

Katrina M. Powell

Review Essay

Reconciling Past and Place through Rhetorics of Peacemaking, Accountability, and Human Rights in the Archives

Relocating Authority: Japanese Americans Writing to Redress Mass Incarceration

Mira Shimabukuro

Boulder: UP of Colorado, 2015. 266 pp.

Shades of Sulh: The Rhetorics of Arab-Islamic Reconciliation

Rasha Diab

Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburg P, 2016. 264 pp.

The Homesick Phone Book: Addressing Rhetorics in the Age of Perpetual Conflict

Cynthia Haynes

Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2016. 244 pp.

The current climate of travel bans, violence and conflict, and reconciliation and accountability in this country and across the globe make the three books discussed here timely and relevant, as they each point out early in their introductions. Individually and collectively, these volumes provide a fascinating way to view the affordances of rhetorical approaches to issues

CCC 70:2 / DECEMBER 2018

of conflict, human rights, and reconciliation. Each in various ways attends to the intersections of cultural rhetorics, place, and positionality, navigating history and location with insight and innovation. In addition to what they say about cultural spaces and places, each author provides unique methodologies as well, making newly available archives come alive and treating us to archival methodologies that are important and lasting. On their own

each is fascinating—but together they generate arguments and questions that our field is poised to address. In this essay, I provide brief overviews of the books and the ways that each provides us not only with content worthy of our attention but also ways of reading and writing archival research that provide unique insights into our understanding of those texts.

In the last few decades, reconciliation and accountability have been central topics among scholars both in and outside of rhetoric, as we seek to understand how individuals and communities that have been wronged can be reconciled with those committing the offenses, and at the same time how those committing the offenses can be held accountable. The debates around the “success” of South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) have alerted us to the complexities of reconciliation and accountability, as societies seek to move forward from something as grotesque as apartheid. Indeed, concern over the TRC’s approach of forgiveness illustrates the near impossibility of reconciliation (Doxtader, *With Faith*; Gready; Hatch). Related to this controversy are the discussions of human rights more generally and the constructed, discursive, and mediated notions of universal human rights that can be steeped in Westernized and/or colonialist discourses of policing sovereign states. Rhetoric scholar Erik Doxtader notes in “With Double-Binds to Spare: Assuming the Rhetorical Question of Human Rights Language as Such” that there is “deep and heated dispute over whether there are truly universal human rights or if the power of rights rests on the particular features, interests, and desires, of individuals, society, culture, and politics, and the law” (409). As the broader international community might insist on particular human rights or commission proceedings, smaller and less powerful nation-states can resist those calls, citing colonialist policing of sovereignty (such as

In addition to what they say about cultural spaces and places, each author provides unique methodologies as well, making newly available archives come alive and treating us to archival methodologies that are important and lasting.

the international community's call for a TRC to address the recent war in Sri Lanka). The complex interweavings of society and individuals and the desire to move forward as a society while individuals still suffer is the difficult rhetorical work of truth and reconciliation commissions. Despite the near impossibility for true reconciliation, however that may be defined by particular nation-states or communities, people continue to examine and reexamine moments in history not only to reveal new historical facts but also to unearth the variety of ways that rhetorical understandings of a particular moment can influence our understandings of an event.

Even if the international community does not call for a formal reconciliation process, many communities are in the process of issuing apologies and in some cases reparations (e.g., US forced sterilizations, Canada's residential schools, American Indian forced removals, to name a few). The recasted histories of these places with human rights rhetorics at the center inform our parallel conversations about forced displacement and migration issues and serve to set records straight and provide more complex, broad-reaching, and messy histories than have been presented earlier. These approaches can shed light on current practices as policies are written about how to attend to the dispossessed or forcibly displaced as humanely as possible.

Within rhetorical studies, these and related issues have long been discussed with an attention to the language implications of narrating human rights violations and concerns and the corresponding legal, political, media, and literary genres. The work of Arabella Lyon and Lester Olson, Wendy Hesford, Carol Bohmer and Amy Schuman, and Eric Doxtader, among others, contribute to our understanding of human rights as a discursive endeavor, expanding the work of scholars such as Lynn Hunt, Joseph Slaughter, Sophia McClennan and Alexandra Schultheis Moore, Eleni Coundouriotis and Lauren M. E. Goodlad, Kerry Bystrom, Makau Mata, Kay Schaffer and Sidonie Smith, and others who examine the narrative and constructed nature of human rights discourses and the consequential issues that follow. All these scholars have provided us with very fruitful discussions to help us see how narrative, representation, legal definitions (of *refugee*, for instance), factor into the ways that policies get written and implemented often in inequitable ways. The recent special issue of the *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, for instance, focuses on "Human Rights and Peacebuilding," drawing attention

to the seemingly disparate definitions of *human rights* and the practical and logistical concerns in implementing peace-building measures. According to editor Michelle Parlevliet, linking human rights and peace building may seem a natural fit, yet doing so is difficult because “endeavors in the two realms can both complement and contradict one another” (333). As the authors in the issue highlight, it is often because of rhetorical understandings of concepts, cultures, and practices that can contribute to these difficulties, and rhetoric is well poised to address some of these issues, as the three works discussed here illustrate.

The three recent books examined here represent intriguing ways to contribute to these discussions. In each, there is less of a rhetoric of blame than rhetorics of exploration and juxtaposition, where newly available archival documents are placed alongside historically accepted fact. Each challenges us to resee a moment and to look more deeply at what we find in relation to all the other artifacts we have. As a group, these volumes represent the ways that rhetorical scholarship can point us to historical moments with a discursive lens. Though the books approach their topics from different theoretical lenses, each examines events focusing on the rhetorics located in those events to shed new light on moments in history, not only to recover artifacts but also to challenge our notions of rhetorical theory. Also, all incorporate interdisciplinary approaches, again highlighting the reach of rhetorical and literacy studies to help us understand rhetorics of reconciliation and accountability. I also am drawn to their methodologies, doing the careful work that recently Jacqueline Jones Royster and Gesa Kirsch suggest is necessary for complex histories such as these—archival and observational and using what they call “strategic contemplation [. . .] to take into account as much as possible but to withhold judgment for a time and resist coming to closure too soon in order to make the time to invite creativity, wonder, and inspiration into the research process” (85). It is encouraging to see the work in these volumes. They show us the affordances of rhetorical analysis in understanding the complexity of history and tragic injustices and the ways that individuals and communities strive to reconcile those moments through participation in rhetorical retelling.

Each challenges us to resee a moment and to look more deeply at what we find in relation to all the other artifacts we have.

In *Relocating Authority: Japanese Americans Writing to Redress Mass Incarceration*, Mira Shimabukuro's powerful interdisciplinary approach is clear from the outset. The foreword is written by UCLA Japanese and Asian American scholar Lane Ryo Hirabayashi, retired George and Sakaye Aratani Professor of the Japanese American Incarceration, Redress and Community Chair at UCLA, who highlights the interdisciplinary value of the book, including Shimabukuro's attention to the vernacular and the everyday. Hirabayashi suggests that Shimabukuro creates "a whole new episteme—that is, new perspectives and new sets of tools—for reading resistance in vernacular accounts" (x). Indeed, it is striking how Shimabukuro weaves rhetorical analysis of historical narrative and newly digitized archival material from the Densho Project in Seattle, such as letters, petitions, charters, meeting notes, public hearings, and testimony, together with her own family's history.

As she intersperses her family's connections into her analysis of archival documents, her book reads like a detective novel. Her father received funding, like many community historians, from the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, and he and her stepmother knew several activists whom Shimabukuro interviews for the book. In order to set the record straight on the long-standing historical contribution and literacy practices of Asian Americans, she delves into public and private writing of Asian Americans during and after the internments of World War II. In fact, she shows us that resistance rhetoric of Asian Americans is not new, beginning with literacy practices "dating back to at least the 1880s when . . . Japanese language and bi-lingual newspapers began to circulate" (11). Shimabukuro points out that "writing about early Asian American discursive practices can be a performance of Asian American rhetoric itself" (9), where writing to redress consists of a number of rhetorical moves typical of Asian and Asian American writing.

Using an approach that extends rhetorical listening (Ratcliffe) and historical ethnography (Royster), Shimabukuro fashions a methodology that attends to "culturally contingent context" (Monberg qtd. in Shimabukuro 17) that draws attention to the "hard to footnote or cite" sites of knowledge that are equally important to understanding rhetorical history and theory. Her revised methodology, what she calls "rhetorical attendance" (23), therefore, places her experiences and knowledge as the daughter of activists side by side with published scholarship (24–25). In doing so, she

demonstrates the rhetorical (and visual) power of flattening the relationship of these (archival) texts and how this flattening reframes our understanding of previous readings of a historical moment.

Situating her work in literacy studies and theory and attending to Nikkei literate practices, she places the literacy of a variety of Japanese communities within their historical migration contexts, highlighting the ways that historical literacy practices impacted their education and literacy practices upon arrival in the United States. In particular, she highlights in Chapter 3 the “vibrant Japanese-language press,” what Shimabukuro calls “community vernaculars” (59), which reached “many Nikkei households, as circulation numbers cited range from 4,000 to 25,000 during a period when the Issei population in the western states ranged from 50,000 to 65,000” (59).

These historical contexts set up a counternarrative to the dominant one of little resistance by Japanese Americans forced into concentration camps after the bombing of Pearl Harbor. The historical perception is that the Japanese went willingly and submissively. This narrative was perpetuated by some Japanese themselves (e.g., the Japanese American Citizens League [JACL]) who saw acceptance as a way to demonstrate their loyalty to the United States. In addition, the US military facilitated this narrative to absolve them from justifying the incarceration of US citizens. Shimabukuro argues, however, that there is evidence of resistance and that much of it came in the form of writing—either for public use as in pamphlets and petitions or for private use as a means to reflect and engage with personal feelings—all writing that served to redress.

Shimabukuro’s methodological approach is worth discussing in detail, as it is informed by Ratcliffe’s notion of rhetorical listening. Yet Shimabukuro offers an extended model to this approach that accounts for issues of access and perspective. She notes that often “foreign” students and writers have had a limited position with rhetoric and composition scholarship. She says, “This perpetual state of foreignness in which US-based Asians often find themselves can even be detected in comp/rhet where, aside from the studies mentioned earlier, Asians have tended to attain visible subjectivity only as international or ESL/ELL students” (9). As a consequence, then, when

Ratcliffe points us towards this text, we do not “hear” it amidst a chorus of other incarcerated voices; we do not see where the microphone is plugged in; we do not know who has “spoken” before. We also do not know how expensive or cheap or easily found this memoir is over others[. . .] While Ratcliffe’s

model of rhetorical listening certainly holds value for the classroom, it still seems predicated on an assumption that a plethora of voices that should be rhetorically listened to will have the access they need to that shared rhetorical space, that microcosm of the public sphere. As far as I can tell from the past ten years of teaching, access (both in terms of the bodies of students and teachers of color *and* of materials in multicultural-ized curriculum) continues to override the good intent behind Ratcliffe's model. (16)

The result for Shimabukuro, then, is to build an approach of "rhetorical attendance," where she places any literacy or writing practices within these broader contexts, including access. She says of rhetorical attendance that it "doesn't stop with these epistemologically rich memories of widely varied and sometimes fleeting moments of intersubjective receptivity. Attendance is vigilant, not passive. One must 'apply oneself,' must 'stretch one's mind,' must be 'consequent of' what has come before and 'follow' with something new" (25). She also says, "Rhetorical attendance is not about individual lives but a complex interacting array of knowledge still being collected, still being shared, still being redistributed back to the people whose material lives served as the source of the knowledge" (44). Furthermore, she hopes "to highlight how writing-to-redress does more than encode or preserve a response. It also serves as a means to expand a rhetorical, and thus, political activity: the collective struggle to relocate authority away from one's oppressors and back into the community itself" (30). She also says, "writing-to-redress is akin to Jacqueline Jones-Royster's Afrofeminist model of 'literacy as sociopolitical action'" (26), in that she examines multiple texts across multiple contexts. She finally explains that "rhetorically attending to one's subject requires an explicit awareness and mention that culture and experience inform our decisions about when to ask questions and when to stay silent, about how to contemplate the implications of our work and anticipate the feelings of those with whom we stand. As such, lifelong conversations and eavesdroppings matter as much as feminist rhetorical theory and New Literacy studies" (27).

The analysis chapters of Shimabukuro's book, then, examine various archival documents, some newly recovered and some reread with rhetorical attendance in mind. She examines the "politics of archival recovery projects" and the ways that historically resistance of the imprisoned Japanese has been ignored to serve a variety of purposes. She examines the recovered documents by two incarcerated women whose archival recovery work

reshaped the historical understanding of Japanese American internment as a “necessity.” The work of these friends, Michi Weglyn and Aiko Herzig-Yoshinaga, fueled the redress movement. While examining the implications of their work, Shimabukuro also examines her own experiences of the archives. Her reflexivity of the methodology, of being in the archives and surrounded by the “sheer amount of it all” (51), is part of what led her to the questions of literacy as action, public forms of writing, such as newsletters and petitions, and private forms of writing, such as diaries and letters located at the Japanese American National Museum (JANM).

She then moves to discuss the ways that these two women were instrumental in compelling the government to form the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) and to conduct public hearings. These hearings were not unlike Truth and Reconciliation Commissions, but she spends much of the chapter examining the literacy networks that occurred before the war to emphasize the historical context of literacy in Nikkei communities and in turn the conditions of the camps that impacted literate activities within the camps, such as living conditions that were unacceptable and racist discourses that led to this kind of incarceration. As Shimabukuro points out, “Collective strikes, protests, petitions, and written complaints regarding living conditions would also continue through the camp years.” Like Liisa Malkki’s “good refugee,” the Nikkei living in camps were expected to comply, to show their US patriotism by being good prisoners. What is fascinating in her account is the way that literacy, as a form of organizing and confining, was simultaneously the way that “incarcerees had, at their jobs, regular access to tools such as typewriters, mimeograph machines, notebook paper, and pens” (69). As a result of their work assignments in managing and organizing the camps, they had access to collectively write and distribute writing to redress. Shimabukuro is careful not to romanticize the conditions of the camps; however, she highlights that women’s work in the camps had significant impact on the distribution of resistance texts and contexts. She also notes that the “recovery of written text composed as a means to survive and resist oppression takes on particular saliency when key aspects of the truth have been downplayed, distorted, or denied” (38). Her project, then, seeks to uncover those “key aspects” so that readers can see and hear writing-to-redress more fully.

Foundational to Shimabukuro’s approach is the way she unpacks the Japanese terms *gaman* (“to endure/persevere”) and *shikatanai* (“it cannot

be helped”). Shimabukuro demonstrates how these terms have been used to create a specific identity of Japanese, but also how they can be renegotiated to demonstrate resolve and resilience rather than mere passivity. In her discussion of rhetorics of *gaman*, Shimabukuro beautifully describes her access to the activist community, both as a daughter of activists and as a friend with other children of activists. She was exposed to rhetorics of *gaman* in multiple ways, including the embodiment of it as an actor in a play, living the lines, learning to “persevere” and “bear up” in the face of adversity. Shimabukuro does not compare incarceration with embodied experiences of the other as an Asian American graduate student not seeing the voices represented in her course work; however, it is easy to see that she had to draw on *gaman* to negotiate the difficulties of higher education as a woman of color. *Gaman*, she tells us, has been “misinterpreted as a call to internalize or accept oppression without complaint” (80). However, as she shows us, *gaman* is “to do one’s best in times of frustration and adversity” and, as she points out, to use the rhetorical means available to resist and redress. In this way, Shimabukuro, like both Rasha Diab and Cynthia Haynes discussed later, does in practice what she is examining: she is redressing the fields of rhetorical and literacy studies, doing her best in the adversity that the field presents. She also points out that “while *gaman* is often discussed in terms of individual survivance, it has, at its base, an ethical commitment to a collective good” (82). She explains that “Writing-to-*Gaman*, as I have come to call the activities and texts of this private form of writing-to-redress, speaks to the use of this quiet technology to privately organize one’s emotion-thoughts and/or verbalize dissent while sharpening an awareness of oneself as connected to others enduring hardship” (87). This writing-to-*gaman* is what she found in the private writing such as diaries, letters, and unpublished poems in the archive. In describing her process of analysis, she highlights the ways *gaman* and rhetorical attendance helped her dive deeper in the texts, shifting her coding scheme to account more fully for organizing emotion, verbalizing dissent, and awareness of communal hardships. She concludes, then, that writing-to-*gaman* served partially as a rhetorical rehearsal (citing Kimberly Harrison) for writing to redress, but with the addition of understanding that rehearsal in relation to the collective experience of hardship.

Shimabukuro specifically addresses women’s contributions to the movements, particularly the mothers of draft-age citizens, and the rhe-

torical impact of the petition signed to resist the draft, which was used to conscript their sons even while their civil rights were in jeopardy. While their petition did not stop the draft, the mothers' protests were recorded, the injustice noted, and their rhetorical participation in the resistance archived. As one review notes, the chapter discussing this petition is the "highlight" of the book (Niiya): we see the researcher engage with the story, coming to find hidden narratives not only through her archival expertise but also through the luck of her family knowing the daughter of one of the petitioners. In this way, Shimabukuro notes, these archives serve as authority to reconsider the dominant narrative of Japanese American history and their responses to the forced relocations. She concludes that "writing-to-redress matters not just because of what it illuminates about the past but because of what it can generate anew" (209).

Her personal reflections, remembrances, and descriptions of coming to knowledge of this history both as a child and later as a scholar serve as an extended literacy narrative, and in doing so she cultivates "our theoretical understanding of the relationship between literacy and social justice" (214). In this way her book is both a text about writing to redress and writing to redress in action:

Which is why, in my attempts to attend to this ethos and all its competing definitions and implicit rhetorics, I have tried to stretch my mind toward a common denominator across all meanings. Given the strength, silence, internalization, forbearance, self-discipline, suppression, and emotional control, it seems that, no matter whether one is simply accepting of or persevering through adversity, in order to *gaman* one must strive to focus inwardly while maintaining an outward silence, all to endure hardship so as not to inflict further emotional strain on others. That is, to *gaman* one must simultaneously develop an interpersonal awareness of self and cultivate the self-discipline necessary to exert control over one's emotion-thoughts, all in order to attend to the larger community's well-being. (83–84)

As shown in the discussion of Rasha Diab's discussion of *şulh*, this focus on the good of the community is a common theme in these approaches to resistance.

Finally, Shimabukuro points specifically to the field's limitations and the work that needs to be done. She notes these limitations as "negligence" in part because of the absence of Asian American voices in anthologies and collections. Her pointed redress of the field is imperative to consider. Indeed

her study shows us how much is missing from the field and our responsibility to unearth and (re)examine texts with rhetorical attendance. Not only have “the uses of writing by US-based writers racially constructed as Asian . . . been so under-theorized,” but, as Shimabukuro’s work illustrates, indeed, the uses of writing generally have been undertheorized because of this omission. Her important work begins to fill this gap, though her research indicates that there is much more to do in recovering the “hidden narratives” that remain in examining the human rights issues of the time.¹

Rasha Diab’s *Shades of Ṣulḥ: The Rhetorics of Arab-Islamic Reconciliation* is also an example of unearthing hidden narratives. Though Shima-

Shimabukuro’s discussion of writing-as-gaman and Diab’s discussion of ṣulḥ together make for critical ways to understand how reconciliation and accountability can be understood from non-Western lenses, adding critical dimensions to these concepts and their practical processes.

bukuro does not situate her work within rhetorics of reconciliation the way that Diab does more explicitly, each is concerned with the community implications of the archival documents they assess, attending to the ways that communities and individuals use rhetoric to heal during and after times of suffering. Shimabukuro’s discussion of writing-as-gaman and Diab’s discus-

sion of ṣulḥ together make for critical ways to understand how reconciliation and accountability can be understood from non-Western lenses, adding critical dimensions to these concepts and their practical processes.

As Chanon Adsanatham points out in a review in *Peitho Journal*, Diab’s book is the “first book-length study of Arab-Islamic rhetoric of peace grounded in rhetorical studies” (144). In this way the book is groundbreaking, but it is also significant in its treatment of archival material to resituate our understanding of rhetorics of reconciliation, calling on rhetoric scholars interested in human rights to examine in particular documents like the Charter of Medina as they contain early human rights discourses. Like Shimabukuro, Diab frames her analysis through Ratcliffe’s notion of rhetorical listening and in turn suggests that instruction in rhetoric can indeed be a way to teach peacemaking.

Diab analyzes rhetorics of reconciliation through the Islamic notion of ṣulḥ. As she defines it, ṣulḥ is a “peacemaking practice” (3), “a cultural, rhetorically mediated resource for peace that complements and extends our scholarship on Arabic rhetoric and the rhetorics of peacemaking and

reconciliation" (4). Specifically, *ṣulḥ* "articulates a critique for justice and peace"; it "(a) initiates peacemaking using forgiveness, apology, or simply a commitment to make amends; (b) interpellates a community that pursues peace; and (c) names witnesses to the peace process as a way to foreground the discourse of accountability" (4). Using comparative and cultural rhetorics (informed by rhetorical and communications studies) together with work in the field of peace studies, Diab provides alternative ways of seeing "rhetoric's potential for countering violence" (4).

Ṣulḥ and *gaman* are important interrelated concepts of peacemaking, both accounting for the well-being of the community. Literally translated, *ṣulḥ* means reconciliation. However, as Diab points out, the "word captures the practices, rituals, process, and goals of *ṣulḥ*, a very old sociopolitical traditional reconciliation practice in the Arab world that relies heavily on mediation" (42). However, she is committed to explaining that the Arab definition does not entail submitting to or resigning to something in the negative sense. Rather, *ṣulḥ* means to reconcile *with* (43), where there is not submission, but rather a coming together for a common, communal goal to move forward. *Ṣulḥ* is unique in its "attention to the restorative (read social, psychological, and ethical) needs of the victim, perpetrator, and community" (45). Diab also says, "*Ṣulḥ* as a process or an event manifests a cultural and

In addition, hers is the first to use rhetorical methodology to examine Arab-Islamic rhetorics, extending the work in sociolinguistics, philosophy, and poetics in important ways, including the ways that *ṣulḥ* as a rhetorical practice is a way of doing.

doctrinal framework of peacebuilding that seeks not only to solve a problem but also to address the grounds that enabled an act of violence or oppression" (47). The process, she explains, proceeds "as elders, mediators, and pursuers of *ṣulḥ* disengage from a logic of violence and revenge; as rhetors, they creatively reframe the situation from intractability to possibility" (50).

Situating her work at the intersection of cultural rhetorics and historiography, Diab outlines for us the current work being done on Arab-Islamic rhetoric and the ways her study extends cultural rhetorics and draws attention to the understudied area in rhetorical studies. Indeed, she explains that the focus on medieval translations has too narrowly focused the contributions of Arab-Islamic rhetoric for the rhetorical tradition. She therefore calls for further expansion of the contributions to focus on "a variety of rhetorical practices" in the Arab-Islamic tradition, including peacemaking rhetorics.

In addition, hers is the first to use rhetorical methodology to examine Arab-Islamic rhetorics, extending the work in sociolinguistics, philosophy, and poetics in important ways, including the ways that *ṣulḥ* as a rhetorical practice is a way of doing. She calls for understanding “cultural rhetorics of peacemaking around the globe” as a way to highlight the ways that *ṣulḥ*’s attention to relationality can extend how we engage in peacemaking enterprises and how relating it to restorative justice (11) can be instructive and productive. As she points out in her chapter analyzing Anwar al-Sadat’s 1977 speech, by not placing his rhetoric within the *ṣulḥ* tradition, scholars miss very important aspects of Sadat’s rhetoric as a way of being. In her careful analysis, she shows us just how glaring an omission it is not to place these discourses within the *ṣulḥ* practices of peacemaking. She points out how *ṣulḥ* practices offer nuanced ways of reconciliation that other restorative justice models do not, because *ṣulḥ* includes a commitment to the pursuit of peace within a deliberative community. In her three case studies she highlights *ṣulḥ*’s features (13) and sets up her analyses by contextualizing rhetorics of peacemaking and “grounds *ṣulḥ* in its cultural imperatives and doctrinal roots” (16). Examining the topoi of memory, justice, and prudence within various contexts of peacemaking and reconciliation rhetorics, Diab explains rhetorical remembering and rhetorical forgetting as both processes toward reconciliation. She sites South Africa and Sierra Leone as illustrative examples of serving similar purposes—reconciliation and healing—even if the approaches are different (28–29).

She says whichever process is used, “their decisions seek and enable an interventionist rhetoric that counters violence, refashions their subject positions, and remembers that the ultimate goal is reconciliation and justice” (29). As she explains, however, restorative justice or punitive justice are key elements to the decisions communities make in remembering and forgetting. She notes that Western conceptions of what constitutes justice are steeped in punitive actions, where perpetrators are punished for crimes against the state (and its legal system)—reconciliation is not necessarily a goal. Restorative justice, however, focuses on individuals and communities and “restoring” their relationships. My summary oversimplifies here, but Diab explains at length the difficulties in recognizing the wrongs committed against victims/survivors and the role that recognizing rights or restorative needs of perpetrators might play in obtaining justice. She also explains the role of political leaders in managing justice, referred to as

prudence, especially when the goals are not attained and victims do not feel they have been adequately recognized or that perpetrators have had appropriate accountability.

In her chapter that situates *ṣulḥ* historically, she explains why prudence is so important. Practices of *ṣulḥ* can counter violence discourses through rhetorics of “recognition and apology, mediation, sweet persuasion, listening, and silence” (55). Meticulously she explains these nuances of *ṣulḥ* and the various ways over the course of history it has been used in Muslim communities, emphasizing the commitment to peace, where people “seek to realize a relational imperative in addition to the moral one” (59). She notes, “Persuading victims (and/or their families) to accept reconciliation is often a tricky, reiterative, or cyclical process; it mandates savvy rhetorical performance, delicate evocation of shared values, and recognition of the decisiveness of time and timing” (73). The symbolic rituals of apology and acceptance also serve as performative aspects of reconciliation, making the process a “rhetorically rich, and . . . complex, iterative, often messy” process (80).

Aside from her analysis chapters where she analyzes Muhammad Anwar al-Sadat’s “Speech to the Knesset,” which “resuscitated Egyptian-Israeli peace talks in 1977” (112), and the play *The Great Court of Ṣulḥ*, written by Muhammad Madi Abu al-Aza’im just after World War I as a didactic toward lasting peace, Diab’s careful analyses show *ṣulḥ* as rhetorical method. She highlights the didactic, epideictic, deliberative, and constitutive features of each. In addition to these informative, well-researched, and insightful descriptions of archival analyses, her chapter outlining the convergences of *ṣulḥ* and human rights discourses is an important treatment of *ṣulḥ*’s unrecognized contribution to the history of human rights. As she notes, human rights rhetorics scholars are aware of the limitations of rights discourses, particularly as they are manifest in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). Diab points out too that the Constitution of Medina (seventh century) is largely left out of rights discussion, with the Magna Carta often cited as the earliest example of articulating human rights. The Western oversight is significant in part because of the Medina Charter’s uniqueness: it “affirms equal rights, countering the pervasiveness of a tribally driven logic of superiority . . . and exemplifies convergence of *ṣulḥ* rhetoric and articulation of human rights and the need for deliberate(d) communal investment to affirm and institutionalize rights” (83). In her

narrative of the history of the Prophet Muhammad's move to Yathrib and his role as arbiter of peace among the variety of tribes in the area, she offers a critical lens into the rise of "rhetorical leadership" as a way to mediate the conflicts among various tribes, religions, cultures, and communities. Under his leadership, "as citizens Medinians were united, transcended tribal and religious divisions, and agreed to be governed by a constitution that provided collective protection, affirmed rights, and bound community members to one another and to their city-state" (89) through Muhammad's strategies of "fractioning, reframing, and rewriting power" (89). Because of this "interplay of fractioning and affirmation of rights" (92) that "manifests in the form of written, legally binding contracts, affirming rights while also asserting obligations, it [*ṣulḥ*] proved to be a useful conflict resolution resource" (92). In addition, the Constitution of Medina's "relation imperative . . . balances self and other's rights and obligations" and "is not just a cornerstone of restorative justice and *ṣulḥ* but is also consistent with, if not conducive to, human rights discourse" (92). She further complicates the notion of human rights as it is articulated in the UDHR, emphasizing "a new subject, a citizen who is invested in and benefits from a reconciled city-state" (109).

Diab situates her discussions within human rights rhetorics (particularly Doxtader; Gregg; Lyon and Olson). Her work could also be in conversation with Hesford et al.'s recent work on precarity and the work of Lauren Berlant and Gillian Whitlock, particularly conversations about witnessing and recognition and the role of accountability. She does not specifically discuss how *ṣulḥ* might address gender-based violence, but it would be interesting to take her analysis to the testimonies discussed by Caruth, Kennedy, and Whitlock, among others. Diab's focus is to examine the rhetorical practices of *ṣulḥ* in these situations and its influence, but the implications for *ṣulḥ* for arbitration of gender-based or domestic violence, or any conflict between vulnerable or marginalized groups would be beneficial. This is not a critique of Diab's work, however, but rather a recognition that her discussion is important and provocative and could offer insights into other areas of study.

Finally, Diab's analysis of rhetorics of reconciliation through the concept of *ṣulḥ* informs our notions of deliberative rhetoric and peacemaking. Like Shimabukuro and Haynes, Diab highlights the importance of feminist revisionist explorations of historical work and the rethinking the field must do in relation to this work. Both Shimabukuro and Diab are informed by

Royster and LuMing Mao, “troubling” the ways we understand concepts and events (8). Her attention to what’s been excluded in the archives echoes both Haynes’s and Shimabukuro’s calls to attend to the historical record as well and in this way influences the ways we teach rhetorics of human rights and reconciliation. Diab’s methodological approach to cultural rhetorics is interdisciplinary as well—creating a method that attends to the fluidity of *ṣulḥ* as a concept and drawing together concepts and approaches from rhetorical studies, foreign policy, and peace studies. She combines rhetorical analysis and critical discourse analysis to attend to both the precision of the language and the larger cultural contexts of the artifacts. Like Shimabukuro and Haynes, Diab examines particular moments in history, yet she also challenges what we know about the rhetorical tradition by placing rhetorics of peacemaking through *ṣulḥ* alongside traditional epideictic and deliberative rhetoric. As Diab points out, her work intersects with the growing scholarship of rhetorics of peacemaking, reconciliation, and human rights and its intersections with peace studies (5), stating, “This growing scholarship demonstrates yet again that rhetoric and violence can be neither reduced to the assumption that rhetoric is/enables violence nor that rhetoric is readily antithetical to violence” (5).

Ultimately her work challenges the Western lens of what “justice” means across contexts. Diab’s analysis underscores the implications of dominant Western definitions of peace and reconciliation and calls attention to the ways that analyzing deliberative rhetorics can account for these cross-cultural contexts.

While both Shimabukuro and Diab recognize the violent potential of rhetoric, both are also hopeful in rhetoric’s intervention potential to community well-being and restoration through *gaman* and *ṣulḥ*, respectively. Cynthia Haynes’s book departs from Shimabukuro and Diab somewhat. She too is concerned with the dual nature of rhetoric’s potential for violence and restoration. However, where she differs is her notion of rhetoric on the threshold, the immediacy and urgency with which rhetoric is continually on the verge of either “violence or vitality” (2).

Haynes’s beautifully written book won the 2016 Rhetoric Society of America’s annual book prize, and it is easy to see why. The prose is gorgeous, weaving theory and poetics seamlessly. She examines terms from classical

Haynes’s beautifully written book won the 2016 Rhetoric Society of America’s annual book prize, and it is easy to see why. The prose is gorgeous, weaving theory and poetics seamlessly.

rhetoric such as *topoi*, *address*, and *arrangement* together with issues of the law and ethics. She does this beginning with a close examination of a Berlin phonebook, published in 1941, listing the addresses of residents, focusing particularly on the ways that residents were “marked.” In the remaining chapters, she also assigns physical addresses to each discussion, pointing out the simultaneous potential for rhetoric’s address within them.²

All this is done through the kind of performative writing for which she advocates, both for writers and for teachers of writing: as Diane Davis says on the book jacket, Haynes’s book is a “tour de force, a beautifully sustained performance of the very sort of offshore writing and reading for which she

A reading experience akin to Hélène Cixous or Julia Kristeva, the book is at times difficult and emotionally hard, with lyrical prose and scattered bits of poetry making for an abstract read—but in a good way.

calls—a performance, that is, of the infinite responsibility involved in the groundless worlding of the world.” This apt description highlights the unique quality of Haynes’s writing: she places rhetoric, and all its redeeming qualities, alongside its potential for

violence. She does this through the close reading of the dwellings listed in the phone book, examining not only the physical facts of those dwellings and who lived there, but the metaphysical aspects of dwellings and home as explored by Heidegger. She recognizes rhetoric’s obviously troubled relationship with Heidegger but critically examines dwelling as a way to understand how rhetoric resides in physical and ontological spaces. And as Davis’s description suggests, there is an ethical responsibility to do so, to not only see rhetoric as simply restorative and liberating but rather to examine its actual use and potential. A reading experience akin to Hélène Cixous or Julia Kristeva, the book is at times difficult and emotionally hard, with lyrical prose and scattered bits of poetry making for an abstract read—but in a good way. Haynes trusts the reader to make connections, and indeed she advocates for abstraction. In one chapter she urges pedagogy that sets “up the conditions for writing nomadically—as refugees from reason” (105).

Haynes’s stated purpose is to “situate rhetoric’s address not just next door to evil, or across the theoretical fence, but [to] install rhetoric at the same address, with the same phone number, connected to the same switchboard, and utilized and understood by the same operators” (3). In doing so, she underscores the nature of conflict as continually on a threshold. Her complex discussion of Heidegger’s thoughts on dwelling and being help

readers understand how conflict is constant, and because it is, rhetoric is implicated in its constantness. Physical addresses such as Ground Zero or the school shooting in Norway illustrate “rhetorical threshold” as the paradox of dwellings of “both love and violence” (177).

Haynes examines rhetoric’s link to violence through physical address, using the Berlin telephone book as archive, proposing that the “*address* is a synecdoche of *dwelling*” (19). Expanding Heidegger’s notion of dwelling and Avital Ronell’s “politics of the telephone” (18), Haynes explains that dwelling has an ontological implication—it is “not based *merely* in staying in one place, just as building is not concerned merely with the construction of physical structures. For Heidegger, ‘Dwelling is the manner in which mortals are on the earth’” (Heidegger, “Building” 148; qtd. in Haynes 21). The implication, as Haynes suggests, is that by forcibly removing someone from a *mere* building, the impacts go beyond physical relocation. There is a bare life quality to forcible removal, and the removal of Jewish residents from their homes is the example in the extreme. In the phone book the “rhetorical death” of Jewish residents may have seemed of relatively little consequence on the surface, but the materiality of the actual deaths, subsequent to the removal from the phone book, is what links rhetoric to violence. She points to the dual qualities of rhetoric in multiple ways:

Violence and vitality (even children lived there) not only shared a Berlin bunker at Hitler’s Reich Chancellery, his headquarters at Vosstrasse 6 . . . ; they shared the same rhetorical address as Ground Zero, both of which render an inferno that leads Derrida to remind us: “cinders there are [*il y a là cendre*]” (*Cinders* 21). . . Homesickness (as discussed here) is not about missing home, it is about the sickness called Homeland Security and our rhetorical task of addressing it in an age of perpetual conflict. (2–3)

A critical chapter in the book is “Writing Offshore: Heidegger’s Hütte, Todtnauberg, Germany.” Those who first read portions of this essay in *JAC* will be familiar with Haynes’s examination of Heidegger’s notion of dwelling. Immersed within the other chapters of this book, however, the chapter takes on an instructive importance—she’s teaching us to read. Using Derrida’s discussion of the “stakes of writing for those who are denied the right ‘to choose their place, to move about freely’” (98–99), Haynes suggests that in “these dire straights, rhetoric may be their only refuge” (99). She says, “Rhetoric *as* refuge rearticulates the paths of the poets and illuminates their abstract trajectories. Displacing argument [critical thinking] is rhetoric’s supreme

task; disinventing *logos* is rhetoric's sacred duty. Rhetoric and composition theorists on the fringe have voiced similar manifestos in recent years, yet their rejections of argumentation pedagogy have too often been perceived as having infringed upon the hallowed ground of critical thinking and are, finally, relegated to the ranks of renegade rhetorics" (99). These renegade rhetorics, like the works of Lynn Worsham, Geoffrey Sirc, Gregory Ulmer, and Victor Vitanza (99–100), can inform our pedagogies as well, she argues. Like Diab and Shimabukuro, Haynes's careful consideration of these rhetorical complexities offers insights into the ways that rhetorical attention to address refuge can challenge how we write and teach others to write.

In particular Haynes examines these issues in her shorter chapters about postconflict pedagogy and glitch rhetoric, extending her theoretical discussions to implications for pedagogy. If rhetoric is refuge, then writing

Haynes's ... focus on conflict and violence and paradoxes of rhetoric's interventionist potential provides helpful ways of understanding the discursive nature of human rights as a concept.

is meant to unmoor us, and argumentation pedagogy does not get us there, she asserts. Whether discussing web design, war games, or filmed beheadings, Haynes attends to the ways that "writing the hearing" (146) is critical to understand the paradoxes of rhetoric. Hence her

writing (and her advocacy for postconflict pedagogy) is playful, nonlinear, emotional, partisan, and powerful—all at the same time. It's not the kind of writing we often see published in our field.³ She argues:

[W]e engineer our sanctuaries, rather than sanctify our *bricoleurs*. We seek refuge in reason rather than learn a new a game. We do not like to drift. But adrift is always where we *are*. And at play is always *how* we are. No matter how much we tinker, no matter how deep we dig, no matter how solid our edifice—play will push us out to sea every time. (156)

In her final chapter discussing the wargame "America's Army," Haynes demonstrates why "theorycrafting" is necessary to be prepared, as a rhetorician and as a human. She says that looking at the violence of rhetoric closely, such as witnessing the violent filmed death of journalist Daniel Pearl online, is part of the unmooring that is necessary to counter that violence. She says, "I chose not to look away . . . if you do not comprehend, you're perpetually doomed to queue up for the most gruesome endgame content wearing zero rhetorical gear" (187).

While Haynes does not situate her work explicitly within human rights rhetorics, it is clear this book has implications for that area of study—her focus on conflict and violence and paradoxes of rhetoric’s interventionist potential provide helpful ways of understanding the discursive nature of human rights as a concept. Haynes’s consideration of Luann Frank’s discussion of Heidegger’s lectures on Rilke’s poems and Derrida’s treatment of displacement are insightful, but her brief autobiographical insights also inform us how the teaching, writing, and study of rhetoric constitute an unmooring. In her description of her relationship with her daughter and her mentor, she recounts the feeling of being out to sea, being unmoored and accepting that fluidity as a way to be and consequently as a way to teach and read. This deeply personal insight was moving, and this way of writing, not unlike Shimabukuro’s, reveals to us the hidden ways that thoughts and theories and ways of teaching get discovered or connected or revealed to us in our lives outside the classroom or away from the writing desk. And they matter: it matters to know Haynes’s process of coming to know or process of thinking, it helps underscore the complexity of her theories and the urgency of her arguments about rhetoric as refuge. This is not to say, however, that we get a “logical” story—we don’t. We get the ebbs and flows of thoughts and theories and humans coming together; we get the abstractions of the relationships, leaving us to discover for ourselves. It’s work and it’s worth it. After reading these moments of unmooring, I then went back to the earlier pages to understand more deeply how Frank’s read of Heidegger was central to Haynes’s discussion. It was a pleasure, in the Derridian sense, where the fissures made me stop, think, go back, read again, and more deeply engage with the text on its own terms.

All three of these insightful works suggest that archives function in hidden or layered ways and the importance of continued archival work to challenging what we know about rhetoric in addition to particular moments in history. With the fury of tweets and posts and policy changes about any number of current conflicts in this country and beyond happening at a rapid pace, the implications discussed in all three books help us understand the ways rhetoric can help us unpack these discourses. Each include a combination of methods, archival research, and implications for research and pedagogy. The three in conversation highlight the relevance of our rhetorical work as well. Religion, cultural and political conflict, human rights, displacement, and reconciliation are all urgent conversations at

center stage, and as the international community continues to seek policy that is inclusive, these three books highlight the necessity of a rhetorical perspective.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Tarryn Abrahams for her research assistance with this essay.

Notes

1. In a recent work I discuss how “alternative ledgers” are “a kind of nonlinear storytelling created from ‘fragments’ and hidden narratives not often included in historical archives. As a theory, alternative ledgers tries to account for the ‘interior’—the local, anecdotal knowledge that is often eclipsed by the official record” (Powell 26). The three books in this review are examples, to varying degrees, of this kind of approach, exposing those hidden moments that significantly inform historical knowledge.

2. Several of Haynes’s chapters are significantly revised reprints from journals such as *Games and Culture*, *Pre/Text*, and *Fast Capitalism*. This range of publications is indicative of the reach of Haynes’s project.

3. CCC’s recent call for “Unconventional Scholarship” is an exciting move for the field to publish more of the kind of work in which Haynes and others engage. As the call states, within “our field’s methodological diversity, the genre of the traditional scholarly article doesn’t always ‘fit’ the needs of scholars and writers who are looking for forms and models to articulate their ideas, experiences, and research. To further methodological, epistemological, and scholarly pluralism, CCC calls for submissions that might fall under the category of ‘unconventional’ scholarship. We won’t define this category in advance, but rather invite scholars, writers, researchers, and thinkers in the field to submit work for consideration that might lie outside, adjacent, or in opposition to the ‘normative’ bounds of the scholarly article.” The innovation and award-winning nature of Haynes’s book reinforce the relevance and contribution of the scholarship called for by CCC.

Works Cited

- | | |
|---|---|
| Adsanatham, Chanon. Review of <i>Shades of Şulh</i> . <i>Peitho Journal</i> , vol. 20, no. 1, 2017, pp. 144–49. | Bohmer, Carol, and Amy Shuman. <i>Rejecting Refugees: Political Asylum in the 21st Century</i> . Routledge, 2007. |
| Berlant, Lauren. <i>Cruel Optimism</i> . Duke UP, 2011. | Bystrom, Kerry. “Literature and Human Rights.” <i>Handbook of Human Rights</i> , |

- edited by Thomas Cushman, Routledge, 2012, pp. 637–46.
- Caruth, Cathy. *Listening to Trauma: Conversations with Leaders in the Theory and Treatment of Catastrophic Experience*. The Johns Hopkins UP, 2014.
- Coundouriotis, Eleni, and Lauren M. E. Goodlad. "Introduction: Comparative Human Rights: Literature, Art, Politics." *Journal of Human Rights*, vol. 9, no. 3, 2010, pp. 121–26.
- Doxtader, Erik. "With Double-Binds to Spare: Assuming the Rhetorical Question of Human Rights Language as Such." *The Routledge Companion to Human Rights Literature*, edited by Sophia McClennen and Alexandra Schultheis Moore, Routledge, 2016, pp. 405–13.
- . *With Faith in the Works of Words: The Beginnings of Reconciliation in South Africa, 1985–1995*. David Philip, 2009.
- Gready, Paul. *The Era of Transitional Justice: The Aftermath of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa and Beyond*. Routledge, 2010.
- Gregg, Benjamin. *Human Rights as Social Construction*. Cambridge UP, 2012.
- Hatch, John B. *Race and Reconciliation: Redressing the Wounds of Injustice*. Lexington Books, 2008.
- Hesford, Wendy S. *Spectacular Rhetorics*. Duke UP, 2012.
- Hesford, Wendy S., et al., editors. *Precarious Rhetorics*. Ohio State UP, 2018.
- Hunt, Lynn. *Inventing Human Rights: A History*. W.W. Norton, 2008.
- Kennedy, Rosanne, and Gillian Whitlock. "Introduction to Special Issue: Witnessing, Trauma, and Social Suffering: Feminist Perspectives." *Australian Feminist Studies*, vol. 26, 2011.
- Lyon, Arabella. *Deliberative Acts: Democracy, Rhetoric, Rights*. Pennsylvania State UP, 2013.
- Lyon, Arabella, and Lester Olson, editors. *Human Rights Rhetorics*. Routledge, 2012.
- Mack, Katherine. *From Apartheid to Democracy: Deliberating Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa*. Pennsylvania State UP, 2014.
- Malkki, Liisa. *Purity and Exile: Violence, Memory, and National Cosmology among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania*. U of Chicago P, 1995.
- Matua, Makau. "Savages, Victims, and Saviors: The Metaphor of Human Rights." *Harvard International Law Journal*, vol. 42, no. 1, 2001, pp. 201–45.
- McClennen, Sophia A., and Alexandra Schultheis Moore, editors. *The Routledge Companion to Literature and Human Rights*. Routledge, 2015.
- Niiya, Brian. "Book Review: 'Relocating Authority' with the Written Word." *Densho Blog*, 19 Apr. 2016, densho.org/book-review-relocating-authority-written-word/. Accessed 1 Jan. 2018.
- Parlevliet, Michelle, guest editor. "Human Rights and Peacebuilding: Complementary and Contradictory, Complex and Contingent." Special issue of *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, vol. 9, no. 3, 2017, pp. 333–57.
- Powell, Katrina M. "Hidden Archives: Revealing Untold Stories." *Journal of American Studies*, vol. 52, no. 1, 2018, pp. 26–44.
- Ratcliffe, Krista. "Rhetorical Listening: A Trope for Interpretive Invention and a 'Code of Cross-Cultural Conduct.'"

- College Composition and Communication*, vol. 51, no. 2, 1999, pp. 195–224.
- Royster, Jacqueline Jones. *Traces of a Stream: Literacy and Social Change among African American Women*. U of Pittsburgh P, 2000.
- Royster, Jacqueline Jones, and Gesa Kirsch. *Feminist Rhetorical Practices*. Southern Illinois UP, 2012.
- Schaffer, Kay, and Sidonie Smith. *Human Rights and Narrated Lives*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.
- Slaughter, Joseph. *Human Rights, Inc.: The World Novel, Narrative Form, and International Law*. Fordham UP, 2007.
- Whitlock, Gillian. *Postcolonial Life Narratives: Testimonial Transactions*. Oxford UP, 2015.

Katrina M. Powell

Katrina M. Powell is professor of English and director of the Center for Rhetoric in Society at Virginia Tech. She teaches courses in autobiography, research methodologies, and rhetorics of social justice; her research focuses on displacement narratives and human rights rhetorics across transnational contexts. She is the author of *The Anguish of Displacement* (2007) and *Identity and Power in Narratives of Displacement* (2015) and editor of “Answer at Once”: *Letters from Mountain Families in Shenandoah National Park* (2009) and *Practicing Research in Writing Studies: Reflexive and Ethically Responsible Research* (with Pamela Takayoshi, 2012) and has published articles in *Biography*, *College Composition and Communication*, *College English*, and *Journal of American Studies*.