multiplicity of simultaneous and conflicting truths that the idea of rhetorics implies. Instead, Fredal’s book ends on an unnecessarily combative note. Or is he performing the “zero-sum” rhetoric he explores?

Fredal’s version of the Sophists unfortunately appears to derive almost entirely from the texts of Plato and Aristotle and concentrates on their favorite sophistic anthem: making the weaker case appear stronger. With a little more attention to neo-sophistic rhetoric, Fredal might have found contemporary discussions of the sophistic concepts of kairos and nomos tremendously useful in realizing his desire to define a rhetoric that accounts for “the sense of time, of place, and of the contingencies of action produced through lived practice and live performance” (200).

Overall, *Rhetorical Action in Ancient Athens* is an impressively ambitious, enjoyably provocative, and admirably defended text. Fredal’s insights bring a clarity and unity to an unexpectedly broad scope of cultural events and habits, fitting them sensibly within a newly defined, performative ancient rhetoric. If the author overreaches, he can be forgiven. Or he can write another book. Or maybe he’d rather step outside.

---


Reviewed by Resa Crane Bizzaro, East Carolina University

In mid-October 2006, in Snow Hill, North Carolina, members of the Tuscarora nation staged a “peaceful occupation” of Fort Neoheroka, the final stronghold destroyed by colonial forces during the Tuscarora War of 1711–1713. The purpose of this modern-day occupation was to highlight problems the Tuscarora encountered in maintaining a connection to one of their ancestral grounds. The Tuscarora’s stated goals included stopping the farming and ground-disturbing activities (including periodic archaeological digs) at the site, repatriating to the site remains currently located in East Carolina University’s Archaeological
Laboratory, transferring ownership of the Fort from private hands to the Tuscarora, and compensating property "owners" for their loss. The occupation was peacefully ended by the Greene County Sherriff, who asked the protesters to evacuate the property. Donald Davis, the Mayor of Snow Hill, sent word that he had called an impromptu town meeting for the following week to discuss and attempt to resolve the issues brought forward by the Tuscarora.

In their efforts to garner community support for their actions, the Tuscarora established a website and sent mass mailings to several Native American lists. They encouraged others to attend the meeting and make phone calls, send e-mails and faxes, and inform those in positions of power that "we are all united on this and will not rest until the Neoheroka is given the respect it is due, until the site is protected from further disturbance, and until our ancestors [sic] remains are properly repatriated to the ground there at the fort" (www.myspace.com/tuscarorasonforneoheroke).

For me, this event demonstrates that Native American rhetorics continue to be alive and active. And the rhetorical strategies used by this Tuscarora group show that, indeed, modern-day indigenous peoples are still concerned with matters of survival and resistance (survivance) and the rhetorics essential to an articulation of their ongoing struggles. Ernest Stromberg's *American Indian Rhetorics of Survivance* suggests that the preoccupation with survival and resistance has been and still is of paramount concern for indigenous peoples in the United States; the book provides a thoughtful introduction and overview for understanding Native American rhetorical communities and strategies.

In his "Introduction," Stromberg notes that most contributors focus their essays on "the post-contact rhetoric of American Indian orators and speakers who have bridged the communication gap between their own traditions and cultural traditions of the European and American colonizers" rather than on pre-contact rhetoric (5). Stromberg comments upon the necessity of examining tribally specific rhetorical traditions; however, it would be impossible to provide that assessment and discussion in one book. Instead, the collection aims to "enrich our understanding of what might be considered Pan-Indian rhetorical traditions developed over five hundred years of ongoing struggle" (6). The book is organized
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in four parts: Appropriation and Resistance; Rhetorical Self-Fashioning; Writing, Rhetoric, and Pedagogy; and A Theory of Rhetoric, a Rhetoric of Theory.

To my knowledge, there are few—if any—comprehensive collections on Indian rhetorics. While some essays do take up the notion of what an Indian rhetoric looks like and how it functions, no in-depth examination is available—especially one that includes work from a variety of nations. Many people have not considered, and are perhaps unaware, that the indigenous peoples of this country have or use rhetorical strategies. As Michael Dorris explains, the portrayal over centuries of Native Americans as savages and pagans, who are “backward, ignorant,... [and] without vision” (qtd. in Stromberg 241) has contributed to the perception that Indians are arhetorical. However, as Karen A. Redfield points out, “Indigenous people in the Americas were never silent, even if they were rarely heard by Euro-Americans” (151).

Perhaps the best way to look at this collection of essays is to use Redfield’s terms of “external” and “internal” rhetorics; these terms emphasize audience, a concern that has always been important in native rhetorics. Redfield defines external rhetoric as “the attempt [by Native Americans] to find ways to communicate with non-Native people” (151). By contrast, internal rhetoric reflects the position that Indians “no longer have to be concerned about whether or not non-Indian audiences understand or approve of what they are saying” (158). To Redfield’s categories, I would also add a hybrid rhetoric, which includes features of both internal and external rhetorics and bridges the audience gap between them. Most of the essays in Stromberg’s collection fall within one or more of these categories.

Until recently, the rhetorical strategy used most often has been external rhetoric. For instance, Malea D. Powell’s essay, “Sarah Winnemucca Hopkins: Her Wrongs and Claims,” provides a strong example of such writing. Powell describes Winnemucca’s concern—in Life Among the Piutes—with a non-Native audience, portraying herself and others from the Piute nation as “good” Indians. She also notes that Winnemucca’s text has been dismissed by some critics because of its clear sense of audience and persona; however, this strategy was one consciously adopted by Winnemucca in her efforts to identify her nation
as a group of “complete human being[s] with problems and shortcomings as well as strengths and victories” (74). Drawing upon the work of LaVonne Ruoff, Powell argues that Winnemucca’s ultimate goal was to enable her white audience to identify with her (and, by extension, with the Piute and all Native Americans) as human beings; this identification would allow whites to understand their injustices against indigenous peoples and to influence public policy makers. Winnemucca was rightly—and, perhaps, inevitably—concerned with audience, purpose, and persona.

Another example of external rhetoric can be seen in Matthew Dennis’ essay, “Red Jacket’s Rhetoric”; Red Jacket attempted to establish a tradition for a discourse of peace—a middle ground where neither side could dominate or disengage. According to Dennis, Seneca orators benefited from America’s developing “culture of sensibility,” in which the new country wished to portray itself as a “moral community” (19). A prominent rhetorician, Red Jacket pressed the Senecan claim against American morality, citing in his speeches the very issues of “filial neglect or cold disregard made against George III by American patriots so recently” (22). Finally, Dennis notes that Red Jacket went even further; he used the rhetorical tactic of playing powers against each other in several instances, including his description of the efforts of both the “white man” and the “king’s children” to seek an alliance with the Seneca. After comparing the claims of both groups, Red Jacket ultimately concluded that the “Indians must take care of themselves” (qtd. in Stromberg 28).

Hybrid rhetorics are evidenced in the book as well. Using both external and internal rhetorical strategies, these hybrid texts appeal to audiences outside and within Native American communities. In “Communicating History,” for example, Anthony G. Murphey argues that James Welch’s novel Killing Custer communicates a revised and empowering history for Native Americans today. This new history rests upon Murphy’s discussion of the “truth value” of historical accounts, which is bound to appeal to readers who are sympathetic to and part of Indian communities. Murphy points out that while Welch’s primary audience includes Lakota, Cheyenne, Arapaho, and other Native Americans (internal), the book’s readership “would likely be largely white” (external;
In addition, Murphy argues that Welch's book allows his audience to see that the Battle of the Little Big Horn ended the Plains Indians' traditional way of life and shows how its repercussions affect the lives of the modern indigenous peoples. As a hybrid rhetoric, this newly contextualized history appeals to both Euro-American and Native American audiences.

In terms of modern repercussions, perhaps the most striking essay in the book is Peter d'Errico's chapter on the legal aspects of Native American sovereignty, which covers ground from 1493 to the present. D'Errico's discussion of the "shell game" of indigenous peoples' rights to self-determination demonstrates his point that the United States government continues to dominate indigenous peoples unfairly. Comparing papal bulls to Supreme Court rulings, d'Errico states that the United States' claims on indigenous nations' land is based upon a doctrine of Christian supremacy. He offers a rereading of legal documents, noting that "in law and history books, 'European' [was] substituted for 'Christian'" (240). Citing legal cases in support of his explanation of the evolution of white-Indian relations, d'Errico also discusses sovereignty. In international cases, sovereignty confers both external and internal power to a state. Through a detailed analysis, d'Errico explains that in Supreme Court cases indigenous groups in America have been granted conflicting status as both independent and dependent governments, which places Native Americans in a kind of limbo where they cannot assert power against the US government. D'Errico's essay appeals to both external and internal audiences, since readers would have to agree that the US legal system should not be able to evade its responsibility of recognizing and negotiating with Indian nations according to treaties signed by both parties.

Although some aspects of internal rhetoric are present in a number of essays, the final contribution to the book probably appeals most to an internal audience or, certainly, to cultural insiders. In "Wennebojo Meets a 'Real Indian'," Richard Clark Eckert uses language directed explicitly to an Indian audience. His story contains many references to Anishinaabeg linguistic and cultural practices, although people from other indigenous groups will recognize a number of references as well. The story is about Wennebojo, a trickster figure who attends a powwow looking for a "real"
Indian. At first, Eckert offers translations for Anishinaabeg words such as *boozhoo* (hello), and *megwitch* (thank you); however, later in the story he uses the terms *migis* and *kinnikinnick* without giving any specific rendering of them in English. Eckert also refers to specific aspects of powwows—such as “Grand Entry,” “black medicine water,” and “elaborate porcupine roaches”—without defining or explaining them; obviously, this author is not primarily concerned with a non-Indian audience’s understanding or approval, a clear demonstration of a rhetoric that is internal in its intentions.

The book itself offers much to those new to a study of Native rhetorics. While some scholars might find the “Introduction” too simplistic, I believe this emerging area of study needs to be placed in its proper context and connected to traditions familiar to novice readers. A thorough theoretical grounding is necessary for its audience—mostly an audience external to indigenous cultures. Impatient readers may wonder why Stromberg (or another contributor) didn’t simply offer one chapter that identifies and defines the characteristics of a Native rhetoric; however, those readers would miss the point of the chapters’ multiple layers: that Native “stories” seldom give a direct answer. Rather, the characteristics of an indigenous rhetoric are revealed in hearing all the stories. Besides, Indian rhetorics are multiple, just as multiple as Indian nations across the United States.

I would like to have seen at least one essay that discussed a pre-contact Native rhetoric in order to contrast it with a post-contact one. Perhaps that essay falls outside the intended scope of this book. Or, since indigenous cultures were oral before the advent of Columbus, perhaps it is impossible to retrieve a pre-contact rhetoric. It would also be interesting to see an essay that deals overtly with issues of inclusion using the government-mandated blood quantum process. The mixed-blood Native rhetoricians included here all speak from an acknowledged Indian perspective; of course, these Native peoples were communicating in a time when mixed-bloods were regarded as Indians rather than Europeans.

Stromberg and the other contributors have provided excellent material upon which other scholars of Native rhetoric can build. The essays demonstrate aspects of Native rhetorics, even as they describe those rhetorics in the work of others. Redfield’s terminology allows us to
classify rhetorical concerns in this book in much the same way we can classify the rhetorical concerns of American Indian speakers and writers in any rhetorical situation.


Reviewed by K. Hyoejin Yoon, West Chester University

Recently, liberal pundits have referred to the Bush administration’s relational politics as “cowboy diplomacy,” connoting a lawless, aggressive, and fear-mongering approach to conflict and difference. Punishing Schools argues that such an approach is reflected in and sponsored by what the authors call “zero tolerance culture,” where the reflex to punish and enforce belies an intrinsically fearful culture. Through detailed ethnographic research, and political, textual, and cultural analyses of both local practices and broader cultural narratives, William Lyons and Julie Drew illustrate how schooling policies and school culture have been built upon fears (of difference and youth) and concomitant punishment of actual, perceived, and projected dangers. Their comparative case study of two Ohio high schools (one suburban and one urban) fleshes out a vivid picture of the infiltration of “zero tolerance” policies towards crime and drugs into schools.

Lyons and Drew’s study provides thick descriptions of the physical structures of the schools; interviews with parents, teachers, administrators, and students; and analyses of local newspaper articles, government reports, and discussions with city planners. Their ethnographic details and sustained emphasis on the local make unique and substantive contributions to critical pedagogy literature in both content and method. Expansive ideological and philosophical issues, so well addressed by educational theorists, are vividly illustrated in particular discursive and