James F Klumpp

THE RHETORICAL COMPLEXITY OF SOCIAL
MOVEMENTS:A METHOD AND APPLICATION

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

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

of the sociology of collectivities. Systems Analysis
will be my primary tool.

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

Leland Griffin, who has authored the major works
in movement studies in rhetoric, recognizes the dynamic
nature of movements in his initial article on the
methods of criticism in historical movements. He
writes, "the historical movement, looked upon as a
sustained process of social influence, is dynamic, and
has its beginning, its progression and its termination."[1]
There is inevitably a problem in viewing dynamic
phenomena because our tools of analysis are by and large
static. The quotation above is an excellent example
of the problem. The three segment analysis leads to
characterization of the rhetoric of the segments, and
this characterization violates the "dynamic" assumption
that Griffin recognizes. Systems analysis claims that
by concentrating on the operation of the system
rather than the constituents of the system, the system

can be viewed from a new dynamic perspective.

Herbert Simons also has recognized the dynamic
nature of the social movement. He argues that social
movements have many rhetorical requirements,
satisfaction of which may be contradictory. Simons
also begins with organizational theory but not
necessarily systemic theory. The most telling
restriction on Simons' study is that he is concerned
with "a leader-centered conception of persuasion in
social movements."[2] To concentrate on the leader and
his rhetoric is to ignore important nonleadership
rhetoric and movements with no strong viable
leadership.

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

In the rest of the paper I want to explain a
method for an organizational history of a movement
based on general systems theory, then explain a method
for rhetorical analysis based on the organizational

history, and finally look at the events at Columbia University in the spring of 1968 as an application of the method.

A Systemic Perspective on Organizational History

General systems theory was developed as a method centered in no specific field but general to scientific study, and is useful in viewing phenomena from the atom to the universe and from the dyad to the world community. To understand a system the investigator studies three elements.[3] First are the components: What are the system's constituent parts? Second are the attributes: What are the characteristics of these components? Third and most important are the relationships: How do the components within the system interact with each other and with the environment?

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

In the particular case of organizations people are the most important components, and to view an

organization from a systems perspective the investigator
looks at the activity patterns that define the
relationships between the people.[4] E.H. Schein defines
an organization as "the rational coordination of the
activities of a number of people for the achievement of
some common, explicit purpose or goal, through division
of labor and function and through a hierarchy of
authority and responsibility."[5]

A systems analyst recognizes the essence of a
movement not in its members nor in its beliefs, but
rather in its activities to command energy and redirect
the energy toward its purpose. Paradoxically, the
purpose toward which a movement is formed is not its
most important goal, at least not if importance is
to be judged by where the most energy is expended.
A movement devotes far more energy in working toward
its continued existence and growth.

The energy in a movement is channeled into five
functions.[6] The first is the input function. To work
toward its goals and at the same time grow, an
organization must acquire the commitment of energy,
either indirectly through money or directly through
participation. In social movements this requires that
the movement attract people from the environment[7] and

identify them with the movement. For many social organizations monetary reward serves to identify the member with the organization but in movements more than any other type of organization, rhetoric must achieve the identification. When new funds or members are needed the movement must respond with rhetoric that identifies the sources of energy with the movement.

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

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

In performing the maintenance function, rhetoric
continues the identification to keep the movement
together and the activity patterns to bring stability
to the relationships.

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

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

These functions provide the framework for a
social history of an organization. At different times
different functions will be most important and the
organization's history plots the change in functional
needs.

An organization's history begins as a number of people come together and commit themselves to sacrificing individual action for interaction and coordinated group activity, then out of this commitment must develop group norms recognized and accepted by the members. These norms serve the dual function of providing stability in coordination of activity and celebrating the movement's existence as a movement.

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

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

The Rhetorical Role in
Organizational History

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

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

A rhetorical study of these moments of opportunity is not simply a valueless describption, however. Every movement has goals some of which flow from its ideology and some from its need to perpetuate itself and grow as an organization. Rhetoric may redirect the movement toward achievement or failure, and a rhetorical study will describe the promise and threat of these opportunities and rhetoric's influence on their outcome.

As noted earlier, most studies of the rhetoric of social movements have personified the movement, treated the rhetoric as extended discourse, and evaluated the strategies in terms of ideological goals. In this study I want to concentrate on the organizational goals. Within this context the organizational history developed from the five functions provides a central method for assessing rhetorical opportunities.

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

Secondly, the situation of the moment determines the relative importance of various functions in the movement's history. For example, input is a movement's greatest initial need, but later some dramatic new push may be planned that also requires a fresh rush of input.

At either time the siutation requires rhetoric that
attracts energy and marshalls it for contribution to
the movement. At other times a change in the
movement's environment may make adjustment to the
change the dominant requirement. The situation
determines the problem or opportunity and so the critic
must have an understanding of the situation.

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

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

The rhetorical analysis of the movement from the
perspective delineated here begins with the organizational
history. Then the critic studies the influence of
rhetoric in recreating and redirecting the movement.

[handwritten margin note: possibility with separatist literature]

In the next section I use this method to analyse the
Columbia University student movement of 1968. First,
I look at the ideology of the movement since the
(ideology is a major source of rhetorical material).
Then I take some periods from the organizational
history of the Columbia movement, look at their
rhetorical demands and assess the influence rhetoric
had on the later history.

The Influence of Rhetoric on the
Columbia Student Movement

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

Finally, after seven days, the administration
called New York City police onto campus and in an
action marked by widespread violence, the police
cleared the buildings. The violence of the police

action, felt by bystanders, faculty, students, administrators, and newsmen as well as the occupants of the buildings, had a dramatic impact on the students and faculty of Columbia.[8]

Ideology of the Columbia Movement

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

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

The radical explanation of Vietnam and racism

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

The radicals saw the power structure as an — *How do you know
that This is what
they thought*
intricate network of interlocking relationships that
directed the imperialistic society. Thus all authority
was suspect of involvement. It was easy for any power
source to be implicated and become the target of the
radical charges.

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

This philosophy transformed decision making into
participatory democracy. Each issue went to the
brotherhood for decision. There was full discussion
and all received a vote. the decisions that effected
ones life were made by him through participatory
democracy.

These two concpets were to appear again and
again as important sources of radical response to
rhetorical opportunities.

The Initial Commitment
to the Movement

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

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

levels was established and the two major issues of the
crisis were surrogates for major national problems.

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

The second demand was an end to the construction
of the gymnasium in Morningside Park. The location of
the gym in Harlem park land and its design with
separate facilities for white students and black
community had transformed it into a symbol of racism.
One SAS leader said, "What would you do if somebody

came and took your property? Took your property as
they're doing in Morningside with this gym?"[15] The
whites also supported the charge. Mark Rudd said in
Hamilton Hall early in the rally, "We're here because
the University steals land from black people, because
we want them to stop building that gym."[16]

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

The local issues also allowed solidification of
the movement around a definite common devil figure--the
Columbia administration. "What's at issue here is
politics--the politics of this university,"[17] SDS
leader Ted Gold offered. The gym was being built
because the administration overrode faculty and
student objections. affiliated with IDA through
administration doubletalk.

While the administration provided the devil
figure, in order to convert the opposition to the
administration into commitment to action the protesters
needed to believe that their efforts would be
rewarded. The reinforcement of success was a prominent

part of the rhetoric of the radical leaders. "The administration building has been closed down by us,"[18] Mark Rudd explains when relaying word that Low Library was locked. To interpret Vice-President Truman's offer to meet students in McMillan Theatre, Rudd argues, "After we've gone to the son of a bitch a million times and he hasn't responded to us, now he asks to meet us in McMillan. Our force has brought him down."[19] Later at the gym site, Rudd illustrates the group's power by ordering the administration to get busy and secure the release of an arrested demonstrator. "Go or we'll shut the site down,"[20] he warned. The issues gave the students a reason to be involved, the emphasis on the administration as a devil figure gave their involvement a focus, and the power over the administration gave them hope of success if they participated.

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

charge into Hamilton Hall.

Development of the
Organizational Structure

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

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

The need to develop patterns that would preserve

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

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

The demonstrators had a new purpose to hold them

to the movement--they were to block Coleman's exit.
Rudd reinforced this purpose and increased the
intensity of the situation with one of his responsive
interviews.

> I just want to ask people, is this a
> demonstration, incidentally?
> YES!
> I want to ask people, are we disrupting
> the university's function?
> YES!
> Is the university disrupting people all
> over the world?
> YES!
> Are we going to stay here until all of
> our demands are met?
> YES!
> No deans leave this building?
> YES![22]

The crowds answers of "yes" built into a crescendo and
then such rituals ended with the chanting of slogans.

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

Again, however, the attempt to organize the
movement threatened its unity. The rational tone of
the leadership proposal diminished the excitement of
the demonstration and people began to drift from the
building. SAS leader Bill Sales quickly shouted, "Hey,
look, people! Now if you want to get a whole lot of
people strung up today, just drift out of here and

you'll fuck up good. . . . Can you white people tie
up Columbia? Can you beat these administrators like
those guys at Howard beat those cats down there?"[23]
The crowd responded to his question with a loud "Yes!"
Sales then promised food, blankets and other provisions
would be gathered to secure the building. A SDS
leader rose and began speaking to the administration's
sins and the demonstrators shouted support. The common
purpose had failed to hold the group together in the
less-charged atmosphere, but the combination of threat,
challenge, and promise of provisions along with the
developing ritual established their unity.

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

Rudd had taken control and bugun to organize the
group. Students continued to argue the wisdom of
keeping the Dean hostage but those in favor prevailed
and as the night wore on, students began to bed down in

Hamilton. Few left.

In the hours in Hamilton Hall the norms to give
the demonstration continuity had been established.
Rituals were developed to declare unity. A list of
demands had been drafted to give the movement focus.
The management norm of participatory democracy had been
established and accepted by the demonstrators. Maybe
more importantly, the promise of provisions had
transformed the movement from an "outdoor movement" to
a "building movement"--a movement with a territorial
base and a commitment to establishing a living style
within the territory. During those hours in Hamilton
the students had been held together while the nature
of the group changed from a frenzied mob to a stable
social movement.

Stability During the Occupation

The movement soon expanded from Hamilton into
four other buildings. During the next seven days the
major functional needs were output and maintenance.
The radicals were satisfied with the number of people
in the buildings, in fact the buildings were near
capacity, so they worried little about input. The
buildings were relatively isolated from the outside
world and most of the activity outside the buildings

was waiting for the completion of negotiations so the adaptive function was of little importance. The major tasks were convincing the community that the movements ideology was valid, and maintaining the stability of the movement in the buildings.

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

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

Provisions were provided in each building and work details were established as needed. The work was a cooperative effort. Bedding and medical supplies and services were provided as well as food. Perhaps most importantly, most of the day was spent in discussion

and participatory democracy. Thus the rituals established in Hamilton were continued, and since they symbolized the salient ideology they reinforced the radical position.

The other force holding the students to their position was their feeling of power. The possession of territory symbolized their power and they now controlled even the nerve center of the University--the office of the President.[26] In addition, the failure of the administration to act against them and the increasingly bold statements by the SCC student leadership reflected a sense of power.

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

Disintegration following the "Bust"

The critical moment of the Columbia crisis was the police "bust." The bloody clearing of the buildings marked both danger and opportunity for the movement. It robbed the movement of its territorial base that was so important to the identity. It put the students back

into the community and destroyed the communes. But at
the same time it alienated the campus community from
the administration, producing large numbers of
dissidents from which to mold a broader movement.

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

Having to serve the input, maintenance, and
adaptive functions concurrently created special
problems. The large increase in membership, from about
one thousand to six thousand, practically required a
reconstituting of the movement, yet the old members
had to feel the continuity with the movement as it had
been. In addition, the new members were by and large
more moderate than those in the buildings leading to

problems in adjusting to the audience. The continuity
of the movement needed to be insured despite drastic
changes resulting from eviction. Given the new
membership, the difference in politics, and the loss of
the buildings the radicals had to reformulate the
movement with a large number of modifications without
losing the enthusiasm of the previous members.

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

The opportunity to accomplish the change occurred
on May 1 at a meeting of the strikers in Wollman
Auditorium. The SDS leadership recognized the need.
"The original six demands are no longer sufficient,"
Dave Gilbert told the group, "in addition to winning

political demands, we must begin to create a new
University."[27] But as Mark Rudd began to speak the
chance slipped away.

Rudd first reviewed the occupation and offered
the strike as proof of the victory of the "bust."
This brought cheers. He then made his argument for
continued demands. "Let's be extremely clear on what
we're demanding and let's be clear in why we're doing
all this. I think its clear to the seven hundred
people who were busted and those who were beat up and
those who witnessed it. We're doing this in order to
create a human society and to fight exploitation of man
by man and we think that this University was an example
of this exploitation."[28] Rudd had chosen to place the
strike in a broader context than student power and had,
in fact, ignored the issue of student power. Jerry

Avorn observed, "The thrust of Rudd's argument was
clear: he was trying to persuade the more moderate
students to join the strike on his terms and not seek
to change the nature. With the prospect of an influx
of liberals onto the new Strike Coordinating Committee,
Rudd and the other leaders were faced with the dilemma
of rejecting this new support in the interest of
preserving the purity of the radical movement or

accepting the moderates in the interests of building a mass movement."[29]

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

Rudd had never really wedded the student power and the imperialism issues. His concern was broader than the campus and he failed to make clear how the two issues complemented each other. He was followed to the platform by moderate spokesmen who proposed that to insure broad representation only support for the strike be required for membership on the steering committee. They also suggested that the strike focus narrowly on resignation of the administration, getting the police off campus, and restructuring the university power structure.

The SDS agreed to the latter plan and the chance
to establish the radical ideology and its link to
student power had passed. The leadership of the
movement had passed into a more moderate structure.
Two weeks later the radicals and the moderate students
would separate into two groups and the hopes for a
broader movement were dashed.

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

The radical search for the ritual to maintain
the old core of the movement failed. Rallies were
held but rallies seem to require escalating excitment
that could not be maintained day after day. Those who
had been in the buildings formed communes but these
did not have the same meaning out in the world where
the life style of the buildings could not be maintained.
The liberation classes offered an alternative but they

included the faculty and new members of the movement
and soon turned their attention to academic subjects.
In short, there was no form of ritual remaining and
without it the old structure of the movement died even
as the broader structure of the movement failed to
maintain the old principles.

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

Conclusion

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

This problem is instructive of the nature of
movements as well as the nature of the method. The
movement is a tremendously complex phenomenon.

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

Social movements are tremendously rich setting
for rhetoric. The virtue of the method of this study
is that it helps the rhetorician realize the richness
and begin exploration of it.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Leland M. Griffin, "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," Quarterly Journal of Speech 38(April 1952) 184. For Griffin's other works see "The Rhetorical Structure of the 'New Left' Movement: Part I," Quarterly Journal of Speech 50(April 1964)113-135, and "A Dramatistic Theory of the Rhetoric of Movements" in Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke ed. by William Rueckert (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1969), pp. 456-478.

[2]Herbert W. Simons, "Requirements, Problems and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," Quarterly Journal of Speech 56(February 1970)1-11.

[3]The classical work on defining systems is A.D. Hall and R.E. Fagen, "Definition of System," General Systems 1(1956)18-28. This article along with many others is reprinted in Modern Systems Research for the Behavioral Scientists ed. by Walter Buckley (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1968). For an application of general systems theory to sociology see Walter Buckley, Sociology and Modern Systems Theory (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967).

[4]For a systems analysis of organizations see Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966). Also Karl E. Weick, The Social Psychology of Organizing (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1969).

[5]E.H. Schein, Organizational Psychology (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 8.

[6]These functions are adapted from Katz and Kahn, pp. 84-99. They are based on an "open system" model of the organization used by these two authors and by Weick.

Katz characterizes an open system: "Organizations as a special class of open systems have properties of their own, but they share other properties in common with all open systems. These include the importation of energy from the environment, the through-put or transformation of the imported energy into some product form which is characteristic of the system, the exporting of that product into the environment, and the reenergizing of the system from sources in the environment.

"Open systems also share the characteristics of negative entropy, feedback, homeostasis, differentiation, and equifinality. The law of negative entropy states that system survive and maintain their characteristic internal order only so long as they import from the environment more energy than they expend in the process of transformation and exportation. . . . Feedback . . . enables the system to correct for its own malfunctioning or for changes in the environment, and thus to maintain a steady state or homeostasis. This is a dynamic rather than a static balance, however. Open systems are not at rest but tend toward differentiation and elaboration, both because of subsystem dynamics and because of the relationship between growth and survival."(p. 28)

[7]"Environment" may be defined as the set of components and relationships beyond the boundaries of the system. Open systems are said to have "partial inclusion," i.e. "only parts of persons are actually used in an organization"(Weick, p. 7). Thus individuals may be said to be partially in the system and partially in the environment, and one of the functions of the organization is to convince the member to maximize his inclusion.

[8]For accounts of the Columbia crisis see Jerry L. Avorn and the staff of the Columbia Spectator, Up Against the Ivy Wall (New York: Atheneum, 1969). The Cox Commission, Crisis at Columbia (New York: Vintage Books, 1968). The New York Times, July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968. Columbia Spectator, April 24 to May 8, 1968.

[9]Hans Toch, The Social Psychology of Social Movements (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merril Co., 1965), p. 21.

[10]For a general explanation of radical ideology at Columbia see Steve Halliwell, "Columbia: An Explanation," in The New Left, ed. by Priscilla Long (Boston: Porter Sargent Publisher, 1969), pp. 200-215. A more accurate view of the ideology would be gained from simply reviewing the rhetoric of the crisis. The quotations included here will provide some support for the interpretation outlined here.

[11]Quoted in Avorn, et.al., p. 49.

[12]Quoted in Ibid., p. 48.

[13]Quoted in Ibid., p. 84.

[14]Cox Commission, p. 94.

[15]Quoted in Avorn, et.al., p. 39.

[16]Quoted in Ibid., pp. 49-50.

[17]Quoted in Bbid., p. 38.

[18]Quoted in Ibid., p. 42.

[19]Quoted in Ibid., p. 43.

[20]Quoted in Ibid., p. 46

[21]Quoted in Ibid., pp. 49-50.

[22]Quoted in Ibid., p. 50.

[23]Quoted in Ibid., p. 52.

[24]Quoted in Ibid., p. 53.

[25]For descriptions of life inside the buildings see Ibid., pp. 117-130; Cox Commission, pp. 109, 137-138; Michael Stern, "Damage Negligible in Low; Demonstrators Keep Order," Columbia Spectator, April 26, 1968, pp. 1ff.

[26]For some discussion of the importance of territory in mass movements see Robert W. McColl, "Vietnam, Cuba, and the Ghetto," Kansas Alumni, 67 (February 1969)11.

[27]Quoted in Avorn, _et. al._, p. 220.

[28]Quoted in _Ibid._, pp. 220-221.

[29]_Ibid._, p. 221.

[30]Quoted in _Ibid._

A Classification of Rhetorical Functions in Social Movements

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

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