where Dorothy was eventually baptized and confirmed.

Dorothy Day graduated from high school in 1914 and enrolled at the University of Illinois at Urbana with a competitive scholarship of \$300 in hand, which was awarded to her by the *Hearst Chicago Examiner*. Day began questioning religion and spirituality while simultaneously becoming interested in social issues. Exposed to the likes of Marx, Gorki, Chekhov, Tolstoy, and Dostoevsky, Day adopted a radical political stance, developed anti-capitalist and anarchistic philosophies, and abandoned both religion as well as a college education (Anderson, 1982; Day, 1952; Coles, 1987; Forest, 1986; Miller 1987).

In 1916, Dorothy Day and family moved to New York City, where her father took a job as a journalist for the *New York Morning Telegraph*. Day, like her brothers and father, wanted to be a journalist. Her father was against his daughter pursuing such work, and it is suspected he attempted to prevent her from securing a writing position. Through 1920 Day wrote on behalf of the *Call* and the *Masses*, socialist/communist periodicals devoted to labor issues and anarchist interests. Day was incarcerated in 1917 for thirty-days for picketing the White House on behalf of imprisoned suffragettes. This period of Day's life has been given much scrutiny for it reveals her humanity and stands in contrast to the religious "fool for Christ" she would become.

During this time Dorothy Day had a relationship with Lionel Moise resulting in a terminated pregnancy, a major depression, and a suicide attempt. Within the space of one year, the relationship with Moise ended, and Day married and divorced Berkeley Tobey as well (Day, 1952; Coles, 1987; Forest, 1986; Miller, 1987). Between 1920 and 1923, Day moved to Chicago, then to New Orleans, and returned to New York City as a survivor of personal strife, exhibiting a steadfast resilience.

Dorothy Day was known to demonstrate both compassion and strength under the direst of circumstances. Her early experiences, in part, and her unwavering faith following her conversion, informed her hallmark capacity for deep empathy (Anderson, 1982; Day, 1952; Coles, 1987; Forest, 1986; Miller, 1987; Riegle, 2003).

Following her return to New York, Dorothy Day wrote her first book, *The Eleventh Virgin*, and used the proceeds from this published work to buy a small, shoreline fishing shack in Staten Island. She met Forster Batterham who became her common-law husband. Day initiated a prayerful life, studied nature and religion, and fell in love with Batterham, an anarchist, atheist, and biologist. In 1927, Day and Batterham's daughter, Tamar Teresa was born. Tamar's birth was a "prayer answered" as Day was uncertain of her ability to conceive following her earlier aborted pregnancy. As Dorothy Day's spirituality deepened, she wanted to baptize her daughter and provide her instruction in Roman Catholicism. Day regarded the Catholic Church as "the protector of immigrants and common laborers," revered the practice and traditions of the faith, and above all loved Christ, and loved love (Day, 1952; Miller, 1987; www.catholicworker.org). The shift in Dorothy Day's living faith and commitment to raising her daughter within her faith created a rift between Day and Batterham. She felt she was forced to make a choice "between God and man." Day wrote in *The Long Loneliness*,

...it was impossible to talk about religion or faith to him. A wall immediately separated us. The very love of nature, and the study of her secrets which was bringing me to faith, cut Forster off from religion (1952, p. 134).

Furthermore,

There were conflicts because Forster did not believe in bringing children into such a world as we lived. He still was obsessed by the war. His fear of responsibility, his dislike of having the control of others, his extreme individualism made him feel that he of all men should not be a father (1952, p. 136).

Day left Batterham. To the surprise of some who knew her, Dorothy Day converted to Roman Catholicism at the age of 30 under the instruction of Sister Aloysia Mary Mulhearn of Staten Island, while struggling as a single mother to support her daughter (Anderson, 1982; Day, 1952; Coles, 1987; Forest, 1986; Miller, 1987).

Day traveled and worked in California and Mexico, returning again to New York. After Tamar had contracted malaria abroad, and upon Day's return she was introduced to the most influential person in her evolving vocation, Peter Maurin. Dorothy Day met Maurin for the first time in her kitchen in 1932. She regarded their meeting as divine providence as his profound influence upon her and the spiritual and philosophical underpinnings of Maurin's "program to change society" would form the tenets and forever guide the work of the Catholic Worker Movement. A French, Catholic, peasant, layperson apostle, wandering prophet, poet, and thinker, Peter Maurin became Dorothy Day's teacher and co-founder of the Catholic Worker Movement. He approached Day with the idea that the Catholic Worker Movement should strive to make the Papal Encyclicals a reality in daily life through works of mercy as defined in Christ's "Sermon on the Mount." Maurin used many catch phrases in his discourse including "the worker as the scholar and the scholar as the worker." Maurin was a scholar and worked as a laborer throughout his life, shunning material possessions and living in voluntary poverty. Upon meeting Dorothy Day he noted her formal education, but also her lack of a Roman Catholic education, which he provided to her. Maurin promoted the philosophy and practice of "personalism" influenced by Peter Kropotkin's conceptualization of a collaborative society of mutual aid.

Kropotkin argued industrialization destroyed “the village” and a return to small communities would better serve humankind (2003, Ellis). Maurin proposed the structure of the movement, which includes a newspaper, houses of hospitality (sheltering the homeless and feeding the hungry), farming communities, and round-table discussions (Ellsberg, 1992; Day, 2004; Holben and Chatfield, 2010; Miller, 1987; Forest, 1986).

These discussions, regular occurrences within Catholic Worker communities, arguably prepared Dorothy for the thousands of extemporaneous speeches she would deliver. The goals of personalism are to feed and clothe the hungry and initiate discussion addressing the needs of the poor and oppressed. The Catholic Worker Movement seeks to impart the notion that we are our “brother’s keeper,” implicating each person’s individual responsibility for their neighbors and espousing works of mercy over government responsibility for social needs. The social justice aims of the Catholic Church, as put forth by the Papal Encyclicals, revitalized and mobilized the Catholic Worker Movement (Anderson, 1982; Day, 1952; Coles, 1987; Forest, 1986; Miller, 1987).

Since its inception, the *Catholic Worker* newspaper has been offered to its audiences for a penny an issue or 25-cents for an annual subscription. This policy persists today. Launched in 1933, 2,500 copies were printed, growing to 185,000 by 1940, and circulation dwindled to 90,000 during the 1990’s. The unpaid editorial and writing staff consistently address Roman Catholic faith and practice, issues of social justice related to labor, immigrant issues, and the needs of the poor and working poor. The newspaper is staunchly anti-capitalist and devoted to community-based needs and services.

Personalist, individual determinism is favored over government or institutional solutions. An absolute commitment to non-violent solutions, to peace studies, and active personal practices are foundational tenets (Anderson, 1982; Day, 1952; Coles, 1987; Forest, 1986; Miller, 1987; www.catholicworker.org).

Today, there are nearly 200 Catholic Worker Hospitality Houses and Communities throughout the world. Each house is unique to its community, serving guests guided by the tenets of Catholicism, gentle anarchism, and pacifism, and providing works of mercy daily. Hospitality houses and farming communes operate without traditional management or organizational structure.

Dorothy Day's personal peace activism was substantial and proved to be a life-long commitment. Day opposed war preparation and war throughout her life, including WWI, WWII, the Korean War, and the war in Viet Nam. She traveled to Cuba, Italy, Africa, and the former U.S.S.R. She vehemently supported pacifism within her *Catholic Worker* writings: she refused to participate in civil defense drills, consistently opposed nuclear weaponry, and was incarcerated for her public protest activities in 1917, 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1973. At the age of 76 she walked alongside Cesar Chavez calling for the unionization of the United Farm Workers (Anderson, 1982; Day, 1952; Coles, 1987; Forest, 1986; Miller, 1987). Dorothy Day published her column, "On Pilgrimage" for 47 years. She authored eight books, including *The Eleventh Virgin* (1929), *From Union Square to Rome* (1938), *House of Hospitality* (1939), *On Pilgrimage* (1948), *Loaves and Fishes* (1963), *The Long Loneliness* (1952), *On Pilgrimage: The Sixties* (1972), and *Therese: A Life of Therese of Lisieux* (1979). In addition to her writings and public protest activities, Day delivered thousands of mostly extemporaneous speeches.

Day once said she was urged by Peter Maurin, “never turn-down an opportunity to speak.” Although she preferred writing to public speaking, she would return to public speaking again and again, out of a “sense of duty to spread the word” (Larson, 2007). Marquette University houses the Dorothy Day Catholic Worker Collection. Her public activities from 1933 to 1980 are recorded in the collection including correspondence inviting her to speak, notes of gratitude following appearances, and news accounts of her speaking engagements. In a review of thousands of documents, there are few notes or manuscripts related to specific speaking engagements. Dorothy Day spoke “on her feet” and “from her heart” delivering unscripted presentations (i.e. extemporaneous speeches) on most occasions.

Dorothy Day, despite her well-publicized proclamation, “Don’t call me a saint” has been deemed a “Servant of God” by the Vatican and the process of canonization for sainthood is well underway as the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops unanimously agreed to support canonization at the urging of Cardinal Timothy M. Dolan (Otterman, 2012, November 26). The prospect of Day’s sainthood invites paradoxical responses. There is discussion of miracles, of her life as an exemplar of modern-day sainthood; yet her past, especially her terminated first-pregnancy, is offered as a substantial reason to block such a high-flown declaration as recently debated within the public sphere. Both her family and some present-day workers within the movement regard canonization as counter-intuitive and perhaps against Day’s personal wishes. Dorothy Day actively lived her ideals, but she also knew she lived a very human life. She was well aware of her foibles and indiscretions and she would be the first one to decry whitewashing or trying to sanitize a complicated life.

Activist Daniel Berrigan, SJ comments, “Can you imagine her portrait, all gussied up, unfurled from above the high altar of St. Peter’s?” (Elie, 1998, November 8).

Understanding the notion of paradox in Day’s life and witness is further complicated by those who argue that her life was only paradoxical to those with a limited understanding of Roman Catholic belief and practice. In particular, the sacraments of The Eucharist and Reconciliation respectively acknowledge unity with Christ and the forgiveness of sins for all of the faithful. Any account of Day’s rhetoric and leadership must be fully cognizant of and account for this religious dimension. Indeed, leaders who advance any foundational principles or guiding tenets must cope with contrary perceptions; the model to be developed within this study is designed to address and account for the inevitable paradoxes of a life of commitment.

At Dorothy Day’s funeral mass, an attending undertaker was asked about the arrangements for her burial. “She was a lovely lady,” he said. “We’re doing this way below cost. The Worker gives us a lot of business, and besides, Miss Day is part of the Community” (McCarthy, 2005, December 9). For the cost of \$380 Dorothy Day was buried, by the same undertakers she sided with during a strike against the New York Catholic Archdiocese over pay and working conditions.

Purpose of the Study and Rationale

In this study, I will analyze Dorothy Day’s extemporaneous public address in an effort to highlight Day’s importance as an orator and a social movement leader. In doing so, I hope to contribute to the interdisciplinary field of rhetorical communication and leadership.

Dorothy Day's extemporaneous speeches have not previously been the focus of academic research. These unscripted, public, dialogical encounters span over 50 years and 29 digitized recordings are available, however 17 recordings (approximately 20 hours) are evaluated within this study¹⁰. Given her early life, conversion, influences, and experiences, Day's rhetoric is distinct and is an expression (now available in the form of recorded, digitized artifacts) of both her communication style as well as of her leadership approach¹¹. I hope to interrogate the components that make Day's rhetoric and leadership distinctive. To accomplish this goal, I will introduce, conceptualize, develop and apply Encounter rhetoric. Encounter rhetoric is significant in that it offers a new interdisciplinary model or framework for assessing rhetorical communication.

As envisioned in this study, Encounter rhetoric is a synthesis of *theory of invitational rhetoric*, (Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008; Bordwell & Delaure, 2008; Foss & Griffin, 1992 & 1995; Sullivan & Turner, 1999) *transformational leadership theory*, (Bass & Avolio 1990; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Einwohner, 2007; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987; Northouse, 2007; Prindeville, 2004) and *social movement leadership theory* (Griffin, 1952; Simons, 1970; Stewart, 1980; Stewart, Smith, & Denton, 2001; Woodward & Denton, 2004).

Dorothy Day's extemporaneous speeches may be more aptly described as *encounters*, for she consistently creates opportunities for dialogue during all such occasions, establishing favorable conditions for authentic exchange.

¹⁰ The methodological approach is presented in Chapter 4.

¹¹ It should be noted the speeches evaluated from 1958 to 1975 were delivered after The Catholic Worker Movement was well established. The manner in which the public regarded Dorothy Day differed from 1933 to 1958, especially in relation to her consistent pacifist stance. This issue is further addressed in Chapter 4 within the discussion of the method of discourse selection for the study.

These extemporaneous encounters, analyzed via the new framework developed through a synthesis of the three aforementioned theoretical constructs offer the opportunity for rhetorical and leadership scholars to learn more about Dorothy Day's discursive strategies and provides a potential exemplar for extending influence within leadership settings particular to social movements. In addition, I advance the claim that the normative standards of encounter rhetoric can also be extended to a variety of contexts where rhetorical communication and leadership is practiced.

Encounter rhetoric, to be fully introduced in Chapter 3, is an expression of "taking love seriously" as previously discussed in the Preface. As the research objective, research goal, and research questions are introduced, and the theoretical underpinnings of my framework are presented in the following chapter, my hope is that encounter rhetoric will not be dismissed as idealistic. Rather, my argument is that the framework is necessarily idealistic or grounded within an ideal. First, if we can conceptualize an ideal the potential exists to realize it. Second, Dorothy Day's extemporaneous discourse coupled with her life's work demonstrate a profound commitment to "taking love seriously." This is especially evident within her unscripted spoken word. To take love seriously or to apply encounter rhetoric is not a romantic notion in any sense. It is a belief in our capacity and faith in our ability, if only momentarily, to encounter one another in an authentic dialogue and really listen to one another - - an act of discovery - - instead of listening for reinforcements of our preconceived notions or for evidence of fault. Encounter rhetoric demands a degree of trust in one another and a vision for a different means or process for considering presumed binary positions.

Research Objective, Research Goal, and Research Questions

The research objective, research goal, and research questions guiding the dissertation project, then, are as follows:

Research Objective:

To critically analyze a sample of Dorothy Day's extemporaneous speeches applying a new framework of rhetorical communication and leadership derived from a synthesis of the theory of invitational rhetoric, transformational leadership theory, and social movement theory.

Research Goal:

Through an analysis of Dorothy Day's extemporaneous speeches, evaluate the applicability of a new framework of rhetorical communication and leadership that can serve as a model for communication practitioners and leaders of marginalized groups.

Research Questions:

- (1.) How can the theory of invitational rhetoric, transformational leadership theory, and social movement theory inform a new framework of rhetorical communication and leadership?

- (2.) How did Dorothy Day's extemporaneous encounters help reveal her activities as a rhetorical communicator and leader within the Catholic Worker Movement?

In this chapter I have provided: a general explanation of my interest in Dorothy Day's extemporaneous encounters;¹² a brief biography of Dorothy Day; a description, rationale, and approach to this study; and finally, the research objective, goal, and questions pertinent to this study. Chapter 2 presents a literature review and a theoretical base grounding the analytical framework for the study. These discussions help clarify my argument for the importance of this study and allow me to take the first steps in answering Research Question (1.).

¹² Dorothy Day's *extemporaneous speeches* (also referred to as "talks," "dialogue," "dialogical exchanges," "extemporaneous discourse," and as "public discourse") are unscripted and include open conversations with audience members. The studied remarks and dialogic exchanges are referred to as "*encounters*" as the digitized speeches held within the Marquette University Dorothy Day Archives are not planned or carefully orchestrated public speaking events. "Encounter Rhetoric," discussed further in Chapter 3, is presented as a "model," a "framework," and as a "rubric" comprised of a set of communication and leadership principles for (1.) analysis of extemporaneous discourse (an analytical framework) and (2.) as a potential guide for future practice (e.g. communicating via extemporaneous discourse and dialogical exchange).

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL BASE

This chapter includes three sections: an introduction, a literature review, and a description of the theoretical foundations for this study. Prior to introducing the literature review and theoretical base, examples of archival artifacts are presented to highlight what prompted my interest in Dorothy Day's extemporaneous speeches. The artifacts provide evidence of Day's influence and impact as a public speaker. As an interdisciplinary doctoral candidate, my studies in communication and leadership are experienced within two departments, however the disciplines are closely aligned resulting in theoretical connections. My process of discovering interdisciplinary commonalities is provided to demonstrate how the framework introduced in Chapter 3 was developed. In particular, the theoretical base is comprised of three theories sharing a communitarian ethic. The following introduction includes discussion of how communitarianism infuses the resulting synthesized framework.

The literature review examines scholarship specifically addressing Dorothy Day's rhetorical appeals or communication as well as her leadership within The Catholic Worker Movement. The theoretical base reviews the literature of the analytical framework to be applied to the analysis, including invitational rhetoric, transformational leadership theory, and social movement leadership theory. The introduction, literature review, and theoretical base discussed in Chapter 2 provide (1.) a foundational explanation of the newly developed framework (presented in Chapter 3) and (2.) a view of the development of the framework.

Thus, the introduction, literature review, and theoretical base developed in this chapter concretely position my argument and provide the foundation for the framework that will be fully presented and discussed in Chapter 3.

Introduction

My interest is in the persuasive tools of communicators as leaders and leaders as communicators. Initially, I searched the Dorothy Day archives for documentation related to her formal public address, but found little. I did find appreciative notes following her public lectures. Other notes were from Day regarding an upcoming speaking engagement. For example:

“My dear Miss Day:

I want to tell you how much we appreciate your kindness in coming to Milwaukee and the impression you left upon all who came in contact with you at Marquette University. Faculty members and students were carried away by the story of the work which [sic] you are doing. Dr. Fitzpatrick has lectured to all of his classes in the graduate school of your life and ideas; one Jesuit told me he would like to see you giving the retreats for the priests; two nuns told me they could not sleep Friday night, thinking about your work and praying for your success.”

- *from a letter dated May 20, 1935, Dean J.L. Sullivan, College of Journalism, Marquette University*

“I wish to send you our sincere appreciation for your stirring, spiritual lecture of Friday night...Be certain you did untold good, enlivened many a priestly heart, and when we are able we will co-operate.”

- *a post card signed, “An Augustinian” catalogued 1933-34.*

“Dear Mr. Cadwell,

I will be very glad to come over Sunday evening, January 20, if you don't mind having a woman speaker. I would appreciate it if you would let me know whether this is a meeting or forum...”

- *signed, Dorothy Day, December 20, 1934*

These sorts of notes can be found again and again. Either in preparing for or following Dorothy Day's speaking engagements, there is abundant evidence of Day's impact as a speaker, the role or influence of her gender, and her tremendous status as a layperson within a profound social movement.

In my initial review of Dorothy Day's extemporaneous speeches and related artifacts, I encountered a unique set of narratives that begged for an explanation. Here was a woman who resisted traditional narratives about war and peace, the role of the military, and even the typical modes of social protest. I found myself asking "What was it about Dorothy Day that moved people through these extemporaneous speeches?" I began listening to the available speeches and wrote a paper evaluating a sample of three for a Rhetorical Feminist Theory and Methods course applying invitational rhetoric theory to a rhetorical analysis. In my writing, I began referring to the speeches as "encounters" as each time Dorothy Day spoke, she did so unscripted and allowed substantial time for dialogue with those in attendance. She willingly engaged challenging discussions (Stockwell, 2009, October 5).

My initial paper was an effort to consider and reveal feminist rhetorical praxis. I analyzed the extemporaneous speeches delivered by Dorothy Day through the lens provided by invitational rhetoric. I confirmed the potential sustainability of this feminist framework by comparing Day's discourse against the criteria of equality, immanent value, self-determination, offering, and external conditions (Bordwell Delaure, 2008; Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008; Dow, 1995; Foss, 2009; Foss & Griffen, 1992 & 1995; Lozano-Reich & Cloud, 2009, 2011).

In the extemporaneous discourse analyzed in this initial study, Dorothy Day cultivates external conditions of safety, value, and freedom by demonstrating a willingness to engage in considerable unscripted dialogue grounded by the ideals of the Catholic Worker Movement and reinforced through storytelling. Since egalitarian positions may be challenged by opposition, Day's extemporaneous encounters offer exemplars of invitational rhetoric and demonstrate the need for diligent nurturance of feminist rhetorical scholarship and practice (Stockwell, 2009, October 5).

Through my study of transformational leadership theory, the commonalities between invitational rhetoric and transformational leadership became apparent. Transformational leadership is aimed toward the mutual transformation of leaders and followers through cultivating motivation; appealing to a sense of morality and justice; embodying a collectivist orientation; promoting high expectations for leaders and followers; and validating and promoting specific personality and behavioral characteristics. These leadership characteristics include: idealized influence or charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, model of promoted values/expectations/behaviors, communicator of a shared vision, process oriented, engages and promotes collaboration, authentic and attentive, seeks to cultivate significant change, and an ability to create and articulate shared meaning (ASHE Higher Education Report, 2006; Bass & Avolio, 1990; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Einwohner 2007; Kouzes & Posner 2002; Kuhnert & Lewis 1987; Muijis, Harris, Lumby, Morrison & Sood, 2006; Northouse, 2007; Prindeville 2004).

Finally, social movement theory provides a framework for examining a social movement and views persuasion as a primary means for achieving social movement leadership goals. This construct complements and extends insights gained from transformational leadership theory and invitational rhetoric. Importantly, social movement theory further explicates the functions of leadership and persuasion in meeting the goals of a movement (Griffin, 1952; Gregg, 1971; Oliver & Marwell, 1992; Simons, 1970; Stewart, 1980; Darsey, 1991; Sowards & Renegar, 2006; Stewart, Smith, and Denton, 2012).

The theoretical constructs grounding the ethic to be developed here also share a communitarian ethic. A communitarian ethic places an emphasis upon a given community instead upon individual goals; it seeks to engage in dialogue and debate by establishing a safe psychological environment and perhaps most importantly, assumes equality among all parties. A communitarian ethic acknowledges “the individual as creator and product of a community” (Whipps, 2004, p. 119) and as McCulloch contends,

...Fellowship implies mutual respect, a recognition of the intrinsic worth of each individual. It connotes relationships which are motivated not by selfish or instrumental considerations but by sensitivity to the needs of others and recognition of the moral duty of social responsibility and altruism (1984, p. 439).

A communitarian ethic places an “emphasis on relational interaction as the medium for personal growth in community - - understanding that who we are and how we think is shaped by the kind of community we live in and the freedoms it provides” (Whipps, 2004, p. 129).

The communitarian ethic has been widely evaluated, applied, and debated across disciplines, however the general communitarian tenets of fellowship, cooperation, interdependence, and process-orientation share common ground with the three theories grounding the framework of rhetorical communication and leadership envisioned in this study (Etzioni, 1996; Cochran, 1989; McCulloch, 1984; Moszkowicz, 2007; Whipps, 2004).

For example, a communitarian ethic is implicated in transformational leadership as leaders and followers are mutually transformed. Communitarian roots are readily identified within invitational rhetoric as those in conversation or debate are mutually invited to engage each other under equal conditions. Within social movement theory, a framework is provided that helps one understand that a leader's pragmatic work within the context of a social movement is often aimed toward cultivating change among interdependent communities.

Having outlined some general commonalities and affinities among the various strands of my early investigations, I now turn to a more specific discussion of pertinent literature and conceptual grounding.

Literature Review & Theoretical Base

“Dorothy was a great believer in what de Caussade called ‘the sacrament of the present moment.’ In each situation, in each encounter, in each task before us, she believed, there is a path to God. We do not need to be in a monastery or a chapel. We do not need to become different people first. We can start today, this moment, where we are, to add to the balance of love in the world, to add to the balance of peace” (Ellsberg, 2005, November 21).

A young man once proclaimed, “Dorothy, you just don’t understand. Individuals in this day and age are not what’s important. It’s nations and governments that are important.” Dorothy Day responded, “All individuals are important...They’re all that’s important” (Ellsberg, 2005, November 21). Dorothy Day’s *Catholic Worker* columns, books, formal addresses, and interviews have been analyzed from a variety of disciplinary perspectives, including rhetoric and leadership; however, an analysis of her extemporaneous speeches has not been a discernable focus of scholarship. The literature review that follows addresses extant scholarship examining Day’s rhetorical appeals and leadership. Theories of invitational rhetoric, transformational leadership, and social movement leadership are then reviewed as a means of synthesizing the theoretical base for the analytic framework. This study is distinctive in that it proposes to conduct an interdisciplinary analysis. It is novel in its application of invitational rhetoric, transformational leadership theory, and social movement theory to construct a framework for scholars and practitioners alike. The framework will be introduced in Chapter 3 and its methodological application is described in Chapter 4. It will be applied in Chapter 5 as an analytic tool to understand and appreciate Day’s extraordinary extemporaneous encounters as acts of rhetorical and social movement leadership.

Related Scholarship: Dorothy Day's Rhetorical Appeals and Leadership

The following literature review presents scholarship specifically related to Dorothy Day's rhetorical appeals or communication as well as literature interrogating her leadership within The Catholic Worker Movement. A theoretical base presenting the scholarship of the three theories grounding the analytical framework follows the literature review of rhetorical appeals and leadership.

Rhetorical Appeals

While there are more than one dozen published biographies of Dorothy Day's life and work, not to mention a vast body of scholarship documenting the Catholic Worker Movement from a variety of perspectives and disciplines (Anderson, 1979 & 1982; Campbell, 1984; Fitzwilliams, 2009; Forest, 1986; Haladay, 2006; Hamington, 2007; Jablonski, 2000; Johnson, 2009; Kileup, 2004; Mehlretter, 2007 & 2009; Miller 1987; O'Connor, 1988 & 1991; Roberts, 1984; Rush, 2008; Thorn, Runkel & Mountin, 2001), there are very few rhetorical studies. Nevertheless, Ruth D. Anderson explores Day's formal public address in an analysis of her speech to the 41st Eucharist Conference in Philadelphia, August 6, 1976 (1979; 1982). Anderson explicates the thematic constructs found not only within the formal public address at hand, but those reflected throughout Day's writings and life's work. These themes include Day's commitment to living the Gospels of Christ, to drawing a balance between religious and political aims, the interconnected nature of all things, the responsibility of the individual, and her consistent call for a "radical transformation of the social order" (1982, p. 30).

Anderson notes Day's ability to appeal to disparate audiences, in part, due to her principled nature: her radical pacifist stance, commitment to voluntary poverty, combined with active critique of political, social, and religious institutions as a devout Roman Catholic woman.

Carol J. Jablonski (2000) analyzes the complexities of the rhetoric of public memory related to Day represented by proponents and opponents of her canonization. Jablonski examines the paradoxical Day as well, referring to the "dialectical interplay of orthodoxy and rebellion" furthering a feminist, rhetorical framework focusing on dissenting narratives within the public memory of Dorothy Day. Jablonski refers to Day's presence within public memory as dramatic irony, ultimately cultivating relationships among disparate parties and stances, encouraging "personal activism despite seemingly overwhelming odds against making widespread social change" (2000 p. 43).

Sara Ann Mehlretter (2007) examines the rhetoric of the Catholic Worker Movement and Dorothy Day's spiritual pacifism during World War II and the Vietnam War. To retain a passionately held anti-war stance was to invite criticism for lack of patriotism. Rhetorically, Day sustained the Catholic Worker movement by navigating a sometimes unpopular, radical political involvement. She accomplished this by steadfastly maintaining the movement's pacifist stance through religious identification, invoking an inwardly focused spiritual pacifism, calling for unification of pacifist communities, constantly demanding human dignity for all, and emphasizing prayer as an anchor for all activities.

Dorothy Day's rhetorical ability to apply paradox as a means to engender inclusiveness and community through religious discourse is established through a content analysis of Catholic Worker columns from 1933 to 1980, by Kristine Elizabeth Johnson (2009). Johnson explicates Day as a rhetor of authoritative, virtuous ethos drawing upon Jurgen Habermas' theory of communicative rationality and Sharon Crowley's concept of contingent rhetorical invention. These theorists aid Johnson in explicating how rhetors negotiate and counter absolutist stances in a variety of historical contexts.

Fitzwilliams (2009) suggests that when Day undertakes the complex rhetorical task of addressing and cultivating communities, she might be best apprehended as a woman practicing a "No-Alibi' Rhetoric of Defiance and Devotion." Drawing upon the work of Martin Buber and M.M. Bakhtin, Fitzwilliams argues, "Day is a realistic idealist and a textured-by-humanity communication role model whose authenticity and courage challenges the current climate of cynicism, non-responders, and failed heroes" (2009, p. v). This analysis reinforces the role of paradox in Day's rhetoric and philosophy.

The scholarship addressing Dorothy Day's rhetorical discourse provides evidence of developing interest within the discipline of rhetorical studies as well as the applicability and promise of further analysis within this study. The rhetorical scholarship cited here provides insight into Day's rhetorical efforts, but does not fully account for Day's ethical influence and charismatic appeal.

Leadership

The scholarship within the leadership discipline evaluates Day's influence upon social change and her ability to mobilize resources. However, an evaluation of Dorothy Day's leadership style is a somewhat difficult task for two reasons: (1.) her own humility and (2.) her relationship with her co-leader in the Catholic Worker Movement, Peter Maurin. As Day notes, "There was a long time when I had trouble leading my own life, never mind having a thought or two about how others should lead theirs!" (Cole, 1998, June 6-13, p. 6). Dorothy Day was repeatedly asked about her leadership and she worried that any account would be misread, suffer from revisionism, or contain attributions of misplaced credit, "They want to know how I did this, and when I did that, what I think about one or another subject, and I tell them we've got to settle this business of pronouns before we go any further. I tell them about Peter, and what he did for us - - to us" (p. 6).

While the Catholic Worker Movement cannot be considered without the influence and work of Peter Maurin and his influence on Day, this study specifically examines Dorothy Day's leadership through extemporaneous encounters. Her direct interactions with others were what she valued most and helped define and advance the work of the Catholic Worker Movement. When prodded to explain her leadership style, motives, and authority, she maintained simply, "our actions depend on the people we're here to learn from: We take our cues from them" (Cole, 1998, p. 10). Modestly, Dorothy Day insisted that learning how to lead a movement is best apprehended by getting to know the guests of the Hospitality Houses. This would yield the greatest understanding. In her extemporaneous speeches, Day often spoke of the guests. Indeed, the guests were her primary concern.

Day's protestations aside, her words and deeds can provide rich material for studying leadership. The seeds for a pragmatic rhetorical framework of leadership are evident. For example, Day described herself as a person who could make decisions and accomplish tasks. Her organizational roles enabled her to express her ideals and often called upon her to negotiate difficult conversations. Day had to navigate the uncertainties and complexities of daily living in-community. At the same time, she had to provide guidance and challenge to all of those followers whom she believed were in the midst of a radical spiritual and social movement aimed toward radical transformation (Coles, 1998, June 6-13). Day also had to respond to her detractors and to those who were threatened by the movement's public stances. How she responded to these multiple demands is an important part of the development of this dissertation.

Ben Pauli (2009) weighs Day's religious beliefs along with her social and political beliefs. Pauli extols Day's social engagement, and the authority she derived from her daily-lived ideals. He critiques Day's inability to advance the needs of the women's movement, as the social issues related to legal abortion and birth control were not synchronous with the obvious Roman Catholic religious commitment of the Catholic Worker Movement.

Maurice Hamington (2007) seeks to reveal the leadership approaches of Jane Addams and Dorothy Day, two women who fought the oppression of social systems within historical social movements. Their commonalities are bound by their roles as radical pacifist leaders.

Addams and Day espoused two differing ethical and political commitments. According to Hamington (2007), Day's approach was grounded in charity; Addams's approach was educational, and thus deemed as more in-line with feminist leadership goals than Day's. A potential response to Hamington's critique may lie, in part, in another framework applied to evaluating Dorothy Day's leadership. Elizabeth Jordan Kileup (2004) examines Day's leadership of the Catholic Worker Movement from a Benedictine perspective; she argues that it is firmly grounded in the practice of treating every "guest" as Christ himself, extending a form of unconditional hospitality to individuals, thereby modeling desired behavior for others; in short, leading by example. From this perspective, transformation occurs for individuals and communities alike through a lived ideal, from both extending and receiving unconditional acceptance and care, which is reflective of both feminist ideals and the tenets of transformational leadership theory.

Diana J. Haladay (2006) explicates a framework for leadership through an evaluation of Day's life's work addressing a leader's intention grounded in Christian tenets; the consistent, identifiable behavior of a leader living a set of ideals; attention to the culture of an organization also reflecting the specified ideals; and lastly the reach of the organization and its ability to influence the larger society. Haladay evaluates Dorothy Day's leadership in a careful examination of her vision and leadership activities.

Adopting a feminist evaluation of Dorothy Day's moral vision, June E. O'Connor posits, "...ethics is about seeing as well as about doing" and proclaims:

How one sees life, envisions reality, names the good, the relationship between freedom and determinism, relationships among human beings and between human beings and the rest of nature, the place of and possibilities for truth, justice, care, and the like, will affect how one approaches, as well as resolves, ethical decisions (1991 p. 91).

O'Connor's (1991) study evaluates Day's leadership approach from a variety of perspectives. Day's leadership is described as grounded in charity and hospitality and socially engaged. Day derived authority and influence from her daily-lived ideals, and she demonstrated a consistent ethical commitment in her work and interactions with others.

The evaluation of the literature specifically addressing Dorothy Day's rhetorical appeals and leadership demonstrates scholarly interest in both areas. An interdisciplinary study has not previously been conducted, however. In this dissertation project, I contend that we can further both scholarly and practical understanding of the dialogical, rhetorical means of communication and leadership. By formulating a new framework synthesizing rhetorical communication and leadership theories, specifically within social movements, the needs of marginalized groups may be better served. After developing the framework and establishing the normative criteria for its use, it is applied to Day's extemporaneous discourse in an effort to identify Day's rhetorical communication and leadership. Finally, I will investigate how such a continuously evolving framework has the potential for transformational outcomes in other contexts.

In what follows, the theoretical base for the framework of rhetorical communication and leadership is presented, including a more in-depth discussion of invitational rhetoric, transformational leadership, and social movement leadership theory.

Theoretical Base for the Encounter Rhetoric Framework

The theoretical base of the encounter rhetoric framework is presented to (1.) establish the development of the analytical framework and (2.) position its place within rhetorical communication and leadership scholarship. I developed the encounter rhetoric framework to specifically address extemporaneous discourse and dialogue within a social movement, accounting for rhetorical communication and leadership within particular settings serving marginalized groups. Although each of the theories could independently serve as analytical frameworks for aspects of Dorothy Day's discourse, none of them deal specifically with the unscripted spoken word of leaders, the potential for dialogical exchange within public discourse, or propose strategies for dealing with binary positions. The resulting hybrid framework, grounded within the following theoretical constructs, provides both an analytical framework and a potential rubric to guide communicators as leaders and leaders as communicators within this specific scope of rhetorical practice. A grass roots communication strategy certainly encompasses a variety of modes of communication including published texts, formal public address, and interpersonal communication. Encounter rhetoric, however, serves to highlight the role of extemporaneous delivery and dialogical exchange employed within the context of an overall communication strategy. The following theoretical base reflects this specific scope and the focus of the study.

Invitational Rhetoric

Invitational rhetoric provides the first of three theoretical constructs that ground the framework to be employed in this study. A prevalent critique of traditional rhetorical theories lies in charges of patriarchal bias, pointing to communicative acts employed as a means of domination over others. Often rhetoric is readily defined as persuasion, influence, and inducement with an aim to gain power over another, control a perspective or situation, or struggle over authority. Within the realm of this critique, traditional rhetorical theories posit “winners and losers.” The rhetor with the most knowledge, authority, and qualifications is valued (the winner) at the expense of the less knowledgeable, less powerful speaker or less qualified audience (the loser).

Traditional rhetorical constructs tend to present and codify paternalism, framing the audience as inadequate receivers and/or as competitors within a limited scope of consideration. This is not to say “all persuasion” is violent or somehow coercive, nor lacking usefulness. Traditional approaches do tend to rely heavily upon a competitive model potentially limiting discussions to binary modes (Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008; Bordwell Delaure, 2008; Foss & Griffin, 1992 & 1995; Sullivan & Turner, 1999).

In response, feminist scholars have developed and offered critical analyses and advanced invitational rhetoric as an alternative theoretical and methodological approach for both practice and evaluation. Critical scholarship often seeks to reveal power in order to dismantle it, purposefully committed to redistributing power to include marginalized groups and stances.

As a feminist rhetoric, the goals of invitational rhetoric are grounded by three normative ideals: equality, immanent value, and self-determination (Bordwell Delaure, 2008; Foss & Griffin, 1995).

To realize an invitational rhetorical stance *equality* is a primary condition. The audience and rhetor engage a commitment to mutuality, replacing a competitive approach with a relational approach. Equality focuses upon relationship-building seeking to displace elitism, alienation, and control. The responsibilities of rhetor and audience are altered within an equal context, neither can assume absolute active or passive positions, but rather an exchange of positions is presumed and valued (Bordwell Delaure, 2008, Foss & Griffin, 1995). The second construct, *immanent value*, honors the unconditional and inherent worth of all people. “The essence of this principle is that every being is a unique and necessary part of the pattern of the universe and has value” (Foss and Griffin, 1995, p. 4). One’s worth is not assumed to reside within a continuum or hierarchical structure. Immanent value is not earned nor haggled over; it is an innate human condition.

Finally, *self-determination* is a freely placed trust in individuals to make the best decisions for themselves. Foss and Griffin describe self-determination as “the recognition that audience members are the authorities on their own lives and accords respect to others’ capacity and right to constitute their worlds as they chose” and assumes full acceptance of and trust that “others are doing the best they can at that moment” (1995, p. 4). Invitational rhetoric reflects feminist practices, but it certainly is influenced and informed by traditional rhetorical theorists and theories. As an “invitation” the construct transcends women and women’s interests.

Invitational rhetoric aspires to cultivate perspective and turn taking, allowing a space for audience and rhetor alike to share understandings and world-views. Most importantly, creating an invitational rhetorical environment means appreciating the value of process in communication transactions, not seeking a specific product or outcome. An invitation within a rhetorical encounter suggests an ontological exchange with hopes of nurturing discovery while acknowledging that full transformation may or may not occur (Foss & Griffin, 1995). Traditional rhetorical theory instructs persuaders to anticipate and adapt to resistance; what differentiates an invitational approach is focused attention on process and “listening to” rather than “listening for.” In other words, the invitational approach seeks to understand rather than to isolate a flawed proposition or argument.

So often in our most difficult encounters, we rhetorically engage a form of combative symbol making and/or exchanging. Invitational rhetoric suggests a particular sort of willingness to both potentially yield to another’s perspective and to be open to revise or extend one’s own position. Tentativeness is a requisite condition, furthering inquiry and understanding by posing questions instead of veiled queries as a means of posturing or paternalistic correction (Bordwell Delaure, 2008; Foss & Griffin, 1995).

Another useful heuristic within invitational rhetoric is *resourcement*. Resourcement is a means of negotiating with a hostile audience or situation in an effort to diffuse angry or potentially violent exchanges. Enacted resourcement reframes binary positions and responses by juxtaposing competing frameworks or systems (Bordwell Delaure, 2008; Foss & Griffin, 1995).

As a combination of disengagement and creative response, “It is a means, then, of communicating a perspective that is different from that of the individual who produced the message to which the rhetor is responding” (Foss & Griffin, 1995, p. 9).

Finally, within invitational rhetoric, external conditions related to audience are considered. Invitational rhetoric proposes that for an exchange of understandings to take place, an audience needs safety (from real or perceived danger and/or retribution), to feel valued (for their perspectives and standpoints), and freedom (from restrictions, binary positions, and conditions). Egalitarian external conditions are preferred, “...unconditional positive regard suggests the nature of the autonomy the rhetor accords the audience; the audience has the freedom to make choices without the possibility of losing the respect of the rhetor” (Foss & Griffin, 1995, p. 13).

Invitational rhetoric promotes an exchange of understandings, provides a useful rhetorical heuristic, and aims at reconciling means and ends. Within the framework, audience contributions are carefully conceived and valued, with a patient regard for equitable communication transactions.

Invitational rhetoric is not presented as “the ideal” for all situations and does not aim for a specific transformative end (Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008; Bordwell Delaure, 2008; Foss & Griffin, 1995). Invitational rhetoric as a feminist theoretical discursive model is not without its detractors, but by design welcomes questioning, opposition, and extension. The critiques of invitational rhetoric are familiar within the context of feminist and critical theoretical scholarship. First, invitational rhetoric seems to negatively generalize, as not all traditional persuasion seeks domination.

Foss and Griffin clearly note invitational rhetoric is not always an appropriate choice, but they do tend to present it as an ideal, thereby potentially privileging it as “the” option (Bone, Griffin, Scholz, 2008; Bordwell Delaure, 2008; Dow, 1995; Lozano-Reich & Cloud, 2009). Critics of the framework suggest that some communication (discriminatory, racist, violent, or posing imminent harm) actually demands something other than a mere “invitation.” In addition, invitational rhetoric is critiqued as gender specific, potentially essentialist and may even, however unintentionally, reify gender stereotypes. Critics contend that invitational rhetoric may merely mask a new form of veiled persuasion and that it, too, may foster a lack of agency. It also begs the question, what rhetor does not seek change or some kind of influence? Some are skeptical of the sustainability of invitational rhetoric because they question whether true equality can exist among human beings. Without such critiques in mind, grief and violence could potentially increase for the marginalized groups it seeks, in part, to fully engage (Bone, Griffin, Scholz, 2008; Bordwell Delaure, 2008; Dow, 1995; Lozano-Reich & Cloud, 2009).

While these critiques offer an opportunity to be mindful of the ability of any rhetorical tool to be used to the detriment of democratic communication, invitational rhetoric remains a useful heuristic as it challenges traditional approaches. The traditional approaches are often applied more expediently, more successfully, and are unapologetically aimed toward change, but often seem to favor the powerful over the powerless.

Invitational rhetoric is messy, may or may not deal well with complex nuances inherent in difficult communication, but its application and intent are grounded in hope.

Invitational rhetoric seeks to dismantle binaries and willingly withstands the discomfort of “both/and.” It is intended to open lines of communication.

Therefore, invitational rhetoric offers a theoretical approach to rhetorical communication and analysis that is crucial to the development of the new interdisciplinary framework presented in Chapter 3. Specifically, equality, immanent value, and self-determination are utilized as key characteristics in building the framework.

Transformational Leadership Theory

Transformational leadership theory (Northouse, 2007), the second construct to inform the proposed model, addresses leadership activities guided by a communitarian ethic¹³. Transformational leadership theory shares normative values with invitational rhetoric and it is a source of a communitarian ethic that can offer a useful approach to leadership as a framework for both analysis and future practice.

¹³ It should be noted distributed leadership (Harris & Spillane, 2008) and servant leadership theory (Greenleaf, 2008) are noteworthy leadership theories informing practice and scholarship that could illuminate an analysis of Dorothy Day’s leadership activities. As The Catholic Worker Movement functions without a formal management structure, the focus of power distribution (Harris & Spillane, 2008) within distributed leadership is of interest. Likewise, the proposition of a leader serving the needs of constituents and organizations (Greenleaf, 2008) is well aligned with Dorothy Day’s leadership approach and has previously been applied to an analysis of her leadership of the movement (e.g. Haladay, 2006; Kileup, 2004). Transformational leadership theory (Bass & Avolio 1990; Bennis & Nanus 1985; Einwohner 2007; Kouzes & Posner 2002) was selected specifically for its call for the mutual transformation of leaders and followers focusing upon cultivating motivation, appealing to a sense of morality and justice, and embodying a collectivist orientation, along with the characteristics discussed within the theoretical base of the study. Transformational leadership offers the most accessible framework to align with the other theories contributing to the hybrid framework.

“Transformational leadership involves an exceptional form of influence that moves followers to accomplish more than what is usually expected of them. It is a process that often incorporates charismatic and visionary leadership” (Northouse, 2007, p. 175-176). Characteristics of leaders are described within traditional literature in the form of rather intuitive categories. The theoretical categories and constructs within Leadership scholarship are based upon identifiable approaches and attributes including specific traits, skills, and styles; for example, including situational and contingency approaches to meet specific contextual demands within leadership situations. Leaders are appointed and emerge with a variety of stated or demonstrated values, with relative skill sets, and varying degrees of charisma and aptitudes for applying varied strategies dependent upon needs both immediate and long-term, pro-active and reactive (Northouse, 2007; Prindeville, 2004). Transformational leadership can be contrasted with transactional leadership. Transactional leadership theory expresses the more common exchange between leaders and followers, using a sort of barter system, “for X you receive Y.” Transformational leadership focuses upon the *mutual transformation* of leaders and followers. The mutual transformation of leaders and followers broadly focuses upon: cultivating motivation; appealing to a sense of morality and justice; embodying a collectivist orientation; promoting high expectations for leaders and followers; and validating and promoting specific personality and behavioral characteristics.

A list of personality and behavioral characteristics has been developed as a means to detect and cultivate transformational leadership ¹⁴ (Bass & Avolio 1990; Bennis & Nanus 1985; Einwohner 2007; Kouzes & Posner 2002; Kuhnert & Lewis 1987; Northouse 2007; Prindeville 2004).. “Transformational leadership, according to its proponents, is likely to lead to longer-term change and more genuine organizational reform by raising followers’ levels of consciousness about the importance of the goals they are pursuing as an organization, getting followers to transcend their own self-interest, and moving them to address higher level needs” (Muijis, Harris, Lumby, Morrison & Sood, 2006).

Transformational leadership is a leadership style well suited for complexity. Particular strengths of the theory include a breadth and depth of research supporting its applicability, its intuitive nature, and its adaptability in augmenting other models. Within this construct encouragement of interdependence among leaders and followers and ethical considerations are prevalent.

¹⁴ Personality and behavioral characteristics of transformational leaders include: idealized influence or charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, model of promoted values/expectations/behaviors, communicator of a shared vision, process oriented, engages and promotes collaboration, authentic and attentive, seeks to cultivate significant change, and ability to create and articulate shared meaning. The manner in which these characteristics inform the encounter rhetoric framework is explained in Chapter 4.

In addition, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)¹⁵ developed by Bass and further advanced by Kouzes and Posner, has proven to be an effective measure of the theory and has been applied in a variety of relevant research studies (ASHE Higher Education Report, 2006; Bass & Avolio, 1990 & 2003; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Muijis, Harris, Lumby, Morrison & Sood, 2006; Northouse, 2007).

Transformational leadership, as with any construct, is not without its critics. This approach to leadership has been cited as too broad with perhaps too much emphasis upon personality versus behavior. Some view transformational leadership as potentially elitist and antidemocratic, its applications as likely to abuse as to empower. Finally, it has been suggested that the body of research applying the theory does not adequately address reciprocity between leaders and followers. In addition, due to a high correlation among factors measured or considered, the MLQ as a tool ought to continually be examined for its validity. The theoretical construct is rather slippery, at times characterized by ideals, inspiration, intellectualism, individualism and simultaneously collectivism. The intent sometimes seems to move individuals collectively toward a goal that may seem beyond reach (Bass & Avolio, 1990; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Muijis, Harris, Lumby, Morrison & Sood, 2006; Northouse, 2007).

¹⁵ The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ Short Form 5X) is the standard measurement tool for assessing the traits and behaviors associated with transformational leadership. According to Goodstein and Lanyon (1999) in a literature review of personality assessments in the workplace, the literature empirically supporting the validity of the MLQ is extensive. More than 7,000 books, articles, and presentations support its validity as a measurement tool. In addition, the references supplied with the MLQ Manual via Mind Garden (Avolio & Bass, 2004) provide more than 100 references in support of the assessment. The MLQ assesses transformational leadership behaviors (noted within the previous footnote) and transactional leadership behaviors including contingent reward, management-by-exception (active and passive), and laissez-faire. For more information on the MLQ tool go to: <http://www.mindgarden.com/products/mlqr.htm>.

Transformational leadership theory will make a unique contribution to the framework proposed here. Transformational leadership theory's focus upon process, collaboration, individualization, modeling of values, and commitment to sharing meaning shares normative theoretical values with invitational rhetoric.

Next, a brief review of social movement theory is offered as a third conceptual vantage point. In particular, a focus on social movement leadership can complement and extend my discussion of transformational leadership.

Social Movement Theory

Social Movement Theory provides a framework for examining a social movement and views persuasion as a primary means for achieving social movement leadership goals. This theoretical construct adds yet another dimension to the rhetorical communication and leadership framework. First, clarification of what constitutes a social movement is necessary.

According to Herbert W. Simons, a social movement can be defined as:

An uninstitutionalized collectivity that mobilizes for action to implement a program for the reconstitution of social norms or values. Movements should be distinguished, as such, from panics, crazes, booms, fads, and hostile outbursts, as well as from the actions of recognized labor unions, government agencies, business organizations, and other institutionalized decision-making bodies (1970).

Researchers study social movement theory and social movements to specifically understand the inherent complexities demanded of leadership. Within social movement theory scholarship, leadership is understood as more than a function of management or administration.

Social movement leaders are decision makers who “inspire commitment, mobilize resources, create and recognize opportunities, devise strategies, frame demands, and influence outcomes” (Morris & Staggenborg, 2004, p. 171). Rhetorical social movement leadership is most often interrogated applying a historical lens; focus is usually centered on a specific period of time, with an eye toward identifying rhetorical strategies and tactics employed by both social movement and status quo leaders whose values often remain in conflict. Contestation often occurs over moral authority (Griffin, 1952; Gregg, 1971; Oliver & Marwell, 1992; Simons, 1970; Stewart, 1980; Darsey, 1991; Sowards & Renegar, 2006; Stewart, Smith, and Denton, 2012).

Since 1933, Dorothy Day and Peter Maurin’s Catholic Worker Movement has been concerned with the needs of the poor and the oppressed as well as the needs of one’s immediate community. The houses of hospitality, the promotion of discussion, the newspaper, and farming communities are all outgrowths of the movement’s anti-establishment stance. The Catholic Worker Movement’s work on behalf of peace and justice has often joined with other movements, evidenced by Day’s public protest activities against WWII, the Korean War, and the Viet Nam War, and her support for the unionization of United Farm Workers with Cesar Chavez (Anderson, 1982; Day, 1952; Coles, 1987; Forest, 1986; Miller 1987).

Importantly, social movement theory further explicates the functions of leadership and persuasion within the goals of a movement (Stewart, 1980; Stewart, Smith, & Denton, 2012; Woodward & Denton, 2004). According to Woodward and Denton, a social movement’s goal is to induce or block change and often seeks to propose, oppose or transform societal norms and values (2004).

A movement's goals may be aimed at innovation, revival, or resistance. A leader of a social movement is continually engaged with efforts to transform reality and alter perceptions, while simultaneously trying to legitimize, mobilize, or sustain a course of action (Woodward & Denton, 2004). A leader within a movement is regarded as the most important symbol of a cause. Key leadership characteristics include presence (charisma), prophecy (the ability to articulate principles), and pragmatism (the ability to achieve goals). Within social movement theory, leaders must be able to manage conflicting demands, roles, and timelines. They must also manage multiple interactions with a host of entities, including interaction with opponents, the media, the establishment, and followers, among others (Stewart, 1980; Stewart, Smith, & Denton, 2001; Woodward & Denton, 2004). Social movement theory also assists with predicting the potential reactions and actions of responding status quo interests, including such tactics as evasion, counter-persuasion, coercion, strategies of adjustment and capitulation.

It has been suggested that Dorothy Day was ahead of her time in her worldview and in her capacity for empathic communication and leadership. Sowards and Renegar (2006) in "Reconceptualizing Rhetorical Activism in Contemporary Feminist Contexts" extend the traditional norms of social movement leadership in an analysis of Day's approach. Specifically, Day's leadership can be regarded as, "...organic and a product of lived experience and expertise. Cultural conditions and exigencies have created circumstances where women choose to be role models and mentors for both men and women..." (2006, p. 62). In addition, Day's leadership demonstrates that leaders can function "from where they are" and "there is not [a] distinction ... between feminist leadership and real life..." (2006, p. 62).

The Catholic Worker Movement gained momentum organically, meeting the immediate needs of the communities served and those needs were determined based upon the experience and expertise of members of the community. As Robert Ellsberg notes, Peter Maurin and Dorothy Day always maintained hope for effective social action: “We can start today, this moment, where we are, to add to the balance of love in the world, to add to the balance of peace” (2005, November 21).

Neither Peter Maurin nor Dorothy Day referred to the Catholic Worker Movement as a social movement; rather it was referred to as a “program.” Nevertheless, a social movement perspective remains relevant here. The tenets of the daily works of mercy, the feeding and clothing of the poor and the commitment to direct action, personalism, pacifism, voluntary poverty, and gentle anarchism grounded within the teachings of Jesus Christ consistently direct the spoken and written words of the program or movement. After all, members are Catholic “workers” and “works of mercy” are at its core. There is a tendency to feel an allegiance to the intentional ambiguous description of the movement, reflective of the anti-establishment underpinnings. Another source of resistance to the label “movement” is the faith enacted and grace embodied, doctrinal assumptions of Roman Catholicism. The instances of grace, the many stories told of and from the trenches of The Catholic Worker, along with reverence for Dorothy Day and the descriptions of her as a mystic, not to mention her status of beatification, certainly could one’s willingness to attempt to empirically classify the work. Arguably, the generation and the sustainability of the movement defy traditional understanding of organizations, hierarchies, and strategic outcomes.

Nevertheless, the story of the movement is both inspirational and compelling for these same reasons and provides evidence of what many movements assert: A community or society *can* function differently from the norms and standards of the established society. As Peter Maurin wrote, “The Catholic Worker believes in creating a *new society*” (Roberts, p. 6) [*My emphasis*].

It also can be argued that the Catholic Worker Movement certainly unabashedly engages social concerns. The movement takes pains to influence others, especially those in power. The ongoing needs of the poor, racism, classism, labor issues, and pacifism are issues addressed tirelessly and repeated over time. The *Catholic Worker* newspaper, the roundtable discussions, the speaking engagements, and protest activities can be labeled as rhetorical acts on behalf of social change. Persuasion is applied as a primary means to sustain the movement and to transform values. The aims of the movement are clearly presented and the leadership, as informal as it may seem, aptly functions to articulate principles and to achieve goals, managing conflicting demands of diverse audiences or entities. Within the framework of social movement theory, the Catholic Worker Movement can be classified as a “social” movement. Even if movement leaders and followers refuse to adopt the label “social movement” scholars can employ social movement theory productively. What is of primary interest is the form of persuasion utilized by Day and the manner in which the Catholic Worker community functions. Such an exploration may reveal how other movements or entities can learn from the Catholic Worker as it models dialogic communication in its efforts to provide relief for marginalized groups.

By developing a framework of rhetorical communication and leadership and employing it to analyze Dorothy Day's extemporaneous speeches, we open up the possibility of revealing Day's "encounters" as more than mere persuasive acts. Informed by the tripartite conceptual foundation of invitational rhetoric, transformational leadership theory, and social movement theory, we are more fully equipped to analyze and evaluate Dorothy Day's extemporaneous encounters. In addition, the new model accommodates both the immediate needs of individuals and the collaborative action demanded to cultivate and maintain a social movement. Without this emphasis "a focus on great leaders risks neglect of structural opportunities and obstacles to collective actions, while an emphasis on structures of opportunity risks slighting human agency" (Morris & Staggenborg, 2004, p. 171).

Chapter 3 will offer a description of the new framework of rhetorical communication and leadership. It will serve as the key heuristic in helping us to understand Dorothy Day's rhetorical strategies and tactics. The model serves as a general template for identifying and evaluating what it means for discourse to be labeled "Encounter Rhetoric" and may dually serve as a rubric for communication and leadership in other contexts.

CHAPTER 3
AN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR RHETORICAL COMMUNICATION
AND LEADERSHIP: “ENCOUNTER RHETORIC”

“I cannot bear the [religious] romantics. I want a religious realist. I want one who prays to see things as they are and to do something about it.” – Dorothy Day
 Jordan, P. (2013, January 23, p. 14).

In this chapter, I argue that encounter rhetoric, a framework for rhetorical communication and leadership, best serves as an analytical framework for this study and in addition, such a model can have utility for communication practitioners and leaders interested in adopting and implementing principles for rhetorical exchanges in contemporary society. In particular, I wish to advance the development of this chapter by supporting the following claims: (1.) Our divisive political climate is in need of a new model that can help us monitor, mediate, and perhaps even reduce polarization and division in public argument; (2.) Despite her anxiety over public speaking, Dorothy Day was able to summon a charismatic presence that moved her audiences; (3.) The principles of dialogue represented in the framework can be ascertained and practiced in both *interpersonal* and in this instance, perhaps more germane to social movements in particular, *public* settings; (4.) Further explanation of the constructs of the framework and its development will help strengthen the argument for the model’s utility; and finally (5.) An overview and summary of key definitions should assist in further comprehending the model and positioning it for the application to Day’s discourse¹⁶.

¹⁶ See pp. 76-78 for key definitions. The reader will note that the new framework is fully described on pp. 72-73. The methodology used to implement this study is outlined in Chapter 4. The analysis employing the model can be found in Chapter 5.

INTRODUCTION

Polarization and Division

A framework for rhetorical communication and leadership may be useful, especially during divisive times and circumstances. During the United States presidential election of 2012 it was noted that political party polarization and division within the United States Congress and the public was at an all time high and on a steep incline since the Carter administration (Haidt, J. & Hetherington, M.J., 2012, September 14; The American National Election Study and Polarized America.com). One example of continuous polarization can be found in the public discourse following the Newtown, Connecticut mass shooting where division in the public debate on proposed gun control legislation is evident. One need only examine a portion of the debates on healthcare, marriage equality, and other “hot button” issues to take the pulse of national discourse. Within the private realm and social media landscape it is difficult to measure polarization. As Nate Silver of *The New York Times* observes, “There is, of course, no way to monitor the conversations that take place in living rooms around the country” (2012, December 14). Steven Strauss (2012, October 14), an Advanced Leadership Fellow at Harvard University argues there are six reasons polarization will continue to vex the U.S. public sphere.

These include: confirmation bias and weak feedback loops (we are not challenged on our beliefs), changing economics of the media industry (complex, niche marketing to narrow belief segments of the population), filter bubbles (Google and Facebook algorithms provide information based upon our monitored interests), ideologically safe Congressional seats (80% of Congressional districts are firmly Democratic or Republican limiting the need or motivation for bipartisan agreement), advocacy industry expansion (special interest groups have tremendous resources and influence), and a lack of a shared context (American solidarity was shaped by the common enemy we met on the battlefield e.g., WWI and WWII and by the chilly and adversarial relationship between the U.S. and the Soviet Union during the Cold War). Strauss argues less than 1% of Americans have served in Afghanistan or Iraq, limiting the shared experience of the effects of war (2012, October 14).

If we acknowledge that polarization and “either/or” orientations continue to proliferate in the public sphere making interventions in political, economic, social, and cultural ills rather remote, perhaps a “both/and” approach to the ethics of communication and leadership is now a prerequisite.

Dorothy Day, Speech Anxiety, and Charisma

As mentioned previously, upon interviewing Catholic Workers at Maryhouse and St. Joseph House in New York, New York and Saints Francis and Therese Catholic Worker House in Worcester, Massachusetts, I found that Dorothy Day was not considered a gifted orator and she experienced a great deal of anxiety over public speaking.

This is confirmed, for example, by one of her biographers, William D. Miller (1982).

According to Miller, in 1967 Dorothy Day wrote in her diary, “The exhausting, and even terrifying experience of speaking when it is easier to write – to close oneself in, behind a desk, in peace and quiet – not to be confronted and challenged for what you say.” Yet, something transformational happened throughout decades of interactions to those in attendance and that transformation has been referred to as a “mystery” (C. Schaeffer-Duffy, personal communication, January 26, 2013).

In *Dorothy Day: Portraits By Those Who Knew Her* (2003), friends of Day comment on her public presentations in interviews. Joe Zarrella, a Catholic Worker explains,

When she gave a public talk, she was very conversational, not dramatic at all. Very seldom did you hear a raised voice or a critical tone. And she never prepared her speeches. She just spoke...she didn't enjoy the speaking though, but spoke from a sense of compulsion (Riegle, 2003, P. 142-143).

And Johannah Hughes Turner, another Catholic Worker adds,

Dorothy was never “cute.” She didn't toss off one-liners. She didn't use slogans. She didn't assume postures, didn't speak in falsetto, didn't exaggerate or use “newspeak.” There was no grandiosity and by the same token no false modesty, no wiggling for approval in spite of the unpopularity of what she was saying. She could be informal, relaxed, intimate, humorous, even a little whimsical sometimes, but mostly she stated what was on her mind in a clear and straightforward way (Riegle, 2003, p. 147).

Vivian Cherry, who photographed Dorothy Day in both 1955 and 1959, speaks of Day's essence,

She had an essential spirit. When she came into a room, no matter how she looked or how she was dressed, she was a special person, especially in her treatment of people. I liked her, liked her very much because she thought of you as a person (Riegle, 2003, p.161).

Dorothy Day's charismatic presence was seemingly formed by a deep humility manifest in a compassionate and respectful regard for others. It is difficult to convey her charismatic gifts to scholars, let alone any interested leaders and communication practitioners.

In, "The Problem with Writing on Rhetorical Charisma, Power, and Spirituality," Smith (1993) presents a means to apprehend the essence of a charismatic, spiritual rhetor through a synthesis of existential philosophy and communication theory. Drawing upon Jaspers and Buber, Burke, Gregg, Kierkegaard, Kaufmann, Johannesen, and Heidegger, for example, Smith posits five constructs "to encourage rhetorical theorists to continue the quest for spirit" or charisma (1993, p. 94).

Smith's argues that language, self-discovery, freedom, dialectical reciprocity, and transcendence are hallmarks of charismatic transcendence. These traits are also embodied within the framework of encounter rhetoric to be developed in this chapter. The traits Smith outlines highlight an approach to studying Dorothy Day's public discourse. Smith contends, "Like the palette of the painter or the notes of the musician, words provide the substance of the rhetor's art," (1993, p. 90) language merits study as it "...is the stuff of an ultimate art which is better able than any other to help one reach a sense of spirit through creativity" (pp. 90-91). In addition, self-discovery or knowing one's core values enables a rhetor to "transcend himself" (p. 92), and freedom to invent, allowing for "the play of either/or" creates choices, and "in choosing one develops selfhood" (p. 93).

A rhetor pursuing Smith's idea of spirit or charisma engages dialectical reciprocity, firmly grounded in interpersonal exchange, and finally transcendence is only achieved within such an exchange, resulting in "the discovery of self...the discovery of the authentic other" (p. 94).

A Framework of and for Dialogue

Encounter rhetoric can be described as a framework of means versus a framework of ends. It is reflective of dialogical perspectives that have developed in a variety of fields including philosophy, psychiatry, psychology, religion, and communication¹⁷(Johannesen, 2008). Both Smith (1993) and Johannesen (2008) posit dialogical communication as a means for ethical persuasion and as a useful tool within public communication, as well as interpersonal communication settings.

Johannesen (2008) contends, for example, synthesizing Douglas Ehninger, Walter Fisher, Wayne Brockriede, and Henry W. Johnstone, Jr., that ethical rhetoric promotes self-discovery, avoids intolerance, is reflexive, bilateral (including mutuality as an important component of personal and intellectual risk), and demonstrates a commitment to the possibility of deliberation including "habits of resoluteness, openness, gentleness, and compassion" (p. 67). Ethical rhetoric exemplifies an attitude of reasonableness with an emphasis upon the sharing of values and participants' personal experiences. In sum, emphasis is placed upon the dialogical processes.

¹⁷ Additional works addressing the variety of dialogical perspectives include Anderson, R., Cissna, K. R., & Arnett, R.C. (eds.). *The reach of dialogue: Confirmation, voice, and community*. Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 1994; and Friedman, M.S. *Martin Buber: The life of dialogue*. New York, NY: Harper Torchbook, 1960.

While a host of the relevant scholarly fields hold that mutuality in public dialogue is difficult to achieve, it is noted, “Public communicators (in speeches, essays, editorials, and mass media appeals) *could* hold and reflect honest, sincere, dialogical attitudes toward their audiences” (Johannesen, 2008, p. 65). In fact, if properly informed and governed by principle, social media interactions could be a source for different ways of achieving mutuality in public venues. Like Smith’s (1993) “quest for spirit,” the new framework I introduce here identifies and demystifies the transformational process that occurs when a leader is mindful of discursive rhetorical encounters within a given moment or set of historical circumstances. The model provides a lens for focusing upon the factors with potential lasting impact. This newly proposed framework is influenced by both theory and experience. Also, in addition to rhetorical communication, leadership is addressed therefore opening up new possibilities for public address and fostering a contemplative, inclusive leadership style.

Conceptualization and Development

Encounter rhetoric, as mentioned previously, is a synthesis of *invitational rhetoric* (Bordwell Delaure, 2008; Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008; Dow, 1995; Foss, 2004; Foss & Foss, 1983, 1988, 1989, 1994; Foss & Griffin, 1992 & 1995; Lozano-Reich & Cloud, 2009, 2011), *transformational leadership theory* (ASHE Higher Education Report; 2006, Bass & Avolio, 1990; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Einwohner 2007; Kouzes & Posner 2002; Kuhnert & Lewis 1987; Muijis, Harris, Lumby, Morrison & Sood, 2006; Northouse, 2007; Prindeville 2004), and *social movement leadership theory* (Griffin, 1952; Gregg, 1971; Oliver & Marwell, 1992; Simons, 1970; Stewart, 1980; Darsey, 1991; Sowards & Renegar, 2006; Stewart, Smith, and Denton, 2012; Morris & Staggenborg, 2004).

At this juncture, it seems prudent to focus on the broad normative criteria that sustain the new model. This elaboration further informs how the framework was developed, reveals its principal assumptions, and identifies additional communicative behaviors that are requisite for an informed and consistent evaluation.

Key theoretical concepts associated with invitational rhetoric include equality (mutuality replaces competitive interactions with relational interactions), immanent value (all persons are to be valued as human beings in a fallible world), self-determination (belief in an individual's capacity for decision-making), offering (one's ideas should be shared rather than forcing them upon others; this requires tentativeness and focus upon process; "listening to" instead of "listening for"), and external conditions (practicing unconditional regard that promotes safety, value, and freedom) (Bordwell Delaure, 2008; Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008; Dow, 1995; Foss, 2004; Foss & Foss, 1983, 1988, 1989, 1994; Foss & Griffin, 1992 & 1995; Lozano-Reich & Cloud, 2009, 2011).

Transformational leadership theory includes mutual transformation (for leaders and followers), appealing to a sense of morality and justice (principled persuasion), cultivating motivation (nurturing the process), and collectivist motivation ("we" trumps "me"). Transformational leadership theory also promotes the following behavioral characteristics: idealized influence or charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, a model of promoted values/expectations/behaviors, communicator of a shared vision, process oriented, engages and promotes collaboration, authentic and attentive, seeks to cultivate significant change, and ability to create and articulate shared meaning (ASHE Higher Education Report, 2006; Bass & Avolio, 1990; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Einwohner 2007; Kouzes & Posner 2002; Kuhnert & Lewis 1987; Muijis, Harris, Lumby, Morrison & Sood, 2006; Northouse, 2007; Prindeville 2004).

Social movement theory posits persuasion as the primary means of influence (in efforts to propose, oppose or transform norms and values), establishes goals of innovation, revival, and resistance (to transform, mobilize, and sustain a course of action), and views the leader as the most important symbol of a social movement (a leader must have an authentic presence and the ability to articulate principles and achieve goals; he or she must manage the conflicting demands of diverse audiences) (Griffin, 1952; Gregg, 1971; Oliver & Marwell, 1992; Simons, 1970; Stewart, 1980; Darsey, 1991; Sowards & Renegar, 2006; Stewart, Smith, and Denton, 2012; Morris & Staggenborg, 2004).

These three theories contribute to the encounter rhetoric model through a shared commitment to transformation of individuals and/or circumstances through principled persuasion. The new model is intended to reflect the importance of process and the inherent worth of all individuals. The synthesis of these theories is meant to serve both communication and leadership goals, with a focus upon dialogical persuasion in extemporaneous settings, and the synthesis envisioned here is specifically designed to meet the needs of marginalized groups or communities. In addition, the newly formed framework attends to the role of paradox in communication and leadership. In an effort to provide a framework that specifically addresses binary positions, acknowledgment of perceived and real paradoxical conditions and/or perceptions assists in mitigating “either/or” positions and attempts to provide a means of understanding, communicating, and leading from a “both/and” orientation. Finally, the new framework promotes collaborative action, mindful of the need to mobilize and sustain resources to meet individual and systemic needs.

These needs are attended to through the work of a social movement and mobilized via grass roots communication.

Therefore, the resulting broad normative criteria that comprise encounter rhetoric include: (1.) principled persuasion as an ethical means to communicate and to lead; (2.) unconditional regard for the value of process, mutuality, and voice; (3.) tentativeness in understanding and concluding; (4.) acknowledgement of paradox in conditions and perceptions; and (5.) collaborative action. After establishing the broad normative criteria from the synthesized theories, I conceptualized how each criterion could be ideally identified and applied, resulting in additional subcomponents for each broad criterion comprising the 5-part framework. For example, for criterion (1.) *principled persuasion as an ethical means to communicate and to lead*, a commitment to persuading from a set of principles that are clearly defined and shared is important if those engaged in a dialogue are to understand the values and beliefs that support a stance on an issue. In addition, a refined understanding of principles may be derived from sharing evidence of enacted principles. The subcomponents developed for criterion (2.) *unconditional regard for the value of process, mutuality, and voice* attempt to describe process, mutuality and voice to promote dialogue, discovery, and freedom of expression. Likewise, the subcomponents developed for criterion (3.) *tentativeness in understanding and concluding*, describe what it means to be “tentative,” namely withholding judgments and conclusions. Tentativeness, within encounter rhetoric, is a temporary suspension of expectations during a dialogical encounter.

The subcomponents for (4.) *acknowledgement of paradox in conditions and perceptions* are meant to assist in addressing binary positions and contradictory claims that may likely be regarded as both true and false, respectively by the discussants. Finally, the subcomponents for (5.) the *collaborative action* criterion identify how goals are accomplished within a social movement.

What follows in Figure 2 is the newly developed framework, which includes the broad normative criteria accompanied by the subcomponents associated with each. The theoretical synthesis captured in my model creates opportunities for both detecting and analyzing encounter rhetoric within an array of communication and leadership contexts, thus serving as a useful analytical framework for studying extemporaneous discourse.

Figure 2.

“Encounter Rhetoric”
An Analytical Framework for Rhetorical Communication and Leadership

- I. Principled Persuasion as an Ethical Means to Communicate and to Lead**
- Communication and leadership committed to persuasion as a means to share meaning, specifically privileging dialogic exchange over monological inducement, coercion or force.
 - Communication and leadership grounded in a principle or a set of principles.
 - Principles and tenets are clearly defined and articulated among parties.
 - Underlying values and value sources are identified and shared among parties.
 - Principles are consistent. Examples or evidence of enacted principles are shared.
- II. Unconditional Regard for the Value of Process, Mutuality, and Voice**
- A primary condition is a commitment to the process of a dialogic exchange, a commitment to an “encounter.” An encounter is exploratory in nature with an emphasis upon the means or process versus upon an end or result. An encounter requires openness to discovery.
 - A value of process is achieved by agreeing upon conditions for discussion and clarifying principles and values that will guide it.
 - An unconditional regard for mutuality requires equality among parties and for the individuals present representing varying communities, however forming an honored, temporary community during the encounter.
 - Unconditional regard for the value of voice is a commitment to uphold freedom of expression and unhindered participation, especially for marginalized voices¹⁸.
- III. Tentativeness in Understanding and Concluding**
- To be tentative in an encounter is to temporarily withhold judgments and conclusions while maintaining a belief in an individual’s capacity for ethical decision-making.
 - To be tentative is to approach an encounter with an orientation of “nothing is inevitable” including intentions, motivations, conclusions, and outcomes.
 - To be tentative is to confirm one’s understanding of another and of one’s self.
 - To be tentative is to have an expectation of a new, revised or refined understanding of conditions and perceptions.

¹⁸ The consideration of value orientation and process is additionally influenced by my study and work at Alverno College, a women’s ability-based liberal arts college. One of the eight abilities includes Valuing in Decision-Making and in addition to serving as an Associate Professor and Department Chair within the disciplinary department of Communication & Technology, I work within the Valuing in Decision-Making Department, overseeing curricular and co-curricular development of this faculty-identified liberal education outcome. I am indebted to my colleagues for their commitment to our students’ development in this area and for their nurturing mentorship throughout this project.

IV. Acknowledgement of Paradox in Conditions and Perceptions

- Communication and leadership often occur within paradoxical conditions and/or among paradoxical perceptions. Complex, often ambiguous dualities exist; conditions or perceptions that are seemingly contradictory or counter intuitive, are nonetheless “true” to those engaged. Conversely, clear dualities may exist with both conflicting and shared values. A means to communicate and lead through encounter rhetoric includes identifying and clarifying paradox, mindful of a commitment to unconditional regard and tentativeness to cultivate shared meaning.

V. Collaborative Action

- Collaborative action seeks to perpetuate a movement, grounded in a principle or set of principles, to serve or relieve marginalized entities.
- The immediate needs of individuals are met and considered concurrently with responses to social, cultural, political, and/or systemic issues.
- The individuals served as well as those collaborating in an effort are assumed to have the ability, presently or in the future, to cultivate profound change.
- Grass-roots communication, accessible to both the individuals served and those collaborating must be pervasive and consistent in its dissemination and principled message.
- The mobilization and sustainability of resources relies upon the steadfast consistency of acting upon the grounding principle or set of principles.

During the initial exploration of the theoretical underpinnings of encounter rhetoric, the development of the framework was influenced by Dorothy Day’s communication and leadership as apprehended through her extemporaneous speeches, writings, and biographies. It should be noted that, following her death, the Catholic Worker Movement remains vibrant without a formal leader. Dorothy Day and Peter Maurin’s legacies motivate individuals to this day to serve the hungry and homeless, promote peace, live by the Gospels of Christ, and provide daily acts of mercy within communities throughout the world. This work ought not be romanticized, for it is certainly difficult to bear witness to human misery and struggle. Living within a hospitality house or community is a complex endeavor (“Roger,” personal communication, January 25, 2013). Social, spiritual, and economic balance and harmony are not easily struck.

Yet, as Claire Schaeffer-Duffy, co-director of Saints Francis and Therese Catholic Worker Community suggests, love is taken seriously (C. Schaeffer-Duffy, personal communication, January 26, 2013). Within the Catholic Worker tradition, human beings are seen and treated as made in the image of God. To take love seriously may seem a lofty proposition especially when we are situated and so often vested within a binary position. To see an adversary in the image of God, within the scope of any religious or spiritual tradition or outside such traditions, within the newly developed model outlined here, means to do so temporarily or tentatively for the sake of a dialogic exchange. The primary assumption, the challenge, and to the pragmatic and perhaps less hopeful, the flaw of encounter rhetoric is the belief in our capacity to implement it. The framework purports we have the ability to have unconditional regard for one another, in an exploration of our better intentions and interests both competing and mutual, in an effort *to listen to understand one another*. Encounter rhetoric requires our imagination and our willingness to learn without anticipating or demanding a specific end. When an “either/or” approach no longer works, a “both/and” orientation may move adversaries to a different position through newly discovered or refined understandings.

Therefore, an “encounter rhetoric” framework applied to the analysis of Dorothy Day’s extemporaneous discourse should lead us to discover helpful rhetorical strategies and means of engagement. The model serves both as an analytic framework and as a normative rubric to guide communicators as leaders and leaders as communicators.

Summative Overview & Definitions

A summative overview defining key terms, constructs, and themes is provided to specifically clarify the parameters of the analytical framework and methodological approach.

An underlying assumption of the study and newly developed framework is that any communicator may function as a leader and a leader's influence is a function of communication. An effective communicator, regardless of one's status within an organization, may emerge as a leader through influence and persuasion. Likewise, a leader's primary means of influence is through the ability to persuade the constituencies one intends to serve as well as those with the power and capacity to support or oppose a cause or effort.

Dorothy Day's *extemporaneous speeches* (also referred to as "talks," "dialogue," "dialogical exchanges," "extemporaneous discourse," and as "public discourse") are unscripted and include open conversations with audience members. The studied remarks and dialogical exchanges are referred to as "*encounters*" as the digitized speeches drawn from the Marquette University Dorothy Day Archives are not planned or carefully orchestrated public speaking events. "Encounter Rhetoric" is presented as a "*framework*," "model," and as a "rubric" comprised of a set of communication and leadership principles for (1.) analysis of extemporaneous discourse and (2.) as a potential guide for future practice (e.g. communicating via extemporaneous discourse and fostering dialogical exchange).

“Encounter Rhetoric” outlines *a framework of means*, placing an emphasis upon mutual regard and exchange among participants and dispensing with the goal of an “end” or specific outcome demanding a “winner or loser” within a dialogical exchange. Encounter rhetoric is a synthesis of invitational rhetoric, transformational leadership theory, and social movement theory. The newly developed framework addresses communication and leadership within a social movement grounded within a communitarian ethic shared by the synthesized theories.

Dorothy Day’s approach to extemporaneous speaking offers a unique opportunity to examine a rhetor with *communication apprehension* and a leader recognized as *adept in mitigating binary positions and paradoxical perceptions and conditions*. Within this study, *binary and dichotomous positions* are acknowledged as opposing positions on an issue, policy, or philosophical perspective. *Paradox* refers to contradictory claims relative to perceptions and/or conditions that may or may not be true for either or both parties. When paradox is seemingly presented, the naming and careful examination of contradictions steeped in strongly held principles or beliefs may lead to a critical analysis that focuses upon the process (why and how binary positions are held and maintained) and that, in turn, may lead to increased shared meaning among disparate entities. It is argued that communicators and leaders are frequently called to mitigate paradox.

Dorothy Day has been lauded as exemplifying “what’s best in Catholic life, that ability we have to be ‘both-and’ and not ‘either-or’” (Otterman, S. 2012, November 26, p. A1). The encounter rhetoric framework assists us in beginning to understand *how* Day does this.

In addition, this study will attempt to account for or explain Day's *charismatic gifts*, following Smith's (1993) assertion that charisma is a function of language, self-discovery, freedom, dialectical reciprocity, and transcendence.

In sum, I hope that the framework developed here will provide some assistance in guiding communicators and leaders to similar positive discursive practices, whether it is the mitigation of paradox or the sustenance of charisma. When the framework is actually applied to other rhetors and contexts, more possibilities may open up. For example, encounter rhetoric's five normative principles: principled persuasion, unconditional regard, tentativeness, acknowledgment of paradox, and collaborative action are each significant measures of rhetorical activity in their own right and deserve sustained attention by rhetorical and leadership scholars, among others. Finally, collaborative action refers to the activities of movement leaders and members to serve immediate needs, influence systemic change, and mobilize resources.

In the next chapter I provide an explanation of the critical approach used in my application of the encounter rhetoric framework and elaborate on the process I used for selecting Day's extemporaneous discourse for analysis.

CHAPTER 4 METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I will describe the critical method I employ in applying the encounter rhetoric framework to Dorothy Day's extemporaneous encounters. To achieve this goal, I will: (1) introduce my critical approach; (2) provide my methodological rationale; and (3) outline the discourse selection process undertaken for this study. The methodology I have adopted will enable me to attend to and answer the research questions I presented in Chapter 1¹⁹.

Introduction

Feminist-identified rhetorical criticism offers an interdisciplinary approach and applies multiple perspectives to address dominant ideologies and how marginalized groups resist ideological forces (Down and Condit, 2005; Smith, 2001; Foss, 2004; Foss and Foss 1983, 1988, 1989, 1994; Foss and Griffin, 1992, 1995). As the project at-hand seeks to develop our understanding of rhetorical communication and leadership, the methodology is appropriate as it "stresses the inductive by generating theory from personal cases, cultural narratives, and individual standpoints (Smith, 2001)."

As a methodology, feminist-identified rhetorical criticism in practice displays a commitment to eliminating oppression of marginalized and or underrepresented groups to cultivate equality between women and men, acknowledging the intersections among gender, race, ethnicity, sexuality, and class. These classifications and intersections, as

¹⁹ See p. 28.

well as the continuum of codified power and constraints, are recognized as socially, politically, and rhetorically constructed (Foss, 2004).

The procedures for implementing the critique include: (1.) the selection of an artifact or text representative of a marginalized or underrepresented entity; (2.) an analysis of the artifact or text examining how it rhetorically maintains an ideology of domination or how domination can be challenged and transformed (the latter is the main focus of this study); (3.) the formulation of a research question phrased to interrogate rhetorical dominance or present strategies for resistance (again, the latter the focus of this study); and (4.) writing a narrative analysis of the discourse through an application of a theoretical construct (encounter rhetoric), as well as appropriating the contribution of the analysis to existing scholarship and practice (Foss, 2004).

Dorothy Day's public address archives are mostly comprised of correspondence related to Day's extemporaneous speeches. The Marquette University Dorothy Day Archives include letters of invitation, letters of thanks, correspondence related to specific travel arrangements, and news articles covering Dorothy Day's speeches. These are the most frequent forms of documentation recorded within the archives. There are few manuscripts or notes related to Day's delivered discourse. This is not uncommon when researching extemporaneous public address. The archives are the repository of twenty-nine digitized recordings of Dorothy Day's extemporaneous speeches delivered between 1958 and 1975. For this study, seventeen extemporaneous speeches, comprising approximately twenty-hours of Dorothy Day's public discourse, was selected for analysis. The selection draws from three decades of available digitized recordings.

The methodology employed, including the representative selection of extemporaneous discourse, reflects a standardized means for evaluating discourse and the materials have never before been the subject of a critical analysis (Bordwell Delaure, Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, 2007, 2008; Foss, 2004; Merriam, 2001; Klenke, 2008; Trochim & Donnelly, 2007; Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009).

Methodological Rationale

Encounter rhetoric, the newly developed framework for rhetorical communication and leadership, informs my analysis of Dorothy Day's extemporaneous speeches. The model allows me to analyze Day's approach to persuasion as a communicator and as a leader. Dorothy Day's writing has been widely studied and much has been written (personal accounts) of encounters with her. While her public speaking and leadership style have been subjected to scholarly scrutiny, her extemporaneous speeches or "encounters" have never been analyzed. Dorothy Day was a successful leader and communicator as evidenced by her co-founding a social movement, and her various roles as author, activist, publisher, and speaker. Day was not a particularly eloquent orator, she was not like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. or Dr. Maya Angelou; however, she moved and transformed people through five decades of public speaking. Determining Day's persuasive influence through an analysis of her efforts at extemporaneous speaking is a chief focus of this study. It should prove useful to a number of grassroots social movement leaders and for communicators and leaders in varied contexts.

As an interdisciplinary study, the methodological approach adopted here reflects a commitment to dual disciplines – rhetorical studies and leadership studies. Several key points related to my approach should help clarify the rationale. First, it should be noted that in rhetorical criticism a theory can be used as a method and a method can advance theory. Second, the study is a recovery project²⁰ and although encounter rhetoric is influenced by invitational rhetoric, a feminist theory, the methodology cannot be fully described as feminist criticism, per se. That is why I described my approach earlier as “feminist-identified.” Second, since the model is grounded in both rhetorical theory and leadership theory, and those theories have been converted into an analytic framework that will be applied to evaluate Dorothy Day’s discourse, the results should reflect this specific scope of inquiry. This approach, adopted within both the communication and leadership disciplines, is also utilized in grounded theory studies (Lyon, A., & Mirivel, J. C., 2011; McNamee, L.G., Peterson, B.L., Pena, J., 2010; Becker, J.H. & Stamp, G.H., 2005; Hoffman, M. F., & Cowan, R. L., 2010).

As McNamee, Peterson, and Pena explain,

“Scholars who engage in grounded theoretical analyses adhere to the interpretive values shared by all qualitative researchers. Particularly, though, they emphasize the process of constant comparison of data to theoretical categories and the development of theoretical frameworks through saturation of coding categories” (2010, June, pp. 262).

²⁰ As noted within the preface, this study begins as a recovery project, “...first to discern and correct the systematic omission of women and, second to correct the sexist and misogynist practices and assumptions associated with specific modes of research” (Roof, J. in Nagy Hesse-Biber, 2007, p. 428).

Thus, my approach should aid in both discourse selection and discourse analysis. This approach I have adopted here, then, is systematic and incorporates standards of practice across multiple humanistic²¹ and social science disciplines²².

What has been developed thus far is a framework that will account for Day's discourse. What remains to be determined is whether Day's discourse meets or fails to meet the framework's normative criteria. Dorothy Day offers scholars an opportunity to learn of a unique form of dialogical exchange that can provide additional insights on the nature of ethical persuasion and leadership. Arguably, modern leaders do not often place themselves in the vulnerable position of answering questions or being challenged continually within the public sphere. Rarely do leaders deliver unscripted messages.

²¹ In defining criticism, Edwin Black argues the process is distinctively humanistic, "Beyond perception is appraisal; beyond seeing a thing is attaching value to it. These two acts – perception and evaluation – distinguishable as they are in theory, are generally experienced as inseparable phases of the same process. That process is criticism... (and) criticism is a humanistic activity. That is to say, criticism is concerned with humanity" (1978, p. 5).

²² For examples of methodological approaches within grounded theory studies, see: Skeat, J. J., & Perry, A. A. (2008). Grounded theory as a method for research in speech and language therapy. *International Journal Of Language & Communication Disorders*, 43(2), 95-109; Lyon, A., & Mirivel, J. C. (2011). Reconstructing Merck's Practical Theory of Communication: The ethics of pharmaceutical sales representative-physician encounters. *Communication Monographs*, 78(1), 53-72; Hoffman, M. F. & Cowan, R. L. (2010). Be careful what you ask for: Structuration Theory and work/life accommodation. *Communication Studies*, 61(2), 205-223; Becker, J. H., & Stamp, G. H. (2005). Impression management in chat rooms: A grounded theory model. *Communication Studies*, 56(3), 243-260; McNamee, L. G., Peterson, B. L., & Pena, J. (2010). A call to educate, participate, invoke and indict: Understanding the communication of online hate groups. *Communication Monographs*, 77(2), 257-280.

A potential limitation of the methodology is a concern the findings will be predetermined and limited by the expectations of the researcher. This question is answered well by Sharan B. Merriam (2001),

Confusion arises about this issue because qualitative research is inductive, leading to interpretive or analytical constructs, even to 'theory.' The argument could be made, however, that most qualitative research inherently shapes or modifies existing theory in that 1) data are analyzed and interpreted in light of the concepts of particular theoretical orientations, and 2) a study's findings are almost always discussed in relation to existing knowledge (some of which is theory) with an eye to demonstrating how the present study has contributed to expanding the knowledge base. Even those who set out to develop a grounded theory do not enter the study with a blank mind, with no notion of what to think about or look for (p. 49).

Importantly, when conducting a rhetorical analysis through an application of a newly developed construct, new findings are expected to emerge (Bordwell Delaure, 2008; Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, 2007; Foss, 2004; Gee, 1992; Krippendorff, 2004; Merriam, 2001; Neuendorf, 2002; Strauss, 1987; Weber, 1990; Klenke, 2008; Trochim & Donnelly, 2007; Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009).

Method of Discourse Selection

The seventeen speeches were selected based upon standard selection principles to provide both breadth and depth in evaluating Dorothy Day's discourse (Bordwell Delaure, 2008; Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, 2007; Foss, 2004; Gee, 1992; Krippendorff, 2004; Merriam, 2001; Neuendorf, 2002; Strauss, 1987; Weber, 1990). These speeches are representative of Dorothy Day's extemporaneous discourse over time, with care taken to select speeches from each decade of available digitized recordings. The selection process is representative of a reasonably practical and systematic approach to apprehending the discourse, following standard practice within the field.

The digitized recordings are much like personal documents as they offer the opportunity to analyze unchanging artifacts without the hindrance of research design (an experiment would yield certain results) which will help me evaluate the applicability of the newly developed framework and generate new insights.

Conversely, the challenge inherent to the selected discourse is that it was not generated for research purposes therefore it may be incomplete. However, great care has been taken to select a representative and “thick” discourse sample (Bordwell Delaure, 2008; Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, 2007; Foss, 2004; Gee, 1992; Krippendorff, 2004; Merriam, 2001; Neuendorf, 2002; Strauss, 1987; Weber, 1990).

What follows is a description of the methodological steps I used to generate the critical analysis via encounter rhetoric. First, the categories developed for Day’s encounter rhetoric reflect the purpose of the study; they are exhaustive, mutually exclusive, sensitizing, and conceptually congruent (See Figure 2., pp. 72-73). From the twenty-nine digitized recordings housed within The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives, seventeen were selected for this study.

The digitized recordings I evaluate include:

Day, D. (Speaker). (1958). *Talk at Marquette University Memorial Library* [CD].

Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.

Day, D. (Speaker). (1959, September 9). *WNTA-TV Interview by Mike Wallace* [CD].

Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.

Day, D. (Speaker). (1960). *Talk at University of Santa Clara* [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.

Day, D. (Speaker). (1960, March 15). *Talk at Black Friars Filmore Street, San*

Francisco, CA [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.

Day, D. (Speaker). (1960, May 3). *The Catholic Worker and Pacifism* [CD]. KPFA

Radio, Berkeley, CA, Pacifica Radio Archive. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.

Day, D. (Speaker). (1965). *Joint Meeting of Franciscan Fraters* [CD]. Milwaukee,

WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.

- Day, D. (Speaker). (1965, November 13). *Peace and the Christian Commitment*.
Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by
Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1967, August). *Peace Makers Conference* [CD]. Milwaukee, WI:
The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University,
within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1969, May 5). *Blessed Are the Poor*, St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul,
MN [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection,
held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1969, September 24). *Address at Marquette University* [CD],
Milwaukee, WI. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker
Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections /
University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1970, October 18). *Reading Notes Addressing Trip to Australia,
India, Africa* [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker
Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections /
University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1971). *Prayer, Ohio Catholic Education Association* [CD].
Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by
Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1971). *Russian Trip Assumption Day*, Tivoli, NY [CD].
Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by
Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.

Day, D. (Speaker). (1972, March 7). *Seton Hall University* (Incomplete) [CD].

Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.

Day, D. (Speaker). (1974, May 26). *Peacemakers Conference*, Tivoli, NY [CD].

Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.

Day, D. (Speaker). (1975, June 24). *Peacemakers Conference*, Tivoli, NY [CD].

Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.

Day, D. (Speaker). (1975, October 12). *Reconciliation with the Poor & Alienated*

Eastern General Conference, Atlantic City, NJ [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections/University Archives.

Transcription of the extemporaneous speeches and dialogue was generated with identifying information including, when available, the host, participants, date, time, and location. Jean Grabowski transcribed the seventeen extemporaneous speeches verbatim. Grabowski has 50 years of transcription experience as a legal secretary preparing transcriptions of depositions for attorneys and court reporters, transcriptions for medical doctors, and for a clinical psychologist. In addition, she worked as a proofreader for a publishing house, for law students studying at Marquette University, and for authors of book manuscripts and film scripts.

The transcripts were reviewed and coded, applying the categories as well as documenting emerging themes and findings. Following each coding session, themes, patterns, questions, and considerations of results and process were noted. Specifically, an initial log was generated to include identifying information and coded to indicate the constructs and themes relative to the newly developed framework of rhetorical communication and leadership, encounter rhetoric. This followed standardized practice within rhetorical criticism (Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, 2007; Foss, 2004; Merriam, 2001). Two-hundred-sixty-eight single spaced pages of transcribed dialogue were analyzed for examples of the five constructs comprising encounter rhetoric including: principled persuasion as an ethical means to communicate and to lead; unconditional regard for the value of process, mutuality, and voice; tentativeness in understanding and concluding; acknowledgement of paradox in conditions and perceptions; and collaborative action (See Figure 2., pp. 72-73). The examples were color coded and categorically logged with identifying titles, dates, and page numbers into a spreadsheet. In addition, examples were coded and logged of Dorothy Day specifically speaking of communication or leadership, of examples of a “both/and” orientation, and of the tenets of the movement (i.e. The Gospels, The Roman Catholic Encyclicals, personalism, and anarchism). Also, compelling stories were coded and logged including the origin of The Catholic Worker Movement, of Peter Maurin, Catholic workers and guests, of time spent in jail, travel, the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, and numerous anecdotal accounts of daily life from tapeworms to toilets. Finally, significant exchanges between audience members and Dorothy Day were coded and logged.

The collected examples noted within the log were drawn upon to generate the analysis presented in Chapter 5, including an introduction addressing how Dorothy Day regarded public speaking as well as a description of the broad structure that provides a context for the dialogic exchanges; this is followed by an analysis of each of the five constructs of encounter rhetoric. Finally, a summary of the study, limitations, and implications for modern practice are offered in Chapter 6.

Throughout the compilation, summarization, and synthesis of the discourse, a continuous review of the pertinent literature as well as emerging scholarship within and outside of the interdisciplinary fields was conducted to support the analytic process.

Additional noteworthy items relating to the artifacts are disclosed to fully and accurately represent the discourse that was placed under analysis.

The speeches evaluated from 1958 to 1975 were delivered after The Catholic Worker Movement was well established. The manner in which Dorothy Day was regarded within the public sphere differed from 1933 to 1958. During this timeframe the conservative press regarded Day as “a busybody and a do-gooder, if not a ‘bleeding heart Liberal’” (Miller, 1982, p. 287).

For example, Dorothy Day maintained a pacifist stance at the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in 1936. A reader of the *Catholic Worker* wrote, “...if you cannot be in tune with the immense majority of Catholics, the best and least you could do would be to keep your hands off a question about which you seem to know next to nothing” (Miller, 1982, p. 315). A self-identified Catholic Worker guest wrote, “You are known amongst the Bowery boys as a fool... [and] in true catholic-action circles of the modern type...you are not welcome, nor respected” (Miller, 1982, p. 315).

During World War II, again, due to Dorothy Day's pacifist stance (Forest, 2011; Miller, 1982), many hospitality houses closed and the circulation of the *Catholic Worker* decreased from 190,000 in 1938 to 50,500.

When Dorothy Day published *The Long Loneliness* (1952), *Catholic World* syndicated-columnist Westbrook Pegler reviewed her biography. According to Miller (1982), Pegler wrote, "its [a] rather niggardly measure of self-revelation...uneven and highly emotional" and criticized her "moral frowsiness" in her "distorted desire to be with the poor and the abandoned." Miller concluded Day was perceived as "a former rough-and-tumble radical who became a Catholic" (1982, p. 322).

The U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation perceived Day as a dangerous radical. The Bureau initiated a file documenting her activities from 1940 through the Vietnam War, even warranting a memorandum filed by J. Edgar Hoover recommending Day "be considered for custodial detention in the event of national emergency" (Forest, 2011, p. 269).

These perceptions of Dorothy Day, held by members of the press, Catholics, conservatives, and liberals, are important to note as the discourse analyzed within the study follows the early decades of the movement. By 1958, the year of the first speech analyzed, Dorothy Day was a revered leader of an established radical social movement rather than a newly emerged leader of a nascent radical social movement. Digital recordings of Day's extemporaneous speeches delivered between 1933 and 1957 are not available to compare and contrast her talks of the early Catholic Worker Movement to the latter phases of her leadership.

Certainly, the experiences of these early years assisted Dorothy Day in developing her ability to mitigate difficult conversations, circumstances, and perceptions.

In addition, the digitized recordings are all drawn from Dorothy Day's extemporaneous speeches delivered in public settings with two exceptions: (1.) *WNTA-TV Interview by Mike Wallace* (Day, 1959, September 9). This interview is included as it, too, represents a dialogue between Day and Wallace and the format is extemporaneous. (2.) *Reading Notes Addressing Trip to Australia, India, Africa* (Day, 1970, October 18). Day's recorded reading notes are included as she refers to these trips in the extemporaneous speeches evaluated from 1971-1975.

In most instances, the names of the audience members are not provided and in some instances dialogue is inaudible. Nonetheless, the rich dialogic exchanges are evaluated and inaudible dialogue is noted within the text.

Since the artifacts studied are recordings of dialogic exchanges and since Dorothy Day spoke conversationally without manuscripts, much of the analysis consists of long, incomplete sentences. As Riegle notes in her evaluation of Day,

...Dorothy's public speaking style was personal, rambling, repetitious, and utterly engaging in its lack of artifice. Actually, it wasn't much different from her style when she was "just sitting around talking," except that she'd be very nervous before a public lecture...she lacked any polish in her oratorical skills. But she was convinced of the need, both to spread the message and to raise money for the work, and from the time the Catholic Worker was founded until ill health confined her to her room, Dorothy spoke often in public. In the early years she answered every request even if she received no stipend even if she was exhausted from a long bus ride because it was one way to ensure both the survival and growth of the Worker (2003, p. 142).

Therefore, the use of “[sic.]” within the analytical narrative is repetitious as well due to Day’s approach to public speaking, to the nature of dialogic exchange, and to present and honor the discursive exchanges.

The methodological approach outlined here allows me to usefully address the research objective, goal, and questions directing this study.

Research Objective:

To critically analyze a sample of Dorothy Day’s extemporaneous speeches applying a new framework of rhetorical communication and leadership derived from a synthesis of the theory of invitational rhetoric, transformational leadership theory, and social movement theory.

Research Goal:

Through an analysis of Dorothy Day’s extemporaneous speeches, evaluate the applicability of a new framework of rhetorical communication and leadership that can serve as a model for communication practitioners and leaders of marginalized groups.

Research Questions:

- (1.) How can the theory of invitational rhetoric, transformational leadership theory, and social movement theory inform a new framework of rhetorical communication and leadership?
- (2.) How did Dorothy Day’s extemporaneous encounters help reveal her activities as a rhetorical communicator and leader within the Catholic Worker Movement?

As indicated earlier, Research Question (1.) refers to the development of the model of rhetorical communication and leadership that will provide the analytical framework for this study²³. Research Question (2.) addresses the application of the framework to generate the analysis.

Having already addressed Research Question (1.) through the development of the analytical model, Chapter 5 will address Research Question (2.) by interrogating Dorothy Day's capacity as a communicator and as a leader. A critical application of the encounter rhetoric model will provide additional insight into Day's extemporaneous discourse and generate a distinctive understanding and application of the nature and function of dialogic exchange as a tool in promoting principled persuasion and leadership.

²³ See Figure 2., pp. 72-73

CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS & EVALUATION OF EXTEMPORANEOUS DISCOURSE

The following analysis and evaluation answer the guiding research questions of the study²⁴. This chapter will interrogate Dorothy Day's capacity as a communicator and as a leader by conducting a critical application of the encounter rhetoric framework. In addition to aiding us in coming to a distinctive understanding of Dorothy Day's extemporaneous speaking, the application of this framework should also reveal the importance of dialogical exchange in ethical persuasion and leadership.

Introduction

Although an apprehensive public speaker, Dorothy Day exhibits a purposeful communication strategy, employing a broad structure to her public discourse. Her negative regard for speechmaking and the consistent format she follows in her extemporaneous talks will serve as an introduction to the analysis and evaluation of her extemporaneous discourse.

“Whenever I talk, I feel I talk too much and I feel that you feel your own failures, I think, and yet we have to go out to the world. The imitation of Christ doesn't mean you don't go out” (Day, 1974, May 26).

²⁴ See p. 28.

Dorothy Day accepted invitations to speak in spite of her fear and feelings of inadequacy, equating public speaking to torture:

I've been sort of captious about those lights above us here. You know that was one of the forms of torture that were used not only by the English against the Irish, but also by the Germans. A German woman doctor came and told us about how they had these terrible glaring lights down upon her while she was imprisoned in a cell in Germany for her refusal to sterilize Jewish prisoners. So that when I come to a convention like this and see these horrifying lights, I think, well at any rate you're participating in some of the sufferings of the world (Day, 1971).

This was Day's opening comment at the Ohio Catholic Education Association Convention (1971) after speaking on behalf of the Catholic Worker as the movement leader for more than 35 years at the time. Foremost, Dorothy Day was a writer, however her public "talks" or encounters were part of an organic communication strategy. In 1960, at the University of Santa Clara, Day said "...if you are in the realm of communicating ideas"... then issuing newspapers or literature, talking with people on the streets, engaging public talks and meetings, performing daily acts of mercy, and even serving time in jail comprise the communication strategy of the social movement. "We do these things to communicate and it reaches far more widely than in any other way. A voice from jail cries out far more loudly" (Day, 1960).

The extemporaneous speeches evaluated from 1958 to 1975 (Day, 1958, 1960, 1960, March 15, 1960, May 3, 1965, 1965, November 13, 1969, May 5, 1969, September 24, 1971, 1971, August 15, 1972, March 7, 1974, May 26, 1975, June 24, 1975, October 12) follow a general format. In most instances, there is a brief introduction of Dorothy Day. Then, Day most often begins a talk by presenting the tenets of the Catholic Worker Movement, its origin story always foregrounding Peter Maurin as the founder of the movement.

Day describes Maurin as a peasant scholar and the person responsible for the culmination of a commitment to living Christ's gospels and the philosophical and political ideals related to personalism and communitarianism. Day often speaks of recent travel and visits whether to Mississippi or Georgia during the Civil Rights Movement or to locations abroad such as Cuba, India or Africa. Day then often reflects upon Roman Catholic practice within the various communities, and highlights particular issues related to poverty and social justice. She frequently speaks of the difficulties inherent to living in community.

Day encourages discussion, stating, "When it comes down to any formal talk, the best thing to do is have people ask questions..." (1967, August). A consistent heuristic is the use of storytelling. Dorothy Day presents aspects of the origin story and/or tenets of the Catholic Worker Movement in every extemporaneous talk. She relies principally on storytelling. Through these narrative encounters, Day is able to underline both the joys and sorrows of living a life patterned after Jesus Christ. Many of the tales illustrate serving the needs of the poor, including stories of individuals struggling to survive the conditions inherent to poverty. Hunger, homelessness, ill health, chemical dependency, mental health issues, and problems in navigating unemployment and health care services all serve to humanize our "brother." Such narratives present the immediate needs and conditions of those experiencing poverty. By speaking from her experience, Day saves individuals from being addressed and treated as abstractions (Day, 1958, 1960, 1960, March 15, 1960, May 3, 1965, 1965, November 13, 1969, May 5, 1969, September 24, 1971, 1971, 1972, March 7, 1974, May 26, 1975, June 24, 1975, October 12).

Even stories of theft among the guests, only to later return some item or provide a monetary gift as penance, can serve up lessons that reinforce how individuals may engage in dichotomous moral-decision making over time (Day, 1960, 1965, 1967 & 1975, June 24, 1975, October 12). These lessons also demonstrate a very human capacity to repent for wrongdoing and the power of one's conscience once driven to restore justice. To convey her own difficulty in remaining committed to living in poverty, Day tells a story of an exchange she had with a guest regarding her personal wardrobe:

When she came to us, you know, no clothing. She said, "Dorothy, I'm terribly disappointed in you, you're always quoting the early (inaudible) Father saying the coat that hangs in your closet belongs to the poor, and look at your closet, you've got three coats: a raincoat, spring coat and winter coat." And she literally wanted me to live up to the things we were quoting. Well, unfortunately, we all make our compromises. We all have to accept the humility that we are Americans... That's one of the hazards of living in *The Catholic Worker*" [sic.] (1975, June 24).

Given the broad structure of the evaluated discourse and mindful of Dorothy Day's dread of public speaking, evidence of a purposeful general communication strategy combining narrative storytelling with more formal strategies of communication can be detected. As Day notes, "A great deal of it, you see, (is) propaganda that is written about and also constantly practiced to see how it works out. You have to rejoice in every opportunity that comes along to get ideas and practice" (1975, June 24). In one instance, Day acknowledges that her public talks have been recorded, "I often wonder what's on these tapes sometimes. They should be checked up on" [sic.] (Day, 1965).

In an effort to evaluate Dorothy Day's dialogical communication and leadership activities as displayed within her extemporaneous encounters and to reveal her activities as a rhetorical communicator and leader within the Catholic Worker Movement, I will now apply the encounter rhetoric model to generate a consistent rhetorical analysis.

The application of the framework is an implementation of rhetorical criticism as the text (extemporaneous speeches) represents a marginalized or underrepresented entity (those living in poverty and voluntary poverty); it reveals how domination can be challenged and transformed (e.g. The Catholic Worker Movement's discourse is in opposition to capitalism and war); and engages strategies for resistance to the status quo (the evaluated discourse reveals such strategies).

The five constructs of encounter rhetoric as developed in Chapter Three include: principled persuasion as an ethical means to communicate and to lead; unconditional regard for the value of process, mutuality, and voice; tentativeness in understanding and concluding; acknowledgement of paradox in conditions and perceptions; and collaborative action (See Figure 2., pp. 72-73). An analysis applying each construct to Dorothy Day's extemporaneous discourse follows.

Principled Persuasion as an Ethical Means to Communicate and to Lead

Although Peter Maurin died in 1949, nine years prior to the first extemporaneous speech analyzed for this study (1958), his presence and the principles he set forth founding The Catholic Worker Movement were influential in all of the discourse evaluated between 1958 and 1975. The tenets of the movement, its underlying values, and philosophical and religious sources were attributed to and synthesized by Maurin and this fact was constantly reinforced and expressed by Dorothy Day.

Peter Maurin conceptualized the Catholic Worker Movement and Dorothy Day served as its pragmatic leader, always deferring to Maurin as a "director" or "leader," even following his death.

The Catholic Worker Movement's primary principles are based on the Gospels of Christ, specifically grounded in Jesus Christ's "Sermon on the Mount" promoting voluntary poverty, pacifism, and holding those among us who are most impoverished as sacred (Day, 1958, 1960, 1960, March 15, 1960, May 3, March 15 1969, May 5, 1969, 1971, August, 15, 1972, March 7 1972, March 7, 1974, May 26, 1975, June 24, May 26, 1975, October 12). The Roman Catholic Encyclicals are also foundational to the movement's commitment to social justice issues, specifically to human and civil rights, as well as labor issues (1958, 1965, 1969, May 5, 1972, March 7, March 7, 1975, October 12). In addition, Dorothy Day speaks of Peter Maurin's doctrine of personalism and direct action, which was influenced by Peter Kropotkin. Day counsels, "get started now, with what you can" and of a "communitarian revolution" (1958, 1969, May 5, 1969, September 24, 1975, June 24). An example of Day's remarks reflecting the movement's principles is evident in discourse drawn from a dialogue from the Peace and Christian Commitment Conference on November 13, 1965:

So that if the principles we study, if the things we learn, if our electoral life does not lead to a greatly enriched personal life of activity, and activity which has always been described as the works of mercy, because all work should be works of mercy...should contribute to the common good, the good of all, whether it's building homes or raising food or working for health departments or teaching school, they are all works of mercy. If they cannot be regarded as works of mercy, they are not fitting work for a human being [sic].

These remarks are an example of principled persuasion as the primary principle guiding the movement, the works of mercy, is explicit. There is further evidence of consistent principled persuasion.

For example, based upon Maurin's conceptualization, Day speaks of the need for the decentralization of "the all encroaching government" promoting localized efforts - - neighbors helping neighbors - - whenever possible. Day often presents Maurin's "synthesis of the cult." The premise here is that "culture" or artistic expression, including anything made with one's hands, along with "cultivation," referring to farming and sustainable living, are guiding principles for living in a community. Day employs Maurin's oft-used lines from Dostoevsky, "beauty will save the world" and "eat what you raise, raise what you eat" to convey the ideological framework for communal living (Day, 1958, 1965, 1969, May 5, 1974, May 26, 1975, June 24, 1975, October 12).

Notably, Day issues pleas for workers and scholars to jointly galvanize the movement. Day appeals for roundtable discussions that can meet our human needs for intellectual and spiritual fulfillment and development. She argues for exchanges where intellectuals can come to understand virtues of hard labor by encountering workers directly. She often extols the virtues of individual actions on behalf of others and the larger community. She argues direct action preserves human dignity:

So that the intellectual life is, the life of the university can be a sterile one unless ways are found of putting into effect the ideas and sometimes it must be done very directly and very simply, in personal hospitality, in sharing what we have, two coats and giving one to the other, taking in somebody who is in need, sharing the money we have to see that others are educated, helping out in the work and the freedom libraries and schools in Mississippi or Alabama and so on. But regarding the importance of the action that each individual, its no matter how small the contribution that is made, is of tremendous importance [sic.] (Day, 1965, November 13).

Finally, Dorothy Day speaks of the "primacy of the spiritual" and of divine providence as she felt "pushed" into much of the movement's efforts.

Crediting Peter Maurin, Day maintains that one's spiritual commitment is the primary sustenance for all things, whether individually, within a community or under the banner of a "communitarian revolution,"

...he (Peter Maurin) always spoke in terms of the primacy of the spiritual. And when you have that type of thing, it's a well ordered life and no matter how often you fail on living up to it, you keep getting back to it and getting back to it, and your life may be irregular and full of travel and things of that sort, but always there's this possibility wherever you are offering up your heart and soul, and to having the sense of God's ever presence is so beautiful and so intensely grateful. Now as for this meeting here, of course, I was in fear and trembling. Thank God for all this modern technology. I can't believe that people hear, can you all hear? [sic.] (1965, November 13).

The constructs of principled persuasion are consistently present within the discourse, as conceptualized by Peter Maurin and expressed by Dorothy Day, with one exception. Although Dorothy Day spoke of the tenets of the movement, arguably status quo values are neither clearly identified nor shared. Rather, as the dominant perspective or system, the status quo values of capitalism or just military action, for example, are assumed as self-evident propositions. In some instances, audience members defend status quo positions. For example, when some individuals press Day for responses related to justifiable war (specifically WWII and the Korean War), justifiable force (in instances of self-defense or preventing imminent harm), and the appropriateness of public assistance or welfare as a means of providing relief for the poor, Day's response to such inquiries are generally consistent. As a pacifist movement, the Catholic Worker response has consistently regarded all acts of war as unjustifiable, even when this stance was clearly in conflict with U.S. policy and the Roman Catholic Church (Day, 1959, September 9 & 1967). With regard to using force to prevent imminent harm, Day (1967) speaks of making such a decision based upon the situation and one's conscience.

Although the Catholic Worker Movement upholds a localized approach to serving the poor, public assistance or welfare is not rejected outright as Dorothy Day asserts in 1969,

May 5:

We certainly help people get on welfare. We've helped them get on welfare, we've helped them get their social security after all they have paid in, their employers paid in, the state has paid in, and so on. In a time of crisis certainly the state is supposed to go ahead and to help in various ways, but it is not the function of the state to go ahead and perform the works of mercy [sic.].

The radical stances of The Catholic Worker Movement stood and stand in contrast to conventional social, cultural, and political norms. An argument may be made that while the underpinning dominant values may be self-evident to the movement, those less familiar with its principles may require more explanation than Day seems to provide. If an ethical commitment to encounter rhetoric is to be useful, even more of an exchange might provide opportunity for additional arguments appealing to the Worker's alternative norms and standards, and thus assure a more refined mutual understanding for all engaged parties (more consideration of this particular observation will be provided within the final chapter). Here it is enough to note that ideological rigidity may close off certain productive rhetorical engagements. Importantly, Dorothy Day's extemporaneous discourse overall exemplifies principled persuasion²⁵. She is consistent in conveying the values of the works of mercy, along with a commitment to Roman Catholic social doctrine, personalism, and direct action. Attention is now turned to the second construct of encounter rhetoric: unconditional regard for the value of process, mutuality, and voice.

²⁵ (See Figure 2., pp. 72-73)

Unconditional Regard for the Value of Process, Mutuality, and Voice

Unconditional regard for the value of process, mutuality, and voice surfaces in two distinct forms within the evaluated discourse: (1.) through the process of dialogic exchange at the public talks (Day 1958, 1960, 1960, March 15, 1960, May 3, 1965, 1969, May 5, 1969, September 24, 1971, August 15), and (2.) through Dorothy Day's narrative examples during dialogic exchanges (Day, 1958, 1960, 1965, 1967, 1971, 1971, August 15, 1972, March 7, March 7, 1975, October 12)²⁶.

Serving as an exemplar of both significant dialogic exchange and a commitment to uphold freedom of expression through storytelling, Dorothy Day's extemporaneous speech entitled, "Peace & The Christian Commitment" is particularly instructive (1965). Day is vociferously challenged by audience members on the issues of just war, the "all-encroaching government," and on the merits of peace activism. A man yells at Day during one exchange, in a reference to WWII, and hollers, "Well what you gotta say about that? [sic.]" Dorothy responds patiently, "Yes, did you have a question?" The man screams in response, "I'm not trying to give you a hard time!" This draws tremendous laughter from the audience as his tone counters his words. Day responds in turn by discussing Peter Maurin's synthesis of culture and cultivation, which also draws laughter and reveals a strategy she applies in situations of conflict. Day comments, "...somebody may threaten but usually a soft answer turns away the wrath, and to be not afraid, realize that people, well, you sympathize with their whole background...[sic.]" (1965). In allowing for such an exchange, Day diffuses conflict.

²⁶ (See Figure 2., pp. 72-73)

She does not dismiss another's point of view and she models dialogical principles, exemplifying the principle of unconditional regard.

At this same event, Dorothy Day is challenged on the perception of The Catholic Worker Movement as a Marxist endeavor and its pacifist commitment relating to conflict in Viet Nam. Day responds by clarifying the movement's position and quotes Peter Maurin, "I think I explained before that the anarchist position of The Catholic Worker, the decentralist position is diametrically opposed to the Marxist belief... Peter Maurin used to say that he agreed with the Marxist criticism of the social order but not for [with] their remedies" (1965). Another audience member proposes that peace activists leave a "bad impression" and questions whether Dorothy Day had a Viet Nam exit plan. Day refers the man to other groups proposing alternatives and maintains The Catholic Worker Movement is a "person-to-person encounter,"

I would say that I am trying to talk tonight about the life of The Catholic Worker over these past 33 years and the things that are within the realm of possibility for each individual, whether man or woman or child, to do... We're not going ahead and talking about for instance the whole John Birch Society, but I'd like to tell a story about, from which by the way I've suffered a good deal in my speaking around the country...[sic.] (1965).

Day (1965) describes The John Birch Society and Young Republicans' printed literature, which alleged she was "brought up on morals charges." According to Day, she was charged for protesting the Red Palmer Raids at the age of 21 within a morals charges court as women arrested for these charges were automatically routed there. After conveying this history, Day (1965) tells the story of a member of the Staten Island John Birch Society who continuously disrupted Catholic Worker meetings and complained to the parish priest that the workers were a "bunch of subversives and communists."

Day describes the Bircher as hostile, often disrupting a meeting and abruptly leaving prior to the group meal served following the meeting. Day suggested to another Catholic Worker, “Why don’t you go after him...you should make him sit down and have a meal with us and so that we can really speak, really talk together [sic.]” (1965). Instead, the man brought the agitator a basket of vegetables and eventually, Dorothy Day met with him, his wife and children:

It seems he had been a policeman in Harlem and he saw his companion policeman shoot dead a boy fleeing from him and then shoot another bullet to prove that he shot twice, once seemingly over the head and another time struck him in the back, and he killed him. And he himself was so horrified at this that he gave up the life of a policeman and became a fireman, and his whole ambition was to serve God and country and he sincerely thought that he was serving God and his Country. I hate the way these two words are equated. But he thought he was serving Him by being a member of the John Birch Society and fighting communism (1965).

Later, the man professed he truly wanted to become a lay missionary in Latin America and for a time, he distributed *The Catholic Worker* and tried to covert other members of The John Birch Society to join The Catholic Worker Movement. As suggested by the construct of unconditional regard, an encounter requires openness to discovery.

Following this story, Day concludes, “The thing is that our enemies are principalities and power, it’s not the man who is opposing us. And I think we have to, everyone can go ahead and work in those ways...it is through imagination and through vision that these ways are open...to have faith in each other and to have trust for each other [sic.]” (1965).

The process and merits of dialogic exchange as well as stories told to model methods of engaging in dialogic exchange are well represented throughout the extemporaneous speeches evaluated between 1958 and 1975, and demonstrate Dorothy Day’s unconditional regard in her interpersonal communication, public discourse, and leadership activities.

Only once was there an indication Dorothy Day received written questions in advance of an event (Day, 1975, June 24), more frequently the exchanges are rather informal,

She [Dorothy Day] has agreed to speak a few words to us and not in the way of a formal lecture at all, about her observations of the recent trip she made to Mexico, and after that we will be having coffee and so then she will be very happy to answer questions which you may wish to propose [sic.] (Day, 1958).

There are many examples of Dorothy Day's willingness to respond to difficult, unscripted questions. The following questions posed by audience members throughout several decades represent the challenges Day encountered:

...for example, in *The Catholic Worker*, last summer in the air raid, you protested against it, and you were calling on our conscience and the state was calling on their conscience and prosecuting you, both of the two parties involved, each one is calling on his conscience, and where do we go from here [sic.] (Day, 1958)?

... I was wondering in this great drive to eliminate poverty, one could be just as efficacious to study modern welfare states and modern capitalism and improve economies, if this is the aim [sic.] (Day, 1960)?

Have you ever had an argument with a militant in discussion (Day, 1969, September 24)?

Violence is a basic need, like Chavez isn't it (Day, 1969, September 24)?

Is human love the hardest thing to give up (Day, 1969, September 24)?

Has there ever been a time when you've felt forced to question the whole, all the work you have been doing [sic.] (Day, 1969, September 24)?

I disagree with everything you said; I believe you are a fascist (Day, 1972, March 7)!

Dorothy Day (1958, 1965, 1971, August 15) tells seemingly endless stories that are drawn from her experience, for example extoling the virtues of people attending mass in Mexico, Cuba, and Russia when it was outlawed and thought to be impossible.

Many stories focus on “little things of our daily life” including the variety of uses of blankets, the elimination of roaches, and the maintenance of bathrooms in communal living (1972, March 7, March 7, 1975, June 24, 1975, October 12). Day retells countless stories of time spent in jail (1959, September 9, 1960, 1960, March 15, 1960, May 3, 1969, May 5, 1969, September 24, 1974, May 26), and is especially fond of references to Peter Maurin and tales about the guests, workers, and scholars she has encountered. All of these narratives evoke a feeling of common cause, “We have to love our enemies, and so many of our enemies are of our own household so we get plenty of practice” (1970, October 18) and “I’m just saying one word, one word can go ahead and start this chain of action, so that peace begins just wherever you are and we don’t realize the results [sic.]” (1972, March 7).

Modeling unconditional regard through spoken discourse and actions, Day demonstrates a commitment to process, valuing a carefully considered means of achieving ends; discovery, valuing the development of one’s understanding of the “other;” and mutuality, through a concrete display of Christian commitment that calls all humans beings together as one body of Christ. And like Christ, her narratives give voice to the marginalized with whom she lives and for whom she bears witness. Dorothy Day quotes St. Ignatius, “‘Love is an exchange of gifts’ and we should be grateful when people take the books that we are reading and go off with our typewriters, I suppose [sic.]” (Day, 1975, October 12).

Conveying an unconditional regard for mutuality and championing opportunities to voice beliefs and concerns, Day observes:

...If you wish to reach the man in the street, you go to the man in the street, and there you are confronting the person, they had a chance to see what you were writing about, and the chance to question it, they would have a chance to go ahead and even to poke fun at or to seriously consider the ideas, and in other words you had this confrontation over and over again [sic.] (Day, 1969, May 5).

And

I would say that when we are talking about these things, we are talking about them not only amongst ourselves, but we are talking about them to the people who have just a sort of a stone wall of resistance, you know, but it's a constant face of reality trying to overcome [sic.] (Day, 1967).

These remarks, in particular, are evidence of Day's commitment to unconditional regard in her willingness to be questioned, challenged, and even ridiculed by those resistant to her message and ideals. Dorothy Day clearly demonstrates communicating and leading via principled persuasion and her commitment to dialogic exchange cultivates discovery with those she engages. She serves as a primary exemplar of unconditional regard.

Tentativeness in Understanding and Concluding

Dorothy Day also demonstrates the encounter rhetoric construct of tentativeness in understanding and concluding²⁷. She does so rhetorically through revelations of necessary concessions, the struggles of daily life, and through person-to-person encounters.

It is arguably a challenge to practice principled persuasion, consistently communicating and leading from a set of tenets while remaining tentative, temporarily withholding judgment and conclusions.

²⁷ (See Figure 2., pp. 72-73)

The merit of approaching a communication interaction tentatively may be realized in a potentially new, revised or refined understanding of conditions and perceptions. To maintain a belief in an individual's capacity for ethical decision-making is an essential aspect of this second construct as it requires faith in any individual's innate value and hope for interactions that set aside binary positions in search of points of agreement. Dorothy Day's spoken discourse reveals tentativeness in the seemingly incongruous compromises made within the context of The Catholic Worker Movement program, in the struggles inherent to communal living, and in person-to-person interactions.

The Christian commitment Peter Maurin and Dorothy Day evangelize embodies the spirit of the construct of tentativeness:

...Peter Maurin felt that when you think in terms of the common good, when you think in terms of human brotherhood, you think in terms of finding concordances, ... points of agreement. Certainly he was always in favor of the dialogue between Marxists and Christians, between those who were the believers and the nonbelievers. He was always in favor of seeing Christ in other men, expecting a capacity for change, a capacity for growth and for learning. He always had this great sense of hope ... this feeling that man has this capacity to change, to learn, to better himself, to work with others, to cooperate rather than to compete. This is the kind of teaching that we had in The Catholic Worker Movement and from one end of the country to the other... [sic.] (Day, 1965).

Within the Catholic Worker Movement, round-table discussions and presentations are essential and speaking with "the man on the street" is regarded as an important communication function within the program. These activities display deeply held values that treasure dialogic exchange and they become especially tested by those holding opposing or dissimilar positions.

Day's encounters consistently demonstrate a helpful tentativeness. She consistently and ardently presents a pacifist position, yet veers from offering any specific policy strategies. She maintains the movement's interpersonal and localized efforts and always redirects policy inquiries to the broader tenets of the movement through storytelling. "I do not conceive it is my duty to try to comment directly on the present state of affairs in any detail as I'm sure to get labeled as either Right Wing or Left Wing or anti-this or anti-that. Instead, I would like to tell you about the efforts for peace and Pope John's encyclical... [sic.]" (Day, 1965). In this instance Dorothy Day speaks of John Paul XXIII's writings on Pope Benedict XV, the "Pacifist Pope" whose papacy during WWI impelled him to consider racism as the driving force preventing peace.

Day articulates Benedict's arguments in relation to America's political adversaries of the time:

...all men are equal in their natural dignity. It is easy enough to accept this in principle, or in the abstract, it is not in public any way...it is necessary however to recognize that because of this principle, all men are brothers, the Chinese too of course, and the North Vietnam, and that men need each other and we must learn that the human family is complete only when it includes all races and that the contribution that each of these has to make is fully and gladly accepted by everyone [sic.] (Day, 1965).

Day (1965) argues a lack of tentativeness, or openness, or any diminished respect for others is a form of treacherous conditional regard:

Look down in this way, there is the most terrible failure all round us, because instead of accepting and respecting other people for what they are, we secretly half expect that when they are completely civilized, they will be just like us. I didn't know that cardinals had such a sense of humor. [laughter] But this is in some ways as dangerous as out and out racism, as it is only a parody of unity and is a one-sided arbitrary attempt to use others to a condition of identity with ourselves...we must learn, gentile and Jew, black and white, all must learn to respect those qualities possessed by the others and as part of the patrimony of the universal human family. Without this respect, without this openness to learn and to be enriched, there can be no hope for a just and lasting peace [sic.].

Tentativeness also is expressed in compromises “that everybody has to make living as we do in this great complicated setup, these modern times” (Day, 1958). Day speaks of paying local taxes, the use of public transportation, and of the necessity to have a second class mailing permit to distribute *The Catholic Worker* newspaper as examples of such compromises. The tenets of the movement call for the decentralization of government and to live simply and sustainably. The foundational principles call for caring for one’s neighbor, the poor, and the elderly. To make use of a second class mailing permit and to assist people with applying for Medicare, emergency housing, and welfare are regarded as concessions. These compromises are evidence of a revised understanding of the conditions of the poor and of the limited means Catholic Workers have to provide direct and immediate relief to so many in need, “I always point out that when people say that we are extremists and absolutists, that we are quite conscious of the fact that we are making compromises every day of our lives” (Day, 1958).

“We have old people up at the farm who will undoubtedly take advantage of Medicare....Medicare will relieve us, help us out in this situation. Certainly we will take advantage of it. I’m just saying there’s other ways of handling it, which is much better for man himself in the long run” (Day, 1965). Day argues that The International League of Garment Workers Union models a better alternative. Union workers access medical and end-of-life care through cooperative initiatives funded through their wages, rather than relying upon the government Medicare program.

Day also articulates the compromises made to serve the needs of the guests and spread the message of the movement:

I really realize the fact that there are terrific compromises all the time, we try to be consistent, we see where we fail, but when you see a family being evicted you do try to get them on welfare. You do try to get them to a place with a roof over their heads. We do accept the services of the State when it comes to getting people to hospitals, but we do accept Medicaid and getting out a paper we accept also the second class mailing permit, ... So that we do in a way accept these subsidies of the government...how much we can do ourselves, to do everything possible we can ourselves. ... as a community you go ahead and do what you can [sic.] (1974, May 26).

Day's compromises represent a worldly tentativeness confronting reality. One needs to be careful when adherence to the principles of the movement come at the expense of those served.

An important aspect of Peter Maurin's program, in addition to the urban hospitality houses, is sustaining agricultural communities. Dorothy Day quotes Maurin, "there is no unemployment on the land." Day explains, "What he meant was that in such communities there was room for the family, room for many children, room for the old people, and that many of the problems of our present day living would be solved by such communities" (Day, 1958). The realities and challenges of communal living, however, do not always synchronize well with Maurin's abstract vision. Day remarks, "it can be a very wonderful and satisfying way of living; [but] it has many problems..." (Day, 1958). Some of the Catholic Worker farming communities Day speaks of are successful and harmonious, while others fail to thrive. Most importantly, it is difficult to attain true sustainability in a farming community, especially when the number of guests fluctuates throughout a given year.

Some communities lack skilled farmers, perhaps relying upon the expertise of one or learning through immersion that might mean just a few days of training. Balancing interdependency is thorny in communal living which can attract “rugged individualists” as well as those struggling with or recovering from chemical dependency or mental illness. During the 1960’s “commune hopping” was prevalent, therefore some of the guests did not necessarily subscribe to the aims of The Catholic Worker Movement, rather they were interested in the lifestyle as part of a largely secular counter-cultural experience (1958, 1960, 1971, August 15):

We suffer a great deal at our farm in Tivoli from those we call commune hoppers who go from commune to commune to find out how things are being done and how they can participate and share, and we learned a great deal but at the same time, sometimes it greatly increased the burden, but the ideas are still so vital to the day, there is still so much, so much a matter of controversy...(Day, 1971, August 15).

Dorothy Day comments on young people living in a Catholic Worker farming community in Eastern Pennsylvania. She claims that once they became engaged and married,

Everybody wanted to get as far away from each other as possible [laughter]. That comes from living too closely in the community of course, in the town. But these are aspects of The Catholic Worker program and I think interesting to everybody because it is all still going on [sic.] (1960, Day).

Through these remarks, Dorothy Day demonstrates tentativeness in understanding and concluding in the many compromises made to get immediate relief to the poor and in the toils of communal living. Of overriding significance is Dorothy Day’s willingness to embrace and understand each individual’s dignity and capacity for growth.

Day also conveys the merits of tentativeness in interpersonal relationships when she relates the story of a young man she describes as “unprepossessing” and “the kind that thought all the Catholic Workers should wear a uniform and that uniform should consist of dungarees or Levis and berets...and a peculiar combination of Greenwich Village...and Southern California” [sic.] (Day, 1965). The young man was viewed as an unusual and problematic guest at a New York Catholic Worker hospitality house. Some visiting priests off-handedly suggested (perhaps in jest) the young man open a Catholic Worker House in Oakland, California and to Day’s surprise, he quickly left New York and did just that:

Oh, I didn’t like him at all in New York, but when I got to Oakland, maybe six months later and saw him dirty and begrimed and exhausted and worn out with his labors, starting a house there in Oakland out of an old store with some rooms in back of it, I began to have far more respect for him. He really did a job, he went to the market, got an old pushcart and went to the market and got all kinds of vegetables and fruits, and pretty soon men came in and took over the kitchen, began serving. And they actually were serving about 1,000 a day there in the offseason when there was no work to be done [sic.] (Day, 1965).

The story serves as an example of the hidden merit and capacity of the individual, and it urges those listening to remain tentative and withhold judgment of one another.

Furthermore, absolutist adherence to principles can interfere with good sense:

A few nights ago, and I was very impatient. They were talking about war and peace. They were talking about the war in Viet Nam, and they said, “Are you opposed to all wars, including the war on poverty?” And I said, “Yes.” [laughter] I woke up the next morning and thought, well, I’m getting too tired to speak anymore really, because of course I don’t disdain the war on poverty in this way...I think that there’s the peace corps, the war on poverty, these are tokens, you might say, of the desire to grow in peace and grow in understanding the problems of the poor [sic.] (Day, 1965).

Stories of the seemingly unusual young man and of Dorothy Day's knee-jerk response to a question regarding the war on poverty serve as concrete examples of the value of withholding judgment. A Christian commitment requires a search for "concordances" and is modeled upon the lives of Jesus Christ and the apostles. Within this religious perspective individuals are seen as part of the Body of Christ; therefore unconditional regard must be extended to all. Even without such spiritual and theological commitment, these examples illustrate our faulty capacity to predict the potential of individuals.

If responses become axiomatic, common sense may not prevail and binary positions are reinforced ontologically and rhetorically. To begin to dismantle binary positions, making way for new and refined understandings and approaching communication and leadership with a degree of tentativeness in judgment, is a fruitful approach. Likewise, as evidenced by Dorothy Day's extemporaneous encounters, acknowledging paradoxical conditions and perceptions generates a critical awareness of points of conflict, and assists in one's ability to mitigate complex real and perceived differences. An application of the fourth construct of encounter rhetoric follows, clarifying the manner in which communication and leadership both suffer and exploit paradox.

Acknowledgement of Paradox in Conditions and Perceptions

“And **paradox literally defines the gospel**—we are inescapably sinners from first to last, but at the very same time, God calls us righteous, leading Luther to exclaim, *simul justus et peccator!*—‘simultaneously justified and a sinner.’

And the notion of paradox runs through virtually all the teachings of Jesus. We must lose ourselves to find ourselves, he says. We must die in order to live. And we can only be first by being last.” - Hughes, R.T. (2012, January 5)

The acknowledgment of paradox in conditions and perceptions, the fourth construct comprising encounter rhetoric, attempts to deal with inconsistencies and ambiguities in settings and conditions²⁸. To name and clarify paradox in communication and leadership is to increase critical awareness, adding depth to a rhetorical encounter, and it assists in clarifying positions and sharing meaning. If Hughes’ maxim “paradox literally defines the gospel” is embraced, it furthers our understanding of Dorothy Day’s capacity to deal with paradox and informs our present-day understanding of how she continues to be perceived in the public sphere. An elucidation of paradox is useful as The Catholic Worker Movement is grounded in the Gospels of Christ.

It is not surprising Dorothy Day is often perceived as paradoxical having spent a lifetime as a radical Roman Catholic and mystic, a woman who was both devout and political, whose early life was steeped in radical politics and marked by an abortion, a suicide attempt, and severed relationships, including with the father of her only child. One might conclude that Day would have reflected on the concept of paradox (Cannon, 2012, November 30; Gibson, 2012, November 14; Golway, 2012, December 7; Muth, 2012, December 24; Otterman, 2012, November 26; Wilson O’Reilly, 2012, November 29; Winters, 2012, December 5; Zaimov, 2012, November 28).

²⁸ (See Figure 2., pp. 72-73)

Day resolved some of the paradoxical nature of her lived experience by acquiring an understanding of reconciliation, forgiveness, and the Gospels of Christ. This alternative understanding aided Day in acquiring a “both-and” orientation toward communication and leadership.

Paradoxical Communication

Dorothy Day’s (1967) communicative challenges relating to paradox are especially evident in two stories, both reflective of the “stone wall of resistance” to the message of the Catholic Worker. These stories suggest a degree of suffering endured by Day in undertaking the task of voicing the message of the movement. After treating these two stories, I will turn to examples of paradoxical conditions, productive illustrations for interrogating Day’s discourse. Following a trip to Cuba in 1962, Dorothy Day spoke of her experiences publicly:

I went down for two reasons. One was because here is a communist country, just within this hemisphere so near to us, and of course I’ve always been greatly interested in communism. My first rosary was given to me by a communist and my first statue of the Blessed Mother was given to me by a communist, and I still have a lot of communist friends, not a lot, I’d say a half dozen that I see. And I’m so interested in the whole idea of their solution to the problems of agriculture and the cooperative farms...[sic.] (1965).

Dorothy Day (1965) attended daily mass while in Cuba and observed displays of Roman Catholic icons and religious practice in the homes she visited. Her experience was contradictory to the understanding of daily life in Cuba following the Cuban Communist Revolution of September 9, 1959. After the revolution, religious practice was banned and Roman Catholic clergy and professionals were persecuted. According to the 1990 U.S. Census, 25.3% of Cuban immigrants, 174,275 Cubans immigrated to the U.S. between 1960 and 1964.

The first wave of this exodus is important to note as Dorothy Day traveled to Cuba in 1962 and made these comments in 1965. In addition, in the years since her remarks made, more than one-half million Cubans have immigrated to the U.S. (Pedraza, 2007).

In her extemporaneous speeches Day (1959, September 9, 1965, 1967, 1971, August 15) makes no attempt to address the political nuances of Communist Cuba. She speaks of her own experience, points to the resulting spiritual outgrowth, and indicates how her Cuban travels can be understood within the tenets of The Catholic Worker Movement. She is consistent in her discursive pattern, acknowledging paradox, naming it explicitly, and in turn relating the experience to a principle, in this case, to spiritual commitments.

Dorothy Day's report of receiving Communion in Cuba generated a furious response. This was not alien to Day's experience. Three years following her trip to Cuba acerbic reactions are conveyed in a series of several stories:

The trouble is people don't believe me when I speak. That's the sad part of it. I don't know how people can just stand by and see you called a liar that way to your face. I remember I spoke at St. Joseph's in Hartford, and I've answered questions about Cuba. There was a Cuban professor there of history who jumped up and began calling me a liar, and when I said my material, my statements I made came from a Basque Priest, Father (inaudible) and I talked to him in Cuba, and he said, well, he's a liar too, and he's a Basque. [laughter] And then he began, he just started shouting at me and the priest also who was there with him, he didn't anyway, attempt to, anyway I was just defenseless there against this attack by this Cuban, a young Cuban history teacher [sic.] (1965).

Dorothy's story is not believed because it is perceived as impossible, not just paradoxical. How could this be true given the experiences of the recent immigrants? In addition to the assumed experience of the Cuban history professor, arguably the powerful American gaze influenced his response as well.

This gaze is cultivated through an American media lens influenced vastly by varying degrees of nationalism favoring U.S. political policy among many mitigating factors (Brummett, 2001). If one believes Dorothy Day provides truthful accounts of her experiences, there were people in Soviet Russia who actually felt “liberated” and there were people in Cuba who enthusiastically supported Fidel Castro (Day, 1965, 1971, August 15). It is conceivable some percentage of people did not view themselves as oppressed. A full analysis of this communication phenomenon cannot be addressed here, however acknowledging and naming the paradox is an expression of encounter rhetoric.

Dorothy Day conveys additional resistance to her Cuban Communion story:

There was a young girl whose daughter, one of our dear friends, she was going to high school and there was a bunch of Cuban students there at that high school, and she said, well, who am I to believe, you know, they said you couldn't possibly go to daily Mass and Communion, the churches were all closed. And I came back from Cuba and said I went to daily Mass and Communion there. So this is one of the issues, you know, wherever you go you find refugees who are saying that the jails are filled with priests and so on. Some dear friends of mine in Brooklyn, when I went down to Cuba, said that it was a place of such utter power that one of their friends, a priest from Fordham University who had been teaching up there, a Spanish priest, was imprisoned in Cuba and the last story was his tongue had been torn out. Well, this is the kind of horror story you got at that time [sic.] (1965).

Here lies the paradox: Both the experience of the refugees' and Dorothy's account of her religious practice are credible. Given the circumstances, the resistance to believing Day's account is reasonable. The young girl's response indicates she felt she must choose between the two perspectives; there is no evidence here of consideration that both perceptions might be true. For the young girl there is only a choice between either Dorothy's story or a version of conditions accepted by the community of immigrants. For Day, this is a trapping to be dismantled.

This is not to say both-and is generalizable to all choices, rather it is to say it may be an alternative means to seek truth and understanding. This is an example of an opportunity for a different rhetorical encounter, naming contradictory circumstances communicated as paradoxical.

Another example of paradoxical communication occurs the same year in an extemporaneous speech entitled “Peace and Christian Commitment” (1965).

In this instance, Dorothy Day discusses Catholic Worker farming communities, corporate farms, and the hardships of immigrant farm workers. Day observes that the Catholic Worker’s message regarding these issues is dismissed and unheard:

The conclusion of Peter Maurin’s program was decentralization to the extent of not subsistence farming, as everybody says, I know that we have been classed as romantic librarians, we have been talked of as people who go in subsistence farming, no matter how long we have talked about the necessity for farming communes or cooperatives, no matter how often we have talked about the problems of the migrant workers throughout the country and the problems of ownership, the problems that grow with the industrial capitalist system in the way of huge corporation farms or what was called factories in the fields, no matter how much we talk about the necessity of studying what is happening in other countries like Russia, like Africa...[sic.] (1965).

Dorothy Day makes the distinction between subsistence farming, which feeds one family, and farming cooperatives, which collaboratively provide for a community. Both the rejected story of Dorothy’s experience in Cuba and of her perception of the misunderstood aim of communal farming within the Catholic Worker Movement demonstrate recognizable phenomena: the willing disbelief of a social movement leader and the presumed skewed messages of the social movement that leader represents. These examples of paradoxical communication, then deal with problems of disbelief and misconceptions without resolutions.

However, Dorothy Day publicly identifies paradox in perceptions as an opportunity – and she implies that this opportunity should be converted into a strategy for leaders to begin to readdress conflicted meanings and positions.

Dorothy Day mediates paradoxical conditions most prominently when relating to the Roman Catholic Church and to The Catholic Worker Movement's commitment to pacifism. In my analysis of three decades of public discourse, Day intentionally rhetorically mediates complex dualities idiosyncratic to her life's commitment within the movement.

Paradoxical Conditions

Dorothy Day's public discourse reflects her ability as a rhetor and as a social movement leader to mitigate copious paradoxical conditions relating to The Roman Catholic Church, The Gospels' providential claim that suffering can be redemptive, and the ever-present conundrums associated with war and pacifism. In an interview with Mike Wallace (1959, September 9) Dorothy Day is confronted with a paradoxical condition emanating from her own words regarding the Roman Catholic Church. Wallace asks, "Do you regard the Catholic Church as the church of the poor?" Day responds, "I certainly do." Wallace probes:

Would you have written this? Despite what you say, you have written this, you said "the Catholic Church is lined up with property with the wealthy, with the state, with capitalism, with all the forces of reaction." How do you reconcile your feeling that on the one hand it is the church of the poor and with this last which you have written and which I have just read [sic.]? (Wallace, M. in Day, 1959, September 9).

Day answers:

I might say, if I had my book in front of me, that you had taken this out of context because I remember writing about how when I wanted to become a Catholic, I looked upon this call of Joseph...and thought of the churches lined up with property, lined up with the rich, and certainly from the earliest days respect is shown to the rich. You see it in the New Testament where we are warned against it, and to this day, of course, respect is shown to the rich instead of to the poor. I am talking about the poor are the people closest to God, and the poor make up the Church, and only something divine could have withstood all the centuries of corruption which necessarily come about in any human institution (1959, September 9).

Mike Wallace seeks clarification, “Even in the Church?” Without hesitation Dorothy states, “Yes, even in the Church. The Church is made up of saints and sinners and there is a constant purification, a constant persecution, which affects purification” (1959, September 9).

Dorothy Day was mindful in her public discourse and respectful of the Roman Catholic Church, her chosen faith, despite the paradoxical view by many of the contrast between Day’s standard of living and those of the hierarchy of the church. While bishops and cardinals live, one could argue, in rather posh settings, Day lived in voluntary poverty. While the Roman Catholic tradition maintains a “preferential option” for the poor, the materialistic wealth of the Church is substantial.

As a layperson and co-founder of The Catholic Worker Movement, Dorothy Day’s lived example stood in stark contrast to the hierarchy, which some may argue itself stands in contrast to the teachings of Jesus Christ. In my analysis of Day’s discourse voluntary poverty is held in the highest regard, but it is never urged upon others. Rather, voluntary poverty is offered as a means of living The Gospels. Day observes that people can participate “here and now” and that they should be guided by their conscience and abilities.

Day was pressed to respond to questions about voluntary poverty throughout her life. She maintained that everyone is called or moved to serve God differently (Day, 1959, September 9, 1965, 1971, August 15). However, it cannot be overstated, her lived ideals served as a form of powerful persuasion, thereby further drawing attention to both the paradox that is often found in Christianity and other religions and the gulf that can occur between principle and practice.

In another example, at the University of Santa Clara in 1960, Dorothy Day was asked, “Ms. Day, how do you explain the paradox of suffering as a form of glory? How do you explain the paradox of carrying, so to speak, a cross of degrading, so to speak, to less than one’s stature in society?”

Day responds quickly:

There’s been written about a whole thesis on the subject. The servant isn’t supposed to be above his master, and if they crucified Christ, they’re supposed to persecute Christ, they’re supposed to persecute all of us Christians and if they’re not persecuting us, there is something wrong with us. The thing is that we’re supposed to serve others....in this way to grow to the supernatural life [sic.] (1960).

Day concedes, “It’s hard to talk about these things when you get into the realm of theology” (1960). The paradoxical conditions experienced within the Catholic Worker Movement may not be generalizable, however the *rhetorical strategy* of always returning to the foundational principles, the tenets of Christ’s Gospels, is a useful means of clarifying a position. If a rhetor cannot return to a set of principles to explain conditional paradox, a critical analysis of a position seems prudent. Day further clarifies, “We are all going to be born to eternal life and by Christ’s suffering, by putting off the old man, by dying for ourselves, we begin to live, and so suffering has its part. It’s part of the life of love, it’s part of the life of losing oneself for one’s brothers” (Day, 1960).

Dorothy Day likens this stance to the patriot's willingness to sacrifice for country, "So I'd have to say that is part of the appeal even of war. It's far more understandable for young men to go off to war than it is for them to be pacifists. It's a completely unfamiliar point of view to us Americans who have a long history of violence in back of us, and taking things by conquest and by fighting our way, by use of force" (Day, 1960).

Likewise, Day stridently maintains a pacifist "hasn't much right to be a pacifist" if one is not willing to suffer physically, face imprisonment, or death.

It's a terrible thing to have to fight, and I think for a woman to be talking about, too. After all, I don't have to face the issue. The only way I am facing the issue is by going to jail, and I suppose that's one of the reasons I had to go. It's not an easy thing to talk about (Day, 1960).

Dorothy Day was incarcerated eleven times, once for 10 days at the age of 75 in California for protesting on behalf of migrant workers alongside Cesar Chavez. She often spoke of her incarcerations resulting from her protests of air raid drills during WWII. Mike Wallace asked her about the civil disobedience, "On April 25, 1959, at the time of your latest arrest for refusing to take cover during an air raid, you were quoted in the *New York Times* as saying you did it because of your obligation to man, can you explain that?" (1959, September 9). Day answers:

...our obligation is to our brother. If you love God, the only way you can show your love for God is by your love for your brother and this has its implications - you don't believe in war, you don't believe in war gains and there is no shelter from atomic weapons and nuclear weapons. There is no shelter from the kind of bacteriological and chemical warfare we are planning, so that to demonstrate as we did, was to bring out our opposition to this and, of course, in demonstrating it was an act of civil disobedience and so we went to jail. We've been to jail for each year for five years now [sic] (1959, September 9).

Day renounces the air raid drills as a form of propaganda and maintains the exercise is not a civil imperative, and largely ineffectual (1959, September 9, 1960, 1960, March 15, 1960, May 3, 1967, 1974, May 26), “One year there was a young physics instructor from Purdue who came and demonstrated because he said there is no defense, that this is a deception, a deceit of the public, that there is, such a law as common sense. So we’re being more realistic than all the people that are putting on the show” [sic.] (Day, 1960, 1960, March 15, 1960, May 3). The paradoxical condition referenced here is a civil practice, a drill that serves no purpose related to safety, if we believe Day’s assertion.

Mike Wallace questions the merit of Dorothy Day’s civil disobedience, “Well, what does this accomplish? You and a handful of people go to jail, what makes you think that anybody aside from your own group really cares” (Day, 1959, September 9)?

Day offers the circulation of The Catholic Worker newspaper (64,000 at the time of the interview) and letters of support received daily. She states further:

Well, I have lived a long lifetime of wars now, and one war has led to another. One of the Popes talked about the fallacy of an armed peace and preparation for war never seems to have deterred people from war. We inevitably fall into it and only by accident are we liable to fall into it, and we spend these billions of dollars on weapons that we say that we don’t intend to use, such as nerve gas and bacteriological warfare [sic.] (Day, 1959, September 9).

When speaking of the police, the prison guards, and judges, all responsible for enforcing the laws, Dorothy Day never admonishes them, “I know, one of my cellmates used to get so mad, furious, you know, and I would tell her, if she regards these people as our enemies, we’re under obligation to love them, actually a chance to practice some of it” [sic.] (Day, 1958).

Day contends:

...we will have debates on this in jail, and with the warden and with the policemen who arrest us, and so on, and they will have a little bit more light on the subject, and we respect them, they are doing what they have to do. It is very often said they are following their conscience; they are doing what they are paid to do as officers [sic.] (Day, 1958).

Dorothy Day speaks of pacifism and the paradox of war describing the process of abstraction functioning to create enemies:

We cannot solve our problems by throwing bombs at people. And this applies to little homemade affairs as well as to the atom or hydrogen bombs. In 48 hours we had 6 airstrikes over Viet Nam, over primarily agricultural country. When we get to this stage we have stopped thinking of others as persons but abstractions, they are communists or fascists, socialists or capitalists. They are to be mistrusted, hated, and if possible, destroyed. We have forgotten that they are our fellow human beings with the same anxieties, the same hesitations, problems, perplexities, before the mystery of our existence [sic.] (Day, 1965).

These examples serve to demonstrate Dorothy Day's pacifist stance in contrast to what's referred to as the "Just War Doctrine" of The Roman Catholic Church. The doctrine presents "conditions for legitimate defense by military force" listed within the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (Catechism, paragraph 2309). Although Christ's "Sermon on the Mount" is revered as a tenet, the Church posits certain grave circumstances -- when other means will not resolve conflict -- make military force morally justifiable. This paradoxical condition manifests in a variety of ways in Day's discourse. For example, "During the Spanish Civil War...*The Catholic Worker*, by the way, was forbidden to be ordered by the bundle by the Cincinnati Archdiocese because of our pacifist stand" (Day, 1971).

Dorothy Day was unafraid to tackle and defend the meaning of her pacifist beliefs:

Of course, everybody here who is interested in The Catholic Worker knows that what's the most controversial as far as our whole Catholic Worker program is our pacifism...I'd like to point out how we are all pacifists in class war and all of you are pacifists in your way, you may deny that you are pacifist but in class war and race war, you are fundamentally pacifists in your positions, you believe in every effort possible to avoid any kind of conflict and we have exactly the same attitude towards all wars, whether they are civil wars or whether they are race wars or class wars, or civil wars or international wars, we have from the very beginning taken this position of pacifism (Day, 1958).

Additionally, Dorothy Day addresses class-based conflict throughout the nearly three decades of discourse represented here, whether relating to labor or poverty issues, Day points to the inequities among classes (Day, 1958, 1967, 1969, May 5, 1969, September 24, 1972, March 7, 1971, 1971, August 15, September 30). Day's narratives point to the conditional paradox associated with hungry and homeless immigrant workers employed by corporations while the people in authority benefit from the profit of a structure supplying food to thousands (Day, 1972, March 7). Disparity and paradox also exist in the jails as Day met individuals who she felt were incarcerated due to their lack of financial resources. Day tells stories of people who were imprisoned because they could not pay for fines, bail, or attorneys. In addition to viewing this as a human rights issue, the cost of housing an individual over time generally exceeds the cost of a fine or bail (Day, 1959, September 9, 1960, 1960, March 15, 1960, May 3, 1969, May 5, 1974, May 26).

Conditional paradox is not limited to The Roman Catholic Church or to the society beyond the confines of the Catholic Worker Movement, however. Within the movement, according to Dorothy Day, tensions exist between the scholar and worker.

Despite the movement's full program including the works of mercy and roundtable discussions, and despite Peter Maurin's catchphrase often repeated by Day, describing "the worker as the scholar and the scholar as the worker," tensions between long-time Catholic Workers and those "young people coming up here all the time to sit around and read books and talk" are directly addressed (Day, 1972, Day, 2004, Ellsberg, 1992, Holben and Chatfield, 2010, Miller, 1987, Forest, 1986). Day acknowledges and explains the paradoxical tensions that can be raised when workers and scholars assess one another:

This kind of thing, you see, this kind of antagonism, this kind of hatred between the worker and the scholar, the bitterness of the worker that felt that he never had a chance to be a scholar, the bitterness of the scholar because he can't get a job and he can't find anyplace for himself in this kind of a social order we're living in, this type of thing is an example, you might say, of class war. I always say we have all kinds of war in our midst at The Catholic Worker, it's not any kind of a utopia, it never will be a utopia. It's kind of a thing that brings out these conflicts and forces you to deal with them (1972).

As a leader and communicator Dorothy Day's willingness to engage this discursive exchange is consistent. Importantly, her keen ability to conceptually draw a conversation on almost any topic back to the principles of The Catholic Worker Movement sustains her distinct eloquence and appeal. Specifically, her ability to name paradox and summon concrete action (the works of mercy) from an abstraction (paradoxical conditions and considerations), is a hallmark of her charismatic gifts:

You are drawn into it and pretty soon... harshness and love, and joy, harshness and joy. It is the two sides of the coin always, the ugly side and the beautiful side, and the tragic side and the joyful side, so that you have all of this in the work. In talking of the works of mercy, it seems to me that's the most potent argument against war (Day, 1972).

Dorothy Day's public discourse exhibits her rhetorical acumen as a social movement leader.

By communicating paradoxical narratives that provide “lessons” for engaged audiences and by paying constant attention to the need for raising and discussing paradoxical conditions, Dorothy Day challenges her audiences to adopt new points of view. By challenging partial points of view and misperceptions, Day effectively engages rhetorical strategies for social and political change.

Collaborative Action

Collaborative action, the fifth and final major construct of encounter rhetoric, seeks to delineate modes of rhetorical mobilization associated with a social movement. In this instance, I will use the framework as an instrument to help me identify and discuss the following rhetorical modes of collaborative action: adherence to a set of principles, attention to the immediate needs of individuals and to social systemic change, pervasive grass-roots communication, and the sustainability of resources (See Figure 2., pp. 72-73).

The principles, norms and standards of *The Catholic Worker*, in opposition to mainstream society, are proposed by Dorothy Day with absolute consistency.

From *The Catholic Worker* newspaper, to the eight books written by Dorothy Day, to twenty-nine digitized recordings of Dorothy Day's extemporaneous speeches delivered between 1958 and 1975, and televised interviews from 1962 to 1974, housed within The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, the aims of the movement are well articulated (Day, 1924, 1939, 1948, 1958, 1959, September 9, 1960, 1960, March 15, May 5, 1960, 1969, September 24, 1969, 1965, 1965, November 13, 1970, October 18, 1970, 1971, 1971, August 15, 1972, 1972, March 7, 1974, May 26, 1975, June 24, 1975, October 12, 1978, 1979, 1997, 1997, Look Up and Live, 1962, September 9, Christopher Close-Up, 1972, February 20, Bill Moyers Journal, 1973, February 20).

The foundational philosophies and normative descriptions are exemplified by the acts of mercy, voluntary poverty, pacifism, personalism, and living in accordance with the justice and charity of Jesus Christ. Examples of collaborative action are evident from the newspaper's first published edition May 1, 1933 (Day, 1960; www.CatholicWorker.org; Rush, 2008; Fitzwilliams, 2009). The social justice commitment of the Roman Catholic Church along with a communitarian ethic are conveyed through stories related by Dorothy Day of the formation of the movement, of living in voluntary poverty within a community, and in discussions of political and social issues of the given time.

Dorothy Day speaks of the development of The Catholic Worker Movement:

Well, the paper started in the middle of the Depression, you know, 1933, and was started actually by a French peasant by the name of Peter Maurin. His name was spelled M-a-u-r-i-n...he had very definite principles and a program of action. He was so compelling a personality and so great a teacher, and had such a background of history that he very soon gathered around him a group of students and more or less impelled people to have a sense of personal responsibility and get busy. So when he talked about our personal responsibility as opposed to State responsibility, calling himself an anarchist and quoting not only St. Francis of Assisi but also Kropotkin, he stressed this to such an extent that we soon found ourselves involved in a program of action that has gone on up to the present time [sic.] (1960).

Day (1958, 1965, 1971) tells the story repeatedly of meeting Peter Maurin and of his proposed “program” that would ultimately become the origin story of The Catholic Worker Movement. Maurin persuaded Day to publish the *Catholic Worker* newspaper, due to both her conversion experience to Roman Catholicism and her background as a journalist for the *Call* and the *Masses*, socialist and communist periodicals devoted to labor issues and anarchist interests. The origin texts may take different forms, but they each provide effective rhetorical appeals.

Yet another origin text is the story of the first hospitality house that was established by the movement and it is a story that was repeated again and again. Following the initial issues of *The Catholic Worker*, a woman came to speak with the founders and as Day reflects:

I remember this woman coming in, she had been sleeping in subways and living out of paper bags, and a friend of hers who she knew very well had thrown herself in front of a subway train because she was pretty well crazed by the complete insecurity that precarity of her life and this girl said, “Why do you write about these things, why do you wait for other people to do them? Why don’t you start something?” And she so aroused our conscience that we walked down the street and rented an apartment and got in touch with neighbors and within a few hours we had beds set up and blankets from our friends around us, and the immediate needs, actually the work is still carried on the same way [sic.] (1965).

The story not only offers a description of how the hospitality houses began, but also conveys a fundamental aspect of how the Catholic Worker Movement functions, an example of collaborative action, “It began, of course, with this personalist approach, it began with I – thou relationships, this encounter between brothers, and answered very directly the need, and so people came in and presented their needs” (Day, 1965).

A common debate persists that is pertinent to understanding the heart of the Catholic Worker Movement and it illustrates the manner in which direct action functions rhetorically and ultimately provides relief to those in need. Some argue a bread line, for example, is a “Band-Aid solution” to the issues related to poverty, hunger, and homelessness. Proponents of this view focus attention on the underlying social, cultural, and political structures that create poverty. Those structures may arguably need to be changed. However, the Catholic Worker Movement argues the immediate needs of the poor must be addressed immediately, “If your brother is hungry and without shelter you must do your best to provide for him, today” (Day, 1959, September 9, 1960, September 9, 1965, 1971, 1971, August 15, September 30). Alongside the daily acts of “immediate action” since 1933, the written and spoken discourse tirelessly addresses the broader issues of racism, classism, labor issues, and promotes pacifism (Anderson, 1979, Fitzwilliams, 2009, Mehlretter, 2007, October 1, 2009, March). In addition, providing immediate relief also rhetorically demonstrates the ongoing needs of the poor, both symbolically and physically. This reinforces the tenets while simultaneously providing those considering joining the movement a credible call to action. Thus, even physical offerings or acts of mercy serve as rhetorical acts.

In other words, The Catholic Worker Movement does not select an “either-or response” but rather addresses the complexities simultaneously through a multi-faceted approach of direct-action and public communication. Seekers may be attracted by this and members receive needed reinforcement. Rhetorical influence generates action and in turn action generates persuasive influence. An illustration:

Houses of hospitality are very basic in our whole work, for the simple reason, and they are attacked and I say just as much as any other radical position we may take is attacked, and people say “there they are, wasting their time putting a band aid on a cancer.” In other words, it’s a waste of time to feed the hungry and clothe the naked and shelter the harborless, visit the prisoner, visit the sick in the hospitals, and bury the dead, and those are the kind of things we’re engaged in here, and those are the Commandments laid down by Christ in his 25th Chapter of St. Matthew, which we here refer to again and again and again [sic.] (Day, 1960).

As Peter Maurin wrote in, “What the Catholic Worker Believes” an “Easy Essay” published in *The Catholic Worker*, “The Catholic Worker believes in creating a new society / within the shell of the old / with the philosophy of the new / which is not a new philosophy / but a very old philosophy / a philosophy so old / that it looks like new ” (Roberts, 1984, p. 6). The systemic or social change proposed by the movement is cultivated one person at a time beginning with the works of mercy and is further embodied in the newspaper, the roundtable discussions, and the farming communities. Day speaks of the potential of the comprehensive “program of action” developed by Maurin, “He had written some poems about the poor, the conditions of the poor, but Peter Maurin went much further of course in the houses of hospitality and the works of mercy. What he went on to was a long-range program of action which would, well, if we started and really got anywhere, it would overturn our present...system.” (1965). This promise of revolutionary change can prove attractive to potential recruits eager to make a difference in the lives of the poor and the marginalized.

To maintain a consistent social movement the mobilization and sustainability of resources are necessary to raise awareness, gain membership, and solicit funding. The Catholic Worker did not initiate a capital campaign to provide shelter, food, and clothing for the poor. As Day would explain, “You just do what needs to be done” (Day, 1965; Day 1965, November 13; Haladay, 2006; Kileup, 2004; Look Up and Live, 1962).

For example, St. Joseph’s House of Hospitality and Maryhouse in New York City originated from the immediate needs of the homeless. The plight of the homeless was made public through *The Catholic Worker*, through Day’s speaking engagements, and through her interactions with people of means who could support the movement. Day would pray and ask others to pray for the unmet needs of the movement and the people it served, whether there was an eviction, a broken boiler needing replacement, the unwanted pressure and attention of the Federal Bureau of Investigation under J. Edgar Hoover’s direction or the loss of membership during WWII due to the movement’s staunch pacifist stance (1958, 1960, 1960, March 15, 1960, May 3, 1965, 1965, November 13, 1972, March 7).

Dorothy Day’s approach to garnering and sustaining resources reflects a belief in “God’s grace” and “divine providence” (1969, May 5, 1975, June 24). She speaks of being “pushed” into efforts rather than any sort of strategic plan:

The very direct action of taking care of these needs and performing these works of mercy, these are the things that Peter Maurin emphasized as a way by which you reach people, a way by which you show your love for God through your love for your fellows, so there in the heart of the slums of New York, down on the east side, we started our first house of hospitality and we didn’t start it on purpose. I often like to point out that we were a more or less pushed into everything and as each thing came along, we were somehow pushed into it [sic.] (1969, May 5).

Throughout her tenure as leader of the Catholic Worker Movement, Dorothy Day solicited resources through grass roots communication via the newspaper and public speeches. However, she believed firmly in mobilizing people and in the power of prayer, as she was urged to do from the beginning by Peter Maurin:

The very fact that we lived in voluntary poverty, I remember when Peter suggested we get the paper started, I said “What would we do for money?” And he said, “In the Catholic Church we don’t need money, what you need are the people who do the work, and the Lord sees to the needs of their taking care of.” I knew he had a complete faith, an absolute faith that you do what you can and the Lord provides your needs, and over and over again certainly with this simple attitude towards prayer, we found it constantly working out [sic.] (1971).

The Catholic Worker Movement continues to garner funds based upon this model of providing works of mercy, prayer, and a belief in providence. There is an abiding belief in divine grace, in giving and in receiving that is traceable to 2 Corinthians 8 & 9, the scripture describing the primary model for Christian stewardship (2001, King James Version).

In 2 Corinthians Paul writes of stewardship encouraging immediate, public action and describes the mutuality between those giving and receiving,

8:11 Now therefore perform the doing of it; that there was a readiness to will, so there may be a performance also out of that which ye have (2001, King James Version).

8:13 For I mean not that other men be eased, and ye burdened:

8:14 But by an equality, that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want: that there may be equality.

8:21 Providing for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men.

9: 7 Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver (2001, King James Version)²⁹.

²⁹ Throughout the Bible masculine pronouns are used as gender-neutral terms for humankind and God. The King James Version is presented here in an effort to convey the original text and doctrine influencing

Dorothy Day lived the ideals of the movement and depended upon Christian stewardship for the movement's sustenance. She shares stories of her experiences, always connecting the examples to the movement's ideals:

I like to tell the story about how our printing bill piled up very high and the printer, a big commercial press that we had been using ever since we started, a press by the way owned by Variety, a big theatrical magazine. When our bill became very high that time, the Accounting Department of the company sent us the bill and said "pray and pay" [laughter], because they read the paper themselves. The printers that set it up read the paper, the people coming in contact with it read the paper and got some of the message very clearly. A great many of the editors very directly took the paper on the street and sold it on street corners, they had an opportunity to practice this idea of being a Fool for Christ, the following of the cross [sic.] (1971).

The direct action of the movement functions rhetorically through a reliance on a Christian commitment and a sensibility that depends on divine providence for membership and resources. Through the encounter rhetoric construct of collaborative action The Catholic Worker Movement is sustained by a combination of shared values, direct action, and grass-roots communication promoting individual action in solidarity with those under the yoke of injustice. By appealing to Christian forms of stewardship, the movement garners resources via a "pray and pay" gestalt.

The Catholic Worker Movement's lived tenets. For additional reading on the controversy of Biblical pronoun use, including an informative bibliography, see Besancon-Spencer (2003), The translation issues in the gender inclusive controversy. *Journal of Religious & Theological Information*, Volume 6, Issue 1, pp. 11-23.

Encounter rhetoric, comprised of principled persuasion as an ethical means to communicate and to lead; unconditional regard for the value of process, mutuality, and voice; tentativeness in understanding and concluding; acknowledgement of paradox in conditions and perceptions; and collaborative action, has proved to be a useful analytic framework. It also has promise as a rubric for communication and leadership, which seeks to mitigate binaries and serve marginalized constituencies. The constructs and components of encounter rhetoric are informed by theories that advance our understanding of extemporaneous discourse and dialogical encounters. The new framework contributes to the interdisciplinary field of rhetorical communication and leadership. The framework offers a means of identifying the rhetorical strategies and tactics of grassroots efforts on behalf of social change. Encounter rhetoric also allows scholars and those serving marginalized groups to more fully interrogate and understand the symbolic and material processes that are associated with social movements. Finally, as a distinct theoretically informed framework that reflects the sentiment of “taking love seriously” in communication and leadership, encounter rhetoric is particularly sensitive to dismantling destructive binary positions in extemporaneous discourse and dialogical exchanges.

In the final chapter, I will draw from this analysis to offer a summary of the project, which will include a final evaluation of Dorothy Day’s discourse, additional implications of the encounter rhetoric model, its limitations, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 6 SUMMARY & CONCLUSION

Introduction

Dorothy Day (1958, 1965, 1997) speaks and writes of “love” for one’s brother and champions Christ as an expression of life lived through The Gospels. She acknowledges this is not always received as a popular or welcome message. Certainly, Day’s unrelenting persistence in word and deed advanced the Catholic Worker Movement’s aims and firmly established her presence as a revered symbol of traditional Roman Catholicism committed to social justice as she strove for human dignity and care for all. These actions are carried-out by acknowledging an associated struggle - - to grow in faith and the love of Christ - - at times firmly, at times gently, often with a sense of humor and gratitude. Dorothy Day writes in *Loaves and Fishes*:

The consolation is this-and this our faith too: By our suffering and our failures, by our acceptance of the Cross, by our struggle to grow in faith, hope, and charity, we unleash *forces* that help to overcome the evil in the world...It is good to be able to laugh with others who laugh at us when they see our...attempts at *social reform*...My criticism turns to gratitude and love, and so my heart is warmed and I am comforted (*my emphasis*) (1997, p. 209).

This dissertation is best interpreted as a critical recovery project as Day’s dialogical encounters reveal the “forces” (rhetorical appeals) and necessary commitments to “social reform” (rhetorical leadership).

In this chapter I will provide a broad summary of the findings generated by applying the encounter rhetoric framework to Dorothy Day's extemporaneous discourse, address the contribution of the model to the interdisciplinary field noting the limitations of this study, and discuss implications for future scholarship and use by communication practitioners and leaders.

Summary

Though she was an apprehensive speaker, Dorothy Day's public discourse reveals The Catholic Worker Movement's communication strategy as well as a discernible format for extemporaneous encounters. Principled persuasion is a vital construct as affirmed by the analysis presented in these pages as are the additional constructs of encounter rhetoric reflecting unconditional regard, tentativeness, mitigating paradox, and collaborative action. Each of these constructs is seen as interconnected and reveal how Dorothy Day was able to adhere to the foundational principles of the movement.

Dorothy Day practiced unconditional regard. Rather than conceiving the other from a perspective of mere tolerance, Day approached other people from a position of acceptance, assuming the inherent dignity and goodness of individuals. Such an orientation is more likely to foster shared meaning than conditional orientations. Likewise, as set forth by her example, maintaining a tentative orientation toward otherwise accepted understandings and perfunctory conclusions engenders epistemological growth, especially in interpersonal communication. Notably, Dorothy Day's ability to acknowledge and explicate paradoxical conditions and perceptions is essential to mitigating and redirecting flawed or misunderstood conceptualizations of beliefs and actions. Finally, Day's leadership exhibits collaborative action through

consistent grass roots communication fully informed by unwavering values and by the mobilization and sustenance of resources even -- posthumously.

In sum, to encapsulate and review the findings of the analysis, this evaluation of Dorothy Day's dialogical exchanges, applying the newly formed framework, encounter rhetoric, does not reflect a commitment to merely impose an argument. Rather, encounter rhetoric is offered as a means to discover arguments and/or means for dismantling binary positions, potentially providing voice to otherwise marginalized individuals. Day's unscripted remarks, responses, and dialogical exchanges reveal her charismatic eloquence grounded in the firmly held principles of the movement, reflecting values of mutuality and discovery, and mitigating paradoxical perceptions and conditions, resulting in the collaborative mobilization of a social movement that continues more than 30 years following her death.

In applying encounter rhetoric to Dorothy Day's extemporaneous discourse, in addition to better understanding her dialogical exchange within these texts, a more clear conception of the potential utility of the model can be apprehended. The following discussion of limitations and implications for modern practice illustrates the encounter rhetoric model's contribution to the interdisciplinary field.

Limitations

While this analysis has some limitations, the constraints are typical of an evaluation situated within a defined scope of inquiry. First, the encounter rhetoric framework has served as the criteria to evaluate Dorothy Day's public discourse and certainly different criteria could result in a different evaluation.

Day's rhetoric could be analyzed from a variety of frameworks from the fields of communication studies, philosophy or theology, or elsewhere for that matter.

As an interdisciplinary enterprise however, encounter rhetoric provides a framework for persuasive communication and leadership that is sensitive to dialogical encounters. The discursive process is viewed as transformational in and of itself and is not burdened by the often constraining demands of a specific end or the potential casualties of a win-lose orientation. Acknowledging paradox in conditions and perceptions assists in dismantling unproductive binary positions, while mindful of the collaborative action necessary to mobilize resources. The constructs of encounter rhetoric are interdependent, theoretically informed, pragmatic, and potentially useful within divisive territories where other options and strategies seem impotent.

Second, the dialogic encounters evaluated for this study also have limitations relating to the difficulty of analyzing unscripted dialogue. The nature of Dorothy Day's discursive speech is described as "personal, rambling, repetitious, and utterly engaging in its lace of artifice" (Riegle, 2003, p. 142). Likewise, the exchanges between Day and audience members are just as laborious to analyze as Day's longer statements. Unlike prepared and edited discourse, extemporaneous discourse provides little structure for the analyst or Day's audience.

However, dialogic exchange and extemporaneous speaking are crucial formats for communicators as leaders and for leaders as communicators to study and practice.

If binary positions are to be mitigated and replaced with more beneficial exchanges leading to shared meanings and potentially new solutions to issues, the interpersonal dimensions of spoken discourse contribute to developing strategies employed by communication practitioners. The merits of bearing the burden of analyzing the spoken word may be especially relevant to those serving marginalized groups and navigating social movements. However, access to these groups may be difficult. A long period of time may be needed to establish relationships of trust with marginalized communities. Furthermore, Day's presence and her interpersonal encounters transformed her audiences, as evidenced by the cultivation and growth of The Catholic Worker Movement, as well as its continued sustainability more than thirty years following Day's death. I argue here that an evaluation of Day's charismatic eloquence is best apprehended from her archived extemporaneous discourse, from listening to the digitized recordings of her unscripted remarks. It should be noted, we may not have access to such discursive examples with other social movement organizations.

A third limiting aspect related to this study and to the potential generalizability of the framework for application in other contexts is the unequivocal influence of Roman Catholic doctrine upon the grounding principles of The Catholic Worker Movement. For example, the mobilization of resources within the movement relies heavily upon prayer and providence. Many might view such a "plan" for resources as ill conceived or naïve at best. Many faith traditions may share expressions of meditative practices and belief in divine intervention and influence, however to assert this viewpoint as wholly accessible or reliable is truly a matter of faith.

For encounter rhetoric to serve secular communities, however, steadfast, thoughtful, well-articulated principles would seem to matter, as they serve to guide ethical decision-making in aspects of communication and leadership serving both individuals and social movement goals.

A fourth limitation has to do with Dorothy Day's seeming inattentiveness to counter-ideologies and counterarguments. Day's discourse is arguably most problematic in its lack of consistently rich exchanges with parties who might hold more mainstream positions and values. In certain instances, Day's radical views may have prevented her from fully engaging those with more traditional views. The discourse analyzed here certainly demonstrates that she shied away from "political solutions." Some of Day's own presumptions may have precluded a more capacious and productive exchange. Within the extemporaneous encounters, Day was invited to give voice to the radical positions of The Catholic Worker Movement. Certainly, she answers difficult questions and mitigates conflict. Day allowed for dialogical exchange, yet encounter rhetoric encourages a process grounded in principled persuasion, which includes an exchange of underlying values, value sources, principles, and tenets. It is not enough to presume that we innately understand all of the dimensions of status-quo values and principles or that we are able to communicate alternative values with perfect translations, but we can be encouraged to form a temporary community and remain tentative with our judgments and humble in our claims for understanding. If only temporarily, encounter rhetoric suggests productive dialogue can emerge from such an exchange.

Participants may be surprised by their own or that of another's articulation of the dialogical constructs, which when properly approached and enacted are themselves under constant rhetorical revision and refinement. If we make use of encounter rhetoric, fully engaged participants pry open the potential for discovery and camaraderie. Positions that are seemingly clear, due to widespread acceptance or due to the pervasive and repetitive binary arguments within the public sphere, can always be reframed and explored further. Encounter rhetoric sets the parameters for an exchange that is grounded in both "listening for" and "listening to."

Implications for Modern Practice

In this section, I consider the implications that attenuate this study. There are important implications related to encounter rhetoric as an analytical framework and as a rubric for communication practitioners and leaders in other contexts.

In addition, the notion of purposefully exchanging values and exploring the role of paradox is an important consideration. Also, the potential relevance of the model in relation to new and social media, including reflections upon parties unwilling or unable to respectfully or safely engage in encounters of mutual regard is addressed. Finally, a call to "take love seriously" in dialogical encounters concludes the study.

Potential Use in Other Contexts

As an analytical framework, encounter rhetoric may be applied to the extemporaneous discourse of other rhetors, especially social movement leaders and all those committed to working with others on behalf of social change.

The usefulness of the model may be further considered and developed as a method of examining the rhetorical acumen of communicators as leaders and leaders as communicators, including orators that are underrepresented in existing scholarship. For example, the extemporaneous discourse of community leaders and organizers within both urban and rural settings redressing economic conditions, poor education, lack of access to clean air and water, healthcare, or achieving agricultural sustainability, among other issues implicating social justice, could be usefully studied through the applied lens of encounter rhetoric. Other researchers are invited to extend and cultivate the model in examinations of apprehensive and demonstrative speakers alike, to give voice to and amplify those who may be relatively unknown outside of their communities, but are effective in their pursuits through consistently effective interpersonal encounters.

The normative standards embedded in the model can also be extended to a variety of contexts where rhetorical communication and leadership is practiced. Therefore, the encounter rhetoric model could serve as a means to evaluate and cultivate current discursive practice in a host of organizational settings. Scrutiny of grounding principles, for example, the foundation of an encounter meant to engender discovery and shared meaning, could enhance dialogic exchange and dismantle binary positions. In this instance, the model might be employed to both inform interpersonal exchange and critique it. This is also a prescription that helps define its utility.

Bridging Dialogical Exchange & Dismantling Binaries

Further consideration of unconditional regard for the value of process, mutuality, and voice, rather than a product driven or “win-lose” conception of interactions could serve to loosen firmly held positions that limit discovery of solutions in a variety of for-profit and non-profit organizations. Within Dorothy Day’s public discourse, traditional values are mostly assumed, most often offered through the questions of audience members, yet they are not fully articulated. If encounter rhetoric is applied as a rubric, more dialogue clarifying the principles and values in the public discussion between marginalized and mainstream positions should receive more attention. The merit of this sort of exchange cannot be overemphasized. Consider Dorothy Day’s example as a leader drawing the admiration of both liberals and conservatives in the U.S. Catholic church, “As someone who was both committed to social justice and loyal to church teachings, Day bridges wings of the contemporary church in a way that few American Catholic figures can (Otterman, 2012, November 26, p. A1).” Indeed, one of the most edifying and surprising outcomes of Dorothy Day’s nearly 50-year commitment to providing the acts of mercy in a host of disparate communities was her ability to identify and achieve concordances. Due to her example, adversaries are pushed to find common ground: The Gospels of Christ, The Roman Catholic Encyclicals, and Roman Catholic Doctrine. How can we dispute one another if we envision our adversaries as part of The Body of Christ, within a faithful and lived commitment to social justice, experiencing forgiveness and reconciliation through the sacraments?

Dorothy Day's example is grounded within a Roman Catholic commitment, however leaders seeking to redress injustices from a variety of worldviews are inevitably called upon to mitigate paradoxical conditions and perceptions. They may do so more effectively by identifying and clarifying both clear and ambiguous dualities. The mobilization of resources through collaborative action provides immediate relief to individuals and may influence systemic change, as person-to-person encounters are rhetorical acts, performing symbolic and material actions in the world reifying the adage, "actions speak louder than words."

The power and necessity of both written texts and formal public remarks comprise a full communication strategy. However, equal attention to dialogical encounters, the role of storytelling, and the value of a leader's physical, engaged presence within a community, should also be highlighted as part of an assemblage of practices to be purposefully investigated and enacted, as demonstrated by this account of The Catholic Worker Movement.

New & Social Media

The potential relevance of encounter rhetoric should also be considered in relation to new and social media. We should be especially mindful of those unwilling or unable to engage in face-to-face or person-to-person discursive exchanges through electronic forums. Dialogical encounters are pervasively enacted via online comments following news stories and through social media platforms such as Twitter, Facebook, Google+, and Instagram, as well as blogs hosted by WordPress, Tumblr, and Weebly, for example. We can search, share, and display ideas and identities through a variety of electronic media devices and platforms.

Success within social media is evaluated through analytics measuring traffic, duration, and conversion (Blanchard, 2011, Berger, 2013). The role of social media in social change efforts is growing. Social media has fueled the Arab Spring (Stepanova, 2011), altered political elections (Shirky, 2011), and opened an unparalleled means to access information and build communities in short; new social media now provide a platform for voices unlike any time before in human history (Dicken-Garcia, 1998, Shih, 2004, Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy, & Silvestre 2011). In addition, this unheralded access to information sharing and access arguably filibusters the landscape of popular culture with a variety of cacophonous messages ranging from the inane and quirky, to the inspirational and fascinating, and at times online discourse can be brutally divisive and even hateful (Capella, 2002; Makinen & Wangu Kuira, 2008). Our choices in the new social media environment are legion. One can for example, quickly access The Library of Congress, The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), learn to peel a hard-boiled egg, connect with a friend or family member, and collaborate with colleagues throughout the world. We get to do so through a variety of choices related to self-presentation: we can be idealized, fictionalized, and even anonymous through a variety of online portals and expressions of text, still and moving images, music and sound. Our passions and interests are at times whittled down to a mere tweet or meme or expanded to the equivalent of a manifesto or encyclopedia.

Entertaining and connecting with one another and sharing information and experiences is enacted within a whole set of ethical considerations relating to collaboration, competition, validity, security, ownership, anonymity, and self-aggrandizement (Dickens-Garcia, 1998; Shih, 2004; Marwick & Boyd, 2010; Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy, & Silvestre 2011). A fully developed consideration or application of encounter rhetoric to socially mediated discursive exchanges cannot be addressed here at any great length given the limited scope of its inclusion in this discussion of implications, however, online forums offer tremendous opportunities for further future research. Connections to and collaborations with community-based communicators and leaders are made possible through easy access to online vehicles and forums. Consider for example, the capacity of Google Docs to create, share, and access online documents or of Skype's free of charge calling, videoing, messaging, and sharing capabilities from almost anywhere. It is important to note, however, developing countries with intermittent electrical service and Internet access may not experience the same ease of use of such services. Likewise, impoverished communities throughout the world may theoretically have access to computers and Internet services, however not to the same degree as persons of means who can bear the cost of a personal computer and monthly Internet fees. In spite of these challenges, the ability to connect to others and share information is tremendous. It is worth considering how many new electronic technologies could be utilized for analysis and interpretation of interpersonal and group communication aimed at social change. I believe the framework developed here can serve as a guide. Navigating the rhetorical encounters on the World Wide Web may present a number of challenges, but it is hard to ignore the significant opportunities that new technologies provide.

Willingness & Valuing an Encounter

To apply encounter rhetoric in any setting, a willingness to adopt the framework is necessary to guide dialogical exchange. Anecdotally, I have ventured to apply the framework in online exchanges, attempting to frame conversations to address opposing and shared values, for example, and it simply does not work if individuals do not agree to a conversation exploring values.

One can practice unconditional regard for another, define and articulate principles, and be met with an unrelenting, ad hominem attack. In any setting, perhaps the greatest barrier is the *willingness* of individuals to participate in an encounter and/or explore the utility of a dialogical framework within an agreed-upon temporary community where process is valued over product or “win-lose” attitudes and conceptualizations.

Encounter rhetoric is not proposed as an easy remedy generalizable to all discursive exchanges. As binary positions are familiar and arguably bolstered within the pervasive public sphere, an invitation to an encounter is an invitation to risk. Not everyone is willing or able to take a risk. Not everyone is willing to expose themselves to a transformational experience. Hope for transformation, after all, may require the suspension of categorically labeling interactions as either “successful” or “failed.” This may demand a paradigm shift in thought and oral exchange. The encounter itself, regardless of the outcome, is valued. Encounter rhetoric assumes varying degrees of uneasiness in approaching judgments and counsels that we seek tentative conclusions. Acknowledging paradox in conditions and perceptions, for both the marginalized and for those who wittingly or unwittingly benefit from status quo systems and conditions, can be beneficial for all involved.

We may find common ground in a shared central tenet of the human condition: We all struggle and in the process we all want to retain our human dignity.

Furthermore, if proposed participants are in grave positions relative to their survival, safety, security, or privacy, for example, an initial emphasis upon the merit of adopting any guidelines or frameworks for discussion would have to be evaluated and addressed. People under incredible pressures and constraints are simply not in a position to engage in dialogue. Certain basic material conditions must be met before dialogue is even possible. Meeting minimum standards of human need would necessarily serve as prerequisites that would have to precede any attempt at dialogical exchange. This “in-between” position, where parties identify a need for a discursive encounter, but are unwilling or unable to do so, is an area for further consideration and research.

Conclusion “A Lifetime Job”

This analysis of Dorothy Day’s public dialogical encounters, applying the newly developed framework, encounter rhetoric, holds promise for offering a refined but nonetheless inevitably imperfect understanding of what it means to “take love seriously.” I am ever mindful of Day’s life-long commitment to studying as well as imparting this approach to communication and leadership³⁰.

³⁰ Written in 1940, Dorothy Day proclaims, “The new social order as it could be and would be if all men loved God and loved their brothers because they are all sons of God! A land of peace and tranquility and joy in work and activity. It is heaven indeed that we are contemplating. Do you expect that we are going to be able to accomplish it here? We can accomplish much, of that I am certain. We can do much to change the face of the earth, in that I have hope and faith. But the pains and sufferings are the price we have to pay. Can we change men in a night or a day” (Day, 2005, p. 87)?

Dorothy Day contemplates the demands and merits of love:

Even the best of human love is filled with self-seeking. To work to increase our love for God and for our fellow man (and the two must go hand in hand), ***this is a lifetime job*** [my emphasis]. We are never going to be finished. Love and ever more love is the only solution to every problem that comes up. If we love each other enough, we will bear with each other's faults and burdens. If we love enough, we are going to light that fire in the hearts of others. And it is love that will burn out the sins and hatreds that sadden us. It is love that will make us want to do great things for each other. No sacrifice and no suffering will then seem too much...I cannot worry much about your sins and miseries when I have so many of my own. I can only love you all, poor fellow travelers, fellow sufferers. I do not want to add one least straw to the burden you already carry. My prayer from day to day is that God will so enlarge my heart that I will see you all, and live with you all in His love (2005, pp. 87-88).

Therefore, encounter rhetoric, informed by the theory of invitational rhetoric, transformational leadership theory, and social movement theory, is a framework that can open new pathways. It offers a promising new model for analysis and practice within the tradition of dialogical communication. Encounter rhetoric acknowledges communicators as leaders and leaders as communicators revealing Dorothy Day's affirmative egalitarian vision and dialogical commitment as key to her extemporaneous discourse. In presenting an evaluation of Day's less formal public narratives for the first time, her charismatic eloquence as an apprehensive but ultimately effective orator is revealed. Within the interdisciplinary field of rhetorical communication and leadership, encounter rhetoric can make a difference. Principled persuasion as an ethical means to communicate and to lead; unconditional regard for the value of process, mutuality, and voice; tentativeness in understanding and concluding; acknowledgement of paradox in conditions and perceptions; and collaborative action reveal themselves as key constructs for fostering and sustaining a social movement (See Figure 2., pp. 72-73).

Finally, this study confirms that Dorothy Day was consistent in her public proclamations of Peter Maurin's conceptualization of the Catholic Worker program, reflecting a practice of unconditional regard, and offering a model of leadership through intentionally lived ideals³¹. For decades Day demonstrated and conveyed the merits of dialogical encounters. The analytical framework developed in these pages offers a useful investigative tool for scholars and definitive guidelines for practitioners who are interested in advancing dialogue. The attempt to dismantle binary positions may be a complex rhetorical approach to communication and leadership, however an analysis of Day's extemporaneous discourse reveals it can be put to good use. The longevity of the Catholic Worker Movement, the thousands of guests served daily, and the continued relevance of Dorothy Day's work and legacy serve as evidence of the potential value in adopting a committed, ethical approach to discursive exchange. Encounter rhetoric is conceptualized and applied with faith in our full capacity to engage dialogue deeply engrained in principles and simultaneously open to discovery of both our adversaries and of ourselves.

³¹ Dorothy Day wrote of Peter Maurin, "He was always in favor of seeing Christ in other men, expecting a capacity for change, a capacity for growth and for learning. He always had this great sense of hope...and his expectations, his feeling that man has this capacity to change, to learn, to better himself, to work with others, to cooperate rather than to compete. This is the kind of teaching that we had in The Catholic Worker Movement and from one end of the country to the other, Peter has spoken at state universities and at seminaries. He died in 1949 and I think it is the measure of his greatness that we still cling so closely to all these ideas of his and try to see where we are working them out and keeping to this line, which is very simple and very fundamental, it's called of course the simplistic approach" (Day, 1965, November 13).

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES

- ASHE Higher Education Report, *A world anew: the latest theories of leadership*. 2006, Vol. 3, Issue 6, p31-70, 39.
- Anderson, R.D. (1979). *The character and communication of a modern-day prophet: A rhetorical analysis of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker*. (Ph.D. Dissertation). University of Oregon.
- Anderson, R.D. (1982, September). Dorothy Day's last speech: A culmination of her life's journey. *Religious Communication Today*, vol. 5, 30-34.
- Anderson, R., Cissna, K. R., & Arnett, R.C. eds., *The Reach of Dialogue: Confirmation, Voice, and Community*. Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 1994.
- Arnold, K., Barling, J., Kelloway, K., McKee, M., Turner, N., (2007). Transformational Leadership and Psychological Well-Being: The Mediating Role of Meaningful Work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 193-203.
- Arvey, R.D., Avolio, B.J., Zhang, Z., & Krueger, R.F. (2007). Developmental and genetic determinants of leadership role occupancy among women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 693-706.
- Aronica, M.T. *Beyond Charismatic Leadership: The New York Catholic Worker Movement*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Author Unknown, letter to Dorothy, catalogues 1933-34, signed "An Augustian," The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Avolio, B.J. & Bass, B.M. (2004). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Manual and sampler set (3rd ed.). Redwood City, CA: Mindgarden.
- Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 4, 231-272.
- Bass, B.M. & Riggio, R.E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Besancon-Spencer (2003), The translation issues in the gender inclusive controversy. *Journal of Religious & Theological Information*, Volume 6, Issue 1, pp. 11-23.

- Becker, J. H., & Stamp, G. H. (2005). Impression management in chat rooms: A grounded theory model. *Communication Studies*, 56 (3), 243-260.
- Belkin, L. (2007, November 1). The feminine critique. *New York Times* (Late Edition [EastCoast]), p. G.1. Retrieved March 26, 2008, from ProQuest Newsstand database. (Document ID: 1375337491).
- Bennis, W.G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Berger, J. (2013) *Contagious: Why things catch on*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Besancon-Spencer (2003), The translation issues in the gender inclusive controversy. *Journal of Religious & Theological Information*, Volume 6, Issue 1, pp. 11-23.
- Bizzell, P., "Feminist Methods of Research in the History of Rhetoric: What Difference Do They Make?" *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, v. 30, no. 4, (Fall 2000).
- Black, E. *Rhetorical Criticism: A study in method* (Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, (1978).
- Blanchard, O. (2011). *Social media ROI: Managing and measuring social media efforts in your organization*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Bordwell Delaure, M. (2008). Planting seeds of change: Ella Baker's radical rhetoric. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 31 (1), 1-28.
- Bone, J.E., Griffin, C.L., & Scholz, L. (2008). Beyond traditional conceptualizations of rhetoric: Invitational rhetoric and a move toward civility. *Western Journal of Communication*, 72 (4), 434-462.
- Boss, G. P. (1976). Essential attributes of the concept of charisma. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, Vol. 41, Issue 3, pp. 300-313.
- Boyd, J. Organizational rhetoric doomed to fail: R.J. Reynolds and the principle of the oxymoron. *Western Journal of Communication*, 68(1) (Winter 2004), 45-71. Retrieved October 14, 2007 from PsycINFO database.
- Brook, B. (2007). Women in history - Dorothy Day. *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*, 5(2), 87-88.
- Brummett, B., "Some Implications of 'Process' or 'Intersubjectivity': Postmodern Rhetoric," in *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*, eds. Lucaites, J.L., Condit, C.M. & Caudill, New York London: Guilford Press (1999), p.157.

- Brummett, B. (2001). *Rhetorical dimensions of popular culture*. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.
- Burke, K. *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1966.
- Burke, K. *A Rhetoric of Motives*, 1969, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cameroon profile. (2012, December 5). News Africa. *BBC*.
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-13146029>
- Campbell, D. (1984, Fall). The Catholic earth mother: Dorothy Day and women's power in the church. *Cross Currents* 34, 270-282.
- Cannon, V. (2012, November 30). Day by Day: A saint for the occupy era. *The New Yorker*, 1-3. <http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/newsdesk/2012/11/dorothy-day-a-saint-for-the-occupy-era.html?printable=true¤tPage=all>
- LeCompte, E. (Date Unknown). Dorothy Day: A saint for our time. *Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good*, 1-3. <http://www.catholicsinalliance.org>
- Cappella, J. H. (2006, January 10). Cynicism and social trust in the new media environment. *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 52, Issue 1, pp. 229-241.
- Catalyst.org/about/mission.shtml
- Catholic Church (2011). *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. 2nd ed. Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, paragraph 2309.
- Catholic Worker, www.catholicworker.org
- Ceccarelli, Leah. "Polysemy: Multiple Meanings in Rhetorical Criticism." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84.4 (Nov. 1998): 395-415.
- Change: Center for Health and Gender Equity:
http://www.genderhealth.org/the_issues/why_women_and_girls/
- Coles, R. (1998, June 6). On moral leadership: Dorothy Day and Peter Maurin in tandem. *America*, 178-20, 5-14.
- Chan, S. (2008, October 6). Remembering Cardinal Cooke. *The New York Times*,
<http://cityroom.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/10/06/remembering-cardinal-cooke/>
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory*. London: Sage Publications.

- Coles, R. (1987). *Dorothy Day: A radical devotion*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co. Cochran, C.E. (1989). The thin theory of community: The communitarians and their critics. *Political Studies*, XXXII, 422-435.
- Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Day, D. (1924). *The eleventh virgin*. New York, NY: Alvert & Charles Boni.
- Day, D. *Letter to Mr. Cadwell*, December 20, 1934. The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (1939). *House of hospitality*. New York, NY: Sheed & Ward.
- Day, D. (1948). *On pilgrimage*. New York, NY: William B. Eerdmans.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1958). *Talk at Marquette University Memorial Library* [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1959, September 9). *WNTA-TV Interview by Mike Wallace* [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1960). *Talk at University of Santa Clara* [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1960, March 15). *Talk at Black Friars Filmore Street, San Francisco, CA* [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1960, May 3). *The Catholic Worker and pacifism* [CD]. KPFA Radio, Berkeley, CA, Pacifica Radio Archive. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1965). *Joint meeting of Franciscan Fraters* [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1965, November 13). *Peace and the Christian commitment*. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.

- Day, D. (Speaker). (1969, May 5). *Blessed are the poor*, St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, MN [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1969, September 24). *Address at Marquette University* [CD], Milwaukee, WI. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1970, October 18). *Reading notes addressing trip to Australia, India, Africa* [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1971). *Prayer, Ohio Catholic Education Association* [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1971, August 15). *Russian Trip Assumption Day*, Tivoli, NY [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (1972). *On pilgrimage: The sixties*. New York, NY: Curtis Books.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1972, March 7). *Seton Hall University (Incomplete)* [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1974, May 26). *Peacemakers Conference*, Tivoli, NY [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1975, June 24). *Peacemakers Conference*, Tivoli, NY [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- Day, D. (Speaker). (1975, October 12). *Reconciliation with the poor & alienated eastern general conference*, Atlantic City, NJ [CD]. Milwaukee, WI: The Dorothy Day Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections/University Archives.
- Day, D. (1978). *From Union Square to Rome*. New York, NY: Arno Press.
- Day, D. (1979). *Therese: A life of Therese of Lisieux*. Springfield, IL: Templegate.
- Day, D. (1997). *Loaves and fishes*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

- Day, D. (1997). *The long loneliness: The autobiography of Dorothy Day*. San Francisco, CA Harper & Row.
- Day, D. (2004). *Peter Maurin: Apostle to the World*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Dicken-Garcia, H. (1998, March). The Internet and continuing historical discourse. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, vol. 75, no. 1, pp. 19-27.
- Dow, B.J. (1995, Spring), feminism, difference(s), and rhetorical studies. *Communication Studies*, 46, 106-117.
- Dussault, M., Patette, D., & Leroux, M. (2008). Principals' transformational leadership and teachers' collective efficacy. *Psychology Reports*, (102), 401-410.
- Einwohner, R. L. (2007). Leadership, authority, and collective action: Jewish resistance in the ghettos of Warsaw and Vilna. *American Behavioral Scientist* (50, 1306).
- Elie, P. (1998, November 8). The patron saint of paradox. *New York Times Magazine*, 44-46.
- Ellis, M. H. (2010). *Peter Maurin: Prophet in the Twentieth Century*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Ellsberg, R. (1992). *Dorothy Day, selected writings: By little and by little*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Ellsberg, R. (2005, November 21). Five years with Dorothy Day. *America*, 193 (16), 8-10.
- Erickson, D. (2007, November). A developmental re-forming of the phases of meaning in transformational learning. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 58(1), 61-80. Retrieved March 25, 2008, from Academic Search Elite database. Persistent link to this record <http://0search.ebscohost.com/topcat.switchinc.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=afh&AN=27329880&site=ehost-live>
- Etzioni, A. (1996). *The new golden rule: Community and morality in a democratic society*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Evans, S. (1997). *Born for liberty*. New York, NY: Free Press Paperbacks.
- Fitzwilliams, C.C. (2009). *A unity of contraries: Dorothy Day and the "no-alibi" rhetoric of defiance and devotion*. (Ph.D. Dissertation). Duquesne University.
- Forest, J. (1986). *Love is the measure: A biography of Dorothy Day*. New York, Paulist Press.

- Forest, J. (2011). *All is Grace: A Biography of Dorothy Day*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.foss
- Foss, S.K. (2009). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and practice (4th ed.)*. Long Grove, IL: Wave Press, Inc.
- Foss, K.A., & Foss, S.K. (1983). The status of research on women and communication. *Communication Quarterly*, 31, 195-204.
- Foss, K.A., & Foss, S.K. (1989). Incorporating the feminist perspective in communication scholarship: A research commentary. In K. Carter & C. Spitzack (Eds.), *Doing research on women's communication: Perspectives on theory and method* (pp. 65-91). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Foss, K.A., & Foss, S.K. (1994). Personal experience as evidence in feminist scholarship. *Western Journal of Communication*, 58, 39-43.
- Foss, S.K., Foss, K.A. (1988). What distinguishes feminist scholarship in communication studies. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 11, 195-203.
- Foss, S.K. & Griffin, C. (1992). A feminist perspective on rhetorical theory: Toward a clarification of boundaries. *Western Journal of Communication*, 56, 330-349.
- Foss, S.K. & Griffin, C. (1995). Beyond persuasion: A proposal for an invitational rhetoric. *Communication Monographs*, 62, 1-18.
- Friedman, M.S. *Martin Buber: The Life of Dialogue*. New York, NY: Harper Torchbook, 1960.
- Gee, J.P. (1992). Discourse analysis. In M. LeCompte, et. al. (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (chapter 6). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Gibson, D. (2012, November 14). Saint Dorothy Day? Controversial, yes, but Bishops push for canonization. Religion News Service via Huffington Post Religion, 1-3. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/11/14/saint-dorothy-day-controv_n_2133584.html
- Gillespie, N.A. & Mann, L. (2004). Transformational leadership and shared values: The building blocks of trust. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(6), 588-607.
- Golway, T. (2012, December 7). The case of St. Dorothy says more about the sad state of political discourse than it does about Catholic 'strategy.' *Capital New York*, 1-4. <http://www.capitalnewyork.com/article/politics/2012/12/6796131/case-st-dorothy-says-more-about-sad-state-political-discourse-it-do>

- Goodnight, G.T. & Olson, K.M. Shared power, foreign policy, and Haiti, 1994: Public memories of war and race. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 601-34 (2006). Retrieved October 14, 2007 from PsycINFO database.
- Goodstein, L.D. & Lanyon, R.I. (1999). Applications of personality assessment in the workplace: A review. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13, 3.
- Goody, J., Gavin, M., Johnson, P. D., Frazier, M.L., & Snow, D.B. (2009). In the Eyes of the Beholder: Transformational Leadership, Positive Psychology Capital, and Performance. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 15 (4), 353-367.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (2008). *The Servant as Leader*. Westfield, IN: The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.
- Griffin, L. M. The rhetoric of historical movements.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 38 (1952): 184-188.
- Haidt, J. & Hetherington, M.J. (2012, September 17). Look How Far We’ve Come Apart. The New York Times, Opinion Pages.
<http://campaignstops.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/17/look-how-far-weve-come-apart/>
- Haladay, D. J. (2006). *Integral leadership: A case study of Dorothy Day’s leadership of the Catholic Worker Movement*. (Ph.D. Dissertation). Fielding Graduate University.
- Half the Sky Movement: Turning Oppression into Opportunity Worldwide:
<http://www.halftheskymovement.org/pages/movement>
- Hamington, M. (2007, Summer). Two leaders, two utopias: Jane Addams and Dorothy Day. *NWSA Journal*, 19 (2), 159-186.
- Harris, A. & Spillane, J. (2008). Distributed leadership through the looking glass. *Management in Education*, vol. 22(1), 31-34.
- Hennacy, A. (1954). *Autobiography of a Catholic anarchist*. New York, NY: Catholic Worker Books.
- Hilmes, M. (2007). *Only connect: a cultural history of broadcasting in the United States*, (2nd. Edition). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Hoffman, M. F. & Cowan, R. L. (2010). Be careful what you ask for: Structuration Theory and work/life accommodation. *Communication Studies*, 61(2), 205-223.

- Holben, L. & Chatfield, K. (2010). *All the Way to Heaven: A Theological Reflection on Dorothy Day, Peter Maurin, and the Catholic Worker*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (2000). *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (2000). *All About Love: New Visions*. New York, NY: William Morrow and Company.
- Hughes, R. T. (2005). *The vocation of a Christian scholar: How Christian faith can sustain the life of the mind* (Revised Edition). Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Hyre, M. (1990, Winter). The scholars must become workers so the workers may become scholars: By three Catholic workers. *Religion and Intellectual Life*, 7, 12-25.
- Isaac, C., Griffin, L., & Cames, M. (2010). A qualitative study of faculty members' views of women chairs. *Journal of Women's Health*. 19, 533 – 546.
- Jablonski, C. J. (2000). Dorothy Day's contested legacy: "Humble irony" as a constraint on memory. *Journal of Communication & Religion*, 23, 29-49.
- Jackson, C., (2009). Potential Extensions to Transformational Leadership Models. *Academic Leadership Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 1-11.
- Jamieson, K.H., and Kohrs Campbell, K. "Rhetorical Hybrids: Fusions of Generic Elements." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68.2 (May 1982): 146–57.
- Jasinski, J. "The Status of Theory and Method in Rhetorical Criticism." *Western Journal of Communication* 65.3 (Summer 2001): 249–70.
- Jaskyte, K. (2004). Transformational Leadership, Organizational Culture, and Innovativeness in Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 15 (2), 153-165.
- Johannesen, R. L. (2008). *Ethics in Human Communication* (6th ed.) Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Johnson, K.E. *Meeting when he asks to be met: Public religious discourse in the Catholic Worker*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Purdue University, 2009.

- Jordan, P. (2013, January 23). 'The Gospel Is Hard' A Friend Remembers Dorothy Day. *Commonweal: A Review of Religion, Politics & Culture*, 11-14.
- Jung, D.I. & Sosik, J.J. (2002). Transformational leadership in work groups: The role of empowerment, cohesiveness, and collective efficacy on perceived group performance. *Small Group Research*, 33(3), 313-336.
- Kietzmann, J., Hermkens, K., McCarthy, I., and Silvestre, B. (2011, May-June). Social media? Get serious! Understanding the functional building blocks of social media. *Business Horizons*, Volume 54, Issue 3, pp. 241-251.
- Kileup, J.E. (2004). *Pilgrim leadership: Dorothy Day and the Benedictine way of transformation*. Ph.D. Dissertation). Gonzaga University.
- Klenke, Karin (Ed.) *Qualitative research in the study of leadership*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing, 2008.
- Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krupa, S. J. (2001, August 27). Celebrating Dorothy Day. *America: The National Catholic Weekly*,
http://www.americamagazine.org/content/article.cfm?article_id=1140
- Kuhnert, KW & Lewis, P. (1987, October). Transactional and transformational leadership: a constructive/developmental analysis. *The Academy of Management Review*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 648-657. Retrieved:<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=03637425%28198710%2912%3A4%3C648%3ATATLAC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-C>
- Larson, C. (Writer/Director/Producer). (2007). *Dorothy Day: Don't call me a saint*. [DVD]. Los Angeles, CA: One Lucky Dog Productions.
- Lozano-Reich, N., & Cloud, D. (2009, April). The uncivil tongue: Invitational rhetoric and the problem of inequality. *Western Journal of Communication*, 3(2), 220-226.
- Lunsford, A. A. (2010). *Reclaiming rhetorica: Women in the rhetorical tradition*. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press.
- Lyon, A. & Mirivel, J. C. (2011). Reconstructing Merck's Practical Theory of Communication: The ethics of pharmaceutical sales representative-physician encounters. *Communication Monographs*, 78(1), 53-72.

- Makinen, M. & Kuira, M. W. (2008, July). Social media and postelection crisis in Kenya. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, Vol. 13, no. 3., pp. 328-335.
- Mandell, Barbara & Pherwani, Shilpa (2003). Source Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Transformational Leadership Style: A Gender Comparison. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(3): 387-404.
- Marwick, A.E. (2010, July 7). I tweet honest, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience. *New Media & Society*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 114-133.
- Maurin, P. (1984). *Easy essays*. Chicago, IL: Franciscan Herald Press.
- McCarthy, D. (Ed.) *The heart of Catholic social teaching: Its origins and contemporary significance*. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2009.
- McCulloch, C. (1984). The problem of fellowship in communitarian theory: William Morris and Peter Kropotkin. *Political Studies*, XXXII, 437-450.
- McNamee, L. G., Peterson, B. L., & Pena, J. (2010). A call to educate, participate, invoke and indict: Understanding the communication of online hate groups. *Communication Monographs*, 77(2), 257-280.
- Mehlretter, S.A. (2007, October 15). If we speak, what shall we say? The Catholic Workers: Rhetoric of spiritual pacifism during World War II. *NCA Religious Communication Association*, Conference Paper.
- Mehlretter, S. A. (2009, March). Dorothy Day, the Catholic workers, and moderation in religious protest during the Vietnam War. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 32, 132.
- Merriam, S.B. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and expanded from case study research in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- McCarthy, C. (2009, December 9). The outsider. *The Nation*. <http://mstprix.dev.thenation.com/doc/19801220/mccarthy/>.
- Miller, D. H. From one voice a chorus: Elizabeth Cady Stanton's 1860 address to the New York State Legislature. *Women's Studies in Communication* 22.2 (Fall 1999): 152. *Expanded Academic ASAP*. Thomson Gale. Alverno College Library. 11 Feb. 2007 <http://0find.galegroup.com.topcat.switchinc.org:80/itx/infomark.do?&contentSet=IACDocuments&type=retrieve&tabID=T002&prodId=EAIM&docId=A58361797&source=gale&srcprod=EAIM&userGroupName=switch_acl&version=1.0>.

- Miller, W.D. (1987). *Dorothy Day: A biography*. Harper & Row Publishers, San Francisco, CA.
- Morris, A.D. & Staggenborg, S. (2004). "Leadership in social movements" in *The Blackwell companion to social movements*, Snow, D.A., Soule, S.A., Kriesi, H. (eds.) Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Moszkowicz, D. (2007). Michael Walzer's justification of humanitarian intervention: Communitarian? Cosmopolitan? Adequate? *Political Theology*, PT 8.3, 281-297.
- Mountford, M. (2005). The journey toward transformational learning in a statewide doctoral program. *Innovative Higher Education*, 30(3), 213-227. Retrieved March 26, 2008, doi:10.1007/s10755-005-6305-4
- Muijs, D., Harris, A., Lumby, J., Morrison, M., & Sood, K. (2006, February). Leadership and leadership development in highly effective further education providers. Is there a relationship? *Journal of Further & Higher Education*, 30(1), 87-106. Retrieved March 26, 2008, doi:10.1080/03098770500432096.
- Muth, C. (2012, December 24). Sainthood Cause for Dorothy Day met with mix of emotions. *Catholic News Service*, 1-2, <http://www.americancatholic.org/news/news2print/newsreport.aspx?id=4040>
- Neuendorf (2002). *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nielson, K., Randall, R., Yarker, J. & Brenner, S. (2008). The effects of transformational leadership on followers' perceived work characteristics and psychological well being: A longitudinal study. *Work & Stress* 22 (1), 16 – 32.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminist approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Northouse, P.G. (2007). *Leadership: theory and practice* (4th edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- O'Connor, J. (1988, July). Dorothy Day and gender identity: The rhetoric and the reality. *Horizons*, 15, 7-20.
- O'Connor, J. (1991). *The moral vision of Dorothy Day: A feminist perspective*. New York, NY: Crossroads.
- Otterman, S. (2012, November 26) In hero of the Catholic left, a conservative Cardinal sees a saint. *New York Times*, [A1http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/27/nyregion/sainthood-for-dorothy-dolan-cardinal-timothy-dolan.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0&pagewanted=print](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/27/nyregion/sainthood-for-dorothy-dolan-cardinal-timothy-dolan.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0&pagewanted=print)

- Ozaralli, N. (2003). Effects of transformational leadership on empowerment and team effectiveness. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(6), 335-344.
- Parry, K.W. and Proctor-Thomson, S.B. (2002). Perceived Integrity of Transformational Leaders in Organisational Settings. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 35, 75-96.
- Pattison, M. (2012, November 13). US bishops endorse sainthood cause of Catholic Worker's Dorothy Day. *Catholic News Service*.
<http://www.catholicnews.com/data/stories/cns/1204800.htm>
- Pauli, B. (2009). Faith, authority, and anarchism: Dorothy Day as leader and believer. *Conference Papers: Southern Political Science Association, Annual Meeting*, 1-22.
- Pear, R. (2013, February 1). Birth control rule altered to allay religious objections. *The New York Times*, pp. A1.
- Pedraza, S. (2007). Political disaffection in Cuba's revolution and exodus. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Pillai, R. & Williams, E. A. (2004). Transformational leadership, self-efficacy, group cohesiveness, commitment, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(2), 144-159.
- Piehl, M.(2006) *Breaking bread: the Catholic Worker and the origin of Catholic radicalism in America*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Prindeville, D-M. (2004, March). Feminist nations: A study of Native American women in southwestern tribal politics. *Political Research Quarterly*, vol. 57, no.1, pp. 101-112. Retrieved:<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=10659129%28200403%2957%3A1%3101%3ANASON%3E2.0.CO%3B2-F>
- Riano, P. (1994) Gender in communication: Women's contributions. In P. Riano (Ed.), *Women in grassroots communication: Furthering social change* (pp.30-44). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Riegle, R. G. (2003). Dorothy Day: Portraits by those who knew her. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Ritchie, J. & Ronald, K. (2001). *Available means: An anthology of women's rhetoric(s)*. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press.
- Roberts, N. L. (1984). *Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker*. State University of New York Press, New York, NY.

- Rosenberg, A. & Hirschberg, J. (2009, July). Perception from text and speech. *Speech Communication*, Vol. 51, Issue 7, pp. 640-655.
- Rosser, V. (2003). Faculty and staff members' perceptions of effective leadership: Are there differences between women and men leaders? *Equity & Excellence in Education*. 36(1), 71-81.
- Rubin, R., Munz, D. & Bommer, W. (2005). Leading from within: The effects of emotion recognition and personality on transformational leadership behavior. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 48 (5), pp. 845 – 858.
- Ruiz, V., Du Bois, E.C. (2000). *Unequal sisters: A multicultural reader in U.S. women's history*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Rush, K. L. (2008). *Dorothy Day and the matter of authority: A rhetorical analysis*. (M.A.Thesis). The University of Georgia.
- Salzberg, S. (1995). *Lovingkindness: The revolutionary art of happiness*. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications.
- Saunders, W. The process of becoming a saint. *Catholic Education Resource Center*. <http://www.catholiceducation.org/articles/religion/re0136.html>.
- Sessions, D. (2012, December 3). How to campaign for sainthood. Grassroots supporters, lobbyists, miracles, politics—even for the most venerated Catholics, it's a long climb. *Newsweek*, 1-5. <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2012/12/02/how-to-campaign-for-sainthood.html>
- Shih, H. (2004, July). Extended technology acceptance model of Internet utilization behavior. *Information & Management*, Volume 41, Issue 6, pp. 719-729.
- Shirky, C. (2011, January/February). The political power of social media: Technology, the public sphere, and political change. *Foreign Affairs*, pp. 1-12.
- Silver, N. (2012, December 14). In public 'conversation' on guns, a rhetorical shift. *The New York Times: FiveThirtyEight*, Nate Silber's Political Calculus. <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/12/14/in-public-conversation-on-guns-a-rhetorical-shift/>
- Simons, H. W. Requirements, problems and strategies: A theory of persuasion for social movements. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 30 (1970): 1-11.
- Simons, H.W. From post-9/11 melodrama to quagmire in Iraq: A rhetorical history. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* Vol. 10, NO. 2, pp. 183-194 (2007). Retrieved October 14, 2007 from PsycINFO database.

- Skeat, J. J., & Perry, A. A. (2008). Grounded theory as a method for research in speech and language therapy. *International Journal Of Language & Communication Disorders*, 43(2), 95-109.
- Smith, C.R. (1993). The problem with writing on rhetorical charisma, power, and spirituality. *The Journal of Communication and Religion*, p. 83-97.
- Sowards, S.K. & Renegar, V.R. (2006). Reconceptualizing rhetorical activism in contemporary feminist contexts. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, pp. 57-74.
- Stein, M.S., Walker, J.R., & Forde, D.R. (1994, March). Setting diagnostic thresholds for social phobia: considerations from a community survey of social anxiety. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, pp. 408-12.
- Stepanova, E. (2011, May). The role of information communication technologies in the "Arab Spring:" Implications beyond the region. PONARS Eurasia, Policy Memo No. 159, pp. 1-6.
- Stewart, C. A functional approach to the rhetoric of social movements. *Central States Speech Journal* 31 (1980), 298-305.
- Stewart, C., Smith, C. & Denton, R. *Persuasion and social movements*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 2001.
- Stockwell, T. (2009, October 5). Dorothy Day's invitational rhetoric: A feminist rhetorical analysis of extemporaneous encounters. Submitted to Professor Patricia Sullivan, PhD, State University of New York at New Paltz (*unpublished*).
- Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss, S. (2012, October 14). Six reasons American political polarization will only get worse. The Huffington Post.
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/stevenstrauss/megatrend-six-reasons_1965182.html
- Sullivan, P.A., & Goldzwig, S.R. (1995). A relational approach to moral decision making: The majority approach in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 81, 167-180.
- Sullivan, P.A., & Turner, L.H. (Fall 1999). The Zoe Baird spectacle: silences, sins, and status. *Western Journal of Communication* (63) 4, 413-432.

- Sullivan, J.L. *Letter to Dorothy Day, May 20, 1935*. The Dorothy Day – Catholic Worker Collection, held by Marquette University, within the Special Collections / University Archives.
- The United Nations / Global Issues / Women, <http://www.un.org/en/globalissues/women/>
- Thorn, W.J., Runkel, P.M. & Mountin, S. (eds.) (2001). *Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement: Centenary essays*, Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press.
- Trochim, W. & Donnelly, J.P. *Research method knowledge base* (3rd ed.). Mason, OH: Atomic Dog Publishing, 2007.
- Tully, S. (2007, December 21). What barriers hold women back? *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(17), B4-B4. Retrieved March 25, 2008, from Academic Search Elite database.
- United States of America Bureau of Labor and Statistics, <http://data.bls.gov/>.
- United States of America Library of Congress, <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/index.html>.
- U.S. Department of State, Office of Global Women's Issues: <http://www.state.gov/s/gwi/>
- Weber (1990). *Basic content analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications
- Whipps, J.D. (2004). Jane Addams's social thought as a model for pragmatist-feminist communitarianism. *Hypatia* vol 19, no. 2, 118-133.
- Wildemuth, B. M. *Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science*. Westport, Conn.: Libraries Unlimited, 2009.
- Wilson O'Reilly, (2012, November 29). Bill Donohue: Dorothy Day, Cardinal Dolan obviously Republicans. *Commonweal Magazine*, 1-3. <http://www.commonwealmagazine.org/blog/?p=22130&print=1>
- Winters, J.S. (2012, December 5). To hell with it – Dorothy Day. *National Catholic Reporter*, 1-14, <http://ncronline.org/blogs/distinctly-catholic/hell-it-dorothy-day>
- Women for Women International, <http://www.womenforwomen.org/news-women-for-women/women-for-women-critical-issues.php>
- Woodward, G.C. & Denton, Jr. (2004). *Persuasion and influence in American life*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

- World Bank / Gender/Thematic Data: [http://datatopics.worldbank.org/gender/thematic data](http://datatopics.worldbank.org/gender/thematic-data)).
- Young, Paula (2004). Leadership and Gender in Higher Education: a case study. *Journal of Further & Higher Education*. 28(1): 95-106.
- Zaimov, S. (2012, November 28). Cardinal Dolan calls for Sainthood of 'Liberal Hero' Dorothy Day. *The Christian Post*, 1-3.
[http://global.christianpost.com/news/cardinal-dolan-calls-for-sainthood-of-liberal hero-dorothy-day-85724/print.html](http://global.christianpost.com/news/cardinal-dolan-calls-for-sainthood-of-liberal-hero-dorothy-day-85724/print.html)
- Zhang, Y. & Wildemuth, B.M. Qualitative analysis of content, p. 308-319, in *Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science*. Wildemuth, B.M. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited, 2009.
- Zinn, H. (2005). *A people's history of the United States: 1492 – Present*, New York, NY: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
- Zwick M. & Zwick L. (2012, December 29). What the New York Times did not say about Dorothy Day. *The Houston Catholic Worker*, 1-4.
[http://cjd.org/2012/12/29/what-the-new-york-times-did-not-say-about-dorothy day/](http://cjd.org/2012/12/29/what-the-new-york-times-did-not-say-about-dorothy-day/)