

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

College of the Liberal Arts

DEFENDING DARFUR:

THE PROBLEMS AND POTENTIAL OF SPEAKING FOR OTHERS

A Dissertation in

Communication Arts and Sciences

by

Cynthia D. Boes

Copyright 2010 Cynthia D. Boes

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

May 2010

The dissertation of Cynthia D. Boes was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Thomas W. Benson
Edwin Erle Sparks Professor of Rhetoric
Head of the Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
Thesis Adviser
Chair of Committee

J. Michael Hogan
Professor of Communication Arts and Sciences

Jeremy Engels
Assistant Professor of Communication Arts and Sciences

Linda Selzer
Associate Professor of English and American Studies

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School.

Abstract

Since Linda Alcoff wrote “The Problem of Speaking for Others” in 1991, the literature of speaking for others has developed slowly and sporadically. Theorists and critics in various disciplines have used her conclusions as well as those of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak to create a broader understanding of various ways of “speaking” and the ways in which a speaker can help and hurt the spoken-for while speaking. In this dissertation, I analyze the literature of speaking for others along with other relevant scholarly literature to help make clearer what it means to speak for others and why and how such an act could benefit the spoken-for. One of the major concerns in speaking for others is the way the speakers’ identity affect the message. Identity theories and whiteness studies help to explain what it is about the speakers’ identity that is significant for their message and possible ways to overcome potential problems that identities might place on the message. Rhetorical theory also directly relates to speaking for others, showing what it means to speak and how the message can be most effective. In this dissertation, I synthesize speaking for others, identity, and rhetorical literature to create a stronger understanding of the benefits and problems inherent in the act of speaking for others. In order to understand how these conclusions affect speaking, I apply them to ten popular culture texts which speak for Darfur and their speakers. I analyze the identities of the speaker, spoken-for, and audience to show how identities affect the messages. I also analyze the messages to demonstrate ways that speakers for Darfur are able to help the Darfurian victims as well as ways in which their messages might hinder an audience from taking action to help the Darfurian people.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1. Why Speak for Others?	1
The origin of scholarship on speaking for others.....	5
Speaking for others: Theories and case studies	9
The importance of rhetoric: Identification and silence	20
The importance of identity: Concepts.....	28
The lack of dialogue: A case study	36
Defining speaking for others.....	44
Chapter preview	49
Chapter 2. A Framework for a Criticism of Speaking for Others.....	52
The spoken-for as subaltern and silenced	52
Identifying the speaker.....	64
Identifying the speaking act	67
Rhetorical criticism of speaking for others	71
Chapter 3. The Situation for Speakers for Darfur.....	74
The conflict	75
The Darfuri people.....	96
Speakers' identities	104
The audience	128
Chapter 4. A Rhetorical Criticism of Speaking for Darfur.....	134
What it means to <i>speak</i> for Darfur	134
Being <i>for</i> Darfur.....	161
Darfurians as <i>Others</i>	172
Chapter 5. Conclusion.....	182
Notes	191
Bibliography.....	205

Chapter 1. Why Speak for Others?

In 1994, the African country of Rwanda found itself in the midst of chaos. Between April and July the Hutu militia murdered between eight hundred thousand and one million Rwandans. Despite the enormity of the massacre, most people not directly affected by the civil war either did not care enough about the genocide to pressure legislators into taking action or did not know how to help the Rwandan people. Human rights organizations such as Human Rights Watch and the Red Cross along with missionaries to Rwanda who had been evacuated from Rwanda in early April spoke out about the genocide occurring in Rwanda, but their words did not persuade those in a position to act to help the Rwandans.¹ Samantha Power, in her analysis of genocide in the twenty-first century, found that the world was aware that genocide was occurring but had no will to change it. Citizens did not place political pressure on the government and so the government chose the safer route of talking about genocide rather than acting to stop it.² During the Rwandan genocide, the Clinton administration heard updates about the atrocities that were occurring, but “no group or groups in the United States made Clinton administration decisionmakers feel or fear that they would pay a political price for doing nothing to save Rwandans. Indeed, all the signals told them to steer clear.”³ As a result of this world-wide inaction, those innocent men, women, and children were murdered without anyone stepping in to help them. When people do not speak out against genocide or other problems such as war, famine, discrimination, or environmental degradation, the outside world is less likely to learn about the problem and to have an opportunity to aid the victims.

When people do speak out about the problems of the world, if they are unable to make those in positions of power care, the problems persist. In 2000, a conflict emerged with similarities to the devastation of the Rwandan Civil War. Rebels in Darfur, the western region of Sudan, began to protest their lack of representation in Khartoum. In 2003, the Sudanese government sent militia into Darfur to fight against rebel fighters who were attacking government posts. The militia, called the Janjaweed, began to systematically destroy the civilian population in Darfur.⁴ They burned villages, raped women, and murdered men, women, and children throughout the region. For the first year of the Darfur conflict, the world outside Sudan ignored information regarding the attacks on the civilian population just as they ignored the situation in Rwanda. However, in 2004 people in the United States as well as countries throughout the world began to use public forums to inform the United Nations (UN) and their own governments and citizens about the plight of the people of Darfur. Since that time, humanitarian aid has been sent to the people throughout the region to lessen their suffering somewhat, but the violence has not ended. The problem is not that people are not speaking out about the issue but that the government has not instituted policies to lead to permanent change to end the conflict. Because the situation has continued for six years, a closer look at the rhetorical choices the advocates of Darfur are making is warranted to see if those choices have failed to persuade the audience to pressure the government to take action.

The potential problems that emerge when a person from one social group represents the interests of a group to which s/he does not belong have led scholars from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds to evaluate the phenomenon they have entitled “speaking for others.”⁵ Scholars of rhetoric, philosophy, women’s studies, intercultural

studies, English, whiteness studies, and media have all studied speaking for others and taken multiple stances regarding the concept. Some merely describe what speaking for others involves, without passing judgment; some analyze who should speak and who should not; some criticize the act of speaking for others as a selfish act which takes power from the other; and some discuss what it means to be an other. While each argument has the potential to increase knowledge and understanding about speaking for others, three problems persist in the scholarship. First, the absence of dialogue among scholars who study speaking for others reduces our ability to thoroughly understand what it means to speak for others in a productive way. Second, the lack of a clear definition of speaking for others hinders any attempt to use the works of more than one scholar since many scholars use the same terms for what could be different issues. Third, the critics of speaking for others fail to take into consideration the scholarship of rhetoric and identities which directly pertains to and could help increase an understanding of speaking for others.

In order to analyze the act of speaking for others more systematically, I evaluate the way people speak for others in popular culture to reach a mass audience. This means of speaking for others is generally more visible than other methods such as legislation, interpersonal representation, personal action, and public protest. The phrase “speaking for others,” if taken literally, indicates a verbal message, but the act of speaking for others in popular culture can also be written, visual, experiential, or a variety of the four together. Musicians, writers, directors, actors, talk show hosts, and others in the public eye use their visibility and the media to promote the issues with which they are concerned and persuade their audiences to become aware, understand, agree, and take action. While

some evidence suggests that the media makes an impact on the audience's political choices, specifically foreign policy, that evidence does not show whether the media affects foreign policy or if foreign policy affects what the media shows.⁶ Because media messages are polysemic, different audiences receive the messages in different ways. Some use the information to affect their political choices, others use the messages only to legitimate their own political points of view.⁷ The benefit of speaking for others in popular culture, therefore, is public awareness and residual effects rather than more visible, immediate changes. Despite fostering a less immediate and concrete change than speaking for others in legislation, speaking for others in popular culture carries a different kind of power. Speaking for others to a mass audience has the potential to shape the way that society at large thinks about and understands the spoken-for. If speakers do not represent the spoken-for in a fair or acceptable way, the spoken-for could be subject to additional hardships from the audience. In the following chapters, I use the current scholarship on speaking for others together with work in rhetoric and identity studies to examine speaking for the displaced persons in Darfur through popular culture. First, I synthesize the current literature on speaking for others with rhetoric and identity literature in order to create a more coherent understanding of speaking for others in popular culture. I then use the conclusions drawn from the synthesis of literature to do a rhetorical criticism of nine speaking for others' texts in order to show positive and negative ways to speak for others.

The origin of scholarship on speaking for others

On March 4, 1972, philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Michel Foucault recorded a conversation that brought the issue of speaking for others to the attention of scholars. Deleuze summarizes Foucault's work by saying that his theoretical analyses of institutions makes him "aware of the necessity for confined individuals to speak for themselves."⁸ Foucault claims that while the intellectual was once required to speak the truth in the name of those who could not speak the truth, currently "the masses," including those who in the past were forbidden to speak the truth, are able to understand and express themselves.⁹ Deleuze praises Foucault for being the first to show "the indignity of speaking for others."¹⁰ The two then argue that oppressed people, in this case prisoners, have the capacity to speak for themselves.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak responds to this article and other works by postmodern critics. Spivak critiques Foucault and Deleuze for their lack of clarity and precision when discussing subjectivity and representation. She argues that in Deleuze's and Foucault's analysis, "two senses of representation are being run together: representation as 'speaking for,' as in politics, and representation as 're-presentation,' as in art or philosophy."¹¹ By ignoring the difference between representation as a political act and representation as an artistic or philosophical means of presenting reality in a different way, Spivak argues that Foucault and Deleuze do not deal with the problems inherent in speaking for others. In addition, Spivak argues that when the philosophers make arguments regarding the masses, they themselves are, in fact, speaking for others and, at the same time, denying they are doing any such thing. In their arguments, "the intellectuals represent themselves as transparent" and therefore are not subject to any

interpretation or critique, but Spivak claims they are still representing the oppressed and taking no responsibility for that representation.¹² Foucault and Deleuze argue that those who were forbidden to speak the truth – the oppressed masses – can speak and know their social condition.¹³ Spivak, on the other hand, questions whether a subaltern other can speak. A subaltern is a person of inferior rank as “expressed in terms of class, caste, age, gender and office or in any other way.”¹⁴ Spivak argues that those whom others identify as subaltern and who then speak out on their own behalf are not truly subaltern.¹⁵

Subalterns – and subaltern women, specifically – are often the object of examination and protection by those who can speak. Rarely, however, are they subjects who are able to speak for themselves. Spivak does not then propose that others speak out for the subaltern, however. Instead, specifically addressing subaltern women, she proposes that feminists interested in participating in antisexist work learn to speak *to* subaltern women instead of speaking *for* them in order to unlearn female privilege.¹⁶ By doing this, Spivak argues, intellectuals will not reinforce the oppression of the subaltern.

Four years after Spivak’s article, Linda Alcoff, a professor of Philosophy and Women’s studies, continued the conversation about speaking for others. Alcoff argues that when people speak for others, the speaker’s social location, which she equates with social identity, can influence the way the audience interprets the message. Social identity is “the individual’s knowledge that he belongs to certain social groups together with some emotional and value significance to him of this group membership.”¹⁷ That social location, Alcoff claims, “has an epistemically significant impact on that speaker’s claims and can serve either to authorize or disauthorize one’s speech.”¹⁸ Alcoff maintains that “certain privileged locations are discursively dangerous” because a person’s identity can

negatively affect the spoken-for.¹⁹ The danger increases when privileged people speak for less privileged people because, she argues, a speaker is not in control of the positionality, location, or context in which s/he speaks, and “certain contexts and locations are allied with structures of oppression.”²⁰ When a person identified with the oppressors speaks for the oppressed, the power structure remains with the oppressor, rather than changing to benefit the oppressed. While Alcoff critiques those who would speak for others, she also argues that the loss of control a speaker has over his or her social location does not take away accountability to act when a person witnesses injustice occurring to others. Instead of claiming that speaking for others is always a negative act, Alcoff claims that social location influences, but does not necessarily determine, meaning and truth. She encourages those who would speak for others to consider four practices, or four “interrogatory processes . . . to help evaluate possible and actual instances of speaking for.”²¹ Speakers are to (1) closely analyze, and fight against, the impetus to speak, (2) determine how their social location and context affect the message, (3) realize their own accountability and responsibility, and (4) evaluate the probable or actual effects of the words. Finally, instead of completely absenting themselves from any advocacy for the oppressed, Alcoff suggests that speakers use Spivak’s suggestion of speaking *to*, where the person who speaks “neither abnegates his or her discursive role nor presumes an authenticity of the oppressed but still allows for the possibility that the oppressed will produce a ‘countersentence’ that can then suggest a new historical narrative.”²² Thus the speaker is still speaking for others, but more competently because they have spoken *to* the other as well.

When taken together, the individual contributions of Foucault and Deleuze, Spivak, and Alcoff provide a preliminary understanding of who is the other and what it means to speak for him or her. Spivak and Alcoff each show the danger to the spoken-for when a person speaks for that other without considering whether the other needs to be represented and, if so, what type of representation the other needs. The person who does not interrogate his or her social position risks further disempowering and silencing the spoken-for. Foucault and Deleuze, Spivak, and Alcoff create the groundwork for the evaluation of speaking for others, but unfortunately the interdisciplinary dialogue ends with them. A dialogue between disciplines on the subject of speaking for others might enable critics to consider the act from various points of view. Currently, the scholars who analyze speaking for others do so using their own disciplinary scholarship and assumptions to come to conclusions regarding how speaking for others does and should work. Some scholars cite Spivak and/or Alcoff, but most do not use any other speaking for others literature. Scholars cover the same issues that others have already covered, such as problems of not understanding the group being spoken for, without considering previous work that discuss those issues. Other scholars, such as Perreault, contradict the other research without specifically addressing the arguments made previously. By themselves, these analyses are sufficient to understand a specific aspect of a specific act of speaking for others but do not relate to any other speaking acts. When, however, scholars from one disciplinary background use any applicable conclusions of scholars from other disciplines in their own analysis, a broader view of speaking for others emerges and conclusions can be made to apply to speaking for others as a category rather than for a specific speaking act.

Speaking for others is not the only subject that suffers from this lack of dialogue. Many other issues that scholars discuss have similar problems and others will have these problems in the future as well. The reason that the issue of speaking for others needs a more comprehensive dialogue that leads to clearer understanding is because of the potential real-world application of the more theoretical discussions. The study of speaking for others is, ostensibly, meant to benefit those who face hardships such as poverty, war, famine, or others that threaten their lives. If the scholarship does not provide a clear understanding of what it means to speak for others in the most beneficial way, then it is not fulfilling that purpose and those who wish to speak for others have no resources to assist them in forming their messages and improving the lives of those needing their help the most. In the following chapters, I take the scholarship of Foucault and Deleuze, Spivak, and Alcoff and synthesize it with the scholarship of others who have addressed speaking for others with their own specific disciplinary foci. The conclusions that result from this synthesis can be added to identity and rhetorical studies and then used to apply to speaking for others as a whole. Then, I apply those conclusions by doing a rhetorical criticism of various acts of speaking for Darfur.

Speaking for others: Theories and case studies

While the lack of interdisciplinary dialogue limits current scholarship regarding speaking for others, the literature that exists provides a starting point from which to begin to understand the problems and potential of speaking for others. Scholars have focused their analyses of speaking for others in many ways, and by drawing them together we can begin to see what speaking for others can be. In this section I introduce various concepts

found in the literature that addresses speaking for others. Scholars doing theoretical work, including Raka Shome, Robert Shuter, Mary Garrett, Dolores Tanno and Fred Jandt, often find speaking for others to be negative and hurtful to the group being spoken for when speakers do not interrogate their own social locations and do not consider their own motivations and assumptions.²³ Yet these scholars have neglected to consider the scholarship of textual analysts, who have come to a variety of conclusions regarding the potential of speaking for others based on specific cases. Patricia Geesey finds that speaking for others can be problematic when the speaker focuses on the wrong issues; Jeanne Perreault argues that speaking for others often is beneficial and unproblematic; and Brian McGee argues that new definitions must be made before speaking for others can be declared unproblematic.²⁴ Charles Stewart and Andrew Lakritz provide textual analyses which are descriptive rather than prescriptive in their analysis and in their descriptions, allowing readers to make their own judgments.²⁵ When the various works are drawn together to create a scholarly dialogue, a clearer and more complete understanding of what it means to speak for others emerges.

Intercultural Communication scholars Dolores Tanno and Fred Jandt write that, when people speak for others and especially when researchers speak for their subjects who are members of a different culture, they have a tendency to unfairly represent that culture.²⁶ Some researchers do not understand the cultures and traditions of the group they are studying. They either study groups to learn more about their own groups, which Communication scholar Mary Garrett warns against, or, as Communication scholar Robert Shuter warns, they attribute more difference to another culture than may exist and assume that theirs is the position that all others want to have.²⁷ The lack of knowledge of

other cultures causes researchers to make wrong assumptions about the group and therefore critics misrepresent that group.²⁸

In order to avoid this misrepresentation, researchers – and advocates – should be aware of their own social location and the way that location affects their representation of the spoken-for. When critics enter another culture, they encounter an ethical problem, “how, and with what authority, can ‘I’ ever speak for ‘others’?”²⁹ The act of speaking for others is not only an issue of helping a disempowered group, but also a statement about power:

Of seeing how our ability to represent the “oppressed” itself might be caught in larger geopolitical relations of imperialism that might allow a white American to easily move to some third world country to study it, but that do not allow a parallel movement of someone from the third world to come to the West.³⁰

So, while the act itself may be immediately beneficial, it could also reinforce the power structures that keep the empowered and disempowered in their respective social locations. An awareness of this imbalance of power is the first step to changing those power structures.

Additionally, advocates should strive to understand the culture and traditions on their own merits and not as opposed to the advocates’ own cultures and traditions. Folklorist Susan Ritchie describes the way that folklorists’ desire to present the folklore of the disenfranchised to the public led them to “ventriloquist strategies of representation.”³¹ Unlike the researchers condemned by Garrett and Shuter, these researchers purposefully set out to help the disenfranchised, and yet while they did not necessarily misrepresent the groups for which they spoke, they did not question whether

the silenced groups wanted their voices heard: “The mutism of cultural groups is only a problem within a world where the ultimate aspiration is to have a voice.”³² Ritchie warns scholars to make sure that they not only faithfully represent the groups, but also are careful to not betray the context of the folklore. Thus, we can see that advocates need to immerse themselves in the culture they are representing and, once they immerse themselves, openly assess the other. They can then decide whether they have the right to speak out for the other in an acceptable way.

This problem of social location and speaking for others is one that affects scholars writing about speaking for others as much as it affects those who speak. These scholars place themselves in the position of a judge of those who speak for others. They make judgments about how a speaker best represents another group despite the fact that the scholars are no more a part of the group than the speaker is. Many scholars who study the way that speaking for others and identity work together include a discussion of their own subject position. Andrew Lakritz discusses his authority as a writer and how his position as a white, heterosexual, Jewish man affects his writing. Leslie Bow discusses the duality involved in being female (feminist) and Asian American. Scholars’ various subject positions play a part in their identity as a person and as a critic, but that social location does not exclude them from speaking about those who speak for others. It does necessitate that the scholars understand their own position and work to move past that in understanding the phenomenon of speaking for others. Communications scholar Nick Couldry argues that “clarifying the space from where we speak as ‘selves’ is the best way for reformulating the basis on which we can claim to speak in ‘the third person.’”³³

After Zora Neale Hurston left the South to obtain her PhD, she returned to speak about Southern Blacks but found that, although she was once a member of their community, she no longer belonged. According to Lakritz, some critics argue that the social distance created between Hurston and her community keeps her from being able to speak about them objectively in her novels.³⁴ Lakritz suggests, however, that her new social location gives her the ability to step back and see her community as an outsider after having experienced it as an insider.³⁵ Her previous and current social locations compel her to analyze the way her location bears upon her writing. Those who belong to multiple groups also find difficulty in speaking for themselves. Bow argues that even when she does speak for one of the multiple groups to which she belongs, there is a tension between them.³⁶ How she represents herself as a female as opposed to how she represents herself as an Asian-American can create problems for either group. All speakers and critics are distanced from their subject, whether that subject is a group to which they belong or not. The critics who analyze those who speak for others have argued that the social distance between different social identities is not insurmountable. The key to representing the points of view of others is to focus on the group being spoken for and their needs and to never assume one has the right to speak. Instead, speakers should approach their act of speaking with a skepticism about the ideologies they are expressing as they represent others to an audience. That skepticism “seeks at all times to keep the voice that describes ‘others’ *loyal* to the questioning of the voice that seeks to figure out its ‘self.’”³⁷ As speakers question their right to speak and are willing to withdraw that right, and also speak sensitively and self-reflexively, speaking for others becomes a more positive act for the speaker and spoken-for.

The previous theorists of speaking for others focused on the speaker and the spoken-for, but other critics add the critical third group, the audience, to demonstrate how speaking for others is beneficial or detrimental to the spoken-for. When speakers speak to an audience predisposed to judge the spoken-for harshly, they need to be careful not to focus on those issues that make the audience more disposed to judge the spoken-for harshly. Furthermore, the speaker should be careful not to reinforce negative stereotypes to the detriment of the spoken-for. In Patricia Geesey's analysis of autobiographies of North African women arguing on behalf of the North African women in France, she finds that those who speak for others can affirm negative stereotypes when examples are given that are not representative.³⁸ *Le Voile du Silence*, an autobiography by Djura, a North African woman living in France, contains emotionally charged examples of hardships North African women experience that are not representative of the experiences of all North African women and not viewed as hardships by some but are consistent with negative stereotypes that the French already have about North African culture. Geesey argues, "A desire to focus attention on the injustices suffered by women all over the world must be tempered with an awareness of the existing cultural, religious, class, and geographic specificities that affect women's lives."³⁹ Geesey claims that some aspects of North African culture that Westerners view as hardships are accepted and embraced by the North African women. Djura's autobiography shows her point of view but not that of the entire culture. Yet the audience could view her story as a representation of the point of view of all North African women. Geesey also analyzed *L'Honneur et L'amertume: Le Destin Ordinaire d'une Femme Kabyle* by Nedjma Plantade, who transcribed the story of Algerian-Kabyle immigrant Louisa Azzizen. Geesey finds Plantade's work more useful

than Djura's in part because her audience "is not a Western reader avid for a description of women's oppression. Louisa Azzizen's story is meant to further the cause of tolerance and understanding between first-generation North African immigrants and their offspring."⁴⁰

The difference in audience and purpose that Geesey describes provides an understanding of one type of speaking for others which should be avoided. Speakers can harm the spoken-for if they do not focus their message on their specific audience. If the speaker's motivation for speaking is to make internal changes to the oppressed group he or she should direct the message to the oppressed group. These messages may be able to induce action within the group to help them become more self-supporting or to change key factors leading to their oppression. If a speaker presents that same message to a socially empowered audience with power to increase or decrease that oppression, however, the message may be received as evidence of the spoken-for's difference and unworthiness, reinforcing the "otherness" and leading to no change in situation and increasing oppression.

Alcoff's warning against speaking for others without examination has been challenged by several critics. Alcoff claims that speaking for and speaking about are the same act with the same consequences. Communication scholar Brian McGee deals with Alcoff's argument directly when he argues that W.E.B. DuBois' response to the Ku Klux Klan's anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic remarks bypasses some of the problems of speaking for others that Alcoff introduces in her article. McGee argues that speaking *about* Jews and Catholics is different than speaking *for* them. McGee agrees that speaking *for* can be problematic, but argues that Alcoff should not conflate speaking *for*

and speaking *about*.⁴¹ The difference is that speaking *for* implicitly denies the other is able to speak for themselves by speaking *instead of* them while speaking *about* describes the situation of the other without denying their ability to speak. McGee argues that speaking *about* is preferable to speaking *for*, especially since the third option is not speaking at all. Nick Couldry also argues that the differences between speaking *for* and speaking *about* should be maintained. He claims that speaking *for*,

is incompatible with claiming for ourselves the right to speak and be heard without interference. . . . [While] to deny ourselves the possibility of speaking *about* others leads to incoherence on an epistemological level: for there is no possibility of making interesting claims about myself, which does not at some level entail claims about ‘others’ as well.⁴²

Couldry’s argument goes beyond McGee’s in that he does not accept speaking *about* as an unproblematic option to speaking *for*. Instead, Couldry argues that those who speak *about* the other need to maintain skepticism: “such a sustained practice of skepticism is the only thing that licenses ‘us’ to speak ‘about’ others.”⁴³

Perreault’s study of speaking for chain gang prisoners also expands Alcoff’s arguments regarding speaking for others. While Perreault does not directly cite Alcoff or discuss her findings, she finds that a person with social power speaking for others can be beneficial when the speaker aligns the message with the audience instead of with the subject. Her analysis of an autobiography written by a European American man from the North who was imprisoned on a Southern chain gang shows the message as ineffective because it focuses more attention on the Northern European American man who wrote it than on the situation of chain gang prisoners as a whole. On the other hand, she argues

that a book by John Spivak, another European American man from the North, was effective because it sheds light on Southern chain gangs and compares their freedom with the freedom of all Americans. In addition, because of his social location as a person with social power Langston Hughes states that Spivak includes some facts that ““only a white man could have obtained.””⁴⁴ Thus Alcoff’s argument that social power is problematic can be true, but also true is that the social power of a speaker can help the spoken-for by providing access to information to which the groups own members may not have access.

Not all scholars present arguments that judge whether the speakers are benefiting or harming the spoken-for. Some scholarship describes the situation and the manner of speaking involved in the act of speaking for others. While this description does not provide a tool to measure the positives and negatives of speaking for others, it does help to provide a more general critique of the act of speaking for others. Charles Stewart, a scholar of rhetoric, claims that those who present what he calls “other-directed protest” are fulfilling an ego function, but he does not judge whether that ego function is problematic.⁴⁵ Stewart’s article appeared in the same year as Alcoff’s and, while he uses the work of other rhetorical scholars without considering Spivak’s or Alcoff’s articles, his article provides some evidence that helps strengthen Alcoff’s claims. Stewart builds on Richard Gregg’s argument that the focus of “self-directed protest,” or protest in which an individual speaks out on behalf of their own group, fulfills the ego function of enhancing or building up the individual’s self-hood.⁴⁶ Stewart claims that those who present other-directed protest also fulfill an ego function and he shows that the difference between self- and other-directed protest is that other-directed protest boosts the ego of the speaker rather than the spoken-for.⁴⁷ The rhetoric of self-directed protesters shows that their egos

have been ignored, their identities are strong and virtuous, and the enemy is ignorant and/or malicious.⁴⁸ Other-directed protesters are not oppressed or dispossessed in society, and so the rhetoric emphasizes their own power and goodness.⁴⁹

In Stewart's analysis of the protest of the pro-life, anti-apartheid, and animal rights movements, he finds that protesters focus on four aspects of their own identity. Stewart's article complements Garrett's argument that critics study other cultures to learn more about their own when he argues that the first aspect protesters focus on is the affirmation of their self-esteem: "The rhetoric of all three other-directed movements was replete with stories of victories and successes through aggressive educational, legislative, legal, and investigative efforts that had achieved worldwide attention and raise the consciousness of millions."⁵⁰ Stewart's argument, when added to Alcoff's warning that social identity can have unintended affects on the spoken-for, shows the potential dangers when speakers extol the status of their organizations in order to place themselves at the height of social movement hierarchies and enhanced self-identities. Stewart states that other-directed protest movements recognize the victimization of the spoken-for, but instead of focusing on the spoken-for, speakers focus on their own victimization as movement members.⁵¹ Speakers refer to incidents in which they suffer for the movement and express anger but also pride as a result of that suffering. This analysis provides examples that parallel and complement Garrett's and Alcoff's argument and, when put together, the three arguments present a more complete understanding of speaking for others.

Lakritz's analysis of speaking for others also provides examples to help contrast and enhance Alcoff's arguments. Lakritz analyzes James Agee's and Walker Evans's

book *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men*, which documents the lives of Southern sharecroppers. In the book, Agee is critical of his own subject position and refuses to speak for the southern sharecroppers. In the 400 pages of the book, Agee does not tell about the lives of the sharecroppers, only about his experiences with them. He struggles to de-authorize and disaffiliate himself from his own identity, the identity which, Lakritz argues, gives him the ability to write the book in the first place.⁵² Just as John Spivak was able to get information on chain gangs that would not be available to African-Americans, Agee had access to money and publishers that the sharecroppers would not. Agee's argument follows Alcoff's practice of fighting against the impulse to speak, and yet Lakritz finds that while Agee does not speak for the sharecroppers, the sharecroppers are not speaking for themselves either. Instead, Agee writes a book about himself, in which he narrates an encounter between the privileged and the disadvantaged and, as McGee warned, the voice of the oppressed is still not heard.

Each of the critics and theorists of speaking for others adds a critical element to understanding how this type of speaking act works. Taken individually, each provides insight into one specific area of speaking for others, but when looked at as a whole, a clearer understanding of speaking for others in general emerges. By synthesizing the current arguments in a way that shows the way they relate to each other, the conclusions can be used to explain not only the specific act being analyzed, but also the way speaking for others works in general.

The importance of rhetoric: Identification and silence

The study of rhetoric spans centuries, from the time of the classical rhetoricians to modern rhetorical scholars. Rhetoric has held a marginalized position, however, since Plato described it as a “knack producing gratification and pleasure” and equated it with cookery, makeup, and sophistic.⁵³ To this day, rhetoric remains “on the periphery, at the service of other, more fundamental standards.”⁵⁴ The same can be said in the study of speaking for others. Rhetorical theorist Kenneth Burke’s theories of identification and division in rhetoric can increase our understanding of speaking for others by showing how speakers can create a bridge between themselves, the audience, and the spoken-for. The scholarship on the rhetoric of othering is another area of study that can increase understanding of speaking for others by showing the ways others are created rhetorically, and how others can be made non-other. Additionally, rhetoric and composition scholar Cheryl Glenn and other rhetorical scholars’ work on silencing could also enrich the scholarship of speaking for others by helping us see when speaking for others is needed and when it should be avoided. Ignoring the field of rhetoric has limited the extent to which scholars understand speaking for others, and adding Burke’s theories of identification, the rhetorical scholarship on othering, and the rhetorical scholarship on silencing to the scholarship, helps explain how speaking for others functions rhetorically.

Identification is a key concept that helps explain speaking for others. One of the main critiques against speaking for others is that the speaker’s identity is different from the spoken-for and therefore the speaker’s identity can hinder any representation of the spoken-for.⁵⁵ While those who speak for others are speaking for groups to which they do not belong, Burke argues that every human being is necessarily divided from every other

human being because, “if men were wholly and truly of one substance, absolute communication would be of man’s very essence.”⁵⁶ Burke’s analysis suggests that each individual is an actor who takes on roles available to a member of a group. Thus identity is absent until the actor attempts to connect with others using rhetoric.⁵⁷ The extent to which one individual is divided from others varies but the fact of division does not. Thus, when individuals speak for anyone other than themselves, they speak for others.⁵⁸ Rhetoric bridges this gap of division by creating identification between people, and Richard Gregg argues that identification is necessary for communication to be effective.⁵⁹ The extent to which the individual identifies with others is the extent to which a person will be accepted as being consubstantial, or substantially one, with the other: “To identify A with B is to make A ‘consubstantial’ with B.”⁶⁰ Identification brings people together so that the centrality of the individual becomes subordinate to sharing between people through empathy and sympathy.⁶¹ While this identification does not completely make one person the same as another, speakers do not need to show themselves as exactly the same as the audience. Because identification with an audience can create a connection between the needs and wants of the speaker and audience, speakers can make the message more persuasive by focusing on those aspects of their own identity which are most salient to the audience. In addition, speakers have the opportunity to show ways in which the spoken-for and audience are consubstantial. By creating a connection between the three groups involved, speakers create messages that connect with the audience.

Scholarship in rhetoric not only shows the way identification works but also explains the extent to which groups have been divided from others. Many who speak for others do so by trying to move the line between *us* and *them* so that the *us* includes the

spoken-for. This movement of the line between *us* and *them* is vital to counteracting the negative aspects of being other. Chantal Mouffe argues that in a liberal democracy, a line always separates *us* and *them*.⁶² This duality creates a tension when it comes to human rights, because those on the outside are incommensurable with the inside.⁶³ In times of war or strife, societies unite on a common enemy at which they can point their anger. This is most successful when society has a “visible, point-to-able form of people with a certain kind of ‘blood’” as in the case of the Jews during the Holocaust.⁶⁴ Rhetorical scholar Robert Ivie argues that the other becomes alien or “enemies of universal truths and univocal values” when concerned individuals have not presented a rhetoric of identification.⁶⁵ If the rhetoric identifies the other as enemy, it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to garner support to aid them. The rhetoric of identification promotes democracy and peace between groups previously divided, but shared humanity is not enough of a connection between *us* and *them* to connect the two groups and so the speaker needs to do more to get the audience to stop seeing the other as enemy. A danger of presenting the other as an enemy and evil is that war and death become possible solutions to rid us from the other.⁶⁶ The rhetoric of the “evil other” is “a constant distraction from seriously addressing the underlying causes of terrorism” or in the case of Darfur, murder and destruction, “and readjusting political expectations accordingly.”⁶⁷ Ivie argues that speakers counter the rhetoric of evil by keeping the boundaries between *us* and *them* fuzzy and therefore making similarities and points of identification easier to locate.⁶⁸ This does not mean that all differences should be eliminated. While emphasizing similarities is important, Mouffe argues that the elimination of differences would not allow any judgment of good or bad differences. Instead, she argues that differences

should be brought “to the fore, to make them visible so that they can enter the terrain of contestation.”⁶⁹ When speaking for others, then, speakers should move the border between *us* and *them* so that the spoken-for becomes part of *us*. Speakers also need to counter any previous rhetoric of evil in order to identify the similarities between the audience and spoken-for while at the same time acknowledging and contesting differences. Understanding how others are created and the ways to avoid creating division between audience and spoken-for will help to keep the audience willing to come to the aid of the spoken-for.

In order to identify themselves with the spoken-for and audience, speakers should be more aware of differences between their own culture and the culture of the spoken-for. The differences between cultures can affect the message being given. Starosta and Coleman argue that interethnic speakers have the opportunity to soothe interethnic differences because through the message, “the audience forms impressions about that speaker’s culture, its goodwill, its interest in future relations, and its sense of common cause of solidarity in the face of common challenges.”⁷⁰ When speakers represent a group other than the audience, they can help minimize difference between the two groups through their messages, but only if they understand who both groups are.

While the rhetorical concepts of identification and othering can help us to understand the relationship between the speaker, the spoken-for, and the audience, the study of silence and silencing by scholars of rhetoric can help us understand whether speakers should be or need to be speaking. Silence is “a specific rhetorical art,” according to Glenn, which is every bit as important as speech.⁷¹ Some societies expect silence from subordinate members. Adults tell children that they are to be seen and not heard and some

have argued, “Silence gives grace to woman—though that is not the case likewise with a man.”⁷² In some societies, silence is not just expected, but forced: “one party simply cannot voice his or her complaints or points because the other party insists on speaking within a different language game or genre of discourse.”⁷³ Silence can be a tool of the powerful, who sit in silent judgment over the weak, or a punishment of the weak, not allowed to express their own words. Rhetorical scholar Rosa Eberly’s analysis of Andrea Dworkin’s book *Mercy* shows that when people are not allowed to speak for themselves the potential for misrepresentation increases. Dworkin argues that when critics discuss her work, “She is not given the chance to speak in her own voice.”⁷⁴ When a person is willing and desires to speak, those who speak for them harm them by taking away that power. Dworkin claims that she is not only silenced, but misrepresented and “erased, maligned, ridiculed in violent and abusive language” because she is a politically dissident, female writer.⁷⁵ When empowered members of society do not listen to the oppressed, those members silence the oppressed. This silencing leaves the oppressed in doubt and unsure about their futures.⁷⁶ In addition, by speaking from a position of power, the speaker stifles the voices of the oppressed by not allowing their less powerful voices to be heard. Spivak argues that those who speak and know their position are not truly subaltern. Thus, to silence those who do know their condition and wish to speak risks keeping them subaltern and taking any power they do possess. In these cases, advocates should work to make the voices of the group members heard instead of adding their own, unwanted and unneeded voices.

Not all oppressed groups are necessarily silenced, however. Those oppressed group members that speak out on their own behalf are sometimes denied access to an

audience by those with social power. Oppressed group members who are aware of this problem are sometimes able to be heard by using rhetorical strategies that best fit the situation: “[Frederick] Douglass’s life and rhetoric . . . demonstrate . . . that [oppressed groups] can speak on their own terms; can take control of their rhetoric and can negotiate, resist, and even overturn the restrictions that they face.”⁷⁷ Jacqueline Bacon analyzes the rhetoric of African American men and women and European American women from 1820 to 1861. She finds that, while many times the empowered members of society did not listen to the oppressed, some of the oppressed utilized rhetorical strategies that made society pay attention to what they had to say. Each of the different oppressed groups employed different rhetorical strategies based on their own social location and the expectations of the empowered European American males who had the power to abolish slavery.

Identification occurs when the rhetor speaks the language of the audience by identifying his or her ways with the audience. Bacon’s analysis extends this argument in her conclusion that, while Audre Lorde argues that “the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house,” oppressed people can use the “tools of the oppressor” in order to empower themselves.⁷⁸ Those tools must be challenged, expanded and revised, however, in order to “reveal the limits of the master’s control of language.”⁷⁹ Her analysis shows that oppressed people can speak when they consider their audience’s prejudices and hesitation to listen and use rhetorical tools to bypass these problems. African American males would use the rhetorical tool of digressing to present philosophical arguments regarding the institution of slavery. The European American audience of the time only wanted to hear stories and anecdotes about slavery from the

African American males. European American male abolitionists then used the stories to philosophize about the institution of slavery. This limitation was unacceptable to many African American men who wanted to speak against the institution of slavery rather than just giving stories about their experience. In order to present their anti-slavery arguments without losing access to their audience, the African American men spoke against slavery as an institution, but would then apologize for digressing, thus appearing to follow the guidelines given to them while actually saying what they wanted to say. The three groups Bacon discussed – African American males, European American females, and African American females – found tools that allowed them to be heard. When African Americans spoke out against slavery, they showed their own intelligence and ability to reason. When European Americans attempted to speak for them, they added to the barriers that stopped the oppressed from being heard.

While rhetorical tools are available to allow the oppressed to be heard, some groups are not willing to employ them. Charles Braithwaite wrote a review of power and silencing in the communication discipline and found two warrants for silence. First, “Silence as a communicative action is associated with social situations in which the relationship of the focal participants is uncertain, unpredictable, or ambiguous.”⁸⁰ Secondly, “Silence as a communicative action is associated with social situations in which there is a known and unequal distribution of power among focal participants.”⁸¹ Thus, oppressed group members may refuse to speak for themselves when they are not certain of the consequences of speaking. Glenn acknowledges that at times, oppressed people make the conscious, strategic choice to be silent: “When Anita Hill used public silence, she also held power. Neither the white men on the [Senate] committee nor the

president of the United States knew what she knew. . . . But as soon as she spoke . . . the white male senators sat silently, judging her to be a liar.”⁸² Silence can thus be an act of active, political resistance in which the silent person retains control and ending that silence could mean further oppression.⁸³ Lester Olson finds that some people are silent because of past experiences of oppression. Either the silent have been punished with words, which makes them view words as punishment and therefore negative or the words of the silent have been punished thus making speaking out dangerous.⁸⁴ Regardless of the reason people silence themselves, those who make the choice to be silent rather than suffering shame or punishment at the hands of the empowered are the ones who could use the help of those outside their group to make their needs heard.

Dana Cloud’s analysis of the rhetoric of silence, which she defines as “a discursive pattern in which speakers gesture incompletely toward what cannot be uttered in a context of oppression,” also shows that oppressed groups sometimes make the conscious choice to remain silent.⁸⁵ Cloud’s subject E. O. Friday, a black man who experienced discrimination in the workplace, silences himself because of necessity and self-preservation rather than lack of ability to speak for himself. Cloud argues that Friday’s silence does not mean that he is content with the situation in which he finds himself. Rather, he silences himself in order that the problems he faces do not worsen.⁸⁶ In the case of individuals such as Friday, speaking for others can be a beneficial, if not essential, act since their lives and livelihoods are at stake. Should someone outside the workplace, a person in a position to be heard without threat of ramifications to Friday and his black co-workers, choose to speak on his behalf, things could change for him, and he may be able to find his own voice. Thus, speaking for others does not always mean

refusing to listen or stifling the voices of those who are weaker. Without taking into account that some groups cannot or will not speak for themselves while others can and should, the assumptions of those who unilaterally oppose speaking for others are incomplete and problematic themselves.

Rhetorical scholars provide an understanding of the way rhetoric affects who can speak and how they speak which will improve the understanding of speaking for others. With Burke's theories of division and identification, scholars of speaking for others can become more aware of the reasons for speaking and the ways in which those who do speak identify with the spoken-for and persuade the audience. The scholarship on the rhetoric of othering shows how divisions are formed and can be overcome. Additionally, the study of silence and silencing can help determine whether a group has been silenced externally, uses rhetorical strategies to be heard, or chooses silence as protection, scholars can ascertain whether those who are speaking for others are helping or hindering the spoken-for. The work of rhetorical scholars, when added to the work that has already been done on speaking for others, can enhance our understanding of what it means to speak for others and how persuasion works for the audience, the spoken-for, and the speakers, and therefore a more complete theory of speaking for others can emerge.

The importance of identity: Concepts

The inclusion of rhetorical scholarship in the literature of speaking for others helps to explain when advocates should speak for others and how best to help the spoken-for. When we add identity studies to that literature, we get a better idea of the way the identities of the three groups involved – the speaker, spoken-for, and audience –

influence the effectiveness of speaking for others. Those who speak for others have at least two groups with whom they identify. They must be able to demonstrate consubstantiality with the audience to whom they speak as well as identifying with the “spoken-for.” Identifying with the spoken-for allows the speaker to understand the needs of the spoken-for and represent them rather than their own group, while identifying with the audience in order to satisfy those needs. Identity studies show how the physical, social, racial, and cultural attributes of an individual are formed and can aid in understanding how one can identify with others. By applying identity studies to speaking for others literature, we can examine the relationship between the speaker and spoken-for in order to understand the extent to which a speaker really is speaking for others. Additionally, whiteness studies can help to explain Alcoff’s “discursively dangerous location” and the extent to which the whiteness of white Americans can harm black Africans.

Identities are socially constructed and always changing although many people fight to maintain a fixed identity. Eric Eisenberg states that each person is born with a “surround” or an environment that influences our lives.⁸⁷ Some of the effects of this surround “will occur consciously, but many others occur at the cellular level” and thus identity is both biologically and socially constructed.⁸⁸ Biological identities do not change, but the ways in which others respond to that identity can change even those things we “know to be true” about ourselves.⁸⁹ This identity change can be seen in the way that race has been defined over the last century – where Italians, Irish, and Jews in the United States shifted from being classified as black to white.⁹⁰ Thus, identities can be understood to be formed discursively as well as biologically. “The discursive approach

sees identification as a construction, a process never completed.”⁹¹ Identities are in a “state of continuous construction and reconstruction,” and therefore the inclination to place an individual who speaks for others in one rigid social identity and exclude them from another is problematic.⁹² Randall Lake argues that identity is a “dialectical site” where the tensions between essentialist, or biological, and conjunctural, or dialectic, identity come together.⁹³ His description of the two main characters in *Dances with Wolves* – Dunbar, Kevin Costner’s character, and Stands with a Fist, Mary McDonnell’s character – show this dialectical nature. Dunbar and Stands with a Fist inhabit the liminal space between what it means to be Native American and what it means to be European American. While both are essentially European Americans, they inhabit the Native American culture dialectically – Stands With a Fist lives with a Native American tribe and Dunbar becomes closely associated with the tribe and is friends with some of the tribal members. Lake argues that when Dunbar and Stands with a Fist go to speak against the oppression of the Native Americans, “they in a sense *are* (and are not) the other, which they do not construct but instead know via their lived experience of its (their) authentic traditions, their representational authority is validated.”⁹⁴ For Lake, then, intimate exposure to the culture of another group allows a non-member to take on, in part, the identity of that group.

While some identity scholars welcome the idea that identities are formed through discourse and are not the property of any one culture or group, others argue that the tendency to take on other identities can be problematic. Kathleen Roberts finds that European Americans attempting to take on Native American cultural practices through powwows do not do so harmlessly. She argues that, while European Americans take on

some aspects of the powwow and Native American identity, the “taking on” of those aspects does not make it an authentic cultural experience. Instead, the event is a “pseudocultural event” and “very different from powwows produced by Native Americans.”⁹⁵ Roberts calls this taking on of the identity of others “pernicious” and says the European Americans engage in this pseudocultural event because they believe they have the “‘right’ of individual expression.”⁹⁶ While claiming their rights of expression, the European Americans are damaging the Native Americans. Thus, while speakers can take on aspects of the identities of the spoken-for, the motivation for taking on the identity is very important, as is also apparent in the literature on speaking for others.

When advocates desire to benefit the other, they can sometimes become temporary members of the other. People from one social group can enter other groups primarily because of the fluidity of groups. According to self-categorization theory, individuals categorize social behaviors that are most relevant to their group, and those behaviors become in-group stereotypic and in-group normative.⁹⁷ The social categories created by group members generate social identities. Self-categorization theory can aid the study of speaking for others with its argument that “self-categorization is both social and dynamic: it is inextricable from and interacts within the social frame of reference. Change in either influences the other. Thus, there is a fluidity to group norms and self-categories.”⁹⁸ If the person speaking for others can exhibit stereotypical in-group behaviors in a way that the spoken-for finds acceptable, self-categorization theory suggests that speakers can share the identity of the spoken-for group, even if other characteristics differ from that group.

Despite the fluidity of identities, whiteness studies show that the difference between blackness and whiteness is significant and cannot be overlooked. Whiteness studies examine the way that whiteness, the dominant identity in the United States, overpowers other identities. This power of whiteness is one of the primary social locations against which critics of speaking for others warn. One of the reasons whiteness is dangerous is that many do not realize white privilege exists. Peggy McIntosh describes white privilege as a benefit that is carefully protected but not overtly expressed.⁹⁹ This “invisible knapsack of white privilege” allows white people to live their lives without experiencing numerous irritations experienced by the rest of American society. That privilege is visible, if one is aware and looking for it, in multiple forms, including schooling, work, and even entertainment. Richard Dyer analyzed *Jezebel*, *Simba*, and *Night of the Living Dead*, three films from 1938, 1955, and 1969 respectively, to locate the position of whiteness in cinema.¹⁰⁰ In all three he found certain levels of power and personality granted to the white characters that were denied characters of other races or ethnicities. Dyer argues that the way oppressed groups are represented in the media is a part of their oppression. Films throughout much of the 20th century praise whiteness and marginalize non-whiteness. Americans do not always see this marginalization, but while unaware of it, they still participate in the oppression by uncritically viewing the films

White privilege may be invisible to many, but is an attribute that those who are white guard closely. Some scholars claim that whiteness has an element of possessiveness. Cheryl Harris discusses the elements of whiteness that can be considered property.¹⁰¹ While whiteness is not physical to the extent that possessions and property are generally considered physical, Harris claims that whiteness inherently possesses traits

that exemplify traditional and modern theories of property and can therefore be defended legally as though it was a physical possession. She finds that property rights of disposition, use and enjoyment, reputation and status, and exclusion relate to whiteness. Thus, case law which attempted to define race were attempts to determine whether people with Black ancestry were entitled to the property of whiteness or not.¹⁰² George Lipsitz also describes whiteness as a possession.¹⁰³ He argues that since colonial times, European Americans have carefully institutionalized race in order to “create economic advantages through a possessive investment in whiteness for European Americans.”¹⁰⁴ This institutionalization of race allows a societal dichotomy that empowers European Americans monetarily, politically, and socially while preventing people of other cultural groups from enjoying those same privileges. While the possessive element of whiteness places white people in a more socially advantageous situation, that possession also separates a white person from any black people to whom they might speak. Whiteness is a visual property that entitles its bearer to certain social advantages, but its visual characteristics make it clearly separate from non-whiteness.¹⁰⁵ Thus when white people speak for non-white people, the visual nature of skin color can separate the speaker from the spoken-for.

Whiteness is not the property of a single group throughout history. Thomas Nakayama and Robert Krizek analyze the discourses of literature, surveys, and interviews and find that the way people describe whiteness shows how they see whiteness as powerful and scientific while the boundaries of whiteness actually alter throughout history.¹⁰⁶ Like all identities, whiteness is rhetorically constructed, allowing some cultural groups to become included under the privileges of whiteness and others excluded

at various points throughout history. Karen Brodtkin Sacks's description of Jews in the United States shows the way that the position of groups can change in society from one with little or no power to one with equal status of the dominant group.¹⁰⁷ While Jews in the U.S. were oppressed for many years, and would be considered a different "race" from most European Americans, after some time Jews were accepted as members of the "white race" while African Americans have been institutionally excluded from gaining the same rights and privileges.

Because of their continued exclusion from the privileges of whiteness, African Americans are more aware of the power of whiteness than other groups may be. bell hooks explains that whiteness has been informally studied by African Americans since the times of slavery in order that the slaves, and successive generations, could understand better the group dominating them.¹⁰⁸ hooks discusses the way that white students, confronted with the fact that black people watch white people with close scrutiny often are shocked. She attributes this shock to "racist thinking [that] perpetuates the fantasy that the other who is subjugated, who is subhuman, lacks the ability to comprehend, to understand, to see the working of the powerful."¹⁰⁹ This "racist thinking" may be one reason that European Americans or other empowered groups feel the need to take charge of the causes of the oppressed. If advocates think that the other cannot understand the way the powerful work, then they will also assume that the other cannot persuade the powerful to make societal changes. If those who speak for others begin to speak with these assumptions, they create the problems that Spivak, Alcoff, Geesey, and other critics of speaking for others warn against.

The power that comes with white privilege compels European Americans to be especially cautious before speaking for others, as their privilege is always present: a possession that can be interpreted by the audience as unlimited. Despite this privilege, however, the scholarship on identities shows that identities are variable and therefore the boundaries of whiteness are variable, as the example of the Jews in the United States shows, and those who have been socially oppressed are sometimes able to enter the empowered group. Studies of “white trash” in the United States also show that some groups that may be expected to enjoy the privileges of whiteness are instead excluded. Poor whites do not have the same social power as other European Americans and therefore are not included in the whiteness category.¹¹⁰ The boundary between whiteness and non-whiteness is fairly rigid, but those boundaries can be crossed. The excluded group cannot decide to cross boundaries, however. Only when those who have power allow the outsiders in are they considered white. White trash did not choose to be excluded and the Jewish Americans took many years before they were included. When a European American speaks for others, they should be aware of the privilege they carry with them because of their whiteness, and be sensitive to the way that their whiteness effects their speaking.

An understanding of identity is important for a more thorough understanding of speaking for others. By taking this body of literature into account, we can more thoroughly account for the way that social identity affects speaking for others. The work of scholars such as Alcoff who are concerned with the way that social identities affect the speaker and the spoken-for could benefit from identity studies which deal with what social identity is and the ways it changes and is manipulated. By understanding how

group and individual identities are formed and changed over times, scholars can better understand who the other is, and what it means to speak for them. Additionally, by focusing more attention on the ways that outsiders experience another culture in order to fairly represent them, as opposed to merely taking on certain aspects of a culture without really understanding them, we can more clearly understand how to speak for others in a way that more fairly represents the spoken-for. Identity studies enhance the work on speaking for others and putting the two together will make speaking for others scholarship more complete.

The lack of dialogue: A case study

Most scholarship on speaking for others does not consider rhetoric and identity scholarship and rarely considers other scholarship on speaking for others. The inclusion of rhetorical and identity theories as well as the other speaking for others literature could benefit scholars of speaking for others. This section is an analysis of Perreault's article on U.S. Northern white men speaking for prisoners on chain gangs in the South. Perreault argues that one of her subjects speaks for others in a more profitable way than another but the scholarship on speaking for others shows that that argument is problematic. While Perreault makes conclusions that do add to the general understanding of speaking for others, an addition of conclusions from other literature on speaking for others and the literature on rhetoric and identity could benefit those conclusions.

One of the texts Perreault analyzes, the book *I Am a Fugitive from a Chain Gang*, speaks for chain gang prisoners by telling of the life of its author, Robert E. Burns. Perreault argues that Burns's book, while ostensibly telling the story of prisoners' lives

on a chain gang in general, is actually a tale expressing his own experience as a Northern U.S., European American male on a chain gang. Burns separates himself from the other prisoners by emphasizing that he is not filthy and uncouth like the “hill billies” and not deserving of working alongside his fellow “Negro” prisoners.¹¹¹ Burns’s story makes the inequality in treatment between himself and other prisoners clear, but he does not analyze the chain gang system and the issues of power, class, and race found within the system. Instead, Perreault argues, Burns “reaffirm[s] the solipsism and the political ineffectuality of telling one’s own story” by describing his own success and courage at the expense of others.¹¹² Perreault also analyzes *Georgia Nigger*, a book by John Spivak. While Burns’s book is a story written by an actual chain gang member, Spivak comes at the story as an outsider, an observer and narrator telling the stories of others. His book takes a broader look at the system as a whole rather than focusing on an individual member of a chain gang. He covertly photographed documents and prison camps, and took notes from prisoners begging for help. He also extends the problem of chain gangs from being a problem for Southern African Americans on chain gangs to being a problem of the rights of all Americans and thus, Perreault argues, “Offers us a bridge across the brutal distance between self and other.”¹¹³ Perreault’s argument is drawn from a detailed and compelling comparison of the two accounts of life on a chain gang but could benefit from the broader view of the ways that speaking for others affects audiences. Other scholarship could help her see and identify other limitations or benefits of each speaker, especially in regards to those arguments against co-opting the voices of the powerless. Spivak, by making himself, a Northern U.S., European American male, the spokesman for Southern prisoners presents a potential threat to those for whom he speaks. While Perreault states

that Spivak is “telling a story that is fundamentally not his own,” she does not acknowledge the problems that may occur when telling the story of and speaking for others suggested by Alcoff, Spivak, and the other scholars of speaking for others.¹¹⁴

Other work on speaking for others directly relates to Perreault’s analysis and would help her and her readers better understand the problems and potential of speaking for others by Spivak and Burns. Linda Bell warns that even in fighting racism, people may be perpetuating it. Therefore, Bell argues, a person’s motivation in speaking for others is not sufficient when considering whether they are speaking for others in a way that benefits the other.¹¹⁵ Alcoff argues that a person’s social location, or social identity, “has an epistemically significant impact on that speaker’s claims and can serve either to authorize or disauthorize one’s speech.”¹¹⁶ When we consider that social identity is “the individual’s knowledge that [s/]he belongs to certain social groups together with some emotional and value significance to him[/her] of this group membership,” we can deduce that the social location of an individual is not limited to the groups to which s/he identifies, but also includes the groups to which the audience would assign him or her.¹¹⁷ If the audience places negative emotional and value significance on a certain group membership and places a person speaking for others within that group, they may respond negatively to any representation that speaker gives of a completely separate group. For example, if those in charge of the Southern prison system viewed Northern men as enemies and former conquerors, then any attempt by Spivak to assist them and change their system would be seen as intrusive and hostile. As Spivak represents Southern chain gang prisoners, the social identity the audience of his book attributes to Spivak may or may not negatively reflect on, not only Spivak, but also the prisoners he attempts to help.

Alcoff goes on to argue that the social location is not only epistemically salient; it also potentially reinforces the oppression of the spoken-for. Thus, using Alcoff's argument, we can argue that Spivak's social identity as a Northern U.S., European American male could serve to impact negatively the chain gang prisoners.

Geesey's arguments could also benefit Perreault's conclusions. Geesey encourages speakers to resist the temptation to speak for others to a hostile or prejudiced audience and instead only speak for themselves to the groups to which they belong. In her analysis of women speaking for North African women, she finds that by publishing stories about North African women in France to a Western audience without placing the stories in their necessary cultural contexts, North African writer Djura affirms negative stereotypes about North African women in a way that many North African women resist.¹¹⁸ Because of these types of representations, the women being spoken for "fight a daily battle to prove that it is not 'France' that has 'liberated' them, but rather the women themselves who have struggled within their own culture as well as within French society to impose themselves as subjects acting of their free will."¹¹⁹ Thus the women are further oppressed by being presented as helpless victims who need to be rescued when in fact they are perfectly capable of fighting their own battles. In the same way, Spivak may be "liberating" a group that is already working to liberate itself. Worse, his attempts to help may exemplify Stewart's analysis that other-directed protestors focus on themselves and the good they do rather than focusing on the spoken-for.¹²⁰ Perreault reports that Spivak did not go to the South "to discover things he did not know, but rather to document and authenticate the information he had already gathered through his research."¹²¹ Perreault argues that this increases Spivak's authority and right to speak for others. However, it

could also be argued that, with a preconceived notion of what he would find, Spivak does not seek to discover what means the oppressed use to create their own freedom. By speaking for the Georgia prison system to the rest of the nation, and indeed the rest of the world, Spivak made the chain gang prisoners in Georgia appear helpless, further reinscribing their status as victims. The chain gang prisoners Spivak spoke for may have been helpless, but in view of the literature demonstrating the ways speaking for others can silence a group, her assumption that his speaking is a necessarily positive act needs more explanation and evidence to be acceptable.

Scholarship on speaking for others can also help to explain the way that group membership affects the way people speak for others. Perreault praises Spivak without considering the extent to which he harms the chain gang prisoners, but also disparages Burns without considering whether his story is valid. Geesey warns that even those who are members of the groups they represent may misrepresent that group.¹²² By speaking of his own experience, which is vastly different from that of the other prisoners, and by not dealing with issues of race, he did cause the kinds of problems she warned about. On the other hand, no one person contains every characteristic that is representative of a group. Groups are made up of a variety of people with a variety of subject positions and characteristics who identify with groups based on the characteristics they find most salient.¹²³ While Burns may be far from the “prototypical” chain gang prisoner, he is still a chain gang prisoner and thus he is not misrepresenting himself by giving his story as he lived it. Therefore, while Burns’ story may not have been the type of story Perreault finds representative of life in a chain gang, his is one story among many stories. Every chain gang prisoner has a unique experience and any story told by a prisoner would represent

his own point of view and ignore problems that are salient to the experiences of other prisoners. Sandra Harding states that many individual stories work together to describe a group rather than a single “true” story.¹²⁴ The problem would come if Burns claimed his experience was typical of life in a chain gang, but since Perreault argues that in his autobiography, Burns actively separated himself from other prisoners, we can assume that he did not try to generalize his experience. Perreault does not consider Burns’ story to be a valid representation of the chain gang system as a whole and does not allow for different representations of a group and therefore dismisses it without considering it to be one of the many stories that help his audience, the American public, to understand everything that makes up the group.

Without an understanding of the work on speaking for others in different disciplines, Perreault’s analysis does not create an understanding of the act of speaking for others in the way a more thorough analysis would. Her criticism does shed light on her specific subjects of analysis, yet even that understanding is limited without treatment of speaking for others literature. She hinders the potential dialogue and increase in knowledge by not addressing other pertinent work done on speaking for others. By no means should Perreault agree with the other literature on speaking for others; some of it may apply and some others of it may be proved wrong by her analysis. By addressing that literature, however, she could either refute claims or add to the theories of others. Instead, her analysis has no clear relationship to other studies of speaking for others. This problem is widespread throughout literature which discusses speaking for others. In the same way that Perreault’s analysis suffers by not considering the work of other scholars, the body of literature on speaking for others suffers by not considering other theories and

analyses of speaking for others. Scholars who make arguments in order to understand more generally the way that speaking for others works in specific situations would do well to open their analyses to speaking for others in general. In this way we could understand the benefits and problems that come with speaking for others in various ways and, potentially, help those who wish to speak for others by providing them with a framework to speak so that they help rather than harm those for whom they speak. As it stands currently, however, scholars are making little contribution to those struggling to right society's wrongs and those who would turn to the scholarly literature would find no clear solutions for the problems they encounter.

Ignoring other related literatures is also limiting to the understanding of speaking for others. Perreault's argument that Burns distances himself from other chain gang prisoners and is not a typical chain gang member can be understood with Burke's theory of identification. Burns was, in a physical sense, a chain gang prisoner. Perreault does not argue that he was not a physical prisoner; instead she argues that his writings distanced him from other prisoners. Therefore we can say that the distance was not physical but rhetorical. Burke argues that persuasion happens when the rhetor speaks the language of the audience "by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, *identifying* [the speakers] ways with [the audience]." ¹²⁵ Thus, the way a person speaks, the language in which s/he chooses to speak, is an indication of who his or her audience is. Burns's rhetoric identifies him as divided from the prisoners and as consubstantial with the free, European American audience he addresses. Perreault argues that Burns does not truly represent the experience of chain gang prisoners, but her argument is based on his rhetoric. While Burns may in fact have had the same experiences as the rest of the

prisoners, he chose to identify himself with those who do not share his identity as prisoner. Burke argues that people are necessarily different, or divided, from one another because otherwise “there would be no need for the rhetorician to proclaim their identity.”¹²⁶ Burns had the opportunity to proclaim his identity because he was necessarily different than and divided from both the prisoners and his audience. He chose to identify with his audience rather than his fellow prisoners.

Perreault’s analysis of Burns and Spivak would also have benefited from an understanding of the fluidity of groups and the lack of strict social boundaries which are analyzed in identity theories. Her argument is that Burns was a chain gang member, but did not represent the group as much as he represented himself, while Spivak was not a chain gang member, but represented them well. Identity theories show that Burns was not a prototypical member of chain gangs and thus was excluded by other chain gang members or excluded himself.¹²⁷ Spivak on the other hand may have exhibited some behaviors that were more accepted by the chain gang members and thus may have been included in their group and given access to more privileged information.¹²⁸

In this dissertation I draw together the arguments regarding speaking for others and synthesize the arguments the various scholars in their various disciplines have made, so that a scholarly conversation and framework for analysis emerges. This conversation leads to a more complete understanding of how speaking for others can be done in a way that benefits more than it harms the spoken-for. Just as Cloud uses the conceptual conclusions of theoretical arguments by philosophers, rhetoricians, and other scholars to guide her rhetorical criticism, I use conceptual conclusions drawn from the literature on speaking for others, identities and rhetorical criticism to add to rhetorical criticism

methods in order to analyze situations in which people are speaking for others in legislative contexts and popular culture. In this way, I can provide a more complete understanding of the benefits and problems of speaking for others so that those who want to speak for others can benefit from the strengths and weaknesses of others who have come before them.

Defining speaking for others

When the literature on speaking for others is synthesized in a way that creates an interdisciplinary dialogue, a workable definition of speaking for others also emerges. Speaking for others is a dynamic process in itself with different types, goals, and foci that go into it. Because of this, each writer who uses the term uses it with their own specific definition in mind, but do not make clear to the reader what that definition is. Thus, those writers who cite Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Alcoff and their conclusions regarding who can speak and the problems of speaking for others risk misapplying the citations if they do not verify whether their own understanding of what it means to speak for others aligns with or departs from Spivak's and Alcoff's meanings and whether the type, goal, and focus is the same.

The most general definition of speaking for others is the act of speaking on behalf of a group to which the speaker does not belong. This general definition comes from three definitions similar enough to create a central, unproblematic definition for scholarship.¹²⁹ Perreault defines it as “a writer in one subject position [speaking] . . . for people in another.”¹³⁰ Stewart uses the term other-directed protest rather than speaking for others, but his definition is similar in that other-directed movements “(1) are created,

led, and populated primarily by those who do not perceive themselves to be dispossessed and (2) they are struggling for the freedom, equality, justice, and rights of others rather than selves.”¹³¹ Alcoff describes “speaking for others” as speaking on behalf of those who are unlike the speaker.¹³² In each case, the idea is of a person representing a group that is different from his or her own in some way. Additionally, as each scholar delves into their research, it becomes clear that the critique of the act of speaking for others generally focuses on those who speak on behalf of a less privileged group. Perreault’s spoken-for are chain gang prisoners; Stewart’s spoken-for groups are the unborn, animals, and Black South Africans; and Alcoff clearly states in her article that speaking for others is often on behalf of the less privileged. Those with power generally speak for themselves and those with similar social power to the oppressed more often speak for themselves. Thus we could say speaking for others is the act of speaking on behalf of a group that is less privileged than the speaker’s own group.

This general definition spans most of the literature. Yet, because of the different types, goals, and foci, one scholar’s use of the term may differ from others. The three words in the phrase “speaking for others” each have specific meaning which help clarify what it means to speak for others. *Speaking* in speaking for others carries with it the assumption of presenting a public message of protest with the purpose of aiding a group. Alcoff’s example of Rigoberta Menchu is a Guatemalan woman speaking out for 33 native groups in her country. Her message is an oral message; however other types of speaking also fit in the definition of *speaking*. Perreault’s and Geesey’s texts are both in written form, but they are public and clearly protest the situation of chain gang prisoners and North African women. Public messages can be visual, as in print advertisements,

television shows, movies, graffiti, or photo essays. Experiential messages can also be speaking. Video games and role-playing exhibits would fit into this type of speaking for others. Finally, speaking can be fiction or nonfiction. Some speakers use real life experiences, while others let fictional characters tell a story to the audience that is a more generalized account of the experience of the spoken-for. Each of the types is speaking for others when the message is public and the speaker purposefully speaks on behalf of a group.

The size of the audience of a message is another important consideration when evaluating speaking for others. While the act can be described as speaking whether given to three people or three million, the responsibility of the speaker changes. The larger the audience spoken to, the greater responsibility the speaker has in representing the spoken-for. While speakers have a responsibility to represent the spoken-for fairly no matter how large the audience, those who speak to larger audiences have more opportunity to change public opinion on the topic and to potentially initiate change. Therefore, speakers to large audiences should take more care to learn as much about the spoken-for as they can.

The literature on speaking for others also helps to focus on what it means to speak *for* others. Alcoff conflates speaking *for* and speaking *about* others because, she argues, the two are difficult to distinguish from one another. McGee's separation of the two concepts helps to explain what it means to speak *for*. McGee claims that DuBois' response to the attack by the Klan against Jews and Catholics is speaking *about* the Klan's anti-Catholicism and anti-Semitism rather than speaking *for* Jews and Catholics. DuBois does not claim to represent the interests of the Jews and Catholics, but rather critiques the Klan's arguments.¹³³ McGee claims speaking *for* implicitly denies the other

can speak, but speaking *about* leaves some room for the other to speak for themselves. He acknowledges that this distinction is slippery and difficult to distinguish in practice, but that this slipperiness does not mean a distinction does not exist. I would argue that some problems occur when one speaks *about* the other; nevertheless, the distinction proves useful when determining the extent to which a person should speak *for* others. Because of this distinction, however, speaking *for* others should be analyzed separately from speaking *about* others. The goals of speaking *for* are also important to consider. Whereas speaking *about* is for the purpose of providing information about a group, speaking *for* is for the purpose of persuading the audience to change their point of view towards the spoken-for and possibly to take action to help them.

Speaking *for* should also be understood as being different than speaking *with*. Speaking *with* includes “addressing an audience together with the other.”¹³⁴ When advocates speak *for*, they have access to an audience and the other is not present or allowed to add their ideas to the message. Instead, the speaker takes on the empowered role of expert and presents all the information on their own leaving the spoken-for as disempowered subject, unable to speak. When speaking *with*, the audience can hear the point of view of the other from their own mouth, but the advocate is present to help draw in an audience or interpret the ideas of the other to an audience that may not understand them. Green Day’s video of “Working Class Hero” does this. Instead of Green Day telling the audience about Darfur and how to get involved in ending the conflict, they allow their celebrity to draw the audience to the message, and then provide time during instrumental moments in the song for Darfurians to speak for themselves.

Speaking for others also is speaking on behalf of another group to which the speaker does not belong, but some scholars alter that focus. Alcoff, Perreault, and Geesey vary from that idea of speaking for *others* by discussing group members speaking for their own group. Alcoff argues that the problems of speaking for others cannot be solved “by simply restricting the practice of speaking for others to speaking for groups in which one is a member.”¹³⁵ The lines which distinguish one group from another are difficult to gauge, and many times, individuals straddle the line between different groups and therefore are both other and group member. Geesey’s analysis focuses less on the position of the speaker than the position of the audience to whom the speaker speaks and the way a message crafted to an empowered audience should differ from that presented to the oppressed group themselves. While Alcoff and Geesey show how speaking for one’s own group is similar to speaking for others, Perreault shows that speaking for others can be similar to speaking for one’s own group. Perreault begins her analysis by defining speaking for others as a person in one subject position speaking for people in another.¹³⁶ Following her analysis, however, she collapses the dichotomy between speaking for others and speaking for oneself in her analysis of a white man speaking for black Georgia chain gang prisoners and his “understanding that the violation of one person is a violation of self.”¹³⁷ Alcoff’s and Geesey’s conclusions regarding speaking for one’s own group can be extended to speaking for others in cases in which the problems of identity and whiteness when an empowered or white speaker speaks for an oppressed other do not apply. Perreault’s argument helps provide an example of the way identification can benefit the spoken-for.

These various expansions upon the definition of speaking for others, when viewed together, help to shape and differentiate ways in which people speak for others. They also make clear that speaking for others does not happen in a singular way. Each scholar demonstrates, through his or her work, that his or her understanding of speaking for others is somewhat different from that of others. While this complicates an attempt to define speaking for others, it also creates more possibilities in which to understand speaking for others. Speaking for others should be understood as occurring in multiple and varying ways. Just as no group contains identical group members, no group has a singular way to be represented. For the purpose of this study of speaking for Darfur, I generally discuss speaking for others as a public act of speaking on behalf of and instead of a threatened group that holds a different social location but about which the speaker claims a unique expertise or understanding – more specifically as occurring when the empowered speak for the oppressed.

Chapter preview

Since a more comprehensive understanding of speaking for others will help increase the understanding of the way it works, in chapter two I further synthesize the literature of speaking for others, identity, and rhetoric to create a framework with which to critique speaking for others. This framework provides a definition of speaking for others so that each speaking act can be evaluated as to whether it constitutes that act. The framework will then address the problems of speaking for others that the various critics and theorists have addressed and use that scholarship to determine the extent to which each speaking act does or does not overcome those problems. Finally, the framework

uses literature on identity and rhetoric to help make the critique stronger and more beneficial for the critic.

After creating a framework for analyzing speaking for others, in chapter three I analyze the situation surrounding speaking for Darfurians through popular culture. First, I provide an overview of the conflict in Darfur to give a common understanding of the situation the speakers are speaking against and to determine the extent to which the Darfuri people can speak for themselves or are silenced. I also analyze the speakers' social location. The texts I am analyzing are *The Oprah Winfrey Show's* episode "The Shocking Story George Clooney Has to Tell"; television show *ER's* three episodes on Darfur; Deborah Norville's interview with Angelina Jolie on MSNBC's *Deborah Norville Tonight*; the movie *Hotel Rwanda*; a series of advertisements by Save Darfur; an advertisement by Be a Witness; *New York Times* editorials by Nick Kristof; and the video game "Darfur is Dying." An analysis of each speaker's social location will show the extent to which each inhabits a "discursively dangerous" social location.¹³⁸ Finally, chapter three contains an analysis of the audience of these messages and the potential problems speakers may encounter when addressing that audience. This analysis will provide the groundwork for the rhetorical criticism in chapter four.

In chapter four I take the analysis of the context of the cases of speaking for others and the conceptual conclusions from the literature of speaking for others, rhetoric, and identity studies and add that analysis to literature on critical rhetoric in order to do a rhetorical criticism of popular culture rhetoric. I analyze the ways people speak for others to a mass audience through television dramas, television talk shows, movies, advertisements, video games, and editorials. The speaking acts use various methods to

reach and persuade the audience, and the analysis will find commonalities which both help and hurt the spoken-for.

In chapter five, I use the conclusions from the previous chapters to show how speaking for others actually helps and hinders the spoken-for. The synthesis of the literature on speaking for others, identity, and rhetoric provides the boundaries and guidelines by which speaking for others can be beneficial and problematic. The analysis of speaking for others in popular culture shows how those boundaries and guidelines have worked and provides a starting point from which future acts of speaking for others can be done.

Chapter 2. A Framework for a Criticism of Speaking for Others

The study of speaking for others from the first analyses until today have been incomplete and therefore a new framework for evaluating speaking for others needs to be developed. In this chapter, I synthesize the literature that exists across disciplines in order to come up with a broader understanding of what is positive in speaking for others, and what is negative. The speaking for others literature has been helpful for understanding specific situations and by adding scholarship on silencing, rhetoric, identities, and whiteness helps to explain why speaking for others is positive in some situations and negative in others.

The spoken-for as subaltern and silenced

A person speaking to persuade is considered successful if the speaker persuades the audience by his or her rhetoric. This kind of success should not be the only goal of a speaker, however. Many speakers are able to move their audience to action, but if they are being moved in the wrong direction or for the wrong reasons, that persuasion cannot be considered ethical. Adolf Hitler is well known as a “successful” speaker, but his message was not ethical. While most people who speak for others cannot be compared to Hitler, it remains true that we need another understanding of what successful speaking is. A successful speaking for others should demonstrate an understanding of the audience’s needs, but the most successful speaking for others may be refraining from speaking. While it is sometimes not possible to bring the other to an audience, to do so benefits the other more than speaking for them does. Allowing the group to speak for themselves, if at all possible, not only allows the group to present the message they want, but also gives

them the power of speaking. Before advocates can decide whether the group can speak for themselves, however the advocate should evaluate whether the other is subaltern or silenced.

Spivak claims that those who know their circumstances and speak about them are not truly of an inferior rank, or subaltern.¹ If we accept her premise, then before advocates speak, they should decide whether the oppressed group knows their circumstances and speaks out about those circumstances. Foucault and Deleuze argue that the masses can speak, and in the current century, technology helps to make this supposition more of a reality. Using mass media, many oppressed groups can obtain access to an audience outside their immediate physical location. The speaker's burden is different for those who can truly be defined as subaltern by Spivak's definition and for those who are oppressed and experiencing difficult circumstances. The subaltern has more need of a person or group that can speak for them so that their victimization can be changed than other oppressed groups because the subaltern cannot speak for themselves. Spivak suggests that concerned people speak *to* rather than speak *for* the subaltern other and so speaking *for* the subaltern is not the only option. Speaking for the subaltern other, however, can be a beneficial action and not necessarily a negative, disempowering one. When a person chooses to speak for the subaltern, they should be sensitive to the extent to which the other is oppressed and act accordingly. The critic should also evaluate the oppressed status of the other to determine the extent to which the other can participate in their own representation. Some groups, such as child soldiers in Uganda, have become so thoroughly entrenched in their circumstances that they do not see the possibility of escape. In order to avoid being killed themselves, the children are forced to kill family

members or community members and thus lose any community support other than the military.² Other disempowered groups, like illegal immigrants in the United States, have shown the ability to speak for themselves. On May 1, 2006, thousands of illegal immigrants took to the streets in the U.S.-wide protests, the “Day without Immigrants.”³ The children then are subaltern and immigrants are not. An understanding of the circumstances that the other endures allows critics to determine if they can speak out for themselves.

Subalterns are silent because they do not know or can not speak about their situation. Silence does not always mean a group is subaltern, though. The scholarship on silencing shows that, while oppressed people do not always speak, they often do understand their circumstances clearly and because of those circumstances they are silent. Before speaking for others, an advocate should analyze the circumstances surrounding the non-subaltern oppressed other to ascertain whether they are capable and desirous of speaking for themselves or have been externally or internally silenced.

External silence is manifested in several different ways. One way in which people are externally silenced is by threat of force. The oppressing group silences the oppressed group by threatening their jobs, lives, family, or other things of value if the oppressed speak out.⁴ If carried out, the threats would increase the victim’s suffering. Since the victim is already suffering, s/he often chooses to be silent, “suggesting a self-censorship born of necessity rather than lack of knowledge, sense of common sense, or desire for change.”⁵ Some scholars of speaking for others warn that by not speaking for themselves oppressed others risk further disempowering themselves, but when faced with the realities of the threatened acts, many victims choose to accept that risk. While many are

silenced because they do want to avoid further suffering some may still speak out despite the threat. Thus, the threat in itself is not justification for an advocate to speak for the oppressed other, as we will see later in this chapter. For those oppressed others who do choose to be silent, however, when a person in a position of social power speaks they bring a voice to the voiceless and can benefit the other.

Another way oppressors silence oppressed groups is by denying access to an audience able to bring about change. While speakers other than the spoken-for speak about or for the oppressed other, the spoken-for themselves are not allowed to contribute their own voices and opinions. When those speaking do not have the best interests of the oppressed other in mind or have not spoken *to* the other in order to understand the other's needs and points of view, those needs and points of view are not represented. The speakers instead are speaking for their own group's interests. Andrea Dworkin claimed that publishers either refused to publish her works in forums public enough to reach her audience or refused to allow her to respond to criticism of her work.⁶ This silencing did not keep her from speaking, but kept her voice from reaching those for whom the message was written and, when she became the subject of criticism, kept her from defending her message which kept the voice of the powerful audible while silencing her own. When the oppressed other's points of view are not considered, any action taken would not be in their best interest but instead would benefit the speaker. The oppressed group may be denied access to an audience because of language barriers, lack of knowledge that a public forum exists, or institutionalized laws or regulations.⁷ Language barriers are problems that emerge when translators are not available or permitted to aid the other. Oppressed groups who are illiterate and do not have access to television, radio,

or internet rely on others to inform them about any public forum that exists. When oppressors are in control of that information and do not share it with the oppressed group, the group does not have the opportunity to explain their circumstances and points-of-view. Laws and regulations can deny access to an audience when those who speak the language and know about a public forum are still silenced because they cannot lawfully be included. For example, in Roman times women, slaves, and non-citizens were excluded from the polis and therefore unable to speak to those capable of enacting changes that would benefit their lives. A speaker who does have access to an audience able to bring about change, and who is interested in making those changes fit the oppressed others' interests has the opportunity to present those interests to the audience and thus be considered.

External silence could also be manifested when the oppressor allows the oppressed to speak only about certain subjects or speak in certain ways. This type of silencing is “used by the dominant class to control the discursive actions of the dominated.”⁸ During the abolition movement, primarily European American male abolitionists philosophize about the institution of slavery.⁹ Many European Americans wanted African Americans to tell only stories and anecdotes about slavery. Many African Americans wanted to speak against the institution of slavery rather than just giving stories about their experience. They were only allowed to speak, however, if they did not include their own point of view, suggestions as to what factors contribute to their oppression, or how change could come about. One problem with limiting the content about which oppressed others can speak is that their physical presence indicates that they are in accord with other arguments presented. The audience may therefore falsely believe

that any inaccurate arguments presented are the point of view of the spoken-for. This type of selective silencing could also be seen in the editing of media such as television, documentary film, or radio. In the editing process, the words of the oppressed group are included, but the editors have the power to cut out those statements that address issues of most importance to the group. Again, the oppressed other's voices are heard and the audience can assume participation and acceptance of the overall message, while the group may be silenced on issues that are most important to them. If speakers invite the oppressed other to participate in the speaking process and include the information that the oppressed group feels is important, speakers can empower the oppressed rather than silencing them.

Oppressed groups also sometimes silence themselves and this internal silencing is manifested in different ways for different reasons. One reason groups silence themselves is because they feel shame about their circumstances. An oppressed person may feel shame because they feel they have participated in their own circumstances. Rape victims are often silent about rape not only because the rapist threatens them, but also because the victims feel they brought the rape upon themselves. "Survivors of violence are often blamed for having had the experience;" they may have been told that the way they dressed or acted encouraged the rapist and therefore it was their own fault.¹⁰ When victims feel they brought on their own victimization, they may feel the abuse is their fault and not the oppressors'. In order to hide what they view as a crime in which they participated, they refuse to let anyone know what happened."¹¹ Advocates for the shamed other may be better able to see the real criminal and victim for who they are and thus want to speak for them. People who speak for the shamed other need to be sensitive to the

victim's shame, however, and careful not to reinforce the victims' feelings of guilt regarding their participation in the circumstances.

Other groups may silence themselves because of their perceived relationship with others. Silence can be used “with social situations in which the relationship of the focal participants is uncertain, unpredictable, or ambiguous.”¹² Thus if a victim is not certain of the way their message will be received by an audience, they may choose to avoid speaking. Additionally, groups may silence themselves if there is a “known and unequal distribution of power among focal participants.”¹³ The knowledge of that unequal power may intimidate a victim even if the audience is not intentionally silencing them. With this type of silencing, the victim has a message and does not have shame in that message, but the relationship with the audience becomes a hindrance to allowing their voices to be heard. Advocates should not take this silence as an excuse to speak for others; rather they should speak *to* the other. They can reassure the other of the power of the message and the receptiveness of the audience, if possible and open up the channels to allow them to speak for themselves.

For those who silence themselves, advocates can also try to help them see the importance of speaking because although speech may elicit fear and pain, that fear and pain does not diminish when the speaker is silent. In “The Transformation of Silence,” Lorde writes of her own struggle to speak, “of course, I am afraid, because the transformation of silence into language and action is an act of self-revelation, and that always seems fraught with danger.”¹⁴ Lorde then goes on to say, however, “we can sit in our corners forever . . . and we will still be no less afraid.”¹⁵ Lorde also argues, in “The Master’s Tools,” that speaking allows the oppressed person to define their own

experiences and bring about real change.¹⁶ When an oppressed group defines themselves in terms of another group, that other group must be always existing and consistent for the definition to hold. The oppressed group is limited by what is possible in the other group. If, on the other hand, they define themselves on their own terms, without consideration of the other group, their own group is strengthened and changed without the need of any other group. So when a person speaks for an oppressed other and defines the oppressed other the possibilities are limited, but when the oppressed other speaks for themselves in their own way, their options are limitless.

Silencing occurs more prevalently in societies in which social norms dictate what can be talked about, what cannot be talked about, and when that discussion can occur.¹⁷ The problems an oppressed group faces may be a prohibited topic of conversation because of the morals or beliefs of their culture. For example, rape victims are also silent about rape because of the stigma of discussing sex and sexuality in many cultures and religions. Because sex is not talked about, victims may not know how to talk about sex as a crime or may feel that because sex cannot be talked about it, anything related to sex must be kept silent as well. This silencing of society can increase the prevalence of the crime as well.¹⁸ When a person silences themselves because of social norms, a speaker should be as sensitive as possible in the manner in which they speak so they relay the information that reaches the audience, but also are sensitive to the social norms of the oppressed other. If the speaker draws attention to the victim or victims in a society in which there is stigma attached to the crime, their victimization may be increased by other society members, some of whom may be or may have been victims themselves. The victims may be shunned, ignored, or scolded for those actions.¹⁹

Ideally, when a group is externally or internally silenced, advocates for the oppressed group should seek to take down the boundaries that do not allow speaking rather than taking on the role of the speaker. Advocates can provide information so that the oppressed group knows when and where an audience is available. They can provide access to audiences so that the oppressed group is able to speak for themselves. Not all the barriers that silence the oppressed other are surmountable, however. It may not be possible for advocates to protect the oppressed group from threats from a powerful oppressor and therefore even if advocates provide access to an audience, the oppressed group members may face serious repercussions if they speak. Oppressed group members who feel guilt and shame about their circumstances also may have difficulty overcoming their shame, and advocates who provide audiences may only increase that guilt and shame.

When the oppressed group chooses to remain silent, they can be considered a silenced other. The two options available to improve the situation of this silenced other are either for there to be silence about the other's circumstances or for an advocate to speak on behalf of the other and thus become a speaker for others. At times, silence seems to be the best option. Cheryl Glenn's analysis of Anita Hill shows that when she finally spoke out about Clarence Thomas sexually harassing her, the ensuing accusations and judgment upon her was more difficult to endure than the silence that preceded it.²⁰

Silence is often not a good option, however. McGee argues that silence testifies on its own: in "Anglo-American jurisprudence and talk about politics [silence] commonly has been taken to signify assent to current conditions or the inability to answer an argument."²¹ Thus, when nobody speaks out about the problems an oppressed group

faces, those with the power to make a positive change for the group could assume that the group does not desire change and is satisfied with their situation. When silence will be negative for the silenced other, speaking for others becomes the best option in order to improve their circumstances. When an advocate has concluded that the oppressed group is a silenced other and that silence would negatively affect that other, speaking for others becomes a beneficial option.

The oppressed group that is not subaltern or silenced and already speaking for themselves should be allowed to speak. Advocates of the unsilenced oppressed group should support the group with additional resources, information, or access to an audience. When advocates become speakers for the unsilenced oppressed group rather than remaining advocates, they take attention away from the oppressed and silence them. Many oppressed groups do have the ability to speak for themselves and do not require someone to speak for them. When African American males were expected to keep their speeches to examples and “facts” during abolition, they were able to speak for themselves in other ways. In order to present their anti-slavery arguments without irritating their audience, the African American men spoke against slavery as an institution, but then apologized for digressing. They were thus able to speak about those things they wished to speak about in a way acceptable to their audience.²² They showed they had the capacity to think more deeply about the institution of slavery and discuss solutions even though they were denied the right by the European American abolitionists who claimed to speak for them. If European Americans had provided more resources for the African American speakers rather than speaking for them, the voices of slaves and former slaves may have helped to make the transition from slavery to freedom smoother. By speaking for

themselves, oppressed groups demonstrate their own intelligence and ability. They show that they have the capacity to think critically about their situation and take control of their own fate. Often, oppressed groups are seen as helpless and unable to take care of their own problems. By speaking for themselves, oppressed groups show that can fight for themselves. When speakers speak for an unsilenced other, especially when they are in a position to allow the other to speak for themselves, they place themselves in the position of power and ability and place the spoken-for in a dependent role. Actions taken to improve the circumstances of the silenced other will proceed on the assumption of the other as dependent instead of capable and independent and thus further oppression is possible. In most cases, this type of representation is negative and should be avoided.

While speaking for the unsilenced other should generally be avoided, the other sometimes has been represented in the public mind in a way that prejudices the mindset of the audience before s/he has a chance to speak. When these “enemy others” speak, their social location “has an epistemically significant impact on that speaker’s claims and can serve either to authorize or disauthorize [their] speech.”²³ Enemy others “hold nothing in common” with the audience. The other and audience, therefore, “speak of one another as evil.”²⁴ Thus the enemy other would not be trusted and the things they said would be discounted. Enemy others could potentially overcome the mistrust their audience has for them. Any speaker has the opportunity to establish their credibility when presenting a message, and some have the rhetorical skill and finesse to change an audience’s opinion about them. Enemy others who do not have this type of skill, however, may need the assistance of a speaker from the audience’s group to get their message across to the audience. For many audiences in the United States, Muslims are an

enemy other. While Muslims may wish to speak out regarding mistreatment they receive, some American audiences would reject the message of a Muslim speaker unless the speaker can present him/herself in a way the audience deems acceptable. Speakers who have identities that are acceptable to the audience are more likely to be listened to when they speak on behalf of the enemy other than the other would be. While the speakers' identity is also epistemically salient, it is less discursively dangerous than the enemy other's identity and thus the audience is less likely to dismiss their message immediately. A non-Muslim advocate speaking for Muslims would be less likely to be immediately rejected by many American audiences and the message would have a better chance to reach the audience and make changes to benefit the Muslims. In order to determine whether the other is an enemy other and therefore should be spoken for, speakers should identify the extent to which the other has been vilified in the mind of the audience.

The silencing of an oppressed other does not allow the circumstances of that other to become more positive. Instead the silenced other is forced to continue to endure negative circumstances unless an advocate comes forward to speak for them. Advocates must be careful to learn why the other has been silenced before they speak. If the other is silenced but would like to speak, advocates should help provide access to let their voices be heard. If the silent other wishes to remain silent, then a speaker from another group would be more beneficial. Speaking for a silenced other may alleviate some of the negative circumstances, but allowing the other to speak for themselves empowers them further and makes chances for success greater as well.

Identifying the speaker

If the other is subaltern and silenced, then a speaker is warranted, but just as the identity of the other may have a negative effect on their message, so also may the identity of a speaker. Critics of speaking for others should analyze the identity of the speaker in order to determine the extent to which the identity affects the audience. Alcoff's warning that a speaker's social location is epistemically salient is at least as true of the advocate as it is of the other. Alcoff warns speakers to analyze and fight against the impetus to speak, especially after interrogating the speaker's location and the context of the speaking act.²⁵ An unacceptable advocate speaking for others is more detrimental to the oppressed other because the advocate is silencing the other while presenting a discursively dangerous message. The rhetoric of an unacceptable speaker would be no more listened to than the rhetoric of an unacceptable other.

In order to identify whether a speaker's identity is discursively dangerous, a critic must have a thorough understanding of the identities of the speaker, spoken-for, and audience. With an understanding of the three groups, a critic can discover not only the social location of each group, but also the dynamics that exist between the groups. If any of the groups are at odds with each other or if a certain point of identification – race, gender, sexuality, or religion – creates boundaries between the speaker and audience, conscientious advocates should recognize and determine in what ways that point of identity affects the speaking act. Specifically, they should discover which of the points of identity may cause conflict or lack of trust with those from the other groups. Critics must analyze these points of identity with an understanding that identities are not fixed. While a speaker's identity may hinder their effectiveness in speaking for others, identities are

malleable and dynamic and a conscientious speaker can shape their identity in a way that helps the spoken-for.²⁶ Individuals fit into different categories based on those aspects of their identity that are most salient with the group and therefore, if a speaker is able to emphasize salient points of their identity while downplaying the problematic aspects, they may be able to bypass the danger about which Alcoff warns.²⁷

Alcoff's warning to speakers for others is beneficial but without an understanding of how rhetoric affects identities cannot be complete.²⁸ While some identities may be dangerous on their own, just as an enemy other can use rhetorical strategies to overcome their position, so can a speaker for others. Kenneth Burke describes how identifying one's self with another is essential to persuasion: "it is so clearly a matter of rhetoric to persuade a man by identifying your cause with his interests."²⁹ The difference between identity and identification is important to note at this point. Andrew Lakritz describes two instances of speaking for others that help to explain this difference. Ralph Ellison spoke for the black community regarding segregation. Ellison is African American and Southern and therefore shares salient points of identity with those for whom he spoke. Those two points of identity are especially salient when we consider segregation is an issue situated by race and location – an issue directly affecting non-whites in the South. Hannah Arendt claims she is qualified to speak about issues of race because of her marginalization as a Jew and a female and thus she understands the issues of "all oppressed or underprivileged peoples."³⁰ Arendt also claims authority to speak because of her sympathy with the children forced to walk to school under guard. While she does not claim to share an identity with African Americans, she finds points in which she is consubstantial with the community and on that basis spoke as if one with authority.

Those who share identity with those for whom they speak are often, but not always, more easily accepted by the spoken-for than those who identify with them.³¹ While Arendt claims consubstantiality with the African American community, Lakritz reports that she was largely criticized for presuming the points of identification were valid. Arendt's subject position elicited outrage from both members and non-members of the African American community. Her subject position is that of an "elite European (albeit exiled) and member of a privileged class, one who does not share the North American history or racial discrimination and thus is foreign to its character."³² Her identification with the African American community was not accepted because certain salient parts of her own identity were too important to discount.

Although Arendt is Jewish, in the United States being Jewish is most closely equated with whiteness.³³ Whiteness can come in the way of attempts at identification, and so that specific point of Arendt's identity makes her claim of identification problematic. Whiteness is also a possession that is subtle but pervasive and thus has a definite effect on the message.³⁴ A critique of speaking for others in which the speaker or audience is white and the spoken-for is not must take this power differential into account. The power that whiteness holds can negatively affect a spoken-for group despite other points of identification between the speaker and spoken-for.

While the power of whiteness is capable of overpowering and disempowering others, advocates can overcome these problems. One of the major problems people had with Arendt was not just that she was Jewish, but that the claims she made were not acceptable to the spoken-for. Randall Lake claims that European Americans can successfully identify with others if they understand who the other is and what they

need.³⁵ In *Dances With Wolves*, when John Dunbar and Stands With a Fist claim a shared identity with Native Americans, their claim may be more valid than Arendt's because they lived with, worked, with, talked with, and understood the problems the Native Americans faced. Arendt's relationship with the African American community was less involved. She had no experience within the community, only marginally through hearing the issues and speaking from her experience with marginality as a Jewish woman. Dunbar and Stands With a Fist overcame whiteness based on their experiences with the community. Thus, they were better able to argue identification with the Native American community. Additionally, Dunbar and Stands with a Fist went to speak to the government with the approval of the Native American tribe. When advocates desire to become speakers, they should demonstrate a similar authorization to speak.

Identifying the speaking act

Once a critic of speaking for others analyzes the position of the spoken-for and speaker, they can begin to determine whether the speaking act constitutes speaking for others. In the previous chapter, I defined speaking for others as a public act of speaking (speaking) on behalf of and instead of (for) a threatened group that holds a different social location but about which the speaker claims a unique expertise or understanding (others) – more specifically as occurring when the empowered speak for the oppressed. In order for the speaking act to fit this definition it should first be clear that the act is *speaking* for others: a public, purposeful message of protest. Just as rhetorical studies has broadened itself from a focus on public address to a focus on a variety of rhetorical texts, so this definition of speaking includes spoken, written, visual, and experiential acts that

are public, purposeful messages of protest. The act of *speaking* for others must be a public act in which a clear, purposeful message is being addressed to an audience. Previous analyses of speaking for others have focused on books, editorials, speeches, and art. To these types of texts I will add movies, television, advertisements, and video games. Other means of drawing attention to oppressed groups, including charity concerts, calls for boycotts against oppressors, and fundraisers often provide assistance for the group and are public, but do not carry the clear, purposeful message of protest required for a speaking act. These events only constitute speaking when the songs or speeches involved specifically talk about the oppressed group and the situation surrounding that oppression.

The second part of the speaking act to be identified is whether the speaker is speaking *for* others. Brian McGee describes four different types of speaking: speaking *for*, speaking *about*, speaking *to*, and speaking *with*. To differentiate between speaking *about* and speaking *for*, critics should look for calls for action and claims of representing the needs of the spoken-for. Speaking *for* is speaking in the place of others.³⁶ McGee describes speaking *for* as a construction of the other as different and lacking competence to speak for themselves.³⁷ While this description is primarily used to condemn the act of speaking *for* others, it also addresses the key aspects of the definition of speaking for others we use in our own definition – the speaker speaks *instead of* the other. Speaking *about* is discussing who the other is while not claiming to represent them. When W.E.B. DuBois spoke *about* Catholics and Jews, he discussed the Ku Klux Klan's illogical arguments regarding them by describing how Jews and Catholics differed from the Klan's representation of them. DuBois did not claim to represent the point of view of the

two groups. Speaking *about* often accompanies speaking *for* but the differences are important enough to require a separate type of evaluation. When speaking *about*, speakers are not claiming to represent the other's point of view or requesting action on their behalf. These two issues are central to speaking for others and are the reason for many of the problems scholars such as Spivak, Jeanne Perreault, and McGee warn against. Speaking *to* "requires the immediate or mediated presence of [the] other to the message."³⁸ This is the type of speaking Linda Alcoff and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak advocate as a way to mitigate the problems of speaking *for* because in speaking *to* the other becomes a part of their own liberation rather than remaining a helpless victim. Speaking *with*, McGee defines as either "direct, dialectical interchange between interlocutors . . . [or] addressing an audience together with the other."³⁹ In either case, the other is present and involved in the exchange and thus the possibility of misrepresentation is decreased. Speaking *to* and *with* are also important when fighting oppression, but the burdens and benefits involved in these types of speaking are significantly different from those of speaking *for*. When speaking *to* and *with*, the other is present and involved in the speaking act and so critiques of speaking *for* others do not apply.

A speaking act can also be considered speaking *for* others if speakers claim some familiarity or understanding based on their experience living with, working with, and experiencing similar circumstances to the spoken-for. This is especially true when the speakers demonstrate some instances of speaking *to* or *with* the oppressed group prior to representing them publicly. In speaking *for* others, speakers are claiming the right to speak *instead of* the spoken-for and this is generally because of some knowledge and

experience they feel gives them authority. In Perreault's analysis of Spivak and Burns speaking for the chain gang prisoners, each claimed that special knowledge – through experience as a chain gang prisoner and through research and visits to the chain gang prisons. The critic of speaking for others should examine these claims or assumptions within the rhetoric to ascertain validity based on the speakers' identity and the spoken-for's identity. The critic of speaking for others should also analyze whether aspects of the spoken-for's culture are being "co-opted and commodified to suit the desires of individuals" or whether advocates search for an authentic representation of the problems the spoken-for face.⁴⁰

The final part of the definition of speaking for others to be identified is whether or not the act is speaking for *others*. Some theorists of speaking for others claim that speaking for anyone who is not the speaker themselves can be problematic.⁴¹ While Burke argues that each person is divided from each other person, and therefore an other is anyone other than the self, the concept of speaking for others implies a sense of group membership and not individual identity.⁴² Alcoff and Geesey both point out problems that can occur even when a person is speaking for one's own group. Alcoff uses her own identity as a Panamanian-American as an example of the problems of identifying a person as a member of a group. Her identity as half white/Angla and half Panamanian mestiza places her in conflicting groups and therefore classifying her in either group is problematic.⁴³ Geesey's analysis of North African women in France speaking for their own groups shows that even when group identification is more easily classified, the person speaking may do so in a way that is unacceptable to others within the group. These problems of speaking for one's own group are real, but are of a different type that

the problems of speaking for *others* and therefore, I will only focus on texts in which the speaker is clearly not a member of the group for whom they speak.

Rhetorical criticism of speaking for others

The final task of the critic of speaking for others is a rhetorical criticism of the act of speaking for others to determine whether the speaker aids or hinders the spoken-for with their message. A rhetorical criticism of speaking for others should identify the way that power is expressed in the rhetoric. To do this, a critique of speaking for others can utilize a critical rhetoric which analyses the extent to which the rhetoric of domination and the rhetoric of freedom works to liberate the spoken-for. According to Raymie McKerrow, “the focus of a critique of domination is on the discourse of power which creates and sustains the social practices which control the dominated. . . . a critique of ideologies.”⁴⁴ Using this critique of domination in a rhetorical criticism of speaking for others will help to bring out those messages that reinforce the dominant paradigm and further disempower the spoken-for. This critique emphasizes not the validity of an argument but the ways that the speaker does or does not reinforce the hegemony of a culture.⁴⁵ This critique is necessary to understand whether speaking for others allows society to accept the other or creates more of a distance between the dominant social group and the disempowered. A critique of freedom is “a self-reflexive critique that turns its back on itself even as it promotes a realignment in the forces of power that construct social relations.”⁴⁶ By analyzing the social structures, we see which structures are acceptable to the audience and therefore the ways in which the structures can be opened to introduce other speakers outside the structure. With a critical rhetoric, critics can see

whether speakers normalize the status quo and create a space for the problems of the oppressed other to be heard.

A rhetorical criticism of speaking for others must also analyze the ways in which a speaker represents the spoken-for. Specifically, whether they “do violence to the [people] they claim authority to write and speak about.”⁴⁷ After analyzing the identities of the speaker, spoken-for, and audience, critics of speaking for others should look at the way that speakers address and describe each group in the rhetoric. Critics should see if the speaker is representing the spoken-for in an inaccurate or disempowering way, and if the arguments address the real needs of the audience.⁴⁸ The spoken-for may be disempowered by presenting them as less powerful than they are, (mis)placing blame on them, or reinforcing victimization. Additionally, we must see the extent to which the speaker humanizes the victims in their own rhetoric and keeps them from being seen as different. After seeing the extent to which the spoken-for has been othered in society at large, we need to analyze the extent to which the speaker creates more division between the group and the audience, and the ways the speaker overcomes the otherness that already exists. Also we can look at the way the speaker dehumanizes or makes real the oppressor and thus makes a solution possible and viable. Finally, we should see if the speaker addresses the audience in a way that persuades them to take action or if the rhetoric makes action seem impossible, unnecessary, or unwanted. Speakers need to speak in ways in which the audience finds acceptable and which addresses the needs of the spoken-for.

An analysis of speaking for others should serve the function of finding the ideal ways for people to represent those in need. By analyzing the context of speaking for

others and doing a rhetorical criticism based on critical rhetoric, critics will be able to more completely understand the way that the rhetoric of speaking for others works in each situation they encounter. An understanding of identity and rhetoric added to the understanding of the limitations and potential that speaking for others has makes the analysis more complete and conclusions about speaking for others more applicable to the act of speaking for others in general, rather than individual situations only. In the next two chapters, the framework of speaking for others will help to show the ways speaking for Darfur may be problematic and will also show the way that future speakers can speak for the oppressed other more effectively.

Chapter 3. The Situation for Speakers for Darfur

Those who speak for others do so because of the care and compassion they have for the group for which they speak. The speakers, generally, are not only speaking, but acting to help the people for whom they speak. Angelina Jolie has visited with refugees in Darfur or Eastern Chad three times and her humanitarian organization, the Jolie-Pitt Foundation, donates money to aid the humanitarian effort there. George Clooney and Don Cheadle have each visited the region twice and helped found Not on Our Watch, an organization dedicated to drawing worldwide attention to international crises such as Darfur. These advocates and many others sacrifice their time, money, and energy for a cause they care about which shows a dedication that goes beyond the level of involvement of the everyday person. This desire to help those less fortunate is to be commended, but a person's motivation is not sufficient to consider when a person speaks for others.¹ This dissertation seeks not to condemn those who want to help others, but rather to provide an understanding of how to help in a way that benefits the spoken-for.

Speaking for others starts before the speaker begins speaking. A person who desires to speak for a group to which they do not belong should first understand the history of the conflict so that they can better represent the spoken-for.² The larger the audience is and therefore the potential impact their message can have, the more complete their understanding should be. The knowledge of the history of the conflict should include an understanding of the experiences of the victims, the actions of the oppressors, and the role of any other people involved. Potential speakers should also be aware of anything already done which attempted to solve the conflict. After having a clear understanding of the situation, speakers should next study the Darfuri people and assess

whether they are subaltern or silenced or if they are capable of speaking for themselves. Speakers should also have an awareness of their own social location and how that social location affects the message. Finally, speakers must understand the audience to determine what type of message would be most persuasive. A critic of speaking for others should have the same understanding. In this chapter, I use the conclusions made from the synthesis of the literature of speaking for others and identity to help identify these various critical elements in order to demonstrate how and why such an understanding is necessary.

The conflict

The conflict in the Darfur region of Sudan is a complex issue in a country many people could not locate on a map. Before speakers for Darfur suggest solutions to end the conflict, they should first comprehend the causes of the conflict. Shuter argues that a rhetorical critic needs to understand the culture of the speaker because “culture and rhetoric are inseparable—a critique of discourse is a critique of the culture that produced it.”³ Speakers draw their rhetoric from their own culture and speak from the ideology of that culture. However, the spoken-for come from a different culture with different ideologies and different needs. When speakers do not understand the culture of the spoken-for, they speak from their own ideologies and assumptions and may misrepresent the spoken-for. With a clearer understanding of how the current conflict began and the motivations of both sides of the struggle, speakers can begin to understand what solution will be most successful and beneficial to the parties involved. An understanding of the conflict will include knowledge of the history of conflict in Darfur and Sudan, the current

state of conflict in Darfur, the various people involved, and the solutions attempted thus far. When speakers have an understanding of this situation they reduce the chance of misrepresenting that group.

The current conflict in Darfur is one of many conflicts in the past century in Sudan. The most recent and extensive conflict in Sudan was a twenty-two year civil war between North and South Sudan. One motivation for the North/South war was that the government is located in the northern city of Khartoum and that government did not allow equal representation for all states. Additionally, the North did not share the profit from the sale of oil which is found predominately in the South. There was also a religious component to the war as the North is predominately Muslim and the South is Christian and Animist. The current government is Islamist and seeks to place Muslim principles – called Sharia law – on all citizens.

From the time the war began in 1983 until the peace deal was signed in 2005, an estimated 1.5 million people lost their lives in the North/South war. In 2005, the rebels in the South and the government of Sudan signed the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) which made John Garang, the leader of Southern rebel group Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA), Sudan's first Vice President. When Garang was killed in a plane crash shortly after signing the CPA, Salva Kiir, another leader in the SPLA became first Vice President. The CPA also guaranteed that the South would be self-governing in six years, the Northern Sudanese troops would withdraw from the South, and the North and South would share profits from the sale of Sudan's oil. While the CPA was a promising step for peace in Sudan, the government of Sudan has not fulfilled their promises and in October 2007 the Southern leaders suspended relations with Khartoum in

protest. Relations were renewed the following month but in June 2008, troops from both sides converged on Abyei, a town in an oil-rich region which is a disputed territory between the North and South and violence ensued. Two weeks later, the two sides agreed to allow international arbitration to decide what would happen with the region but violence has continued in the South over the past year. The North/South war has been in the focus of attention in Sudan for decades. It was not until the North and South signed the CPA in 2005 and a fragile peace created some measure of stability in Sudan that the focus in Sudan shifted to the fairly new humanitarian crisis in Darfur.

Darfur is a region made up of three states on the Western border of Sudan. North Darfur is semi-desert and water is scarce. Wells and wadis (rivers) dry up in the winter making life for the people there difficult. North Darfur is mainly populated by the Zaghawa tribe, a camel-herding nomadic tribe. West Darfur has more agriculture because of rain that falls on the mountain that dominates the region – Jebel Marra. The Fur, Masalit, Daju, and Berti tribes all farm on the land in Western Darfur. South Darfur is much lush, rains sustain grasses and reliable well water and the Baggara tribe lives in this region. The entire Darfur region is sparsely populated and is cut off from the rest of the country. There is no reliable access to the more largely populated and powerful cities of the east. Railways provide irregular service to Darfur and roads are easily washed away during the rainy season. Water is not always reliable either, even in Western and Southern Darfur. The region suffered major droughts in 1984 and 1991 which led to tribes moving out of their regions to find reliable water sources in other areas. The droughts led to land quarrels in areas where water still was available. A locust infestation in 2004 and 2005 also affected the farmers in Western Darfur and caused more instability

in the region. The current conflict feeds off of this unease between the Zaghawa, Fur, Masalit, Daju, and Berti tribes and the Baggara tribe.

The Zaghawa in the North and the Fur, Masalit, Daju, and Berti tribes in the west are labeled as and self-identify as black Africans and the Baggara in the south as Arabs. “‘The Arabs want to get rid of anyone with black skin,’ Youssef Yakob Abdullah said. In the area of Darfur that he fled, ‘there are no blacks left,’ he said.”⁴ Labeling the Darfurians as either “black” or “Arab” is somewhat misleading and causes misunderstanding about the Darfur conflict. Some Darfuri experts claim that there exists “an ideological and racist definition as to who is ‘Arab’ and who are zuraq, black.”⁵ When crowds staged a demonstration during UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moons visit to IDP camps, a BBC news correspondent reported, “Most of the refugees in Darfur are black Africans - although reports suggested those who staged the demo were chanting pro-government slogans in Arabic.”⁶ This report leads one to believe that “black Africans” spoke one language and the “Arabs” spoke another, but in Darfur, Arabic is a predominant language and the Darfurians who identify themselves as Arab are generally indistinguishable from the “black Africans.” Arabic people came to Darfur centuries ago and intermarried with the Africans there so that all tribes have both Arabic and African ancestry. Additionally, those identified as black and those identified as Arab also share religion as Islam is the dominant religion in the region. Outsiders would find it difficult to distinguish one group from another.

A clearer understanding of how the “surround” or environment affects the identity of the Darfuri people can also help speakers for Darfur to gain a better insight into what solutions will help them in their struggle.⁷ In Darfur, identity is more than just biological;

there are social aspects as well. Some of the tribes identify themselves as Arabic because they are nomadic, while the farmers more often identify as African. Additionally, the conflict has evolved from a conflict between Baggara and the African tribes to a more mixed one. Alex de Waal argues,

“It's easy to take this simplified construct of Arabs and Africans, and turn it into something that's meaningful, even though it may not be ethnographically or historically correct. . . . A lot of the “African” groups have defected to join the government, and a lot of the “Arab” groups have defected to join the rebels,’ he said, adding that belligerents on both sides are black and Muslim, with Islamists present in both camps.”⁸

Former Janjaweed Tusher Mohamed Mahdi states that he fought in the militia until he became disillusioned with the government. He entered a Sudan Liberation Army (SLA) checkpoint with a white flag and the SLA “debriefed and questioned [him] for days.”⁹ Mahdi says, “It made us feel bad that we had believed the government's lies. We were told that the SLA wanted to kill us and take our animals, that's why we did what we used to do.”¹⁰ Mahdi self-identifies as Arab, and yet he and other Arabs fight on the side of the rebels. The rebels are seeking more representation and freedom in their region not ethnic purity. Thus to identify the conflict as African versus Arab is misleading and does not get to the cause of the conflict. Because race is such a salient part of the American identity, it is a temptation to look at the problem as a racial one, but this tendency could lead to the speaker or audience analyzing the conflict to learn more about their own culture.¹¹ Instead, speakers should base their ideas about the conflict in the Darfuri culture and the racial context there.

The current conflict in Darfur began in 2000 when rebels from the Fur, Masalit, and Zaghawa tribes of Darfur published the *kitab al-aswad* (*Black Book*), which protested the way in which power was centralized around the Nile River in central Sudan. The rest

of the country, the western states in particular, was not equally represented politically in the government in Khartoum. The two main rebel groups in Darfur are the SLA and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM). Both groups oppose the government in Khartoum, but the SLA, though Muslim, seeks a secular government. JEM is Islamist, but seeks equal representation not only for Darfur, but for all the marginalized groups in Sudan. According to Gerard Prunier, the *kitab al-aswad* created controversy not because the book shed light on unknown information; other groups have complained about the same issues and the South had rebelled and fought for the similar reasons. The problem for the government of Sudan was that the rebels “had dared to put into print what everybody knew but did not want to talk about.”¹²

The similarities between Darfur and the South did not end with their motivation for the rebellion. The two groups joined forces for a time in 2001, when the Darfuri rebels signed a “Memorandum of Understanding” with the SPLA. In South Darfur, the SPLA engaged in some brief skirmishes with Sudanese troops and the Janjaweed, supported by the government of Sudan, fought back by launching their campaign of attacks against unarmed civilians in villages throughout the region. In April 2002 Arab militia attacked Shoba in Northern Darfur, burning 600 houses, killing seventeen people, and wounding many others. The attack that many consider to be the initiation of war was a rebel attack in February 2003. SLA rebels attacked and took over the town of Gulu in West Darfur. Peace talks between SLA and the government of Sudan after the attack failed and SLA and JEM attacked el Fasher, the capital of West Darfur. This attack escalated the violence, which has continued unabated ever since.

The conflict in Darfur has been devastating to the people in Darfur. The Janjaweed kill indiscriminately, use rape as a weapon, burn towns and fields to the ground, and poison the wells with dead bodies. The conflict is ongoing so actual figures are hard to verify, but human rights groups have estimated that as many as two and a half million people have been forced from their homes and an estimated 400,000 people have been killed. Many who lose their homes end up trying to exist in hills or caves, struggling to find food or water and avoid the Janjaweed who patrol the areas.

Those who are able to make it to refugee or Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) camps also face situations far from ideal. Any shelters that are available are tents which were meant for temporary living and not long-term housing. During the rainy season, flooding and disease run rampant through the camps and so malaria, flooding, and lack of shelter are dangers. Security is also a problem for those who seek the safety of the camps. The camps have peacekeepers, aid workers, and higher numbers of people and so there is some safety for those living within the boundaries of the camps. Outside the camps the safety ends. The Janjaweed patrol the borders of the camps to find and rape women who come out to collect firewood or to kill men who leave the camps. Even within the camps safety is not assured. One of the largest IDP camps, Kalma Camp near Nyala in South Darfur, is home to 90,000 people in an area the size of Central Park. Some of the residents carry weapons to protect themselves, but in 2007 the police told residents to hand over all weapons or the army would invade the camp and force the residents to give up their weapons.¹³ In August 2008, Sudanese troops entered Kalma Camp and opened fire, killing at least eight and as many as fifty residents of the camp.¹⁴ The attack was ostensibly to root out the rebel factions. In Otash camp, also near the city of Nyala,

Sudanese security forces forcibly removed hundreds of IDPs, including men, women, and children. The life of camp residents is one of constant discomfort and fear. As some IDPs and refugees have been in camps for a majority of the conflict, they have endured these conditions for up to six years even though most are innocent.

The most violent period of the Darfur conflict occurred in 2003 and 2004. Since that time, the violence has abated somewhat, but murder, rape, and destruction continue to be a threat to the Darfuri people to the present time. Various humanitarian agencies have worked to reduce the death toll and return refugees and IDPs to their homes and have been successful to an extent. Since aid workers and peacekeepers entered Darfur, the violence has decreased. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations Mission in the Sudan (UNMIS), and International Organization for Migration report that over 100,000 displaced Darfuri civilians were able to return home from January to June 2007.¹⁵ This still leaves over 2 million without homes, however, and more potentially to come as Janjaweed and Sudanese military attacks continue.

On May 5, 2006, a seemingly positive step for peace took place when leaders of the SLA and the Sudanese government signed the Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA). Under the terms of the deal, the SLA's leader, Minni Minnawi, became an advisor to the president. While this deal looked good in theory, violence resumed shortly after the agreement was signed, the SLA splintered into various factions, and Minnawi reportedly has little influence over Khartoum's policy. Then, in October 2007, Muhajiriya, a town held by SLA-Minnawi, was burned by government and militia showing that the deal did not lead to peace even for the one group that signed it. Other rebel groups, including JEM

refused to sign the peace agreement because “it did not offer enough power sharing or access to Sudan's oil wealth, for the people of Darfur.”¹⁶ With only Minnawi's branch of the SLA abiding by the agreement, the Janjaweed attacking civilians and villages soon after the signing, and the government doing nothing to stop them; the DPA has become a piece of paper with no power.

In August 2007, sixteen rebel commanders met in Tanzania in order to try to find common demands to present to the government but even then, the leader of one segment of the Sudan Liberation Movement refused to come because the government of Sudan would not guarantee protection for his people.¹⁷ The groups reached a decision, but when they were scheduled to meet to have talks with the government in November, only one rebel group attended and the peace talks again failed. JEM leader Khalil Ibrahim had warned they would not come if rebel groups other than JEM and SLA came. SLA leader Abdul Wahid al-Nur also warned that he would not come, primarily because the talks were held in Libya. One leader of a rebel group suggested meeting in The Netherlands rather than the less neutral Libya but no meeting has yet been arranged. A November 2007 report by the International Crisis Group states that “violence is again increasing, access for humanitarian agencies is decreasing, international peacekeeping is not yet effective, and a political settlement remains far off.”¹⁸ As of September, 2009, there have been no peace talks and getting rebel groups together with the Sudanese government to have those talks have a slim chance of happening.

The fighting in 2008 has continued to endanger the lives of thousands of Darfuri men, women, and children. In the weekend of February 8, 2008, Janjaweed militia, supported by the Sudanese Air Force, initiated a new campaign of attacks which badly

burned two towns. 12,000 refugees fled to the neighboring country of Chad to flee the violence and 800 children remain missing following the attacks. Those who tried to pass into Chad were held up at the border by Sudanese troops. Two weeks later, new air strikes hit Western Darfur bringing the total civilians affected in February 2008 to more than 50,000. In May 2008, the violence escaped the boundaries of western Sudan when JEM attacked Omdurman, a city just outside of Khartoum in May 2008 and an estimated 220 people died. Following the attack, government officials announced that they would never negotiate with JEM.¹⁹ The government of Sudan also retaliated by conducting at least four airstrikes. One of them hit a school, killing at least seven children.²⁰ In the past year and a half, the attacks have continued sporadically and to a smaller degree than the initial fighting in 2003 and 2004. The fighting seems unlikely to end altogether, however, and outside help is needed if the atrocities are to end for the people of Darfur.

Outside aid in Darfur has made some impact on the violence, but has not been sufficient to end it. While the fighting in Darfur began in earnest in 2003, the international community was slow to realize it was taking place and therefore it took months before they took any action to stop the atrocities or aid its victims. Aid agencies became aware of the conflict in September 2003, but the government of Sudan resisted and halted aid until May 2004. The press in Sudan first reported on the Darfur conflict in the middle of 2003 and some international press reported on it in November 2003. The first article in the United States was written by Somini Sengupta on January 26, 2004 in *The New York Times*. The delay in news reports on Darfur slowed information and thus there was no urgency for action for people outside of Sudan. The African Union (AU) first met to discuss Darfur in May 2004 and it was not until January 2005 that the UN

created the Commission of Inquiry on Darfur and March 2005 that they created the UNMIS. The UN has enacted several resolutions in the past four years specifically dealing with Darfur.²¹ These resolutions have done a variety of things – asked for cooperation from the government of Sudan, demanded militia disarmament, and referred the conflict to the International Criminal Court (ICC) – and yet the government of Sudan has not cooperated and the militia continues to be armed.²² The ICC has yet to arrest the men for whom they issued warrants.

In August 2004, the first peacekeepers entered Darfur. The initial force consisted of 125 African Union monitors and 300 peacekeeping troops. The mission was to assess the conflict to determine whether further intervention was necessary. In mid-2005, the AU increased the number of peacekeepers from 300 to 7,000, a number that still was unable to control the chaos in a region the size of Spain.²³ The AU did not have sufficient resources to support a prolonged mission and so planned to withdraw those troops at the end of September 2006 and replace them with UN troops. UN resolution 1769, passed in the end of August 2006, would allow 17,000 UN troops to replace the AU troops, but Sudan refused to allow the UN to be in control of any military presence within their borders and was reluctant to allow them to take any part in the troop increase and so there are still only 7,000 peacekeepers in Darfur.²⁴ Analysts argue that sending troops into Darfur without the approval of the government of Sudan would be virtually impossible but getting the government of Sudan to agree to armed outsiders entering the country and then following through with any agreement has proved unsuccessful.²⁵ The government of Sudan has a habit of being cooperative at negotiations and then completely ignoring its own agreements, and making demands that are difficult to meet due to logistics or rebel

needs and desires.²⁶ They blatantly disregarded the DPA within days of signing and are the sole reason the peacekeeping force has not reached its full numbers. They agree with the UN ambassadors in public, but then change their minds or add provisions that make full implementation impossible.

The AU agreed to keep its troops in Sudan and the AU and UN reached agreements regarding the leadership and deployment of 23,000 troops in June 2007. The government of Sudan approved the agreement the following week, but later scaled that number back to 19,000 and finally agreed to a peacekeeping force with AU leaders. They refused troops from Thailand, Nepal, Sweden, and Norway and want troops only from African or Muslim countries.²⁷ At the end of 2007, the commander of the joint AU/UN force (UNAMID) reported that only 9,000 troops would be ready as of January 1, 2008 and none of the required twenty-four helicopters had yet been donated to the peacekeeping force.²⁸ General Martin Luther Agwai, former head of the AU force, warned that the 9,000 troops would be unable to support the peacekeeping efforts in the region because the rebels and militias outnumber them too much.²⁹ Even with additional troops, analysts argue that African troops will not have sufficient experience to handle the pressure of peacekeeping in Darfur.³⁰ As of August 2009, the AU peacekeeping force in Darfur still had not reached its full strength.

The United States government has acted unilaterally to help the people of Darfur. In June 2006, President George W. Bush labeled the situation in Darfur “genocide” and stated, “America will not turn away from this tragedy.”³¹ The actions taken include laws passed by Congress and executive orders passed by Bush.³² These laws and orders have included enacting sanctions, allowing seizure of property in the United States used to

support the government of Sudan or rebels in Sudan, approving appropriations to aid the civilians, and establishing a day of prayer for Sudan. The United States government has established committees to examine the issue and have pledged to do what they can to aid the Darfuri refugees in whatever way they can. Despite these actions, business in Sudan continues with little negative effect. The United States has never been a large trading partner with Sudan and other countries have continued trade. China remains one of the main trading partners, and the U.K. doubled exports and increased imports by two million pounds between 2002 and 2006.³³ The IDPs and refugees continue to suffer despite the aid and prayers and an estimated 10,000 people are dying per month.³⁴

The conflict in Darfur persists despite action on its behalf because ever since it began, the government of Sudan has worked to hinder any outside agency from aiding the Darfuri people. From the beginning, the government of Sudan has denied any widespread killing. They reject the idea that 400,000 people have died, declaring that the number is closer to 9,000. They also consistently deny any attacks by the Sudanese air force or the rebels occur, despite multiple eyewitness accounts verifying attacks. Humanitarian groups, journalists, and individuals from the UN or other countries' governments who are concerned with the dying and suffering in Darfur are hesitant to speak out because the government of Sudan also has a history of refusing entry into the country to those who oppose them. Journalists speak out about the conflict in Darfur, but find access to the region difficult to obtain. The government of Sudan has arrested many journalists who report on the conflict, and even shut down the Arab Al Jazeera network in Sudan when it became the first network to report on the situation.³⁵ Some journalists have sneaked across the border to get the stories, but if discovered face expulsion. Rob Crilly, a British

journalist based in Sudan reported on his blog that it is regular practice that he waits ten to fourteen days for a travel permit and by that time, the story he sought may be unavailable.³⁶ Journalists thus must weigh the consequences of reporting the full truth and potentially leaving the country or experiencing other interference.

Aid workers are even more hesitant to give public testimony about the circumstances they witness in Darfur than journalists. Many are denied any access to Darfur at the border between Chad and Sudan. Some aid workers are granted 72 hour travel permits, but then told to give 72 hours pre-flight notice, thus ending their trip before it begins.³⁷ Once in Darfur, many aid workers are kept in larger towns and denied access to the IDPs because the government of Sudan claims that it is too dangerous to travel outside the cities.³⁸ Those that are granted authorization to enter the region are careful to avoid expulsion. A blogger working for a humanitarian agency in South Darfur for a year spoke out against the government in her blog, but was very vague about her whereabouts and identified herself on her personal profile as: “Aid worker, female, 31, extremely single. Would tell you more about myself, but don't really want the Sudanese government to kick me out of the country for this...”³⁹ When the International Rescue Committee reported on an increase in sexual violence in Darfur, “its workers were hauled before government officials, and its efforts to get visas and travel permits became mired in red tape.”⁴⁰ The head of Care International was expelled and some speculate it is because he fired a Sudanese man who was working as a spy for the government of Sudan.⁴¹ Some aid agencies have been expelled for airing their political viewpoints about Darfur, and since their aim is to aid the victims of the attacks, they are caught between the choice of telling the stories of the people and leaving them to fend for themselves, or

staying behind and helping them silently. Aid workers must balance the short-term benefits of working in the country and helping the individuals they encounter with the long-term benefits of speaking out and potentially helping to end the conflict. Thus some aid workers are silenced for fear of the repercussions to the Darfurians or themselves.

Aid groups are also in danger from the fighting in Darfur. In September 2007, rebels attacked the Sudanese army who then retaliated and a town of 7,000 was destroyed, with 2 buildings left standing. Because of the violence, aid group Médécins Sans Frontières (MSF), also known as Doctors without Borders, was forced to withdraw from that area. In January 2008, the World Food Programme (WFP) reported that 22 trucks were stolen and 18 drivers missing.⁴² By March, the number increased to 37 trucks stolen and 23 drivers missing and the WFP was forced to cut their delivery of food by 50 percent. In addition, the WFP provided transportation to other aid workers through its Humanitarian Air Service and they warned that lack of funding would lead to them ending that service which provided access to Darfur for 8,000 people per month.⁴³ Two World Vision workers were shot in the head in 2007 and other aid workers from other NGOs (non-governmental organizations) in the country are presumed dead as well. Aid workers have the best information to share about the situation on the ground in Darfur because of their constant access to the Darfuri people and if they could speak would be able to give strong evidence regarding what is happening in Darfur and what needs to be done to end the conflict. The danger the aid workers face adds to the risk of expulsion however and causes many to avoid speaking publicly about their experiences.

Diplomats from the UN and other countries face similar problems to those of the aid workers and journalists. Initially, the government of Sudan refused to allow any UN

officials to enter the country.⁴⁴ When they were allowed in, Darfurians who spoke to those officials were arrested.⁴⁵ Since the conflict began, many UN and other government officials have been expelled from the country. In 2006, Sudan expelled UNMIS head Jan Pronk for being openly critical of the government of Sudan. In August 2007, the government of Sudan expelled EU (European Union) diplomat Kent Degerfelt and Canadian diplomat Nuala Lawlor for “mistake[s] in protocol,” a vague accusation which more likely means criticizing Sudan.⁴⁶ In November 2007, the head of the UN’s Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in Darfur was expelled for telling IDPs not to return to their villages after 1,000 refugees were rounded up by gunpoint by government of Sudan troops, placed on trucks and forced to relocate to nearby cities.⁴⁷ In July 2008, Janjaweed attacked UNAMID peacekeepers and killed eight and wounded twenty-two. UN officials hypothesize that the attacks were a response to ICC indictments of President Bashir. Shortly after the UN Security Council condemned the attacks as a war crime, another peacekeeper was killed. While the attacks may be coincidental, the evidence leads to the conclusion that when outsiders publicly attack or criticize Sudan, people in Sudan get hurt or relocated, and thus speaking out against the government of Sudan is a risk that officials and other speakers must carefully weigh.

Because of the interference from the government of Sudan, resolution to the Darfuri conflict requires delicacy and outside interference not only has the potential to help, but also to hinder the process. Speakers who are openly critical of the government may risk their work or the lives of the people in the group with which they are affiliated. If an aid worker is seen with a speaker who later speaks openly and critically about the conflict, that worker could be expelled and the aid they gave no longer available to the

Darfuri people who need it most. Speakers must be aware of the precariousness of the situation for journalists, aid workers, and UN officials in Darfur so they do not endanger the work already being done.

The government of Sudan clearly has interfered with people trying to aid Darfur, but their complicity in the conflict goes even further. They have openly accepted Janjaweed leaders within the government. In May, 2007, Luis Moreno-Ocampo of the International Criminal Court (ICC) issued arrest warrants for Humanitarian Affairs Minister Ahmed Haroun and Janjaweed leader Ali Muhammed Ali Abd alRahman, also called Ali Kushayb. Moreno-Ocampo has what he calls a “great case” against Haroun, but has not yet arrested him.⁴⁸ Haroun is wanted as the minister in charge of Darfur and for organizing and funding the Janjaweed. Ali Kushayb is wanted for ordering murder, torture, and rape of civilians in attacks in Western Darfur. The UN passed a resolution in March 2005 requiring Sudan to cooperate with the ICC, but Sudan is not cooperating. In fact, rather than submitting the two men to the ICC, Sudan has hired Haroun as Humanitarian Minister, and part of his job is to look into human rights affairs in Darfur. The government of Sudan claimed they would try Haroun and Kushayb in Sudanese courts, but Kushayb’s trial was suspended in 2007 and Haroun was briefly detained and released.⁴⁹ In addition, in January 2008, the government of Sudan appointed Musa Hilal, the man accused of coordinating Janjaweed attacks, as special advisor to the president on ethnic affairs. In June 2008, Moreno-Ocampo issued a statement to the UN stating that new evidence suggests that other officials high up in the government of Sudan are responsible for some of the crimes in Darfur. In July Moreno-Ocampo revealed that he

was accusing President Omar al Bashir. The government of Sudan ignores the warrants, stating that Sudan is not a member of the ICC sponsoring Statute – the Statute of Rome.⁵⁰

In one month following an attack on Omdurman, a city outside Khartoum, one hundred rebels were arrested and thirty-eight sentenced to death. In the six months since the attacks in Darfur, the government has not arrested anyone in the Janjaweed for the atrocities against civilians in the five years of the conflict. The government of Sudan could do something to help end the conflict, they simply choose not to.

Widespread evidence shows that the government of Sudan directly contributes to the violence by sponsoring the Janjaweed and providing them with weapons. The government of Sudan denies any such involvement but Brian Steidle, who worked with the UN in the early days of the conflict, found that the government of Sudan would attack villages on a regular basis and either claim that they had not attacked or that the attack was defensive. Steidle found evidence in many cases showing that the military initiated the fights.⁵¹ In August 2007, Amnesty International reported that Russian Antonov 12 fighter planes as well as Sudanese Air Force helicopters were in Darfur and used in attacks on villages.⁵² One month later, rebels from the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) claimed that Sudanese military planes bombed the town of Haskanita, killing at least twenty-eight people.⁵³ In 2008, in an interview with the UK's *Telegraph*, a Janjaweed commander claimed that not only was his militia armed by the Sudanese government, but that he had met with President Bashir twice in 2006 and was asked to move North to engage with the rebels there.⁵⁴ The UN collected evidence like that listed above and concluded in a March 2008 report that the government of Sudan has engaged in the raping and looting in Darfur.⁵⁵ Bashir and his government in Khartoum are directly

involved in the attacks on civilians in Darfur. Speakers seeking to end the conflict must understand that solutions which rely on the government of Sudan's goodwill are doomed to failure before they begin.

The rebels in Darfur are not blameless victims in the conflict and have increased the suffering of the people they claim to represent. A former rebel reports that he left the movement because ““they seemed to want to use civilian suffering caused by government and Janjaweed attacks in their PR campaign.””⁵⁶ While not all rebels are evil, the rebel groups have split throughout the years and, at present, there are at least twelve separate rebel factions and some NGOs report as many as twenty-three.⁵⁷ Each rebel group has slightly different demands and so finding a common ground on which to create a peace agreement is difficult. Rebels have been accused of attacking, robbing, injuring, and even killing civilians, AU troops, and humanitarian groups. In some cases, the government of Sudan reports that rebels attack villages but evidence shows attacks are actually by Janjaweed or the government of Sudan. The Sudanese army attacks villages and then responds to inquiries about the attacks by claiming bandits provoked a fight by attacking the soldiers out on routine patrols.⁵⁸ These claims are generally disbelieved. While sometimes the attacks are not by rebels, rebels have been credibly accused of attacking aid workers and AU troops in Darfur. In November, 2006, thirty IDP camp residents were killed in attacks by rebels.⁵⁹ In 2007, rebels killed at least one aid worker, kidnapped one hundred aid workers, and hijacked one hundred vehicles.⁶⁰ In September 2007, SLA-Unity, a splinter group from the SLA, attacked an AU peacekeeping base. Men in thirty vehicles attacked the base, killing ten and injuring seven. An additional

forty people were listed as missing. The ICC has issued arrest warrants for rebel leaders for war crimes alongside the indictments of government of Sudan and Janjaweed leaders.

China's relationship with Sudan is another important component of the Darfur conflict. China receives much of its oil from Sudan and is one of Sudan's biggest trading partners. Because of this, China has slowed progress in the UN attempts to take action in Darfur: "As a permanent member of the Security Council, China has blocked efforts to send UN peacekeepers to Darfur without Sudan's consent."⁶¹ Various human rights organizations and humanitarians have tried to pressure China to take a more active role in helping the people of Darfur by sanctioning the government. While China has not imposed sanctions, threats of a boycott of the 2008 Olympics – nicknamed the "genocide Olympics" by some activists – may have led China to use their influence in Sudan. China voted for UN Resolution 1769, which approved peacekeepers for Darfur and in November 2007, Sudan agreed to allow the UN to supplement the AU forces in Darfur, possibly under pressure from China.⁶² Rebels still reject China's presence in Sudan. JEM's December 2007 attacks on a Chinese-run oil field in Kordofan were, according to Commander Abdel Aziz Nur al-Ashr, "another attempt at telling Chinese companies to leave the country' 'Our goal is for oil revenues to go back to the Sudanese people and that is a strategic plan of [JEM's] movement'"⁶³ Relying on China to help end the conflict is problematic because of China's human rights record.⁶⁴ The Chinese government denied a visa to former Olympian and Darfur activist Joey Cheeks to come to the Beijing Olympics in 2008. Other human rights issues in China, including their treatment of Tibetans and the Uighar minority, suggest that relying on China to help end the conflict may be futile as well.

When speaking for a group, it is important to not only connect the spoken-for with the audience, but also to be careful to recognize that good and bad exists within each group.⁶⁵ Many uninformed speakers present the Darfuri rebels as the good side in the conflict and the government of Sudan and Janjaweed as the bad side. Some of the rebel groups are willing to hurt those around them to get what they want, whether they injure or kill civilians, Janjaweed, or military. Most of the speakers ignore the rebels, referring to them in passing but not labeling them as a positive or negative force. Kristof does deal with them briefly however:

The rebels have also killed and robbed civilians, but not nearly as often as the Sudanese government. The limits of rebel discipline were underscored when I rolled up to a rebel checkpoint: the commander scolded me for not calling ahead because, he said, the rebels might have shot me by mistake.⁶⁶

By not seeing the negative in the rebels, speakers such as Steidle speak incorrectly for Darfur. The government of Sudan and the Janjaweed are creating a large proportion of the suffering in Darfur, but the actions of the rebels hinder and even hurt the progress in helping the victims.

The situation in Darfur, like most situations that lead people to speak for others, is complicated and takes time and effort to understand. The summary given here is just that, a summary, and does not cover all the information necessary for speakers for Darfur to have prior to speaking. Speakers who do not have a full understanding of all that contributes to the conflict cannot represent the victims as accurately as those who do. When speaking for Darfur, speakers must understand the various causes to the conflict before they suggest solutions. Speakers must be sensitive to the delicacy in which advocates for Darfur within Sudan work so they do not endanger that work or the lives of the people. They must also avoid labeling the conflict as African against Arab or good

against bad and look at the good and bad that exist in both sides of the conflict. Without a comprehensive understanding of the conflict, speakers cannot truly claim to fully understand the needs of the spoken-for and their speaking is less beneficial than that of a knowledgeable speaker.

The Darfuri people

Linda Alcoff warns advocates to fight against the impetus to speak.⁶⁷ The first way to do this as advocates for Darfur is to determine the extent to which the Darfuri people can speak for themselves. A subaltern group – that is, a group which does not know their situation and cannot speak about it – needs the help of an advocate to change their circumstances.⁶⁸ The advocate may need to speak for the subaltern, or may instead need to help the other understand their situation, and help them speak for themselves. The second way to fight against the impetus to speak is to evaluate the extent to which the other is silenced. A silenced other may need an advocate to give them a voice or to speak for them. If advocates do not first evaluate the situation of the spoken-for, they may be silencing rather than helping them.

The Darfuri people are not subaltern. They do know their situation and are able to talk about that situation if given access to an audience. Several popular culture texts have Darfuri speakers talking about their situation intelligently and thoughtfully. *All About Darfur* is a documentary by an English woman of Sudanese descent.⁶⁹ In the documentary, the filmmaker asks Sudanese people from Khartoum and Darfur their opinions about the conflict and what can be done to end it. The answers demonstrate an understanding of the complexity of the conflict. *Darfur Diaries* is a documentary by three American filmmakers.⁷⁰ In this film, the filmmakers talk to the IDPs and refugees from

Darfur as well as to rebels fighting against the Janjaweed and Sudanese Army. The people give their histories and also tell what they feel would be the best solution to the conflict. “Voices from Darfur,” a group of refugees from Darfur, also speak out for their native country in a tour of the United States in 2008. Each of these examples shows that the people of Darfur know their situation and, when given the opportunity, can speak for themselves. Their ability to speak for themselves and examples of doing so show that they understand what is happening in their region and that they know, possibly better than anyone else, what needs to happen to resolve the conflict. Thus they are clearly not subaltern and do not necessarily need to be spoken for. Since the people of Darfur do not need to be spoken for as subaltern, we must next determine whether or not they have been silenced, and the reason for that silence.

Four ways that oppressors externally silence a group, as explained in chapter two, are lack of knowledge, institutionalized laws and regulations, access to an audience, and threat of force. When we analyze the social location of the Darfuri people, it becomes clear that they are silenced, to some extent, in each of the ways listed. An understanding of how and why they are silenced could provide advocates with beneficial tools to use to help the Darfuri other.

When oppressors deny the oppressed access to information pertinent to their situation, the oppressed are unable to make informed decisions to alleviate their suffering. In general, the Darfuri people have shown evidence that they are very knowledgeable about the complexities of the conflict and because they understand the history of the struggle in their region, have a better understanding of what could or could not work to solve the conflict in a way that would benefit themselves most. The only area that the

people have been ignorant is in relation to the ICC and the ICC's attempts to arrest key players in the Janjaweed. The Institute for War and Peace Reporting investigated and found that in 2007, 80% of the Darfuri people, including educated Darfurians, did not know about the ICC.⁷¹ This lack of knowledge meant that the Darfuri people could not comment on the arrest warrants and government of Sudan's refusal to cooperate unless an advocate speaks to them about this topic. As this one area is marginal to the main causes of the conflict, ignorance does not completely silence them about the conflict in general.

Oppressors also silence their victims by passing laws and regulations which make it difficult or dangerous for the oppressed to speak for themselves. Because of the way the government in Khartoum functions, the Darfuri people are practically excluded from citizenship in Sudan. While they are technically Sudanese citizens, they are not represented in the government in Khartoum. The conflict began as a response to this lack of representation and instead of including them equally in the government, the government of Sudan is sponsoring the attacks against them. Sudan is not a deliberative democracy which allows the voices of all involved to be heard. Instead, many groups are excluded from any public debate and so the Darfurians have no national government to which they can appeal. They cannot rely on democratic political means for support.⁷² The implications of this are that if the Darfuri people want to be heard in Khartoum, others with more influence in the government have to speak for them. The government of Sudan claims that they do not recognize western influence in their government and fights against non-Muslim or non-African interference. The CPA came about in part through the influence of US diplomats. These two conflicting facts suggest that Americans may or may not be the best people to represent the Darfuri people to the government of Sudan.

The oppressed are sometimes silenced even when they speak. This happens when their oppressor denies them access to an audience with the power to help them. Some people in Darfur do speak out audiences around the world. SLA leader Abdul Wahid Al-Nur published an article in the Wall Street Journal in June 2008. Al-Nur's message is available to a large audience, but Darfuri people who speak do not always have access to that type of audience. For ten years Awatif Ahmed Isshag, a 24-year-old Darfuri woman, has written a monthly paper which she posts on a tree near el Fasher in North Darfur. Her articles vary from issues from people's daily lives as well as more political issues including "stories about security in El Fasher . . . and a poem criticizing government officials who pretend that everything is okay."⁷³ While her audience is small and local, she can speak. Unfortunately, the government of Sudan does not listen to the voices of people outside the circle of power in the Nile Region of Sudan and until western journalists discovered her, people outside Darfur did not hear her message either. Her voice is available to be heard, but the most powerful audience is not listening. Other people in Darfur have spoken to a larger audience when others gave them that kind of access, even when they are not as well known as Al-Nur. *Darfur Diaries: Message from Home, All about Darfur*, "Voices from Darfur," and the "Working Class Hero" video all show that when access to a larger audience is provided, the citizens of Darfur can and will speak out about their situation. Providing access to an audience does not guarantee that audience will listen to the message, however. Audiences must be drawn in to listen and many would not choose to listen if Darfurians were the only draw. People with celebrity are more likely to gather a large audience and because of this many of the speakers in this analysis have a better chance of getting the message heard than

individuals could on their own. Even this access to an audience is endangered however. The government of Sudan's practice of arresting or denying entry to Darfur to people who speak against the government limits access to those Darfuri voices which makes it difficult for citizens of Darfur can take their own messages outside the country to audiences able to help them.

The Darfurians are also silenced externally with threat of force. The government of Sudan is no less willing to harm or arrest its citizens than it is to expel outsiders. In January 2007, Awatif Ahmed Isshag, the 24-year-old Darfuri journalist, reported that she received harassing phone calls related to her monthly paper. Suleiman Jamous is a leader of the SLA who is referred to as "politically savvy and enjoys the trust of nearly all the commanders on ground."⁷⁴ He is fluent in English and often speaks to journalists and NGO representatives who visit the region. In 2006 he entered a UN hospital to recover from injuries and the government of Sudan did not allow him to leave for more than a year. Jamous did not let his imprisonment silence him, he continues to talk to aid workers and NGOs, but others may not be as willing to risk re-imprisonment and would therefore silence themselves so they would not have to experience the threatened suffering. When the government of Sudan threatens the life or freedom of Darfurians, just as any other oppressed group, the Darfurians may be silenced.⁷⁵

Sometimes the Darfurians are silenced by the people claiming to help them. Advocates can silence the other by limiting the topics they can speak out about.⁷⁶ While the people of Darfur have shown they can speak intelligently about causes of the conflict and possible solutions, many times messages about Darfur only show the people starving or wounded and if they do speak, the Darfurians generally only explain what violence

they have experienced or atrocities they have witnessed. The aid worker or newsperson then explains the reasons for the violence and the solutions to solve the conflict. By not allowing the Darfuri people to speak publicly to an audience on subjects beyond their personal trauma, advocates do not allow them truly and fully to speak.

As the above section shows, the Darfuri people have been externally silenced. The government of Sudan; the inaccessible location; and even advocates for Darfur have contributed to this silencing. This silencing does not mean the people of Darfur are unable to speak, it means they have not been given the opportunity to speak safely to an audience that will listen and take action to help them. Advocates for Darfur would do well to take this into consideration before speaking. The Darfuri people want to speak and if given an opportunity will speak. Every time a person speaks for Darfur without understanding this, they risk further silencing the Darfurians and hindering rather than helping the people. By defining Darfurians instead of allowing Darfurians to define themselves, speakers deny the Darfurians the opportunity to empower themselves. Instead of speaking for Darfur, the advocates should try to help Darfurians overcome the barriers to speaking and being heard in order to allow the people to speak for themselves. Lack of access to the people in the country makes it more difficult to let the Darfurians speak for themselves, but many of the speakers have been to Darfur and met people, and Darfuri refugees are available to speak as well. Since documentaries and speaking tours may not attract large audiences, celebrities have an opportunity to be creative in letting the Darfuri people's voices be heard. Green Day's video for "Working Class Hero" is an example of celebrities providing an audience for the other to speak. In the video, Green Day covers the John Lennon song, while in breaks between verses and chorus, ten

Darfuri people speak out about the conflict, not only explaining their experiences, but also what they think should be done and how the audience can help. Green Day's celebrity draws in the audience, but they leave the speaking to the people. Thus the people of Darfur show they are capable, intelligent people and retain the power that comes from speaking for themselves.

While speakers should encourage the externally silenced Darfurians to speak, they should also encourage some of the internally silenced Darfurians to speak as well. Some Darfurians may silence themselves because they are uncertain whether an American audience would listen to them.⁷⁷ Others may silence themselves because they perceive the power difference between them and an American audience to be intimidating.⁷⁸ This type of silencing may be overcome if advocates can reduce the uncertainty or reassure Darfurians that any power difference is nonexistent or unimportant. Speakers should be more sensitive to Darfurians who are internally silenced because of shame, however, especially on the subject of rape. Women throughout the world are reluctant to talk about rape experiences, but the laws and culture of Sudan exacerbate the shame Sudanese victims of rape feel. The social norms in Sudan dictate the sex cannot be talked about.⁷⁹ President Bashir denies that rape happens, but medical personnel in the region report that it is a widespread problem.⁸⁰ Some of the silencing of rape victims is external silencing, because many women who have spoken out about the rape were arrested themselves for having sex outside of marriage. Sudanese law states that four male witnesses must testify before a rapist can be convicted of assault. The laws are a reflection of the culture, however, a culture in which women are subjected to punishment for extramarital sex while men are rarely punished. According to Amnesty International, rape victims in

Darfur, “face a lifetime of stigma and marginalisation from their own families and communities.”⁸¹ Few women report rape because they fear exclusion from their families. Women who are not married are also unwilling to come forward about the assault for fear they will be seen as unclean and therefore ineligible for marriage. Internal silencing experienced by the rape victims in Darfur is an example of how speaking for others can be beneficial. Speaking may end up being disempowering rather than empowering for the individual.⁸² The women cannot or will not speak and for the violence to end need someone else to speak for them. Speakers must be sensitive to the women, however, and avoid placing the stigma upon individuals by drawing attention to specific women who have been raped. The internally silenced victims in Darfur are a portion of the victims and the silencing, but are a portion that needs others to speak for them.

The people of Darfur, although not subaltern, are a silenced other. They are externally silenced through lack of knowledge, institutionalized laws, threat of force, and lack of access to an audience. Unfortunately, they are also silenced by the speakers who claim to be helping them. Instead of facilitating the process of allowing the Darfuri people to speak for themselves, the speakers presume to speak. Darfurians face many barriers to speaking for themselves, and many speakers do not have the resources or ability to surpass these barriers. Thus, in the next section, we will analyze each speaker’s identity to determine whether or not they have the resources to enable Darfurians to speak for themselves.

Speakers' identities

In chapter four, I examine the rhetoric of eight individuals or groups that use popular culture texts to speak for Darfur. Each speaker has a social location which is epistemologically salient for the message.⁸³ Identities are not fixed, however, and so speakers have the opportunity to make their identity more acceptable to the spoken-for and audience.⁸⁴ One way speakers can make their social location more beneficial is to become immersed in the culture so they can understand the people and speak *to* them before speaking *for* them.⁸⁵ Critics of speaking for others should understand a speaker's background and its potential effect on the message. While speakers can make themselves more acceptable to an audience while speaking in the way they present themselves, their identity may determine whether or not an audience will give them the opportunity.⁸⁶ By analyzing each speaker's identity in all its complexity, we can better understand the impact those identities have when each speaker speaks for Darfur.

Celebrities have an additional element to their social identity that is salient when speaking for others. Speakers can externally silence Darfurians with the impact their celebrity has on the audience. Celebrity speakers need to be more aware of their social location and the way the social location and context affects the message than speakers who come to the speaking situation with less notoriety and more expertise. Celebrities are not transparent intellectuals or in this case transparent celebrities who can speak without their identity affecting their message.⁸⁷ The benefit of having a celebrity speak for others is that celebrities attract the attention of the public:

Looking at one US network's overall coverage of Africa over 2005-06, FAIR [national media watch group Fairness & Accuracy in Reporting,] found that NBC

Nightly News ran 70 Africa-related segments, of which 18, or one-quarter, featured celebrities. “Many of those [stories] focused on Bono, with whom NBC anchor Brian Williams traveled to Africa in May 2006,” points out FAIR.⁸⁸

Some critics feel that celebrity involvement, while sometimes superficial or misguided, can be beneficial because the celebrities “know their limitations better and are usually more genuinely interested in discovering how best to use their status.”⁸⁹ Attention to a cause potentially brings money, which can help those in need. Lionello Boscardi of the UN World Food Program argues that celebrity involvement in social causes is comparable to product endorsement, where the celebrity is used to draw attention to the product, in this case the charity or group in need.⁹⁰ Some studies show that this attention can be effective to get the attention of the public and the media. In the week following the release of the movie *Blood Diamond*, news programs ran eleven news stories on the role of diamonds in Sierra Leone’s civil war, nine more stories than ran during the twelve years of the war itself.⁹¹ The access to an audience that celebrities have benefits the spoken-for in ways non-celebrities cannot.

The more well-known a speaker is, the more their identity has the potential to negatively affect the spoken-for. While a speaker’s celebrity can draw an audience to listen to their messages, the people who make up the audience are often consuming the celebrity and not the message. If celebrity speakers do not divert attention to the cause for which they speak, they can attract all the attention they are hoping to focus on the spoken-for. Bono and Brian Williams’ trip to Africa in 2006 resulted in seven news stories; however six of the seven “prominently featured the rock star” instead of focusing on the African people.⁹² Also, audience members are often aware of the history of the

celebrity and various negative aspects of their lives. Celebrities are seen as spoiled, rich, out of touch, and unaware of the problems of the average American and therefore audiences can label the rhetoric of celebrities as fake.

People who desire to speak for others should carefully weigh the need to speak with the effect their identity has upon the message. Some speakers may have a very positive history, which enhances the rhetoric; others have negative pasts, which may negatively affect the spoken-for. Some celebrities are so well-known that the rhetoric becomes all about the celebrity and not the cause for which he or she speaks. Speakers must avoid speaking without considering the way their identity affects the message. If they truly wish to help the spoken-for, they must be willing to silence themselves if necessary or at least alter the message in a way that circumvents that negative image.

Cynthia Boes

As I examine the history of Darfur and the escalation of the conflict, my own identity is a salient part of my interpretation of the events and of my critique of the speakers for Darfur. Following Nick Couldry's advice, I will be clarifying the space I speak as a self before speaking in the third person.⁹³ One of the most salient aspects of my identity is that I am a European-American living in the United States. I have not personally lived in an arid African region where I struggled for subsistence even before worrying about being attacked by militia. Having never visited Sudan or any other African nation, my ability to relate is further diminished. In addition, I am a Christian and have little first-hand knowledge of Islam and the practices that might contribute to the conflict. I am a native English speaker with a little knowledge of other languages, but Arabic is not a language that I am familiar with, and so my ability to understand Sudan

and the feelings of its people are further reduced as I can only gain information about Darfur from English speakers or texts that have been translated to English. I also have very limited access to information coming from people from Darfur. Having shortcomings in my understanding of Darfur does not necessarily preclude me from speaking:

The argument . . . is not that only third world scholars can write about third worlds; rather, the issue is that as we research Other worlds we need to examine our own nationalized, racialized, gendered privileges that inform our subject position and our intellectual constructions of the world we claim to study.⁹⁴

Knowing my subject positions allows me to be aware of ways in which my identity may hinder my understanding of the Darfurian people.

While certain aspects of my identity and experience keep me from understanding the situation in Darfur, others help to make up for those limitations. I am a mother, and that part of my identity helps me to identify with mothers who fear for the lives of their children and mourn their loss. Additionally, I have lived in other countries and had extensive exposure to and relationship with other cultures – not Sudanese or African, but different enough to help me understand that difference is important to consider. The rest of the shortcomings of my identity in understanding the conflict, I make up for by exposing myself to as much information about the conflict as I can access. Robert Shuter challenges critics of intercultural rhetoric to “to immerse themselves intellectually in the culture of the community being studied.”⁹⁵ I have read every English-language book available about the conflict in Darfur. I read news articles every day from magazines and newspapers from around the world about the conflict. I read blogs written by Sudanese

people, AU peacekeepers, and aid workers in Darfur. Thus, while my identity limits me in my analysis, I combat those limitations with personal experiences and research in order to present as reasonable and educated an assessment of the rhetoric of speaking for Darfur as I am able.

Speakers for Darfur also have limitations in their identity which make identification difficult. Even those who have been to Darfur cannot have a complete understanding of the conflict when they have only spent a few days in the region. Speakers must educate themselves about the conflict as much as possible before they speak. Additionally, being aware of the limitations is important so speakers leave room for Darfuri people to influence their rhetoric.

The Oprah Winfrey Show

The name George Clooney is recognized globally. Clooney is a hugely popular and successful television and movie star. He appears regularly on talk shows and awards shows as well. Clooney's celebrity affects his rhetoric when he speaks for Darfur. Clooney has spoken for Darfur several times. The message I analyze is his initial report on Darfur in an appearance on *The Oprah Winfrey Show* in April, 2006. The episode, entitled "The Shocking Story George Clooney Has to Tell," includes video of a trip Clooney took with his father to a refugee camp in Chad and an interview between Clooney and Oprah Winfrey. Clooney became interested in Darfur because, as he says, "I'd had a fairly decent year, and I thought, you know, I should cash in some of that capital on bringing some attention to things that – that concerned me, and [Darfur] concerned me."⁹⁶ The "fairly decent year" he describes was 2005 in which he produced and starred in the movie *Syriana* and wrote, directed, and starred in the movie *Good*

Night, and Good Luck. Clooney won an Oscar for his role in *Syriana* and was nominated for directing and writing *Good Night, and Good Luck*. Clooney uses the fame garnered from these successes to help draw attention to Darfur.

Clooney states that he was “slow to the [Africa] movement” but once he learned about Darfur he dedicated himself to finding a way to solve the conflict.⁹⁷ After his appearance on *Oprah*, Clooney used the premiere of *Ocean’s Thirteen* as a benefit to raise money for Darfur. Several other stars of the movie are also advocates for Darfur and the benefit at the premiere provided the movie stars with the opportunity to speak about the conflict to reporters. Clooney has appeared on numerous talk shows to discuss Darfur. He testified alongside Elie Wiesel to the UN Security Council. In 2007, Clooney set up the charity, “Not on our Watch” with Don Cheadle, Brad Pitt, and Matt Damon, his *Ocean’s Thirteen* co-stars. As of January 2008, they had raised \$9.3 million. In January 2008, Clooney was made United Nations (UN) “messenger of peace” because he had “seen first-hand the pain experienced by the victims of war and made it [his] personal mission to help end violence and human suffering.”⁹⁸ Clooney’s appearance on *Oprah* launched his advocacy for Darfur, but at the time he spoke he had only just been to Darfur and his subsequent humanitarian work for Darfur was not a part of his identity.

While Clooney does not emphasize his own identity and celebrity when he speaks for Darfur, his identity as a famous, good-looking, single man is a salient part of his identity and affects the way the audience responds to him and his message. After Clooney appeared on *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, the message boards discussing his appearance on *Oprah* often mentioned how successful and attractive he was. In a *Los Angeles Times* story on Clooney, his celebrity overpowers his message. The article appears on the cover

of the Calendar section – a section devoted to movies and television and not “hard” news. Clooney discusses Darfur to the *Los Angeles Times* reporter, but the only line that makes it into the article is, “He was worried that not enough is being done for the refugees of Darfur, Sudan – even though he’s helped raise more than \$10 million for relief, Clooney fears as many as 2 million more may die.”⁹⁹ The article went on to say, “nothing that Clooney said over the course of a two-hour dinner resonated like the story he told about his aunt, singer Rosemary Clooney.” The rest of the article discusses that story and Clooney’s fame and fortune. While Clooney’s celebrity allows him to bring up issues like Darfur for the public to hear, many journalists report on and audiences would rather hear about issues relating to his celebrity and not the causes he supports.

Clooney is aware of the criticism of celebrities taking on social causes. He does not address the problem of overcoming the force of celebrity but when activists question the motivation and success of celebrity activists like Clooney, he responds, “I welcome any of these dumb pundits who make celebrities out to be bad guys to a discussion about Darfur. Because I’ve been there and I’ve met all the players, and I guarantee you, the pundits haven’t.”¹⁰⁰ While it is true that Clooney has been to Africa, he has not been to Darfur. He met Darfuri people in a refugee camp in Chad. Additionally, Clooney’s trip was fairly short, enough time to film a documentary on his experiences there, but additional research on Darfur or trips to Darfur would be needed for him to get a full understanding of the history and culture of Darfur. As Clooney has researched Darfur, he has some knowledge of the background of the conflict and the role of the various groups involved. More importantly, however, this statement shows that Clooney does not consider his identity as being discursively dangerous to his message. Instead of

addressing the common critique made against celebrity advocates and thus overcoming the objections, Clooney ignores them and so the identity is not made more acceptable to his audience. A person's social location is not only the group membership to which an individual identifies, but also the group membership applied to them by others.¹⁰¹ Thus Clooney should not ignore the way others identify him.

Clooney's identity is also that of a privileged white male. While that does not mean he cannot identify with oppressed black Africans, it makes it harder to find that common ground and to convince the audience that there is common ground. Whiteness is regarded as a powerful possession that, although not often acknowledged, gives social power to the bearer. In the United States, there is a racial hierarchy that some black Americans can find difficult to overcome. bell hooks well-regarded African American scholar found that, upon going to a cultural studies conference found there to be a distinct racial hierarchy in who could speak at the conference.¹⁰² At the same conference, however, she met a biracial couple in which the white man had shifted locations and began "to see the world differently."¹⁰³ A speaker such as Clooney can also interrogate the way that his whiteness allows him to speak, and decide whether speaking reinforces that subjugation. Speakers cannot stop being white, but they can interrogate that whiteness and then immerse themselves in the culture to become more closely identified with the other.¹⁰⁴ When a speaker has immersed themselves, if it is necessary to speak for the other, the speaker can more faithfully represent the other and speak with their voice.

At the time he spoke on *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, Clooney was very new to the movement and had not yet started his charity, done interviews or become a messenger of peace. Thus the audience viewed him not as an expert on Darfur, but as another celebrity

trying to get press attention. Nevertheless, his identity as a celebrity drew an audience that may not be willing to watch the less famous guests on the episode. Clooney was the draw for the entire episode; commercials featured him and not the other stories in the episode that took up more television time. Clooney's identity does not preclude him from speaking. It does however suggest he should speak *to* the people in Darfur more than he has. Clooney's celebrity causes him to be a focus of attention when he speaks and so the people of Darfur are not as well represented as they should be.

Oprah Winfrey is one of the world's most recognizable women and her identity plays a role in her advocacy of Darfur in the episode as well. *The Oprah Winfrey Show* is in its twenty-fourth season and is broadcast in 132 countries, including Sudan, Libya, Chad and the Central African Republic.¹⁰⁵ Her talk show is rated number one in the United States. Winfrey is the world's richest woman and has been honored as one of *Time Magazine's* 100 most influential people in the world for the past four years. *Forbes* has listed her as the most influential celebrity five times. She has a media empire which, in addition to *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, includes *O Magazine*, Harpo Productions, and the Oxygen television network. Winfrey has great influence on her audience. In 1996, the beef industry sued her after she stated on her talk show that fear of mad cow disease had stopped her from eating hamburgers. Following the episode's air date, cattle prices fell for two weeks and while experts claim meat prices were already declining, the incident has been called the "Oprah Crash" of 1996.¹⁰⁶ Barack Obama's success has also been attributed in some small part to Winfrey's social influence.¹⁰⁷ Whether she actually influenced people's votes, she drew people to see her and therefore listen to Obama on their tour of primary states.¹⁰⁸ This influence and worldwide fame also draw an audience

that might not otherwise hear about Darfur. Winfrey's and Clooney's influence work together to help draw in an audience.

Winfrey spends a great deal of time away from the media in her work with various humanitarian causes as well. Winfrey has won a Global Humanitarian Action Award from The United Nations Association of the United States of America for her efforts on behalf of the oppressed around the world.¹⁰⁹ Her humanitarian work and focus on her shows has generally been on women and children. Winfrey's private charity, The Oprah Winfrey Foundation, provides grants and millions of dollars in donations to "support the education and empowerment of women, children and families in the United States and around the world."¹¹⁰ Her public charity, Oprah's Angel Network gives all of the profits to benefit non-profit organizations worldwide. Besides contributing money to humanitarian causes, Winfrey has also dedicated several episodes each year to humanitarian issues around the world and specifically in Africa.

In 2002, Winfrey visited South Africa, a visit which began a focus on South Africa specifically, but Africa as a whole as well. Her episode, "The Shocking Story George Clooney Has to Tell," marked her first show on the crisis in Darfur but she has done shows on oppressed people in South Africa, Uganda, Rwanda, Ethiopia, and other African countries as well. Winfrey said of her trip to South Africa, "my prime goal was to show African children as happy and responsive and loving so that people could see, 'Oh, these children are just like my children.' When people see children with distended bellies and flies on their eyes, they block it out and don't relate."¹¹¹ Thus Winfrey sees the need to identify the audience with the spoken-for and make each group consubstantial with the other.¹¹² Winfrey followed up the April 2006 episode on Darfur with others which

deliberately referred to the conflict. In October 2006, she interviewed Senator Barack Obama, and talked with him for several minutes about his point of view on the conflict. Also in 2006, she met with Elie Wiesel a survivor of the Nazi Holocaust who currently speaks out against genocide in the world and spoke with him regarding Darfur as well.

Winfrey's identity balances Clooney's on the show. They both draw audiences to watch their rhetoric, but in different ways and with different emphases. Her role as an influential persona is different from Clooney's because people expect to hear about social issues from her. Her extensive work with various humanitarian causes draws in audiences and so when Clooney appeared on her show, his interest in Darfur was not edited as it was in the *Los Angeles Times* article. Winfrey uses her knowledge of other, neighboring African countries to ask questions to Clooney and compare what he saw. She facilitates his message more than she speaks for Darfur herself. Together their identities provide some level of authority which allows them to speak.

Winfrey's identity as an African American woman also gives her authority with the audience. She is given the right to speak because her blackness has a peripheral relationship to the spoken-for. While Clooney could have similar or superior experiences and knowledge about Darfur than Winfrey, his whiteness is a possession that provides him with social privileges.¹¹³ While he may not wish to take advantage of those privileges, he cannot put off whiteness as it is a part of his social location. With an American audience, that whiteness separates him from the blackness of the spoken-for. Clooney, speaking on his own, may have to overcome the separation that his whiteness has with the blackness of the spoken-for. Since Winfrey is an African-American woman, however, she connects them with her own blackness.

ER

The television show *ER* comes to a close in 2009 after fifteen years on the air. In 2006, two characters left the hospital in Chicago for an IDP camp in Darfur. In these three episodes, former *ER* cast member Noah Wyle reprises his role as Dr. Carter, who had left Chicago to work for a medical aid organization, similar to Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF). The first episode brings Carter to Darfur to work alongside Dr. Stephen Dakarai, played by Eamonn Walker, and aid worker Debbie, played by Mary McCormack. In the second episode Mekhi Phifer's character Dr. Pratt travels from Chicago to Darfur to work in the IDP camp. Throughout the episodes fictional doctors, aid workers, government officials, IDPs, and Janjaweed interact and help the audience see what life in Darfur is like.

ER's Darfur storyline is one example of the way the show deals with social and political issues. "Work on the Darfur story . . . began eight months [before the show aired]. It's an extension of the show's previous attention to Africa in an arc that brought Dr. Carter to Africa to fight AIDS."¹¹⁴ *ER* has dealt with many social and political issues throughout its fourteen years. In past seasons, Carter and Dr. Luka Kovac, played by Goran Visnjic, worked with the same fictional medical aid agency in the Congo. Other *ER* episodes have dealt with AIDS, rape, domestic abuse, as well as political issues such as the high cost of healthcare. For the Darfur episodes, producers consulted with Oxfam, MSF, Human Rights First, and other aid groups to get their facts correct.

The actors and writers of *ER* episodes each have demonstrated concern with other humanitarian causes around the world to varying degrees. Actor Mekhi Phifer admits, "When I first read the script, I didn't know much about Darfur. After reading it, and

reading up on (Darfur), you have to be affected by it. You have to feel it. There's a basic genocide going on.”¹¹⁵ Phifer has dedicated time and money in his personal life to other African causes. He has been to Nigeria on a humanitarian trip and is on the board of directors of The Vine Group, USA - a nonprofit organization which raises money for education in Africa. Wyle is also involved in various humanitarian causes. He is a member of Human Rights Watch and Doctors of the World. Wyle said later of the shows, ““You're taking characters people are very familiar with and having them be your eyes and ears. I think we could have gotten a little more political, not pulled our punches as much.”¹¹⁶ Writers, R. Scott Gemmill and David Zabel, won the Humanitas Prize for the episode “There Are No Angels Here.”¹¹⁷ The Humanitas Prize “is an award given to film and television screenwriters whose works promote human dignity, meaning and freedom.”¹¹⁸ Gemmill previously won the award for an episode of *JAG* in 1999 which focused on Iraq. The humanitarian backgrounds of the actors and writers of the *ER* episode give them sensitivity towards the story they tell which leads them to present it in a positive, empowering way.

ER speaks for Darfur in a different way from *The Oprah Winfrey Show* because it is a fictionalized story of Darfur. None of the actors claimed explicitly that they were representing Darfur, but the message of the show was clearly meant to show the audience what Darfur is like and what needs to be done to help the people. Because the filmmakers are transparent, the voices of Darfurians and aid workers appear to come through unmediated. Because it is a fictional version of a real conflict, the result could be a less authentic speaking for Darfur. Because the producers spent time and consulted

authorities, however, they were able to overcome the lack of personal knowledge of the Darfuri conflict to some extent and to speak for Darfur intelligently.¹¹⁹

Angelina Jolie

Angelina Jolie has generally been known by the public more for her personal life than for the movies in which she starred. From the time she gained public attention at the age of eighteen, the media has focused on her beauty and sexuality. The media pay a lot of attention to her romantic relationships as well. One of the overly publicized relationships was with Billy Bob Thornton because of its scandalous and disturbing aspects, including passionate public kisses, matching tattoos, and vials of each other's blood which each wore on a necklace. Her relationship with Brad Pitt has gained her even more attention with the media outlets paying so much attention that when her child with Brad Pitt was born in Namibia, tourism and attention to the country increased greatly. She and Pitt later sold pictures of the new baby for \$4 million and donated the money to charity. In the past nine years, however, her volunteer work has gained more press as well. Jolie speaks for Darfur as an extension of her work with refugees around the world with the UNHCR. In 2004 she spoke in an interview with Deborah Norville on *Deborah Norville Tonight*. In the half hour interview, Jolie shares her experience from trips she took to Darfur with the UNHCR.

Jolie's identity is an example of how identities are malleable and change over time.¹²⁰ Jolie's identity changed from wild child to humanitarian after she filmed the movie *Lara Croft: Tomb Raider* in Cambodia. Spending time in Cambodia gave her a new view of the world and she became passionate about helping refugees around the world. In 2001, she contacted the UNHCR and began traveling with them to refugee

camps. While Jolie was excited to help the UNHCR and the refugees they aid, she was always aware of how her public image might affect her involvement in social issues: “I actually sat [the UNHCR representatives] down and said, ‘You do realize that people think I’m strange?’ There are a lot of rumors about me, and I said, ‘Do you really want me? Getting me involved might damage your reputation.’”¹²¹ The UNHCR thought her celebrity would help rather than hinder their mission and asked her to join them as a goodwill ambassador. Jolie considered quitting movies and dedicating herself to social causes, but decided to continue acting in order to have the media attention and money to support her causes. Since she joined the UNHCR in 2001, she has traveled to more than 20 countries. She also brought the world into her home, adopting three children from countries she has visited: Cambodia, Ethiopia, and Vietnam. Jolie donates money as well as time to the humanitarian causes about which she is passionate. In October 2007, Jolie and her partner, Brad Pitt, donated \$1 million to the humanitarian effort in Darfur.¹²² In total, she donates one-third of her income to charity. In 2009, Jolie surpassed Winfrey as the most powerful celebrity, in part because of “the consistent headlines she grabs for her philanthropic efforts.”¹²³ This identity change has been apparent in the media and has changed the way Americans view Jolie. In 2004, however, her change was fairly new and so the point of view of the audience was likely still mixed.

Jolie began speaking for others almost as soon as she changed her worldview. Whereas before 2001, interviewers would ask her about her troubled past, they now ask about her family and her work. Generally, when she speaks, she speaks for all refugees throughout the world and Darfur is just one of many places included. Jolie has spoken about Darfur in an advertisement in which she explains in brief some of the problems

Darfuri people face. In 2004, she appeared on several talk shows discussing her work with UNHCR, Darfur was specifically mentioned in interviews for *Dateline*, *Nightline*, and CNN's *360 with Anderson Cooper* but the interview with Norville is the only one that focuses solely on Darfur. Celebrities like Jolie bring audiences to causes when they speak, but that audience does not always want to listen. After the interview on *360*, viewers who tuned in were disappointed because, "to the annoyance of many who wanted juicy details about Jolie's hunk and their incredibly well-gened daughter, Shiloh Nouvel Jolie-Pitt, Jolie spent the majority of the time talking about war-torn and poverty-stricken countries."¹²⁴ Jolie's experience with Darfur and other refugees around the world gives her authority to speak for Darfur. While her social location once would have hurt her message, it has changed in the past eight years so that she now brings positive attention to the causes she speaks for. Like Clooney, however, her identity as a wealthy, beautiful, white celebrity may make audiences reluctant to accept her as an expert on Darfur. Celebrities can be viewed as out of touch with the "real world" and therefore unable to speak about issues affecting the world outside Hollywood.

Hotel Rwanda

The 1994 war in Rwanda is the most recent case of genocide in the world and is used as a point of comparison for many speakers for Darfur. The slaughter of 800,000 Tutsis by Hutu militia was ignored by the world and speakers use the phrase "never again" to motivate audiences to take action to stop genocide from happening in Darfur. The movie *Hotel Rwanda* takes this comparison a step further by taking the abstract concept of "genocide" and showing the genocide in Rwanda as a real event that affected real people. *Hotel Rwanda* director Terry George stated that he had been looking for a

movie about Africa and found it when he read Keir Pearson's script. The script told a "political and humanitarian story, but [he wanted to] tell it in a way that it could become a piece of entertainment as a movie, that it would make people laugh and cry and feel sorrow."¹²⁵ The filmmakers purposely chose to tell a story about Rwanda for the social impact on current humanitarian crises, especially in The Congo and Sudan, so the world does not make the same mistakes in ignoring the conflicts in The Congo and Sudan as they did while the Rwandan genocide was occurring.

None of the people directly involved in *Hotel Rwanda* have the public attention that Winfrey, Clooney, or Jolie have. Don Cheadle plays the part of the main character, Paul Rusesabagina. Cheadle had been a lesser known actor for many years and his recognition as a premiere actor came in 2005 with his role in *Hotel Rwanda*.¹²⁶ Cheadle's reputation as an activist also began with the movie. His trip to Africa to shoot the movie was his first journey to the continent, but he has returned many times since.¹²⁷ After watching the movie, United States Representative Ed Royce told Cheadle that a conflict similar to the Rwandan genocide was occurring in Sudan. Royce asked Cheadle to come with a congressional delegation to Darfur and "shine light on the area."¹²⁸ In January, 2005, Cheadle took a trip to Darfur and became outraged. He has since become one of Hollywood's biggest advocates for the people of Darfur. He said of the movie, "While attention is being paid, I'm definitely trying to mention the Sudan in every interview I do and appearance I make and keep putting that in front, because I don't want people to say: 'I didn't know.'¹²⁹ Besides the work he has done alongside Clooney, Cheadle co-wrote the book *Not on Our Watch: The Mission to End Genocide in Sudan* with activist John Prendergast in 2007. He wrote the book in order to "stand up and make as much noise as

possible. . . . Hundreds of thousands of people are dying. We can't walk away.”¹³⁰

Cheadle also produced *Darfur Now*, a documentary about six different activists for Darfur. Four of the activists are people around the world speaking for Darfur, and two are activists in Darfur, working to obtain justice and peace for their own people. Director Terry George is known for writing and directing *In the Name of the Father* in 2003, but has had no other major movies. *Hotel Rwanda* is writer Keir Pearson's only major work. Neither George nor Pearson are big names in Hollywood, but the movie was nominated for twenty-nine awards, including three Oscars, three Golden Globes, and three Screen Actors Guild awards. Because Cheadle, George, and Pearson were relatively unknown personalities they are not stuck in the stereotypes from past movies and their personal lives do not overtake the message they bring in the same way as Clooney's and Jolie's do.

While none of the filmmakers or actors had experience with Darfur when making the movie, they provide links to Amnesty International in the DVD for the audience to educate themselves. Amnesty International is an organization fighting for human rights around the world. As an organization they seek to “Stop violence against women, Defend the rights and dignity of those trapped in poverty. . . . Free prisoners of conscience, Protect the rights of refugees and migrants” among other actions to protect human rights.¹³¹ Darfur is listed as one of the priorities of Amnesty International, USA, and works “to ensure security for displaced civilians, access and funding for humanitarian organizations, and accountability for the perpetrators of massive human rights abuses in the region.”¹³² Amnesty has been operating since 1961 and is well-known for its humanitarian work. By joining with Amnesty, *Hotel Rwanda* increases its own credibility

in regards to the conflict and provides the audience with an established organization that will help them to take action in Darfur.

Like *ER*, *Hotel Rwanda* is a fictionalized text that speaks for Darfur, but it is based on a true story. The movie is not about Darfur, but stands as an analogy for the crisis. Telling a story through analogy can often make it difficult to urge action to solve the problem. James Jasinski argues that “argument by comparison is a strategy for measuring the value of something; it does not provide a way of making predictions or urging action.”¹³³ The filmmakers overcome this difficulty by including the DVD’s introduction and pamphlet describing actions to take on behalf of current humanitarian crises such as Darfur. Argumentation by analogy also makes it difficult to relate to the spoken-for as they are not present in the text itself. In chapter four, I will analyze the ways in which this benefits the Darfuri people rather than hinders them.

Nicholas Kristof

Journalists generally speak *about* people groups encountering difficulties, but some use editorials or blogs to speak *for* those groups as well. Nicholas Kristof is one of the first journalists who recognized the conflict in Darfur as a major humanitarian problem. In 2004, he began speaking about the conflict for the *New York Times*; shortly after reporter Somini Sengupta introduced the conflict to the United States. Kristof also speaks for Darfur in a series of editorials on Darfur for the *Times* spanning the past five years. In this analysis I look at his early writings from 2004, in which he introduces his audience to the people of Darfur and the conflict that rages around them. Kristof is the individual speaker in this analysis of speaking for Darfur with the most background and experience to help him understand the people of Darfur. While his whiteness creates a

barrier between him and the spoken-for,¹³⁴ he has a vast deal of personal experience with the spoken-for that increases his level of authority. Kristof studied Arabic in Egypt and while he used interpreters while travelling in Darfur, his knowledge of the language gives him an advantage over other speakers who understand no Arabic. Kristof has lived on four continents and has travelled extensively and so has a unique awareness of cultural difference. He also has a good deal of experience living and working in African countries. He backpacked through Africa before becoming a journalist and began writing to pay for his expenses, which launched his career. Kristof's editorials on Darfur are a natural extension of his activist journalism. Ethiopia, a country which borders Sudan, is another African country about which he has written extensively. Kristof has also focused on other areas of the world where people are oppressed, including Cambodia, China, and Iraq. In 1990 he and his wife won a Pulitzer Prize for articles they co-wrote on Tiananmen Square.

Kristof began reporting on Darfur in March 2004. He won a second Pulitzer in 2006 for those articles. He has visited the area ten times as of May 2008. With his extensive experience in Darfur and countries with similar isolationist societies, Kristof has a great deal of knowledge from which to speak for Darfur. Kristof also has had more access to Darfur than other speakers, and therefore has more opportunity to allow the Darfuri people to speak for themselves. Despite this potential, he often shares his ideas of what is needed to solve the crisis in Darfur, but makes no indication that these ideas are consistent with what the people of Darfur want. Kristof's experience and access make him a credible speaker for Darfur. Although he would do better to help undo the silencing of the Darfuri people, he has clearly spoken *to* Darfurians and thus has a clearer

understanding of the people and culture than other speakers. This experience increases the credibility of his identity so that it is not discursively dangerous.

Save Darfur

Over the past six years, several citizens have formed not-for-profit organizations in order to bring awareness to the conflict in Darfur and aid its people. Save Darfur is one of the largest, most publicly recognized of these organizations. It was founded in 2004 to “raise public awareness and mobilize a massive response to the atrocities in . . . Darfur.”¹³⁵ Its mission is positive but Save Darfur has received a lot of criticism over the years for its myopic viewpoint regarding the conflict. Expert panelists in the Arab American Anti-Discrimination Committee’s Annual National Convention in June 2008 “agreed that U.S. advocacy groups, such as the Save Darfur Coalition, over-simplify the Darfur crisis.”¹³⁶ Save Darfur is involved in many campaigns designed to end the suffering in Darfur, but several of these campaigns have been criticized by analysts and Sudanese people. Brian Steidle’s “Tour for Darfur: Eyewitness to Genocide” has received criticism because of Steidle’s incomplete portrayal of the rebels as the noble side of the conflict. The divestment campaign has also been criticized by Andrew Natsios, Bush’s envoy to Sudan, for disrupting current talks with Sudan.¹³⁷ “Dream for Darfur” was a campaign in which activists carry a torch through former countries in which genocide took place along with twenty U.S. states while the Olympic torch went through other countries. As many experts deny that Darfur constitutes genocide, this campaign has been dismissed as irrelevant. Aid groups and activists disagreed with Save Darfur’s call for a no-flight zone over Darfur and Sam Worthington, the president and chief executive of

Interaction, a coalition of aid groups, accused the organization of being unaware of the “realities on the ground” in Darfur.¹³⁸

Advertisements by Save Darfur were especially worrisome to aid organizations because they claimed that “international relief organizations” felt that the time for negotiations with the government of Sudan was done. Because of the government of Sudan’s habit of expelling or refusing entry to aid agencies that openly challenge them, aid organizations repudiated the advertisements and rebuked Save Darfur for making unsubstantiated statements. In 2007, Save Darfur fired their executive director, David Rubenstein because of the response to their advertisements:

The advertisements strained relationships with aid groups working on the ground in Darfur. . . . Many of the groups opposed some of the tone and content of Save Darfur’s high-decibel advocacy campaign.¹³⁹

I analyze two television advertisements made since Save Darfur fired Rubenstein. Just as Jolie’s identity changed over time, Save Darfur have strived to make their identity more acceptable, since the days of Rubenstein, but effects from their early years linger and affect the audience’s response to the advertisements. Save Darfur speaks from a discursively dangerous social location and must overcome that in order to benefit and not harm the Darfuri people.

Be a Witness

Two more not-for-profit organizations which have spoken for Darfur to a lesser extent than Save Darfur are the Center for American Progress Action Fund and the Genocide Intervention Network. The Center for American Progress Action Fund is a think tank headed by John D. Podesta – the former chief of staff under President Bill Clinton and current professor at Georgetown. Elizabeth Edwards, wife of former Senator

John Edwards, is also a member. The center has many social issues it works towards solving, including health care, but the center focuses most of its attention on clean energy and oil independence. The Genocide Intervention Network is a nonprofit organization that seeks to empower “individuals and communities with the tools to prevent and stop genocide.”¹⁴⁰ They are currently focusing on eight “areas of concern,” including the Central African Republic, Darfur, Democratic Republic of Congo, Eastern Burma, Eastern Chad, Iraq, Somalia, and Sri Lanka, but Darfur is their main focus. The “Be a Witness” advertisement was sponsored by these two organizations and aired in 2005.

Neither the Center for American Progress or the Genocide Intervention Network is well-known enough to have their identity play a significant role on their message, but the lack of identity may also mean they lack the credibility to be heard. They will not draw an audience in the same way that more well-known speakers would. Because they do not have an audience waiting to hear from them, they must work harder to make people listen. On the other hand, both organizations have credibility based on the official nature of who they are. While Clooney speaks only on his own behalf, these two organizations have a board of directors or supporters checking the messages and how they present it. This leads audience members to place more trust in what the speaker says. On the other hand, neither of these organizations is well-known and so audience members do not have a previous understanding of whether the organizations as a whole are credible or not. Additionally, neither speaks exclusively for Darfur. Because they divide their attention between multiple causes, they do not have the perception of expertise that Save Darfur has. On the other hand, neither organization suffers from the onslaught of criticism faced by Save Darfur.

Darfur is Dying

“Darfur is Dying” is a viral video game designed by University of Southern California students in response to the Darfur Digital Activist Contest sponsored by mtvU, Reebok Human Rights Foundation, and the International Crisis Group. The game launched on April 30, 2006. As of September 4, 2006, 800,000 people had played the game 1.7 million times. Tens of thousands of players also clicked on links that go to International Crisis Group to learn more about the conflict, send the game to friends, or send letters to President Bush or Congress member asking for resolution to Darfur.

The team spent half of the time they were conceiving the game becoming informed about the conflict so they could “represent the reality accurately and hopefully be insightful.”¹⁴¹ The creators “worked closely with humanitarian aid workers with extensive on the ground experience in Darfur to develop” the game.¹⁴² Their knowledge is all secondhand but comes from good, reputable sources and helps them have a better understanding of the conflict which they can then forward to the players. They have “immerse[d] themselves intellectually in the culture of the community being studied.”¹⁴³ They also provide links to the ICG for players to get more specific and detailed information about the crisis. The ICG has more credibility and the links add credibility to the game’s creators. The game is among a group of “ethical” computer games which seek to take players into the lives of the oppressed. The creators of the game meant for it to be engaging, but not necessarily fun.¹⁴⁴ While this might seem as if it would discourage people from playing, the nature of the game and urgency of the actual conflict creates an urgency and incentive to play.

The International Crisis Group (ICG) is “generally recognised as the world’s leading independent, non-partisan, source of analysis and advice to governments, and intergovernmental bodies like the United Nations, European Union and World Bank, on the prevention and resolution of deadly conflict.”¹⁴⁵ The ICG has been working in Darfur since the beginning of the conflict to inform world governments about the crisis and seeking involvement to resolve it. MTV is known for its bawdy reality shows and Rock the Vote type civic engagement. The game’s audience is a younger audience which would be drawn to viral video games. MTV is not generally known as a serious venue for political or social issues. This aspect of its identity reduces the credibility of the game; however MTV is only identified as being affiliated with the game on the very bottom of the page in small lettering. Those who look for a “speaker” will find out that MTV, Reebok, and the International Crisis Group are involved but most players will never see or know who the actual speaker is and will view the experience through the actions of the avatar.

The audience

The final group in this chapter is the audience of each of the messages. Having an understanding of the audience will help speakers understand what information they must present and what aspect of the speaker’s identity will be acceptable. Geesey’s analysis shows us that speakers harm the spoken-for when they focus a message meant for the members of the spoken-for group on another audience.¹⁴⁶ Speakers must therefore consider what audience needs to hear the message – the spoken-for to solve problems internally, or a more empowered audience to solve problems from the outside. After

determining which audience should be the recipient of the message, the speaker should have an understanding of what the audience views negatively or disinterestedly. Speakers need to focus their messages on the audience so they do not misrepresent or disempower the other.¹⁴⁷ The audience for the messages I have analyzed is primarily made up of Americans. Americans are known throughout the world to have poor understanding of the rest of the world. Americans tend to be somewhat ignorant of geography and of the culture of people groups. Often whole continents such as Africa or South America are stereotyped as being all the same, despite the diversity of people groups within those continents.¹⁴⁸ Some Americans think that Africa is a country or at least that it is a homogeneous group of people, despite the fact that there are 700 million people in fifty-four countries and a multitude of religious, cultural, and ethnic groups.¹⁴⁹ Because of this ignorance, many Americans are not informed about Darfur and they are not aware of the people, groups, and places involved, thus when speakers mention specific locations or tribes, the audience does not understand and speakers must either explain in more detail or skip these details.

Another quality Americans possess that is salient for speakers for Darfur is their interest in social, humanitarian causes. As a whole, Americans donate a lot of money to aid. In 2007, Americans gave \$306.4 billion to various humanitarian causes.¹⁵⁰ *The Oprah Winfrey Show's* audience has donated \$50 million to her Angel Network. Because Americans can be very generous and concerned with humanitarian issues, they can become distracted from Darfur and cease to support it once they have learned of new crises in other parts of the world. The genocide in Rwanda and Bosnia happened during the lifetime of all Americans over the age of fourteen. Americans are familiar with

genocide and so when the advocates define the Darfur conflict as genocide, were not reluctant to accept that claim. While Americans can be generous and humanitarian-minded, during the period of time that the conflict in Darfur has been going on, several other major humanitarian crises have occurred. Hurricane Katrina hit the Southeastern United States. Contributions to the Red Cross in the four weeks following the disaster exceeded \$1 billion. Television networks reported the crisis nonstop for days. The 2004 tsunami in the Indian Ocean killed nearly 230,000 people and displaced 1.1 million. The Red Cross raised \$150 million in two weeks.¹⁵¹ These crises have taken attention and support away from Darfur. Also, presidential elections have taken the attention of Americans in 2004 and 2008. Advocates must find ways to keep the conflict fresh in the minds of its audience since it has outlasted the other conflicts and the audience may lose interest or forget about its existence.

After the attacks on the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, the attitude of many Americans towards Muslims became more negative. Hate crimes against Muslims increased 1600 percent from 2000 to 2001.¹⁵² Hate crimes increased again in 2004 by 52 percent.¹⁵³ This makes it tempting for advocates to present the conflict as being a fight between Africans and Arab Muslims. The United States is also a country with heightened race sensitivity and so the temptation to make the Darfur conflict a racial one is strong. Americans find it easy to defend the “good” black Africans and to demonize the “evil” Arab Muslims. Many Americans view Muslims in general as an enemy and demonizing them is a rallying point for some speakers for Darfur. Muslims are the “point-to-able form of people with a certain kind of ‘blood,’” which Burke identified as Hitler’s tool to unify his audience against the Jews.

Not only are Muslims a visible enemy, but singular and therefore easier to attack in order to solve the problem. The Darfuri conflict began as a struggle for land and power and not as a racial or religious problem and therefore limiting the struggle to race or religion avoids the real causes and avoids any effective strategy to solve the problems. In addition, the demonization of Muslims means the demonizing of the victims of the conflict “because even civilians are considered to be consenting and contributing members of one evil order or the other.”¹⁵⁴ With the root of the problem lying in power, land use, and independence, solving racial issues will not do enough to end the conflict. Advocates must find a way to identify the Muslim victims with the audience in ways that transcend race and religion.

Americans also have a fascination with celebrities. Celebrity news appears not only in celebrity magazines and websites but also almost as often in “hard” news mediums. More Americans would recognize the face of an A-list celebrity than would recognize the face of a politician other than the President. Additionally, they could probably list ten facts about that celebrity’s life. With this saturation of celebrity news available, the audience to the speaking for others texts will know who many of the celebrity speakers are and may even be drawn to watch because of that knowledge. On the other hand, any negative press that celebrity has received will also be known by the audience and thus their identity can very easily damage the message they present.

While the general audience for each of the messages is the American public, the demographics of the audiences for each specific message are different. *The Oprah Winfrey Show* has a primarily female audience; more than fifty percent are over fifty years old.¹⁵⁵ They are also predominately white. MSNBC has the youngest cable news

audience and is available in 33 million homes. *ER* was a top ten show in 2006 and so has a large diverse audience. *Hotel Rwanda* barely made the top 100 movies of 2004 but likely had an audience of socially conscious people because of its subject matter. The advertisements appear on various channels and times and so reach a variety of audiences and “Darfur is Dying” attracts youth. Youth, specifically have been involved in Darfur in unprecedented numbers.¹⁵⁶ One of the premiere advocacy groups for Darfur is STAND – Students Taking Action Now in Darfur. They have 850 chapters in twenty-five countries worldwide. Young people are the demographic specifically targeted in “Darfur is Dying:” it is a “logical medium for rigorous communication and social change.”¹⁵⁷ Youth do not have the political capital to make change for Darfur, however, and so speakers for Darfur can target them as an audience, but if they desire real change in Darfur must find a way to empower youth politically or reach other audiences with more political influence as well. The age, gender, and race of the audience make the burden of each speaker different from others.

Speakers should be aware of the identity of the audience before they speak for Darfur. Without the knowledge of the group to whom they are speaking, speakers cannot represent the spoken-for well. Speakers can create identification between the audience and spoken-for only if they understand the social location of the two groups. If speakers can identify the audience with the spoken-for, the spoken-for will benefit. Because of the specific audience described above, the speaker for Darfur should not assume the audience has prior knowledge of the conflict and the region. The speaker should also emphasize the magnitude of the conflict to show the audience why they should continue to care about this problem despite other humanitarian crises that might distract them. Finally, the

speaker should be sensitive to the attitude many audience members may have against Islam and seek to decrease that negativity rather than enhance it.

A better understanding of the spoken-for, the speakers, and the audience makes the kind of rhetoric that will be most effective for speaking for Darfur clearer. Ideally, all speakers for Darfur will take into consideration the social location of themselves, their audience, and the spoken-for and speak in a way that best meets the needs of each group. The extent to which the speaker can do this is the extent to which they each speak positively for Darfur.

Chapter 4. A Rhetorical Criticism of Speaking for Darfur

American speakers for Darfur have the difficult task of persuading audiences to care about ending an established conflict halfway around the world. A majority of the audience from which they are urging attention and action has never been to, and in many cases even heard of, the region. This requires careful consideration and planning on the part of the speaker. In order to instigate change, speakers must get attention from a U.S. audience, an audience that presents unique challenges. In order to persuade the audience to take action, speakers must present a message that leaves a significant imprint that lasts beyond the moment of speaking. This daunting task has been attempted by each of the speakers discussed in the previous chapter. Each of the speakers desires to help the people of Darfur. Most have dedicated their own time, money, and energy to aid the Darfuri people and are urging others to do the same. In this analysis of their rhetoric, I use the conceptual conclusion drawn from a synthesis of the literature on speaking for others and rhetoric to examine whether the speakers are able to make an impression on the audience that encourages long-term attitude and behavior change rather than, as one of the speakers says, leaving the audience saying, “‘That’s horrible,’ and then go on eating their dinners.”¹

What it means to *speak* for Darfur

The *speaking* of speaking for others is the act of presenting a public message that clearly and purposefully works to improve the circumstances of the spoken-for. Many media are used to *speak*, and the message is manifested through spoken word, written

word, acting, visual image, and personal engagement. Because the *speaking* in speaking for others is a public act in which speakers clearly and purposefully represent the spoken-for to an audience, several cases of advocacy for Darfur are excluded from this analysis. In past years, multiple events in popular culture have raised money for Darfur. One of the largest was “Rock for Darfur,” a series of concerts by twenty bands throughout the United States in October 2006 and 2007 sponsored by MySpace. The concerts raised money and led to an increased awareness of the Darfuri conflict, but those criteria alone do not place it in the category of speaking for others because the concerts did not have a clear, purposeful message representing the people of Darfur. In order for the concerts’ audience to learn about the conflict and how to solve it, they must look for information outside the concert. The DesignersForDarfur fashion show raised money for Darfur in February, 2007. Again, this event benefited the people of Darfur by raising money for supplies to be donated to aid agencies in Darfur, but cannot be considered speaking as there was no clear, purposeful message given regarding the Darfuri conflict.

On the other hand, many advocates for Darfur do clearly and purposefully speak about the conflict but do so with friends and family on an interpersonal basis. This private advocacy is a way to promote awareness of and assistance for the people of Darfur, but because it is not public, this type of speaking is not considered here. Those who speak in private should also be considerate of how they represent the spoken-for, speaking knowledgably and fairly about the situation. These speakers differ from speakers in a public arena in that public speakers have a greater responsibility because of the numbers of people they reach and the private speaker’s identity and relationship to the audience affects the message in a different way than public messages do. Many other texts do

speak for Darfur in a powerful and compelling way, but because they are available only to limited audiences or presented by relatively unknown people they are more difficult to access as a critic and a smaller audience means less impact as texts and so they are not included in this analysis.

The messages in the eight texts I analyze in this chapter are each public messages designed for and available to an audience of millions of people by speakers who claim the ability to speak instead of the spoken-for. Each of the texts also clearly and purposefully represents the people of Darfur to the audience. Thus each of the messages fits the definition of speaking for others but each does so in a way specific to its genre. In the analysis of how each text *speaks*, I look at the message itself to see if it is a public message clearly meant to benefit the spoken-for. Beyond determining whether the message fits the definition of *speaking*, I analyze the message and determine how they hinder or help the people of Darfur by contributing to the freedom or domination of the Darfurians.² The spoken-for should be represented in an accurate or empowering way and not as less powerful than they are, thus reinforcing their victimization. I also evaluate the ways the speakers identify themselves with the audience, and how this does or does not help the spoken-for.

Direct address of a message to an audience is one of the ways speakers speak for Darfur through news programs, news articles, or talk shows. These public forums allow a speaker to present a message to an audience beyond their immediate family or friends. Each of the texts studied in this medium are public. *The Oprah Winfrey Show* has millions of viewers in 132 countries. Kristof's audience is composed of readers of the *New York Times*, one of the most widely read newspapers in the world with 1.1 million

daily subscribers in 2004.³ Norville's show has been canceled since the interview with Jolie and did not have as large a following as Winfrey and Kristof; however MSNBC is a major cable news channel and thus the show is public. The messages of news and talk shows often speak *about* others or allow people to speak for themselves, but sometimes expert guests are interviewed or appear on the shows, and other times, the newscaster or talk show host present themselves as experts because of past experiences and thus speak *for* Darfur. These types of messages are generally the most straightforward way to speak for others in popular culture. Speakers can explain clearly and explicitly what they want the audience to hear. The message is not limited by time constraints as much as an advertisement and is able to be more explicit and clear than a fictional story would be. Speakers should take advantage of the ability to speak more explicitly by describing the conflict in detail, expressing the urgency of the situation, and explaining what problem needs to be solved.

The Oprah Winfrey Show's episode "The Shocking Story George Clooney Has to Tell" speaks for Darfur. In this episode Clooney and Winfrey bring awareness to the conflict and ask audience members to take action to change the situation for the Darfuri people. Winfrey emphasizes the urgency from the very beginning of the episode. The second statement she makes is, "This is urgent."⁴ In the same monologue, she states, "If we don't listen and do something now, we all are going to have blood on our hands"⁵ These statements emphasize the need for action clearly from the beginning of the message, even before audience members know any details of the problems included in the following hour of the show. Winfrey further demonstrates the urgency and importance of the information she presents in this episode by describing Clooney as

being “on a mission” to find out what is happening in Darfur. Clooney gives a brief summary of the conflict, describing it as a clash between Arab and African Muslims. He describes the Janjaweed as “government-sponsored murdering militias.”⁶ He concludes his description of the conflict by claiming “this is, without question, genocide.”⁷ With these statements presenting a clear message to help aid the people of Darfur, Clooney and Winfrey speak for Darfur.

Nicholas Kristof *speaks* for Darfur in sixteen editorials he wrote for the *New York Times* in 2004. He makes explicit statements throughout his editorials that clearly express the conflict in Darfur and what should be done to solve it. From the very first column he states, “The government of Sudan is engaging in genocide against three large African tribes in its Darfur region here.”⁸ This kind of straightforward statement allows the audience to understand Kristof’s message directly. Kristof sometimes uses language that is less clear, but which also shows how he feels about the conflict and the action (or lack of action) by those with the ability to act. He uses sarcasm to show that the level of importance placed on it in the media is inadequate: “with only 250,000 more deaths it will achieve the gravitas of the Laci Peterson case.”⁹ Kristof also *speaks* by expressing the urgency of the problem. He estimates that 100,000 to 320,000 people will die in 2004 and that in a worst case scenario 1 million could die. Through the arguments presented in each of the sixteen articles written in the public venue of the *New York Times*, Kristof *speaks* for Darfur.

The 2004 *Deborah Norville Tonight* interview with Angelina Jolie *speaks* for Darfur with a clear, purposeful, and public message as well. Jolie visited the region twice that year and, while the half-hour interview has a brief discussion about her life more

broadly than just its relationship to Darfur, the focus is on what needs to be done to end the conflict. The message explains the situation in Darfur to give the audience a more complete understanding of what Jolie sees as being the central problem to solve: bring security to the region before bringing more humanitarian aid. Norville adds to the message by expressing the urgency of the issue in the introduction: it is “the worst situation [Jolie has] ever seen.”¹⁰ By explaining the conflict and its urgency, Jolie and Norville speak for Darfur.

Fictional stories can also speak for others, although in a different way than the news and talk shows do. Most fictional stories are made for public consumption even when they are not received by a public audience. The fictional television program and movie analyzed here both had large audiences. *ER* aired on NBC on Thursday nights, one of the most watched nights of television and continues in syndication. *Hotel Rwanda* appeared on screens throughout the United States and the rest of the world and is available on DVD to rent or buy. Although these messages are public, the message can be unclear because they do not directly explain the message to the audience. Fictional stories often require the audience to infer the message from the conversations and actions of the characters instead of having the speaker state directly what they want the audience to know. Because audiences can misinterpret the message, speakers using this medium must be purposeful in writing the story in a way that not only tells a story but clearly presents the message, explaining the problem and how to solve it. Fiction can be a powerful medium as humans are storytelling creatures who make sense of the world through stories. Because of this, a story about the spoken-for can be more powerful than facts or

statistics about their situation and if the story is well-told, will have a clear message as well.

ER's episodes "Darfur," "Nowhere to Hide," and "There Are No Angels Here" are additional texts that speak for Darfur. The episodes focus on two characters from the Chicago hospital in which the show is the set. The doctors, Carter and Pratt, go to Darfur to work in an IDP camp for a fictional organization similar to MSF. While the story is a fictional representation of life in Darfuri IDP camps, a message about the horror of the conflict and the need for Americans to understand and get involved is expressed through the characters' conversations. Other characters in the show talk about the conflict to Carter and Pratt and, by extension, to the audience. Carter and Pratt also learn about the conflict through events such as attacks on themselves and the camp. With the events and conversations, the message clearly and purposefully speaks for Darfur.

The show's writers explain the reality of Darfur through the experiences of the doctors working there. Carter begins his time in Darfur already accustomed to working in countries engaged in conflicts such as he experiences in Darfur. In former episodes, he went to the Congo with the same humanitarian organization and his character eventually left the Chicago hospital and the show to do humanitarian work fulltime. Pratt's introduction to the country and culture is more abrupt and more closely mirrors the audience's understanding of the conflict. When he enters the country, he experiences culture shock similar to most people travelling to developing countries; he complains about nobody being able to speak English and the lack of paving on the roads.¹¹ After a short time, however, the reality of Darfur becomes clearer to him and, by extension, the audience. On the trip from the airport to the camp, Janjaweed stop the Range Rover Pratt

and his escorts are taking. The Janjaweed strip the vehicle and steal Pratt's baggage and the shoes off his feet. As Pratt is a dark-skinned African American, his companions tell him to speak English to the Janjaweed so they do not mistake him for a Darfurian and kill them all. As he enters the camp, the audience is introduced to camp life, seeing live chickens, tents, and people washing clothing by hand. He comes to the health center and sits next to a man whose toes have been cut off. As he begins work, Pratt encounters IDPs who are sick and wounded in ways he has not experienced before. These experiences show the audience how difficult life in Darfur is and while not sufficient on its own, adds to other aspects of the story to clearly explain how bad life in Darfur is for the victims of the attacks.

ER provides more explanation about Darfur through the story of the experiences of a single family. In the episode "Darfur," one family of father, mother, and two sons is the focus and this family exemplifies life for families in Darfur in general. Carter first meets the family as the doctors treat the two sons for various illnesses typical in camps, such as stomach ache and diarrhea. During the second visit to the clinic, the mother does not come with the boys because she is getting firewood and in the following scene she comes to the clinic after being beaten and bruised in an attack by Janjaweed. Cuts on her thigh are a sign that the Janjaweed raped her as well. When the father comes to the clinic and sees the cuts, he realizes what they mean and runs out of the clinic to avenge his wife. Dr. Dakarai compares the father's actions to the men in Darfur in general: "For men like him, pride slips away on a daily basis. They cannot provide without getting killed so their wives must do it. Then the worst happens. He's had enough. He just wants to be a man again."¹² The final scenes of the episode show Janjaweed beating and killing the

father. Illness, rape, and murder are constant threats for the people of Darfur and through this one family, the audience gets a sense of the toll it places on the family unit and the physical and mental health of the people involved.

The message is more explicit when it comes through to the audience as the other characters inform Carter and Pratt about the conflict and the need for more aid from other countries. Dakarai tells Carter, “Kofi Annan and Colin Powell, they call this genocide and the Congress, they just went on holiday.”¹³ On an airplane to Darfur, a member of the Sudanese Ministry of Education tells Pratt,

AIDS, malaria, dysentery. Two million people homeless not to mention the nearly 400,000 already slaughtered. Boys, babies tossed onto bonfires. Women and young girls raped sometimes by men, sometimes by bayonet. The work of gangs, all things you have seen. But in Darfur it's political and on a massive scale. And while this insanity rages on and on and on, the rest of the world continues its debates: is it or is it not genocide? This is not debate; this is paralysis.¹⁴

In “There Are No Angels Here,” Pratt and Dakarai have a conversation: “Your government promised fifty million dollars in aid only to pull it away.”¹⁵ These conversations, when added to the experiences of the characters, allow the audience to understand the Darfuri conflict and the rest of the world’s lack of assistance to help end the conflict. Thus the message is as clearly speaking for Darfur as the messages in news and talk shows and can be considered speaking for others.

The movie *Hotel Rwanda* is a fictional text that speaks for Darfur but rather than telling a story of Darfurians living through the conflict, *Hotel Rwanda* tells the story through analogy. The story is literally about Rwanda and the genocide that took place there in 1994. The movie shows the ramifications of inaction for conflicts of this type through the fictional representation of the true story of Paul Rusesabagina. Filmmakers use characters’ experiences and conversations as well as radio broadcasts from Hutu

Power Radio, the BBC, and other television and radio sources to tell the Rwandan story. While it may seem the movie is speaking for Rwanda rather than Darfur, the DVD's introduction and inserted pamphlets frame the movie as speaking for Darfur. Don Cheadle introduces the film and gives contact information for Amnesty International for the audience to learn more about Darfur. The movie not only speaks for the victims who lost their homes or even their lives in Rwanda, but also speaks for the victims who currently are losing their homes and lives in Darfur. The filmmakers include the story with points of comparison to Darfur and then it is up to the audience to make the connection between the two conflicts and be persuaded to help end the current conflict.

Similarities between Rwanda and Darfur help to make the analogical argument work. For a comparison to be acceptable to a discerning audience, the similarities between the two cases being compared should clearly outweigh the differences. One of the first similarities between Darfur and Rwanda is that both conflicts are fights over control of a region. In the first scene of the movie, a Hutu leader explains his point of view in a radio broadcast

When people ask me . . . why do I hate all the Tutsis, I say, 'read our history' They are murderers. Rwanda is our Hutu land; we are the majority, they are a minority of traitors and invaders. We will squash them into distinction. We will wipe out the RPF rebels.¹⁶

In Darfur, one of the main reasons for the conflict is tribes struggling for control over fertile land. The two conflicts are between two groups of people who occupy the same land and are led into a deadly conflict to gain control.

The Rwandan Civil War and the Darfuri conflict are both conflicts between two groups of people labeled as ethnically different but physically indistinguishable from

each other. In *Hotel Rwanda*, American journalist Jack Daglish asks a Rwandan journalist the difference between Hutus and Tutsis. He answers,

According to the Belgian colonists, Tutsis are taller, more elegant. It was the Belgians that created the division. They picked . . . those with thinner noses, lighter skin. They used to measure the width of the people's noses. The Belgians used the Tutsis to run the country. When they left, they left the power to the Hutus. The Hutus took revenge on the Tutsis for years of oppression.¹⁷

Daglish then turns to two women sitting at the bar and is unable to see any difference between them, even though one was Hutu and the other Tutsi. Even the militia relies on identification cards to determine if people are Hutu or Tutsi. In a similar way, the conflict in Darfur is between those labeled Arab and those labeled African. These labels are tenuous since intermarriage has caused Darfurians from each tribe to have Arab and African ancestry. The boundary between the two groups is tenuous and yet of utmost importance to those involved.

Circumstances within the conflicts are another similarity between the conflicts. In both conflicts rape is used as a weapon, victims are traumatized, and protection by UN peacekeepers has proved inadequate. Rusesabagina goes to the compound of a Hutu leader, George Rutuganda and sees women naked and beaten; they had obviously been raped, although Rutuganda calls them prostitutes. Darfuri women are often attacked through rape as well. It is an especially vicious weapon the Janjaweed use to intimidate the people.

The affect of the conflicts on innocent victims, especially children, is another unfortunate similarity between Rwanda and Darfur. One of the story lines follows Rusesabagina's son Roger who viewed one of his neighbors being murdered and his parents find him hiding and covered in the blood of the neighbor. Throughout the rest of

the movie, we see the effect this has on the child's fragile psyche. He is jumpy whenever he hears loud noises. Rusesabagina is woken by militia with a gun to his face and after successfully getting rid of them, he finds Roger hiding under the bed whimpering and inconsolable. Children in Darfur also are traumatized by the things they see. Journalists tell stories of children drawing pictures of death and destruction. In a *Newsweek* article, Jolie is pictured with a boy she met whose mind was so altered by the atrocities he witnessed that he had to be tethered so he wouldn't hurt himself or others.¹⁸

The UN's inability to sufficiently deal with the violence is another similarity between conflicts. The three hundred UN troops in Rwanda are insufficient to protect the people. The four soldiers at the hotel have no power because they are peacekeepers, not peacemakers and cannot use their weapons. The inability to act reaches a point when the Hutus enter the hotel grounds, threateningly, and throw a blue helmet towards the peacekeepers. The helmet is bloody and has a hole in it. Oliver states that the militia killed ten peacekeepers, but the peacekeepers still could not use weapons against the attackers. Peacekeepers in Darfur are also insufficient. There are 9,000 UN troops in Darfur, but the number is still insufficient since the region almost twenty times larger than Rwanda. Like Rwanda, peacekeepers and humanitarians have demanded more troops and none have come. Peacekeepers in Darfur have been attacked and killed by both sides of the conflict as well.

While the many similarities between conflicts suggest the analogical argument is a strong one, there are significant differences between the conflicts as well. While an element of both conflicts is a struggle over land, the land being fought for is different. In Rwanda, the region is much more fertile than in Darfur. While this difference does not

significantly alter the message of speakers, the setting of the violence does. The Rwandan genocide was largely an urban one, whereas in Darfur it is almost entirely rural. This is important because it was easier to kill large numbers of people in urban settings which are more densely populated. In rural locations, people receive advance warning of attacks and have more time to hide.¹⁹ The length of time for each of the conflicts is also different. The Rwandan genocide lasted 100 days compared to six years in Darfur. Additionally, the numbers of those killed in the two conflicts are different. In Rwanda, although the time period was much shorter, at least twice as many people were killed. If Darfur was more densely populated, the numbers of those killed would likely be significantly higher. While these differences do not minimize the Darfuri conflict or negate the analogy, they make it difficult to compare solutions and thus action steps in *Hotel Rwanda* need to be general enough to be applicable to both conflicts.

Advertisements are another medium used by advocates to speak for Darfur. They are public in a different way than other media. Advertisements are more limited in available space and time than the other messages and so the advertisement must be condensed significantly to fit the time or space allowed. Additionally, while advertisements are available to a large, public audience, except for during the Super Bowl audiences do not purposefully turn on the television or open a magazine or newspaper to see the advertisements. Advertisements are seen as unwanted fillers or distractions from the articles or shows the audience wants to see, thus their message has to be appealing enough to draw attention and get the main point across quickly and concisely. Advertisements are public, but can easily be publicly ignored.

Two advertisements by Save Darfur, an organization committed to end the Darfur conflict, speak for Darfur. While each of the advertisements are only thirty seconds long, they quickly state the problem of rape, torture, starvation, murder, the government's involvement, and the rest of the world's inaction. The nature of the problems that the advertisements quickly state allows a sense of urgency to come through to the audience. While they cannot go into any great amount of detail about the problem, they give some basic information about of the conflict and provide links for the audience to find more information: "Be a Voice for Darfur at SaveDarfur.org."²⁰

The Be a Witness advertisement aired on television stations in 2004. The message is different than the Save Darfur advertisements because it speaks for Darfur by demonstrating how the American media has ignored Darfur while placing undue attention on trivial news issues. To explain the conflict, the narrator of the ad simply says, "This is happening," but the pictures shown during that statement speak for Darfur more than the words do. The pictures show burned towns, dead bodies, and a starving child and then the narrator labels the conflict as genocide and the power of the pictures shows that the problem is significant enough to warrant action. There are even fewer specifics about the conflict in this advertisement than in the Save Darfur advertisements, and so the message is also less clear. It can be inferred that murder, starvation, and destruction is taking place, but the perpetrator is unknown and exact details about what the pictures mean are missing. The lack of specificity makes the conflict less clear and more open to the audience's interpretation. If speakers hope to encourage the audience to help end the conflict in Darfur, a lack of a specific message is detrimental as it lacks the ability to persuade the audience to take action. The less information that a speaker provides the less

information the audience has immediately available to them. Audience members interested in helping the spoken-for do not have sufficient information to get involved and must search for that information on their own and that makes assistance less likely. The lack of specificity is relevant to the advertisement's main message that the media is not providing information about Darfur to the general public, however, and potential action would focus on the media, thus helping Darfur as well.

Speakers can also use interaction through tools such as computer games to speak for others. The video game "Darfur is Dying" is public since it was played by 800,000 people in the first year it was available and more in the years that followed. Players of the game act out a fictional existence of their own by choosing an IDP avatar and searching for water outside the camps or aid within camps. Players never see actual Darfuri people but live out a guided fictional life of a typical Darfurian. To succeed in the game, avatars must avoid Janjaweed and other dangers and keep sufficient food and water in the camps. The game tries to show the dangers IDPs face. Just like the fictional texts, the creators inject information about Darfur in with the story, in this case by giving the instructions for the game. When first entering the virtual camp, the following message appears:

In the Darfur region of western Sudan, a genocide is occurring. Each day, civilians face prospects of mass killings, torture, rape, and destruction of villages and camps, theft and other human rights abuses at the hands of the Janjaweed militias – bands of fighters backed by the Sudanese government. You are about to be immersed into a refugee camp. . . . Try to maintain a functioning camp for 7 days and you have succeeded in this Darfur digital universe. But this will not end the real conflict. The men, women and children of Darfur have been living under harrowing conditions since 2003.²¹

Throughout the virtual camp are question mark icons and when the mouse passes over the questions marks, information appears regarding camp life, African Union presence, NGO presence, the health of the camp, and Darfuri traditions. When the game is over, the site

provides links to other websites to allow players to get involved to help aid Darfur. The message is not only presented through the intellectual knowledge garnered by the quotes about Darfur, but also through experiential knowledge. By interacting with virtual characters and experiencing virtually some of the terrors of life in Darfur, the audience can feel, to a limited extent, the pressure of life in an IDP camp. By the means listed above, the speakers of “Darfur is Dying” present a clear, purposeful message to a public audience and thus *speak* for Darfur.

Because each of the messages fits the criteria of *speaking*, they can be analyzed as examples of speaking for others. Beyond determining whether a message does *speak*, however, the critic of speaking for others must determine how that message speaks and whether it helps or hinders the spoken-for. Speakers have a variety of rhetorical tools they can use to persuade their audience to take action. The speakers’ use of these tools can determine whether or not they are helping or hindering the Darfurians.

In order to get an audience to receive their message, speakers should identify themselves with the audience. By making themselves consubstantial with the audience and their experiences, speakers create a bond with the audience and can better show that their concerns should be the concerns of the audience.²² Audiences are more likely to be persuaded by people they view as consubstantial with them.²³ *Hotel Rwanda* does not identify the speaker with audience because the speaker is a metaphor for the spoken-for and the focus is on identifying that spoken-for with the audience. The speakers for “Darfur is Dying” absent themselves from the message in a similar way. They bring the audience and spoken-for together exclusively without inserting themselves. The audience only sees the spoken-for and so identifying the spoken-for with the audience is the

primary focus. The rest of the texts have speakers who are visible and clearly different from the spoken-for and so should make a deliberate attempt to make the speaker and audience consubstantial to aid in persuasion.

Because each of the messages is presented to a large public, it is more difficult to identify specifically with each member of the audience. Each audience member has different backgrounds and experiences and so will not view the messages in the same way. The Save Darfur advertisements have ten different speakers of various ages, races, and genders. Some are shown in rural settings and others are in urban settings. Audience members are thus more likely to see people who are similar to them because the advertisement uses a cross section of the American public as the public image of the speaker.

ER uses Pratt and Carter to identify with the audience. Pratt is reluctant to come to Darfur and his point of view towards Darfurians is skeptical, an attitude shared by many Americans. His point of view changes as he experiences the atrocities and meets the people. This conversion of attitude is one which the audience can experience vicariously through Pratt. Carter represents the people who are more interested in supporting global crises. He enters the camp as a person sympathetic and willing to help. Through experiences and conversations, Carter learns about the conflict and what his role, and the role of Americans who identify with him, is in helping through the conflict.

While identifying with the audience is important, most speakers do not do so in an apparent way. Clooney and Jolie do not make any overt attempts to identify with the audience. This is a problem because there are many differences between celebrity speakers in popular culture and the audience: fame, money, power. While Clooney and

Jolie attempt to deemphasize their authority through their rhetoric, their identity still exists and separates them from the audience. Identities are malleable, so the speakers could attempt to identify with the audience to show the audience they are not just rich, bored celebrities using Darfur because it is the trendy thing to do, but real concerned citizens like their viewers who want to help. Unfortunately, this opportunity is not taken by either speaker.

Speakers who desire to help the spoken-for can also inadvertently hurt them by reinforcing a negative power structure which disempowers the spoken-for in the minds of the audience. This is done when speakers describe the spoken-for as impotent and ignorant, unable to help themselves. Speakers also disempower the spoken-for when they present themselves as powerful and as a savior of the spoken-for. This type of speaking is an example of the ego function which focuses on self rather than other.²⁴ A critical rhetoric identifies these ways of speaking in order to weaken the ideologies that emphasize the power of the speaker and deemphasize the power of the spoken-for.²⁵

In many of the speaking for others texts, there is no initiative evident on the part of the people of Darfur to help themselves end the conflict or any evidence of any abilities they might have to govern or care for themselves. On the contrary, the emphasis is often on the lack of power of the people of Darfur. The victims are described as passive receptors of actions done to them. They “have had their villages destroyed . . . children [are] being killed. . . . forced to live in terrible conditions.”²⁶ Clooney states that he felt a sense of hopelessness from the people in the camps: “There is nothing they can do. It’s not like—you know, we sort of pride ourselves in America on the idea that we might be able to pull ourselves up somehow.” “Darfur is Dying,” the Save Darfur advertisements,

and the Be a Witness advertisement primarily portray the Darfurians as victims. They are described and shown as victims of abuse, rape, kidnapping, capture, killings, torture, and harrowing conditions.²⁷ Speakers may discuss abilities the Darfurians had in the past, but the active role in their lives ends when they are attacked: “These people had jobs and property before the Arab Janjaweed militia burned their villages, raped their women, and killed their children.”²⁸ Thus while they may once have had power, it was limited enough that the loss of their home, virtue, and children took all the power from them leaving them unable to take any action on their own to solve their situation. Because the Darfurians are rhetorically created as being disempowered, audience members who are otherwise unfamiliar with Darfur and have no other information to compare are more likely to see Darfurians in this way. Defining Darfurians this way without acknowledging their abilities to act can be defined as “racist thinking [that] perpetuates the fantasy that the other who is subjugated, who is subhuman, lacks the ability to comprehend, to understand, to see the working of the powerful.”²⁹ The disempowered are not unintelligent or incapable, and defining them that way risks further subjugating them.

Some of the descriptions of Darfurians disempower them by making them animal-like. Kristof tells a story of a woman forced to scavenge for food and hide from the Janjaweed – actions which are commensurate with experience of animals or humans from millions of years ago, but not with the experience of the American audience. Kristof describes the same woman as a “homeless, penniless cavewoman.”³⁰ In addition, Kristof quotes a Darfurian woman as saying, “It’s like we’re being hunted.”³¹ Whether he says it or chooses it as the one quote to use in the paper, the sense of Darfurians as animals comes across in many of his articles. A speaker is a “regulator of discourse” who controls

the “discursive actions of the dominated.”³² The Darfurian woman he quotes may have said many things in his interview with her, but by choosing this specific quote over another identifies the spoken-for negatively. The problem with these statements is that they dominate the speaking for others messages. Thus the audience rarely sees Darfurians as people with experience, intelligence, or abilities, and almost always as weak and unable to take care of themselves. Since the construction of identities is an ongoing process, defining the other as weak or animal-like adds a negative aspect to their identity and further disempowers them.

The Darfurians are victims and so the speakers are not lying, but they are omitting a very important aspect of their lives. By focusing only on the stories of how refugees came to be disempowered, the speakers ignore actions the Darfuri people have taken and are taking to end the conflict. Rebels have been negotiating with and fighting against the Sudanese government and the Janjaweed since 2003. Darfurians such as Suleiman Jamous are actively working to end the conflict through diplomatic means. While some of the rebel groups are part of the problem, by not acknowledging action on the part of any Darfuri people, the speakers take any pride in accomplishment from those who are acting to make positive change. Thus, instead of portraying the victims in an empowering way, the speakers reinforce the hegemonic power structure that places white Americans as powerful and black Africans as lacking power. In this way, the situation of the Darfurians mirrors that of the North African women in France how “fight a daily battle to prove that it is not ‘France’ that has ‘liberated’ them but rather the women themselves who have struggled within their own culture as well as within French society to impose

themselves as subjects acting of their free will.”³³ When the Darfurians are described as powerful and capable, that struggle is unnecessary.

While most of the speakers emphasize the power of the speaker, Jolie downplays her own knowledge and power. She is more often defined as expert by Norville. Norville explains Jolie’s experience with the UNHCR and her trips to Darfur and tells the audience how much she knows about the conflict. Jolie speaks in more hesitant terms, not giving definitive answers to questions, but making statements in terms of her own experience and opinion. Unfortunately, she does not reinforce her own lack of experience and knowledge by emphasizing the abilities of the Darfurians. She never quotes the Darfuri people or even specifically mentions individuals within the region. Jolie and Norville discuss the conflict in general terms and the people are merely images shown in the background and always portrayed as poor and downtrodden. Pictures in the Jolie interview are of children crying, being carried around, or beaten or hurt in some way. She emphasizes the inability for the people themselves to act: “you can’t give all these children school bags and . . . food . . . because the Janjaweed . . . will come in and . . . beat them up and take it from them.”³⁴ Thus the people are silenced while Jolie and Norville speak.

Instead of focusing on the spoken-for, many speakers exhibit the ego function of emphasizing their own work and sacrifice and other non-Darfurians rather than the work and sacrifice of the Darfurians.³⁵ In the *Oprah* episode, Winfrey attributes accomplishments to Clooney’s bravery in going to Darfur to witness it for himself. She states that Clooney “risked his life and saw it for himself.”³⁶ Angelina Jolie emphasizes the UN and aid workers in Darfur. She spends most of her time talking about the UN’s

role in providing aid to Darfurians. *ER* presents doctors and aid workers as sacrificing for the Darfurians to the point of being willing to die for them. Carter, Dakarai, and Debbie all have chosen to risk their lives to come and help out the Darfuri people. Dakarai has a life-threatening illness but refuses to leave the camp and his patients to get treatment for it. Janjaweed beat and threaten several doctors at gunpoint. Their sacrifice is so great, that Satina, one of the Darfuri characters, calls them angels.

This emphasis on the power and sacrifice of the speaker or those in positions of power and on the helplessness of the Darfurians risks deemphasizing the capability the Darfurians have of working to govern themselves. While losing homes and livelihood coupled with the psychological damage brought on by their horrendous experiences may render many of the people incapable of acting, it does not leave them all unable to help themselves. Some persevere and fight despite their circumstances and others would act if pulled out of these circumstances. If audiences see Darfur as a country that needs outside governance for an indeterminable amount of time, they are more likely to hesitate to act. Since the Iraq war led to a longer stay and more loss of American lives and money than many Americans anticipated, they are less likely to want to be involved in another country that would be more of a drain of lives and resources. If, on the other hand, they see the Darfuri people as people with strength and intelligence who can govern themselves effectively once given the security to leave the camps, Americans are more likely to consider help as a possibility. Speakers can help this by emphasizing the spoken-for and deemphasizing themselves, aid agencies, and other non-Darfurians.

While most of the texts spent more time emphasizing the power and ability and sacrifice of all groups other than the spoken-for, two of the fictional texts depicted

victims who acted despite the circumstances and empowered groups that did nothing.

Terry George, director of *Hotel Rwanda*, says in a documentary about the film that one of the reasons he made the film was to show his audience that anyone has the ability to help others, but people living through the situation have limited power to get themselves extricated from their circumstances. The movie shows how the Rwandan people fought for themselves, but the lack of outside assistance made that fight less successful than it could have been.

Throughout the movie, filmmakers demonstrate “an understanding of the reasons for the current social relations of power.”³⁷ They show ways that the outside world could have helped the Rwandans but did so only to a limited extent. Some journalists and aid workers in the film save people and tell the outside world about the genocide, but that part of the story is minimal and minimally effective. One of the characters, a Red Cross worker named Anamacha, goes back and forth to Rusesabagina’s hotel, the Milles Collines, bringing orphans she has risked her life to rescue. In the final scene of the movie, she also reunites Rusesabagina’s family with the nieces they feared were dead. While she saves lives and sacrifices herself for Rwandan children, her part in the movie is minor and she saves less than one hundred children while Rusesabagina saves 1,200 lives. Joaquin Phoenix’s character, the journalist Jack Daglish, leaves the safety of the hotel and risks his life to get video footage of the atrocities being committed by Hutu militia throughout the city. Shortly thereafter, however, Daglish left the country with the rest of the non-Rwandans, so his heroism is short lived and ultimately ineffective.

Rusesabagina has conversations with several non-Rwandans which emphasize the extent to which the outside world was ignoring the genocide. In the movie, Rusesabagina

thanks Daghish for shooting a video of people being tortured and killed and sending it to a news agency to be aired. Rusesabagina says,

RUSESABAGINA. It is the only chance that the world will intervene.

DAGLISH. And if no one intervenes, is it still a good thing to show?

RUSESABAGINA. How can they not intervene when they witness such atrocities?

DAGLISH. I think if people see this footage, they'll say "Oh my God, that's horrible," and then go on eating their dinners.³⁸

UN Colonel Oliver and his UN peacekeepers stay at the hotel to give nominal support to the people hiding from the militia. The peacekeepers are not allowed to fire weapons, however, and do not have the support of the rest of the world to help. The issue of race is another reason for the inaction of the rest of the world. When Paul praises Oliver for helping the residents of the hotel, Oliver explains:

OLIVER. You're dirt. We think you're dirt Paul.

RUSESABAGINA. Who is we?

OLIVER. The West. All the superpowers. Everything you believe in Paul, they think you're, they think you're dung. You're worthless.

RUSESABAGINA. I don't understand what you're saying, sir.

OLIVER. Aw, c'mon, don't bullshit me, Paul. You're the smartest man here. You've got 'em all eating out of your hands. You could own this freakin' hotel except for one thing: you're black. You're not even a nigger, you're African. We're not going to stay Paul. We're not going to stop this.³⁹

The next day, the Rwandan residents of the hotel watch as the porters hold umbrellas over the departing, mostly white, foreign guests, including a dog taken by one of the female guests. Mr. Tillens, the hotel owner in Belgium, claims that the Belgians would not come to the rescue of the Rwandans because, "they're cowards."⁴⁰ The movie also plays radio broadcasts of inaction by the world. The hotel staff listens to a broadcast of President Clinton talking about getting U.S. citizens out of Rwanda, saying nothing about helping the Rwandan people. Later, the residents of the hotel hear an interview in which a UN spokesperson describes the atrocities in Rwanda as "acts of genocide" but she refuses

to label it as genocide, thus not requiring the UN to take action. *Hotel Rwanda* deemphasizes the power of the rest of the world. The movie does not show that they do not have power, but that they do not have the courage or compassion to use the power they have. Once the powerful are shown as impotent, the movie shows what the disempowered can do to help themselves.

Hotel Rwanda shows intelligent, caring people forced into circumstances beyond their control which they overcome in whatever ways are available. In the beginning of the movie, Rusesabagina says to his wife “there’s nothing we can do” to help the people around them and worries about how his actions will negatively affect his wife and his family.⁴¹ He wants to wait and let the world help them, but because of the inaction of the rest of the world, ultimately is forced to take care of his family, neighbors, and other hotel guests by himself. Despite his feelings of inadequacy, he does much to help others and in the end saves more than 1,200 people from being massacred. He uses the resources available to him – his position, diplomacy, money, jewels from the hotel safe, personal contacts, and guests’ contacts throughout the world. As a non-Rwandan priest and nuns leave with the foreign guests of the hotel, Rusesabagina takes the children and families under their care and says he will take care of them. Since the UN is powerless to fight off the Hutu militia, Rusesabagina uses his relationship with General Bizimungu, the local military commander, to get protection. He lies and tells Bizimungu that he overheard conversations about spies and satellites used to see whether Bizimungu has contributed to the genocide, persuading the general to provide some protection. He tells the guests to call anyone they know outside Rwanda and “Say goodbye. But when you say goodbye, say it as though you are reaching through the phone and holding their hand. Let them

know that if they let go of that hand, you will die. Shame them.”⁴² When the calls are effective and some of the Rwandans are provided with visas to leave the country, Rusesabagina refuses to leave anyone behind and tricks his wife and children to leave without him. He finally gets all the hotel’s residents to safety by bribing Bizimungu with jewels and alcohol and by warning Bizimungu that he would be tried as a war criminal unless Rusesabagina was alive to testify on his behalf. These actions exemplify Spivak’s argument of disempowered people knowing and speaking about their situation and show that Rusesabagina and the other Rwandan IDPs understood their situation and spoke out and took action to help themselves, therefore empowering themselves. These are the actions of an intelligent, self-sacrificing people, characteristics not often attributed to African victims. The movie shows that while Rusesabagina and the other Rwandans in his hotel could not save themselves, they were not powerless victims who left everything to chance. They took action where they could and were able to survive until they found someone with sufficient influence to get them to safety.

The *ER* episodes glorify aid workers much more than *Hotel Rwanda* does, but balances the glorification with portrayals of intelligent and powerful Darfuri people as well. Itzak, a main character in the final two episodes, is a sheikh and the founder of Human Rights for Darfur, a fictional humanitarian organization. Itzak is portrayed as intelligent and well spoken and is described as a man who is honest with the people. People listen to him and therefore the Janjaweed and government of Sudan consider him to be dangerous and ultimately shoot, arrest, and torture him nearly to death. The rest of the residents of the camp clearly respect Itzak. When Carter and Pratt come upon a group of men beating a Janjaweed man, Pratt tries to intervene, but Carter tells him, “Let Itzak

handle it,” implying that Itzak has a position of leadership in the camp. Itzak’s wife, Satina, is also positively portrayed as intelligent and passionate for her husband and her people. She is pregnant and is courageous despite complications in the pregnancy which require her to be hospitalized. Satina finds the strength to hide from Janjaweed and demand help for her husband. Itzak and Satina both survive and Itzak names his newborn daughter Hope to personify the hope he has for the future generations in Darfur. This portrayal of Itzak and Satina shows the strength that Darfurians have and their ability to lead the people if they are given the opportunity. When audiences see victims of atrocities as lacking power and the capacity to govern themselves, and only able to succeed with the help of outsiders, they are less likely to feel that intervention will be useful. Without strong and good leaders, a weak people will fall prey to the next evil leader who comes along: “even civilians are considered to be consenting and contributing members of one evil order or the other.”⁴³ When the audience sees people with the ability to act, like Rusesabagina, Itzak and Sattina, they can see that outside intervention can be successful and permanent change can happen.

Speaking for others will benefit the spoken-for most when speakers carefully consider the effect the things they show or say have on the spoken-for and audience. If the speaker wants the audience to care about Darfur and potentially act to help end the conflict, they need to speak for Darfurians in an empowering way. Speakers have a tendency to want to evoke pity and sympathy from the audience. While some audience members will be led to act on pity alone, they are not left with a respect for the spoken-for and confidence that the spoken-for can succeed after their liberation. Speakers would

aid Darfur more if they emphasize those Darfurians as intelligent and powerful before explaining the daunting circumstances which hinder their ability to act.

Being *for* Darfur

In the years since the Darfuri conflict began, more speakers than the eight studied here use popular culture to discuss Darfur and the oppression the Darfuri people face. While these people may be *speaking*, they do not claim a level of authority which allows them to represent the point of view of the people of Darfur and so, instead of speaking *for*, these messages speak *about* Darfur. When speakers speak about, they do not speak instead of the other. Speaking about is more descriptive and lacks the action step and claim to represent the needs of the spoken-for. Some journalists discuss Darfur and the conflict, but do not claim to understand the people of Darfur or make any suggestions as to what can help solve the problem. Instead, they inform the audience about the situation. Television shows like *Seventh Heaven* also speak *about* Darfur. In the episode “Can I Just Get Something to Eat?” the Darfur conflict is explained, but the characters do not claim to have some special understanding of why the conflict is occurring or what to do to fix it. Instead, the characters discuss the importance of gaining knowledge on the subject and provide that kind of knowledge. Kristof speaks *about* Darfur in articles he wrote for the *New York Times*. His editorials are different than the articles, however, because they do not merely report on Darfur. In the editorials, Kristof writes about his experiences visiting the region and speaking to the people there. He also goes beyond explaining the conflict to providing solutions to fix the problem.

Each of the speakers for Darfur claim some kind of informed knowledge of Darfur, either from visits the speaker made to the region or research he or she has done to learn more about the conflict. This identification between the speaker and spoken-for leads each of the speakers to claim to represent the point of view of the Darfuri people. These claims are profitable if there is evidence that the speaker understands what the people of Darfur think and need. Spivak's analysis of the subaltern's ability to speak shows the value of speaking *to* the other. Once speakers speak *to*, they can use themselves as a mouthpiece for Darfuri ideas and thus provide an otherwise silenced group with a voice and an audience. Claims to represent the point of view of the spoken-for are problematic when the speaker merely gives his or her own ideas without considering what the spoken-for thinks or wants. If the speaker has not spoken *to* others, they should be careful in the way that they speak *for* others. Demonstrating authorization to speak is an area of weakness with most of the speakers. They not only speak instead of a group that can speak for itself, but also take their authority for granted and find no need to show the audience if or where they have received that authority. The audience may accept this assumption, but it does not benefit the spoken-for. Instead, speaking without authorization reinforces the spoken-for's lack of power and ability to act to solve their problems.

Alcoff warns that advocates should fight against the impetus to speak for others because of the potential for speakers misrepresenting and harming the spoken-for.⁴⁴ When the advocate has spoken *to* the other and demonstrated an understanding of the needs and wants of the other, the other may give authorization for the advocate to become a speaker. That authorization carries with it the assumption that the words of the speaker

are commensurate with the words of the spoken-for. Most speakers for Darfur use their trips to Darfur or refugee camps in Chad as their authority – showing they have spoken *to* the other. Clooney mentions that he and his father “thought we’d come over [to Chad] and take a look for ourselves.”⁴⁵ The *Oprah* episode shows video of Clooney talking with aid workers and asking questions to Darfuri refugees with the use of a translator. Beyond just going to the region, Winfrey claims Clooney “risked his life and saw it for himself” which emphasizes Clooney’s investment in Darfur.⁴⁶ Clooney is on the show to tell the audience “what he wants [them] to know.”⁴⁷ Winfrey asks Clooney to “translate to our viewers what life is like in those refugee camps.”⁴⁸ He is presented as the expert on the situation there to share his knowledge with the audience. The Save Darfur advertisement “How Will History Judge Us” and the Be a Witness advertisement use pictures of Darfuri people to show someone has been to Darfur or Chad and met the Darfuri people there. While it is good when speakers have some familiarity with the country, the pictures alone do not give the speakers credibility. Spending a little time there and talking to a few people is not enough. Taking pictures or knowing people who have taken pictures does not give a speaker sufficient knowledge of a situation to know what help they need.

Jolie rarely raises the subject of her own trips to the region; Deborah Norville and videos playing in the background while she speaks does it for her. Norville mentions twice that Jolie traveled to the region twice in 2004 and video and pictures in the background show Jolie in the camps interacting with Darfuri people. Jolie briefly mentions her time in Darfur when she repudiates a statement by US ambassador to the UN John Danforth. Norville shows a quote in which Danforth criticizes the UN and Jolie uses her experience in Darfur to show that he is wrong: “I’ve been on the ground and I’m

not saying the United Nations couldn't do more. But . . . they are not the political force."⁴⁹ She argues that the UN has to be "balanced" in order to be able to work in the country and that the work the UN does is invaluable. When Norville asks direct questions about Jolie's experiences, Jolie answers by using her time in Darfur as a frame of reference: "in the middle of the night . . . you could hear singing from the mosques and you could hear gunfire."⁵⁰ While Jolie's answers show she has been in the region, they rely more on her experience with the UN than her experience speaking to Darfuri people. She answers questions by referring to the UN: "I spoke to some people in the UN today and I know there are meetings from in the ground to New York to Geneva."⁵¹ She adds the UN in her stories of her experience and when talking about hearing gunfire. She says it happened "when I was even sitting up and speaking with the UN and the NGO."⁵² While the work at the UN gives Jolie credibility in some types of speaking, it does not demonstrate she has spoken *to*.

Kristof is much more specific in stating his authorization to speak and his experience is much more extensive than the other speakers. In his editorials, he tells who specifically he spoke to in Darfur: "Interviews with refugees like Mr. Hussein – as well as with aid workers and U.N. officials leave no doubt that attacks in Darfur are not simply random atrocities."⁵³ He quotes interviews with Darfuri people and tells stories of the people he met. In the stories, he always uses the people's names: "I saw a 4-year-old orphan girl, Nijah Ahmed, carrying her 13-month-old brother, Nibras, on her back."⁵⁴ He took note of who the people are, what they have done, and what they say about their experiences in Darfur. The Save Darfur advertisement "Voices from Darfur" also uses the words of the spoken-for. Though the words are spoken through the voices of

Americans, the words come from Darfuri victims. This level of specificity shows that the speakers met the spoken-for on a deeper level and spoke *to* them rather than just seeing them and hearing about them from others.

ER, *Hotel Rwanda*, and “Darfur is Dying” do not state their knowledge of real Darfuri people. Instead, the actors or avatars become Darfurians or genocide victims. Thus, the speakers claim to understand what people go through even though none of the actors are Darfurian. This is not merely an explanation of the facts of rape, destruction, genocide, or mass killing. The audience is able to witness the lives of prototypical people living through the crisis. The actors and avatars never explicitly claim any expertise or firsthand knowledge of the conflict and in fact none of them had any. Instead, they imply that expertise by showing the audience a glimpse of the world of the spoken-for. “Darfur is Dying” places itself as expert on the conflict with messages explaining the role of various sites throughout the virtual camp and any potential problems associated with those locations. In *ER*, the characters explaining the conflict and suggesting solutions are Sudanese nationals or aid workers in Darfur, thus giving them authority to speak. In *Hotel Rwanda*, the story is told through the eyes of the Rwandan main character, Paul Rusesabagina. Whereas in *ER* the story is told mainly through American doctors, with Darfuri and other African characters speaking periodically, in *Hotel Rwanda* the main speaker is the victim and western voices are given limited attention. Rusesabagina is not only an African living during the conflict, but a person who was proactive and survived the conflict, saving others along the way. Thus his authorization to speak is as someone who knows firsthand both the problem and the solution to genocide. These messages appear authorized to speak and knowledgeable on the topic, and yet the actual experience

is secondhand. The speakers in these fictional texts received information about Darfur from aid workers or other non-Darfurians. While some like Cheadle went to Darfur after the message became public none had spoken to Darfurians prior to presenting the message. The appearance of authorization is as fictional as the message itself.

Besides demonstrating that they have spoken *to* the Darfurians, speakers should explain how audience members can take action to solve the problem. As we saw in chapter three, the audience has many different causes competing for their time, attention, and money. The more information that the speakers can give about the problem and how to solve it, the easier it is for the audience to choose to help Darfur. The speakers for Darfur all use pathos to make the audience understand the conflict and feel pity, sadness, anger, and disgust about the situation. If speakers leave the audience with these feelings and no idea of what to do with them, there is no opportunity for resolution or the hope of resolution. Audiences may agree that Darfur is a problem, but there can be no lasting or real change because the audience does not know what they can do or even that they have the authority to do anything that will make a substantial difference. All of the speakers for Darfur give an action step of some kind but the action steps vary in type and effectiveness. To be effective, the action should be specific enough for the audience to know what to do and how they can act. Burke argues that when speakers do not give a plan, audiences may latch on to any solution they hear, even ones that do not truly help the spoken-for.⁵⁵ Speakers who, using their experience and knowledge of the spoken-for, provide a solution that they know will really benefit the spoken-for help the spoken-for.

Many speakers present action steps from a more negative point of view. Instead of telling the audience what they can do, the speakers tell them what has not been done in

this or similar conflicts. Clooney claims that the “world turns a blind eye” to Darfur.⁵⁶ Kristof accuses his audience of apathy towards Darfur, claiming that while “1,000 people are being killed each week . . . the world yawns.”⁵⁷ He also accuses the government of not taking necessary steps to end the conflict: “Mr. Bush had the ball in his hands - and then fumbled it.”⁵⁸ In some instances, he brings up previous government action but with sarcasm: “a hint of concern in the West has persuaded Sudan to reach a cease-fire there. President Bush finally found his voice last week, protesting the ‘atrocities’ in Darfur.”⁵⁹ Lisa Ling, who also appears on *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, blames the media for previous inaction; they don’t “give us the opportunity to know what’s going on in the world. They’re . . . busy covering the same three stories when there is a genocide happening in Sudan.” Blaming other people of not taking any action could motivate audiences to act so as not to receive the blame themselves. On the other hand, if not followed up with specific actions to take, the audience is still not empowered or knowledgeable enough to take any action.

Unfortunately, many of the calls for action are not applicable to the audience. Many of the solutions involve governmental intervention. While government action is the most likely kind of action to make a real difference, the audience is not composed of governmental officials and the speakers do not tell the audience how their participation will motivate the government to act. Kristof asks for specific action by the government: “a no-flight zone, an arms embargo, an asset freeze on businesses owned by Sudan's ruling party, and greater teamwork with African and Islamic countries to exert more pressure on Sudan.”⁶⁰ He addresses Bush specifically: “If Mr. Bush would step up to the cameras and denounce this genocide, if he would send Colin Powell to the Chad-Sudan

border, if he would telephone Sudan's president again to demand humanitarian access to the concentration camps, he might save hundreds of thousands of lives."⁶¹ He also urges action from the UN and aid communities: "We can save many tens of thousands of lives in the coming weeks – but only if Mr. Bush and Mr. Annan [then-Secretary General of the United Nations] speak out more boldly, if the U.N. Security Council insists on humanitarian access to Darfur and if the aid community mounts a huge effort before the rainy season makes roads impassible beginning in late May."⁶² Jolie identifies the African Union as the appropriate group to take action. Jolie is not in favor of the United States, or even the UN taking over and coming into the country. She states, "I personally love the idea of . . . the African Union being strong . . . Africa helping Africa, and what that could mean for the future of Africa."⁶³ She then expresses doubt that the African Union has the capabilities of handling the situation in Darfur so she asks for the US to try to strengthen the AU with aid, airplanes, and logistics to help solve security problems. "How Will History Judge Us?" calls for action by the UN. Each of these action steps are plausible and could be effective ways to help Darfur. If speakers were addressing Congress of the UN, their arguments would be appropriate. The audience being addressed is overwhelmingly non-governmental, however, and not able to enact the kinds of policies mentioned. Without a way to act, the audience is only left with information about a problem and is unlikely to seek out ways they personally can get involved unless the speaker follows up with a call to contact those representatives or otherwise pressure the people to act.

Despite Kristof's experience in Darfur, some of the solutions he suggests are not only focused on the wrong audience, but also implausible or not helpful to end the

conflict. He praises past actions taken in Sudan in order to encourage similar future actions. At the time the editorial was published, however, the past actions had already failed: “In Sudan, a bit of publicity about Darfur coupled with a written statement from President Bush led Sudan to agree to a cease-fire in April and to improve access for aid agencies. More publicity prompted it to promise to disband the Janjaweed raiders.”⁶⁴ While the ceasefire was signed by both sides, the Government of Sudan broke it within days. Using this as a positive example of actions taken in Sudan is misleading and nullifies any future action he suggests. Other actions that Kristof suggests are ones which other experts claim are ineffective or dangerous: “declare a no-fly zone, to press our Western allies and nearby Arab and African states, to impose an arms embargo and other targeted sanctions, to push a meaningful U.N. resolution even at the risk of a Chinese veto, and to insist upon the deployment of a larger African force.”⁶⁵ Experts widely criticize the no-fly zone as logistically impossible in an area as large as Darfur is and argue that it could result in an escalation of violence.⁶⁶ The United States has imposed sanctions but the US is not a large trading partner with Sudan and so the sanctions will have limited effect.⁶⁷ The UN resolution to deploy a larger force has passed, but no additional troops have entered Darfur. None of these proposed solutions show an understanding of what is needed to help Darfur or what the Darfurians may view as plausible.

The lack of specificity in some solutions also makes it difficult for the audience to know what actions they can take. Kristof claims, “We need more arm-twisting to get Sudan to comply with the cease-fire.”⁶⁸ He does not explain what “arm-twisting” means or how the audience can act on this suggestion. Norville asks Jolie, based on her own

experience joining the UNHCR, what action the audience can take. Jolie's solution is to "find something that matters to you and . . . follow it and educate yourself and . . . educate our children." While education about a conflict is a positive first step, Jolie does not provide any more information for audience members who are already educated by her message or other information they learned about the conflict. The Save Darfur advertisement "Voices from Darfur" asks the audience to "be a voice," another vague statement that does not help the audience to take action. If a speaker does not explain what specific actions the audience should take, the change they desire will not happen.

While speakers have many nonspecific, impractical, or inappropriate actions steps, some of the actions are specifically aimed at the audience, giving them things to do personally. Kristof refers the readers to his blog, which has a list of personal actions they could take. He asks the readers to contact politicians "and demand action."⁶⁹ Thus Kristof adds a practical application for the audience to help solve the action steps which were focused on governmental action. He later tells them, "What can ordinary Americans do? They can call the White House or their members of Congress to demand action, and they can reach into their pockets" to donate money to aid organizations.⁷⁰ In "Darfur is Dying," actions to take when the fictional Janjaweed attack include sending real messages to President Bush, asking representatives to support the people of Darfur, starting a divestment movement on campus, or finding more ways to get involved. The final action provides links to multiple websites with specific information to educate the audience about Darfur and other links to join groups, write letters, donate money, buy merchandise, or educate others. In an introductory segment to the DVD of *Hotel Rwanda*, Don Cheadle compares the action taken by Paul Rusesabagina in Rwanda to actions that

can be taken by the audience by stating, "So now the spotlight turns to you. It's your turn to act. Imagine and take action at amnestyusa.org." ⁷¹ After describing the atrocities that he encountered, Clooney and Winfrey present ways that the audience members could act: attend rallies, call or email the White House, donate money. Clooney also talks about a National Press Club meeting and a march in Washington that he was going to do. As a speaker, he does not ask anything of the audience that he's not also willing to do. He gives phone numbers and provides addresses to help the audience know exactly how to contact the government. He also provides the address and dates of the Rally to Stop Genocide in Washington D.C. Additionally, at the end of the show, Winfrey asks the audience to go to her website, Oprah.com, to find out where to donate money to help the people of Darfur. These action steps provided by Kristof, Clooney and Winfrey, and "Darfur is Dying" are practical and detailed enough to allow the audience to act to make a change.

One way speakers help convince their audience that their assistance will actually benefit the spoken-for is by providing examples of others who have acted to help Darfur or other people in need. Kristof writes about a generous man:

Jack Weisberg, a New Yorker with no previous interest in such causes, asked me for the name of an organization doing good work in Darfur. I mentioned Doctors Without Borders. Saying he was suffering an "attack of conscience," he then wrote the group a check for \$500,000. A lot of lives, in the case of his donation, although even a \$20 contribution goes a long way in Sudan. ⁷²

His example of Weisberg, a man more wealthy than many of the audience members, is vastly different from the ability of the audience to help. Kristof's last sentence tries to overcome that difference, but as an analogy works when the similarities outweigh the differences, is not entirely successful. Winfrey and Liu give the example of viewers'

contributions to the Congo and Pakistan for the same reason. In her case, however, the audience got a clearer picture of what even a small donation can do to help the spoken-for: “Even though you wrote in and said . . . you didn’t have a lot of money, 50 cents, it was a dollar – if you take all these amounts and pool them together it has created \$500,000. So your effort, as little as you think it was, has gone a long, long way.” By providing evidence of the way past efforts have helped, the speakers empower the audience to take action of their own.

Speaking *for* others means speaking instead of a spoken-for, but should also be much more. A speaker cannot truly present information about the spoken-for and the actions they need to help them without speaking *to* them as well. Many speakers do not have the resources of a *New York Times* journalist, world-famous actor, or television producer, however, and so must strive to use all the resources available to learn as much as they can about the people and the situation. Then, in addition to using that information as a basis for the speaking, speakers should present their message as clearly and in as much detail as possible so that the audience understands what the spoken-for needs and how they can help. Because the speaker is the one introducing the topic to the audience, it is their burden to provide as detailed and accurate information as possible, and if the speaker is not fully educated themselves, the information will be inadequate and the spoken-for will not be well-represented.

Darfurians as *Others*

Otherness can create barriers between spoken-for and audience. If an audience cannot identify with the spoken-for, they are less likely to be moved to care and take

action to help them. In an analysis of speaking for others, it is important to evaluate whether the speakers minimize the otherness that exists so that the audience can relate to the spoken-for, or if they emphasize that otherness. I chose Darfurians as the focus of this dissertation because the conflict is a current issue which has received much attention in popular culture. Additionally, however, I chose Darfur because the spoken-for group is very clearly different from the people speaking for them in the United States – based on nationality, language, religion, and sometimes race. When the identity of the spoken-for is clearly other than the speakers, the analysis more clearly shows the problems and potential of speaking for others. When privileged, white Americans speak for oppressed, black Africans, the differences are obvious and speakers must do more to show ways the two groups are consubstantial. In “Darfur is Dying,” *ER*, and *Hotel Rwanda*, the spoken-for is other in a different way. In a sense, the speaker becomes the spoken-for for the length of the movie, show, or game since the actors and avatars are the public face of the speaker. While the stories are based on real life occurrences, they are not documentaries and so the actors and avatars are not the other. They are speakers who act like the other and connecting spoken-for and audience is still important.

Not all people who speak for Darfur are analyzed in this dissertation. People such as Adam and Daoud Hari, Darfurians on speaking tours through the United States, speak for their own country and their people. Since the analysis of identity is different for people who speak for their own group, their speaking does not fit in this analysis. Several American and British people of Sudanese descent speak for the people of Darfur and their speaking is on the border between speaking for others and speaking for themselves. Just as Zora Neale Hurston was an outsider when she returned to her community, these

speakers are *other* than the people for who they speak.⁷³ While they are still different from the spoken-for, they are partially members of the group for whom they speak, and so their messages will not be considered in this analysis. Each of the speakers I am analyzing is American and African American speakers do not identify themselves with a specific African country and thus the African Darfuri group is completely *other*.

The Darfuri people are clearly *other* than the audience as well. While some Darfuri people live in the United States, they are a very small minority. Because of this, speakers need to make the audience consubstantial with the spoken-for. Burke argues that persuasion happens when identification happens between the speaker and audience but when speaking for others, that identification must also occur between the subject, in this case the people of Darfur, and the audience. By showing the audience similarities between them and the spoken-for, the speaker has a better chance of eliciting sympathy. Each of the texts works hard to identify the spoken-for with the audience. This aspect of speaking for others is one which each of the eight speakers accomplishes in different ways.

Some of the speakers identify the spoken-for with the audience by having the audience become the spoken-for. "Darfur is Dying" has the players choose an avatar with the identity of a Darfurian and for the length of the game, the players become the avatar. Each avatar has a name and age, which personalizes them. Players can choose between the adult male, Rahman; the adult female, Sittina; the girls, Elham, Poni, or Abok; and the boys, Jaja, Mahdi, or Deng. This, to a certain extent, allows players to become the other. The avatars risk death and rape in everything they do and the goal of the game is to avoid these consequences. Each avatar has different risks inherent to their identity and the

creators explicitly explain these possible consequences. The adult male character, Rahman, is not allowed to go out of the camp to get water because “It’s very uncommon for an adult male to forage for water because he is likely to be killed by the Janjaweed militia.”⁷⁴ The player receives a message explaining that the consequences are real for the actual people in Darfur. If one of the three female characters is caught by Janjaweed, a message appears: “You have been captured by the militia. You will likely become one of the hundreds of thousands of people already lost to this humanitarian crisis. Girls in Darfur face abuse, rape and kidnapping by the Janjaweed. . . . As someone at a far off computer, and not a child or adult in Sudan, would you like to try again?”⁷⁵ The game thus not only identifies speaker with audience, but then tears that identification apart to show the major difference between player and spoken-for. While becoming the other creates urgency for the audience during the course of the game, nothing within the game shows that the audience members have anything in common with the people their avatar represents. Thus any connection is temporary and ultimately could be inconsequential. After the game is done and the character dies, they emphasize that the players are separate from the conflict and ask for help to end it. This rhetorical technique keeps the audience from blaming the victims for their circumstances. When the spoken-for are consubstantial with the audience, then the audience will be reluctant to blame them.

Many texts identify spoken-for and audience by showing similarities in the way the two groups feel and think. The episode “The Shocking Story George Clooney Has to Tell” begins with Lisa Ling, a reporter for National Geographic Channel, reporting on a situation in Uganda, Sudan’s neighbor to the south. She tells the story of children in Uganda, some of whom are stolen and made to work as soldiers or sex slaves and others,

called the nightwalkers, who travel for miles each night to find a safe place to sleep.⁷⁶

While this section does not talk about Darfur, it is a point of comparison similar to other speakers comparing Darfur and Rwanda. Winfrey and Ling confront the division between the subject and audience, making the audience “a participant in [the] social or economic class,” of the Darfuri people.⁷⁷ While telling the story, Winfrey and Ling repeatedly identify the case of the people in Uganda with the audience. Winfrey states, “If this was happening to your child, you would want the world to know” and “If it was your child, wouldn’t you want someone to help.”⁷⁸ Ling states, “These mothers love their children as much as you love yours” and says “this story is difficult to watch, but just think what it would feel like to live it.”⁷⁹ With these statements, the speakers show the audience that the atrocities are happening to people who have feelings similar to the feelings of the audience. They do not allow the audience to separate themselves, but find points which the audience could identify with – the safety of children – and repeatedly use it to connect the two groups.

A theme throughout *Hotel Rwanda* is the love story of Paul Rusesabagina and his wife Tatiana. Producer Terry George purposely emphasized this love story to make the movie a human story with a larger political and humanitarian message.⁸⁰ Throughout the movie, Paul and Tatiana are seen holding and supporting each other through difficulties. There are moments when each thinks the other is dead or gone and their frantic searches for each other are touching and easily identifiable to a Western audience. Tatiana is a Tutsi and Paul is a Hutu so she tells him to take the children and leave her behind so that he and the kids could be safe. Paul responds, “I would never leave you.”⁸¹ The story of two people loving each other despite horrendous circumstances is one commonly told by

authors in all cultures and time periods. With this story running through the larger story of genocide, the speakers keep the audience connected to the spoken-for.

Kristof identifies the Darfuri people with the audience by describing some Darfurians as intelligent and strong. Kristof states that a teacher that Kristof interviews speaks “in elegant French.”⁸² Another person he interviews is “a college graduate, speaks French, Arabic, English and two African languages.”⁸³ Kristof emphasizes the intelligence of the people who learn and know about the world around them even if they live in huts or tents. When the audience sees pictures of Darfur, it seems desolate and unrefined. Describing the people as intelligent can help the audience see beyond the place they live. Kristof also describes the courage of the people who help family members get to safety even when they are wounded themselves.⁸⁴ This strength in body and character represents the people well. These comparisons also help show that the spoken-for are not weak, amoral, or evil. Instead, they are people just like neighbors or friends the audience might have who happen to live in the midst of a humanitarian crisis. By normalizing the spoken-for, speakers help the audience to empathize and gives them a desire to take action to help the Darfurians.

The actions of the spoken-for are another aspect with which speakers compare experiences of the spoken-for and audience. Winfrey states that Darfuri people go to work every day just like the audience members do. Clooney states, “These people had jobs and property.”⁸⁵ In *Hotel Rwanda*, the Rusesabagina family lives in a home that would not look out of place in the suburbs of any American city. Tatiana does not allow her children to have chocolate before dinner. The family plays cards together in their hotel room. The children do things that children normally do; they jump rope and hula

hoop. By portraying characters as normal and their actions as similar to the audience, the movie minimizes the otherness and helps the audience sympathize with their plight.

The speaker cannot completely identify the spoken-for and the audience because the circumstances are so completely different. Several speakers identify spoken-for and audience to create consubstantiality but then show that the spoken-for are enduring circumstances the audience has never had to face. One night, Paul takes Tatiana to the roof for a romantic candlelight dinner. The identification with the audience ends when their conversation turns to Paul asking Tatiana to push the kids off the roof and then jump rather than allowing the militia to rape and torture them. We can imagine that the mothers described in *The Oprah Winfrey Show* love their children like we love our children, but we are never forced to send our children away to protect them from being kidnapped and made soldiers or sex slaves. Showing these similarities help make the spoken-for consubstantial with the audience and creates a connection that increases the likelihood that the audience will take action.

Religion makes identifying the audience with the people of Darfur problematic. The United States is considered a Christian country and, even if audience members do not consider themselves Christian, may have conflicting feelings regarding Muslims because of the enmity some Muslims have shown to the United States. When speakers do not identify the spoken-for with the audience, the spoken-for becomes alien and can be viewed as evil and so speakers for Darfur need to overcome the separation that religion creates between the audience and spoken-for.⁸⁶ In *Hotel Rwanda*, the filmmakers can bypass this difficulty. Rwanda is not a Muslim country and the main characters in the film are depicted as Christian, not Muslim. Tatiana Rusesabagina wears a cross necklace

during the film. Paul fingers a cross when he considers what to do to save his family. It is easier for people to identify with a spoken-for that does not engage in activities characteristic of their enemies. The audience of *Hotel Rwanda* can identify with the religion of the characters of the story more easily than if the story focused on a Muslim main character and are more likely to be persuaded by the message. The other messages cannot identify the spoken-for as Christian or atheist without misrepresenting the spoken-for and so most avoid mention of Islam. The creators of *ER* do not hide the practice of Islam, however. When Carter first works in the clinic, Debbie says, “At least in the Congo we had . . . beer. I’m not saying anything about anyone’s religion but this place would drive anybody to drink.”⁸⁷ This statement focuses on one aspect of Islam, the practice of abstaining from alcohol, in a light, humorous way. The final scene in the episode is the burial of the Darfuri father. The men of the camp follow cultural tradition and dress in white robes and carry him to the graveyard. One of the men quotes a passage from the Koran which Dakarai translates as saying: “To the earth God will return you. From the earth God will bring you out again.” The funeral is respectfully portrayed and does not contain anything that would be offensive or negative to the audience. These two instances show Islam in a positive way and help to overcome some of the problems the audience may have with the Muslim victims in Darfur.

The show’s creators show negative aspects of the religion and culture as well. After the mother is raped, Dakarai tells Carter, “Do not tell [her husband] she’s been shamed . . . sometimes men disown their wives after they’ve been raped.”⁸⁸ While this sentiment is not true of all Muslims, it is a widespread practice in some Islamic countries and shows the Darfurians negatively. This kind of statement could cause the audience to

begin to blame the victims for their attitude towards rape rather than focusing the blame on the perpetrators. On the other hand, by showing the differences and similarities between the Darfurians and the audience, the speakers keep “boundaries appropriately fuzzy within a prevailing framework of interpretation and political motivation. Fuzzy boundaries are conducive to locating points of identification between adversaries who position themselves on either side of a dividing line.”⁸⁹ Audience members can see both the similarities and differences, the positives and negatives, between themselves and the Darfurians which makes a simplistic hatred of the other more difficult to sustain.

One way speakers help to identify the spoken-for and the audience is by dealing with the issue of race because whiteness is such a powerful part of identity.⁹⁰ Many of the speakers are white, which separates them even more from the Black Africans. While African-Americans do not necessarily understand what it means to be African any more than European-Americans do, the perception of power that whiteness brings with it and the perception that African-Americans must know and care about Africa affects the message. The *ER* episode juxtaposes race. There are several discussions of what it means to be white or black. In one scene, Dakarai downplays the importance of race.

DAKARAI. Carter expected so much more from you.

PRATT. Why? Because I’m black?

DAKARAI. No, because you’re smart.⁹¹

In a later scene, Pratt tells Dakarai, “They told you a brother was coming so you expected Marcus Garvey? Don’t think we have any more in common than color.” Dakarai responds, “I don’t. In fact I think Carter is more African than you are.”⁹² Dakarai also refers to other conflicts where race is a central factor: “...It does not matter whether it is

Somalia, Rwanda, Darfur, New Orleans. When the faces are black, the work is slow.”⁹³

ER deconstructs race and shows that it is humanity and not skin color that should be important.

Speaking for others has many potential pitfalls which speakers should conscientiously avoid before speaking for others. Educating the public about a conflict such as Darfur is important, but if that education does not lead to any action to solve the plight of the Darfurians, the speakers have missed an opportunity to help the spoken-for. While this chapter shows that each of the speakers fits the definition of speaking for others, each does so in differing ways and sometimes the way they speak does more to hurt the spoken-for than to help them. With the conflict in its sixth year and the numbers of dead and displaced rising daily, speakers for Darfur cannot afford to misrepresent or badly represent the spoken-for.

Chapter 5. Conclusion

Speaking for others in popular culture has the potential of bringing the public's attention to injustice and suffering around the world. Despite the potential good that can come from speaking for others, speakers should more clearly think through and analyze the situation for which they are speaking before they speak. Even speakers with the best of intentions can do more to help the spoken-for when they consider the ways that their identity and message can both positively and negatively affect the spoken-for. A carefully constructed message by a speaker who knows both the audience and spoken-for and has crafted his or her message to best identify with both groups will be more likely to result in a positive outcome for the spoken-for.

The situation in Darfur has not ended over the four years since I began writing this dissertation. In March, 2009, Omar al-Bashir ousted thirteen aid groups from Sudan and announced he would expel them all later that year. Following Bashir's announcement, President Obama "said he wanted to 'send a strong, unified, international message that it is not acceptable to put that many people's lives at risk.'"¹ Bashir ultimately allowed the aid workers to return and while violence continues in the region, it is at a much reduced rate. General Martin Luther Agwai "a former Nigerian armed forces chief of staff, noted that there were now 100 to 150 deaths a month in Darfur, down from hundreds or thousands in the past. The number of rape and assault cases has also dropped."² Because of people like Nicholas Kristof, George Clooney, Angelina Jolie, and Don Cheadle and organizations like Save Darfur, though, the situation is becoming better known and people continue to take action to help the Darfuri people.

While violence in Darfur has become less prevalent than it was in the past, a reemergence of violence in South Sudan has led to continued unrest in the country. In the first half of 2009, 1,000 people were killed; some were victims of tribal feuds, and some from attacks such as the UN food convoy attack in June where 40 people died.³ Attacks from the Lord's Resistance Army from Uganda have increased violence in the region as well.⁴ Analysts claim that the resolution of Darfur and South Sudan are linked and both need to be solved for real peace to begin. The new special envoy to Sudan stated:

I believe that the road to peace in Sudan runs through Darfur. The atrocities that have taken place in Darfur are a crime against the world that must be resolved.

We are working aggressively to reverse the ongoing consequences of genocide in Darfur. Though the incidence of violent deaths has improved dramatically since 2005, the situation remains dangerous and dire. Civilians remain vulnerable, living conditions are unacceptable, and the displaced remain unable to return home in security.⁵

Speakers for Darfur still have work to do and including the voices of Darfurians who have plans for peace will help.

The conflicts in Darfur and South Sudan are far from the only human rights issues in the world for which people can speak. Amnesty International is actively analyzing human rights issues in 150 countries around the world. Human Rights Watch is involved in 115 countries, including 23 countries in Africa. Within the United States itself, Human Rights Watch is fighting against the abuse of prisoners, immigration policies, domestic violence and rape victims, and students with disabilities. Advocates for these different issues have the chance to speak out to bring aid to those in need but can better aid them if

they first analyze the situation and their identity before carefully preparing their messages.

Identity literature explains how and why Linda Alcoff's concept of a social location affects the message.⁶ A speaker with an identity that negatively affects their message should either refrain from speaking or, since identities are malleable and speakers are able to use rhetoric to identify with an audience, speakers can present their own identity and credibility in a way that overcomes those aspects of identity the audience may view as deficiencies. Speakers sometimes feel that the audience should ignore any aspects of identity and focus on the message when in truth, that is very hard to do. A speaker who aims to help the spoken-for should present the message that will best help the spoken-for and to do that, the speaker has to do the work and not rely on the audience to do it. Angelina Jolie could ignore the public's view of her as a sexual icon with a strange past. Instead, she often speaks about how she changed her worldview after filming in Cambodia and visiting refugee camps there in order to improve her image for the audience. George Clooney's image is not as tarnished as Jolie's was, but he is a movie star and many Americans view movie stars with causes with suspicion. Instead of trying to overcome this point of view, Clooney scoffs saying "I welcome any of these dumb pundits who make celebrities out to be bad guys to a discussion about Darfur. Because I've been there and I've met all the players, and I guarantee you, the pundits haven't."⁷ By not seriously addressing the audience's view of a speaker's identity, the speaker can lose some audience members who could help the spoken-for. Speakers can only know what areas of their identity might be a distraction if they know the audience

and how the audience will respond to them, so speakers need to understand their audience and how the speakers' social identity will affect the message.

Identity literature also shows how a spoken-for's identity can relate to the speaker's identity. Speakers need to have a clear understanding of the history and needs of the spoken-for. Speakers in popular culture often have sufficient resources to speak *to* the other prior to speaking *for* them even if the other lives in another part of the world. Speaking *to* provides the speaker with a clearer understanding of the real needs of the spoken-for which can then be translated to an audience by the speaker, or in a more ideal situation, the spoken-for can present the message themselves with the speaker providing the resources to access the spoken-for and helping to draw in the audience. The organizers for the Voices from Darfur tour could have chosen celebrities or other concerned Americans to speak for Darfur, but allowing the Darfurians to speak for themselves empowers them and thus begins to break down the structures of domination which keep the Darfurians oppressed.

Especially salient for a European American speaker is the issue of whiteness. Whiteness studies help us understand the extent to which a white speaker's identity can separate them from the spoken-for. Being white is a possession that is pervasive and powerful, even when unacknowledged.⁸ Black Americans experience whiteness as a hierarchy in which the white can look down upon and subjugate the black solely based on skin color. The pervasiveness of whiteness means that, even though identities are malleable and speakers identify themselves with the audience and spoken-for, it is not simple.⁹ The more speakers immerse themselves in the culture for which they are speaking and speaks to the oppressed, the more that whiteness can be overcome.¹⁰ White

speakers should be conscious of and conscientious regarding their social location and work to empower rather than further subjugate the oppressed.

A clear understanding of rhetoric and silencing literature also helps to expand our understanding of the ways in which speaking for others can be beneficial or problematic. Since speaking for others literature cautions advocates to know when to speak and when not to speak, knowing whether the oppressed are silenced can help advocates make that judgment. Rhetoric literature helps explain when victims are silenced and when they silence themselves, which shows whether they can speak for themselves. In Darfur, the people were not subaltern or silenced and yet each of the speakers analyzed chose to speak. The speakers did not fight the impetus to speak, but assumed they had the right. Such a choice can be harmful to a spoken-for who is willing and able to speak for themselves. As critics, we should not advocate messages in which people speak for others as if the speaker has that right, but should interrogate the way speakers may silence rather than help the other.

The literature in rhetorical studies also helps to explain ways in which a speaker can and should identify with the audience. The main danger speaking for others scholars warn against is identity, but speakers can rhetorically identify themselves with both the spoken-for and audience. A speaker who identifies with both groups and identifies the spoken-for with the audience can cross barriers built by identity. Many speakers do not identify themselves with the other two groups but just assume they automatically have a right to speak. The speakers are capable of speaking and drawing an audience, but reinforce the notion of the spoken-for as victim and powerless instead of working to empower the spoken-for.

Rhetoric also shows how the other is separated or identified with the audience. When the identity of the spoken-for has already been identified as alien, the speaker will have a difficult time relating to them. When the spoken-for is considered an enemy, the identification must be carefully done. Speakers who can show the similarities between the groups and blur the lines that separate them may be able to change an enemy other into a group with which the speaker can identify. Speakers who ignore this step have no chance of convincing a hostile audience to help the oppressed.

When the spoken-for is not viewed as enemy, is silenced, or does not have the language skills to speak for themselves, speakers can use the ideas of the spoken-for in their own message, attributing those ideas to the spoken-for. It is preferable for advocates to let the other speak but since that is not always possible, the speaker should be as visible as possible. In *Hotel Rwanda* and “Darfur is Dying” the speaker is invisible and the characters portraying the spoken-for are visible. In this way, the focus is on the other rather than on the speaker. Some of Kristof’s editorials cite the words of the Darfurians to allow them to be heard. Speakers need to include more of this, however. The less the voice of the oppressed is heard, the more they are silenced and oppressed.

When talking about the situation of the spoken-for, speakers should focus on the abilities and power of the other rather than the speaker’s own abilities and power. A critical rhetoric reveals that the more visible the speakers are, physically as well as rhetorically, the more the ideology of the empowered is reinforced. Speakers are rhetorically visible when they focus on their own point of view instead of the spoken-for’s. When speakers allow the spoken-for to be visible, either by letting them speak for themselves or by using their ideas after speaking *to* them, the ideologies are questioned

and the disempowered can become empowered. Speakers like *Hotel Rwanda*, *ER*, and “Darfur is Dying” did the most to make the Darfurians rhetorically visible. Other speakers almost exclusively describe the Darfurians as victims unable to take any action to help themselves. The nature of the conflict in Darfur means many Darfurians are victims in one way or another, but every group has leaders who have shown themselves able to act when necessary. In Rwanda, Paul Rusesabagina saved the lives of thousands of his countrymen. In Darfur, men such as Suleiman Jamous have been calm and reasonable intermediaries between the government and rebels. While presenting stories of the horror and atrocities evokes emotional responses from an audience, that emotional response is not always sufficient to persuade action. Speakers should demonstrate ways that the spoken-for has the ability to act for and govern themselves so that the audience can see that they will not be endlessly dependent on the resources of the audiences.

Speaking for others in popular culture generally involves the rich and famous who have more resources to allow them to speak *to* the other, enable the other to speak, and draw in an audience to hear the message. These resources are not available to all who wish to speak for others, but non-celebrity speakers can still speak productively for others and use the conclusions from this research to help them speak well. The non-celebrity speaker may have less responsibility when speaking to smaller audiences, but that responsibility still exists. Non-celebrity speakers still need to interrogate their own identity, understand the spoken-for, and present the needs of the spoken-for as faithfully to their actual needs as possible.

The identity of celebrities is generally better known by their audience than the identity of non-celebrity speakers. This can be a positive and negative thing. By being

less known, any negative history of the speaker may not be an issue for the audience. Unless the speaker is personally known to the audience, the audience will not have as detailed information about the speaker as they would of a celebrity speaker. When the audience knows the speaker personally, however, just like celebrity speakers they may need to deal with those negative aspects of their identity rhetorically or refrain from speaking. Even if the audience does not know the speaker personally, there may be attributes that are physically obvious to the audience, such as whiteness or Muslim clothing that may be discursively dangerous. Speakers should not ignore those physical aspects of their identity, but either minimize those elements rhetorically or refrain from speaking. Speakers should be aware that some of those aspects of their identity may be epistemically salient and, while the speaker may not think those aspects of their identity are relevant in the speaking situation; if it hinders the audience from hearing the message should be addressed.

Being unknown to an audience means that the speaker must establish the credibility to speak. Speakers may need to explicitly explain in what ways they have the knowledge and authority to speak. While concern for the other may be the motivation speakers have for speaking, that concern does not make them qualified to speak. Many speakers for Darfur do not have the resources to speak *to* Darfurians to learn first-hand what they need to know to gain credibility but they still should become as informed as possible about the situation for which they speak. A dialogue with the other could make the needs of the group clearer; books, articles, and blogs written by the other will help a speaker unable to speak *to* others to have a better understanding of the other. Speakers can also use information that comes from other people who have spoken to the other.

Speakers should get educated from a variety of sources since second-hand information is the interpretation of a person who spoke *to*. A speaker should read multiple books and articles by a variety of news sources to get a broader perspective. If the speaker can talk to people who have experience, the information, though second-hand, will be beneficial.

The messages of speakers for Darfur also reveal a problem with audiences. As audience members, we sometimes let the speaker's identity distract us from the message. While certain aspects of the speaker's identity – their character, trustworthiness, experience – may be relevant, other aspects may not be. Audiences should not be completely uncritical, but should be willing to hear a message and then follow up for verification as needed. Clooney's job and Jolie's sexuality do not preclude them from knowing about Darfur and how to speak for it, but their messages are sometimes ignored because of that identity. Kristof's whiteness does not mean he cannot understand what Darfurians need, but some audience members may reject him as a speaker because he is not black. While critical listening is important, we as audience members should be more critical of the message itself and less critical of identity. It is the speaker's burden to assess their own identity and deal with problems that exist with that identity, but audience members can still listen to messages of speakers who do not deal with those problems.

Throughout history, all around the world, people have relied on others to speak their message to help end their suffering. Advocates for those unable to speak for themselves have a great opportunity to bring awareness to their circumstances and potentially persuade an audience to take action to help alleviate their suffering. For the circumstances of the victims to end, speakers must carefully consider their right to speak and the way they present their messages so that we can truly say, "Never again."

Notes

Chapter 1

¹ Samantha Power, *The Problem from Hell* (New York: Basic Books, 2002) 356-357.

² *Ibid.*, 508.

³ *Ibid.*, 374.

⁴ There is some dispute as to how to spell various Arabic words. Some literature spells Janjaweed as Janjawiid, and some as Janjawid. In this case and the case of other words (Baggara, Kadhafi, Omar), I will use the more widely accepted spellings except in direct quotes.

⁵ Linda Alcoff, "The Problems of Speaking for Others," *Cultural Critique* 20 (Winter 1991-92): 5-32; Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grosberg, 271-313 (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1988); Jeanne Perreault, "Chain Gang Narratives and the Politics of 'Speaking For,'" *Biography* 24 (Winter 2001): 152-171; and Brian McGee, "Speaking about the Other: W. E. B. DuBois Responds to the Klan," *The Southern Communication Journal* 63 (Spring 1998): 208-219.

⁶ Hans Mathias Kepplinger, "Reciprocal Effects: Toward a Theory of Mass Media Effects on Decision Makers." *Press/Politics* 12 (Spring, 2007): 3-23.

⁷ Klaus Bruhn Jensen, "The Politics of Polysemy: Television News, Everyday Consciousness and Political Action," *Media, Culture, and Society* 12 (1990): 58.

⁸ Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977) 206.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 207.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 209.

¹¹ Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" 275.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ Michel Foucault, *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings 1977-1984* (New York: Routledge, 1988) 30, 38.

¹⁴ Ranajit Guha, ed. *Subaltern Studies I: Writings on South Asian History and Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982) vii.

¹⁵ Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" 284-285.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 295.

¹⁷ Henry Tajfel, "Social Categorization," in *Introduction a la Psychologies Sociale*, ed. S. Moscovici, 292 (Paris: Larousse, 1972).

¹⁸ Alcoff, "The Problems of Speaking," 7.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 7.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 15.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 24.

²² *Ibid.*, 23.

²³ Raka Shome, "A Response to William Starosta's 'On the Intersection of Rhetoric and Intercultural Communication,'" in *Rhetoric in Intercultural Contexts*, ed. Alberto González and Dolores V. Tanno, 169-175 (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2000); Robert Shuter, "The Cultures of Rhetoric," in *Rhetoric in Intercultural Contexts*, ed. Alberto González and Dolores V. Tanno, 11-18 (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2000); Mary Garrett, "Some Elementary Methodological Reflections on the Study of the Chinese Rhetorical Tradition," in *Rhetoric in Intercultural Contexts*, ed. Alberto González and Dolores V. Tanno, 53-63 (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2000); and Dolores V. Tanno and Fred E. Jandt, "Redefining the 'Other' in Multicultural Research," *Howard Journal of Communication* 5 (1994): 36-45.

²⁴ McGee, "Speaking about the Other," 215.

²⁵ Charles Stewart, "Championing the Rights of Others and Challenging Evil: The Ego Function in the Rhetoric of Other-directed Social Movements," *Southern Communication Journal* 64 (1991): 91-92; and Andrew Lakritz, "Identification and Difference: Structures of Privilege in Cultural Criticism," in *Who Can Speak: Authority and Critical Identity*, ed. Judith Roof and Robyn Wiegman, 3-29 (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1995).

- ²⁶ Tanno & Jandt, "Redefining the 'Other,'" 36-45.
- ²⁷ Garrett, "Chinese Rhetorical Tradition," 58; Shuter, "The Cultures of Rhetoric," 11-17.
- ²⁸ Shuter, "The Cultures of Rhetoric," 11-17.
- ²⁹ Nick Couldry, "Speaking About Others and Speaking Personally: Reflections after Elspeth Probyn's *Sexing the Self*," *Cultural Studies* 10 (1996): 318.
- ³⁰ Shome, "Response to William Starosta," 172.
- ³¹ Susan Ritchie, "Ventriloquist Folklore: Who Speaks for Representation?" *Western Folklore* 52 (1993): 366.
- ³² Ritchie, "Ventriloquist Folklore," 369.
- ³³ Couldry, "Speaking About Others," 320.
- ³⁴ Lakritz, "Identification and Difference," 19.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, 19-20.
- ³⁶ Leslie Bow, "'For Every Gesture of Loyalty, There Doesn't Have to Be a Betrayal!' Asian American Criticism and the Politics of Locality," in *Who Can Speak: Authority and Critical Identity*, ed. Judith Roof and Robyn Wiegman, 30-55 (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1995).
- ³⁷ Couldry, "Speaking About Others," 325.
- ³⁸ Patricia Geesey, "Who Speaks for North African Women in France?" in *Hearing Many Voices*, ed. M. J. Hardman and Anita Taylor, 201 (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc., 2000). See also Spivak's analysis of Hindu widow sacrifices in "Can the Subaltern Speak?" 294-308.
- ³⁹ Geesey, "Who Speaks," 197.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁴¹ McGee, "Speaking about the Other," 215.
- ⁴² Couldry, "Speaking About Others," 324.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, 325.
- ⁴⁴ Langston Hughes, "Forward from Life" in Perreault, "Chain Gang," 166.
- ⁴⁵ Stewart, "Championing the Rights of Others," 91-105.
- ⁴⁶ Richard Gregg, "The Ego Function of the Rhetoric of Protest," *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 4 (1971): 82.
- ⁴⁷ Stewart, "Championing the Rights of Others," 92.
- ⁴⁸ Gregg, "Ego Function of Rhetoric," 76.
- ⁴⁹ Stewart, "Championing the Rights of Others," 96-100.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 96.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 101-103.
- ⁵² Lakritz, "Identification and Difference," 15.
- ⁵³ Plato, *Gorgias*, 462-463.
- ⁵⁴ Raymie E. McKerrow, "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis," *Communication Monographs* 56 (June 1989): 91.
- ⁵⁵ Alcoff, "The Problems of Speaking," 7.
- ⁵⁶ Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969) 22.
- ⁵⁷ Diane Davis, "Identification: Burke and Freud on Who You Are," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 38 (Spring 2008): 132.
- ⁵⁸ Linda Alcoff alludes to this idea in "The Problem of Speaking for Others," however her description does not cite Burke's work and does not go into the amount of detail Burke does.
- ⁵⁹ Gregg, "Ego Function of Rhetoric," 73.
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 21.
- ⁶¹ Davis, "Identification: Burke and Freud," 129.
- ⁶² Chantal Mouffe, *The Democratic Paradox* (London: Verso, 2000) 4.
- ⁶³ Mouffe, *The Democratic Paradox*, 12.
- ⁶⁴ Kenneth Burke, "The Rhetoric of Hitler's Battle," in *Landmark Essays on Rhetorical Criticism*, ed. Thomas W. Benson, 35 (Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1993).
- ⁶⁵ Robert Ivie, "Evil Enemy Versus Agonistic Other: Rhetorical Constructions of Terrorism," *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 25 (2003): 182.
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 191.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 189.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 192.
- ⁶⁹ Mouffe, *The Democratic Paradox*, 34.

- ⁷⁰ William Starosta and C. Coleman, "Jesse Jackson's 'Hymietown' Apology: A Case Study of Interethnic Rhetorical Analysis," in *Interethnic Communication: Current Research*, ed. Y. Y. Kim, 131 (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1986).
- ⁷¹ Cheryl Glenn, *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004) 2.
- ⁷² Aristotle as quoted in Glenn, *Unspoken*, 20.
- ⁷³ Glenn, *Unspoken*, 6. For an analysis of speaking for others by silencing the other, see Kimberly A. Powell, "The Association of Southern Women for the Prevention of Lynching: Strategies of a Movement in the Comic Frame," *Communication Quarterly* 43 (Winter 1995): 86-99.
- ⁷⁴ Rosa Eberly, *Citizen Critics* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2000) 136.
- ⁷⁵ Quoted in Eberly, *Citizen Critics*, 136.
- ⁷⁶ Glenn, *Unspoken*, 33.
- ⁷⁷ Jacqueline Bacon, *The Humblest May Stand Forth: Rhetoric, Empowerment, and Abolition* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2002) 1-2.
- ⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 236; Audre Lorde, "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House," in *Sister Outsider* (Berkeley, CA: The Crossing Press, 1984), 110.
- ⁷⁹ Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives*, 55; Bacon, *The Humblest May Stand Forth*, 236.
- ⁸⁰ Charles Braithwaite, "Communicative Silence: A Cross-Cultural Study of Basso's Hypothesis," in *Cultural Communication and Intercultural Contact*, ed. Donal Carbaugh, 323 (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1990).
- ⁸¹ Braithwaite, "Communicative Silence," 324.
- ⁸² Glenn, *Unspoken*, 55.
- ⁸³ Lester C. Olson, "On the Margins of Rhetoric: Audre Lorde Transforming Silence into Language and Action," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997): 56.
- ⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 53.
- ⁸⁵ Dana Cloud, "The Null Persona: Race and the Rhetoric of Silence in the Uprising of '34," *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 2 (1999): 179.
- ⁸⁶ Cloud, "The Null Persona," 193.
- ⁸⁷ Eric M. Eisenberg, "Building a Mystery: Toward a New Theory of Communication and Identity," *Journal of Communication* 51 (September 1, 2001): 543.
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 544.
- ⁸⁹ Kenneth Gergen, *The Saturated Self* (New York: Basic Books, 1991) 5.
- ⁹⁰ Karen Brodtkin Sacks, "How the Jews became White," in *Race*, ed. Steven Gregory and Roger Sanjek, 78-102 (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994).
- ⁹¹ Stuart Hall, "Introduction: Who Needs 'Identity'?" in *Questions of Cultural Identity*, ed. Stuart Hall and Paul DuGay, 2 (London: Sage Publications, 1996).
- ⁹² Gergen, *The Saturated Self*, 7.
- ⁹³ Randall A. Lake, "Argumentation and Self: The Enactment of Identity in Dances with Wolves," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 34 (Fall 1997): 68.
- ⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 87.
- ⁹⁵ Kathleen Glenister Roberts, "Emotivism and Pseudocultural Identities," *The Howard Journal of Communications* 14 (2003): 196.
- ⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 195.
- ⁹⁷ Dominic Abrams and Michael A. Hogg, "Social Identification, Self-Categorization, and Social Influence," *European Review of Social Psychology* 1 (1990): 195-228.
- ⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 196-197.
- ⁹⁹ Peggy McIntosh, "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies," in *Critical White Studies: Looking behind the Mirror*, ed. Richard Delgado, 291-299 (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1997).
- ¹⁰⁰ Richard Dyer, "White," in *The Matter of Images: Essays on Representation*, ed. Richard Dyer, 126-148 (London: Routledge, 2002).
- ¹⁰¹ Cheryl L. Harris, "Whiteness as Property," in *Black on White: Black Writers on What It Means to be White*, ed. David R. Roediger, 103-118 (NY: Schocken Books, 1998).
- ¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 113.

- ¹⁰³ George Lipsitz, "The Possessive Investment in Whiteness," in *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics*, ed. George Lipsitz, 1-23 (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998).
- ¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 2.
- ¹⁰⁵ Harris, "Whiteness as Property," 104.
- ¹⁰⁶ Thomas K. Nakayama and Robert L. Krizek, "Whiteness as a Strategic Rhetoric," in *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, ed. Thomas K. Nakayama and Judith N. Martin, 87-106 (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1998).
- ¹⁰⁷ Sacks, "How the Jews became White," 97.
- ¹⁰⁸ bell hooks, "Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination," in *Displacing Whiteness: Essays on Social and Cultural Criticism*, ed. Ruth Frankenberg, 165-179 (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997).
- ¹⁰⁹ hooks, "Representing Whiteness," 168.
- ¹¹⁰ Annalee Newitz and Matthew Wray, "What is White Trash?" in *Whiteness: A Critical Reader*, ed. Mike Hill, 168-185 (Boulder: Westview Press, 1997); Doug Henwood, "Trash-O-Nomics," in *White Trash: Race and Class in America*, ed. Matt Wray and Annalee Newitz, 177-191 (NY: Routledge, 1999); John Hartigan, "Name Calling: Objectifying 'Poor Whites' and 'White Trash' in Detroit," in *White Trash: Race and Class in America*, ed. Matt Wray and Annalee Newitz, 41-56 (NY: Routledge, 1999).
- ¹¹¹ Perreault, "Chain Gang Narratives," 156, 159.
- ¹¹² *Ibid.*, 160.
- ¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 168.
- ¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 161.
- ¹¹⁵ Linda A. Bell, "Introduction," in *Overcoming Racism and Sexism*, eds. L. A. Bell and D. Blumenfeld, 5-32 (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1995).
- ¹¹⁶ Alcoff, "The Problems of Speaking," 7.
- ¹¹⁷ Henri Tajfel, "Social Categorization," 292.
- ¹¹⁸ Geesey, "Who Speaks," 197.
- ¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 199.
- ¹²⁰ Stewart, "Championing the Rights of Others," 101-103.
- ¹²¹ Perreault, "Chain Gang Narratives," 162.
- ¹²² Geesey, "Who Speaks," 197.
- ¹²³ Michael A. Hogg, Deborah J. Terry, and Katherine M. White, "A Tale of Two Theories: A Critical Comparison of Identity Theory with Social Identity Theory," *Social Psychology Quarterly* 58 (Dec 1995): 255-269.
- ¹²⁴ Sandra Harding, "Subjectivity, Experience, and Knowledge: An Epistemology from/for Rainbow Coalition Politics," in *Who Can Speak: Authority and Critical Identity*, ed. Judith Roof and Robyn Wiegman, 120 (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1995).
- ¹²⁵ Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives*, 55.
- ¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 22.
- ¹²⁷ Perreault, "Chain Gang Narratives," 156.
- ¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 165.
- ¹²⁹ Alcoff, "The Problems of Speaking," 7; Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" 273; Perreault, "Chain Gang Narratives," 153; McGee, "Speaking about the Other," 208; Stewart, "Championing the Rights of Others," 91-92.
- ¹³⁰ Perreault, "Chain Gang Narratives," 153.
- ¹³¹ Stewart, "Championing the Rights of Others," 91-92.
- ¹³² Alcoff, "The Problems of Speaking," 7.
- ¹³³ McGee, "Speaking about the Other," 208-219.
- ¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 215.
- ¹³⁵ Alcoff, "The Problems of Speaking," 8.
- ¹³⁶ Perreault, "Chain Gang Narratives," 153.
- ¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 167.
- ¹³⁸ Alcoff, "The Problems of Speaking," 7.

Chapter 2

- ¹ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, 295 (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1988).
- ² Lisa Hughes, "Can International Law Protect Child Soldiers," *Peace Review* 12 (September 2000): 403.
- ³ Anna Gorman, Marjorie Miller and Mitchell Landsberg, "Marchers Fill L.A.'s Streets: Immigrants Demonstrate Peaceful Power," *The Los Angeles Times*, May 2, 2006, A1.
- ⁴ Cheryl Glenn, *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004) 86.
- ⁵ Dana Cloud, "The Null Persona: Race and the Rhetoric of Silence in the Uprising of '34," *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 2 (1999): 179.
- ⁶ Rosa Eberly, *Citizen Critics* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2000) 137.
- ⁷ Glenn, *Unspoken*, 114.
- ⁸ Raymie E. McKerrow, "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis," *Communication Monographs* 56 (June 1989): 93.
- ⁹ Jacqueline Bacon, *The Humblest May Stand Forth: Rhetoric, Empowerment, and Abolition* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2002) 60.
- ¹⁰ Lester C. Olson, "On the Margins of Rhetoric: Audre Lorde Transforming Silence into Language and Action," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997): 55.
- ¹¹ Andrew E. Taslitz, *Rape and the Culture of the Courtroom* (New York: New York University Press, 1999) 20-24.
- ¹² Charles Braithwaite, "Communicative Silence: A Cross-Cultural Study of Basso's Hypothesis," *Cultural Communication and Intercultural Contact* (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1990) 323.
- ¹³ Braithwaite, "Communicative Silence," 324.
- ¹⁴ Audre Lorde, "The Transformation of Silence into Language and Action," in *Sister Outsider* (Berkeley, CA: The Crossing Press, 1984) 42.
- ¹⁵ Lorde, "Transformation of Silence," 42.
- ¹⁶ Lorde, "Master's Tools," 112.
- ¹⁷ Glenn, *Unspoken*, 52, 121.
- ¹⁸ Taslitz, *Rape*, 20.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 20-24.
- ²⁰ Glenn, *Unspoken*, 55.
- ²¹ Brian McGee, "Speaking about the Other: W. E. B. DuBois Responds to the Klan," *The Southern Communication Journal* 63 (Spring 1998): 216.
- ²² Bacon, *The Humblest May Stand Forth*, 61.
- ²³ Linda Alcoff, "The Problems of Speaking for Others," *Cultural Critique* 20 (Winter 1991-92): 7.
- ²⁴ Robert Ivie, "Evil Enemy Versus Agonistic Other: Rhetorical Constructions of Terrorism," *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 25 (2003): 190.
- ²⁵ Alcoff, "The Problems of Speaking," 24-25.
- ²⁶ Eric M. Eisenberg, "Building a Mystery: Toward a New Theory of Communication and Identity," *Journal of Communication* 51 (September 1, 2001): 243.
- ²⁷ Michael A. Hogg, Deborah J. Terry, and Katherine M. White, "A Tale of Two Theories: A Critical Comparison of Identity Theory with Social Identity Theory," *Social Psychology Quarterly* 58 (Dec 1995): 124.
- ²⁸ Johanna Schmertz, "Constructing Essences: Ethos and the Postmodern Spirit of Feminism," *Rhetoric Review* 1 (Autumn 1999): 82-91.
- ²⁹ Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969) 24.
- ³⁰ Hannah Arendt, "Reflections on Little Rock," *Dissent* 6 (Winter 1959): 46.
- ³¹ Patricia Geesey's scholarship on people speaking for their own group provides exceptions to this: "Who Speaks for North African Women in France?" in *Hearing Many Voices*, ed. M. J. Hardman and Anita Taylor, 193-202 (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc., 2000).
- ³² Andrew Lakritz, "Identification and Difference: Structures of Privilege in Cultural Criticism," in *Who Can Speak: Authority and Critical Identity*, ed. Judith Roof and Robyn Wiegman, 7 (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1995).
- ³³ Karen Brodtkin Sacks, "How the Jews became White," in *Race*, ed. Steven Gregory and Roger Sanjek, 97 (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994).

- ³⁴ George Lipsitz, "The Possessive Investment in Whiteness," in *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics*, ed. George Lipsitz, 22-23 (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998).
- ³⁵ Randall A. Lake, "Argumentation and Self: The Enactment of Identity in Dances with Wolves," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 34 (Fall 1997): 87.
- ³⁶ Nick Couldry, "Speaking About Others and Speaking Personally: Reflections after Elspeth Probyn's *Sexing the Self*," *Cultural Studies* 10 (1996): 324.
- ³⁷ McGee, "Speaking about the Other," 208.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, 215.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁰ Kathleen Glenister Roberts, "Emotivism and Pseudocultural Identities," *The Howard Journal of Communications* 14 (2003): 196.
- ⁴¹ Alcoff, "The Problems of Speaking," 7-8; Geesey, "Who Speaks," 201.
- ⁴² Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives*, 22.
- ⁴³ Alcoff, "The Problems of Speaking," 8.
- ⁴⁴ McKerrow, "Critical Rhetoric," 92.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 93.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 91.
- ⁴⁷ Chandra Talpade Mohanty, "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses," in *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, ed. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres, 89 (Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 1991).
- ⁴⁸ Geesey, "Who Speaks;" and Jeanne Perreault, "Chain Gang Narratives and the Politics of 'Speaking For,'" *Biography* 24 (Winter 2001): 152-171.

Chapter 3

- ¹ Linda A. Bell, "Introduction," in *Overcoming Racism and Sexism*, eds. L. A. Bell and D. Blumenfeld, 5-32 (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1995).
- ² William Starosta and C. Coleman, "Jesse Jackson's 'Hymietown' Apology: A Case Study of Interethnic Rhetorical Analysis," in *Interethnic Communication: Current Research*, ed. Y. Y. Kim, 118 (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1986).
- ³ Robert Shuter, "The Cultures of Rhetoric," in *Rhetoric in Intercultural Contexts*, ed. Alberto González and Dolores V. Tanno, 12 (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2000).
- ⁴ Nicholas Kristof, "Will We Say 'Never Again' Yet Again?" *New York Times*, March 27, 2004, <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/03/27/opinion/27KRIS.html?pagewanted=1> (accessed May 15, 2008).
- ⁵ Samuel Totten and Eric Markusen, *Genocide in Darfur* (New York: Routledge, 2006) 9.
- ⁶ "UN Chief 'shocked' By Darfur," *BBCnews.com*, September 5, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6979104.stm> (accessed December 3, 2007).
- ⁷ Eric M. Eisenberg, "Building a Mystery: Toward a New Theory of Communication and Identity," *Journal of Communication* 51 (2001): 543.
- ⁸ "Darfur Conference Aims for Unified Response in Paris / France Darfur Mobilisation Could Damage Efforts to End Conflict, Say Experts," *Sudan Tribune*, June 24, 2007, <http://platform.blogs.com/passionofthepresent/> (accessed January 23, 2008).
- ⁹ Rob Crilly, "In Darfur, Some Arabs Now Fight Alongside Rebels," *The Christian Science Monitor*, May 22, 2007, <http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0522/p04s01-woaf.html> (accessed November 15, 2007).
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹ Mary Garrett, "Some Elementary Methodological Reflections on the Study of the Chinese Rhetorical Tradition," in *Rhetoric in Intercultural Contexts*, ed. Alberto González and Dolores V. Tanno, 58 (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2000).
- ¹² Gerard Prunier, *The Ambiguous Genocide* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005) 77.
- ¹³ Amber Henshaw, "Sudan 'To Disarm Camp,'" *BBCNews.com*, November 22, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7106716.stm> (accessed June 11, 2008).
- ¹⁴ "Sudan 'Kills Refugees in Darfur,'" *BBCNews.com*, August 26, 2008, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7580778.stm> (accessed September 26, 2008).
- ¹⁵ William M. Reilly, "U.N., Darfur Command and Control," *Monsters and Critics*, June 8, 2007, <http://news.monstersandcritics.com/> (accessed June 12, 2007).

- ¹⁶ Martin Plaut, "Darfur - On the Brink of New Conflict," *BBCNews.com*, September 4, 2006, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/5311998.stm> (accessed November 15, 2007).
- ¹⁷ "Darfur's Factions Sit Down to Talks," *TaipeiTimes.com*, August 5, 2007, <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/taiwan/archives/2007/08/05/2003372791> (accessed November 15, 2007).
- ¹⁸ "Darfur Conflict 'Worsens,'" *Darfur Daily News*, November 26, 2007, darfurdaily.blogspot.com/2007/11/darfur-conflict-worsens.html (accessed June 11, 2008).
- ¹⁹ Amber Henshaw, "Assault Heralds Change in Sudan," *BBCNews.com*, May 12, 2008, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7396404.stm> - (accessed June 17, 2008).
- ²⁰ "Darfur School 'Bombed From Air,'" *BBC News.com*, May 5, 2008, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7384395.stm> (accessed June 17, 2008).
- ²¹ Among them Resolution 1502 of 26 Aug 2003; Resolution 1547 of 11 June 2004; Resolution 1556 of 30 July 2004; Resolution 1564 of 18 Sept 2004; Resolution 1574 of 19 Nov 2004; Resolution 1590 of 24 March 2005; Resolution 1591 of 29 Mar 2005; Resolution 1593 of 31 March 2005; Resolution 1627 of 23 Sept 2005; Resolution 1651 of 21 Dec 2005; Resolution 1663 of 24 March 2006; Resolution 1665 of 29 March 2006; Resolution 1672 of 25 Apr 2006; Resolution 1679 of 16 May 2006; Resolution 1706 of 31 Aug 2006; Resolution 1709 of 22 Sept 2006; Resolution 1713 of 29 Sept 2006; Resolution 1714 of 6 Oct 2006
- ²² "Sudan 'Will Defy Darfur Warrants,'" *BBCNews.com*, May 3, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6618527.stm/> (accessed June 11, 2007).
- ²³ The African Union, "Press Statement," *African Union*, July 13, 2005, <http://www.africa-union.org/DARFUR/Press%20release%20on%20Darfur%208-7-%2005.pdf> (accessed May 28, 2008).
- ²⁴ "Annan Warns Sudan on Darfur Aid," *BBCNews.com*, September 5, 2006, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/5317726.stm> (accessed November 15, 2007).
- ²⁵ "Ultimatum for Darfur Peace Force," *BBCNews.com*, September 4, 2006, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/5311144.stm> (accessed November 15, 2007).
- ²⁶ "Khartoum is Fooling the World Again," *Justice Africa*, June 14, 2007, <http://www.justiceafrica.org/blog/2007/06/14/khartoum-is-fooling-the-world-again> (accessed July 31, 2007).
- ²⁷ "UN to Press Sudan on Darfur Force," *BBCNews.com*, December 6, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7130144.stm> (accessed June 11, 2008).
- ²⁸ "Darfur Mission 'Behind Schedule,'" *BBCNews.com*, December 2, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7123378.stm> (accessed June 11, 2008).
- ²⁹ "Darfur Rebels 'Outgun' AU Troops," *BBCNews.com*, October 2, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7025198.stm> (accessed June 22, 2008).
- ³⁰ "Darfur Force to be 'All-African,'" *BBCNews.com*, August 13, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6943435.stm> / (accessed November 15, 2007).
- ³¹ "US Food Aid for Crisis-Hit Darfur," *BBC.com*, May 8, 2006, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/4751751.stm> / (accessed October 18, 2006).
- ³² Among them P.L. 108-287 of 5 Aug 2004; P.L. 108-447 of 8 Dec 2004; P.L. 108-497 of 23 Dec 2004; P.L. 109-13 of 11 May 2005; P.L. 109-102 of 14 Nov 2005; P.L. 109-165 of 10 Jan 2006; P.L. 109-289 of 29 Sept 2006; P.L. 109-344 of 13 Oct 2006; P.L. 109-364 of 17 Oct 2006; EO 13400 of 27 Apr 2006; EO 13412 of 13 Oct 2006.
- ³³ Lord Drayson, "Trade With Sudan," 16 October 2007, <http://www.theyworkforyou.com/wrans/?id=2007-10-16a.49.0&s=sudan> (accessed 22 June 2008).
- ³⁴ "Debate over Darfur Death Toll Intensifies," *USA Today*, November 29, 2006, http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2006-11-29-darfur_x.htm (accessed May 12, 2007).
- ³⁵ Julie Flint, *Darfur: A Short History of a Long War* (London: Zed Books Ltd., 2008) 115.
- ³⁶ Rob Crilly, "Paranoia in Darfur," *South of West*, September 28, 2007, <http://robcrilly.wordpress.com> (accessed June 28, 2008).
- ³⁷ Prunier, *The Ambiguous Genocide*, 133.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, 133.
- ³⁹ Sleepless in Sudan, "Uncensored, Direct from a Daze & Confused Aid Worker in Darfur, Sudan," February 1, 2006, <http://sleeplessinsudan.blogspot.com/> (accessed October 8, 2007).

- ⁴⁰ Stephanie Strom and Lydia Polgreen, "Darfur Advocacy Group Undergoes a Shake-Up," *New York Times*, June 2, 2007, <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/06/02/world/africa/02darfur.html> (accessed June 10, 2008).
- ⁴¹ Rob Crilly, "Paranoia in Darfur."
- ⁴² "Darfur Banditry 'May Cut Rations,'" *BBCNews.com*, January 23, 2008, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7204288.stm/> (accessed June 12, 2008).
- ⁴³ "Bandit Raids Cut Darfur Food Aid," *BBCNews.com*, March 10, 2008, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7287544.stm/> (accessed June 15, 2008).
- ⁴⁴ Prunier, *The Ambiguous Genocide*, 116.
- ⁴⁵ Prunier, *The Ambiguous Genocide*, 113.
- ⁴⁶ "Sudan Lets Expelled EU Envoy Stay," *BBCNews.com*, August 25, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6963861.stm/> (accessed November 15, 2007).
- ⁴⁷ "Sudan Defends Expulsion of UN Man," *BBCNews.com*, November 9, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7086247.stm/> (accessed June 10, 2008).
- ⁴⁸ Romesh Ratnesar, "The Don Quixote of Darfur," *Time*, November 2, 2007, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1680150,00.html> (accessed 10 June 2008).
- ⁴⁹ AFP, "Mussa in Sudan Talks over War Crimes Row," *MyWire.com*, July 20, 2008, <http://www.mywire.com/a/AFP/Mussa-Sudan-talks-over-war/7000177/> (accessed September 23, 2008).
- ⁵⁰ "Sudan 'Will Defy Darfur Warrants.'"
- ⁵¹ Eric Steidle, *The Devil Came on Horseback* (Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books Group, 2007) 91-97, 115, 118, 130.
- ⁵² "Khartoum 'Defying Arms Embargo,'" *BBCNews.com*, August 24, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6961066.stm/> (accessed November 21, 2007).
- ⁵³ "Sudan Planes 'Bomb Darfur Town,'" *BBCNews.com*, September 11, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6988031.stm/> (accessed December 3, 2007).
- ⁵⁴ Nima el Bagir, "We Were Armed by Sudan, Say Darfur Killers," *Telegraph.co.uk*, March 16, 2008, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/1581529/We-were-armed-by-Sudan-say-Darfur-killers.html> (accessed June 15, 2008).
- ⁵⁵ "Sudan Accused over Darfur Strikes," *BBCNews.com*, March 20, 2008, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6988031.stm> (accessed June 22, 2008).
- ⁵⁶ Rob Crilly, "Shades of Grey," *South of West*, September 9, 2007, <http://robcilly.wordpress.com/2007/09/30/shades-of-grey/> (accessed June 22, 2008).
- ⁵⁷ "Rebel Groups Invited to Darfur Peace Talks in August," *Reuters*, July 16, 2007, <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSL1665123> (accessed July 24, 2007).
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 93.
- ⁵⁹ "Militias Raid Refugee Camps in Darfur," *New York Times*, November 3, 2006, A12.
- ⁶⁰ "Darfur Attacks Risk Aid Pullout," *BBCNews.com*, September 24, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7009932.stm> (accessed December 3, 2007).
- ⁶¹ "U.S. Plans Tougher Sudan Sanctions over Darfur Violence," *New York Times*, May 29, 2007, <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/05/29/world/americas/29iht-sudan.1.5910462.html> (accessed May 29, 2007).
- ⁶² Robert F. Worth, "Sudan Says It Will Accept U.N.-African Peace Force in Darfur," *New York Times*, November 17, 2006, A3.
- ⁶³ "Sudan Rebels 'Attack Oil Field,'" *BBCNews.com*, December 12, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7138226.stm/> (accessed June 11, 2008).
- ⁶⁴ Alex Spillius, "US State Department says China's Human Rights Abuses are Worsening," *Telegraph.co.uk*, February 25, 2009, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/4808063/US-State-Department-says-Chinas-human-rights-abuses-are-worsening.html> (accessed February 28, 2009).
- ⁶⁵ Chantal Mouffe, *The Democratic Paradox* (London: Verso, 2000): 60.
- ⁶⁶ Nicholas Kristof, "As Humans are Hunted," *New York Times*, October 13, 2006, <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/13/opinion/13kris.html> (accessed June 15, 2008).
- ⁶⁷ Linda Alcoff, "The Problems of Speaking for Others," *Cultural Critique* 20 (Winter 1991-92): 24.
- ⁶⁸ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, 284-285 (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1988).

- ⁶⁹ *All About Darfur*, DVD, directed by Taghreed Elsanhoury (2005; Taghreed Elsanhoury Productions, 2005).
- ⁷⁰ *Darfur Diaries*, DVD, directed by Aisha Bain, Jen Marlowe, and Adam Shapiro (2004; Canoga Park, CA: Cinema Libre, 2006).
- ⁷¹ "ICC Struggles to Reach Out to Darfuris," *Darfur Daily News*, 21 October 2007, <http://darfurdaily.blogspot.com/2007/10/icc-struggles-to-reach-out-to-darfuris.html> (accessed June 28, 2008).
- ⁷² Mouffe, *The Democratic Paradox*, 41-42.
- ⁷³ Stephanie McCrummen, "In Darfur, A Journalist Branches Out," *The Washington Post*, March 4, 2007, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/03/03/AR2007030301415.html> (accessed June 28, 2008).
- ⁷⁴ Eric Reeves, "Is Khartoum Interested in Darfur Peace Talks? The Case of Suleiman Jamous," *Sudan Reeves.org*, February 15, 2007, www.sudanreeves.org (June 29, 2008).
- ⁷⁵ Cheryl Glenn, *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004) 86.
- ⁷⁶ Jacqueline Bacon, *The Humblest May Stand Forth: Rhetoric, Empowerment, and Abolition* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2002) 60.
- ⁷⁷ Charles Braithwaite, "Communicative Silence: A Cross-Cultural Study of Basso's Hypothesis," in *Cultural Communication and Intercultural Contact*, ed. Donal Carbaugh, 323 (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1990).
- ⁷⁸ Braithwaite, "Communicative Silence," 324.
- ⁷⁹ Glenn, *Unspoken*, 52, 121.
- ⁸⁰ "Sudan: Too Scared to Tell – Sexual Violence in Darfur," *ReliefWeb* February 12, 2008, <http://www.reliefweb.int/> (accessed September 26, 2008).
- ⁸¹ Peter Moszynski, "Rape Victims in Sudan Face Life of Stigma, Says Report," *BMJ*, July 31, 2004, <http://www.bmj.com/cgi/content/extract/329/7460/251-b> (accessed June 29, 2008).
- ⁸² Glenn, *Unspoken*, 55.
- ⁸³ Alcott, "The Problems of Speaking," 7.
- ⁸⁴ Eisenberg, "Building a Mystery," 543.
- ⁸⁵ Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" 295.
- ⁸⁶ Alcott, "The Problems of Speaking," 82.
- ⁸⁷ Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" 279-280.
- ⁸⁸ Danna Harman, "Star Power Brings Attention to Africa," *Christian Science Monitor*, August 22, 2007, <http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0822/p01s01-waof.html> (accessed November 24, 2007).
- ⁸⁹ Danna Harman, "Can Celebrities Really Get Results," *Christian Science Monitor*, August 23, 2007, <http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0823/p01s02-waof.html/> (accessed November 21, 2007).
- ⁹⁰ Harman, "Star Power."
- ⁹¹ Ibid.
- ⁹² Ibid.
- ⁹³ Nick Couldry, "Speaking About Others and Speaking Personally: Reflections after Elspeth Probyn's *Sexing the Self*," *Cultural Studies* 10 (1996): 318.
- ⁹⁴ Raka Shome, "A Response to William Starosta's 'On the Intersection of Rhetoric and Intercultural Communication,'" in *Rhetoric in Intercultural Contexts*, ed. Alberto González and Dolores V. Tanno, 172 (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2000).
- ⁹⁵ Robert Shuter, "The Cultures of Rhetoric," in *Rhetoric in Intercultural Contexts*, ed. Alberto González and Dolores V. Tanno, 16 (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2000).
- ⁹⁶ "The Shocking Story George Clooney has to Tell," *The Oprah Winfrey Show*. Television program. Chicago: Harpo Productions, April 26, 2006.
- ⁹⁷ Ibid.
- ⁹⁸ "Clooney Becomes UN Peace Activist," January 19, 2008, *BBCNews.com*, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/7197674.stm> (accessed June 12, 2008).
- ⁹⁹ John Horn, "The Restless One," *Los Angeles Times*, September 30, 2007, E1.
- ¹⁰⁰ Carolyn Sayre, "10 Questions," *Time*, October 4, 2007, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1668446,00.html> (accessed September 9, 2009).
- ¹⁰¹ Henry Tajfel, "Social Categorization," in *Introduction a la Psychologies Sociale*, ed. S. Moscovici, 292 (Paris: Larousse, 1972).

- ¹⁰² bell hooks, "Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination," in *Displacing Whiteness: Essays on Social and Cultural Criticism*, ed. Ruth Frankenberg, 176-177 (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997).
- ¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 177.
- ¹⁰⁴ Randall A. Lake, "Argumentation and Self: The Enactment of Identity in Dances with Wolves," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 34 (Fall 1997): 87.
- ¹⁰⁵ "Oprah Winfrey's Biography," *Oprah.com*, January 2007, <http://www2.oprah.com/> (accessed June 11, 2007).
- ¹⁰⁶ Janet Lowe, *Oprah Winfrey Speaks: Insight from the World's Most Influential Voice* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 1998) 136.
- ¹⁰⁷ "The Most Influential US Liberals: 1-20," *Telegraph.co.uk*, April 24, 2008, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/1435442/The-most-influential-US-liberals-1-20.html> (accessed September 8, 2008).
- ¹⁰⁸ Alexandra Marks, "Obama and the 'Oprah Effect:' Can She Sway Voters?" *Christian Science Monitor*, December 10, 2007, [http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/1210/p01s03-uspo.html/\(page\)/2](http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/1210/p01s03-uspo.html/(page)/2) (accessed June 11, 2008).
- ¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹¹ Oprah Winfrey, "Oprah Talks to Barack Obama," interview with Barack Obama, *O Magazine*, November 2004, <http://proquest.umi.com.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/pqdweb?index=79&did=766548391&SrchMode=1&sid=1&Fmt=3&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1186848140&clientId=9874> (accessed August 11, 2007).
- ¹¹² Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969) 21.
- ¹¹³ Peggy McIntosh, "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies," in *Critical White Studies: Looking behind the Mirror*, ed. Richard Delgado, 291-292 (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1997); Cheryl L. Harris, "Whiteness as Property," in *Black on White: Black Writers on What It Means to be White*, ed. David R. Roediger, 104 (NY: Schocken Books, 1998).
- ¹¹⁴ Lynn Elber, "'ER' Puts Spotlight on Darfur Tragedy," *Associated Press*, May 3, 2006, http://libproxy.calbaptist.edu:2071/us/lnacademic/results/docview/docview.do?docLinkInd=true&risb=21_T7304405430&format=GNBFI&sort=BOOLEAN&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T7304405433&cisb=22_T7304405432&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=147876&docNo=5 (accessed September 9, 2009).
- ¹¹⁵ Bill Keveney, "Thursday's 'ER' Turns its Lens on Darfur," *USA Today*, May 3, 2006, www.usatoday.com/life/television/news/2006-05-03-er_x.htm (accessed September 9, 2009).
- ¹¹⁶ Amy Amatangelo, "The Insider: Noah Wyle," *Boston Herald*, December 3, 2006, <http://libproxy.calbaptist.edu:2071/us/lnacademic/search/newssubmitForm.do> (accessed September 9, 2009).
- ¹¹⁷ "ER Writers Earn Humanitas Prize," *Buddy TV*, June 30, 2007, <http://www.buddytv.com/articles/er/er-writers-earn-humanitas-priz-7806.aspx> (accessed June 29, 2008).
- ¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁹ Shuter, "The Cultures of Rhetoric," 15.
- ¹²⁰ Eisenberg, "Building a Mystery," 543.
- ¹²¹ Rachel Lynette, *Angelina Jolie* (Detroit, MI: Lucent Books, 2007) 69.
- ¹²² "Jolie-Pitt Foundation Donates \$1 Mio. to Three Groups Working in Darfur Region," *SOS Children's Villages - USA*, 4 October 5 2007, <http://www.sos-usa.org/> (accessed May 13, 2007).
- ¹²³ Matthew Miller, Dorothy Pomerants and Lacy Rose, "The World's Most Powerful Celebrities," *Forbes.com*, June 3, 2009, http://www.forbes.com/2009/06/03/forbes-100-celebrity-09-jolie-oprah-madonna_land.html (accessed September 9, 2009).
- ¹²⁴ "Africa on the Stage," *Austin American-Statesman*, July 14, 2006, http://libproxy.calbaptist.edu:2071/us/lnacademic/results/docview/docview.do?docLinkInd=true&risb=21_T7304495613&format=GNBFI&sort=BOOLEAN&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T7304495616&cisb=22_T7304495615&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=147871&docNo=2 (accessed September 9, 2009).
- ¹²⁵ "A Message For Peace: Making Hotel Rwanda," *Hotel Rwanda* DVD directed by Greg Carson (2004; Santa Monica, CA: MGM Home Entertainment, 2005).

- ¹²⁶ Aldore Collier, "The Inside Story On the 'Always Oscar Worthy' Don Cheadle," *Ebony* 60 (June 2005): 178.
- ¹²⁷ Steve Pratt, "Bearing Witness to Genocide," *Northern Echo*, March 7, 2005
<http://archive.thisisthenortheast.co.uk/2005/3/7/20644.html> (accessed January 8, 2010).
- ¹²⁸ Tina Daunt, "Cause Celebre: After 'Rwanda,' Drawn to Darfur," *Los Angeles Times* (December 22, 2006) E1.
- ¹²⁹ Marissa Charles, "Don Cheadle," *metro.co.uk*, <http://www.metro.co.uk>, February 23, 2005 (accessed July 28, 2009).
- ¹³⁰ Ibid.
- ¹³¹ "About Amnesty International," *Amnesty International*, <http://www.amnesty.org/en/who-we-are/about-amnesty-international> (accessed March 8, 2009).
- ¹³² "Crisis in Darfur," *Amnesty International USA*, 2008,
<http://www.amnestyusa.org/darfur/page.do?id=1351050> (accessed March 8, 2009).
- ¹³³ James Jasinski, *Sourcebook on Rhetoric* (Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage, 2001) 39.
- ¹³⁴ hooks, "Representing Whiteness," 165-179.
- ¹³⁵ "Unity Statement," *Save Darfur*, 2007, www.savedarfur.org (accessed July 4, 2008).
- ¹³⁶ "ADC Convention: Election Year Brings Activists Together," *Arab American News*, June 20, 2008,
<http://www.arabamericannews.com/news/index.php?mod=article&cat=Community&article=1177>
(accessed July 3, 2008).
- ¹³⁷ Jay Fitzgerald, "Save Darfur Rapped; Natsios: Hold Fire on Fidelity, Let Sudan Work," *Boston Herald*, September 10, 2007, 22.
- ¹³⁸ Ibid.
- ¹³⁹ Strom and Polgreen, "Darfur Advocacy Group."
- ¹⁴⁰ "About the Genocide Intervention Network," *Genocide Intervention Network*, www.genocideintervention.net (accessed July 4, 2008).
- ¹⁴¹ Simon Parkin, "Darfur is Dying," *Eurogamer*, September 4, 2006,
http://www.eurogamer.net/articles/i_darfurisdying_pc (accessed July 3, 2008).
- ¹⁴² "About Game," *Darfur is Dying*, 2008, <http://www.darfurisdying.com/> (accessed June 29, 2008).
- ¹⁴³ Robert Shuter, "The Cultures of Rhetoric," in *Rhetoric in Intercultural Contexts*, ed. Alberto González and Dolores V. Tanno, 16 (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2000).
- ¹⁴⁴ Parkin, "Darfur is Dying."
- ¹⁴⁵ "About Crisis Group," *International Crisis Group*, February 2009,
<http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=208&l=1> (accessed February 28, 2009).
- ¹⁴⁶ Geesey, "Who Speaks."
- ¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 197.
- ¹⁴⁸ Kenneth T. Carano and Michael J. Berson, "Breaking Stereotypes: Constructing Geographic Literacy and Cultural Awareness through Technology," *The Social Studies* 98 (March 2007): 65-69.
- ¹⁴⁹ Roger Cohen, "Globalist: Signs that the Worst May Be Over in Africa," *New York Times*, December 4, 2004, http://www.nytimes.com/2004/12/04/news/04iht-globalist_ed3__0.html (accessed July 2, 2008).
- ¹⁵⁰ "US Charity Donations Hit 2007 Record Despite Soft Economy," *AFP*, June 23, 2008,
http://afp.google.com/article/ALeqM5jxccpBITwO2_Cc8vwcI8Q0ONjr2A (July 3, 2008).
- ¹⁵¹ Alan Cooperman and Jacqueline Salmon, "Charities Report Record Donations," *The Washington Post*, January 8, 2005, A01.
- ¹⁵² Tanya Schevitz, "FBI Sees Leap in Anti-Muslim Hate Crimes," *San Francisco Chronicle*, November 26, 2002, <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2002/11/26/MN224441.DTL> (accessed July 2, 2008).
- ¹⁵³ Associated Press, "Report: Anti-Muslim Hate Crimes Up Sharply," *MSNBC*, May 10, 2005,
www.msnbc.msn.com/id/7809537/ (accessed July 2, 2008).
- ¹⁵⁴ Robert Ivie, "Evil Enemy Versus Agonistic Other: Rhetorical Constructions of Terrorism," *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 25 (2003): 184.
- ¹⁵⁵ Victoria Horsford, "Michelle Obama – the Natural," *Black Star News*, June 19, 2008,
<http://www.blackstarnews.com/news/135/ARTICLE/4631/2008-06-19.html> (accessed July 3, 2008).
- ¹⁵⁶ Rebecca Hamilton and Chad Hazlett, "It's the Genocide, Stupid," *The Baltimore Sun*, June 18, 2007,
http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2007-06-18/news/0706180033_1_young-adults-genocide-young-voters
(accessed September 9, 2009).
- ¹⁵⁷ Susana Ruiz, "Darfur is Dying on Capitol Hill" (speech, Congress, Washington DC, 24 May 2006).

Chapter 4

¹ *Hotel Rwanda*, "Hutu Power/Main Title," DVD, directed by Terry George (2004; Santa Monica, CA: MGM Home Entertainment, 2005).

² Raymie E. McKerrow, "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis," *Communication Monographs* 56 (June 1989): 91.

³ "The Future of the *New York Times*," *Business Week*, January 17, 2005, http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/05_03/b3916001_mz001.htm (accessed November 2, 2008).

⁴ "The Shocking Story George Clooney has to Tell," *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, 26 April 2006.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Nicholas Kristof, "Will We Say 'Never Again' Yet Again?" *New York Times*, March 27, 2004, <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/03/27/opinion/27KRIS.html?pagewanted=1> (accessed May 15, 2008).

⁹ Nicholas Kristof, "Dithering as Others Die," *New York Times*, June 26, 2004,

<http://www.nytimes.com/2004/06/26/opinion/26KRIS.html?pagewanted=1> (accessed June 15, 2008).

¹⁰ Norville, "Crisis in Sudan," *Deborah Norville Tonight*. MSNBC, November 29, 2004.

¹¹ "Darfur," *ER*. Television program. New York: NBC Universal, March 2, 2006.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ "No Place to Hide," *ER*. Television program. New York: NBC Universal, April 27, 2006.

¹⁵ "There Are No Angels Here," *ER*. Television program. New York: NBC Universal, May 4, 2006.

¹⁶ *Hotel Rwanda*, "Hutu Power/Main Title,"

¹⁷ *Hotel Rwanda*, "What Makes a Tutsi?"

¹⁸ Christopher Dickey, "Star Power," *Newsweek*, March 19, 2007, <http://www.newsweek.com/id/34021> (accessed September 14, 2009).

¹⁹ Daoud Hari, *The Translator: A Tribesman's Memoir of Darfur* (New York: Random House, 2008) 40-41, 55-56.

²⁰ Save Darfur, "Voices from Darfur," 2007, http://www.savedarfur.org/pages/voices_from_darfur_ad/ (accessed July 4, 2007).

²¹ "Darfur is Dying."

²² Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969) 21.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Charles Stewart, "Championing the Rights of Others and Challenging Evil: The Ego Function in the Rhetoric of Other-directed Social Movements," *Southern Communication Journal* 64 (1991): 92.

²⁵ McKerrow, "Critical Rhetoric," 72.

²⁶ "Shocking Story."

²⁷ "Darfur is Dying."

²⁸ "Shocking Story."

²⁹ hooks, "Representing Whiteness," 168.

³⁰ Nicholas Kristof, "As Humans are Hunted," *New York Times*, October 13, 2006, <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/13/opinion/13kris.html> (accessed June 15, 2008).

³¹ Ibid.

³² McKerrow, "Critical Rhetoric," 92.

³³ Ibid., 199.

³⁴ Angelina Jolie, "Crisis in Sudan," interview by Deborah Norville, *Deborah Norville Tonight*, MSNBC, November 29, 2004.

³⁵ Stewart, "Championing the Rights of Others," 101-103.

³⁶ "Shocking Story."

³⁷ McKerrow, "Critical Rhetoric," 99.

³⁸ *Hotel Rwanda*, "'A Massacre' on TV,"

³⁹ *Hotel Rwanda*, "We Think You're Dirt"

⁴⁰ *Hotel Rwanda*, "Buying Time, Nothing Else,"

⁴¹ *Hotel Rwanda*, "Soldiers in the Street,"

- ⁴² *Hotel Rwanda*, “Forever Four Stars,”
- ⁴³ Robert Ivie, “Evil Enemy Versus Agonistic Other: Rhetorical Constructions of Terrorism,” *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 25 (2003): 184.
- ⁴⁴ Linda Alcoff, “The Problems of Speaking for Others,” *Cultural Critique* 20 (Winter 1991-92): 24.
- ⁴⁵ “Shocking Story.”
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁹ Jolie, “Crisis in Sudan.”
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁵² *Ibid.*
- ⁵³ Kristof, “Never Again.”
- ⁵⁴ Nicholas Kristof, “Magboula’s Brush with Genocide,” *New York Times*, June 23, 2004, <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/06/23/opinion/23KRIS.html?pagewanted=1> (accessed June 15, 2008).
- ⁵⁵ Kenneth Burke, “The Rhetoric of Hitler’s Battle,” in *Landmark Essays on Rhetorical Criticism*, ed. Thomas W. Benson, 48-49 (Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1993).
- ⁵⁶ “Shocking Story.”
- ⁵⁷ Kristof, “Never Again.”
- ⁵⁸ Nicholas Kristof, “Facing Down the Killers,” *New York Times*, December 18, 2004, <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9B0CE0D81530F93BA25751C1A9629C8B63> (accessed June 15, 2008).
- ⁵⁹ Nicholas Kristof, “Cruel Choices,” *New York Times*, April 14, 2004, <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/04/14/opinion/cruel-choices.html?pagewanted=1> (accessed June 15, 2008).
- ⁶⁰ Kristof, “As Humans.”
- ⁶¹ Nicholas Kristof, “Bush Points the Way,” *New York Times*, May 29, 2004, www.nytimes.com/2004/05/29/opinion/29KRIS.html?pagewanted=1 (accessed June 15, 2008).
- ⁶² Nicholas Kristof, “Cruel Choices.”
- ⁶³ Jolie, “Crisis in Sudan.”
- ⁶⁴ Nicholas Kristof, “Dithering.”
- ⁶⁵ Nicholas Kristof, “He Ain’t Heavy,” *New York Times*, October 20, 2004, www.nytimes.com/2004/10/20/opinion/20kris.html (accessed June 15, 2008).
- ⁶⁶ Tom Curry, “Exit Iraq, Enter Darfur?” *MSNBC*, February 8, 2007, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/17034034> (accessed June 8, 2009); Daniel Van Oudenaren, “US-Led No-Fly Zone Would ‘Impede’ Aid to Darfur – Sudan,” *Sudan Tribune*, October 6, 2008, www.sudantribune.com/spip.php?article28839 (accessed June 8, 2009).
- ⁶⁷ Alex Perry, “Will Sanctions End the Darfur Killing?” *Time*, May 29, 2007, <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1626020,00.html>, (accessed June 8, 2009).
- ⁶⁸ Nicholas Kristof, “Cruel Choices.”
- ⁶⁹ Nicholas Kristof, “Dithering.”
- ⁷⁰ Nicholas Kristof, “Facing Down.”
- ⁷¹ *Hotel Rwanda*, intro
- ⁷² Nicholas Kristof, “Facing Down.”
- ⁷³ Andrew Lakritz, “Identification and Difference: Structures of Privilege in Cultural Criticism,” in *Who Can Speak: Authority and Critical Identity*, ed. Judith Roof and Robyn Wiegman, 19 (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1995).
- ⁷⁴ “Darfur is Dying.”
- ⁷⁵ “Darfur is Dying.”
- ⁷⁶ “Shocking Story.”
- ⁷⁷ Burke, *Motives*, 27-28.
- ⁷⁸ “Shocking Story.”
- ⁷⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁰ “A Message For Peace: Making Hotel Rwanda,” *Hotel Rwanda* DVD directed by Greg Carson (2004; Santa Monica, CA: MGM Home Entertainment, 2005).
- ⁸¹ *Hotel Rwanda*, “Buying Time, Nothing Else,”

- ⁸² Kristof, "Starved for Safety," *New York Times*, March 31, 2004, www.nytimes.com/2004/03/31/opinion/31KRIS.html (accessed June 15, 2008).
- ⁸³ Ibid.
- ⁸⁴ Kristof, "Final Solution."
- ⁸⁵ "Shocking Story."
- ⁸⁶ Ivie, "Evil Enemy," 182.
- ⁸⁷ *ER*, "Darfur."
- ⁸⁸ Ibid.
- ⁸⁹ Ivie, "Evil Enemy," 192.
- ⁹⁰ Peggy McIntosh, "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies," in *Critical White Studies: Looking behind the Mirror*, ed. Richard Delgado, 293-294 (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1997).
- ⁹¹ *ER*, "There Are No Angels Here."
- ⁹² Ibid.
- ⁹³ *ER*, "Darfur"

Chapter 5

- ¹ Ken Dilanian, "Sudan to oust aid workers; Obama pressed on Darfur," *USA Today*, March 17, 2009, http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20090317/darfur17_st.art.htm (accessed September 15, 2009).
- ² Gerard Aziakou, "Situation in Darfur Stabilizing: Outgoing UN-AUForce Chief," *AFP*, August 6, 2009, http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5g510eB7KOz-5fhqo9uHh7F4wNA_Q (accessed September 12, 2009).
- ³ Tracy McVeigh, "Guns, Children and Cattle are the New Currency of War in Southern Sudan," *The Observer*, June 21, 2009, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/jun/21/sudan-humanitarian-disaster> (accessed September 12, 2009).
- ⁴ David Blair, "Lord's Resistance Army Targets Children of Sudan," *The Daily Telegraph*, August 10, 2009, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/sudan/5999097/Lords-Resistance-Army-targets-children-of-Sudan.html> (accessed September 12, 2009).
- ⁵ Scott Gration, "This I Believe," *US Department of State*, August 10, 2009, <http://www.state.gov/s/sudan/listserve/127089.htm> (accessed September 15, 2009).
- ⁶ Linda Alcoff, "The Problems of Speaking for Others," *Cultural Critique* 20 (Winter 1991-92): 5-32.
- ⁷ Carolyn Sayre, "10 Questions," *Time*, October 4, 2007, www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1668446,00.html (accessed September 9, 2009).
- ⁸ Peggy McIntosh, "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies," in *Critical White Studies: Looking behind the Mirror*, ed. Richard Delgado, 293-294 (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1997).
- ⁹ Andrew Lakritz, "Identification and Difference: Structures of Privilege in Cultural Criticism," in *Who Can Speak: Authority and Critical Identity*, ed. Judith Roof and Robyn Wiegman, 7 (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1995).
- ¹⁰ Randall A. Lake, "Argumentation and Self: The Enactment of Identity in Dances with Wolves," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 34 (Fall 1997): 87.

Bibliography

- “About Amnesty International.” *Amnesty International*. <http://www.amnesty.org/en/who-we-are/about-amnesty-international> (accessed March 8, 2009).
- “About Crisis Group.” *International Crisis Group*. February 2009. <http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=208&l=1> (accessed February 28, 2009).
- “About Game.” *Darfur is Dying*. 2008. <http://www.darfurisdying.com/> (accessed June 29, 2008).
- “About the Genocide Intervention Network.” *Genocide Intervention Network*. www.genocideintervention.net (accessed July 4, 2008).
- Abrams, Dominic and Michael A. Hogg. “Social Identification, Self-Categorization, and Social Influence.” *European Review of Social Psychology* 1 (1990): 195-228.
- “ADC Convention: Election Year Brings Activists Together.” *Arab American News*, June 20, 2008. <http://www.arabamericannews.com/news/index.php?mod=article&cat=Community&article=1177> (accessed July 3, 2008).
- “Africa on the Stage.” *American-Statesman*, July 14, 2006. http://libproxy.calbaptist.edu:2071/us/lnacademic/results/docview/docview.do?docLinkInd=true&risb=21_T7304495613&format=GNBFI&sort=BOOLEAN&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T7304495616&cisb=22_T7304495615&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=147871&docNo=2 (accessed September 9, 2009).
- The African Union. Press Statement. *African Union*. July 13, 2005. <http://www.african-union.org/DARFUR/Press%20release%20on%20Darfur%208-7-%202005.pdf> (accessed May 28, 2008).
- Alcoff, Linda. “The Problems of Speaking for Others.” *Cultural Critique* 20 (Winter 1991-92): 5-32.
- Amatangelo, Amy. “The Insider: Noah Wyle.” *Boston Herald*, December 3, 2006. <http://libproxy.calbaptist.edu:2071/us/lnacademic/search/newssubmitForm.do> (accessed September 9, 2009).
- “Annan Warns Sudan on Darfur Aid.” *BBCNews.com*, September 5, 2006. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/5317726.stm> (accessed November 15, 2007).
- Arendt, Hannah. “Reflections on Little Rock.” *Dissent* 6 (Winter 1959): 45-56.

- Associated Press. "Report: Anti-Muslim Hate Crimes Up Sharply." *MSNBC*, May 10, 2005. www.msnbc.msn.com/id/7809537/ (accessed July 2, 2008).
- Aziakou, Gerard. "Situation in Darfur Stabilizing: Outgoing UN-AU Force Chief." *AFP*. August 6, 2009. http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5g510eB7KOz-5fhqo9uHh7F4wNA_Q (accessed September 12, 2009).
- Bacon, Jacqueline. *The Humblest May Stand Forth: Rhetoric, Empowerment, and Abolition*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2002.
- "Bandit Raids Cut Darfur Food Aid." *BBCNews.com*, March 10, 2008. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7287544.stm/> (accessed June 15, 2008).
- Bell, Linda A. "Introduction." In *Overcoming Racism and Sexism*, edited by L. A. Bell and D. Blumenfeld, 5-32. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1995.
- Blair, David. "Lord's Resistance Army Targets Children of Sudan." *The Daily Telegraph*, August 10, 2009. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/sudan/5999097/Lords-Resistance-Army-targets-children-of-Sudan.html> (accessed September 12, 2009).
- Bow, Leslie. "'For Every Gesture of Loyalty, There Doesn't Have to Be a Betrayal!'" Asian American Criticism and the Politics of Locality." In *Who Can Speak: Authority and Critical Identity*, edited by Judith Roof and Robyn Wiegman, 30-55. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1995.
- Braithwaite, Charles. "Communicative Silence: A Cross-Cultural Study of Basso's Hypothesis." In *Cultural Communication and Intercultural Contact*, edited by Donal Carbaugh, 303-320. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1990.
- Kenneth Burke. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969.
- , "The Rhetoric of Hitler's Battle." In *Landmark Essays on Rhetorical Criticism*, edited by Thomas W. Benson, 33-50. Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, 1993.
- Carano, Kenneth T. and Michael J. Berson. "Breaking Stereotypes: Constructing Geographic Literacy and Cultural Awareness through Technology." *The Social Studies* 98 (March 2007): 65-69.
- Charles, Marissa. "Don Cheadle." *metro.co.uk*. <http://www.metro.co.uk>. February 23, 2005 (accessed July 28, 2009).

- “Clooney Becomes UN Peace Activist.” *BBCNews.com*, January 19 2008.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/7197674.stm> (accessed June 12, 2008).
- Cloud, Dana. “The Null Persona: Race and the Rhetoric of Silence in the Uprising of ’34.” *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 2 (1999): 177-209.
- Cohen, Roger. “Globalist: Signs that the Worst May Be Over in Africa.” *The New York Times*, December 4, 2004. http://www.nytimes.com/2004/12/04/news/04iht-globalist_ed3__0.html (accessed July 2, 2008).
- Collier, Aldore. “The Inside Story On the 'Always Oscar Worthy' Don Cheadle. *Ebony* 60 (June 2005), 178.
- Cooperman, Alan and Jacqueline Salmon. “Charities Report Record Donations.” *The Washington Post*, January 8, 2005, A01.
- Couldry, Nick. “Speaking About Others and Speaking Personally: Reflections after Elspeth Probyn’s *Sexing the Self*.” *Cultural Studies* 10 (1996): 315-333.
- Crilly, Rob. “In Darfur, Some Arabs Now Fight Alongside Rebels.” *The Christian Science Monitor*, May 22, 2007. <http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0522/p04s01-woaf.html> (accessed November 15, 2007).
- “Paranoia in Darfur.” *South of West*. September 28, 2007.
Robcrilly.wordpress.com/2007/09/28/paranoia-in-darfur, (accessed June 22, 2008).
- “Shades of Grey.” *South of West*. September 9, 2007.
<http://robcrilly.wordpress.com/2007/09/30/shades-of-grey/> (accessed June 22, 2008).
- “Crisis in Darfur.” *Amnesty International USA*. 2008.
<http://www.amnestyusa.org/darfur/page.do?id=1351050> (accessed March 3, 2009).
- Curry, Tom. “Exit Iraq, Enter Darfur?” *MSNBC*, February 8, 2007.
<http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/17034034> (accessed June 8, 2009).
- “Darfur Attacks Risk Aid Pullout.” *BBCNews.com*, September 24, 2007.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7009932.stm> (accessed December 3, 2007).
- “Darfur.” *ER*. Television program. New York: NBC Universal, March 2, 2006.
- “Darfur Banditry ‘May Cut Rations.’” *BBCNews.com*, January 23, 2008.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7204288.stm/> (accessed June 12, 2008).

- "Darfur Conference Aims for Unified Response in Paris / France Darfur Mobilisation Could Damage Efforts to End Conflict, Say Experts." *Sudan Tribune*, June 24, 2007. <http://platform.blogs.com/passionofthepresent/> (January 23, 2008).
- "Darfur Conflict 'Worsens.'" *Darfur Daily News*, November 26, 2007. darfurdaily.blogspot.com/2007/11/darfur-conflict-worsens.html (accessed June 11, 2008).
- "Darfur's Factions Sit Down to Talks," *Taipei Times*, August 5, 2007, <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/taiwan/archives/2007/08/05/2003372791> (accessed November 15, 2007).
- "Darfur Force to be 'All-African.'" *BBCNews.com*, August 13, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6943435.stm> (accessed November 15, 2007).
- "Darfur Mission 'Behind Schedule.'" *BBCNews.com*, December 2, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7123378.stm> (accessed June 11, 2008).
- "Darfur Rebels 'Outgun' AU Troops." *BBCNews.com*, October 2, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7025198.stm> (accessed June 22, 2008).
- "Darfur School 'Bombed From Air.'" *BBCNews.com*, May 5, 2008. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7384395.stm> (accessed June 17, 2008).
- Daunt, Tina. "Cause Celebre: After 'Rwanda,' Drawn to Darfur." *Los Angeles Times*, December 22, 2006, E1.
- Davis, Diane. "Identification: Burke and Freud on Who You Are." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 38 (Spring 2008): 123-147.
- "Debate over Darfur Death Toll Intensifies." *USA Today*, November 29, 2006. http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2006-11-29-darfur_x.htm (accessed May 12, 2007).
- Dickey, Christopher. "Star Power." *Newsweek*, March 19, 2007. <http://www.newsweek.com/id/34021> (accessed September 14, 2009).
- Dilanian, Ken. "Sudan to oust aid workers; Obama pressed on Darfur." *USA Today*, March 17, 2009, http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/news/20090317/darfur17_st.art.htm (accessed September 15, 2009).
- Drayson, Lord. "Trade With Sudan," 16 October 2007, <http://www.theyworkforyou.com/wrans/?id=2007-10-16a.49.0&s=sudan> (accessed 22 June 2008).

- Dyer, Richard. "White." In *The Matter of Images: Essays on Representation*, edited by Richard Dyer, 126-148. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Eberly, Rosa. *Citizen Critics*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2000.
- Eisenberg, Eric M. "Building a Mystery: Toward a New Theory of Communication and Identity." *Journal of Communication* 51 (September 1, 2001): 534-552.
- el Bagir, Nima. "We Were Armed by Sudan, Say Darfur Killers." *Telegraph*, March 16, 2008. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/1581529/We-were-armed-by-Sudan-say-Darfur-killers.html> (accessed June 15, 2008).
- Elber, Lynn. "'ER' Puts Spotlight on Darfur Tragedy." *Associated Press*, May 3, 2006. http://libproxy.calbaptist.edu:2071/us/lnacademic/results/docview/docview.do?docLinkInd=true&risb=21_T7304405430&format=GNBFI&sort=BOOLEAN&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T7304405433&cisb=22_T7304405432&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=147876&docNo=5 (accessed September 9, 2009).
- "'ER' Puts Spotlight on Darfur Tragedy." *The Belleville News-Democrat*, May 4, 2006. http://libproxy.calbaptist.edu:2071/us/lnacademic/results/docview/docview.do?docLinkInd=true&risb=21_T7304405430&format=GNBFI&sort=BOOLEAN&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T7304405433&cisb=22_T7304405432&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=147876&docNo=5 (accessed September 9, 2009).
- "ER Writers Earn Humanitas Prize." *Buddy TV*, June 30, 2007. <http://www.buddytv.com/articles/er/er-writers-earn-humanitas-priz-7806.aspx> (accessed June 29, 2008).
- Fitzgerald, Jay. "Save Darfur Rapped; Natsios: Hold Fire on Fidelity, Let Sudan Work." *Boston Herald*, September 10, 2007, 22.
- Flint, Julie. *Darfur: A Short History of a Long War*. London: Zed Books Ltd., 2008.
- Foucault, Michel. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- . *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings 1977-1984*. New York: Routledge, 1988.
- Garrett, Mary. "Some Elementary Methodological Reflections on the Study of the Chinese Rhetorical Tradition." In *Rhetoric in Intercultural Contexts*, edited by Alberto González and Dolores V. Tanno, 53-63. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2000.
- Geesey, Patricia. "Who Speaks for North African Women in France?" In *Hearing Many Voices*, edited by M. J. Hardman and Anita Taylor, 193-202. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc., 2000.

- Gergen, Kenneth. *The Saturated Self*. New York: Basic Books, 1991.
- Glenn, Cheryl. *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.
- Gorman, Anna, Marjorie Miller and Mitchell Landsberg. "Marchers Fill L.A.'s Streets: Immigrants Demonstrate Peaceful Power." *The Los Angeles Times*, May 2, 2006, A1.
- Gration, Scott. "This I Believe." *US Department of State*. August 10, 2009. <http://www.state.gov/s/sudan/listserve/127089.htm> (accessed September 15, 2009).
- Gregg, Richard. "The Ego Function of the Rhetoric of Protest." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 4 (1971): 71-91.
- Guha, Ranajit. ed. *Subaltern Studies I: Writings on South Asian History and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Hall, Stuart. "Introduction: Who Needs 'Identity'?" In *Questions of Cultural Identity*, edited by Stuart Hall and Paul DuGay, 1-17. London: Sage Publications, 1996.
- Hamilton, Rebecca and Chad Hazlett. "It's the Genocide, Stupid." *The Baltimore Sun*, June 18, 2007. http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2007-06-18/news/0706180033_1_young-adults-genocide-young-voters (accessed September 9, 2009).
- Harding, Sandra. "Subjectivity, Experience, and Knowledge: An Epistemology from/for Rainbow Coalition Politics." In *Who Can Speak: Authority and Critical Identity*, edited by Judith Roof and Robyn Wiegman, 120-136. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1995.
- Hari, Daoud. *The Translator: A Tribesman's Memoir of Darfur*. New York: Random House, 2008.
- Harman, Danna. "Can Celebrities Really Get Results." *Christian Science Monitor*, August 23, 2007. <http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0823/p01s02-woaf.html/> (accessed November 21, 2007).
- "Star Power Brings Attention to Africa." *Christian Science Monitor*, August 22, 2007. <http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0822/p01s01-woaf.html> (accessed November 24, 2007).
- Harris, Cheryl L. "Whiteness as Property." In *Black on White: Black Writers on What It Means to be White*, edited by David R. Roediger, 103-118. New York: Schocken Books, 1998.

- Hartigan, John. "Name Calling: Objectifying 'Poor Whites' and 'White Trash' in Detroit." In *White Trash: Race and Class in America*, edited by Matt Wray and Annalee Newitz, 41-56. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Henshaw, Amber. "Assault Heralds Change in Sudan." *BBCNews.com*, May 12, 2008. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7396404.stm> (accessed June 17, 2008).
- , "Sudan 'To Disarm Camp.'" *BBCNews.com*, November 22, 2007. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7106716.stm> (accessed June 11, 2008).
- Henwood, Doug. "Trash-O-Nomics." In *White Trash: Race and Class in America*, edited by Matt Wray and Annalee Newitz, 177-191. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Hogg, Michael A., Deborah J. Terry, and Katherine M. White. "A Tale of Two Theories: A Critical Comparison of Identity Theory with Social Identity Theory." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 58 (Dec 1995): 255-269.
- hooks, bell. "Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination." In *Displacing Whiteness: Essays on Social and Cultural Criticism*, edited by Ruth Frankenberg, 165-179. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997.
- Horn, John. "The Restless One." *Los Angeles Times*, September 30, 2007, E1.
- Horsford, Victoria. "Michelle Obama – the Natural." *Black Star News*, June 19, 2008. <http://www.blackstarnews.com/news/135/ARTICLE/4631/2008-06-19.html> (accessed July 3, 2008).
- Hotel Rwanda* DVD, directed by Terry George (2004; Santa Monica, CA: MGM Home Entertainment, 2005).
- Hughes, Lisa. "Can International Law Protect Child Soldiers." *Peace Review* 12 (September 2000): 399-405.
- "ICC Struggles to Reach Out to Darfuris." *Darfur Daily News*, October 21, 2007. <http://darfurdaily.blogspot.com/2007/10/icc-struggles-to-reach-out-to-darfuris.html> (accessed June 28, 2008).
- Ivie, Robert. "Evil Enemy Versus Agonistic Other: Rhetorical Constructions of Terrorism." *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 25 (2003): 181-200.
- Jasinski, James. *Sourcebook on Rhetoric*. Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage, 2001.
- Jensen, Klaus Bruhn. "The Politics of Polysemy: Television News, Everyday Consciousness and Political Action." *Media, Culture, and Society* 12 (1990): 57-77.

- Jolie, Angelina. "Crisis in Sudan." By Deborah Norville. *Deborah Norville Tonight*. MSNBC, 29 November 2004.
- "Jolie-Pitt Foundation Donates \$1 Mio. to Three Groups Working in Darfur Region." *SOS Children's Villages – USA*, October 5, 2007, <http://www.sos-usa.org/> (accessed May 13, 2007).
- Kepplinger, Hans Mathias. "Reciprocal Effects: Toward a Theory of Mass Media Effects on Decision Makers." *Press/Politics* 12 (Spring, 2007): 3-23.
- Keveney, Bill. "Thursday's 'ER' Turns its Lens on Darfur." *USA Today*, May 3, 2006 www.usatoday.com/life/television/news/2006-05-03-er_x.htm (accessed September 9, 2009).
- "Khartoum 'Defying Arms Embargo.'" *BBCNews.com*, August 24, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6961066.stm/> (accessed November 21, 2007).
- "Khartoum is Fooling the World Again." *Justice Africa*. June 14, 2007. <http://www.justiceafrica.org/blog/2007/06/14/khartoum-is-fooling-the-world-again> (accessed July 31, 2007).
- Kristof, Nicholas. "As Humans are Hunted." *New York Times*, October 13, 2004, <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/10/13/opinion/13kris.html> (accessed June 15, 2008).
- "Bush Points the Way." *New York Times*, May 29, 2004, www.nytimes.com/2004/05/29/opinion/29KRIS.html?pagewanted=1 (accessed June 15, 2008).
- "Cruel Choices." *New York Times*, April 14, 2004, <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/04/14/opinion/cruel-choices.html?pagewanted=1> (accessed June 15, 2008).
- "Dithering as Others Die." *New York Times*, June 26, 2004. <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/06/26/opinion/26KRIS.html?pagewanted=1> (accessed June 15, 2008).
- "Facing Down the Killers." *New York Times*, December 18, 2004. <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9B0CE0D81530F93BA25751C1A9629C8B63> (accessed June 15, 2008).
- "He Ain't Heavy." *New York Times*, 20 October 2004. www.nytimes.com/2004/10/20/opinion/20kris.html (accessed June 15, 2008).
- "Magboula's Brush with Genocide." *New York Times*, 23 June 2004. <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/06/23/opinion/23KRIS.html?pagewanted=1> (accessed June 15, 2008).

- "Starved for Safety." *New York Times*, March 31, 2004. www.nytimes.com/2004/03/31/opinion/31KRIS.html (accessed June 15, 2008).
- "Will We Say 'Never Again' Yet Again?" *New York Times*, March 27, 2004. <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/03/27/opinion/27KRIS.html?pagewanted=1> (accessed May 15, 2008).
- Lake, Randall A. "Argumentation and Self: The Enactment of Identity in Dances with Wolves." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 34 (Fall 1997): 66-89.
- Lakritz, Andrew. "Identification and Difference: Structures of Privilege in Cultural Criticism." In *Who Can Speak: Authority and Critical Identity*, edited by Judith Roof and Robyn Wiegman, 3-29. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1995.
- Lipsitz, George. "The Possessive Investment in Whiteness." In *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics*, edited by George Lipsitz, 1-23. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998.
- Lorde, Audre. *Sister Outsider*. Berkeley, CA: The Crossing Press, 1984.
- Lowe, Janet. *Oprah Winfrey Speaks: Insight from the World's Most Influential Voice*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 1998.
- Lynette, Rachel. *Angelina Jolie*. Detroit, MI: Lucent Books, 2007.
- Marks, Alexandra. "Obama and the 'Oprah Effect' Can She Sway Voters?" *Christian Science Monitor*, 10 December 2007. [http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/1210/p01s03-uspo.html/\(page\)/2](http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/1210/p01s03-uspo.html/(page)/2) (accessed June 11, 2008).
- McCrummen, Stephanie. "In Darfur, A Journalist Branches Out." *The Washington Post*, 4 March 2007. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/03/03/AR2007030301415.html> (accessed June 28, 2008).
- McGee, Brian. "Speaking about the Other: W. E. B. DuBois Responds to the Klan." *The Southern Communication Journal* 63 (Spring 1998): 208-219.
- McIntosh, Peggy. "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies." In *Critical White Studies: Looking behind the Mirror*, edited by Richard Delgado, 291-299. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1997.
- McKerrow, Raymie E. "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis." *Communication Monographs* 56 (June 1989): 91-111.

- McVeigh, Tracy. "Guns, Children and Cattle are the New Currency of War in Southern Sudan." *The Observer*, June 21, 2009. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/jun/21/sudan-humanitarian-disaster> (accessed September 12, 2009).
- "Militias Raid Refugee Camps in Darfur." *New York Times*, November 3, 2006, A12.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpede. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, edited by Chandra Talpede Mohanty, Ann Russo, & Lourdes Torres, 51-80. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 1991.
- Moszynski, Peter. "Rape Victims in Sudan Face Life of Stigma, Says Report." *BMJ*, July 31, 2004. <http://www.bmj.com/cgi/content/extract/329/7460/251-b> (accessed June 29, 2008).
- Mouffe, Chantal. *The Democratic Paradox*. London: Verso, 2000.
- "Mussa in Sudan Talks over War Crimes Row," *AFP*, July 20, 2008. <http://www.mywire.com/a/AFP/Mussa-Sudan-talks-over-war/7000177/> (accessed September 23, 2008).
- Nakayama, Thomas K. and Robert L. Krizek. "Whiteness as a Strategic Rhetoric." In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity*, edited by Thomas K. Nakayama and Judith N. Martin, 87-106. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1998.
- Newitz, Annalee and Matthew Wray. "What is White Trash?" In *Whiteness: A Critical Reader*, edited by Mike Hill, 168-185. Boulder: Westview Press, 1997.
- "No Place to Hide." *ER*. Television program. New York: NBC Universal, April 27, 2006.
- Olson, Lester C. "On the Margins of Rhetoric: Audre Lorde Transforming Silence into Language and Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997): 49-70.
- "Oprah Winfrey's Biography." *Oprah.com*. January 2007. <http://www2.oprah.com/> (accessed June 11, 2007).
- Parkin, Simon. "Darfur is Dying." *Eurogamer*, September 4, 2006. http://www.eurogamer.net/articles/i_darfurisdying_pc (accessed July 3, 2008).
- Perreault, Jeanne. "Chain Gang Narratives and the Politics of 'Speaking For.'" *Biography* 24 (Winter 2001): 152-171.
- Perry, Alex. "Will Sanctions End the Darfur Killing?" *Time*, 29 May 2007. <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1626020,00.html>, (accessed June 8, 2009).

- Plaut, Martin. "Darfur - On the Brink of New Conflict." *BBCNews.com*, September 4, 2006. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/5311998.stm> (accessed November 15, 2007).
- Power, Samantha. *The Problem from Hell*. New York: Basic Books, 2002.
- Pratt, Steve. "Bearing Witness to Genocide." *Northern Echo*, March 7, 2005. <http://archive.thisisthenortheast.co.uk/2005/3/7/20644.html> (accessed January 8, 2010).
- Prunier, Gerard. *The Ambiguous Genocide*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005.
- Ratnesar, Romesh. "The Don Quixote of Darfur." *Time*, 2 November 2007. <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1680150,00.html> (accessed 10 June 2008).
- "Rebel Groups Invited to Darfur Peace Talks in August." *Reuters*, July 16, 2007. <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSL1665123> (accessed July 24, 2007).
- Reeves, Eric. "Is Khartoum Interested in Darfur Peace Talks? The Case of Suleiman Jamous." *Sudan Reeves.org*, February 15, 2007, www.sudanreeves.org (June 29, 2008).
- Reilly, William M. "U.N., Darfur Command and Control." *Monsters and Critics*, June 8, 2007, <http://news.monstersandcritics.com/> (accessed June 12, 2007).
- Ritchie, Susan. "Ventriloquist Folklore: Who Speaks for Representation?" *Western Folklore* 52 (1993): 365-378.
- Roberts, Kathleen Glenister. "Emotivism and Pseudocultural Identities." *The Howard Journal of Communications* 14 (2003): 195-208.
- Ruiz, Susana. "Darfur is Dying on Capitol Hill." (speech, Congress, Washington DC, May 24, 2006).
- Sacks, Karen Brodtkin. "How the Jews became White." In Steven Gregory and Roger Sanjek, 78-102. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994.
- Save Darfur. "Voices from Darfur." 2007. http://www.savedarfur.org/pages/voices_from_darfur_ad/ (accessed July 4, 2007).
- Sayre, Carolyn. "10 Questions." *Time Magazine*, October 4, 2007. <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1668446,00.html> (accessed September 9, 2009).

- Schevitz, Tanya. "FBI Sees Leap in Anti-Muslim Hate Crimes." *San Francisco Chronicle*, 26 November 2002. <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2002/11/26/MN224441.DTL> (accessed July 2, 2008).
- Schmertz, Johanna. "Constructing Essences: Ethos and the Postmodern Spirit of Feminism." *Rhetoric Review* 1 (Autumn 1999): 82-91.
- Shome, Raka. "A Response to William Starosta's 'On the Intersection of Rhetoric and Intercultural Communication.'" In *Rhetoric in Intercultural Contexts*, edited by Alberto González and Dolores V. Tanno, 169-173. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2000.
- Shuter, Robert. "The Cultures of Rhetoric." In *Rhetoric in Intercultural Contexts*, edited by Alberto González and Dolores V. Tanno, 11-17. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 2000.
- Sleepless in Sudan. "Uncensored, Direct from a Daze & Confused Aid Worker in Darfur, Sudan," February 1, 2006. <http://sleeplessinsudan.blogspot.com/> (accessed October 8, 2007).
- Spillius, Alex. "US State Department says China's Human Rights Abuses are Worsening." *Telegraph.co.uk*, February 25, 2009. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/4808063/US-State-Department-says-Chinas-human-rights-abuses-are-worsening.html> (accessed February 28, 2009).
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, 271-313. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1988.
- Starosta, William and C. Coleman. "Jesse Jackson's 'Hymietown' Apology: A Case Study of Interethnic Rhetorical Analysis." In *Interethnic Communication: Current Research*, edited by Y. Y. Kim, 117-135. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1986.
- Steidle, Eric. *The Devil Came on Horseback*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books Group, 2007.
- Stewart, Charles. "Championing the Rights of Others and Challenging Evil: The Ego Function in the Rhetoric of Other-directed Social Movements." *Southern Communication Journal* 64 (1991): 91-103.
- Strom, Stephanie and Lydia Polgreen. "Darfur Advocacy Group Undergoes a Shake-Up." *New York Times*, June 2, 2007. <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/06/02/world/africa/02darfur.html> (accessed June 10, 2008).
- "Sudan Accused over Darfur Strikes." *BBCNews.com*, March 20, 2008. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6988031.stm> (accessed June 22, 2008).

- “Sudan Defends Expulsion of UN Man.” *BBCNews.com*, November 9, 2007.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7086247.stm/> (accessed June 10, 2008).
- “Sudan ‘Kills Refugees in Darfur.’” *BBCNews.com*, August 26, 2008.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7580778.stm> (accessed September 26, 2008).
- “Sudan Lets Expelled EU Envoy Stay.” *BBCNews.com*, August 25, 2007.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/> (accessed November 15, 2007).
- “Sudan Planes ‘Bomb Darfur Town.’” *BBCNews.com*, September 11, 2007.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6988031.stm/> (accessed December 3, 2007).
- “Sudan Rebels ‘Attack Oil Field.’” *BBCNews.com*, December 12, 2007.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7138226.stm/> (accessed June 11, 2008).
- “Sudan: Too Scared to Tell – Sexual Violence in Darfur.” *ReliefWeb*. February 12, 2008.
<http://www.reliefweb.int/> (accessed September 26, 2008).
- “Sudan ‘Will Defy Darfur Warrants.’” *BBCNews.com*, May 3, 2007.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6618527.stm/> (accessed June 11, 2007).
- Tajfel, Henry. “Social Categorization.” *Introduction a la Psychologies Sociale*, edited by Serge Moscovici, 272-302. Paris: Larousse, 1972.
- Tanno, Dolores V. and Fred E. Jandt. “Redefining the ‘Other’ in Multicultural Research.” *Howard Journal of Communication* 5 (1994): 36-45.
- Taslitz, Andrew E. *Rape and the Culture of the Courtroom*. NY: New York University Press, 1999.
- “The Future of the *New York Times*.” *Business Week*, January 17, 2005.
http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/05_03/b3916001_mz001.htm
 (accessed November 2, 2008).
- “The Most Influential US liberals: 1-20.” *Telegraph*, April 24, 2008.
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/1435442/The-most-influential-US-liberals-1-20.html> (accessed September 8, 2008).
- “The Shocking Story George Clooney has to Tell.” *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, 26 April 2006.
- “There Are No Angels Here.” *ER*. Television program. New York: NBC Universal, May 4, 2006.
- Totten, Samuel and Eric Markusen. *Genocide in Darfur*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

- “Ultimatum for Darfur Peace Force.” *BBCNews.com*, September 4, 2006.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/5311144.stm> (accessed November 15, 2007).
- UN Chief ‘Shocked’ By Darfur.” *BBCnews.com*, September 5, 2007.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6979104.stm> (accessed December 3, 2007).
- “UN to Press Sudan on Darfur Force.” *BBCNews.com*, December 6, 2007.
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7130144.stm> (accessed June 11, 2008).
- “Unity Statement.” *Save Darfur*. 2007. www.savedarfur.org (accessed July 4, 2008).
- “US Charity Donations Hit 2007 Record Despite Soft Economy.” *AFP*, June 23, 2008.
http://afp.google.com/article/ALeqM5jxccpBITwO2_Cc8vwcI8Q0ONJr2A (July 3, 2008).
- “US Food Aid for Crisis-Hit Darfur,” *BBCNews.com*, May 8, 2006,
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/4751751.stm> / (accessed October 18, 2006).
- “U.S. Plans Tougher Sudan Sanctions over Darfur Violence.” *International Herald Tribune*, May 29, 2007.
<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/05/29/world/americas/29iht-sudan.1.5910462.html>
 (accessed May 29, 2007).
- Van Oudenaren, Daniel. “US-Led No-Fly Zone Would ‘Impede’ Aid to Darfur – Sudan.” *Sudan Tribune*, October 6, 2008. www.sudantribune.com/spip.php?article28839 (accessed June 8, 2009).
- Winfrey, Oprah. “Oprah Talks to Barack Obama.” *O Magazine 5*
<http://proquest.umi.com.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/pqdweb?index=79&did=766548391&SrchMode=1&sid=1&Fmt=3&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1186848140&clientId=9874> (accessed August 11, 2007).
- Worth, Robert F. “Sudan Says It Will Accept U.N.-African Peace Force in Darfur.” *New York Times*, November 17, 2006, A3.

Cynthia D. Boes

Assistant Professor
California Baptist University
8432 Magnolia Avenue
Riverside, CA 92504

home (951) 789-5869
work (951) 343-4904
E-mail: cboes@calbaptist.edu

Education

Ph.D. in Communication Arts & Sciences – May 2010
The Pennsylvania State University – State College, PA
Dissertation Advisor: Thomas W. Benson
Dissertation - “Defending Darfur: The Problems and Potential of Speaking for Others

Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies – Rhetoric, Communication, and English
June 2003

Oregon State University – Corvallis, OR
Thesis Advisor: Robert Iltis
Thesis - “Other-Directed Protest: A Study of Galen Fisher’s Anti-Internment Rhetoric”

BS in English, emphasis in Communication – *cum laude* – May 1996
Corban College (formerly Western Baptist College) – Salem, OR

Publications

“Tule Lake: A Memorial to be Forgotten”
Chapter Accepted for Book in Progress - *Transnational Remembrance: Essays on the Global Memoryscape*, eds. Kendall R. Phillips and G. Mitchell Reyes.

Convention Presentations

“Subaltern or Silent in Darfur”
To be presented March 2010 to the Western States Communication Association Conference
– Anchorage Alaska

Teaching Experience

Interpersonal Communication, Professor
California Baptist University, Spring 2008, Spring 2009, Summer 2009, Spring 2010

Oral Communication, Professor
California Baptist University, Fall 2007-Spring 2010