Vol. 27, no. 1, Fall 2024

Editor's Introduction

Rebecca Dingo and Clancy Ratliff

Doi: https://doi.org/10.37514/PEI-J.2024.27.1.01

If we are being honest, this editor's Introduction is not easy to write. The day after the re-election of Donald Trump as president, Clancy texted Rebecca, "Not looking forward to writing this editor's intro" and Rebecca texted back "Right?!" A month later, we still struggle to process what this election will mean for our communities, our universities, and especially the members of our all our communities who are immigrants, of color, and trans. The re-election of Donald Trump as president along with his nominations for White House Cabinet demonstrate what the ACLU executive director, Anthony D. Romero describes as "a clear and present danger to our democratic norms, processes, and institutions." Although The Heritage Foundation has regularly in the past offered a policy plan and road map to a conservative government, Project 2025's nine-hundred-page conservative manifesto offers an extreme reorganizing of the Executive Branch and overall Federal government while also gutting the civil liberties of many already vulnerable populations. Even though Trump tried to distance himself from Project 2025 during his campaign, it is becoming clearer (especially as he nominates underprepared and extremely conservative members to his cabinet) that he is not in actuality distancing himself from this plan at all—which is what many of us suspected in the first place. Locally, both of us are hearing murmurs on our campuses about what the Trump president will mean for our institutions and the students and faculty who reside in them. We anticipate the defunding of the NEA and NEH as last time he was president but as Project 2025 lays out; we also foresee that federal funds will be withdrawn or not granted to universities who chose to protect its DACA and immigrant students from deportation that the new administration claims will happen or who continue to support DEI initiatives or who teach materials the administration might deem as inappropriate. On the Gulf Coast, we brace for the proposed closure of the National Hurricane Center and other forms of environmental harm. As Jen Wingard

Rebecca Dingo is Professor of English at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Rebecca's research has addressed transnational rhetorical and composition studies and in doing so she forwards a transnational feminist lens attuned to global political economy. She is the author of Networking Arguments: Rhetoric, Transnational Feminism, and Public Policy Writing, which received the W. Ross Winterowd Award in 2012. She has published widely in both the field of Women's Studies and Rhetorical Studies. Rebecca has also offered workshops and trainings across the globe on her research, writing pedagogies, and writing development. Her pedagogy seeks to connect theory with practice and all of her classes tend to offer on-the-ground case studies paired with theoretical lenses. Rebecca earned her Ph.D. in English with an emphasis on Rhetoric and Composition from The Ohio State University.

Clancy Ratliff is Friends of the Humanities/Regents Professor in the English department and Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. Her research and teaching interests are in feminist rhetorics, environmental rhetorics, writing program administration, and copyright and authorship. She has published research in Women's Studies Quarterly, Kairos, Pedagogy, and other journals and edited collections. She is involved with several community advocacy organizations, including Sierra Club Delta Chapter, Move the Mindset, Citizens Climate Lobby, Acadiana Regional Coalition on Homelessness and Housing, and Louisiana Association of Sports, Outdoor Adventure, and Recreation (LASOAR).

in a recent private conversation with Rebecca suggested: just look to Texas. She went on to say that Texas is the pilot project for the nation in terms of neoliberal style deregulation, dismantling DEI, and cracking down on immigration. Due to Project 2025, Trump's concerning new cabinet, and Trump's racist, sexist, and fascist rhetoric, we write this editors' introduction in a state of uncertainty, instability, and fear. But all the same we look for moments of hope.

As a result of the election, on Rebecca's mind has been Antonio Gramsci's The Prison Notebooks. Gramsci wrote his groundbreaking book in prison and under a fascist regime. As a result, scholars have recounted that Gramsci himself had to create new words and suggest new understandings of concepts. He rhetorically crafted the term hegemony while arguing about a new civil society and the value of a passive revolution. While both of us are at times perplexed by our teenagers' new language and don't always fully understand their purposes and uses, perhaps this new language is important for current times. Perhaps they are creating new language and meaning that will be useful as Gramsci's was but for these times.

In the same vein of hope, rethinking, and retheorizing feminism this issue of Peitho, is timely. Even though all the content was written and accepted well in advance of the 2024 elections, in this issue, authors offer grounded methods that are applicable to what we as feminist scholars, faculty, and students may be facing in the near future as a result of this election. Nicole Tanquary's essay, "Tara Reade and the Case for a Feminist-Rhetoric Propaganda Studies" focuses on developing what she terms "feminist rhetoric-propaganda studies." Using the case of Tara Reade, who spoke out about President Biden inappropriately touching her and harassing her, Tanquary transparently walks her readers through what this method looks like. In doing so, she demonstrates the importance of close reading for ways in which, in Tanquary's case study, journalists work to frame readers opinions based on the evidence they include and leave out alongside their rhetorical choices. Through this method, Tanquary shows how audiences were able to deflect Biden's harassment of Reade in favor of supporting his run for President. This kind of micro-attention to how language, how and why a story is told, and what is revealed and left out, is going to be an important analytic skill for tracing fascist rhetoric.

In the jointly written essay, "Feminist Intersectionality: Two Writing Center Staff Renegotiating Identities in the Early 2020s" Naya Quintana and Xuan Jiang look at how writing centers are important parts of a university ecology because they can be spaces that establish communities for minoritized writing center staff. The study uses a collaborative autoethnography method to reflect on and share how the authors had to renegotiate their identities during the 2020 COVID pandemic. They noted how, due to their identities, they were at times vulnerable. They captured this experience by concretizing writing center staff members' voices in the essay. The essay ultimately shows how pluralized identities impact the writing center community and can deepen professional connections. This study reminds us that it is sometimes within everyday micro-spaces that small changes and challenges to the status quo can happen. As feminist scholars, it is important for us to attend to and make visible these times and spaces. WC staff's pluriversal identities impact WCs, and deepen the professional connection of WCs as feminized spaces, their services,

and their synergies ultimately for student success.

Melovee Easley and Elenore Long's essay, "Constructing Black Presence in Arizona's State Capitol Museum: Performing a Responsive Rhetorical Art in a Contested Site of Public Memory" demonstrates another way in which feminist rhetorical scholars can use feminist rhetorical and education practices to tell histories of racism in places where education materials about racism are outlawed. As the essay details, Easley was charged with the task of creating a museum exhibit about Buffalo Soldiers in a state where "proposed state legislation prohibited state-sponsored educational materials from referencing institutional racism (directly or indirectly)." Buffalo Soldiers were Black men who were recruited by the US military to help with Western expansion and to decimate indigenous communities. Drawing from Ibram Kendi, Easley understood the "cruel irony" of this practice and wanted to communicate it in the exhibit. Easley's task as a curator was to create an exhibit that would speak to students, children, adults across races about this complex history. The essay tracks the key rhetorical decisions Easley made to walk the fine line between telling and communicating the racist history without actually calling it out. It is this sort of careful crafting that rhetorical scholars will need to engage in these turbulent times.

This issue also features a Cluster Conversation on queer and feminist approaches to rhetorical surveillance studies: a timely collection of scholarship on surveillance (and sousveillance, and counterveillance) and technologies of surveillance as we go into 2025 and the next presidential administration. The editors, Morgan C. Banville and Gavin P. Johnson, do an outstanding job describing and connecting the individual pieces in the cluster, as well as contextualizing the larger area of surveillance studies; instead of our own introduction of the cluster, we urge readers to read their excellent introductory remarks.

Also in this issue are three Recoveries and Reconsiderations pieces. Rachael Mcintosh writes about her experience in the Slavery Documents Collection at the Eberly Family Special Collections Library at Penn State University. She thoughtfully situates her narrative of her encounter with the documents of enslavement in scholarship about archives and brings her own reflection on reading the papers into dialogue with issues in archival methodologies.

Andrew Fiss's piece also reflects on archival documents, particularly a composition book by Black professor Motta Sims. Sims taught home economics at various HBCUs, and her personal composition book integrates scrapbook creating and writing Written when Sims was a student, this artifact reveals the scientific knowledge in home economics, and Fiss notes the feminization of domestic science and its exclusion from STEM fields.

Alexandra Sladky's essay on "Iphis and Ianthe" shows us a new translation of Ovid's story that prompts a reconsideration of the complexity of Iphis's gender. The character Iphis was born a girl but raised as a boy and then betrothed to Ianthe. Sladky provides detailed explanations of particular translation choices in previous translations of Ovid, such as the word prodigiosus, and in the new translation by Stephanie

McCarter.