

This article was downloaded by: [University of Utah]

On: 05 July 2011, At: 07:44

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Quarterly Journal of Speech

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rqjs20>

Location Matters: The Rhetoric of Place in Protest

Danielle Endres Danielle Endres is an Assistant Professor of Communication and Faculty in Environmental Humanities at the University of Utah & Samantha Senda-Cook Samantha Senda-Cook is an Assistant Professor in Communication Studies at Creighton University

Available online: 04 Jul 2011

To cite this article: Danielle Endres Danielle Endres is an Assistant Professor of Communication and Faculty in Environmental Humanities at the University of Utah & Samantha Senda-Cook Samantha Senda-Cook is an Assistant Professor in Communication Studies at Creighton University (2011): Location Matters: The Rhetoric of Place in Protest, Quarterly Journal of Speech, 97:3, 257-282

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00335630.2011.585167>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Location Matters: The Rhetoric of Place in Protest

Danielle Endres & Samantha Senda-Cook

Social movements often deploy place rhetorically in their protests. The rhetorical performance and (re)construction of places in protest can function in line with the goals of a social movement. Our essay offers a heuristic framework—place in protest—for theorizing the rhetorical force of place and its relationship to social movements. Through analysis of a variety of protest events, we demonstrate how the (re)construction of place may be considered a rhetorical tactic along with the tactics we traditionally associate with protest, such as speeches, marches, and signs. This essay has implications for the study of social movements, the rhetoricity of place, and how we study places.

Keywords: Rhetoric; Place; Social Movements; Protest

The rhetorical deployment of place is a common tactic for social movements. Calling on fond memories of or attachment to particular places, environmental social movements routinely ask their supporters to take action to “save” special places including Yosemite Valley, Glen Canyon, and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR). Beyond referencing particular places in their arguments for social change, social movements have also relied on the rhetoricity of places themselves by holding protest events in particularly meaningful places or using protest events to create temporary fissures in the dominant meanings of places. The 1963 Civil Rights Movement’s March on Washington culminated at the Lincoln Memorial in the Washington Mall in part because of the significance of that place: both its proximity to the center of Federal Government and Abraham Lincoln’s role in freeing slaves. As Martin Luther King Jr. delivered his famous “I Have a Dream” speech, the place

Danielle Endres is an Assistant Professor of Communication and Faculty in Environmental Humanities at the University of Utah. Samantha Senda-Cook is an Assistant Professor in Communication Studies at Creighton University. A previous version of this manuscript was presented at, and appears in the proceedings from, the Alta Argumentation Conference in 2007. We would like to thank Julie Schutten, Deborah Cox Callister, and Autumn Garrison who assisted with some of the data collection for this essay. Correspondence to: Danielle Endres, Department of Communication, University of Utah, 255 S. Central Campus, Salt Lake City, UT 84112, USA. Email: danielle.endres@utah.edu

and the presence of hundreds of thousands of people congregating in that place also constituted the movement's goals. The 2003 anti-war (in Iraq) protesters who took to the streets—indeed, any protest that marches through city streets—not only sent a visual message of the strength of the movement through images of city streets brimming with people but also temporarily reconstructed city streets from places for transportation into places of protest. These are just a few examples of how place is rhetorically significant to social movement protest. “In short,” as Tim Cresswell notes, “the qualities of place that make them good strategic tools of power simultaneously make them ripe for resistance in highly visible and often outrageous ways.”¹ (Re)constructing the meaning of place, even in temporary ways, can be a tactical act of resistance along with the tactics we traditionally associate with protest, such as speeches, marches, and signs. As we will demonstrate, place (re)constructions can function rhetorically to challenge dominant meanings and practices in a place. Place is a performer along with activists in making and unmaking the possibilities of protest.

Although scholars in geography and sociology regularly attend to the implications of theories of place for social movements and activism,² rhetoricians have yet to turn to place as a way to examine the rhetorical performances of social movement protest. This essay provides a foundation for such an examination by articulating the rhetorical force of place in protest. We argue that place can serve as a unique heuristic for rhetorical studies of social movements. Traditionally research on social movements has been focused on the actions of protesters through their words or use of bodies, our discussion of place in protest shifts attention to how embodied rhetorics of protest are always situated in particular places. In other words, studying bodies and words can reveal only part of the rhetorical tactics of protest. Studying how words and bodies interact in and with place allows us to see social movement rhetoric from a new perspective. Beyond this specific contribution, our heuristic also contributes to a general understanding of the rhetoricity of place by specifically attending to how bodies, words, and places all interact in rhetoric. Further, the concept of place in protest has implications for understanding how to study the rhetoric of place.

We build our argument by pulling together threads of existing research on place to offer a critical lens—*place in protest*—with which to ask questions relevant to a more comprehensive analysis of how place functions along with other rhetorical performances in social movement discourse. Place in protest allows us to understand how social movements use both *place-based arguments* and *place-as-rhetoric*. Place-based arguments discursively invoke images or memories of a place to support an argument, such as summoning the melting of the arctic as a reason to stop global warming, and make salient that dominant place meanings are sometimes linked to systems of power that discourage protest. In addition to examining such indirect invocations of place, we are interested in how social movements construct and reconstruct places in line with their challenges to the status quo (e.g., gay pride celebrations taking over everyday city streets to temporarily queer them). Place-as-rhetoric is at the core of our contribution to the study of place in protest and place generally; it assumes that the very place in which a protest occurs is a rhetorical

performance that is part of the message of the movement. We will further refine place-as-rhetoric by distinguishing three ways in which places act rhetorically. First, protesters may *build on a pre-existing meaning of a place* to help make their point, such as holding a protest event at a state capital so that protesters can direct their message to this symbol of government. Second, protests can *temporarily reconstruct the meaning* (and challenge the dominant meaning) of a particular place, such as Critical Mass's take-over of car lanes in downtown city streets to raise awareness about bicycles as a "legitimate" form of transportation. These temporary reconstructions of places create short-term fissures in the dominant meanings of places in productive ways. Third, *repeated reconstructions over time* can result in new place meanings, such as how the 1960s UC Berkeley Free Speech Movement's repeated use of the front steps of Sproul Hall (a building that at the time housed campus administration offices) for their protests eventually resulted in its being known as a place for protest on campus, even though the building now houses student services. In these three ways, places themselves—not discourse about places—are rhetorical tactics in movements toward social change.

Our essay proceeds in five steps. First, we begin by defining place and examining its relationship to space. Second, we articulate the place in protest framework by relating it to current conversations in rhetorical studies. The study of place in protest necessitates that we look to its relationship with rhetorical artifacts, materiality, embodiment, ephemerality, and ethnographic presence. Third, we flesh out the place in protest framework through rhetorical analysis of various social movements' use of place. Fourth, we use an extended example from our participant observation at two protest events to highlight the value of researcher presence for studying place in protest. Finally, we conclude the essay by discussing the implications for social movements, the rhetoric of place, and approaches to studying place.

Place and Space

The study of place has long been associated with cultural geographers, urban sociologists, some cultural studies scholars,³ and more recently with rhetoric scholars.⁴ Because place and space are fundamentally interrelated concepts, our discussion of place necessitates that we also address its relationship to space. Both terms and their interrelation are "a matter of some dispute" within the interdisciplinary literature.⁵ However, a general tenet is that the connection between place and space can be described as one of particular to general.

Place refers to particular locations (e.g., a city, a particular shopping mall, or a park) that are semi-bounded, a combination of material and symbolic qualities, and embodied. For example a city is semi-bounded by city limits (*semi*-bounded because these limits can be a matter of debate, change over time, or be re-drawn within a single year), includes material structures like buildings and roads, has symbolic meanings such as being perceived as a college town or an urban metropolis, and is experienced on a daily basis by the people who live, work, or visit it.

Space refers to a more general notion of how society and social practice are regulated (and sometimes disciplined) by spatial thinking (e.g., capitalist mode of production or gendered notions of private and public spaces). Henri Lefebvre refers to the production of space as a way to understand that “(social) space is (social) product,” a process that is under constant construction, reconstruction, and sometimes subject to deconstruction.⁶ Places exist in the interrelationship with spaces, such that a particular shopping mall or park is not only its own particular, semi-bounded location but also is influenced by and influences spatial structures such as the previously noted capitalist mode of production or the idea of green space. For example, even though every city is a particular locality with its own unique material, symbolic and embodied qualities, every city is also part of a spatial system that links localities into broader social structures and practices.

Although we characterize space as more general or abstract than place, we should not be tempted to assume that space is just a blank slate into which meaning is imbedded to form place.⁷ Rather, both space and place are socially constructed and imbued with meaning. Moreover, we should also not be tempted to assume that place and space are opposites.⁸ Although it is possible to make distinctions between the two concepts, each is always influenced by and influencing the other.⁹ We see value in turning a critical lens specifically to place because we are interested in how social movements use particular locations—places—for rhetorical effect (while recognizing that the deployment of place always involves space). Our artifact is place in protest.¹⁰

Locating Place in Protest in Rhetorical Theory

Place is a rhetorical phenomenon. Instead of merely arguing that people make meanings for places through discourse, we argue that places, imbued with meaning and consequences, are rhetorical performances. While many rhetoric scholars would agree that place is indeed rhetorical, Raymie McKerrow reminds us that traditional rhetorical theory often views place and space “as externalities influencing discourse, to be sure, but also as physical entities having no other meaning beyond what appears as commonsense evidence of one’s competence in performing according to community standards,” or speaking in the right place.¹¹ This perspective on place lacks recognition of the power inherent in place.¹² Using place as a heuristic for studying social movements recognizes not only that social protest is inherently out of place, but also that place is more than just a backdrop for the rhetoric of social protest.

Before discussing how place fits into rhetorical theory, it is important to distinguish place from some seemingly related rhetorical concepts. Some might wonder how place is related to Burke’s concept of scene from the pentad.¹³ While scene operates as a setting in which argumentation and rhetoric occur, we argue that place itself acts rhetorically. Even when scene is part of a dominant pentad pair, the assumption is that scene is being invoked rhetorically in a message as opposed to scene as rhetoric in itself. Similarly, place is neither merely a part of the rhetorical situation that calls forth rhetorical response, nor is it an environment within which

rhetoric takes place.¹⁴ Since many of our examples will be drawn from the environmental movement, it is important to note that place is not simply the environment or a natural place. Although geographer Yi-Fu Tuan often discusses place in relationship to natural places, places can also refer to built environments like cities.¹⁵ Others may think of the classical rhetorical concept of *topoi*, or commonplaces for argument, in relation to place.¹⁶ While the concept of *topoi* serves as an abstract spatial heuristic for developing arguments, *topoi* do not have concrete physical aspects that places do.

As stated above, rhetorical scholars have already engaged in analysis of places such as memorials, museums, highways, and shopping areas. However, these scholars focus on the place in relation to consumerism, memory, postmodern living, urban and suburban spaces, and identity as opposed to our focus on protest and social movements. We contribute to this body of scholarship by more precisely theorizing how the confluence of physical structures, locations and bodies can function rhetorically for social movements. Conceptualizing how social movements deploy place to emphasize dissenting viewpoints demonstrates how places exist in states of protest. Social movements contest and remake places while the places themselves contest and remake social structures. In order to articulate place as a heuristic for understanding protest rhetoric, we further articulate the concept of place in protest by relating it to current conversations in rhetorical theory and criticism.

Place in Protest as Rhetorical Artifact

Place, and more specifically place in protest, is a rhetorical artifact, both in its materiality and symbolicity. This claim is indebted to over thirty years of scholarship questioning and expanding what can count as a rhetorical artifact. Conceiving of place as an artifact stands on the shoulders of critical scholars, such as Philip Wander, McKerrow, and Michael McGee, who first started to question “the things we study.”¹⁷ This questioning resulted in rhetorical critics turning to a variety of artifacts beyond the traditional focus on speeches including textual fragments, visual artifacts, vernacular texts, performances, bodies, memorials and museums, and places or spaces. Our examination of place in protest as a rhetorical artifact builds not just from this general expansion of rhetorical artifacts, but also specifically from scholars who demonstrate that memorials, museums, shopping malls, and other places are rhetorical performances.¹⁸ Place in protest builds from the notion that place is rhetorical to specifically show how the rhetorical performances of place in protest are a rich intersection of bodies, material aspects, past meanings, present performances, and future possibilities.

Place in Protest as Material Rhetoric

Place in protest is a material rhetoric.¹⁹ We adhere to Carole Blair’s conception of the materiality of rhetoric, meaning that place in protest is a combination of material and

symbolic qualities and that place in protest has material consequences.²⁰ Cresswell argues that places are both material and symbolic:

A church, for instance, is a place. It is neither just a particular material artifact, nor just a set of religious ideas; it is always both. Places are duplicitous in that they cannot be reduced to the concrete or the “merely ideological”; rather they display an uneasy and fluid tension between them.²¹

As place is a fluid tension between materiality and symbolism, our examination of place in protest as material rhetoric not only focuses on material structures but also the symbols that are interrelated with these structures. Many protest events encompass this fluidity between the material and the discursive because they are held in places with symbolic meaning or are meant to alter or challenge the dominant meaning of a place. While we consider how material structures are rhetorical, in part, because of their symbolicity, we also examine how these physical structures have material consequences. According to Blair, “we must ask not just what a text means but, more generally, what it does: and we must not understand what it does adhering strictly to what it is supposed to do.”²² We are interested in what places in protest do in terms of how they occupy places in new ways, disrupt traffic and bodies, and can have a variety of results beyond the intent of protest organizers.

As we will demonstrate in our analysis, material rhetoric is always temporary. Place in protest acts as a reminder that places are always being reconstructed or deconstructed. We are interested in material aspects of place that are best revealed when we consider materiality as fluid, temporary, and embodied. For example, we examine how temporary (re)constructions of place affect the *feelings* of a place, shaping its materiality in less immediately evident ways. It is at this node of feeling, of pathos, that our essay directly pushes against other conceptions of the material as physical or as social conditions. Indeed, materiality includes physicality and social conditions, but it also includes embodied experiences in place. This understanding of materiality helps us think about the ways in which places as well as the people in them are always in the process of becoming. If we are to take materiality seriously in rhetorical scholarship, it is worthwhile to flesh out the stylistic, affective, and powerful differences among variations of the material.

Place in Protest as Embodied Rhetoric

Place in protest allows us to understand body rhetoric in terms of how the body is always located in place. Rhetoricians are increasingly examining the role of bodies in rhetoric.²³ Examination of place in protest involves viewing bodies as rhetorical because, for example, the congregation of bodies at a protest can communicate the strength of support for the movement. However, viewing place in protest as an embodied phenomenon uniquely directs our attention to the interrelationship between bodies and places.²⁴ Bodies are always in (or out of) place. Phil Hubbard, Rob Kitchin, and Gill Valentine write, “Indeed, being ‘in place’ involves a range of cognitive (mental) and physical (corporeal) performances that are constantly

evolving as people encounter place.”²⁵ Not only are the bodies of protesters place-based rhetorical performances, but places are embodied rhetorical performances. During a protest event, human bodies interact with the physical structures to change a place, allowing it to take on significance that might otherwise remain unrealized. Further, place in protest acts on those bodies that encounter the march—they may have to move to avoid the march, be touched or spoken to by the protesters, get a headache from the noise, become distracted from work, or be moved to join the protest march. As de Certeau contends through his discussion of the “rhetoric of walking,” the place and the visitor rhetorically engage one another as the place communicates and the pedestrian “speaks” back.²⁶ While not all protest involves bodies in proximity to other bodies, most protest events do involve some use of and consequences for the body, whether it is through presence (e.g., a march) or absence (e.g., a product boycott). In these ways, the rhetorical deployment of place as a protest tactic tells us something interesting about the rhetoricity of bodies in place.

Place in Protest as Ephemeral Rhetoric

In her examination of the Toxic Links Coalition’s Stop Cancer Where It Starts toxic tour, Phaedra Pezzullo argues that protest rhetoric is ephemeral in that much of what happens at a protest event will not be documented for posterity (although a speech may be transcribed and disseminated, this artifact only characterizes part of the event).²⁷ The rhetoric of place in protest is also ephemeral, not only because of Pezzullo’s argument that protest is ephemeral, but also because places themselves are ephemeral. Places, although seemingly permanent because of their physical structures like buildings, streets, and the like, are actually quite fluid because they are constantly being reiterated, reinforced, or reinterpreted. Both the physical and symbolic aspects of place are dynamic. For example, although a building may seem to be stable and permanent, graffiti, cracks, weeds, and earthquakes can all alter a physical structure. Moreover, buildings and other physical structures can be torn down. For example, advocates from urban renewal movements frequently propose replacing old buildings with new ones, often resulting in resistance movements of people who are trying to save their homes from demolition. While scholars have primarily studied things with a perceived high level of durability like memorials or museums, our focus on place in protest turns our attention to constructions of place that have a lower range of durability, that is, the duration of the protest event.²⁸ This understanding of the fluidity of place is particularly important to the rhetoric of place in protest because the possibility of struggling over and reimagining places is what motivates social movements’ attempts to reconstruct places. Places are “made, maintained and contested”²⁹ through the rhetorical practices and performances of protesters. Beyond the fluidity of the physical and embodied aspects of a place, the concomitant symbolism of places is continually under challenge. Social movements use the lack of stability and permanence in places to their advantage when enacting place in protest.

Place in Protest as Experiential Rhetoric

The material, embodied and ephemeral nature of place all lend support to our claim that place in protest is experiential. According to Hubbard, Kitchin and Valentine, place is “defined by (and constructed in terms of) the lived experiences of people.”³⁰ The experiential nature of place in protest, therefore, has implications for how we can study it. Place in protest may be best understood through co-presence or experience with the place as opposed to a mediated experience (although, as we will show, it is still possible to interrogate the rhetoric of place in protest without being there). Building from Pezzullo’s argument that a rhetorician’s presence can make a difference in terms of a rhetorical critique of social movements, we suggest that participant observation is a useful tool for scholars interested in studying place in protest. Pezzullo emphasizes the benefits of being present, which for her involves more than reading a text or listening to a speaker.³¹ It involves the rhetorician’s attention and physical body. It necessitates using multiple senses (sight, smell, etc.) to make sense of a place and understand how its rhetoric is working. Along the same lines, Blair posits that “being there” significantly changes even conventional rhetorical analyses.³² In particular, she suggests that critiquing the text of a speech—a conventional rhetorical artifact—from the shelter of one’s office is quite different from critiquing the same speech having heard it delivered in the rain with a crowd of people, for example. The examination of place in protest is enhanced by drawing from the research practices of ethnography and qualitative research used by scholars in relation to toxic tours, memorials, museums, street performances, and climate change activism.³³ We argue that being present can allow the researcher to document something as seemingly nebulous and non-textual as how place is constructed in protest.

Place in Protest

Recall that we argue that place in protest works in two ways: place-based arguments and place-as-rhetoric. Although social movements employ both of these forms, we focus more heavily on place-as-rhetoric because it offers a new way of thinking about the role of place in social movements. Nonetheless, it is important to understand how place-based arguments are deployed by social movements to show how place-as-rhetoric is different.

Place-Based Arguments

The first and more traditional conceptualization of place in protest—place-based argument—involves a discursive description of a specific place as support for an argument. This way of thinking about place is not new; rhetoricians have shown how invoking a conception of place is an argumentative resource for movements. In the context of social movements, place-based arguments are meant to support the goals of the movement. Michael Heaney and Fabio Rojas note, “places are symbols in the discursive repertoires of movements”³⁴ For example, as Thomas St. Antoine argues,

the new urbanism movement calls forth negative images of suburban places and positive nostalgic images of ideal neighborhoods in their arguments for new urban developments.³⁵

The appeal to sense of place or saving a place is typical in the rhetoric of the environmental movement, particularly within conservation and wilderness protection.³⁶ For example, J. Robert Cox uses Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca's concept of the locus of the irreparable to describe how places are characterized as unique, precarious, and irreparable in order to call for action to save them.³⁷ Cox uses the example of the Nature Conservancy's attempt to protect alluvial woodland in the South. Attachment to place becomes a reason to "save" the place.³⁸ Lawrence Buell clarifies, "an awakened sense of physical location and of belonging to some sort of place-based community have a great deal to do with activating environmental concern."³⁹ The environmental movement's appeals to place can also involve making comparisons between valued places and less valued places. For example, the Sierra Club strategically chose to sacrifice Glen Canyon, a place "hardly anyone had seen,"⁴⁰ in order to advocate for the conservation of wilderness in Colorado called into place as "Echo Park" and "Split Mountain Gorge," knowing that there is an "affective bond between people and place or setting."⁴¹

Place-based arguments rely less on presence in the particular place than does the use of place-as-rhetoric. The Sierra Club and Nature Conservancy called for people to save wilderness places where their members do not generally live, but visit as tourists and outdoor recreators. In the latter case, the Sierra Club relied on their members' memories or experiences with Echo Park and Split Mountain Gorge to motivate them to act to save those places. Place-based-argument, then, assumes that non-physically present places can be evoked through language and argument.

Place-as-rhetoric

Place-as-rhetoric refers to the material (physical and embodied) aspects of a place having meaning and consequence, be it through bodies, signage, buildings, fences, flags, and so on. Unlike place-based arguments that may invoke a non-present place to support an argument, place-as-rhetoric assumes that place itself is rhetorical. Take, for example, the Castro District in San Francisco. The Castro District has historical and political significance for the Gay Rights Movement. It was the base of operations for Harvey Milk, the first openly gay councilperson in San Francisco, and was transformed from a place where gay people congregated to the center of the Gay Rights Movement in San Francisco. On the one hand, using place-based arguments, people could invoke the Castro District—a place with a decidedly queer meaning—as evidence of the city's celebration of queer identity. On the other hand, in place-as-rhetoric, the material aspects of the place argue for the queerness of the place. Walking through the Castro District, the rainbow flags, pink triangles, gay and lesbian bars, sex positive stores, and billboards tell us something about the meaning of that place, that it is a safe place for queer people to be. Beyond the meaning, the Castro district has material consequences for the people who walk through the

neighborhood—they are confronted with an open, affirming, and queer place, which some people find liberating, others find mundane, and others find terrifying. Similarly, Blair suggests that the Civil Rights Memorial Center at once confronts complacency and challenges spectators to take action.⁴² We extend Blair's contention to claim that members of a social movement can create a place of confrontation through place in protest.

In the remainder of this section, we discuss three ways in which social movements use place tactically: (1) building on a pre-existing meaning of a place, (2) temporarily reconstructing the meaning of a place, and (3) repeated reconstructions that result in new place meanings.

Pre-Existing Meaning

The National Mall in Washington, DC has become known as a place of protest. This is not the only meaning of the Mall, but enough famous protests have occurred there to associate it with protest. As the center of US Government, the National Mall is not only physically located near Congress (the intended audience of many social movements), it is also symbolic of the nation's values and ideals. Social movements may want to call forth a return to values that are symbolized by the Mall (i.e., freedom of speech, liberty, equality) or to highlight fissures in these ideals. The 1963 March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom was held at the National Mall with speakers addressing the crowd from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial. The Lincoln Memorial explicitly associated the movement with Lincoln's emancipation of slaves.⁴³ Over 200,000 people filled the Mall, creating an image event when the photos were disseminated via the national news media. As a result of the March on Washington and other protest events, the National Mall has become "widely understood as a place where aggrieved populations can gather to register their discontent with social, economic, or political conditions."⁴⁴

Because protest has become part of the meaning of the National Mall, contemporary social movements often choose to use the venue for their own protest events. For example, the Million Man and Million Mom Marches occurred on the National Mall. Led by Louis Farrakhan of the Nation of Islam, the Million Man March was held on October 16, 1995. Farrakhan's speech during the Million Man March recurrently highlighted the symbolism of holding the march in this place.⁴⁵ In addition to the meaning of the National Mall as a place of protest, particularly for African Americans, Farrakhan challenged the dominant meaning of the National Mall by pointing out that "Right here on this mall where we are standing, according to books written on Washington, DC, slaves used to be brought right here on this Mall in chains to be sold up and down the eastern seaboard. Right along this mall, going over to the White House, our fathers were sold into slavery."⁴⁶ Similarly, the Million Mom March on Washington, held on May 14, 2000 to address gun violence, located its protest at the National Mall. An article on the Million Mom March in *The Independent* stated, "With the Capitol just far enough away to be framed by a camera lens, Washington's National Mall awaits the next event in the *marching season*."⁴⁷

Similarly, many protest events in Salt Lake City occur at either the Wallace F. Bennett Federal Building or the Utah State Capitol Building (as is common in other cities and state capitals). In addition to their general meaning as symbols of government, these places have come to be known as places for protest. At an anti-war protest at Salt Lake City's Federal Building that one of us attended in 2007, the plaza outside the building was filled with people during the noon hour. The presence of bodies and signs clearly marked the plaza as a place of protest that day. Several of the speakers faced, turned to, or gestured toward the building when discussing US policy on the war in Iraq. For this protest, it mattered that we stood in the plaza of the Federal Building, a symbol of the Federal Government. The protest would have felt different had it been held on the steps of the Utah State Capitol, for example, because state legislators do not have the power to stop a war (although they can lobby their Congress people). However, several protests that have happened at the State Capitol rely on symbolic proximity to state legislators to make their points. One of us attended a lunchtime protest event at the State Capitol rotunda that specifically called for state legislators to prevent the passage of a bill that would have allowed hotter levels of radioactive waste to be stored at a low-level waste facility in the state. Being at the State Capitol not only served the practical purpose of being able to direct the message to legislators as they walked by the protest on their way to the cafeteria, but also drew from the symbolic image of the rotunda filled with people and signs to communicate to those who learned of the event through news coverage. Although this event occurred while legislators were present, there have also been protest events at the State Capitol on weekends when legislators are not present. Whether or not the building is occupied, organizers use proximity to these symbolic physical structures to constantly refer to getting their message to the governing bodies—both individual and collective—held within their walls.

The rhetoric and meaning of place can also forge an association between non-social movement actors and social movements. Approximately 1.8 million people attended Barack Obama's inauguration speech on the steps of the Capitol building. In this case, the meaning of the National Mall associated President Obama's election with a continuation of the Civil Rights Movement and the goals of the 1963 March on Washington. In linking the inauguration with civil rights, Katharine Seelye's article in the *New York Times* called the inauguration "a civil rights victory on the Mall." She noted the symbolism of the National Mall for civil rights struggles: "When Mr. Obama delivers his Inaugural Address, he will be looking out across the National Mall, which was once a slave market, beyond the White House, also built by slaves, to the Lincoln Memorial, honoring the president who freed the slaves."⁴⁸ While previous inaugurations have been held in the same place, the historic nature of President Obama's election as the first African American president in the US called forth the meanings of the place for the Civil Rights Movement. The confluence of structures, people, and meanings was central to the inauguration.

Situating a social movement protest or event at a particular place that is associated with social activism can be a tactical move by social movements to use the rhetoric of the place as part of the meaning of their protest or event. At times, the pre-existing

constellations of meaning for a place can allow for associations between members of the establishment and a historical social movement. In this sense, social protest is not just about what is said. It is often just as important where the event occurs because of the meanings places hold and the particular memories and feelings these places evoke for the attendees. Once a place like the National Mall is designated as a place of protest, each social movement that chooses to use that place for its own protest event reinforces the meaning of that place. As Cresswell states, “value and meaning are not inherent in any space or place—indeed, they must be created, reproduced, and defended from heresy.”⁴⁹

Temporary Reconstruction

While some social movements may choose to hold their events at places with relatively stable meanings associated with protest, other social movements use particular places to challenge the dominant meanings of such places and temporarily enact alternate meanings. We argue that many protests enact ephemeral fissures in the meaning of place. Ephemeral fissures in place refer to temporary (an hour, a day, a week, etc.) reconstructions of the meaning of a place. These tactical moves temporarily “transgress the expectations of place” by positing an alternate vision.⁵⁰ This form of protest assumes that “places are never finished but always becoming.”⁵¹ Although geographers often conceptualize place transformation over long periods of time that result in a semi-permanent change, like neighborhood gentrification or the creation of a Gay neighborhood,⁵² we are interested in temporary transformations of place, ranging between a couple of hours to a couple of months, which then return to status quo notions of place (albeit often leaving residual traces of the fissure in meaning). For example, the 1999 World Trade Organization (WTO) protests reconstituted downtown Seattle as a place of anarchy and civil disobedience instead of commerce.⁵³ For the week of the WTO meetings, protesters employed various tactics to redefine downtown Seattle in ways that confronted globalization and, in effect, embodied an alternate set of values. This disrupted and confronted the people who live and work in downtown Seattle, the police who were tasked with monitoring the protest, and the other protestors. However, after the WTO meetings ended, the place returned to business as usual. Isaac West’s scholarship reveals two other instances in which social movements temporarily reconstruct the meaning of kitchens and bathrooms, respectively. He reveals how La WISP (the Los Angeles chapter of Women Strike for Peace), a women’s pacifist group, “politicized the space of the kitchen as a site of direct political action through letter writing, phone calls, and fundraising parties. As a result, the previously private space of the kitchen now served as a base for their public operations.”⁵⁴ Similarly, PISSAR (People in Search of Safe and Accessible Bathrooms) transformed public bathrooms “into a space of coalitional politics” by holding their meetings in bathrooms.⁵⁵ In these examples, the place itself is temporarily transformed to challenge dominant (and oppressive) meanings and replace them with places of safety and empowerment.

The 1969 American Indian Movement's (AIM) take-over of Alcatraz Island offers another example of the temporary reconstruction of place. Through their 19-month occupation, AIM temporarily reconstructed the meaning of the former prison-turned-Federal property to be an American Indian place, an act of asserting the inherent sovereignty of indigenous peoples. AIM's reconstitution of Alcatraz was itself an argument for their right to occupy and self-govern on their own land. On November 20, 1969, the "Indians of All Tribes" took over Alcatraz Island and occupied it for 18 months, ending on June 11, 1971. "These Indians of All Tribes claimed the island by 'right of discovery' and by the terms of the 1868 Treaty of Fort Laramie, which gave Indians the right to unused Federal property that had previously been Indian land."⁵⁶ In *The Alcatraz Proclamation to the Great White Father and his People*, the Indians of All Tribes claimed Alcatraz as Indian land and offered a treaty to "purchase said Alcatraz Island for twenty-four dollars in glass beads and red cloth, a precedent set by the white man's purchase of a similar island about 300 years ago."⁵⁷ However, more important than the proclamation, the activists reconstructed the meaning of Alcatraz through their physical occupation of it. American Indian bodies lived on Alcatraz during the occupation. Moreover, the occupiers re-named the island and the buildings on it in support of their cause. The sign on the port read, "INDIAN LANDING." Just beyond the port a sign was re-purposed to say "INDIANS WELCOME," "UNITED INDIAN PROPERTY," and "INDIAN LAND." One building was designated, with paint on a window, the "DEPT. OF INDIAN Bureau of White Affairs."

The occupation of Alcatraz was fundamentally linked to place. The Indians of All Nations physically occupied the place and through their bodily presence and renaming of the buildings called forth a new meaning of the Alcatraz as Indian land. However, this occupation was only temporary. The US Federal Government forced the activists to leave the island after 19 months of occupation. Alcatraz Island is now a part of the US National Park Service. Tour boats regularly take people to Alcatraz to learn about its history as a Federal prison. Although some "graffiti" remains and a few other remnants from the occupation may still be seen on Alcatraz, the dominant meaning of the island is now controlled by the Park Service. Cynthia Duquette Smith and Teresa Bergman argue that under this paradigm Alcatraz reproduces the history of the island as a prison more than it does the history of the AIM occupation. They state, "The materiality of an Alcatraz tour, characterized by the visitor's physical and sensory engagement with the island's spaces, overpowers attempts at remembering the counternarratives of resistance available on the island in its visual exhibits and orientation film."⁵⁸ Yet, despite the dominant narrative, there are residual traces of the occupation for those who know where to look or what to look for; visitors to Alcatraz disembark at a port that still has the words "INDIAN LAND" painted on it.⁵⁹

While we can draw some conclusions about the rhetoric of place in protest during the WTO protest, PISSAR's and La WISP's transformation of everyday places into political places, and the Alcatraz occupation without physically having been there at the time of the protest, we argue that a researcher's physical presence at a protest event can make a difference in the analysis. Pezzullo's study of toxic tours⁶⁰ provides

an example of temporary reconstructions, both physical and symbolic, that challenge the meaning of the places on the tours. Although she did not specifically attend to the study of the rhetoric of place, her analysis reveals that participant observation combined with rhetorical criticism allows the critic to focus on material aspects of being there and the experiences that would be lost if one merely read a transcript of the tour guide's narrative or saw a video. While it is possible to study the rhetoric of place in protest historically or through the media, as we have shown, we argue that studying it through a researcher's physical presence can reveal different insights and findings about how place acts rhetorically.

For example, participation in a Critical Mass bike ride allowed one of us to experience the temporary reconstruction of the meaning of the city streets as it happened. On set nights all over the world, bike riders take to the streets to block traffic and raise awareness of the need to share the road with bicycles. City streets are temporarily transformed from lanes for car traffic to paths for which lanes serve less use. Cyclists travel in a pack, making their collective impact greater than the cars they varyingly follow, bully (as motorists sometimes do to cyclists), and mock. "The point is not to *block* traffic, since the idea is that bicycles *are* traffic. The point is to take control of the road, dictate the flow of traffic and enable cyclists to spend a couple of hours driving the city streets in relative safety."⁶¹ This, as we will discuss later, can result in more permanent changes to place such as the creation of bike lanes. These rides would be very difficult, if not impossible, to study without attending because they are usually not documented beyond perhaps a short blip in the news. Moreover, if one sought to examine them from a car or a news report, the meanings of the activity and the place would be construed differently because of the different perspective someone in a car might have about the event or the media frame.

Repeated Reconstruction

Repeated temporary constructions of place may result in long-lasting additions to the meaning of a place. Recall our example of the March on Washington. The presence and memory of bodies gathered in protest at the National Mall has, over time, associated that place with protests and marches. Similarly, as we mentioned above, Critical Mass protests may be related to the shift in meaning for some streets as shared places for cars and bicycles and the construction of bike lanes. Even if protests in places do not result in permanent changes, there may be residual traces of the fissure in meaning, such as the graffiti on Alcatraz.

In another way, the social movement's goal may be to construct a more permanent change in the meaning of place. For example, the Gay Rights Movement often seeks to create gay-friendly and safe places. These places range from full neighborhoods (e.g., West Hollywood, Castro) to gay rights centers, and may in turn serve to legitimize the movement to mainstream audiences. In his analysis of the gay press's verbal attempts (though newspaper stories) to reconstruct the meaning of West Hollywood, Benjamin Forest argues, "The narrative construction of a 'gay city,' and thus the attempt to create an identity based on more than sexual acts, suggests that

the gay press sought to portray gayness as akin to ethnicity, in contrast to homophobic characterizations of gayness as a perversion, sickness, or moral failure.”⁶² These more permanent changes in places do not happen overnight, but are the culmination of years of repeated (re)constructions of meaning. While it is possible to track these changes over time as Forest did in his examination of the gay press’s representation of the place, a researcher’s presence can reveal a more nuanced reading of the subtle changes in the feel of the neighborhood that happened over time by observing changes in the fliers or graffiti, the people and their behaviors, and the businesses in the neighborhood. Because these changes can happen over a long period of time, presence for this form of place in protest can be more difficult than attending a discrete and bounded protest event that will last a few hours or a few days. Although neither of us has engaged in this sort of long-term participant observation as a researcher, one of us lived in San Francisco for over twenty years and observed subtle changes in the Castro district as it solidified its identity as a center of gay rights and subtly shifted to incorporate the broader GLBTQ movement.

Despite the success of some repeated reconstructive efforts, even more permanent reconstructions of place are open to reinterpretation. As Cresswell states, “The new social spaces that result from the transgression of old social spaces will themselves become old social spaces pregnant with the possibility of transgression.”⁶³ In this way, place in protest is always temporary just as places are always subject to struggle over their meanings and consequences.

Step It Up: An Extended Example

Although we have shown that is possible and desirable to study the rhetoric of place in protest without physically being at the protest events, the study of place in protest can be enhanced by participant observation because it allows the researcher to more fully attend to the embodied and sensual aspects of place in protest. This is particularly the case for the first two forms of place-as-rhetoric—building on a pre-existing meaning and temporarily reconstructing meaning through protest. As mentioned above, it can be more difficult to engage in the type of long term participant observation needed to notice repeated constructions that result in more permanent changes in meaning. In order to further our claim about the importance of presence to studying place in protest, we now offer a detailed analysis, using participant observation, of two protest events held in Salt Lake City as part of the Step It Up climate change campaign.⁶⁴ As part of this movement, we participated in two events: a protest using yoga at Liberty Park and a rally at the downtown Washington Square Park in front of the Mayor’s office. Organizers of the two Step It Up events used signs, groups of people, buildings, a stage, streets, and bodies to alter the meaning of the places at which these events were held.

Although we are more interested in using Step It Up as an example of place-as-rhetoric, it is important to note that we observed several instances of place-based rhetoric, particularly at the Washington Square Park event. At this climate change rally, former Mayor Rocky Anderson called for Utahans to enact particular climate

change prevention practices as a means to protect our beautiful natural surroundings. Further, several of the groups that were invited to table at this event evoked various aspects of Utah's landscape as things that could be harmed by climate change and called for people to act to cut carbon emissions in order to save these places. Nationwide Step It Up events used similar claims by talking about places, like the Marshall Islands or the Arctic, that would be and are impacted by global climate change.⁶⁵ As we noted above, place-based arguments are quite common for environmentally focused social movements, and the Step It Up rallies were no exception.

During the Step It Up events we attended, we saw all three kinds of place-as-rhetoric: pre-existing meaning, temporary reconstruction, and repeated reconstruction. Step It Up demonstrates the ways that the three forms of place-as-rhetoric work in concert with each other. Instead of dividing our analysis into separate sections for each of the forms of place-as-rhetoric, we will show how all three interact in one protest event. For example, the pre-existing meanings of a place can constrain efforts to create new meanings, even temporary ones. Additionally, pre-existing meanings can fade in favor of new meanings even when those new meanings are only ever cultivated through temporary events. We also attend to the consequences of place-as-rhetoric by demonstrating how these deployments worked effectively (and in line with the stated intentions of protest organizers) as well as how they can come into conflict with one another.

The downtown event was located at Washington Square Park, which surrounds the City/County Building. Located in the center of downtown Salt Lake City, Washington Square Park and the City/County Building is a place that for many people represents local government, and specifically the mayor. The pre-existing meaning of this place, then, is associated with local government. However, this is not the only meaning associated with the place. Washington Square is perhaps better known by Salt Lakers for the variety of summer festivals that take place in the park during the summer months. The City/County Building and Washington Square Park occupy an entire city block located across the street from the main public library and Library Square. Often summer festivals will reserve these two blocks and close the road between them to make room for celebrations of such things as heritage or the arts. Consistently holding summer festivals in this place over several years reconstructed the meaning of this place to include being a place for festivals. Moreover, because most protest events in the city take place at the State Capitol or Federal Building, Washington Square Park, despite its association with a center of government, is not widely perceived as a place for protests. Thus, Washington Square Park holds competing constructions of place. To reconstruct its meaning as a place of protest, social movement organizers have to contend with ingrained perceptions of the place as both a center of local government and a festival site. On the day of the Step It Up event, we noticed that the place looked and felt different than a normal day because of signs hanging on the perimeter on a fence, booths from invited organizations and businesses, the smell of pizza from a local vendor, a stage, the sounds of music and speeches, an inflatable

jumping gym, and a collection of participants. Our initial impression was that the place looked, smelled, and felt like a festival and not a protest.

The second event we attended was a yoga sun salutation gathering in Liberty Park at the corner of two main thoroughfares leading to the park. Liberty Park is a typical city park with playgrounds, walking and running paths, picnic areas, and playgrounds. People come to the park to engage in individual or small group activities such as biking, playing tennis or football, attending the aviary, holding parties, or drumming in a circle. Protest events are less typical at this park than they are in downtown Salt Lake City. Indeed, besides the Step It Up protest, we have not observed other protest events at this park. In this sense, the organizers of the sun salutation protest had to temporarily reconstruct the meaning of the corner of the park they occupied as a place of protest. The organizer cited her desire to show people that Liberty Park could function as a site of political action as one of her reasons for selecting that location. The place was changed on the day of the Step It Up event by a sign facing the passing cars, a group of people doing yoga, sounds of the organizer guiding participants through a bullhorn, and an information table flanked by two large speakers. All of these physical alterations contributed to an atmosphere different from a usual day. In a basic sense, these factors meant something was happening and served as a reason to attend or at least take notice, which temporarily reconstructed the meaning. Yet, when the rally ended, the park returned to everyday activities. Even though the existing meaning of the park remained, the place successfully communicated a different meaning albeit temporarily.

Place-as-rhetoric does not always support the purposes of the protest organizers. Dominant meanings of a place may limit the possibilities for creating fissures or temporarily reconstructing a place. Places can also create counter messages that undermine or confuse the position of the movement or goal of the event. For example, the Washington Square Park event felt like a festival instead of a protest event. The reasons for this disconnect between the stated purpose of a protest and the festival-like feel of the event are complicated and related to several factors. In an effort to reach a wider audience than those who typically attend environmental protest events in Salt Lake City, one of the organizers told us they specifically attempted to evoke a Woodstock-esque feel to the protest by scheduling music interspersed with political speeches, an outdoor setting, and a gathering of like-minded organizations. In fact, they advertised the event as a "Free Concert" on the flyers and in media outlets. In one sense, the organizers relied on the meaning reconstructed by years of summer festivals to make the event seem welcoming to the general public. However, the dominant understanding of Washington Square Park as a site for non-political festivals combined with the advertisement of the event as a free concert played up the festival aspect and downplayed the protest aspect of the event. Further, the physical layout and feel of the place as we encountered it also emphasized the festival qualities as opposed to protest qualities. The park was fenced in, and police monitored the entrances, a concession to the constraint that participants could not have alcohol unless they created a beer garden and the expectation that all downtown events, especially concerts, will have fences.⁶⁶ As we approached the event,

the first thing we saw was a “Free Concert” sign posted on the temporary chain link fence (see Figure 1). Seeing this sign and the fence was jarring to us. Even though we knew there would be music at the event, we had expected a protest rally (perhaps because we had found out about the event on the Step It Up Website where it was clearly linked with the national Step It Up protest events). Embodied actions at the event also made it feel more like a festival than a rally. Typically, a protest calls forth images of people marching, holding signs, obstructing traffic, or assembling for a protest rally. Yet we noticed a carnivalesque atmosphere with children jumping in a moonwalk, people hula hooping, and a costumed person walking on stilts (see Figures 2 and 3). Beyond these sights, it also sounded and smelled like a festival. Both music and the sound of chattering voices made us feel like we were at a festival as opposed to a protest event where we might expect to hear speeches, protest chants, and less talking among the audience. Although we are not sure exactly what a protest event would smell like (hopefully not like tear gas), having attended many festivals at Washington Square, the smell of food and beer wafting through the air reminded us of those other festivals.

Even when we observed the protest-oriented aspects of the event, they were drowned out by the festival atmosphere. While Mayor Rocky Anderson was on stage explaining why we needed to call on Congress to mandate caps on carbon emissions, we could see the waste produced by disposable containers, hear the complaints of some people who brought protest signs and were initially denied access to the “beer garden” because of them, smell the exhaust of generators ensuring that the children’s moonwalk stayed inflated, notice how few people were actually facing the stage during Anderson’s speech, and feel the confusion of the many messages of this place.



Figure 1. Free concert sign and chain link “beer garden.” Photo taken by Danielle Endres.



Figure 2. Dancing with hula hoops. Photo taken by Deborah Cox Callister. Reproduced with permission.

In addition to our impressions of the event, interviewees reported feeling the same as they usually do when they are there for other concerts and festivals, such as the Arts Festival, the Jazz Festival, and the Living Cultures Festival. By advertising the event as a concert, setting up a fence, selling beer and food, and playing music, Step It Up organizers evoked a festival site in line with an already existing meaning of the



Figure 3. Man on stilts. Photo taken by Deborah Cox Callister. Reproduced with permission.

place. Consequently, the event lacked a protest spirit. This is evidenced by a large number of interviewees who did not know what Step It Up was, or that they were at an event that was one of hundreds in a national response to anthropogenic climate change.

Our experience emphasizes the strength that established norms have on an event when it occurs in a meaningful place. Cresswell confirms,

Place is produced by practice that adheres to (ideological) beliefs about what is the appropriate thing to do. But place reproduces the beliefs that produce it in a way that makes them appear natural, self-evident, and commonsense Thus places are active forces in the reproduction of norms—in the definition of appropriate practice. Place constitutes our ideas about what is appropriate as much as it is constituted by them.⁶⁷

Although the temporary transformation of a place for social movement purposes can significantly challenge expected practices in that place, sometimes the norms of the place are too strong, particularly when the movement plays into them.

By being at these places as the rallies occurred, we obtained a perspective that would have been difficult to ascertain otherwise. While being present can increase the number of rhetorical factors taken into account, it can also mean the difference between being able to study something or not. Significantly, Pezzullo stresses the importance of presence not only to acknowledge those non-verbal, non-visual rhetorical phenomena, but also as a means of documenting marginalized perspectives. She states, “This experiential approach to rhetorical and cultural analysis is, I believe, particularly useful in studying an ‘emergent’ practice such as toxic tours, because it provides the opportunity to examine a side of public discourse that tends to be marginalized in traditional written records.”⁶⁸ Regarding the rallies we attended, relying on media coverage alone would have yielded a very different story, in one case because there was no media coverage of the event (Liberty Park) and in the other case because the media coverage generally stayed on the message of the purpose of the action: a protest rally about climate change (Washington Square).

Implications

Through the analysis of several protest events, we have demonstrated a framework for understanding the importance of place for social movement protest. Rhetoricians have previously discussed what we are calling place-based arguments in which the rhetor invokes a particular place as warrant for a claim. The main contribution of our essay is the discussion of place-as-rhetoric, in which place is not just a discursive resource but is itself rhetorical. That is, the confluence of physical structures, bodies, and symbols in particular locations construct the meaning and consequences of a place. Social movements tactically (re)construct the place in which protests occur in line with their challenges to the status quo. As we have shown, constructions can align with existing meanings of a place or reconstructions can temporarily change the meaning of a place to create a fissure in the dominant meaning of the place. These (re)constructions are not only about meaning, but they also have consequences by confronting, challenging, and acting on people who encounter the protest events.

We have also revealed how these temporary fissures, when repeated over time, can result in more permanent changes in the meaning and consequences of places. We hope that our framework will serve as a starting point for a continued conversation about the role of place in the rhetoric of social movements. Specifically, the study of place in protest has implications for social movement rhetoric, the rhetoric of place, and rhetorical methods.

Place plays an important role in social movements and protest. Our findings suggest that while social movements are discursive movements of meaning over time,⁶⁹ they are also contextualized and situated through particular protest events at particular places. Often these places have rhetorical import, such as the choice of a place commonly associated with protest or an attempt to disrupt a dominant meaning of a particular place. On the other hand, the dominant meanings of some places may limit the potential of a protest to create a fissure in meaning, as the Step It Up rally demonstrates. Putting on protests in particular places may develop a cycle of many movements using that place, which can normalize the meaning of a place as a place of protest, such as the National Mall in Washington. However, designated places of protest can also become a constraint. For example, free speech zones on college campuses often have the result of framing free speech as something that happens only in specific, designated areas. Similarly, urban and suburban zoning laws may confine protests to particular areas and times, so long as protesters obtain a permit for protest. We are not saying that these designated free-speech zones or permits for protest are inherently problematic; indeed, they do sanction and guarantee the possibility of protest in certain places. However, it is also important for movements to protest outside of designated zones if they seek to rupture the meaning of particular places. The establishment of generic protest zones ignores (or perhaps recognizes) the strength that place can have for the success of an argument; they make it possible to confine protest and free speech so that ruptures can be avoided entirely. Critical Mass would not have the same effect if they had to obtain a permit in advance, and the streets were cleared and monitored by the police. Moreover, with the increased attempts to control where protests can and cannot occur through permitting and police presences, McCarthy and McPhail argue that the designated places for protest are often far removed from the target of protest and that the public forum is shrinking.⁷⁰ Further examination of how social movements use place rhetorically may yield creative ways to increase the size of the public forum and create fissures and resistance.

Beyond the importance of our essay for the rhetoric of social movements, there are also implications for the rhetorical study of place in general. Rhetorical scholars have begun to consider place as rhetorical, a move we support. Considering place in protest as a rhetorical artifact calls for more attention to how place can act as a node for understanding how locations, bodies, words, visual symbols, experiences, memories, and dominant meanings all interact to make and remake place. By showing how place in protest is ephemeral, we emphasize that places, even though seemingly permanent because of the presence of built structures, are in constant negotiation. Places in protest challenge the dominant meaning of place by their very nature. Protest is always

out of place (e.g., people taking over streets and preventing normal car traffic) and thus temporarily highlights both the constructed nature of place and that place is under constant negotiation. Place in protest also makes salient the embodied and experiential nature of place. Place subtly changes as bodies move through it, and those bodies make choices (often unconscious) about whether to conform to the expectations of place or transgress those expectations. Yet we can and should recognize the embodied and experiential aspects of place even in studies that do not focus on transgressions of the meaning of place. Blair moves in this direction when she notes how she watched and listened to people as they interacted with the Gateway Arch in St. Louis.⁷¹ Further investigations into the rhetoric of place can increase our understanding of the ways in which rhetoric can be ephemeral, embodied, and experienced in place. Our discussion of place in protest also demands that we grapple with the materiality of rhetoric, not just that material objects and bodies can be rhetorical but also that all rhetoric has material consequences through acting on physical structures and bodies. Our study of place in protest particularly attends to the stylistic and affective aspects of material rhetoric, or the feeling of a place. Continued examination of place in terms of material feeling contributes to the ongoing conversation about rhetoric and materiality by reminding us that materiality always involves bodies and experiences.

Finally, our examination of place in protest demonstrates the value of researcher presence in the study of place. Although many methods can be used to examine the rhetoric of place, we suggest that the use of participant observation can enhance the ability of rhetorical critics to understand the experiential, embodied, and ephemeral aspects of place (re)construction. We used participant observation and interviewing along with traditional textual analysis to show how both approaches can reveal important things about the rhetoric of place. However, textual analysis relies on the existence of collected artifacts and can only go so far. Participant observation and researcher presence, in line with Pezzullo's scholarship, can assist the critic in making claims about extra-textual aspects of place. Physically being present at an event and incorporating qualitative methods is necessary to feel present and collect multi-sensory artifacts. Taking notes and recording is helpful, but also learning to smell, feel, hear, taste, and see rhetoric all around is necessary because otherwise ephemeral and material rhetorical devices remain unnoticed. These methods offer the opportunity to critique on-the-ground rhetoric, rather than media representations of it (as image events would require us to do); they provide the means to interrogate the undocumented (or under-documented) aspects of place, which is particularly relevant for ephemeral social movement protest.

Notes

- [1] Tim Cresswell, *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology and Transgression* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 164.
- [2] For example: Cresswell, *In Place/Out of Place*; John D. McCarthy and Clark McPhail, "Places of Protest: The Public Forum in Principle and Practice," *Mobilization: An International*

- Journal* 11, no. 2 (2006): 229–47; Deborah G. Martin and Byron Miller, “Space and Contentious Politics,” *Mobilization: An International Journal* 8, no. 2 (2003): 143–56; William H. Sewell, “Space in Contentious Politics,” in *Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*, ed. Ronald R. Aminzade, Jack A. Goldstone, Doug McAdam, Elizabeth J. Perry, William H. Sewell Jr., and Charles Tilly, 51–88 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- [3] For example: Manuel Castells, *The City and Grassroots: A Cross Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983); Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984); David Harvey, *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference* (Cambridge MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1997); Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson Smith (Malden, MA: Blackwell Press, 1974); Doreen Massey, *For Space* (London: Sage Publications, 2005).
- [4] For example: Donovan Conley and Greg Dickinson, ed., “Space, Matter, Mediation, and the Prospects of Democracy [special issue],” *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 27, no. 1 (2010); Greg Dickinson, “Memories for Sale: Nostalgia and the Construction of Identity in Old Pasadena,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83, no. 1 (1997): 1–27; Greg Dickinson, “Joe’s Rhetoric: Finding Authenticity at Starbucks,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32, no. 4 (2002): 5–27; Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian Ott, ed., *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010); Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki, “Memory and myth at the Buffalo Bill Museum,” *Western Journal of Communication* 69, no. 2 (2005): 85–108; Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki, “Spaces of Remembering and Forgetting: The Reverent Eye/I at the Plains Indian Museum,” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 3, no. 1 (2006): 27–47; Raymie McKerrow, “Space and Time in the Postmodern Polity,” *Western Journal of Communication* 63, no. 3 (1999): 271–90; Sonja Modesti, “Home Sweet Home: Tattoo Parlors as Postmodern Spaces of Agency,” *Western Journal of Communication* 72, no. 3 (2008): 197–212; Della Pollack, ed., *Exceptional Spaces: Essays in Performance and History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998); Raka Shome, “Space Matters: The Power and Practice of Space,” *Communication Theory* 13, no. 1 (2003): 39–56; Jessie Stewart and Greg Dickinson, “Enunciating Locality in the Postmodern Suburb: FlatIron Crossing and the Colorado Lifestyle,” *Western Journal of Communication* 72, no. 3 (2008): 280–307; Andrew F. Wood, *City Ubiquitous: Place, Communication, and the Rise of Omnitopia* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2009).
- [5] Phil Hubbard, Rob Kitchin, and Gill Valentine, ed., *Key Thinkers on Space and Place* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004), 3.
- [6] Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, 26.
- [7] Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, 1–67; Massey, *For Space*, 11–12.
- [8] Massey, in particular, challenges her readers to think beyond the distinction between place as particular and space as abstract. Specifically, she cautions against the assumption that space is not concrete, which can follow from the distinction between place as particular and space as abstract (see p. 6, 68). While we value Massey’s thought experiment, we do not agree that we should abandon the distinction. We see value in the distinction between place and space as long as we recognize that the distinction does not mean that place and space are separate and unrelated. Place and space are always interconnected. Moreover, we believe that it is still possible to see space as concrete even when we view it as more general or abstract than particular locations. Places are concrete particular locations, but spaces are also concrete social structures.
- [9] Carole Blair, Greg Dickinson and Brian L. Ott, “Introduction: Rhetoric/Memory/Place,” in *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*, ed. Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian Ott (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010), 23.

- [10] This is similar to Blair, Dickinson and Ott's focus on memory places as rhetorical artifacts. Blair, Dickinson and Ott, "Introduction," 22–34.
- [11] McKerrow, "Space and Time," 271.
- [12] McKerrow, "Space and Time," 272. See also Shome, "Space Matters," 39.
- [13] Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969). See also: Mari Boor Tonn, Valerie A. Endress, and John N. Diamond, "Hunting and Heritage on Trial: A Dramatistic Debate Over Tragedy, Tradition, and Territory," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 79, no. 2 (1993): 165–81.
- [14] Lloyd F. Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 1, no. 1 (1968): 1–14.
- [15] Yi-Fu Tuan, *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974).
- [16] Aristotle, *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, trans., George A. Kennedy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 46.
- [17] Martha Solomon, "The Things We Study: Texts and their Interactions," *Communication Monographs* 60, no. 1 (1993): 62–68. See also: Raymie McKerrow, "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis," *Communication Monographs*, no. 256 (1989): 91–111; Michael Calvin McGee, "Text, Context, and the Fragmentation of Contemporary Culture," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 54, no. 3 (1990): 274–89; Philip Wander, "The Ideological Turn in Modern Criticism," *Central States Speech Journal* 34, no. 1 (1983): 1–18.
- [18] See endnote 4.
- [19] Although we will not specifically engage in the materiality debate, to understand the range of perspectives on materiality and rhetoric, see: Barbara A. Biesecker and John Louis Lucaites, ed., *Rhetoric, Materiality & Politics* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2009); Carole Blair, "Contemporary US Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric's Materiality," in *Rhetorical Bodies*, ed. Jack Selzer and Sharon Crowley (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999): 16–57; Dana L. Cloud, "The Materiality of Discourse as Oxymoron: A Challenge to Critical Rhetoric," *Western Journal of Communication* 58, no. 3 (Summer 1994): 141–63; Ronald Walter Greene, "Another Materialist Rhetoric," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 15, no. 1 (1998): 21–41; Richard Rogers, "Overcoming the Objectification of Nature in Constitutive Theories: Toward a Transhuman, Materialist Theory of Communication," *Western Journal of Communication* 62, no. 3 (1998), 244–72.
- [20] Blair, "Contemporary US Memorials," 21–23.
- [21] Cresswell, *In Place/Out of Place*, 13. See also: Gerard Kyle and Garry Chick, "The Social Construction of a Sense of Place," *Leisure Sciences* 29, no. 3 (2007): 209–25.
- [22] Blair, "Contemporary US Memorials," 23.
- [23] See for example: Kevin Michael DeLuca, *Image Politics: The New Rhetoric of Environmental Activism* (New York: Guilford Press, 1999); Christine Harold, "Tracking Heroin Chic: The Abject Body Reconfigures the Rational Argument," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 36, no. 2 (1999): 65–76; Gerard A. Hauser, "Incongruous Bodies: Arguments for Personal Sufficiency and Public Insufficiency," *Argumentation & Advocacy* 36, no. 1 (1999): 1–8; Debra Hawhee, *Bodily Arts: Rhetoric and Athletics in Ancient Greece* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005); Raymie E. McKerrow, "Corporeality and Cultural Rhetoric: A Site for Rhetoric's Future," *Southern Communication Journal* 63, no. 4 (1998): 315–28.
- [24] Dickinson argues for a tripartite relationship between space, bodies, and subjectivities. Dickinson, "Joe's Rhetoric," 9.
- [25] Hubbard et al., *Key Thinkers*, 6.
- [26] De Certeau, 99. It is important to note that de Certeau uses the terms place and space in a different way than most scholars. He argues that "space is a practiced place" (117), an inversion of the relationship we have laid out. Nonetheless, his point highlights the relationship between bodies, spaces, and places.

- [27] Phaedra Pezzullo, "Resisting 'National Breast Cancer Awareness Month': The Rhetoric of Counterpublics and their Cultural Performances," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 89, no. 4 (2003): 345–65.
- [28] This references Blair's argument that that physical structures have a range of durability, but none will endure forever. Blair, "Contemporary US Memorial," 37.
- [29] Tim Cresswell, *Place: A Short Introduction* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 5.
- [30] Hubbard et al., *Key Thinkers*, 5.
- [31] See especially: Pezzullo, "Resisting;" Phaedra Pezzullo, *Toxic Tourism: Rhetorics of Pollution, Travel, and Environmental Justice* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2007); Phaedra Pezzullo, "Performing Critical Interruptions: Stories, Rhetorical Invention, and the Environmental Justice Movement," *Western Journal of Communication* 65, no. 1 (2001): 1–25.
- [32] Carole Blair, "Reflections on Criticism and Bodies: Parables from Public Places," *Western Journal of Communication* 65, no. 3 (2001): 271–94.
- [33] Blair, "Reflections on Criticism;" Dickinson, Ott, and Aoki, "Memory and Myth;" Dickinson, Ott, and Aoki, "Spaces of Remembering;" Danielle Endres, Leah Sprain, and Tarla Rai Peterson, "The Necessity of Praxis in Environmental Communication Research: A Case Study of the Step It Up 2007 National Research Project" *Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture* 2, no. 2 (2008): 237–45; Christine Garlough, "On the Political Uses of Folklore: Performance and Grassroots Feminism in West India," *Journal of American Folklore* 121, no. 480 (Spring 2008), 167–91; Pezzullo, "Resisting;" Pezzullo, *Toxic Tourism*.
- [34] Michael T. Heaney and Fabio Rojas, "The Place of Framing: Multiple Audiences and Antiwar Protests Near Fort Bragg," *Qualitative Sociology* 29, no. 4 (2006), 488.
- [35] Thomas J. St. Antoine, "Making Heaven out of Hell: New Urbanism and the Refutation of Suburban Spaces," *Southern Communication Journal* 72, no. 2 (2007), 127–44.
- [36] See for example: J. Robert Cox, "The Die is Cast: Topical and Ontological Dimensions of the Locus of Irreparable," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68, no. 3 (1982): 227–39; Christine Oravec, "Conservatism vs. Preservationism: The 'Public Interest' in the Hetch Hetchy Controversy," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70, no. 4 (1984): 444–58.
- [37] Cox, "The Die is Cast."
- [38] Cox, "The Die is Cast."
- [39] Lawrence Buell, *Writing for an Endangered World: Literature, Culture, and Environment in the US and Beyond* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 56.
- [40] R. Ingebretsen, *History of Glen Canyon and the Glen Canyon Institute* (n.d.). Retrieved July 24, 2007 from <http://www.glencañon.org/library/articles/presaccount.php>, 4.
- [41] Tuan, *Topophilia*, 4.
- [42] Carole Blair, "Civil Rights/Civil Sites: '... Until Justice Rolls Down Like Waters,'" *Carroll C. Arnold Distinguished Lecture 2006* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2007).
- [43] W. H. Sewell Jr., "Space in Contentious Politics" in *Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*, ed., Ronald R. Aminzade, Jack A. Goldstone, Doug McAdam, Elizabeth J. Perry, William H. Sewell Jr., and Charles Tilly, 51–89 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- [44] Heaney and Rojas, "The Place of Framing," 489.
- [45] Louis Farrakhan, "Transcript from Minister Louis Farrakhan's remarks at the Million Man March," *CNN.com*, October 17, 1995. Retrieved March 30, 2009 from <http://www-cgi.cnn.com/US/9510/megamarch/10-16/transcript/>
- [46] Farrakhan, "Transcript," 10.
- [47] Mary Dejevsky, "Million Moms to Protest over Guns" *The Independent*, May 13, 2000. Retrieved March 30, 2009 from Lexis Nexis database.
- [48] Katharine Q. Seelye, "A Civil Rights Party on the Mall," *New York Times*, January 17, 2009. Retrieved March 30, 2009 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/18/us/politics/18civil.html>

- [49] Cresswell, *In Place/Out of Place*, 9.
- [50] Cresswell, *In Place/Out of Place*, 8.
- [51] Cresswell, *Place: A Short Introduction*, 35.
- [52] Benjamin Forest, "West Hollywood as Symbol: The Significance of Place in the Construction of a Gay Identity," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 13, no. 2 (1995): 133–57.
- [53] Kevin M. DeLuca and Jennifer Peebles, "From the Public Sphere to Public Screen: Democracy, Activism, and the 'Violence' of Seattle," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 19, no. 2 (2002): 125–51.
- [54] Isaac West, "Performing Resistance in/from the Kitchen: The Practice of Maternal Pacifist Politics and LaWISP's Cookbooks," *Women's Studies in Communication* 30, no. 3 (2007), 370.
- [55] Isaac West, "PISSAR's Critically Queer and Disabled Politics," *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 7, no. 2 (2010), 164.
- [56] Troy Johnson, Duane Champagne, and Joane Nagel, "American Indian Activism and Transformations: Lessons from Alcatraz," in *American Indian Activism: Alcatraz to the Longest Walk*, ed., Troy Johnson, Joane Nagel, and Duane Champagne, 9–44 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 27.
- [57] Indians of All Nations, "The Alcatraz Proclamation to the Great White Father and His People" in *Red Power: The American Indians' Fight for Freedom*, 2 edition, ed., Alvin M. Josephy Jr., Joane Nagel, and Troy Johnson, 39–43 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 40.
- [58] Cynthia Duquette Smith and Teresa Bergman, "You Were on Indian Land: Alcatraz Island as Recalcitrant Memory Space," in *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*, ed., Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian Ott, 160–88 (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010), 162.
- [59] This is based on one of the author's observations during her last visit to Alcatraz in 2000.
- [60] Pezzullo, *Toxic Tourism*.
- [61] Joseph Heath and Andrew Potter, *Nation of Rebels: Why Counterculture became Consumer Culture* (New York: Harper Business, 2004), 286.
- [62] Forest, "West Hollywood as Symbol," 134.
- [63] Cresswell, *In Place/Out of Place*, 176.
- [64] Step It Up involved actions across the US in 2007 to challenge Congress to pass legislation that would ensure that we would cut carbon emissions by 80 percent by 2050. It is a specific campaign within the larger movement to mitigate global warming.
- [65] Danielle Endres, Leah Sprain, and Tarla Rai Peterson, ed., *Social Movement to Address Climate Change: Local Steps for Global Change* (Amherst, NY: Cambria Press, 2009).
- [66] One of the authors asked a police officer about the fences. His response was that they had "to keep the beer in and the smoking out," essentially creating a "beer garden."
- [67] Cresswell, *In Place/Out of Place*, 16.
- [68] Pezzullo, *Toxic Tourism*, 18.
- [69] Michael Calvin McGee, "Social Movement: Phenomenon or Meaning?" *Central States Speech Journal* 31, no. 4 (1980): 233–44.
- [70] McCarthy and McPhail, *Place of Protest*, 229–32; 243–44.
- [71] Blair, "Reflections on Criticism," 283–85.