

[]: National Day of Silence's Rhetorical Silence as Performative Rhetorical Activism

Hillery Glasby

As a queer¹ person, I used to feel ambivalent about National Day of Silence (DOS), a day of commemoration where participants take a collective vow of silence to bring awareness to the bullying and discrimination Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans*, Queer+ (LGBTQ) youth face. I respected the day and what it stood for, but I admit that it didn't make a lot of sense to me. I got into a heated debate with another lesbian about the role of DOS for the LGBTQ community, many years ago. I argued that being silent might be redundant, ineffective, and irresponsible: why would anyone be silent if they had a point to make? And more specifically, why would LGBTQ people remain silent, considering many of us have been or have felt closeted at one point in time? I thought of two people in particular as I stated my case: Jess, the main character of Leslie Feinberg's *Stone Butch Blues*, and Reinaldo Arenas, a counter-revolutionary gay Cuban writer who died of AIDS in exile. Both struggled for years to articulate their experiences and fight for not only for the opportunity to speak, but also for the chance to be heard. Speaking out about the injustices they faced provided them with salvation, empowerment, and human connection. Arenas did not remain silent, even when his life was at stake. On the other hand, Jess endured so much silence that it took a toll on her emotional well-being.

I quoted Arenas, to support my case:

The difference between the Communist system and the Capitalist system, is that although both give you a kick in the ass, in the Communist system, they kick you and you have to applaud, and in the Capitalist system they kick you

Hillery Glasby is a PhD Candidate in Rhetoric and Composition at Ohio University and the Assistant Director of the Graduate Writing and Research Center. She teaches composition courses focused on revolution(ary) rhetoric(s), anti-LGBTQ bullying movements, LGBTQ identities and writing, environmental sustainability, and sexual literacy. Hillery has also taught LGBTQ literature and Queer Rhetorics and Writing. Her aim in the classroom, and in her scholarship, is to tie theory to practice in the vein of rhetorical agency and social justice.

¹ I use the term *queer* not only as a sexual identity, but also as a critical, political identifier for LGBTQ individuals that are engaged in social action and constant critiques of dominant Discourse(s) and hegemonic systems and institutions of oppression.

and you can scream, and I came here to scream. I then traveled through several countries: Venezuela, Sweden, Denmark, Spain, France, Portugal. In all of these countries I screamed; it was my treasure, it was all I had. (288)

After years of being unable to write freely, remaining silent was no longer an option for Arenas; he screamed because he *could*. In their books, both Arenas and Feinberg describe the exhilaration, and the necessity, of speaking about and against injustice.

Still, my opponent—I *hate to call her that since she is my partner, and because her points ultimately changed my mind about DOS*—wasn't convinced. She was adamant that the gesture of silence sent a clear message that speaking could not; she argued that it was effective precisely because it used no words—that's what made people stop and think. She said it was radical—a different breed of activism. She also reminded me that it might take more strategy and will power for outspoken queers to remain silent rather than to argue their case. I thought of myself: quick to respond and slow to listen. I wondered how my own silence might make a statement someday.

I listened carefully to her position because it was obvious DOS was important to her; she actively participated in DOS events every year. And on that day each year, her profile picture showed her staring directly at the camera, wearing a t-shirt that said "Day of Silence" and heavy black electrical tape across her mouth in the shape of an "x". I went home and looked at the photo and listened to what it was telling me. I researched DOS and read through the manual available online. I looked at pictures and watched participants in high schools and colleges across the world. The visual statement was riveting. Most people are accustomed to talking, but they aren't so familiar with being asked to listen, especially for voices they *aren't* hearing. Even though the theory behind DOS left me feeling conflicted, the practice—and her performance—of silent demonstration struck me. I now understand silence is a revolutionary form of protest.



Hear me silent, for I complain mutely.

—Sor Juana Inès de la Cruz

Despite being defined as the absence of sound, silence can function as a form of expression and an articulation of voice, particularly when that silence is intentional. The void is pronounced because *intention*, like brackets, surrounds it. Fae Chubin explains how intentional silence can function as "an active and meaningful response" to oppression, a "performative reaction" (178). Rather than respond with words, intentional silences employ a gesture of intentional withholding. Byron Hawk agrees that intentional silences are embedded with power,

under the control of those refusing to speak. He understands how these silent (re)actions, in their subtlety, are “subversive—present but silent” (Hawk 389). Something that is present-yet-absent is odd, even paradoxical, so it can serve a counter-logical purpose. The intended silence aims to produce an anticipated effect (and affect) for the intended audience. In this way, silence is not only instrumental, but also *rhetorical* and *counter-logical*.

Western culture is classified as being centered on loud, aggressive political rhetoric that functions to speak up, speak over, and shut down. Political discussions are polemic and rather than engage in democratic discussions, presidential debates often turn into one candidate yelling over another. More recently, the response of All Lives Matter to the Black Lives Matter movement demonstrates the ways those in power speak loud(er) to drown out the voices of the marginalized. Because queer people are usually barred from speaking, it is intriguing that they would choose to be silent on a day of LGBTQ activism. Trying to make a point through silence seems counter-intuitive because it doesn't aim to “make any noise,” although it most definitely catches people's attention. Rather than verbally engaging with an audience, the intentionally silent change the rules of the game by deciding to engage non-verbally. Intentional silence is unconventional in that it functions internally as well as externally. Both the intended audience and the silent rhetor are affected by the silence—they are both, simultaneously, given space to think and hopefully to reflect.

National Day of Silence (DOS)

DOS was first pioneered by students at the University of Virginia in 1996. The following year, Maria Pulzetti, an 18-year-old UVA student, took the silent movement national. By 1997, over 100 universities participated, from the United States to Australia, and each year the numbers of countries and universities joining the campaign continue to grow exponentially. Although it has grown at a slower pace, high school participation in DOS has steadily increased as well. In 1997, no high schools were participating, but by 2010, over 8,000 were involved in DOS. DOS and its events were initially created to provide a space where “students can speak out against harassment and demand change for their schools and communities” (GLSEN *DOS Organizing* 2). Participation ranges from large-scale open discussions, to panel presentations. Some of these events are school-sponsored; others are organized underground, amongst smaller groups of students. Some participants demonstrate in public spaces with signs, distributing fliers, *performing* their silence; others participate on a more passive level, simply opting not to speak during the school day. DOS usually finishes with a Break the Silence event, where participants share stories and collaboratively reflect on their experience of the day. As the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) explains, in DOS, “silence is used as a tactic to provide a space for personal reflections about the consequences of being silent

and silenced. The Day of Silence is an effort that can raise awareness on this issue, prompting people to talk and think about it” (*DOS Organizing* 4).

For these reasons, I argue that National Day of Silence (DOS) enacts and embodies a *rhetorical silence*, presenting those involved with a quiet, transformative space that presents an opportunity for reflection, peaceful protest, and social activism. I also argue that the queer silences of DOS constitute a distinctive form of rhetorical activism, understood and deployed as counter-logic since they function outside of, and against, standard conventions. DOS’ rhetorical silence is an example of an intentional, organized, and performative withholding. This form of rhetorical activism works, through collaboration, to reclaim the voices and stories that have gone unheard for generations.

For DOS, the active participants are performative rhetors, and the people they encounter throughout the day become their audience, even if unwillingly. They deliver silence—and in that silence, a message. Whether the participant is shy and simply remains quiet, passing out cards to friends and teachers, or the participant is more outwardly obvious about their participation, holding a sign or wearing tape over their² mouth, DOS participants draw people in. In doing so, they insist that their audience stop and think. The question printed at the bottom of the DOS card starts this process: “What are you going to do to end the silence?” In this way, DOS’ rhetorical silence provides an opportunity for engagement and reflection. It asks the audience what actions they will take, while also considering them active participants in DOS, even if indirectly. Putting the audience on the spot in this way is unexpected, catching the audience off guard. Jaqueline Rhodes describes how “playing with those cultural logics” in innovative ways like this “creat[es] rhetorically powerful counter-logics (Rhodes “Queered”). In a similar way, DOS participants disrupt dominant logics by asking rather than telling, and by making passerbys a part of their protest. DOS produces counter-logic because it does not assert a forceful argument in the same way dominant culture does, rather it remains quiet, creating a place for consideration instead of a delivering a pre-packaged argument. DOS presents observer-listeners with an emotional appeal for reflection, a starting point. By drawing attention to the missing voices of the oppressed, practitioners of DOS bring them into the fold as an enthymeme. Observers of DOS are expected to fill the gap to determine not only what is missing, but the source of the void as well.

² I use the plural, gender-neutral pronoun here out of respect for multiple and fluid gender identities, as there are many in the queer community who choose to remain outside of the he/she binary and its binarized pronoun arrangement.

Queer Silence: A Historically Muted Group

Instances of muteness which, by dint of saying nothing, imposed silence. Censorship.

—Michel Foucault

Historically, the silencing of the LGBTQ community and the systematic denial of non-normative sexualities has functioned to prevent and ignore homosexual sexual desire and practices. As a result, homosexual sex was situated as sinful, shameful, unnatural, and—until 1974—categorized as a mental disorder³. This refusal of gay identities did not stop homosexuality activity; it merely shrouded it in secrecy. Homosexual encounters that occurred in private spaces, like bathhouses, quickly evaporated once the participants were back in normative public spaces. After all, secrets are meant to be kept “inside,” left unspoken. Gay mouths were to remain shut (Alexander “Ethos”). After all, the proverbial “closed mouth” cannot engage in oral sex or a discussion about non-normative identities, sexual practices, and desires.

Because LGBTQ history has been significantly shaped vis-à-vis silence, LGBTQ people have a complicated relationship with intentional silences. While they can protect and disguise us, they also conceal and erase our identities and experiences. As a result, the “closet” has become a symbol of this silence. Remaining silent—i.e. closeted—about our sexualities is a calculated and contextualized move we may or may not make throughout our lives. Jonathan Alexander and Jackie Rhodes explain queer silence in terms of Grindstaff’s “rhetorical secret,” which

was dominant in much of the first part of the twentieth century’s construction of homosexuality: for gays and lesbians, the ‘love that dare not speak its name’ demanded careful narrative handling, forcing many to construct their sexual identities on the notion of secrecy, misdirection, and obfuscation; at the same time, such secrecy worked spectacularly to uphold heteronormativity by creating silences, stigmas, and shame around the homosexual. (“Logos”)

Because dominant culture framed homosexuality as something to be avoided for so many years, LGBTQ people have long been socialized to avoid their own feelings, desires, truths, and lived experiences. They keep their sexualities concealed, given certain (hetero)normative contexts, audiences, and situations in

³ Before 1974, homosexuality was classified as a mental illness in the DSM-II, a disorder “treated” by doctors and psychiatrists. According to Phil Hickey, the APA voted to remove it from the list after the early ‘70s gay rights movement resisted the classification. Playfully, Hickey points out, “so all the people who had this terrible ‘illness’ were ‘cured’ overnight—by a *vote!*” Ultimately, he argues “the homosexual community has managed to liberate themselves from psychiatric oppression” (Hickey “Homosexuality”).

order to protect themselves. In this way, the secret of their sexuality becomes rhetorical. As Michel Foucault, Eve Sedgwick, and Sara Ahmed theorize, the silent mask of the closet becomes internalized over time, and LGBTQ people learn to discipline and regulate themselves and their non-normative behavior. This self-regulation stems from and feeds fear, shame, and a discretion that operates in favor of the comfort levels of others.

Because of this disavowal, LGBTQ voices have been underrepresented, if not altogether absent, from dominant discourse and the rhetorical tradition until recent decades. It wasn't too long ago that the LGBTQ community faced open public discrimination, painted in broad strokes as unnatural, deviant perverts. These efforts worked to undermine the credibility and participation of LGBTQ people. Alexander and Rhodes explain, "queers often find that the logics of the larger culture are aligned to discredit queers, disavow the legitimacy of their interests, and discombobulate their attempts to find social justice" ("Logos"). They posit a closed mouth, tied tongue, and forced silence as visual representations of the refusal of ethos for LGBTQ individuals and the community as a whole, since they have not always had the ability to claim authority over their own lives; rhetorical agency is denied, and they are expected to remain tight-lipped and quiet (Alexander and Rhodes *Queered*).

LGBTQ people also silence themselves at times as a result of mainstream culture's efforts to keep us quiet and out of the conversation, socially and politically. Keeping queers discreet maintains their status in the margins of political involvement and representation. This system of dominance forces queers and their social and political agendas into the "closet".

Dominant discourse and its logic work tirelessly to silence fringe populations in order to render them—the Other, invisible, isolated, and in some cases non-existent. So how can queers gain visibility and political clout when they are systematically delegitimized, from within the private spaces of their bedrooms to the public forum at large?

As queers claimed and demanded more authority, the closet became even more stifling. After centuries of closeted life void of discursive power, the LGBTQ community entered the plague years. The AIDS epidemic became ubiquitous, not only in the private lives of homosexuals but also in public rhetoric. The "gay disease/cancer" consumed the minds of normative society in the '80s, making gays visible at the cost of a stigma they had not known before, and in response, the gay community posited to its own that "Silence = Death." This was the first major campaign encouraging gays to break their long held silence. Although empowering for some, this message also tormented those who had been silenced for too long and for those who understood that self-disclosure regarding their sexuality was dangerous. The tension within the gay community mounted as some now associated silence with *both* death and safety: what options were left? Silent, and other alternate queer, rhetorical activisms allow for

and encourage a reimagining of the long established Silence = Death equation: perhaps now we might argue that Silence = Δ (change).

Rhetorical Silence: Performative Rhetorical Activism

People talking without speaking, people hearing without listening, people writing songs that voices never share. And no one dared, disturb the sound of silence.

—Simon & Garfunkel

Too often, silence is understood only as existing in opposition to speech. Silence can indicate a failure to communicate or a state of inactivity. In conversations, it can feel like an uncomfortable void needing to be filled. Silence can be a reaction, a response, a result—an articulation, especially when it is *named*. “Named” silences, like DOS, are significant. Those demarcating the silence do so intentionally, using rhetorical silence as a way to fight back against and resist authority. And when they are deployed in direct opposition to dominant discourse, they can “be used to perform resistance” (Hao 299). The intention to resist plays out in a unique rhetorical situation. Exigency, intended audience, author/agent/rhetor, and (silent) message are joined together to birth a *rhetorical* silence.

If silence is the absence of sound, rhetorical silence is the intentional absence of sound in order to produce a specific effect, or affect. Rhetorical silence is deliberate and valuable, and it can be an innovative methodology for calling attention to a particular issue or problem, such as youth bullying. Barry Brummett positions rhetorical silence as *strategic*, particularly “when someone has a pressing reason to speak, but does not” (289). These rhetorical silences, Cheryl Glenn claims, are a rhetorical art “as powerful as the spoken or written word” (9). And though her scholarship on rhetorical silences is based primarily on the hushed female and Native American voices and perspectives throughout Western culture, insightful parallels can be drawn between the feminist and indigenous silences Glenn examines and intentionally resistant queer silence(s) like those enacted on DOS.

Silences are a way for marginalized groups to resist and disrupt the status quo, especially when they are collective. Organized silence draws from the imposed silences marginalized groups experience vis-à-vis normalized social practices that perpetuate hegemony (Clair 67). Robin Patric Clair also explores the ways in which “those silenced voices can be organized in ways to be heard” (Clair xiii). These silenced voices join forces in order to be heard—even if nothing is said. This organized, performative silence embodies “collaboration *as* resistance” (Leonardi and Pope 266), especially when it is positioned in direct response to silences prescribed by dominant homophobic culture. Clair elaborates on the many persuasive modalities of an organized, performative silence. She explains, “it speaks of oppression; it enunciates defiance; it articulates re-

sistance. Furthermore, it evidences creativity; it demonstrates control; it languishes in frustration; and it isolates the [silent] while simultaneously joining [them] to others who have known or know of the imposed silence” (147). The verbs used in Clair’s statement are connotative of traditional, voiced speech acts: *speaks, enunciates, articulates*. Without words, (self, or otherwise-) silenced individuals make legitimate points, establish agency, and build communities of action. Through collaboration, the oppressed undertake a reclamation project, working to regain rhetorical agency in order to be heard. DOS aims to operate under these conditions.

In fact, the DOS Organizing Manual explains the movement as “building a coalition [...] to win victories that couldn’t be won by one group alone” (3). This collaboration functions on two complementary levels: the act of organizing and working together constitutes resistance because Othered group members realize they are not alone and find solidarity in one another, and the silent resistance gains more political momentum with more members participating each year. As participants’ dedication grows, more high schools and universities are motivated to join the resistance and register for DOS. Thus the rhetorical silence grows louder and stronger in numbers and volume—both capacity and clamor.

Despite refusing to speak during DOS, participants communicate by brandishing DOS cards as they move throughout their day so their now-very-apparent silence is accompanied and amplified by a written message that conveys a specific rhetorical purpose. These cards allow them to provide a clear written explanation of their counter-logical approach. Rather than speak about these silences, the organized silence reenacts and reproduces them. In this way, DOS draws attention to the years of silence bullied and harassed LGBTQ individuals have faced. Mouths sealed with duct tape, t-shirts, pins, cards, and signs deliver DOS’ message loud and clear:

Please understand my reasons for not speaking today. I am participating in the Day of Silence (DOS), a national youth movement bringing attention to the silence faced by lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people and their allies. *My deliberate silence echoes that silence*, which is caused by anti-LGBT bullying, name calling and harassment. I believe that ending that silence is the first step toward building awareness and making a commitment to address these injustices. *Think about the voices you are not hearing today.* (GLSEN “Get Ready,” my emphasis)

Instructing readers to summon absent voices is a rhetorical strategy that shifts queer silence from memory to fruition, and from theory to practice.

DOS then becomes a vehicle for social action for those who participate annually, and “in essence, [these annual] rituals create symbols. They do not just reflect meaning, but also articulate it” (Hao 272). First, DOS participants disrupt the spaces of heteronormativity they inhabit with calculated action in rela-

tion to marginalization. Then they name their deliberate, collective silence with DOS cards where unheard voices ask for acknowledgement. If the audience-observers are put in a position to “think about the voices [they] are not hearing today,” they must also contemplate and acknowledge the political context for the silence. DOS participants use the corporeal body to enact an absence, thus embodying what Julie Bokser calls a “self-declared ‘inscription’ of silence.” It is the performative “delivery of silence” that commands attention (Bokser 18) through embodiment, where “embodiment refers to the active processes by which the body is realized and made meaningful” (Chubin 183). The silenced subject is “made meaningful” because of the bracketed intention and context of the silence.

The DOS logo itself calls attention to the brazen delivery of silence, as the silence is paradoxically front-loaded with an open, screaming mouth:



Fig. 1: “Get Connected”; *Day of Silence*; dayofsilence.org; 2011; web; 10 Mar. 2012.

The use of red and black, quintessential propaganda colors, create an “in your face” effect for the viewer, and although the event’s premise is silence, the intrepid expression (for expression works here on two levels: the expression on the person’s face and the more traditional voiced notion of expression) is apparent. DOS exists in a distinctive rhetorical realm and contributes to the evolving queer archive using non-normative methodologies and rhetorical strategies “that can enliven student awareness about the movement of ideas and emotions across and through public debates about the queer” (Alexander and Rhodes “A Turn”). Public action and dialog are necessary components for DOS since institutions that participate are encouraged by GLSEN to create press releases and notify school and local media for increased visibility.

The cards DOS participants distribute invite contemplation through action, and the reason for this rhetorical move is justice. As GLSEN explains, DOS is not a forceful tell, rather it is an “ask”:

The Day of Silence is a call to action. Students can use this day, as well as other GLSEN Days of Action, as a means of achieving an “ask.” An ask is a

very specific action that calls for a change in school policies, climate and culture to achieve a larger goal of safe schools for all, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity/expression. Some examples of an ask include: adding sexual orientation and gender identity/expression in your school's non-discrimination or anti-harassment policy or training teachers to respond effectively to anti-LGBT bullying, harassment and name-calling. (GLSEN *DOS Organizing 7*)

Asking people to stop and think about the brute social and political injustices the queer community has faced, and continues to face, brings suffering to the surface. The "ask" students are to follow through on moves their rhetorical agency to rhetorical activism to impart abstract ideals such as fairness and equality, as well as for more concrete goals like policy change.

Rhetorical Silence(s) as a Space for Meaning Making

Only those who don't listen to the silence think it's silence.

—Geoffrey Sirc

So what is silence's function in the learning process? What can rhetorical silence teach us? Silence creates a space for "a change in knowledge, in a person's way of thinking" (Hawk 381). In other words, silence serves an imagined purpose, to effect not just change, but also a *changing*. Rather than simply getting someone to "switch sides" and jump on board with an argument, *changing* requires an on-going discovery process that leads to personal and social transformation. DOS provides a fertile space in classrooms and on college campuses for a process of discovery and reflection to take place. The silent participants are the facilitators of this self-reflective process. Rhetorical silences also provide a site for participatory meaning making.

Rhetor and audience silently contemplate the possibilities. Silence and wonderment are offered to grow learners' minds, setting all on a journey of unearthing. Arabella Lyon explains, "This silence is somewhat like an enthymeme. For both, there is a missing term, or piece of the logic. Unlike the enthymeme though, the missing term is not readily known. Hence, its apprehension requires effort. Silence calls the student to action" (138). This knowledge generation is fostered through rhetorical listening since "silence creates the possibility of listening, which allows a larger context and forestructure to develop" (Hawk 384). Asking people to think, primarily outside of their own experiences, provides more transformative learning experiences since "the experiences of others often ignite greater self reflection" (Sowards and Renegar 66). Analyzing others' perspectives interrupts our own habits of mind, and the ideological shakedown unfolds. Krista Ratcliffe calls this methodology *rhetorical listening*, what she describes as "a trope for interpretive invention, one that emerges from a space within the logos where listeners may employ their agency" (204). Rhetorical

listening invokes “*understanding* as [its] end,” which is achieved through an invitation to witness (Ratcliffe 204). According to her line of reasoning, *logos* is understood as “laying,’ [which] entails laying others’ ideas in front of us in order to let these ideas lie before us” (Ratcliffe 202). This laying allows the observer to bear witness to the experiences and injustices of others.

Listening to stories that lay outside our own experiences provides not only space for reflection, but also an expanded context for our own beliefs and actions. Transformation has a better chance of taking place when we carefully consider the difference placed before us, if we are willing to explore our prejudices and (mis)conceptions. According to Jack Mezirow, “we transform our frames of reference through *critical reflection* on the assumptions upon which our interpretations, beliefs, and habits of mind or points of view are based [...] self-reflection can lead to significant personal transformations” (7). In other words, offering a silent space centered on this type of critical self-reflection provides a gentle and conscientious methodology of listening to, and for, the experiences of Others.

Rhetorical silences like DOS take a non-confrontational approach, expressing a “clear discomfort with persuasion argumentation. Instead one is to remonstrate (*jian*),” where “differences of opinion can be acknowledged through a more respectful process of modeling or demonstration” (Kameen 139). The goal of these situations is learning to listen and learn from others. The same can be said of DOS; the day’s rhetorical silence offers transformative moments that can fundamentally change people, who may then gain agency in their own lives and thus be inspired to effect social change for others as well.

I have often pondered the best way to observe and engage in political action on this critical day. Is it to speak out against injustices because silence is no longer culturally mandatory for LGBTQ individuals in the West, or should we practice rhetorical silence to connect with the pain of our past? DOS presents options for both. Silence *is* a way of speaking out, and for those who disagree, Breaking the Silence events offer opportunities to speak out on a more articulated and heightened level since speakers have held their ideas and feelings in all day. Those who have participated in DOS have interesting things to say about the power of self-imposed, performative silence and its teachable moments.

DOS provides a performative rhetoric premised with justice and understanding, and it sees *both* contemplation and action as key features in and of that goal. It is this bridge, built between justice in/through thoughtfulness and action, which creates a unique transformative space. Through rhetorical silence, DOS creates generative opportunities for *changing*, a result of moving muted oppression from the abstract to the concrete through clear and present embodied performance. Therefore DOS might be understood as a silent, performative space that also serves as an open invitation to listen and learn. DOS recalls and invokes the silence queers have suffered in the past in an attempt to honor the

bullying and discrimination LGBTQ people face in the present. The desire to recognize and restore hushed voices through remembrance and peaceful protest is the foundation of DOS. By connecting with the history of queers' absent rhetoric, and attempting to better understand and contextualize those missing voices through silence, new groundwork is being laid as we imagine and (re)create new queer rhetoric(s). It is in this way we collectively aim to liberate and restore rhetorical agency to marginalized groups, to provide access to the rights and privileges dominant culture enjoys, and to investigate the possibilities of things unspoken and unwritten—to reclaim, to resurface, and to crack the tradition wide open to expose its gaping voids.

What will *you*, dear reader, do to end the silence?

Works Cited

- Alexander, Jonathon and Jacqueline Rhodes. *Queered. Technoculture 2* (2012). Web. 9 Mar. 2012.
- "Queer Rhetoric and the Pleasures of the Archive." *Enculturation* 16 Jan. 2012. Web. 9 Mar. 2012.
- Arenas, Reinaldo. *Before Night Falls*. New York: Penguin, 1993. Print.
- Bokser, Julie A. "Sor Juana's Rhetoric of Silence." *Rhetoric Review* 25.1 (2006): 5-21. Print.
- Brummett, Barry. "Towards a Theory of Silence as a Political Strategy." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66 (1980): 289-303. Print.
- Clair, Robin Patric. *Organizing Silence*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998. Print.
- Chubin, Fae. "You May Smother My Voice, But You Will Hear My Silence." *Sexualities*. 17.1/2 (2014): 176-193. Print.
- Darsey, James. "From 'Gay is Good' to the Scourge of AIDS: The Evolution of Gay Liberation Rhetoric, 1977-1990." *Readings on the Rhetoric of Social Protest*. 2nd Edition. Ed. Charles E. Morris III and Stephen Browne. State College: Strata Publishing, 2006. 301-325. Print.
- Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN). *Day of Silence*, 2011. Web. 6 Mar. 2012.
- *Day of Silence Organizing Manual*. 2009. Print.
- Glenn, Cheryl. *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004. Print.
- Hao, Richie Neal. "Rethinking Critical Pedagogy: Implications on Silence and Silent Bodies." *Text and Performance Quarterly*. 31.3 (2011): 267-284. Print.
- "Silence as Cultural Pedagogical Performance: Possibilities in Silence Research." *The Review of Communication*. 10.4 (2010): 290-305. Print.

- Hawk, Byron. "A Rhetoric/Pedagogy of Silences: Sub-version in Paul Kameen's *Writing/Teaching*." *Pedagogy* 3.3 (2003): 377-397. Print.
- Hickey, Paul. "Homosexuality: The Mental Illness that Went Away." *Behaviorism and Mental Health*. 2 Jan. 2013. Web. 10 Oct. 2015.
- Kameen, Paul. *Writing/Teaching*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2000. Print.
- Leonardi, Susan J. and Rebecca Pope. "Screaming Divas: Collaboration as Feminist Practice." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 13.2 (1994): 259-270. Print.
- Lyon, Arabella. "Confucian Silence and Remonstrance: A Basis for Deliberation?" *Rhetoric Before and Beyond the Greeks*. Ed. Carol S. Lipson and Roberta Binkley. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004. 131-145. Print.
- Ratcliffe, Krista. "Rhetorical Listening: A Trope for Interpretive Invention and a 'Code of Cross-Cultural Conduct.'" *College Composition and Communication* 51.2 (1999): 195-224. Print.
- Sowards, Stacey K. and Valerie Renegar. "Reconceptualizing Rhetorical Activism in Contemporary Feminist Contexts." *The Howard Journal of Communications* 17: 57-74. Print.



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike International 4.0 License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>; or, (b) send a letter to Creative Commons, 171 2nd Street, Suite 500, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA