

ENGL 788 The Rhetoric of Violence (Topics in Rhetorical Criticism and Theory)
Class Meeting: Monday 6:30 – 9:20
Location: HH 150
Professor Frankie Condon
Office: Hagey Hall 147
Email: fcondon@uwaterloo.ca
Telephone: 416.768.4253
Office Hours: Monday 4:00 – 5:30 and by appointment

Course Description

Many years ago, when I was a graduate student, I was persuaded by my dissertation advisor to submit my work to the editor of a book series: a man who was at the time very well known in the field of composition and rhetoric. My dissertation dealt with the writing classroom as a site of institutional and symbolic violence and with the possibilities, given that context, for performative nonviolent pedagogies – that is for teaching that both critiques and resists violence and teaches for a more peaceful world. The editor responded that the term “violence” is so overused that it cannot be theorized and nonviolence so naïve an idea as to be absurd.

The response stung me. And so, I laid aside my dissertation after it was finished and began to do and re-theorize the work I had begun in it using other terms. But I never thought he was right and I still don't. The problem of defining violence, of historicizing and theorizing the ideological conditions for and material conditions of violence, and the rhetorical means by which the reproduction of violence is assured is not to be avoided because it is hard or complicated. Nor is the apparent ubiquity of violence a reason not to study it.

This course takes up a single central question: how are individuals and groups persuaded to tolerate as well as to participate in violence? To be clear, I do not know the answer, nor do I expect any of us will know the answer in any definitive sense by the end of the term. Instead, my hope is that, together, we will work at the intersections and within the interstices of critical theory, rhetorical theory, and the creative arts to take up this question: its grounds, the definitional and conceptual terms it raises, and its implications for the work any of us may do as scholars, teachers, activists, and as citizens.

The assigned readings situate this question in a large (big-here, long-now) sense and provide address of it from a variety of perspectives. My own conviction is, however, that the purpose of both theory and art is not merely to represent or describe the world, but to change it. Whether in the projects you choose to work at over the course of the term or in your teaching or in your everyday lives, I hope that you will be able to use your learning in this course not merely to theorize the world around you and the means and forms of persuasion to which we are all subject, but also to perform yourself and your relations more justly. The course will be discussion-based, rather than driven by lecture. I hope that you will freely and courageously bring your own insights, questions, lived experience, and intellectual and political commitments to the work we do together during our discussions and that you will produce work in the class that furthers your own interests, needs, and commitments, that moves those interests, needs, and commitments beyond the abstract to the real, material, and the lived, and that contributes to the collective learning of the class.

Required Readings

Books

Arendt, Hannah. *On Violence*. Mariner Books, 2001.

Butler, Judith. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. Verso, 2006.

Condon, Frankie. *I Hope I Join the Band: Narrative, Affiliation, and Antiracist Rhetoric*. Utah State University Press, 2012.

Zizek, Slavoj. *Violence*. Picador, 2008.

Excerpts and Articles (On Reserve and Learn)

Bourdieu, Pierre and Loic Wacquant. "Symbolic Violence": **pdf**

Crosswhite, James. *Deep Rhetoric: Philosophy, Reason, Violence, Justice, Wisdom*. The University of Chicago Press, 2013. Introduction and Chapters 1 and 2 (pp 1 – 105): **pdf**.

Fanon, Franz. "Concerning Violence." Excerpted from *The Wretched of the Earth*. Constance Farrington, translator. New York: Grove Weidenfeld: **pdf**.

Power, Samantha. "Bystanders to Genocide." *The Atlantic Monthly*, September 2001: **pdf**.

Lyons, Scott. "Rhetorical Sovereignty: What do American Indians Want from Writing." *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 51, No. 3 (Feb., 2000), pp. 447-468: **pdf**.

Vizenor, Gerald. ...

King, Elizabeth. ...

Martin Luther King (power?)

Althusser, Louis. *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. Pdf.

Said, Edward. "Identity, Negation, and Violence." *New Left Review* 1/171 September – October, 1988: **pdf**.

Course Assignments

- Bi-weekly meeting with Frankie: each week, I will meet with half of you, either individually or in a small group. Individual meetings will be scheduled for the term on the first day of class, as will small group meetings. Unforeseen circumstances will, of course, arise, and we'll deal with those as they come up. We'll use the individual and small group meetings to talk about your reading of the course materials – where you are excited or interested, confused or troubled. We'll discuss the design of your projects and your progress on them. We can also use this time to talk about any concerns you may have about how the course is going.
- Teach us: during the first half of the term, each of you should find and “read” one outside source that you bring to the class – teaching us how this reading deepens, extends, or complicates the assigned readings and/or our discussion of them. I urge you to look for rhetorical theory and criticism from non-western traditions and/or produced by scholars historically excluded from the western rhetorical tradition and its canon, and/or texts that provide an opportunity for the class to better understand the critical contributions of non-western rhetorical theory and critical practice. Materials for this assignment might include scholarly source material (an published article in an area that interests you, for example), a twitter feed or stream or other social media, a documentary or other film, art, poetry, a novel or short story. In short, find a source that will not only further your interests and project, but that will also contribute to the learning all of us are able to accomplish in the course.
- Final project: Each of you should complete a significant project over the course of the term. Projects may include a traditional scholarly essay, a hypertext, a short film or other work of art. In short, I will support you to the best of my ability in designing and executing a project for this course that feels fulfilling and important to you, and that furthers your scholarly, activist, pedagogical interests and needs. We will begin discussing your projects in our first individual meetings and will continue discussing them throughout the term. I have reserved several classes at the end of term both for workshopping projects and for showing or discussing them with the class. If you choose to do a maker- or creative project, you should plan to write a short essay theorizing your work and its relation to our course readings and class discussions. If you choose to produce a more traditional scholarly essay, you should plan to compose and share an author's note describing your process, what you have learned, and how that learning connects to the course readings and our discussions.

Course Grading

I am concerned that your grades for this course reflect not only my judgement of the exchange value of the work you accomplish, but also the use value of that work – to your ongoing graduate study as well as to the work you hope to do in the future. Toward this end, I would like to use one of our individual meetings at mid-term, and our final meeting at the end of term to talk about grading and about your grades in the course, in particular. To be clear, I do not intend our conversation to be an opportunity for me to school you in your failures and pronounce what your grade will be. Nor do I intend our conversation to take the form of a negotiation in which either of us is forced to compromise in order to come to agreement. Instead, I hope our conversation will be one in which we may talk together openly and honestly about what you have learned, how you have learned, how well you have met your own expectations for yourself as a student, and how well you have worked to your own potential as you understand it. I will talk with you about what I have learned from and with you, about the quality of your contributions to the learning of your classmates as I perceive those contributions, about what I perceive as the potential of your work (your contributions to class discussion, your teaching, and your final project) as well as challenges I hope you will continue to address even after our course together is completed. I believe – based on past experience with this grading practice – that we will come to agreement on both a midterm and final grade. In the event that we do not agree, we can decide together how to proceed: whether through some form of mediation, or by combining our two different grades to come to a single grade, or through some other means to be determined together.

Finally, we will be reading and talking about politics, about political philosophy and rhetoric throughout the term. My conviction is that there is no politically neutral, objective, or politically inert position any of us might occupy. The choices we make with regard to which facts we acknowledge as facts, which claims we address as “scientific” knowledge, as well as our convictions about what may constitute moral or universal truths are all political. Even “I don’t know” and “I don’t care” are politically charged claims. I will be clear about my political and moral convictions. It does not follow, however, that I will expect you to agree or adopt my positions; I will not. I may challenge you, just as you may challenge me to articulate positions we hold more clearly, support them more fully, or examine more carefully the implications of the positions we hold. Our challenge – and I do mean *our* challenge – will be to engage one another in such conversations with care, with respect, and with kindness. Together, we will need to learn to value not only agreement, but also dissent. We will need to learn what kindness means in a context in which we value dissent for the opportunities it presents to learn, and to respect the dissenter even and especially when we do not, in the end, come to agreement. As we work through the grading process throughout the term, we will talk about the quality of any dissent you offer: about its grounding assumptions and reason, the ethos of your articulations of dissent, and the timeliness and tactical or strategic value of that dissent. You will not be graded, nor should you grade yourselves on the degree to which you agree with my politics or the politics of your classmates.

As you consider your grades throughout the term, consider these queries regarding the quality of your labour:

- The quality of your preparation prior to each class (did you read the assigned work, think about what you read prior to our class discussion, come to class with insights to share and questions to pose?);
- The quality of your presence in the class (did you attend regularly and participate fully? Did you embody an active presence with and for your classmates?)
- The quality of your agency as a learner (were you an active participant in your own learning? Did you ask the questions that emerged for you? Did you explore those questions with me and with your classmates as an agent of your own learning?)
- The quality of your engagement as a student (what are your expectations for yourself in a course such as ours? How well did you meet those expectations? What did you do well and in what ways might you have struggled? Did you ask for help when or to the extent that you struggled?)
- The quality of your engagement with me (did you attend your individual and small group meetings with me? Did you bring your interest and engagement in the course as well as your questions and your concerns to those meetings? Did you ask me for help – understanding that to ask for help is a sign of curiosity, interest, engagement, and desire to learn – when you needed it?)
- The quality of your teaching moment in class (did you choose a text that would be of interest and meet the needs and interests of your classmates as well as your own needs and interests? Did you present that text in ways that invited your classmates to a conversation with you about the questions that text raises and the insights it offers? Did you address that text in the fullness of its complexity and nuance?)
- The quality of your final project (did you choose a project that would challenge you and provide an opportunity for you to learn something you don’t already know or believe? Did you engage in the work required to complete your project to the best of your ability – managing your time wisely, applying yourself fully to the tasks associated with that project, and accomplishing a project that contributed meaningfully to your own learning as well as to the learning of your classmates and me?)
- The quality of your care and support for your classmates in the context of a learning community (did you recognize your fellow students as co-learners? Did you allow yourself to learn from as well as with them well and deeply? Did you make meaningful contributions to their learning? And did you help to create and sustain conditions in which all of us might

learn by listening with care, recognizing and acknowledging the needs of your fellow students, and by honouring their perspectives, knowledge, needs and interests?)

I encourage you to use these queries to guide you as you move through the course, returning to them throughout the term to consider how you are doing. We may use the queries as a guide when we meet together to discuss grading both at mid-term and at the close of the semester.

Course Calendar

Week	Reading	Topic	Activity
12 September	Crosswhite, Althusser	Rhetoric, demonstration, and ambiguity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wicked problems • Monkey mind • The struggle over exigence 	Course Introduction and discussion; scheduling of individual and small group meetings
19 September	Arendt	Rhetoric of violence and the functionary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obedience and the power of <i>as if</i> • Simulations of reason • Simulations of love 	
26 September	Zizek	Rhetoric of violence as abstraction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstraction and the making of the Other • Absence and the suffering of others • Becoming violence 	
26 September	Said, Fanon, Power	Rhetoric of violence as abstraction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstraction and the making of the Other • Absence and the suffering of others • Becoming violence 	
3 October	Butler	Rhetoric of violence and propaganda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foreclosures of the mind • The sacred and the profane • Subjectivity and the subjugation of the will 	
10 October			Thanksgiving and Study Days
17 October	Bourdieu	Rhetoric of violence and propaganda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foreclosures of the mind • The sacred and the profane • Subjectivity and the subjugation of the will 	
24 October	Condon	Rhetoric, identity, affiliation, and disaffiliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imperfect past and future perfect • Story and affiliation • The braided narrative 	
31 October	Condon, King, MLK	Resisting rhetorics and the theatre of violence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pupil • As through the eyes of others • Embodied rhetorics of resistance 	
7 November	Vizenor, Lyons	Rhetorical Sovereignty and the making of thick relations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The place of spirit • Decolonizing consciousness • The making of meaning in a long now 	
14 November		Project workshopping	
21 November		Project workshopping	
28 November		Project showcases	
5 December		Project showcases and celebration	

STATEMENT OF TEACHING PHILOSOPHY

Frankie Condon

Fall 2016

For many years, I have been both moved and inspired by a question posed to Mary Rose O'Reilly by one of her professors, Ihab Hassan: "Is it possible to teach English so that people stop killing each other?" (*The Peaceable Classroom* 9) Removed from the social and educational context in which the question was originally posed, however - a widespread, collective recognition of the brutality and senselessness of war during the Vietnam era - the pairing of the teaching of English with peacemaking is more likely to provoke confusion than insight among readers of a statement of teaching philosophy such as this one. To understand whether or how there might be any sort of intersection between the study of English - of rhetoric and writing in particular - and the transformation of human relations requires something more than allowing the query to stand, functionally, as a rhetorical question.

In his book, *The Geometry of Violence*, criminologist Harold Pepinsky, argues that violence plays out along a spectrum of human relations ranging from the least affiliative and most violent to the most affiliative and least violent. Societies and cultures with expansive definitions of affiliation and higher valuations of affinity, care, contingency and mutuality are less likely to be riven by either systemic violence (e.g. political or social violence) or by widespread patterns of individual violence. The study of rhetoric and writing, it seems to me, constitutes one means by which we may examine, engage, and extend the critical, analytical, interpretive, performative and communicative means by which we have historically made and continue to make our relations: preserving and reproducing conditions produced by existing or inherited relations or, alternatively, creatively resisting and shifting or transforming those relations.

That the process of insertion into existing social relations and, by extension, into particular perspectival horizons begins at birth and continues throughout our lives is true. It does not necessarily follow, however, that we possess no agency within those relations; we can, in fact, shift, alter or even transform those relations. How we do this work, by what means, within what limits, for what purposes, and to what effect are questions with which I am most concerned both as a scholar and as a teacher.

There are, Linda Alcoff notes, two aspects to what we might understand as social identity: "our socially perceived self within the systems of perception and classification and the networks of community in which we live;" and our *lived subjectivity* or who we understand and experience ourselves as being (*Visible Identities* 93). Rather than representing these two aspects of social identity in binary terms (exterior and interior or embodied and felt, for example), Alcoff asks us to consider the ways and degrees to which disparate experiences of being a self and of being called to perform *as if* one is a particular sort of self fail to map neatly onto one another. She asks readers to notice and make sense of the discontinuities among and between the range of experiences that constitute our being in and of the world. While we cannot possess objective understanding of our lives as we live them, as Gadamer points out, our situatedness in place, time, and experience do enable ways of knowing. We are capable of what Gadamer terms *effective historical consciousness*: capable, in other words, of "reflective awareness of the horizon of our situation." We are capable of recognizing that horizon as fluid and dynamic rather than static and given, and capable of recognizing that this horizon is not the only determinant of our understanding and our ability to make meaning. (Alcoff 95)

My aim in the classroom is to invite students to notice, wonder at, and engage critically the power not only of language, itself, but of particular rhetorical modes and strategies for communicating (and performing) the known and the production of new knowledge. I challenge

students to question and critique representations of social relations as natural and given and to recognize the ways and degrees to which these relations are, in fact, the products of human labour. I want students to recognize the ways in which they are always, already knowledge producers and rhetorical agents in the construction of meaning. I want also to support and sustain students as they recognize the degree to which as they exercise rhetorical agency they are in fact participating in the reproduction or potentially at least the struggle to transform social relations. I want to support and sustain students, providing them with appropriate conceptual and practical scaffolding as they acquire broader and deeper fluencies in the range of analytical, interpretive, performative and communicative modes of engagement or acts that constitute the means by which individual and collective perspectival horizons are recognized and shifted for themselves and others. I hope to teach my students also to recognize the degree to which these modes of engagement are constituted by complex, ongoing processes of affiliation and disaffiliation or the making and unmaking, creating, inhabiting, and destroying or transforming of human relations. In other words, the study of rhetoric is also necessarily the study of how human relations are forged in and through language: shaped, enabled, and constrained through our representations of ourselves, of others, and of that which constitutes knowledge within particular contexts or communities. The study of rhetoric should engage all of us in the study not only of what is said and how, but also toward what ends and for whose benefit. We make and claim our relations as we compose across a wide variety of contexts asserting the legitimacy of our presence as rhetors and knowledge producers within communities to which we do or hope to belong. We may pass on the ideological as well as the intellectual legacies of our forebears, but we may also transform those legacies as we compose. I hope students leave my courses with an expanded sense of their intellectual and rhetorical antecedents as well as with a much greater sense of their own contingency, their interdependence and the mutuality of their needs and interests across disparate visible and invisible identities and social and lived subjectivities. Furthermore, I hope that students leave my courses with a greatly enlarged sense of their capability and responsibility as scholars, rhetoricians and writers, as citizens of the world, to those who will come after us.

I recognize the political and hence contested nature of the work I aim to do as a teacher. I believe that the purpose of critical theory is not only to explain the world, but also to change it. By extension, I believe that the purpose of writing as an activity central to higher education curricula is not merely to prove that one has learned, but to contribute meaningfully to the conditions in which learning is possible: to participate in the collective creation and sustenance of learningful relations as well as in the making of meaning and the production of new and usable knowledge.

Often, I believe, critical pedagogy is misunderstood and misrepresented as being inherently coercive and critical teachers as being engaged in the political inculcation of their students. These misconstruals are, I believe, an effect of an inadequate understanding of the range of conceptions of change and change-agency that inform the theory and practice of critical pedagogy. While I am not dismissive of the power of the *agon* in the cultivation of rhetorical agency or of oppositional pedagogy (a praxis distinct from the tradition of critical pedagogy) per se, these are not modes or approaches that play a significant role in my own teaching. I tend to see both oppositional pedagogy and the *agon* as being tactically useful on occasion, but more generally ineffective (and often dishonest) in argument, persuasion, as well as in teaching and learning. Neither am I terribly interested in the pedagogical potential of traditional practices of negotiation, which I believe preserve the status quo by, in effect, purchasing or manufacturing consent. Instead, as a teacher I labour to both enact and teach an array of interconnected intellectual and rhetorical processes that, taken together, constitute both a rhetorical appeal and a rhetorical means by which shifts in perspectival horizon and, consequently, in the character and quality of human relations might be initiated.

In brief, these processes might be categorized into four types: those associated with *decentering*; those associated with *nuancing*; those associated with *kairotic engagement*; and those associated with *readiness*. *Decentering* is the ongoing process of listening (recognizing and acknowledging) to the meaning-making practices of others while, simultaneously recognizing and honouring difference by dis-placing one's self (social and lived subjectivities) from the center of meaning. I understand the process of *decentering* as a continuous revisioning of the quality of one's presence with/for and attentiveness to the other. *Nuancing* is the ongoing process of transmemoration and witness: of situating one's own story of being and becoming - of social and lived subjectivity - in relationship to the histories, epistemologies, and rhetorical traditions of others without privileging one's own story or using that story to overwrite, subvert, or appropriate the stories others might tell. *Kairotic engagement* is the ongoing process of recognizing, articulating, revising, and re-articulating the rhetorical exigence that attends analysis, interpretation, critique, creative intervention, and the making of meaning or new knowledge; that is, of continual engagement with the ways and degrees to which problems, contradictions, or questions are amenable to address (or redress) through discourse. *Readiness* is the ongoing process of cultivating and sustaining a mindscape capable of wonderment: capable of being surprised by and interested in the world, in why the world is as it is and how it came to be so, and in the marvellous variety of ways in which the world might be created, inhabited, and represented by others. Here I understand "interest" in the double sense of being both intrigued by others - by what others say and know and do - and being needful of affiliation and of the recognition and care co-created through affiliative relationships with others. Finally, however, none of these processes taken singly or together nor the variety of in-class discussions and activities and writing assignments that I might engage in any given course seem sufficient to me to justify a claim that mine is a critical praxis absent an ongoing, reflective consciousness of the constancy of failure to the endeavours of teaching and learning and a shared commitment to learn from failure. That is, *humility* is central to any meaningful practice of critical pedagogy and integral to *humility* is the recognition that failure is inevitable. I strive for willingness to learn from failure and, when appropriate and ethical, to make pedagogical failures visible to students such that they might engage reflectively and learningfully with them as well.

Frequently, critics of critical pedagogy assert that the greatest risks associated with this approach to teaching are that students will feel pressured to adopt the politics of their teachers in order to succeed in the course or, alternatively, be so alienated by the fact of their political differences with their teacher that learning becomes impossible. My own experience suggests a different kind of risk or challenge altogether. To engage - to really engage - critically in the study of writing as a communicative act requires that we study the epistemological and rhetorical means by which knowledge is produced and disseminated. To engage - to really engage - critically in the study of writing as a communicative act requires that we study public rhetorics that, by design, shape how we think, perform our selves, and act in relation to others. But to engage - to really engage - at all in any of these studies requires both interest and a sense of need for learning. The greatest challenge I face in the classroom is the extent to which students tend to confuse exchange-value and use-value or, more frequently, to believe that the only thing to be gained from any given writing assignment or any writing course is the exchange-value represented by a grade. My challenge is not that students adopt my politics in service of achieving a good grade; they just don't nor do I require or expect them to. My challenge is that some of my students have learned too well the lesson that school is boring; that the subjects about which one might write as well as the activity of writing are boring; that being curious is boring; that the only knowledge worth acquiring in school are the usable skills that might be associated with workplace competencies and that learning those is boring. Too many of my students have been schooled for years by the ringing of bells that not only tell them it's time to move from one classroom to another, but also to shut off the past moment from the current one--that there

are no integral or fruitful intersections, continuities, or intriguing discontinuities between the subjects that they study (Gatto 1-5). The interferences of an audit culture in public education seem to have had the prevailing effect of teaching students that the value of learning and the quality of one's education is measured by the number and range of information bytes emptied of nuance and complexity one might acquire that can be easily and quickly performed and judged.

And so perhaps it is most accurate to say that my greatest challenge as a teacher is to create and sustain conditions in which joy is possible in the classrooms I share with students and to help students recognize the necessity of joy to learning well and deeply. I am speaking less here of fun - though, of course, I think having fun is good - than of the affective dimensions of learning at the conjoinment of interest and pleasure, seriousness and absurdity. These are the intellectual and creative intersections where learners discover in themselves and one another the strange and unfamiliar and find it good; where laughter fractures totalities; where the possibility exists for both gentle and exuberant celebrations of the miracle of our collective presence on this earth, at this place - together at the interstices of learning and knowing, being and becoming, of self and other (Ehrenreich 261). The value of joy to learning is not the degree to which momentary pleasure releases us from labour, from pressure, anxiety, or loss. I do not think of joy as a safety valve, for example (Ehrenreich 257). Rather, I think the value of joy derives from the ways in which the experience of joy releases us from bondage to the expected and the familiar - from rigid adherence to rules and compulsive adherence to social constraints. To experience joy in learning is to experience, even momentarily and provisionally, a release into creative intellectualism - into the as-if, the what-if, and the whys of matters that viewed without joy seem either exceptionally mundane or so permanent, so fixed as to be beyond question. In some sense, I suppose I am suggesting that learning - really learning - constitutes an act of misbehaviour in relation to the familiar and the known and that, similarly, writing well demands a certain mischievousness - the willingness to play the trickster as well as an openness to being tricked and making sense of that. I am interested and, I'll admit, invested as a teacher, a co-learner, and as a writer in the ebullient joy that erupts among students as they learn to collude in the making of mischief as well as in the gentler joy that emerges in moments of recognition and acknowledgement of mutuality, contingency, interdependence, for it is in such moments that I am most convinced that not only are we all learning, but that our lives as learners and as writers are and will be changed for the better by having learned together.

Works Cited

Alcoff, Linda Martin. *Visible Identities: Race, Gender, and the Self*. Oxford University Press, 2006.

Ehrenreich, Barbara. *Dancing in the Streets: A History of Collective Joy*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2006.

Gatto, John and Thomas Moore. *Dumbing Us Down: The Hidden Curriculum of Compulsory Schooling*. New Society Publishers, 2nd edition, 2002.

O'Reilly, Mary Rose. *The Peacable Classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1993.

UNIVERSITY POLICIES

Academic Integrity: Take the time now to familiarize yourself with the summary of Policy #71. In order to avoid offences such as plagiarism, cheating, and double submission, consult “How to Avoid Plagiarism and Other Written Offences: A Guide for Students and Instructors”. Consult Academic Integrity at UW for more information. Visit this link to learn about the University of Waterloo’s expectations and policies regarding Academic Integrity.

Accommodations: The University of Waterloo has a long-standing commitment to support the participation and access to university programs, services, and facilities by persons with disabilities. Students who have a permanent disability as well as those with a temporary disability get AccessAbility Services. To register for services, you must provide documentation from a qualified professional to verify your disability. Please contact them at 519-888-4567 ext. 35082 or drop into Needles Hall 1132 to book an appointment to meet with an advisor to discuss their services and supports.

Grievances: In case that a decision affecting some aspect of a student’s university life has been unfair or unreasonable, they may have grounds for initiating a grievance according to Policy 70, Student Petitions and Grievances, Section 4, <https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-70>. When in doubt, please be certain to contact the department’s administrative assistant who will provide further assistance.

Discipline: Familiarize yourself with “academic integrity” to avoid committing an academic offence, and to take responsibility for your actions. Consult Policy 71 for all categories of offences and types of penalties.

Appeals: A decision made or penalty imposed under Policy 70 (Student Petitions and Grievances) (other than a petition) or Policy 71 (Student Discipline) may be appealed if there is a ground. A student who believes he/she has a ground for an appeal should refer to Policy 72 (Student Appeals) <http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm>

Topics

Rhetoric, demonstration, and ambiguity

- Wicked problems
- Monkey mind
- The struggle over exigence

Primary texts: Crosswhite, Althusser

Rhetoric of violence and the functionary

- Obedience and the power of *as if*
- Simulations of reason
- Simulations of love

Primary texts: Arendt

Rhetoric of violence as abstraction

- Abstraction and the making of the Other
- Absence and the suffering of others
- Becoming violence

Primary texts: Said; Fanon; Zizek

Rhetoric of violence and propaganda

- Foreclosures of the mind
- The sacred and the profane
- Subjectivity and the subjugation of the will

Primary texts: Butler; Bourdieu

Rhetoric, identity, affiliation, and disaffiliation

- Imperfect past and future perfect
- Story and affiliation
- The braided narrative

Primary texts: Condon

Resisting rhetorics and the theatre of violence

- The pupil
- As through the eyes of others
- Embodied rhetorics of resistance

Primary texts: Condon, King

Rhetorical Sovereignty and the making of thick relations

- The place of spirit
- Decolonizing consciousness
- The making of meaning in a long now

Primary texts: Vizenor, Lyons, Condon

Speakers:

Jay Dolmage – disability and the asylum
 Lamees Al-Ethari – the invasion of Iraq
 Brian Dunn – the Pink Triangle
 Zainab Ramahi – Gaza