DOROTHY DAY AND THE MATTER OF AUTHORITY:

A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

by

KATIE LOUISE RUSH

(Under the Direction of John M. Murphy)

ABSTRACT

One of the main rhetorical tasks of Dorothy Day, co-founder of the Catholic Worker movement, was to establish her authority. In this study, I address this rhetorical challenge by analyzing two pieces of Day's rhetoric—*The Catholic Worker* newspaper and Day's autobiography *The Long Loneliness*. I argue that Day drew on the resources of the newspaper and autobiographical genres to establish her authority and, moreover, that she exercised her authority in two contrasting ways. In some instances, she assumed the role of the prophet, criticizing her community from a distance. In other instances, she located herself firmly within her community, drawing on rhetorical traditions to build identification with her audience. The tension between these two rhetorical styles, the prophetic and the personal, is a central characteristic of Day's rhetoric.

INDEX WORDS: Dorothy Day, Catholic Worker Movement, Authority, Rhetoric, Identification, Prophetic Voice, Rhetorical Traditions

DOROTHY DAY AND THE MATTER OF AUTHORITY:

A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

by

KATIE LOUISE RUSH

B.A., The University of Texas at Austin, 2004

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2008

DOROTHY DAY AND THE MATTER OF AUTHORITY:

A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

by

KATIE LOUISE RUSH

Major Professor:	John M. Murphy
Committee:	Kelly Happe
	Thomas M. Lessl

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank first and foremost my parents, Charlie and Brenda, and my sister, Leah, for the invaluable support they provided me, without which I could not have completed this thesis. I must also extend my sincere appreciation to my advisor, John Murphy, for his encouragement and ready assistance, and to my committee members Tom Lessl and Kelly Happe for their enthusiasm and thoughtful feedback.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

On May 1st, 1933, Dorothy Day released the first issue of the newspaper *The Catholic Worker* in New York's Union Square. The newspaper, which she co-founded with itinerant French theologian Peter Maurin, addressed the unemployed to assure them that the Catholic Church, to which she was a recent convert, had a social program to care for their material needs as well as their spiritual ones.[1] Needless to say, the amount of material need at this time in American history was immense; 1933 was one of the worst years of the Great Depression, with more than thirteen million people out of work.[2] Initially, the newspaper caused confusion and skepticism. At this point, the American Catholic Church had yet to become very involved with social justice issues. As far as politics went, its hierarchy "stood slightly to the right of Herbert Hoover."[3] Moreover, Union Square was the site where Socialists voiced their agendas, where Communists hawked *The Daily Worker*. Neither of these groups had much truck with religion.

This disconnect was one of the main reasons why Day founded *The Catholic Worker*. In the first issue, she wrote, "It's time there was a Catholic paper printed for the unemployed. The fundamental aim of most radical sheets is conversion of its readers to radicalism and atheism. Is it not possible to be radical and not atheist? Is it not possible to protest, to expose, to complain, to point out abuses and demand reforms without desiring the overthrow of religion?"[4] Previously a journalist for radical papers the *Call*, *The Masses*, and *The Liberator*, Day had long been

[1] Dorothy Day, "To Our Readers," *The Catholic Worker*, May 1, 1933.
[2] Dorothy Day, *The Long Loneliness: The Autobiography of Dorothy Day* (Garden City, NY: Image Books, 1959).
[3] Dwight Macdonald, "Introduction," in *The Catholic Worker: Volumes 1–7, 1933–1940*, ed. Dorothy Day, *Radical Periodicals in the United States* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Reprint Corporation, 1970), 1.
[4] Day, "To Our Readers."

concerned with the struggles of laborers. Her conversion to Catholicism did not erase this concern; rather, it provided a new imperative to help alleviate suffering.

The paper's circulation ballooned rapidly. Day printed 2,500 copies of the first edition; three years later, circulation reached 65,000, and it topped 185,000 by the end of the decade.[5] Coming on the heels of the newspaper's publication was the establishment of the Catholic Worker's first house of hospitality. Part homeless shelter, part soup kitchen, the house of hospitality was a central component of Maurin's social program designed to create a world "where it is easier for people to be good."[6] As *The Catholic Worker* gained readers across the country, dozens of houses of hospitality sprang up as people tried to live out the ideals presented in the newspaper. Soon the Catholic Worker was more than a periodical; it became a movement.

While the Catholic Workers were frequently hailed for their service to the poor, not all of their principles were as well-received. Primary among these was their adoption of absolute pacifism, which they advocated consistently through the Spanish Civil War, World War II, and the Vietnam War. Day's unswerving commitment to nonviolence, after the bombing of Pearl Harbor in particular, cost the movement dearly. Bishops urged churches to end their bulk subscriptions to the newspaper, and circulation plummeted. Many houses of hospitality shut their doors, and internal tensions among Catholic Worker communities ran high. Still, Day refused to change her message.[7]

The bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki confirmed all too vividly Day's predictions about the devastating costs of war.[8] She dedicated the rest of her years to elaborating on this

---

[5] Martin E. Marty, *Modern American Religion, Volume 2: The Noise of Conflict, 1919–1941* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).
[6] Day, *The Long Loneliness: The Autobiography of Dorothy Day*.
[7] See Carol J. Jablonski, "Resisting the 'Inevitability' of War: The Catholic Worker Movement and World War II," in *American Rhetoric in the New Deal Era, 1932–1945*, ed. Thomas W. Benson, *A Rhetorical History of the United States* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2006).
[8] Ibid.

theme through her newspaper and other media, explaining that her understanding of pacifism entailed a rejection of all warfare—political, class, and race wars alike. In this way, Day targeted all forms of injustice at once. Repeatedly, she expressed her concern for the dignity of the individual and her yearning for universal brotherhood. In addition to her articles in *The Catholic Worker*, Day penned several autobiographical works that offered personal explanations for her activism. These books raised her profile, as did her speeches to student groups and other organizations throughout the country.

After Dorothy Day died in 1980, those in the Catholic Worker movement stuck to its original principles and continued the work of the founders. Though the movement has remained small, its influence has been far-reaching.[9] In the Depression Era, the Catholic Worker philosophy presented a significant "alternative to the helplessness of the government and the remoteness of many in the intellectual and religious communities."[10] Moreover, the movement sparked important conversations in the American Catholic Church about Christians' obligations during war, and it provided the justification Catholics needed in seeking status as conscientious objectors.[11] In some ways, the Catholic Workers prefigured the protest movements of the 1960s and 1970s, particularly in their direct action tactics, anti-bourgeois mentality, and communal living.[12] Several Workers, like Michael Harrington, gained important experience working in the houses of hospitality or in the editorial office of *The Catholic Worker* before rising to prominence in subsequent decades. Other activists, including Philip and Daniel Berrigan and

[9] Macdonald, "Introduction."
[10] Marty, *Modern American Religion, Volume 2: The Noise of Conflict, 1919–1941*, 337.
[11] Charles Chatfield, "The Catholic Worker in the United States Peace Tradition," in *American Catholic Pacifism: The Influence of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*, ed. Anne Klejment and Nancy L. Roberts (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996). See also John O'Sullivan, "An Uneasy Community: Catholics in Civilian Public Service During World War II," in *Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement: Centenary Essays*, ed. William J. Thorn, Phillip M. Runkel, and Susan Mountin (Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 2001).
[12] Macdonald, "Introduction," 11.

Cesar Chavez, looked to Day as inspiration.[13] Today the movement is notable for both the consistency of its message and its longevity,[14] and Day is characterized by many as a prophet, visionary, and saint.

Rhetorical Challenges

And yet, throughout her lifetime, Day continually had to reinforce her authority to speak. Her message was not always a popular one; to get audiences even to consider it, she had to position herself as an authority. This task is fundamental for all rhetors, but in Day's case, it was complicated by two rhetorical obstacles.

The first of these, already alluded to, is the dissonance between secular radicalism and religion. At this point, I must pause for a moment to explain what I mean by radicalism. This concept has several definitions, but for my purposes, I will abide by Day's understanding of the term. She spoke of radicalism as a set of principles concerned with the poor above all. Its aim is to overcome society's injustices by attacking capitalist and imperialist systems of power and establishing a new order.[15] Some of the radicals that Day frequently came into contact with were Socialists, Communists, and Wobblies (members of the International Workers of the World, or the I.W.W.).

The political radicals that Day had associated with during her youth had taken Marx at his word and believed, as had she before her return to faith, that religion was the opiate of the masses. This opinion tended to put radicals at odds with religious individuals, and since Day wished to appeal to both groups, her task was doubly difficult. The differences in religious belief

[13] Alden Whitman, "Dorothy Day, Catholic Activist, 83, Dies," *The New York Times*, December 1, 1980.
[14] Macdonald, "Introduction."
[15] Anne Klejment, "The Radical Origins of Catholic Pacifism: Dorothy Day and the Lyrical Left During World War I," in *American Catholic Pacifism: The Influence of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*, ed. Anne Klejment and Nancy L. Roberts (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996).

aside, the two audiences contrasted in other ways as well. Radicals embraced the overthrow of the government, equal government by all, or anarchy—depending on their specific affiliations. Day perceived religious individuals as being less likely to challenge their government and actively fight for the rights of the poor. The Catholic Church, specifically, represented one of the most monolithic hierarchies in the Western world, and Catholic leaders in America during that era tended to support the status quo politically. Day's ability to play both sides—to tout her credentials as a radical and simultaneously share her religious faith—made her suspect. Thus, the divergence of Day's two target audiences presented a substantial rhetorical obstacle.

A second rhetorical obstacle Day faced was her gender. As has been argued many times previously, most notably by Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, women throughout history have had an especially difficult time voicing concerns in the public sphere.[16] Their difficulties have typically been a result of prevailing attitudes about men's and women's social roles. In her study of early feminist rhetoric, Campbell notes that many of these attitudes in the nineteenth century were wrapped up in the larger notion of "true womanhood," which described women as docile, domestic beings by nature who could best improve society by instilling virtues in their children. Women were looked upon favorably as having strong moral character. However, their purity depended on their domesticity, and women who spoke out publicly against society's ills drew scorn.[17] Public rhetoric emphasized reason; it was competitive, even aggressive. By the standards of the nineteenth century, these were masculine qualities. Accordingly, most people felt that advocating reform in the public sphere was best left to men. "Quite simply, in

[16] Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "Femininity and Feminism: To Be or Not to Be a Woman," *Communication Quarterly* 31, no. 2 (1983), Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, *Man Cannot Speak for Her* (New York: Praeger, 1989). See also Martha M. Solomon, "The Role of the Suffrage Press in the Woman's Rights Movement," in *A Voice of Their Own: The Woman Suffrage Press, 1840–1910*, ed. Martha M. Solomon, *Studies in Rhetoric and Communication* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1991).
[17] Campbell, *Man Cannot Speak for Her*, 10.

nineteenth-century America, femininity and rhetorical action were seen as mutually exclusive. No 'true woman' could be a public persuader."[18] Women who tried their hand at public persuasion, effectively challenging the notion of "true womanhood," were met with swift and scathing criticism.

Much had changed by the time Day came on the scene, yet she, too, faced constricting attitudes about traditional gender roles. As a young adult, she encountered strong opposition from her father about working outside the home as a journalist. A journalist himself, he felt that the newspaper business was no place for his daughter.[19] Day explains in her autobiography that he deliberately tried to frustrate her attempts at finding a job; her first interviews were thwarted "in some cases because my father had told his city editor friends to lecture me on the subject of newspaper work for women."[20] Day's writings suggest that she faced similar constraints throughout her career. Jablonski explains:

> The rhetorical constraints of gender certainly were apparent in Day's writing, where she made a point of deferring to a system that privileged male speech, particularly that of bishops and clergy. From the beginning of the Catholic Worker movement, she acknowledged that there were those who might question why she, a lay woman and convert, could have anything to say. Day's frequent references to herself as Peter Maurin's 'disciple' may have been an effort to authorize herself to speak. . . . Her perplexity over people who treated her as though she could not understand family life because she was not married (and her reminders to readers that she did, indeed, have a family) suggest that Day regularly dealt with the dilemma of seeming to be—and not to be—what audiences expected of a woman in public life.[21]

Jablonski makes it clear that this "dilemma" was an ongoing one, that Day continually had to reinforce her authority to speak. Considering the importance of this task in Day's work,

---

[18] Ibid., 9–10.
[19] William D. Miller, *Dorothy Day: A Biography*, 1st ed. (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1982).
[20] Day, *The Long Loneliness: The Autobiography of Dorothy Day*, 48.
[21] Carol J. Jablonski, "Dorothy Day's Contested Legacy: "Humble Irony" As a Constraint on Memory," *Journal of Communication & Religion* 23, no. 1 (2000): 34. See also Carol J. Jablonski, "Dorothy Day," in *Women Public Speakers in the United States, 1925–1993: A Bio-Critical Sourcebook*, ed. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994).

the issue of authority merits closer attention. In my thesis, I wish to address this rhetorical challenge by analyzing two pieces of Day's rhetoric—*The Catholic Worker* newspaper and Day's autobiography *The Long Loneliness*. I argue that Day drew on the resources of the newspaper and autobiographical genres to establish her authority and, moreover, that she exercised her authority in two contrasting ways. In some instances, she assumed the role of the prophet, criticizing her community from a distance. In other instances, she located herself firmly within her community, speaking more personally and building identification with her audience. The tension between these two rhetorical styles, the prophetic and the personal, is a central characteristic of Day's rhetoric.

Literature Review

The history of the Catholic Worker movement is well-documented, in large part because of Day's own efforts to record it. At the request of William D. Miller, Day sent her papers to the archives at Marquette University. Miller spent years combing through these sources and eventually produced the first full-length history of the Catholic Worker movement (aside from Day's own narratives) and subsequently, a comprehensive biography of Day.[22] The latter book details many of the defining moments of her life: her loss of faith in college and her subsequent flirtation with Socialism and Communism; her traumatic love affairs in her bohemian days and her common-law marriage to Forster Batterham; the birth of her daughter and her conversion to Catholicism; her introduction to Peter Maurin and their efforts in the Catholic Worker movement; and much more in between. Of course, Day had written about much of this herself, but her account is more selective; large chunks of her youth are missing in most of her autobiographical works. Miller does a useful service in filling in these gaps.

[22] Respectively, Miller, *Dorothy Day: A Biography*, William D. Miller, *A Harsh and Dreadful Love: Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement* (New York: Liveright, 1973).

Mel Piehl, another historian, contributed valuable insight on the intellectual origins of the Catholic Worker philosophy.[23] He identified some of the European influences that Maurin advanced in his teachings and in the pages of *The Catholic Worker*: Mauritain's and Mounier's philosophies of personalism, English theories of distributism, and Dostoyevsky's and Berdyaev's ideas about poverty and possibilities for a renewed society. Piehl argues that Catholic radicalism in America originated with the Catholic Worker movement. Many other historians and religious scholars have followed in Piehl's footsteps, elaborating upon the philosophical and religious roots of the movement and its impact on later thinkers.[24]

The movement has received less attention from rhetorical scholars, with the notable exception of Carol Jablonski. Jablonski has published on Day and Maurin's pacifist stance in the 1930s, as articulated in *The Catholic Worker*.[25] She highlights the movement to show that the inevitability of WWII was, in fact, not felt by all Americans in the years preceding the conflict. Elsewhere, Jablonski has argued that Day's primary persuasive strategy was irony and that she typified, as Burke would put it, the "humble ironist," for she recognized her reliance upon the contrasting viewpoints of her opponents.[26] Irony was a natural choice for Day, according to Jablonski, since it fit into the nihilistic intellectual climate of the early twentieth century; it helped her overcome the rhetorical constraints of gender; and it was already a part of her arsenal as an experienced journalist. Jablonski claims that Day's use of irony allowed her to be

[23] Mel Piehl, *Breaking Bread: The Catholic Worker and the Origin of Catholic Radicalism in America* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982).
[24] See, for example, Anne Klejment and Nancy L. Roberts, *American Catholic Pacifism: The Influence of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996), William J. Thorn, Phillip M. Runkel, and Susan Mountin, *Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement: Centenary Essays* (Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 2001), Mark Zwick and Louise Zwick, *The Catholic Worker Movement: Intellectual and Spiritual Origins* (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2005).
[25] Jablonski, "Resisting the 'Inevitability' of War: The Catholic Worker Movement and World War II."
[26] Jablonski, "Dorothy Day's Contested Legacy: "Humble Irony" As a Constraint on Memory."

confrontational one moment and inclusive the next, which fit her paradoxical character and made her an effective rhetor.

For my thesis, I intend to extend Jablonski's analysis, with authority as the guiding theoretical concept. I use selected editorials from *The Catholic Worker* and one of Day's autobiographical works, *The Long Loneliness*, as central texts. Day's newspaper and autobiography afforded her different opportunities for exercising authority, and she used them for different but complementary ends.

The Catholic Worker newspaper was the first point of contact that most people had to Dorothy Day and what came to be the Catholic Worker movement. In the year the paper was founded, there were more than 300 Catholic newspapers and journals in the United States; *The Catholic Worker* was characterized as "the most unique of the Catholic labor papers" for its "vivacious style" and original journalistic methods.[27] The paper was a hodgepodge of personal anecdotes, weighty theological arguments, book reviews, and Maurin's "Easy Essays," of which the following excerpt is representative:

> The Catholic Worker Isms
>
> 1. *The Catholic Worker*
>   stands for cooperativism
>   against capitalism.
> 2. *The Catholic Worker*
>   stands for personalism
>   against socialism.
> 3. *The Catholic Worker*
>   stands for leadership
>   against dictatorship.
> 4. *The Catholic Worker*
>   stands for agrarianism
>   against industrialism.

[27] Heinz Eulau, "Proselytizing in the Catholic Press," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 11, no. 2 (1947): 192.

5. *The Catholic Worker*
stands for decentralism
against totalitarianism.[28]

Especially prominent in the newspaper were reports of injustice occurring throughout the United States and abroad: lynchings, poor working conditions, damaging government policies, and the like. The paper not only denounced these wrongs, but also exhorted readers to join the Catholic Workers in combating them. And readers did join in, contributing time and money to Day and Maurin's causes. Before long, the title "The Catholic Worker" represented more than a newspaper, but a coherent group and ideology as well.

In her study of the woman suffrage press, Solomon explains how newspapers can play a critical role in developing social movements.[29] One of a social movement's most important functions is to attract potential members, and in this regard, newspapers can help a great deal. By informing readers of certain happenings in their communities and beyond, newspapers can raise readers' consciousness of society's problems and offer a common lens through which readers may interpret the news. Public lectures can accomplish the same things, but lecturers are limited by time and geography; newspapers can reach a larger audience. Furthermore, newspapers allow audiences to absorb news commentary in their own time and reflect on it individually. Lectures and meetings may be successful at rousing individuals' passion for a cause, but unless people attend such events frequently, their commitment over time is likely to wane. Newspapers can help sustain people's interest by offering continued inspiration in the form of success stories or timely reports. In addition, newspapers can help identify and establish leaders of social movements, as these same individuals often publish or contribute to the newspapers. Finally, newspapers can become a forum for leaders and other members of the movement to

[28] Peter Maurin, "Easy Essays," *The Catholic Worker*, March 1944.
[29] Solomon, "The Role of the Suffrage Press in the Woman's Rights Movement."

communicate. In all of these ways, newspapers can help build community. This was certainly true of *The Catholic Worker*.

Throughout both *The Catholic Worker* and *The Long Loneliness,* Day draws alternately on the personal and the prophetic styles. However, some media are better suited to some rhetorical styles than others, and Day's autobiography is a case in point. Like her newspaper, Day's autobiography also spotlights injustice, but its central subject, naturally, is Day. Her confrontations with injustice are subsumed by the matter of her ideological becoming, of her attempts to reconcile her radical sympathies with a newfound religious faith. The personal style of the text is a logical result of the personal subject matter.

As Watson has argued, in a nod to Fisher, autobiography builds identification through narrative.[30] Hence, autobiography has been an important tool for social activists seeking to boost credibility and advance their causes. In his study of Malcolm X's autobiography, Benson describes the genre's rhetorical appeal: "one of the greatest rhetorical potentialities of the autobiographical genre lies in its ability to take a reader inside the writer's experience, and to show how early mistakes led to later enlightenment."[31] In such a way, social movement leaders can use personal narratives to present their lives as examples to their audience of what to emulate (or what to reject, as the case may be).

Autobiographies were not traditionally considered rhetorical artifacts, but several scholars—most notably, Benson, Griffin,[32] and Watson—have ably demonstrated the rhetorical

---

[30] Walter R. Fisher, "Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument," in *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*, ed. John Louis Lucaites, Celeste Michelle Condit, and Sally Caudill (New York: The Guilford Press, 1999), Martha Watson, *Lives of Their Own: Rhetorical Dimensions in Autobiographies of Women Activists*, *Studies in Rhetoric/Communication* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1999).
[31] Thomas W. Benson, "Rhetoric and Autobiography: The Case of Malcolm X," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60, no. 1 (1974): 3.
[32] Charles J. G. Griffin, "The Rhetoric of Form in Conversion Narratives," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 76, no. 2 (1990).

qualities inherent in the autobiographical form. All three have emphasized that the author, as portrayed in the autobiography, is the product of a rhetorical construction. In telling his or her story, an autobiographer selects certain personal experiences and excludes others, creating a clear identity and life trajectory. These selections amount to intentional choices that autobiographers make, keeping a particular audience and purpose in mind. Indeed, the author, as portrayed in the autobiography, may bear little resemblance to a historian's profile of him or her.

The Long Loneliness is the most complete of Day's autobiographical works. Published in 1952, it follows two other books by Day: *The Eleventh Virgin* (1924), a pseudo-autobiographical novel, and *From Union Square to Rome* (1938), a book addressed to her brother that offers an explanation for her religious conversion.[33] While both of these books provide glimpses into Day's life, they leave out important parts, including her introduction to Peter Maurin and the birth of the Catholic Worker movement. *The Long Loneliness* includes these moments and much about the subsequent work of the movement.

At the time of the book's publication, the movement's initial popularity, established in the years of the Great Depression, had largely subsided. The country was in the throes of the Cold War, and again, Day's pacifist stance was likely to be misunderstood. While Day's monthly columns in *The Catholic Worker* afforded her frequent opportunities to convey her views, the autobiography allowed her to share her life with readers in more depth. *The Long Loneliness* was well-received, garnering positive reviews from the *New York Times*, *Newsweek*, and the *Herald Tribune*.[34] It also attracted the attention of writer Dwight Macdonald, who subsequently profiled

[33] Paul Elie, "Why & How Day Wrote It," *Commonweal*, May 3, 2002.
[34] Ibid.

Day in *The New Yorker*, shining a bright spotlight on the Catholic Worker movement in the process.[35]

To recap, both newspapers and autobiographies have been used by social movement leaders in the past to further their rhetorical ends. So it was with Day. Through *The Catholic Worker* and *The Long Loneliness*, Day managed to navigate around the aforementioned rhetorical obstacles and assert her authority.

Theoretical Perspectives on Authority

The importance of authority in rhetorical studies has long been recognized, and scholars have tackled the subject in a variety of ways. Here, I identify two theoretical perspectives that are particularly helpful in illuminating Day's appeals to authority. The first perspective I'll call, for the sake of simplicity, the prophetic model. Rhetors who channel the prophetic persona, in Japp's terms,[36] appeal to transcendent truths, thereby locating authority first and foremost outside themselves and their communities. Rhetors' access to these transcendent truths, in turn, legitimates their authority by extension. Darsey describes the prophetic ethos in a similar way. The messages that prophets convey are not their own. They speak God's message, for God, at God's command. Thus, their authority is contingent on God's authority.[37]

It is the prophet's task to bring a reluctant audience into accord with sacred principles.[38] This mission, along with a prophet's claim to divine authority, lends itself to a particular rhetorical style. Assured of the truth of their divine message, prophets speak bluntly, their criticisms and exhortations unabashed. In her analysis of Angelina Grimké's address at

[35] For a version of the profile, originally published in two parts, see Dwight Macdonald, "Dorothy Day," in *Memoirs of a Revolutionist: Essays in Political Criticism* (New York: Farrar Straus and Cudahy, 1957).
[36] Phyllis M. Japp, "Esther or Isaiah?: The Abolitionist–Feminist Rhetoric of Angelina Grimké," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 71, no. 3 (1985).
[37] James Francis Darsey, *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America* (New York: New York University Press, 1997).
[38] Ibid., 16.

Pennsylvania Hall, Japp describes how Grimké drew on the prophetic persona of Isaiah to challenge her audience:

> She did not flatter or cajole. Via the prophetic persona, as one chosen of God to present God's message, she admonished the uncommitted, exhorted the faithful, and rebuked the opposition. In the words of Isaiah, she spoke of the sin of slavery and her divine mission to uncover that sin. . . . [She] confidently proclaimed her fearlessness: "There is nothing to be feared from those who would stop our mouths, but they themselves should fear and tremble." She was ready to face violence or even death if necessary.[39]

In addition to being bold, prophetic rhetoric is often uncivil and uncompromising. In these respects, Darsey explains, it has much in common with radical rhetoric, a tradition "characterized by a steadfast refusal to adapt itself to the perspectives of its audience."[40] Indeed, "prophetic rhetoric violates one of the traditional functions of rhetoric by emphasizing separation over identification."[41]

In this way, the prophetic model differs markedly from the second theoretical perspective. This perspective, drawn in part from Farrell and White,[42] and articulated most clearly by Murphy,[43] locates authority not in a speaker's possession of sacred principles, but in his or her rhetorical virtuosity. In the first view, authority is a *quality* or characteristic that individuals possess, permitting them to speak. In the second view, authority is an *occurrence* generated and enacted through speech or other discourse. Individuals are not endowed with authority a priori by virtue of character, intellect, or knowledge of divine truths; rather, they create authority. And they do so not by setting themselves apart from their communities, but by immersing themselves in their communities'

[39] Japp, "Esther or Isaiah?: The Abolitionist–Feminist Rhetoric of Angelina Grimké," 342.
[40] Darsey, *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America*, 5–6.
[41] Ibid., 22.
[42] Thomas B. Farrell, *Norms of Rhetorical Culture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993), James Boyd White, *Acts of Hope: Creating Authority in Literature, Law, and Politics* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1994).
[43] John M. Murphy, "Inventing Authority: Bill Clinton, Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Orchestration of Rhetorical Traditions," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83, no. 1 (1997).

rhetorical traditions, and then masterfully interpreting and interweaving these traditions as present needs require.

Farrell looks to Aristotle's discussion of ethos to argue that a speaker's authority cannot be taken for granted. Rather, speakers must make the case for their authority, like any argument, and, like any argument, one's claim to authority may be challenged. Farrell explains, "Aristotle is emphatic that ethos is more than an intrinsic character trait of the speaker. As he repeatedly insists, it is the character of the speaker as presented or made manifest by the speech. . . . he clearly regards ethos as a mode of proof, rather than just an impressionistic aura of credibility and trust."[44]

Similarly, White sees authority as something constituted through rhetorical acts. However, he describes its creation less as an argument, and more as an art. The most effective rhetors gain authority through performance, or enactment. Likewise, institutions do not demand respect on their own accord; rhetors must paint institutions in such a way that wins audiences' loyalty:

> Authority is created by an act of art. The authority of the law, or the church, or the language of poetic convention, or whatever institution the writer addresses, does not simply exist in unproblematic form in the external world, to be observed or described, obeyed or resisted, but is constituted in one's writing. It is not just 'the church' or 'the law' that I ask you to obey, or disobey, it is the church or the law as made in my text: it is because it is like this, or, more properly, because we can make it be like this, that one should resist, or yield to, its influence.[45]

In this description of authority, White destabilizes the traditional understanding of institutions as permanent, immutable, or all-powerful entities. Instead, he suggests that institutions exist at the mercy of rhetors, who define and redefine them at will to suit their purposes. Rhetors' creative capacity to reenvision their circumstances for the better amounts to "acts of hope."

---

[44] Farrell, *Norms of Rhetorical Culture*, 69.
[45] White, *Acts of Hope: Creating Authority in Literature, Law, and Politics*, 276.

Murphy builds on Farrell's and White's discussions of authority by incorporating the role of rhetorical traditions. If rhetors are artists, then rhetorical traditions are their materials. Rhetorical traditions help us make sense of our world and shape our experience. Bakhtin tells us that each text we encounter is an amalgamation of different voices and languages, set in perpetual conversation with one another.[46] Similarly, rhetoric may be seen as an artful amalgamation of rhetorical traditions. Rhetors develop authority for themselves through the process of orchestrating these traditions into a logical, persuasive whole. Murphy explains: authority is "grounded through the cultural grammar of traditions, performed through the embodiment of aesthetic expectations, and legitimated through a reflective augmentation of past wisdom. In short, authority occurs when rhetors enact, display and augment the complex voices percolating through community life."[47]

Accordingly, rhetors who exert this type of authority must be fluent in the languages of their communities. They achieve fluency by being active members of their communities and speaking *within* their communities. Their rhetorical style is personal; it emphasizes identification between rhetors and their audiences. Clearly, this style differs from the prophetic style, as prophets tend to position themselves in contrast to their communities. Already at odds with society, prophets have little to lose by issuing condemnation. As different as these styles and appeals to authority may be, they are not mutually exclusive. The rhetoric of Dorothy Day indicates as much, for she used a blend of both rhetorical styles and appeals.

[46] Mikhail M. Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, *University of Texas Press Slavic Series* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981).
[47] Murphy, "Inventing Authority: Bill Clinton, Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Orchestration of Rhetorical Traditions," 76.

Chapter Outline

In the chapters that follow, I examine Day's appeals to authority in more depth. The second chapter centers on the prophetic rhetoric of Day as exemplified in *The Catholic Worker* newspaper. I argue that Day drew upon three dimensions of the prophetic persona—the messenger, the judge, and the suffering servant—to locate her authority in a divine source. The prophetic model is particularly helpful in accounting for the paradox that several scholars have observed in Day: though radical in her politics, she remained conservative in her religious beliefs. Darsey describes the prophet in this very way: conservative in his commitment to the covenant, he is at the same time radical in his willingness to challenge the established social order. In the second half of Chapter Two I show that Day also drew on another persona, that of the humble penitent. This persona represented a departure from traditional prophetic rhetoric, but it allowed Day to build identification with audiences even as she issued prophetic denunciations.

In the third chapter, I draw on the second theoretical perspective, advanced by Murphy, to show how Day also generated authority by orchestrating religious and radical rhetorical traditions into a coherent whole. In using this strategy, Day spoke from *within* her communities, not *at* her communities from a distance. I examine Day's autobiography *The Long Loneliness* as my central text. Throughout the book, she relies on religious and radical allusions to situate herself within religious and radical circles and boost her credibility. She also uses religious and radical voices to create perspective by incongruity, a technique aimed at raising her audience's consciousness and converting them to her cause. In Chapter Three I elaborate on these techniques, examining them in conjunction with structure and voice, two rhetorical resources of autobiography. Ultimately, I argue that Day's chief rhetorical strategy in her autobiography is

identification, not division, and accordingly, the text represents a useful counterbalance to Day's prophetic rhetoric.

In the fourth and final chapter, I discuss the two perspectives on authority once more, as I examine the effects of using both strategies in tandem. Though the two approaches to asserting authority may exist in tension, they are not mutually exclusive. The success of Dorothy Day suggests that social reformers may be most effective by adopting a blend of the prophetic and personal approaches.

In brief, the rhetoric of the Catholic Worker movement yields interesting insight into the ways that social movement leaders can assert their authority. The two perspectives on authority that I have mentioned here lend themselves to vastly different rhetorical styles, each in tension with the other. Advocates for social change may gravitate toward one style in particular or adopt both. Dorothy Day is one example of a reformer who adopted both, proving that the two styles and the two ways of exercising authority can be complementary. Accordingly, she demonstrated a commitment to sacred principles and, simultaneously, a connection with her communities. This technique allowed her to transcend the arguments of those who opposed her, while also staying grounded in the communities that made her who she was.

CHAPTER 2

THE PROPHETIC VOICE OF DOROTHY DAY

"In an age of chaos people look for a new order. . . . The time to create order out of chaos is now."[48] Published in the April 1942 edition of *The Catholic Worker*, Peter Maurin's lines could hardly have been more apt. The country was again engaged in a world war, the outcome as yet uncertain. Most opponents to the United States's involvement in war had grown quiet or changed their minds following the attack on Pearl Harbor. Not so *The Catholic Worker*. Dorothy Day and other writers for the newspaper carried on their pacifist message despite the increasing disapproval it received. As a result, the Catholic Workers and their philosophy grew ever more detached from mainstream America.

In this chapter, I examine the rhetoric of the Catholic Worker movement at the trough of its popularity, when Day's authority was most threatened. I argue that Day responded to this rhetorical challenge by drawing on a prophetic ethos to locate her authority in a divine source. She drew on a prophetic ethos by presenting herself as a messenger, judge, and suffering servant. She also modeled for her audience the proper response to her message by assuming the role of the humble penitent, another persona. This posture is not characteristic of traditional prophetic speech; as such, it indicates a variation of prophetic rhetoric, which allows for a more inclusive style of communication.

[48] Peter Maurin, "For a New Order," *The Catholic Worker*, April 1942.

Day's Pacifist Stand

Dorothy Day's commitment to pacifism predates the founding of *The Catholic Worker*. Formerly a member of the radical left, she initially aligned her arguments against war with her antipathy for capitalism: she saw war simply as a way for the rich to benefit at the expense of the poor.[49] Day's arguments against war changed over the years, but her pacifist commitment never wavered.

In the early days of *The Catholic Worker*, many readers did not identify the newspaper as a pacifist publication. It is unlikely that Day herself characterized the paper in such a way. But later, when she grew more pronounced in her judgment against war in her denunciations of the Spanish Civil War and World War II, she expressed confusion as to why anyone would be surprised by her pacifist stand.[50] Her stories about lynchings and labor strikes, present from the newspaper's founding, evidenced Day's strong belief in nonviolence. To her, violence of any sort amounted to war, and she loathed all types equally—be it war between races, classes, or countries.[51]

In the years leading up to the U.S.'s involvement in WWII, Day's beliefs were not drastically different from those of many other Americans. With the memory of WWI fresh in their minds, many citizens favored an isolationist approach to foreign affairs and were opposed to entering another war. President Roosevelt complied with the wishes of the electorate and signed a series of neutrality bills into law in the 1930s. As the fighting escalated abroad and foreign leaders increased their appeals for American intervention, Roosevelt remained reluctant to commit for fear of alienating voters; the 1940 presidential election was fast approaching, and critics were quick to interpret any defensive strategies on Roosevelt's part as warmongering. His

[49] Chatfield, "The Catholic Worker in the United States Peace Tradition."
[50] Jablonski, "Resisting the 'Inevitability' of War: The Catholic Worker Movement and World War II."
[51] Ibid.

efforts to strengthen the military through conscription, for example, met fierce resistance, pushing Roosevelt to maintain repeatedly that the country was not going to war. Even financial assistance to Allied forces was a cause of concern for some isolationists in Congress.[52]

However, the country's anti-war sentiments faded abruptly after the attack on Pearl Harbor, and Day's continued resistance to war put her increasingly at odds with American society. Even fellow Catholics could not make sense of her position, for it seemed discordant with much of the Church's history. Miller explains, "Historically, the relationship between the Church and bearing arms had been close. The medieval ideal of knightly valor appeared to have been that of the Church itself. Later, with the rise of the national state, there was the Thomistic doctrine of the 'just war' to remove the pain of a suffering conscience for anyone who had scruples about killing in warfare."[53] Some Catholic clergy, including the influential John A. Ryan, drew on this tradition to delegitimize *The Catholic Worker*'s arguments against conscription.[54] But if the clergy feared that the publication would sway the masses, they need not have worried; in those years, "American Catholics were known for their patriotism, militarism, and deference to civil and ecclesiastical authority—not their pacifism."[55]

Thus, Day's position distanced her from her religious community as well as American society at large. Moreover, her absolute pacifism led to divisions within the Catholic Worker movement. John Cogley, head of the Chicago house of hospitality, was one of the leading voices of opposition. His understanding of just war doctrine was that Catholics should follow their own

---

[52] Robert Dallek, *Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Foreign Policy, 1932–1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), David M. Kennedy, *Freedom from Fear: The American People in Depression and War, 1929–1945*, The Oxford History of the United States (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).
[53] Miller, *Dorothy Day: A Biography*, 313.
[54] Patrick G. Coy, "Conscription and the Catholic Conscience in World War II," in *American Catholic Pacifism: The Influence of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*, ed. Anne Klejment and Nancy L. Roberts (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996).
[55] Jablonski, "Resisting the 'Inevitability' of War: The Catholic Worker Movement and World War II," 445.

consciences; if Catholics felt led to fight Hitler, who was Day to argue otherwise?[56] Even Peter Maurin questioned whether the Catholic Workers should not keep quiet about their pacifist views during WWII.[57]

Day's persistence in the face of all of this opposition is all the more remarkable considering her status as a layperson in the Catholic Church. Coy explains that in the pre-Vatican II era, it was rare for laity to encourage other laypersons to develop independent judgments on moral concerns, particularly "issues like conscription and war, which touched at least peripherally on the sensitive and thorny question of church-state relations and the responsibilities of the individual to the State."[58] In brief, "what is important here is that Dorothy Day chose to stake the future of her Catholic Worker movement on a position that ran absolutely contrary to this historical pattern."[59]

Day's uncompromising pacifist stance struck most people as unreasonable. Readers wrote in to complain: could Day just stick to helping the poor and leave the issue of war alone? But Day did not care about being reasonable if human reason itself had become corrupt. Instead, she pledged herself to what she considered divine wisdom, articulated in the Sermon on the Mount. She was less concerned with seeking readers' favor than in winning their obedience for God. Hers was the language of a prophet.

---

[56] Francis J. Sicius, "Prophecy Faces Tradition: The Pacifist Debate," in *American Catholic Pacifism: The Influence of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*, ed. Anne Klejment and Nancy L. Roberts (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996).
[57] Patricia McNeal, "Catholic Peace Organizations and World War II," in *American Catholic Pacifism: The Influence of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*, ed. Anne Klejment and Nancy L. Roberts (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996).
[58] Coy, "Conscription and the Catholic Conscience in World War II," 54.
[59] Ibid.

The Prophetic Voice

Prophetic discourse has a long tradition in America, from the colonial era to the present day. The prophetic style has proved remarkably flexible over the years, as mainstream political leaders and radical reformers alike have appropriated it to achieve divergent objectives (e.g. motivating people to support war[60] and urging an end to warfare[61]). In each case, rhetors using the prophetic voice have spoken with the conviction that God was on their side.

In Puritan New England, prophetic rhetoric existed in the form of the jeremiad. Bercovitch describes the jeremiad as a political sermon, "a ritual designed to join social criticism to spiritual renewal."[62] The jeremiad was a form the Puritans brought with them from Europe and adapted to fit new purposes. Traditionally, it "was a lament over the ways of the world. It decried the sins of 'the people'—a community, a nation, a civilization, mankind in general—and warned of God's wrath to follow."[63] Like the prophetic messages of old, jeremiads were a mixture of fierce criticism and exhortation, designed to persuade listeners to submit to God's will or risk severe consequences. The Puritans' variation on the traditional jeremiad contained a similar message but possessed a more optimistic tone. Puritans viewed themselves as God's chosen people, charged with the mission of creating a New Jerusalem, a paragon of Christian community. They believed that any punishments God inflicted upon them, his favored few, were corrective, not destructive; trials were a testament to God's love.[64] The Puritan jeremiad, accordingly, reaffirmed the Puritan errand. In this way, the jeremiad fueled Americans' faith in progress and, ultimately, in democracy.

---

[60] Ernest G. Bormann, "Fetching Good out of Evil: A Rhetorical Use of Calamity," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 63 (1977).
[61] Dorothy Day, "Our Country Passes from Undeclared to Declared War; We Continue Our Christian Pacifist Stand," *The Catholic Worker*, January 1942.
[62] Sacvan Bercovitch, *The American Jeremiad* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978), xi.
[63] Ibid., 7.
[64] Ibid.

Bormann characterizes the Puritan jeremiad as representative of a rhetorical form he terms the "Fetching Good Out of Evil" type.[65] According to Bormann, this type of rhetoric provides audiences a sense of order and a positive vision of the future in the midst of troubled times. Rhetors rely on its power to unite communities as well as its "potential to provide a powerful impetus to action and reform."[66]

Dorothy Day and other writers for *The Catholic Worker* may well have been attracted to the prophetic style for these very reasons, yet the prophetic discourse of the Catholic Worker movement differed from the American jeremiad in at least one key respect. Namely, Catholic Workers did not speak of themselves or their fellow citizens as a chosen people. Instead, they celebrated the universality of the Catholic Church and their mutual membership, along with their country's enemies, in the Mystical Body of Christ. As they pronounced boldly in a 1948 article in *The Catholic Worker*, "We are Un-American; We are Catholics."[67] This celebration of commonality bore little resemblance to the Puritans' conception of themselves as a sacred remnant.

Rather, the Catholic Workers' celebration of commonality ("We are Catholics") entailed a rejection of citizenship ("We are Un-American"). Although they expressed love for their country and their president, the Catholic Workers wanted little to do with American government. Day, for example, was supportive of the suffrage movement, but she never exercised her right to vote for she had no faith in the political system. She never sought nonprofit status for the houses of hospitality because she refused government assistance when she could raise her own funds independently. She paid property and sales taxes, but was less forthcoming with federal taxes—

[65] Bormann, "Fetching Good out of Evil: A Rhetorical Use of Calamity."
[66] Ibid.: 32.
[67] Mel Piehl, "The Catholic Worker and Peace in the Early Cold War Era," in *American Catholic Pacifism: The Influence of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*, ed. Anne Klejment and Nancy L. Roberts (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996), 80.

she did not want to fund wars. During WWII she resisted conscription by educating men on the Catholic grounds for conscientious objection; during the civil defense air raid drills of the 1950s, she was jailed multiple times for her refusal to participate.

Day's unease with government involvement is one of the main differences between the prophetic message of *The Catholic Worker* and the American jeremiad, which upholds the "Establishment," sometimes to a fault.[68] Day preferred to challenge the powers that be, work around them, or simply separate herself from them. As a result, her rhetoric was out of line with much of the other religio-political rhetoric of the era. In his comparative study of the Catholic Worker movement and the social gospel movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Trawick illuminates this distinction:

> If the social gospelers looked to a Kingdom that would transform the existing power structures of the country, Day's vision draws more on the monastic spirit of withdrawal from the world and at the same time ministering to it. . . . Day's theological forebear here is Saint Augustine, and her vision of the body of Christ shares much with Augustine's City of God. The City of God is a city of sojourners, a small band removed from the temptations of the earthly city and having little traffic with it. Yet, the very disassociation with the world allows a prophetic distance that gives the City of God its transforming power even against the Earthly City.[69]

The American jeremiad permits limited "prophetic distance," for it is entangled in fundamental assumptions about "the viability and nobility of the American experiment."[70] Day was not bound by these assumptions. Accordingly, the prophetic message of *The Catholic Worker* had a more radical dimension, as a voice of opposition to the prevailing social order.

---

[68] John M. Murphy, "'A Time of Shame and Sorrow': Robert F. Kennedy and the American Jeremiad," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 76 (1990).
[69] Robert Trawick, "Dorothy Day and the Social Gospel Movement: Different Theologies, Common Concerns," in *Gender and the Social Gospel*, ed. Wendy J. Deichmann Edwards and Carolyn De Swarte Gifford (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 146. See also R. A. R. Edwards, "Jane Addams, Walter Rauschenbusch, and Dorothy Day: A Comparative Study of Settlement Theology," in *Gender and the Social Gospel*, ed. Wendy J. Deichmann Edwards and Carolyn De Swarte Gifford (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2003).
[70] Murphy, "'A Time of Shame and Sorrow': Robert F. Kennedy and the American Jeremiad," 412.

To better understand the prophetic element of Day's radical message, we can find no better resource than James Darsey's *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America*.[71] Darsey likens prophetic discourse to radical rhetoric: "Both have in common a sense of mission, a desire to bring the practice of the people into accord with a sacred principle, and an uncompromising, often excoriating stance toward a reluctant audience."[72] Like a radical reformer's mission, the prophet's task is to rouse an apathetic audience by revealing sacred principles and pronouncing judgment on its actions (or inaction, as the case may be). And like the political radical, the prophet is distinguished, in part, by a firm refusal to adapt to his or her audience's perspectives. This refusal does not signify a breakdown of order, but rather "an alternative order, a rationality not accounted for in the Graeco–Roman model."[73]

A strong ethos is central to the rhetoric of Old Testament and modern-day prophets alike. Their ethos is formed through a process of conversion and eventual submission. Initially, prophets often display a reluctance to speak. Then prophets undergo a rebirth, or conversion: "rebirth is a mechanism for overcoming the anxiety of chaos by the complete subordination of the self to the divine will; the prophet exchanges self for certitude, the absolute negation of chaos. It is from this position that the prophet makes his criticism of his society; the prophet stands as a synecdochal realization of God's will."[74] However, birth cannot occur without a prior death, symbolized in the prophets' separation from worldly pleasures and prior relationships. Prophets eventually emerge from this rebirth or conversion with a new commitment to their

[71] Darsey, *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America*.
[72] Ibid., 16.
[73] Ibid., 5–6.
[74] Ibid., 29.

divine assignment. Accordingly, another characteristic of prophets' ethos is a submissive attitude, evidenced by an abandonment of self and by a willingness to suffer.[75]

While Darsey speaks of ethos more than authority, per se, the two concepts are clearly related. A prophet's authority derives from his or her ethos, which is rooted in a connection to sacred principles. However, the prophet's ethos is not secured simply because he or she possesses some degree of truth. He or she must prophesy.

Prophetic messages are judgmental in nature. Their need arises in times of chaos, when people have forgotten the sacred principles upon which their communities are founded. Prophets do not try to argue or prove their points because their message is self-evident. Instead, they reveal the truths that audiences inherently know but have neglected. Announcing these truths to a willful people is no simple task; it often brings suffering and alienation for the prophets. Darsey explains that the Old Testament prophets typically lived in the wilderness, set apart from the very communities they sought to reform. Their rhetoric, consequently, tends to emphasize separation over identification.

The Catholic Worker as Prophetic Vehicle

Dorothy Day broadcast her prophetic message via *The Catholic Worker* newspaper. As the main organ of the Catholic Worker philosophy, the paper helped define and grow the movement. Solomon documents how radical activists have often relied on newspapers to further their goals, such as gaining new members. She explains that a social movement leader's first task is to get potential members to see themselves as a group. This task involves definition of group identity, which, in the case of radical social movements at least, begins with a rejection of an

[75] Ibid., 33.

established order.[76] The Catholic Worker movement was already well-established prior to the onset of WWII. But I highlight this period of its history in particular because it represents a defining moment for the newspaper and the movement, insofar as it helped refine the movement's identity and prophetic witness.

Day's prophetic voice is manifest in *The Catholic Worker* in a number of ways. Here, I concentrate on three dimensions of the prophetic persona revealed in the newspaper: 1) the messenger, 2) the suffering servant, and 3) the judge. I examine each in turn.

At the most fundamental level, a prophet is a messenger. The words she speaks are not her own, but God's. Thus, prophetic speech occupies a unique rhetorical niche. "Contrary to the assumptions of traditional Graeco-Roman rhetorical theory, prophecy shatters the unity of rhetoric. *Inventio* and *action* are not products of the same agent."[77] If a prophet's virtue is not in her skillful powers of invention, then, it lies in her dependable transmission of another's message.

In *The Catholic Worker*, Day and other writers position themselves as messengers, usually by channeling well-known prophets of the Bible. The following excerpt illustrates my point. Day's first editorial following the bombing of Pearl Harbor begins as a letter: "Dear Fellow Workers in Christ. . . ."[78] Immediately thereafter, Day shifts her address, turning to God in prayer: "Lord God, merciful God, our Father, shall we keep silent, or shall we speak? And if we speak, what shall we say?" It appears at first glance as though Day is inviting readers to listen to her own personal meditation.

[76] Solomon, "The Role of the Suffrage Press in the Woman's Rights Movement," 5.
[77] Darsey, *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America*, 16.
[78] Day, "Our Country Passes from Undeclared to Declared War; We Continue Our Christian Pacifist Stand."

But "why do 'private' prayers appear in a public text?"[79] This question, which Zulick asks in her examination of the Old Testament book of Jeremiah, gains renewed relevance here. For as she argues, "A dialogue between the prophet and YHWH . . . is not a simple reflection of the state of a prophet's soul. Its privacy is a representation, with a communicative purpose."[80] In this case, Day's prayer may be serving several purposes. Her words may be an attempt to unite the Workers in a common prayer, or to offer a model of how one should approach God in troubled times. As a preface to her article, the prayer also establishes Day's relationship to God, bolstering her credentials as one of the faithful. Like Jeremiah, she feels inner turmoil about her responsibility in the world. Should she speak or keep silent? What should she say? In the passage that follows, Day recalls Scripture that provides the answers to her questions:

> we have forgotten so much. We have all forgotten. And how can we know unless you tell us. [sic] "'For whoever calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.' How then are they to call upon Him in whom they have not believed? But how are they to believe Him whom they have not heard? And how are they to hear, if no one preaches? And how are men to preach unless they be sent? As it is written, 'How beautiful are the feet of those who preach the gospel of peace'."[81]

Here, Day quotes a section of Paul's letter to the Romans,[82] which she follows with a quotation from the Sermon on the Mount, the "gospel of peace" if ever there was one. In mimicking Paul's letter with a letter of her own, she draws on the prophetic tradition established in the New Testament epistles. Her series of rhetorical questions implies that she is sent, as are her readers, to spread God's word as Paul did.

That Day gravitates to Paul should come as no surprise. Both were converts, and both felt compelled to spread the gospel message to broad audiences. Paul is credited as the first apostle to

[79] Margaret D. Zulick, "The Agon of Jeremiah: On the Dialogic Invention of Prophetic Ethos," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 78, no. 2 (1992): 128.
[80] Ibid.
[81] Day, "Our Country Passes from Undeclared to Declared War; We Continue Our Christian Pacifist Stand."
[82] Romans 10:14–15. The quotation within the quotation comes from Isaiah 52:7.

evangelize to Gentiles, effectively reaching beyond his own tightly-knit Jewish community to connect with outsiders and to build the Church. Similarly, Day broadcast the gospel message to all who would listen. Her method of "preaching" was in keeping with the Greek definition of the word, *kērysso*, which means simply "to be a herald, to announce."[83] By opening her article in prayer, Day sets the tone for what is to follow, making the issue of war secondary to the gospel message. The gospel becomes a lens through which she interprets the war and other current events.

Perhaps the most direct example of Catholic Workers depicting themselves as messengers of God comes in an article printed the following year.[84] An unidentified author puts forth a lengthy series of questions to rulers, challenging them to reexamine their course of action in the present war. Who is the author to speak so boldly? "Only an ordinary person," she maintains humbly, yet one with special vision.[85] "I can only see how dark the world is, that the present distress is beyond human power, and that men are looking everywhere save where alone there is hope." Lest the author leaves readers unclear as to the source of her vision, she follows up by linking herself explicitly to God:

> Since God . . . by a voice crying in the wilderness calls men to repentance, I appeal to you to judge whether in my words there is any sense or wisdom; whether God may not be speaking through one of the least of His servants; whether I am not voicing the deep need of humanity at this hour, . . . indeed whether I am not speaking for your own conscience. . . . Listen, if not to me, then to your own heart, to humanity, to God.[86]

[83] John A. Witmer, "Romans," in *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: New Testament*, ed. John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck (Colorado Springs, CO: Chariot Victor Publishing, 1985), 481.
[84] "A Peace Broadcast—to Rulers and Others," *The Catholic Worker*, March 1942.
[85] As Darsey observes, metaphors of vision are common in prophetic rhetoric, for prophets are seers above all. Their logic is about showing or revealing more than proving or arguing. See Darsey, *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America*, 19.
[86] "A Peace Broadcast—to Rulers and Others."

Again, a familiar Biblical reference ("a voice crying in the wilderness"[87]) is used to align *The Catholic Worker* with the prophetic tradition and identify the paper as a vehicle of divine truth. The reference to the voice crying in the wilderness originates in the Old Testament book of Isaiah. Martin writes that "true prophets were 'voices,' for their messages were from God."[88] He explains that in the book of Isaiah, the prophet is urging the Israelites, who were living in a spiritual wilderness, to prepare themselves for the coming of the Lord.

The voice crying in the wilderness appears again in the New Testament in each of the Gospels, in reference to John the Baptist, who preached of the coming Messiah.[89] John the Baptist lived in the wilderness, so Jews who wished to hear his message had to leave their towns to do so. Barbieri Jr. states that John's preaching in the desert "suggests that he came to separate people from the religious systems of the day."[90] To be sure, his message differed from that of his Jewish contemporaries, for he asserted that repentance was a prerequisite for entering the coming kingdom of heaven; the traditional Jewish understanding was that the Jews, because of their membership in the covenant of Abraham, were already assured entrance.[91] In "A Peace Broadcast," the author assumes a place in the prophetic lineage of Isaiah and John the Baptist, suggesting that God is again speaking through a person to call for men's repentance. By harking back to the "voice crying in the wilderness," the author acknowledges her distance from the community she addresses. Here, the gap is an ideological one, and like John the Baptist, she has no interest in meeting in the middle. The wilderness is a lonely place, perhaps, but it has a certain

[87] See Isaiah 40:3, Matthew 3:1–4, Mark 1:1–4, Luke 1:76–78, and John 1:23.
[88] John A. Martin, "Isaiah," in *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: Old Testament*, ed. John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck (Colorado Springs, CO: Chariot Victor Publishing, 1985), 1091.
[89] Ibid.
[90] Louis A. Barbieri Jr., "Matthew," in *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: New Testament*, ed. John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck (Colorado Springs, CO: Chariot Victor Publishing, 1985), 24.
[91] Ibid.

purity. The author leaves it to her audience to join her in the wilderness and repent of their sinful ways.

Of course, the need for repentance is occasioned only by sin, so the author's call for repentance in this article is simultaneously an indictment. As well as portraying themselves as divine messengers, then, writers of *The Catholic Worker* assume the role of judge—a second dimension of the prophetic persona. Darsey describes the prophet's judgment as a reaction brought about by moments of crisis, or chaos, when the people have forgotten their responsibilities or grown apathetic to the sin surrounding them. To overcome the chaos, a prophet seeks to reaffirm the sacred order by enacting the righteous wrath and compassion of God. In such a way, the prophet becomes the vessel of God's pathos, standing "against the a-pathos or apathy of humankind, humankind as it has become inured to the demands of justice and righteousness, to the needs of the powerless."[92]

In Day's view, WWII amounted to a "monstrous crime" for which all people were responsible.[93] She used *The Catholic Worker* to make her case. Her spiritual advisor, Father John J. Hugo, pressed her to justify her position doctrinally,[94] and she complied, publishing numerous articles about just war theory (with which many American Catholics were then unacquainted). However, it seems that the matter was more simple for Day. She believed that war was inherently wrong because it violated Jesus's commandment to love others: "How can we love our brother and kill him? How can we fulfill the Gospel precept to be perfect as our Heavenly Father is perfect; how can we follow the precept to love God when we kill our fellow men? How

[92] Darsey, *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America*, 26.
[93] Dorothy Day, "Why Do the Members of Christ Tear One Another? Why Do We Rise up against Our Own Body in Such Madness? Have We Forgotten That We Are All Members One of Another?—St. Clement," *The Catholic Worker*, February 1942.
[94] Miller, *A Harsh and Dreadful Love: Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*.

can war be compatible with such love?"[95] Day's fellow citizens may well have answered that all rules have certain exceptions, of which Hitler and Tojo were good examples.

Day countered these sentiments with vivid examples of her own to illustrate the horrors of war and shake readers out of their complacency. One of the consequences of the war that greatly bothered Day was the English blockade of Europe, which prevented many Europeans from receiving much-needed food supplies. Day labeled the blockade a "weapon of starvation" and denounced Americans' complicity in the tactic. In one of her articles about the blockade, Day drew an allusion to the Irish famine, an example that may have resonated well with her Irish-Catholic readers. She then offered a graphic depiction of the starving masses: "Living skeletons, lying in heaps, with grotesque shapes, just skin and bones and fetid odors and inhuman sounds,--do they know they are creatures of body and soul, temples of the Holy Spirit? Do they know they are dying for a great and noble cause—are they pleading with us not to send food so that their countries may be free?"[96] Day dismissed the idea that the United States could not get food to the needy because the Nazis and the Russians prevented it. "We may complain of the Nazis and we may complain of the Russians, but the great obstacle in the way is the enormous apathy of the American people, who are consenting to the British blockade of Europe."[97]

Day expressed similar indignation at the violence the American military committed on the battlefield, again, because it did not accord with Jesus's commandment to love others. In some instances, she set Biblical commandments in direct contrast to what she perceived as sinful behaviors to maximize the distance between God's will and humanity's actions:

> "Greater love hath no man than this," Christ said, "that he should lay down his life for his friend."

[95] Dorothy Day, "Aims and Purposes," *The Catholic Worker*, May 1943. The Gospel precepts to which Day refers are included in the Sermon on the Mount. See Matthew 5:43–48.
[96] Dorothy Day, "It Takes So Long to Die," *The Catholic Worker*, July–August 1942.
[97] Ibid.

> "Love is the measure by which we shall be judged," St. John of the Cross said.
>
> "Love is the fulfilling of the law," St. John, the beloved disciple said.
>
> Read the last discourse of Jesus to his disciples. Read the letters of St. John in the New Testament. And how can we express this love—by bombers, by blockades?
>
> Here is a clipping from the Herald Tribune, a statement of a soldier describing the use of the bayonet against the Japanese:
>
> "He (his father) should have been with us and seen how good it was. We got into them good and proper, and I can't say I remember much about it, except that it made me feel pretty good. I reckon that was the way with the rest of the company, by the way my pals were yelling all the time."
>
> Is this a Christian speaking?[98]

Day's rhetorical questions prompt her audience to compare the actions of the soldier with the laws of the New Testament. The laws themselves receive no elaboration, just repetition. They are presented as though they were self-evident; their truth is affirmed by virtue of the fact that religious authorities uttered them first. Presented in this context, the soldier's words are jarring, in both content and style. The first three quotations (of Christ, St. John of the Cross, and St. John, "the beloved disciple") are aphorisms: timeless, dispassionate, straightforward. The quotation of the soldier (an unnamed G.I. with a faulty memory and raucous friends) is an anecdote: subjective, unrefined, visceral. Day's questions are leading; she is asking her audience to participate, to determine which one of these things is not like the others, which attitude does not belong. In this excerpt, Day's distaste for war is clear, but her judgment is still somewhat restrained. She is exhorting her audience to realize their unreasonableness rather than condemning them outright.

[98] Day, "Why Do the Members of Christ Tear One Another? Why Do We Rise up against Our Own Body in Such Madness? Have We Forgotten That We Are All Members One of Another?—St. Clement."

Perhaps the most openly judgmental article of the period is penned by an anonymous author. Day published it on the front page of *The Catholic Worker* the following month. The author condemns political leaders for their self-righteousness, ambition, and pride, which blind them to the truth: that war will bring nothing but destruction for all involved. The author's message is a bold one, but she begins meekly. She states that she wishes to speak to rulers simply as one human being to other human beings, "neither to reprove nor command, but to ask you each to put a few questions to yourselves."[99] Thereupon follows a relentless interrogation that reads like a verbal assault:

> Most of you at one time or another refer to God, or appeal to Him more or less confidently as on your side. Which of you sincerely believes in God as the Supreme ruler and Judge of mankind? Do you constantly consult Him, pray long and fervently for light and guidance; or do you really rely far more on your own wisdom and the power you can call upon and control? Whatever you are, or whatever you think you can do, do you never remember that you are human, that one day you will die, and then will have to stand before God and give an account to Him of what you have done for humanity; and do you never tremble for that, and all the more because of the position you hold. . . ?
>
> Whatever you may profess, or think, or hope; whether you are fighting for right or wrong, for good or evil; whether you will be remembered as an aggressor or a defender of humanity, a liberator or an enslaver; are you not all driven to be doing much the same thing; flooding the world with suffering, deluging the earth with blood, destroying people's lives and homes, trying to starve people into submission, forcing the rest of the world to arm against you? Are you not each compelled, whoever started it first, to plot and intrigue against other nations, resorting to the meanest tricks and stooping to the vilest acts of treachery, ready to adopt the methods you condemn in others the moment they do; and meanwhile indulging in boasts, threats and jeers? Whatever your intentions may be, do you not see that the actual result so far has been to make this world more like hell. . . ?[100]

Here the author interrupts her winding sentences with just the punctuation necessary to draw them out further, compounding sin upon sin. With each sentence her fury mounts. No leader is overlooked. Even the pope is not above suspicion: "Are you, dear Holy Father, like the rulers of

[99] "A Peace Broadcast—to Rulers and Others."
[100] Ibid.

the world, concerned for the prestige of your office, afraid lest you should fail, or looking for the applause, or fearful of the condemnation of men?"[101] In this section, the author pits herself against the powers that be. The severe tone suggests a rigid view of morality: good vs. evil, with nothing in between. In its boldness and certainty, "A Peace Broadcast" exemplifies the judgment characteristic of prophetic speech.

Of course, the views the newspaper published earned the movement a good deal of criticism. Among the charges leveled at Day's pacifism was that it was mere "sentimentality." This accusation undercut the sacrificial nature of her service, and she fired back:

> let those who talk of softness, of sentimentality, come to live with us in cold, unheated houses in the slums. Let them come to live with the criminal, the unbalanced. . . .
>
> let their eyes be mortified by the sight of bodily excretions, diseased limbs, eyes, noses, mouths.
>
> Let their noses be mortified by the smells of sewage, decay and rotten flesh. Yes, and the smell of the sweat, blood and tears spoken of so blithely by Mr. Churchill, and so widely and bravely quoted by comfortable people.
>
> Let their ears be mortified by harsh and screaming voices, by the constant coming and going of people living herded together. . . .
>
> Then when they have lived with these comrades, with these sights and sounds, let our critics talk of sentimentality.[102]

With this retort, Day establishes herself as a suffering servant, a third dimension of the prophetic persona. The suffering servant archetype can be found in Isaiah, where the servant is someone who endures persecution to reconcile people with their God. In his discussion of the suffering servant archetype, Darsey points to Christ as the prime example in Western mythology of a

[101] Ibid.
[102] Day, "Why Do the Members of Christ Tear One Another? Why Do We Rise up against Our Own Body in Such Madness? Have We Forgotten That We Are All Members One of Another?—St. Clement."

servant suffering for a divine purpose. For Darsey, suffering is not only a consequence of the prophet's calling; it is a testament to her commitment.

The above excerpt from *The Catholic Worker* has several purposes. It aims, first of all, to refute the claims of Day's detractors: the Catholic Workers are *not* being "sentimental" in their opposition to war, she argues. Second, and more important, the passage aims to elevate the authority of Day and the Catholic Workers by suggesting that their alternative perspective is superior. Implicit is the claim that they are more qualified to judge the value of the war because they are more intimately acquainted with the kind of suffering it entails. Unlike their "comfortable" critics, they know what it means to suffer. Third and finally, the passage is a challenge to others to come experience the life of the Catholic Workers and gain the understanding that comes through their labors. Barring that, readers may learn from the virtual experience Day creates for them in her searing portrayal of life in a Catholic Worker house of hospitality, where blood, tears, and sweat are a material reality.[103]

The impact of this passage is achieved rhetorically through parallel structure, unremitting repetition, and an abundance of details that amount to sensory overload. Importantly, Day does not contradict her critics by trying to identify with them or show how her reasoning is like theirs; rather, she elaborates on their differences and widens the gap between them. Hers is an act of dissociation. The blood, tears, and sweat that comfortable people are familiar with exist as a rhetorical catchphrase, mere words. For her, they exist in reality, as things to be sopped up and wiped away. By drawing this distinction, Day answers critics by affirming that she has a solid grasp on reality, more so than they. In such a way, Day offers her suffering as proof of her prophetic witness.

[103] See the following for a fuller discussion on rhetoric as it relates to virtual experience: Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, *The Rhetorical Act* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1982), 8–9.

To review, the rhetoric of Dorothy Day and *The Catholic Worker* draws heavily on the prophetic dimensions of the messenger, the judge, and the suffering servant. The prophetic persona lent strength to the Catholic Workers' widely unpopular position against the war by grounding their claims in a transcendent reality. But throughout these same articles, another persona appears—that of the humble penitent. At this point, I turn my attention to this persona to discuss how it relates to the previous three while also signifying a break with the traditional descriptions of prophetic ethos.

Day as Humble Penitent

The persona of the humble penitent is most closely tied to that of the suffering servant. The connection is clear in the aforementioned excerpt from *The Catholic Worker*, which associates service to the poor (or more precisely, the suffering it entails) with mortification, a form of penance. The correlation between the two personae is also manifest in the Christian tradition in the person of Jesus, the suffering servant who underwent crucifixion to atone for the sins of humanity.

Though suffering and penance often go hand in hand, the presence of the former does not necessarily imply the latter. Prophets traditionally underwent suffering, but not usually because of their sins. They tended to be obedient messengers of God's judgment—not objects of judgment themselves.[104] This distinction was reflected in their speech, in which they often maintained a separation between themselves and their audience. According to Darsey, "The prophet does not speak as a member of the group he is addressing; he does not speak in the

[104] Jonah is one notable exception, though he, too, eventually complied with God's will.

inclusive 'we.' As a messenger, the prophet speaks in the voice of the divine 'I,' and the message of judgment is against 'you' the people."[105]

In this respect, Day broke with the prophetic tradition. She spoke frequently in the inclusive "we," assuming the role of the humble penitent even as she issued judgment. "We must all admit our guilt, our participation in the social order which has resulted in this monstrous crime of war," she wrote in February 1942.[106] And in a 1943 editorial: "How can we cease to cry out against injustice and human misery? . . . how can we do anything but howl over these sins in which we share? They are our sins. Just as we believe in the communion of saints—that we share in the merits of the saints, so we must believe that we share in the guilt of such cruelty and injustice."[107] In speaking of "our guilt" and "our sins," Day abandoned the I/you binary of traditional prophetic discourse, seeking identification with her audience instead. This move represents a notable departure from traditional prophetic discourse.

As well as conveying her personal beliefs, Day's confessional statements furthered other ends. In one sense, the shift in language appears to be a defensive measure. Just as Day did not want to appear sentimental, neither did she want to come across as self-righteous or hypocritical. Her admission of guilt in one instance follows directly from the observation that the "accusation 'holier than thou' is also made against us."[108] The inclusive language may have helped to ward off such accusations while also making her fierce rebukes easier to swallow.

Second, the confessional statements were instructional. They served as a model for her audience of the proper response to God's judgment. Day enacted the contrition she hoped her

[105] Darsey, *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America*, 26.
[106] Day, "Why Do the Members of Christ Tear One Another? Why Do We Rise up against Our Own Body in Such Madness? Have We Forgotten That We Are All Members One of Another?—St. Clement."
[107] Day, "Aims and Purposes."
[108] Day, "Why Do the Members of Christ Tear One Another? Why Do We Rise up against Our Own Body in Such Madness? Have We Forgotten That We Are All Members One of Another?—St. Clement."

readers would feel. Similarly, Jesus adopted plural first-person pronouns and a humble tone when teaching his followers how to pray: "Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name. . . . Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors."[109]

Third, the inclusive language of the humble penitent allowed for the growth of a radical social movement. This may never have been one of Day's stated goals, but her language was conducive to the development of a movement nonetheless. Even as she maintained her prophetic distance from the earthly city, through her inclusive language she reached out to potential members to join her in the wilderness. The inclusive pronoun "we" constituted the Catholic Workers as a unified body with a distinct identity.

This is not to say that all readers were eager to join Day's movement, nor even that her calls for repentance were well-received. Many of these passages were likely to have precisely the opposite effect. Even so, they are significant because they represent a variation of prophetic discourse that veers away from the Old Testament tradition.

To summarize thus far: Dorothy Day drew on the prophetic voice in *The Catholic Worker* newspaper to condemn WWII. By rooting her authority in a prophetic ethos, Day aligned herself with a transcendent order and distanced herself from her community. However, Day simultaneously adopted the character of the humble penitent, a role that enabled her to grow her movement by building identification with readers. Day's use of identification offered a counterbalance to her prophetic rhetoric of division.

In the following chapter, I examine Day's strategic use of identification in a new setting and with a new medium. I turn my attention to the Catholic Worker movement a decade later, to the early 1950s. With the Cold War in full swing and the Catholic Worker movement under FBI surveillance, Day published her autobiography, *The Long Loneliness*, which linked the radical

[109] Matthew 5:9, 5:12

politics of her past with the Catholic commitment of her present. In this text, Day grounds her authority within the radical and religious communities of which she was a part by blending diverse traditions into a cohesive whole.

CHAPTER 3
THE PERSONAL VOICE OF DOROTHY DAY

As previously noted, Day was a journalist by trade; her newspaper was an effective vehicle for spreading her social and religious philosophy. Why, then, did she feel the need to compose an autobiography as well? In this chapter I argue that Day's autobiography serves a special function in her body of writings. Rather than existing solely as a record of her life and her efforts with the Catholic Worker movement, her autobiography functions as a persuasive tool as well. In effect, Day offered her life as an argument. Her blend of radical and religious allusions in her text reflects the blend of radical and religious ideologies that comprised her personal philosophy. Ultimately, the book afforded her a greater opportunity to establish authority through identification—a more personal style of persuasion.

This chapter proceeds, first, with a brief discussion of the rhetorical potential inherent in the autobiographical genre. Next, I argue that Day used autobiography to blend the radical and religious traditions that influenced her life and, consequently, the Catholic Worker philosophy. From there, I draw on the works of Bakhtin and Murphy to suggest that authors can build authority by incorporating rhetorical traditions in their discourse. Finally, I offer a critical analysis of *The Long Loneliness*, noting how Day used structure, perspective by incongruity, and an authorial voice to establish her authority and grow her movement.

Autobiography as Persuasion

Autobiographies are inherently rhetorical. Authors make intentional choices when writing their autobiographies, keeping a particular audience in mind. They choose certain personal

experiences to include and reject others, creating a clear life trajectory—in essence, making implicit arguments through personal example and testimony. Moreover, writers often compose their autobiographies with set objectives.

For autobiographers to accomplish their chosen objectives, they must first convince readers that they are reliable. To this end, autobiographers must construct coherent narrative identities.[110] "Construct" is the key word here, for autobiographies are not characterized by faithful depictions of their subjects; rather, autobiographies are a form that allows writers to describe themselves as they see themselves or as they wish to be.[111] Through careful selection and exclusion of past experiences, autobiographers endeavor to create stable, unified identities and give meaning to their lives.

As Griffin explains, conversion narratives, like Day's, can put a kink in this process.[112] Conversions indicate a fundamental about-face in one's thought patterns or belief systems—a significant point of disjuncture in one's life. Transformations such as these challenge the stable, unified identities that readers find persuasive. How are autobiographers to account for these radical transformations? Griffin suggests that the very "problem" of conversion contains a potential solution. As he puts it, "Conversion represents both a problem and an opportunity to autobiographers, challenging them to create myths of self that account plausibly for the dramatic shifts in attitude and behavior that follow from an authentic conversion experience even as it provides them with the kind of insight that makes such an accounting possible."[113] The "myths of self" that Griffin refers to here take the form of unifying principles or metaphors that coordinate disparate life experiences into a coherent whole. He looks to Chuck Colson's

[110] Griffin, "The Rhetoric of Form in Conversion Narratives."
[111] Ibid. See also Georges Gusdorf, "Conditions and Limits of Autobiography," in *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*, ed. James Olney (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980).
[112] Griffin, "The Rhetoric of Form in Conversion Narratives."
[113] Ibid.: 152.

autobiography as an example. Colson's autobiography features a conversion, but this experience is subsumed by the central theme of the book, Colson's continual struggle between humility and pride. Likewise, Day's quest for authentic community and her struggle to overcome "the long loneliness" are central themes of her autobiography that unify her life experiences.

Once autobiographers have established the coherence of their narrative identities, they are likely to be more successful in accomplishing their other rhetorical ends—and these may have little to do with the authors per se. In *Lives of Their Own: Rhetorical Dimensions in Autobiographies of Women Activists*, Martha Watson observes that a number of prominent women activists throughout history penned autobiographies to tout their causes more than their personal lives. Indeed, many of them were hesitant to speak openly in the public forum about their lives, and it was only their devotion to their causes that enabled them to speak. When women wrote their autobiographies in this way, in service to a cause greater than themselves, "their autobiographies became extensions of their public advocacy."[114] Recalling the autobiographies of activists Emma Goldman, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and others, Watson elaborates: "their life stories complemented and supplemented their more explicitly agitative and argumentative discourses on behalf of their causes. As they recall their lives, these authors, whether consciously or not, attest to readers about the importance, value, and significance of their causes and urge the readers' appreciation of their commitment."[115]

Watson identifies two main rhetorical resources of the autobiography: its chronological structure and the author's voice. The chronological structure of autobiographical narratives allows readers to see what experiences influenced writers to think and behave in certain ways. By gaining understanding of writers' motivations, readers are more likely to be tolerant or

[114] Watson, *Lives of Their Own: Rhetorical Dimensions in Autobiographies of Women Activists*, 3.
[115] Ibid.

accepting of writers' ideas and actions—depicted, as they are, as the inevitable products of an orderly, logical progression. Moreover, "the chronological structure permits the authors to establish common ground with their readers, to build a bond with them before discussing more controversial and potentially divisive topics."[116] In *The Long Loneliness*, Day reaches back into her childhood to explain her life. Many of the experiences that Day describes are common ones; plenty of readers should be able to identify with her and appreciate the values she espouses, values like family, work, discipline, sacrifice, and service.

The second key rhetorical resource of the autobiography is the author's voice, which lends a certain degree of credibility to the writer. Watson explains: "the author's voice carries unusual weight in an autobiography. . . . we cannot deny that she is the authority on her own life. And if the author has won our confidence with appealing stories of her childhood or poignant recollections of her disappointments, we as readers are predisposed to attend to her voice."[117] Furthermore, the authorial voice in autobiographies has an intimate quality that invites readers to connect with the writers. In *The Long Loneliness*, Day's voice is so earnest, so vulnerable at times, that to reject it outright seems criminal.

Each of these rhetorical resources centers on identification. When both are in use, they offer a powerful way for writers to strengthen their credibility. Thus, for rhetors with special challenges in establishing authority, autobiographies can be a particularly helpful medium. Such was the case for Dorothy Day.

[116] Ibid., 10. Watson's arguments about autobiographies' rhetorical resources owe much to Fisher's discussions of the narrative paradigm.
[117] Ibid., 11.

Speaking to (and through) Communities

The Long Loneliness also helped Day boost her authority by providing an opportunity for her to establish her credentials with two very different communities—the radical left and the Roman Catholic Church. But, as I suggested in the first chapter, this opportunity to identify with both groups also presented a rhetorical challenge, for each group looked askance upon the other.

The radical tradition is an integral part of U.S. history, yet it remains difficult to define, as American radicalism has taken many different forms. In his appreciative history of radicalism in America, Lens characterizes the radical individual "as an antidote to privilege. Whatever his failings and ineptitudes, he has tried to repair the balance between those who have too much and those who have too little. In dozens of different ways, under innumerable philosophical flags, he has led, planned, or participated in social upheavals to uproot unjust societies and replace them with equitable ones."[118] Whereas mainstream politicians choose to effect change through gradual reforms of existing institutions, radicals tend to challenge these institutions directly by promoting more fundamental changes.

For much of Day's early life, in the 1920s and the 1930s in particular, the radical left was a vocal force on the American political scene, embodied in syndicalist, Socialist, and Communist organizations, among others. These groups attracted many members as laborers, fed-up with their harsh working conditions and the excesses of industrial capitalism, organized to assert their rights. Their discontent grew as the Great Depression wore on. Citizens demanded change, radical change if necessary. Interior Secretary Harold Ickes recognized as much, when he composed his diary entry of September 15, 1934: "'The country is much more radical than the Administration,'" he said. Roosevelt "'would have to move further to the left in order to hold the

[118] Sidney Lens, *Radicalism in America*, Revised ed. (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., 1982), 1.

country. . . . [A] breakdown on the part of the Administration would result in an extreme radical movement, the extent of which no one could foresee.'"[119]

But by the 1950s, the size and influence of the radical left had diminished significantly. Labor unrest subsided as Americans' economic prospects improved, and the Cold War assumed its place as the country's chief preoccupation.[120] The Red Scare was fueled by a series of events: the Soviets' testing of the atomic bomb, Mao Tse-tung's rise to power, the Alger Hiss trial, Senator McCarthy's crusade against Communists, and other incidents. Collectively, these events created a hostile atmosphere for those in the radical left. But Day remained impressed by many radical heroes of the past, and in her writing she recalled their sacrifices. The tales of Eugene V. Debs, the Haymarket martyrs, and others comprised a rich well from which she drew inspiration.

The Catholic tradition represented the second major strain of thought that contributed to Day's ideology. Day grew up nominally Protestant, but became attracted to the Catholic faith as she grew older. Thomas à Kempis's *The Imitation of Christ* and the stories of the saints, as told by William James in *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, were early influences that led to her conversion. Five years after joining the Church, she met Peter Maurin, who acquainted her with the Catholic philosophy of personalism and the Church's social teachings, including the papal encyclicals on labor, *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*. These writings, among others, were gradually folded into her consciousness with the radical philosophies of her youth. Her own writing was infused with references to the Catholic tradition.

Catholics were still a fairly marginalized group in America when Day converted. But while this status may have helped them to identify with the radical left in the early part of the century, by the 1950s it led many to conform ever more closely to mainstream America. Zwick

[119] Quoted in Kennedy, *Freedom from Fear: The American People in Depression and War, 1929–1945*, 223.
[120] James T. Patterson, *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945–1974*, Oxford History of the United States (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 165.

and Zwick explain: "Given the history of anti-Catholicism and the accusation that loyalty to the pope was treasonous, it had been difficult for Catholics, many of whom were immigrants, to go against the American mainstream. . . . The desire for acceptance created an almost superpatriotism in American Catholics to prove their allegiance to the United States."[121] It was this attitude, certainly more so than the social teachings of the Church, that put Day's radical inclinations at odds with her Catholic community.

The Long Loneliness is an account of Day's efforts to reconcile the radical and Catholic communities. Moreover, it is a declaration that such reconciliation is possible. Day enacts this reconciliation through language. By appropriating the voices of the radical and religious communities of which she was a part, Day creates her own distinct voice and pays homage to each group in the process. While some critics have mischaracterized autobiographies as "essentially solitary" accounts or merely "personal" or "particular" stories with little connection to the greater public,[122] Day's autobiography exists, unequivocally, as a social product. Accordingly, the authority Day generates in her autobiography grows out of her connection to her communities.

A Blend of Traditions

The notion that discourse is a social phenomenon receives full articulation in the works of Bakhtin. In his view, all discourse is a hodgepodge of diverse voices and languages, swirling about in perpetual dialogue with one another. In this respect, at least, *The Long Loneliness* is not unique. What makes discourse unique are the creative ways in which an author borrows languages and voices and wrangles them together into a coherent, artistic whole. As Bakhtin

[121] Zwick and Zwick, *The Catholic Worker Movement: Intellectual and Spiritual Origins*, 254.
[122] Benson argues against these perspectives of autobiography in Benson, "Rhetoric and Autobiography: The Case of Malcolm X," 7–8.

explains, this is no easy process: "Language is not a neutral medium that passes freely and easily into the private property of the speaker's intentions; it is populated—overpopulated—with the intentions of others. Expropriating it, forcing it to submit to one's own intentions and accents, is a difficult and complicated process."[123] Yet it is only through this process that authors create meaning for themselves and for others.

By "selectively assimilating the words of others," individuals develop their personal ideologies.[124] In one sense, *The Long Loneliness* is simply a record of Day's ideological becoming. The voices she assimilates into her writing are notable for their diversity. She refers frequently to writers, thinkers, and other figures who influenced her, from Dostoyevsky to Mauritain, Debs to Jesus. She quotes these individuals throughout her books, sometimes at great length. Valenta nicely summarizes the character and effect of the community of voices that Day calls forth:

> In *The Long Loneliness*, she has put together perhaps her most complex and nuanced collage—interspersing anonymous destitutes, famous secular radicals, radical Christians and Catholics. . . . To this extent, Dorothy Day's readings and writing sustain—both metaphorically and literally—a community of voices, crossing borders of history, religion, class, politics, mental and physical health. Her autobiographical writings revivify ancient and medieval lives thought irrelevant to modern, capitalist society. They bring contradictory modern voices and ideas, religious and radical, factual and fictional, in touch with each other. And in bringing this community together on paper as well as in life—making fluid the boundaries separating the written and the lived, as well as the past and the present, the spiritual and the radical—Day both found the integration and community for which she so yearned and made it possible for others.[125]

Here, Valenta highlights the synthesis Day creates between form and content. In her autobiography, Day unites disparate influences through a synthesis of politically radical and

[123] Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," 284.
[124] Ibid., 341.
[125] Markha G. Valenta, "In Fear and Trembling of Abstraction: Dorothy Day and Jacques Derrida Writing the Religious in (Post)Modern Society," in *Missing Links: Arts, Religion and Reality*, ed. Jonneke Bekkenkamp (London: Lit Verlag, 2000), 125.

Catholic ideas. Her contrasting life experiences—as a radical bohemian in Greenwich Village and as a meditative social worker on a spiritual retreat—ultimately converge. The synthesis of all of these elements is fused into being on the printed page, as Day's narrative identity coheres.

In his discussion of Bakhtin's work, Murphy elaborates on how this synthesis, or unity, comes about: "unity results from the interanimation of languages and voices as they visualize each other in the other's light." The effect is "analogous to a symphony in which a contrapuntal theme illuminates a primary melody."[126] With this metaphor, Murphy likens a rhetor to a conductor, one who orchestrates diverse sounds into one harmonious masterpiece.

While Bakhtin locates an author's style in the way he or she weaves together diverse voices into a coherent whole, Murphy goes one step further, suggesting that these voices—rhetorical traditions—are the building blocks with which rhetors construct authority. "Authority partly derives," he explains, "from a demonstrated familiarity with a cultural grammar and from the aesthetic ability to move effectively within that tradition."[127] In incorporating different languages into one's text, a rhetor links herself to different communities and absorbs their values into her message. "By speaking through traditions, one can speak for communities," Murphy says. It is also in this way, by speaking through traditions, that one can create communities. The Catholic Worker movement is one example.

In the section that follows, I turn my attention to Day's *The Long Loneliness* to show the ways in which Day generates authority and establishes a community using the rhetorical resources of autobiography mentioned previously—chronological structure and the author's voice—and another strategy, perspective by incongruity.

[126] Murphy, "Inventing Authority: Bill Clinton, Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Orchestration of Rhetorical Traditions," 74.
[127] Ibid.: 75–76.

The Long Loneliness: Structure

"My life has been divided into two parts," Day writes passively in the opening pages of her book.[128] Here she refers to her life before faith and afterward, before the birth of *The Catholic Worker* and in the years following. But in her autobiography, Day divides her life into three parts: Part One, "Searching," offers an account of her childhood and her young adulthood, the latter of which was spent in radical circles; Part Two, "Natural Happiness," features her common-law marriage, the birth of her daughter, and her conversion to Catholicism; and Part Three, "Love is the Measure," tells of her meeting with Maurin and the growth of the Catholic Worker community. Each section, representing a distinct part of her life, builds on the section before it. Day leads readers through the events of her past, including them on her journey so that they may understand how she became who she is and why she believes as she does. In the process, she establishes her ties to the radical and the religious communities, respectively, and positions herself as a humble leader of a powerful social movement.

In Part One, Day concentrates on her early affinity for radical politics. She says that she first became aware of social justice issues in high school, when she began reading a paper her brother worked for, *The Day Book*, which focused on local labor struggles. Day's other readings at this time, particularly by the Russian anarchist Prince Peter Kropotkin and by Upton Sinclair, acquainted her with the problems of the poor and gave her a sense of purpose: "Kropotkin especially brought to my mind the plight of the poor, of the workers, and though my only experience of the destitute was in books, the very fact that *The Jungle* was about Chicago where I lived, whose streets I walked, made me feel that from then on my life was to be linked to theirs, their interests were to be mine; I had received a call, a vocation, a direction to my life."[129]

[128] Day, *The Long Loneliness: The Autobiography of Dorothy Day*, 9.
[129] Ibid., 36.

The concern that Day felt for the poor was not shared by the Christians she encountered, at least not in the way she wished:

> "Children look at things very directly and simply. I did not see anyone taking off his coat and giving it to the poor. I didn't see anyone having a banquet and calling in the lame, the halt and the blind. And those who were doing it, like the Salvation Army, did not appeal to me. I wanted, though I did not know it then, a synthesis. I wanted life and I wanted the abundant life. I wanted it for others too. I did not want just the few, the missionary-minded people like the Salvation Army, to be kind to the poor. . . . I wanted everyone to be kind. I wanted every home to be open to the lame, the halt and the blind. . . . Only then did people really live, really love their brothers. In such love was the abundant life and I did not have the slightest idea how to find it.[130]

This passage marks the first occasion in which Day wishes for a synthesis of Christian thought and practice. Thereafter, *synthesis* becomes one of the book's central themes. In Day's mind, the Good Life, the abundant life, depended upon it.

Day's yearning for universal brotherhood led her to join the Socialist party in college, and gradually she grew scornful of her childhood religion. She rejected religion's emphasis on peace and joy and meekness in the face of suffering: "the ugliness of life in a world which professed itself to be Christian appalled me."[131] Over time, she felt a widening separation between herself and the other Christians she knew, a gulf between her type of faith and theirs. Throughout the remainder of Part One, Day speaks out about the social injustices she witnessed and about her growing involvement in Socialist, Communist, and syndicalist circles, effectively establishing her allegiance to the radical tradition, which, at this point, she paints in stark contrast to the religious tradition of her youth.

At the start of Part II, Day skips to her common-law marriage with Forster Batterham. The years she spent with him, her years of "natural happiness," were pivotal ones, and Part Two, accordingly, serves as a structural pivot in her autobiography. During her years with Forster,

[130] Ibid., 37–38.
[131] Ibid., 40.

Dorothy found herself turning back to God, not in despair but in gratitude. When her daughter was born, Day vowed not to let her waste her youth in aimless wandering as she had done; she baptized her in the Catholic Church and shortly thereafter, underwent baptism and confirmation herself. These decisions were difficult for Day, who knew that they meant an end to her relationship with Forster, an atheist who rejected the institution of marriage.

Day's conversion brought with it another sadness, too, over her rift with her radical friends. Newly Catholic, Day was as concerned as always about labor struggles, poverty, and war, but her faith was at odds with radical ideologies. Again, Day "longed to make a synthesis reconciling body and soul, this world and the next, the teachings of Prince Peter Kropotkin and Prince Demetrius Gallitzin, who had become a missionary priest in rural Pennsylvania."[132] She turned to God in anguish and prayed for a way to help the poor.

A few days later, Peter Maurin showed up on her doorstep. Part Three begins with their meeting. In describing this event directly after her tearful plea, Day suggests that Maurin, with his comprehensive program for the improvement of society, was God's answer to her prayers. Day felt that Maurin offered the synthesis she had been seeking. "His friends were Jews, Protestants, agnostics, as well as Catholics, and he found a common ground with all in what he termed the Thomistic doctrine of the common good. He ignored differences to stress concordance. . . . He wanted to make a new synthesis, as St. Thomas had done in the Middle Ages."[133] Up to this point, Day had highlighted the tensions between the radical and religious traditions as she saw them. She wanted a synthesis but bemoaned the lack of Catholic leadership that could unite the ideologies. When Maurin came on the scene with his unified theory, she

[132] Ibid., 147.
[133] Ibid., 166, 91.

quickly adopted it. The rest of Part Three details the Catholic Worker philosophy and records the growth of the movement, her new family.

As Watson argues, the chronological structure of autobiographies is one of their chief rhetorical resources. In *The Long Loneliness*, we see how this strategy works. Day spends most of her time at the start of the book detailing her youth. Hers was an ordinary childhood, just like that of her readers. It is unlikely that any of them would find her childhood actions objectionable. By the time Day begins to challenge the religious ideas she grew up with, readers are already invested in her story and sympathetic to her troubles. In a word, the chronological structure allows Day to build identification with her audiences from the start.

Furthermore, the structure of Day's book bestows a certain degree of inevitability upon the events of her life, arranged as they are in a neat, chronological order. Day's growing devotion to radical politics makes sense, given her increasing awareness of injustice in the world and her disillusionment with religion. And when she finds radical ideologies wanting, too, readers may find it understandable that she returns to religion, but this time to the religion of the masses—those she identifies with most.

At the same time, the chronological structure builds a sense of anticipation. When will Day's journey end? How will she find the synthesis and the community she is looking for? Day answers these questions in Part Three. In this section, Day is no longer a pilgrim; she has reached her destination. The synthesis she yearned for she finds in the Catholic Worker movement. In Part Three, Day fits form to function, weaving together the radical and religious experiences of her life into a coherent whole. Structurally, Part Three is a synthesis of Parts One and Two.

Perspective by Incongruity

The synthesis achieved in Part Three is all the more noteworthy because up to this point in her narrative, Day has presented her religious and radical affiliations as divergent influences. In both Parts One and Two, Day is concerned by injustice, but she deals with the problem in different ways. In the first part, Day allies herself with radical groups to protest and demand reform, but this tack leaves her unfulfilled. In the second part, she immerses herself in religious study and prayer; this approach ultimately proves inadequate as well. In both sections, Day's frustration is evident as she describes a certain paradox: the religious people she observes who profess a faith in Biblical teachings take no actions to better society, and those who do strive to reform society are not religious. Day's growing dissatisfaction with the radical and the religious circles, and with what she perceives as their incongruity, propels her narrative forward as she seeks resolution through the Catholic Worker movement. In this section, I elaborate upon Day's use of perspective by incongruity, a second rhetorical strategy featured in her autobiography.

In her study of Norman Thomas's radical rhetoric, Karen Whedbee identifies perspective by incongruity as an effective rhetorical strategy to use on apathetic audiences. Such audiences are unlikely to pay heed to a rhetor's message unless she first unsettles them or startles them out of their indifference. "By violating our expectations and introducing ambiguity into our vocabulary, perspective by incongruity serves as an 'opening wedge' that fractures our sense of how the world does and ought to function. It generates a kind of identity crisis that subsides only when meaning settles down once again to a fairly stable new orientation."[134] Whedbee explains that this strategy is concerned with more than persuasion, or simply urging an audience to adopt one's position. Its aim is no less than conversion—the radical alteration of an audience's ways of

[134] Karen Whedbee, "Perspective by Incongruity in Norman Thomas's 'Some Wrong Roads to Peace'," *Western Journal of Communication* 65, no. 1 (2001): 48–49.

thinking about fundamental matters of identity and being in the world. In *The Long Loneliness*, Day puts her conversion front and center. She does not inflict incongruity on her audience so much as she reveals to readers the conflicted feelings she experienced when radical and religious groups worked at cross-purposes. This approach allows readers to experience the incongruity along with her, to learn how she responded to it.

As Day saw it, overcoming suffering required more than periodic handouts or sermons; only if people attacked the roots of injustice could change occur. And on this count, she felt, the Church had failed dismally. "Disabled men, without arms and legs . . . ; farmers gaunt and harried with debt; mothers weighed down with children at their skirts, in their arms, in their wombs, children ailing and rickety—all this long procession of desperate people called to me. Where were the saints to try to change the social order, not just to minister to the slaves but to do away with slavery?"[135] The situation perplexed Day all the more when she realized that the radicals she encountered, who had no religious faith at all, were consumed with the problem of injustice and were doing everything they could to end it. This paradox weighed heavily on Day and eventually, she chose to side with the radicals:

> I read in the New Testament—'Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle but also to the froward'; and on the other hand there was that call to action: 'Workers of the world, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains.' Jesus said, 'Blessed are the meek,' but I could not be meek at the thought of injustice. I wanted a Lord who would scourge the money-changers out of the temple, and I wanted to help all those who raised their hand against oppression. For me Christ no longer walked the streets of this world. He was two thousand years dead and new prophets had risen up in His place. I was in love now with the masses. . . . The poor and oppressed were going to rise up, they were collectively the new Messiah, and they would release the captives.[136]

In this passage from Part One, Day uses perspective by incongruity to challenge her audience's beliefs and arouse their consciences. The juxtaposition of the two traditions—radical and

[135] Day, *The Long Loneliness: The Autobiography of Dorothy Day*, 43.
[136] Ibid., 43–44.

religious—in the identification of the masses as "the new Messiah" provokes audiences to reflect and demands a response.

In Part Two, after Day's conversion, she again joins religious and radical allusions, though this time she positions herself on the sidelines. In the selection that follows, Day writes about a Washington, DC hunger march, organized by Communists. She feels admiration for the marchers who struggled for reforms not just for themselves, but for others. "How our dear Lord must love them," she writes. "They were his friends, His comrades, and who knows how close to His heart in their attempt to work for justice."[137] Once again she recalls the story of Jesus overthrowing the money-changers' tables in the temple, and she likens his "divine courage" to the marchers'. To strengthen the comparison, she continues, "The years have passed, and most of the legislation called for by those workers is on the books now. I wonder how many realize just how much they owe the hunger marchers, who endured fast and cold, who were like the Son of Man, when He said, 'The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests but the Son of man hath not where [sic] to lay his head.'"[138]

Here, Day alludes to a passage in the Gospel of Luke (chapter 9), when Jesus warns potential disciples of the high costs of following him. Day draws similarities between Jesus and the marchers, but sees herself and other Catholics as falling outside the group:

> Radicalism was thriving among all groups except the Catholics. I felt out of it all. There was Catholic membership in all these groups of course, but no Catholic leadership. . . . I stood on the curb and watched [the marchers], joy and pride in the courage of this band of men and women mounting in my heart, and with it a bitterness too that since I was now a Catholic, with fundamental philosophical differences, I could not be out there with them. I could write, I could protest, to arouse the conscience, but where was the Catholic leadership in the gathering of bands of men and women together, for the actual works of mercy that the comrades had always made part of their technique in reaching the workers?[139]

[137] Ibid., 161.
[138] Ibid.
[139] Ibid., 160–61.

Again, Day describes the workers as the pious ones (those performing the works of mercy), a characterization that may have surprised Americans who read of the strike in newspapers, in which hysterical journalists decried the "Communist menace."[140] By comparing the workers to Christ, Day prods readers to rethink their assumptions about radical political groups and to question religious groups for their failure to actively fight oppression.

In sum, perspective by incongruity is a valuable strategy in *The Long Loneliness*, and it fulfills several functions. As an integral part of the plot, the incongruities Day perceives drive her to seek resolution; thus, perspective by incongruity is built into the structure of the book and propels the narrative. Second, and perhaps more important, these incongruities, or contradictions, allow Day to highlight the hypocrisy of her religious community in a more subtle way than a strict reprimand. By pointing out incongruities, Day suggests indirectly that the Church should reexamine its priorities and follow Jesus's example in denouncing greed. Finally, readers gain insight into Day's character as they see her wrestle with these incongruities throughout her young adulthood. In calling attention to these contradictions, Day comes across as earnest and straightforward. These qualities, in turn, make Day's voice more compelling.

The Author's Voice(s)

As Watson noted, the author's voice is another main rhetorical resource of autobiographies. She argues that readers are predisposed to attend to the voice of autobiographers, for they speak as experts in a personal tone. Perhaps a better way to characterize Day's voice, though, is in the plural—in the authorial *voices* she marshals together. For indeed, Day's text is peppered with the voices of others from the very start. She derives her

[140] Ibid., 159.

credibility not just from her personal experiences, but by linking herself to other religious and radical leaders before her.

In some parts of the book, Day emphasizes her connection to religious figures. She leads into her preface with a quotation from Mary Ward, an English nun from whom she borrowed the phrase "the long loneliness" for her title. The first chapter heading, "Confession," is reminiscent of Augustine's *Confessions* and situates the book firmly in the genre of spiritual autobiography. In this section, Day describes in great detail the experience of confessing one's sins to a priest and then compares the act of confession to that of writing an autobiography. Both are difficult, yet for her, both are necessary. "I pray with St. Augustine," she writes, "'Lord, that I may know myself, in order to know Thee.'"[141] With these allusions in her opening pages, Day makes her allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church clear.

In other passages, Day echoes the voices of radical leaders, thereby establishing herself solidly in the radical tradition. One prime example occurs in a section of the book in which Day details her first run-in with the law. On that occasion, Day was arrested for joining other suffragists in a march on Washington. She was pronounced guilty—of what exact charges is unclear—and sentenced to thirty days in jail. Day offers a detailed account of the humiliations and abuses she endured there, which would likely be somewhat shocking for those in her audience who had not experienced such treatment themselves. In protest, Day and the other suffragists embarked on a hunger strike that lasted for ten days. Day's suffering during this period was pronounced, and she continually meditated upon it. "I reflected on the desolation of poverty, of destitution, of sickness and sin. That I would be free after thirty days meant nothing to me. I would never be free again, never free when I knew that behind bars all over the world there were women and men, young girls and boys, suffering constraint, punishment, isolation

[141] Ibid., 9.

and hardship for crimes of which all of us were guilty."[142] In this passage, Day echoes the sentiments of the martyred Socialist leader Eugene Debs in his "Statement to the Court": "years ago I recognized my kinship with all living being [sic], and I made up my mind that I was not one bit better than the meanest on earth. I said then, and I say now, that while there is a lower class, I am in it, while there is a criminal element I am of it, and while there is a soul in prison, I am not free."[143] In both passages, the authors proclaim feelings of universal brotherhood, identifying with criminals throughout the world. The similarity between the two statements is likely no accident; in another chapter of the book, Day refers outright to Debs's declaration as "noble words."[144] In modeling her words after his, Day positions herself as a martyr in the radical tradition.

Throughout much of the book, Day alternates between radical and religious voices, or she uses both languages at once to emphasize their incongruity. But in Part Three, Day blends the voices in a different way, creating a synthesis of language that reflects the ideological synthesis of the Catholic Worker movement. In this part of the book, the voices are no longer clashing with one another so much as interanimating one another.

Day presents Maurin's ideas as the ultimate synthesis. Maurin draws on the preamble to the constitution of the International Workers of the World (IWW) to call for a new society built within the shell of the old,[145] and he appropriates the Communist call for revolution into the Catholic Worker philosophy. He justifies the worth of his theory by drawing on Lenin: "'There can be no revolution without a theory of revolution,'" Maurin recites, "so I am trying to give the

[142] Ibid., 75.
[143] Darsey, *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America*, 100.
[144] Day, *The Long Loneliness: The Autobiography of Dorothy Day*, 98.
[145] Ibid., 165–66.

theory of a green revolution."[146] Day, too, relishes the language of revolution: "It is a permanent revolution, this Catholic Worker movement," she maintains.[147] "'All men are brothers.' How often we hear this refrain, the rallying call that strikes a response in every human heart. These are the words of Christ, 'Call no man master, for ye are all brothers.' It is a revolutionary call. . . . Going to the people is the purest and best act in Christian tradition and revolutionary tradition and is the beginning of world brotherhood."[148] Day selected the title *The Catholic Worker* as a deliberate parallel to the Communist *Daily Worker*, she tells us, and she claims the Sermon on the Mount as her manifesto.

Similarly, Day holds up Communist leaders alongside Christ, not to contrast them, but to emphasize their commonalities:

> "To believe in the infinite creative power of the people," Mao-Tse-tung, the secretary of the Communist party in China, wrote with religious fervor. And he said again in 1943, "The maxim 'Three common men will make a genius' tells us that there is great creative power among the people and that there are thousands and thousands of geniuses among them. There are geniuses in every village, every city." It is almost another way of saying that we must and will find Christ in each and every man, when we look on them as brothers.[149]

Here, Day translates Mao's statement into an observation about Christian charity. His writings have "religious fervor," even if they are not explicitly religious. In her efforts to "find Christ in each and every man," Day finds Christ in Mao. In another passage, the comparison between the radical and religious traditions is even more prominent:

> We had a mad friend once, a Jewish worker from the East Side, who wore a rosary around his neck and came to us reciting the Psalms in Hebrew. . . . He sat at the table with us once and held up a piece of dark rye bread which he was eating. "It is the black bread of the poor. It is Russian Jewish bread. It is the flesh of Lenin. Lenin held bread up to the people and he said, 'This is my body, broken for you.' So they worship Lenin. He brought them bread." There is nothing

[146] Ibid., 182.
[147] Ibid., 211.
[148] Ibid., 211–12.
[149] Ibid., 218–19.

> lukewarm about such worship, nothing tepid. It is the crying out of a great hunger.[150]

In this excerpt, a man likens Lenin to Jesus at the Last Supper, suggesting that both men offered salvation to the people. Day might have dismissed the worker's statement as the ramblings of an insane man. But instead, she included it (as coming from a "friend" no less) and thereby gave it credence, even tacking on commentary at the end. Perhaps Day viewed insanity differently in light of her fascination with the "folly of the cross." In any case, "'The truth is the truth,'" she writes, quoting St. Thomas, "'and proceeds from the Holy Ghost, no matter from whose lips it comes.'"[151]

For Day, the activities of the Catholic Worker likewise represent both the radical and the religious traditions. "The spiritual works of mercy include enlightening the ignorant, rebuking the sinner, consoling the afflicted, as well as bearing wrongs patiently, and we have always classed picket lines and the distribution of literature among these works."[152] She compares the workers who distribute literature for the movement to St. Paul, and simultaneously to Trotsky. In sum, throughout her rhetoric, Day acknowledges each tradition and melds it with the other, showing that the two are not wholly incompatible belief systems. In the process, she bolsters her connection to both religious and radical circles. She speaks as one with dual citizenship; her voice exists as a product of the two groups.

The three elements of Day's autobiography that I have called attention to in this chapter—structure, perspective by incongruity, and voice—achieve maximum effect as they work in concert with one another. The incongruity Day highlights between radical and religious groups exists as the autobiography's chief problem. The gnawing discontent she experiences

[150] Ibid., 201.
[151] Ibid., 215.
[152] Ibid.

because of this incongruity propels the narrative forward as she seeks resolution. The chronological structure of the narrative, meanwhile, ensures that readers follow Day's journey alongside her. Finally, Day's voice, a medley of voices past, offers the final indication that she has achieved resolution, or synthesis, linguistically and philosophically. In reconciling radical and religious voices in her own speech, Day enacts the synthesis she wished to find.

As I noted previously, autobiographies have been dismissed in the past as simply "personal" stories or "solitary" accounts. This chapter offers further evidence that autobiographies are not monologic, and even "expert" authors are formed by a variety of influences, reflected in their text as a variety of discourses. Once published, an autobiography joins this community of voices as a separate entity, at once manifold and individual. Accordingly, autobiographers derive their authority as active participants in this community—not as objective outsiders.

This way of generating authority differs significantly from the prophetic approach, detailed previously. In the following chapter, I examine these two strategies in combination and discuss some of the ramifications of Day's approach.

CHAPTER 4
CONCLUSION

In the first chapter, I suggested that Dorothy Day's fundamental rhetorical challenge was to establish authority as a social movement leader. I observed that this task was complicated by two factors: her divergent audiences and her gender. The difficulty of her mission was further compounded by the resistance many Americans felt toward her pacifist message. In the intervening chapters, I discussed several ways in which Day navigated around these problems to build credibility. One way, as seen in excerpts from *The Catholic Worker* newspaper, was by channeling the prophetic persona and rooting her authority in a transcendent source. Another way, exemplified in her autobiography *The Long Loneliness*, involved building identification with her audience by weaving together rhetorical traditions of the radical and religious communities of which she was a part.

Each approach had its benefits. The prophetic voice lent strength to Day in moments when her message was most at odds with mainstream America. Moreover, it underscored her piety (a quality that women of that era were expected to possess) and enabled her to speak more forcefully than gender norms may have allowed. The prophetic stance entailed suffering and alienation, certainly, but her sober acceptance of these consequences offered further testament to her commitment and consequently may have helped catch readers' attention.

The personal voice attracted readers in a different way—by establishing commonalities and strengthening ties. Day knew firsthand about the ideals of political radicals as well as of Roman Catholics. Her experience with both groups gave her the perfect vantage point from which to recognize the strengths and the shortcomings of each group. Moreover, her joint

affiliations gave her the ultimate flexibility; she could identify with either group at will as it fit her purposes. Accordingly, Day used the personal voice to recount her past experiences and draw closer to readers. If the prophetic voice provoked readers' discomfort, the personal voice more likely won their sympathy.

In this way, the two approaches were complementary: the personal voice tempered the prophetic. In one moment, Day castigated people's actions and described the dire outcomes that would surely result if they did not change their ways; in the next moment, she switched tactics by expressing solidarity with her audience and admitting to her own struggles. Both strategies allowed Day to base her authority in something larger than herself. And in the end, Day's two-pronged approach to creating authority proved greater than the sum of its parts. In this chapter, I discuss in more depth the various ways in which Day blended these strategies and the implications they entailed.

Complementary Strategies

It would be a mistake to imply that Day reserved the prophetic voice for her newspaper and the personal voice for her autobiography, for she drew on both strategies within each genre. As I pointed out in Chapter Two, Day blended strategies in *The Catholic Worker* by channeling the prophetic ethos while simultaneously casting herself as the humble penitent. I explained that this dual role allowed her to issue condemnation while also uniting herself with her readers. The blend of approaches I described in Chapter Two was just one of the many ways that Day incorporated prophetic and personal styles within the same text.

Also in *The Catholic Worker*, Day ran a column entitled "Day by Day," which came to be a staple of the newspaper. This column detailed Day's travels around the country as well as the mundane goings-on in Catholic Worker houses of hospitality. "Day by Day" is characterized by

a familiar tone; the column reads like a letter from a family member, and as such, it balances many of the more didactic articles and editorials published in the newspaper.

Likewise, *The Long Loneliness* contains both personal and prophetic elements. Although the book is characterized by a personal style first and foremost, it is in *The Long Loneliness* that Day establishes many of her credentials as a prophet. As readers will recall from my previous description of the prophetic ethos, borrowed from Darsey, prophets often display an initial reluctance to speak; it is ultimately their faith that compels them to prophesy. In *The Long Loneliness*, Day begins humbly, expressing reservations about sharing her story. "I beg pardon of my readers. I am a journalist, not a biographer, not a *book* writer. The sustained effort of writing, of putting pen to paper so many hours a day when there are human beings around who need me, when there is sickness, and hunger, and sorrow, is a harrowingly painful job."[153] And yet Day also suggests that she is impelled to tell her story, that she has "a right [or an obligation, perhaps?] to give an account of myself, a reason for the faith that is in me."[154]

Another critical aspect of the prophet's narrative is a significant conversion experience. In *The Long Loneliness*, Day puts her conversion front and center, as if to prove the authenticity of her faith. Day's autobiography also features accounts of the suffering she endured for the sake of her convictions: the sadness over relationships lost, the physical discomforts in the houses of hospitality, and so on. Finally, Day's story indicates her intimate connection to God, a requisite characteristic of the prophetic experience. She describes being "haunted by God" all her life,[155] and she suggests that God answered her prayers straightaway by sending Maurin to her home. In her account, Day portrays herself as one charged with a divine mission. Taken together with her

[153] Day, *The Long Loneliness: The Autobiography of Dorothy Day*, 9.
[154] Ibid.
[155] Ibid.

other writings, *The Long Loneliness* affirms Day's role as a modern-day prophet, even as it exemplifies her personal style.

As is evidenced by these examples, it was rare for Day to adopt one approach to the exclusion of the other. The two ways of generating authority function interdependently. Thus, Day spoke with the authority that comes from divine assurance, as well as the authority that comes through her lived experience.

At this point I should clarify what might be a point of confusion: to argue that appealing to a community's traditions is an essential way to identify with audiences does not mean that traditions have no place in prophecy. On the contrary, prophets also point to traditions (or more precisely, to communities' failures to uphold their sacred traditions) in urging audiences to change their behavior. Communities that have no sacred traditions produce no prophets.[156] Thus, we see Day-as-prophet citing Church leaders and religious doctrines when she condemns the country's unrighteousness. These doctrines were transmitted and preserved by communities through their traditions, but Day viewed them as no less than revelations from God.

As the prophetic and personal styles both rely on tradition, their main difference lies elsewhere. It is here that we come to the relationship between rhetors and their communities. Speaking as a prophet, Day positioned herself at a critical distance from those she was addressing. As an autobiographer, speaking in the personal style and fluent in radical and religious languages both, she described herself as a product of her communities. The distinction between these two approaches becomes more meaningful when we view Day's efforts to establish herself as a model.

[156] Darsey, *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America*.

A Model Citizen

In writing about her life and the work of the Catholic Worker movement, Day indirectly presented herself as a model for others to emulate. She was certainly not the first leader of a social movement to do so. Solomon describes how suffragists used newspapers to transform the ideal of the "true woman" by presenting an alternate model—the "new woman."[157] Similarly, other autobiographers, recognizing that readers often approach their books in search of direction, have painted themselves as exemplars.[158]

This strategy can potentially be very effective, particularly when models imitate other models that are more well-established. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca explain: "Close adherence to a recognized model guarantees the value of the behavior. The person following the model enjoys an enhanced value, and can thus, in turn, serve as model: the philosopher will be held out as model to the city because he himself has the gods as his model. Saint Theresa inspires the conduct of Christians because she herself had Jesus as model."[159] The same is true of Day. In serving the poor and striving to be a peacemaker, Day showed that she took the gospel message seriously. Her behavior pointed to the example of Jesus; her selfless commitment to him elevated other Christians' reverence for her. As others looked up to her, going so far as to call her a saint, Day used the personal voice and emphasized that she was down to earth. Readers may have found encouragement in learning that her origins were much like theirs. Using the personal voice, Day suggested to readers that she was not that different than they, and so they, too, could live up to the same standards that she did.

[157] Solomon, "The Role of the Suffrage Press in the Woman's Rights Movement," 13.
[158] Watson, *Lives of Their Own: Rhetorical Dimensions in Autobiographies of Women Activists*.
[159] Chaïm Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969), 364.

However, modeling can also be a risky strategy. "A model must keep careful watch on his behavior, for the least deviation will be the justification for a thousand other deviations," Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca caution.[160] In other words, followers may view their model's indiscretions as a license to sin. Alternately, followers may feel that a model's example is unattainable and so abandon their attempts to imitate him or her. Models can perpetuate this notion by setting unrealistically high standards. Day herself aimed for perfection. As she quoted from Matthew 5:48: "Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly father is perfect." A high standard, indeed.

Herein lies one of the several problems with the prophetic model. For one, it leaves little room for anyone but the fully committed. Day's movement was made for zealots. Others inevitably joined in, drawn by the idea of communal living and romantic notions about serving the poor, but more often than not, these individuals soon became a burden on the Catholic Worker communities. In some instances, when they became overrun by people who did not share the same vision as Day or the same level of commitment, the communities folded.

This result may have followed, in part, from Day's own paradoxical rhetoric. Prophets tend to work alone, seeking to transform their communities from a distance. Day tried to bring the people into the wilderness with her, to join her in prophesying. But what kind of community is this, and can it last? These questions became more salient as the Catholic Worker communities experienced internal divisions. Day and Maurin's philosophy dominated the movement, but there were times when other Catholic Workers disagreed about the appropriate course of action in a given situation. The prophetic model is ill-equipped for such moments. Prophets serve as God's mouthpiece; their views should not conflict. If they do, the prophetic model comes up short, as it does not allow for deliberation or compromise. It was moments like these in which Day had to

[160] Ibid., 365.

adjust her approach; a strictly prophetic stance is inflexible, and cannot be sustainable in community.

Day's Legacy

The personal and prophetic voices of Dorothy Day shaped the Catholic Worker movement in important ways. Had Maurin got what he wanted, *The Catholic Worker* would have published nothing but his Easy Essays. Day had something else in mind. Her stories focused readers' attention on the pervasive injustice in society and urged readers to respond. While Maurin was content to lecture audiences about philosophy, Day drew close to audiences by sharing her personal journey. She maintained throughout her life that the founder of the Catholic Worker movement was Peter Maurin, but it is clear that the movement would never have attracted the following it did had Day not exerted her powerful influence.

The precise effect of her contribution is difficult to measure. Her message clearly resonated with many people, as evidenced by the thousands of copies of *The Catholic Worker* that circulated each month and the dozens of houses of hospitality that sprang up across the country. Today, nearly three decades after Day's death, Catholic Worker communities continue to thrive, and *The Catholic Worker* newspaper remains in circulation. Even before Day died, devotees began calling her a saint. The campaign to canonize her began in earnest directly following her death. She had always protested such lofty labels: she didn't want to be dismissed so easily, she insisted. Day felt that she had done nothing extraordinary in helping her neighbors, and others could (and should) do the same.

While her life stands as her greatest accomplishment, Day's writing has its own rhetorical merits. This study has focused on her work in an attempt to understand how she generated authority. I have demonstrated that the prophetic and the personal styles she drew upon to

accomplish this task functioned interdependently. If Day's case is at all representative, other social movement leaders would do well to vary their strategies also, to better establish credibility with broad audiences. To this end, my study invites further analysis about the balance social movement leaders must strike between criticizing the people—products of the established order—and welcoming them into their movement.

REFERENCES

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. “Discourse in the Novel.” In *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, edited by Michael Holquist, 259–422. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Barbieri Jr., Louis A. “Matthew.” In *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: New Testament*, edited by John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck, 13–94. Colorado Springs, CO: Chariot Victor Publishing, 1985.

Benson, Thomas W. “Rhetoric and Autobiography: The Case of Malcolm X.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60, no. 1 (1974): 1–13.

Bercovitch, Sacvan. *The American Jeremiad*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978.

Bormann, Ernest G. “Fetching Good out of Evil: A Rhetorical Use of Calamity.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 63 (1977): 130–39.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. “Femininity and Feminism: To Be or Not to Be a Woman.” *Communication Quarterly* 31, no. 2 (1983): 101–08.

———. *Man Cannot Speak for Her*. New York: Praeger, 1989.

———. *The Rhetorical Act*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1982.

Chatfield, Charles. “The Catholic Worker in the United States Peace Tradition.” In *American Catholic Pacifism: The Influence of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*, edited by Anne Klejment and Nancy L. Roberts, 1–13. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996.

Coy, Patrick G. “Conscription and the Catholic Conscience in World War II.” In *American Catholic Pacifism: The Influence of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*, edited by Anne Klejment and Nancy L. Roberts, 47–64. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996.

Dallek, Robert. *Franklin D. Roosevelt and American Foreign Policy, 1932–1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Darsey, James Francis. *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America*. New York: New York University Press, 1997.

Day, Dorothy. “Aims and Purposes.” *The Catholic Worker*, May 1943.

———. “It Takes So Long to Die.” *The Catholic Worker*, July–August 1942.

———. *The Long Loneliness: The Autobiography of Dorothy Day*. Garden City, NY: Image Books, 1959.

———. “Our Country Passes from Undeclared to Declared War; We Continue Our Christian Pacifist Stand.” *The Catholic Worker*, January 1942.

———. “To Our Readers.” *The Catholic Worker*, May 1, 1933.

———. “Why Do the Members of Christ Tear One Another? Why Do We Rise up against Our Own Body in Such Madness? Have We Forgotten That We Are All Members One of Another?—St. Clement.” *The Catholic Worker*, February 1942.

Edwards, R. A. R. “Jane Addams, Walter Rauschenbusch, and Dorothy Day: A Comparative Study of Settlement Theology.” In *Gender and the Social Gospel*, edited by Wendy J. Deichmann Edwards and Carolyn De Swarte Gifford, 150–66. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2003.

Elie, Paul. “Why & How Day Wrote It.” *Commonweal*, May 3, 2002, 13–15.

Eulau, Heinz. “Proselytizing in the Catholic Press.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 11, no. 2 (1947): 189–97.

Farrell, Thomas B. *Norms of Rhetorical Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.

Fisher, Walter R. “Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument.” In *Contemporary Rhetorical Theory: A Reader*, edited by John Louis Lucaites, Celeste Michelle Condit and Sally Caudill, 265–87. New York: The Guilford Press, 1999.

Griffin, Charles J. G. “The Rhetoric of Form in Conversion Narratives.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 76, no. 2 (1990): 152–63.

Gusdorf, Georges. “Conditions and Limits of Autobiography.” In *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*, edited by James Olney, 28–48. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Jablonski, Carol J. “Dorothy Day.” In *Women Public Speakers in the United States, 1925–1993: A Bio-Critical Sourcebook*, edited by Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, 161–74. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994.

———. “Dorothy Day’s Contested Legacy: “Humble Irony” As a Constraint on Memory.” *Journal of Communication & Religion* 23, no. 1 (2000): 29–49.

———. “Resisting the ‘Inevitability’ of War: The Catholic Worker Movement and World War II.” In *American Rhetoric in the New Deal Era, 1932–1945*, edited by Thomas W. Benson, 419–52. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2006.

Japp, Phyllis M. “Esther or Isaiah?: The Abolitionist–Feminist Rhetoric of Angelina Grimké.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 71, no. 3 (1985): 335–48.

Kennedy, David M. *Freedom from Fear: The American People in Depression and War, 1929–1945*, *The Oxford History of the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Klejment, Anne. "The Radical Origins of Catholic Pacifism: Dorothy Day and the Lyrical Left During World War I." In *American Catholic Pacifism: The Influence of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*, edited by Anne Klejment and Nancy L. Roberts, 15–32. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996.

Klejment, Anne, and Nancy L. Roberts. *American Catholic Pacifism: The Influence of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996.

Lens, Sidney. *Radicalism in America*. Revised ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Pub. Co., 1982.

Macdonald, Dwight. "Dorothy Day." In *Memoirs of a Revolutionist: Essays in Political Criticism*, 349–68. New York: Farrar Straus and Cudahy, 1957.

———. "Introduction." In *The Catholic Worker: Volumes 1–7, 1933–1940*, edited by Dorothy Day, 1–12. Westport, CT: Greenwood Reprint Corporation, 1970.

Martin, John A. "Isaiah." In *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: Old Testament*, edited by John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck, 1029–121. Colorado Springs, CO: Chariot Victor Publishing, 1985.

Marty, Martin E. *Modern American Religion, Volume 2: The Noise of Conflict, 1919–1941*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Maurin, Peter. "Easy Essays." *The Catholic Worker*, March 1944.

———. "For a New Order." *The Catholic Worker*, April 1942.

McNeal, Patricia. “Catholic Peace Organizations and World War II.” In *American Catholic Pacifism: The Influence of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*, edited by Anne Klejment and Nancy L. Roberts, 33–46. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996.

Miller, William D. *Dorothy Day: A Biography*. 1st ed. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1982.

———. *A Harsh and Dreadful Love: Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*. New York: Liveright, 1973.

Murphy, John M. “Inventing Authority: Bill Clinton, Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Orchestration of Rhetorical Traditions.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83, no. 1 (1997): 71–89.

———. “‘A Time of Shame and Sorrow’: Robert F. Kennedy and the American Jeremiad.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 76 (1990): 401–14.

O’Sullivan, John. “An Uneasy Community: Catholics in Civilian Public Service During World War II.” In *Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement: Centenary Essays*, edited by William J. Thorn, Phillip M. Runkel and Susan Mountin, 474–80. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 2001.

Patterson, James T. *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945–1974*, *Oxford History of the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

“A Peace Broadcast—to Rulers and Others.” *The Catholic Worker*, March 1942.

Perelman, Chaïm, and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.

Piehl, Mel. *Breaking Bread: The Catholic Worker and the Origin of Catholic Radicalism in America*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982.

———. “The Catholic Worker and Peace in the Early Cold War Era.” In *American Catholic Pacifism: The Influence of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*, edited by Anne Klejment and Nancy L. Roberts, 77–90. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996.

Sicius, Francis J. “Prophecy Faces Tradition: The Pacifist Debate.” In *American Catholic Pacifism: The Influence of Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*, edited by Anne Klejment and Nancy L. Roberts, 65–76. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996.

Solomon, Martha M. “The Role of the Suffrage Press in the Woman’s Rights Movement.” In *A Voice of Their Own: The Woman Suffrage Press, 1840–1910*, edited by Martha M. Solomon, 1–16. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1991.

Thorn, William J., Phillip M. Runkel, and Susan Mountin. *Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement: Centenary Essays*. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 2001.

Trawick, Robert. “Dorothy Day and the Social Gospel Movement: Different Theologies, Common Concerns.” In *Gender and the Social Gospel*, edited by Wendy J. Deichmann Edwards and Carolyn De Swarte Gifford, 139–49. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2003.

Valenta, Markha G. “In Fear and Trembling of Abstraction: Dorothy Day and Jacques Derrida Writing the Religious in (Post)Modern Society.” In *Missing Links: Arts, Religion and Reality*, edited by Jonneke Bekkenkamp, 107–30. London: Lit Verlag, 2000.

Watson, Martha. *Lives of Their Own: Rhetorical Dimensions in Autobiographies of Women Activists*, *Studies in Rhetoric/Communication*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1999.

Whedbee, Karen. “Perspective by Incongruity in Norman Thomas’s ‘Some Wrong Roads to Peace’.” *Western Journal of Communication* 65, no. 1 (2001): 45–64.

White, James Boyd. *Acts of Hope: Creating Authority in Literature, Law, and Politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Whitman, Alden. “Dorothy Day, Catholic Activist, 83, Dies.” *The New York Times*, December 1, 1980.

Witmer, John A. “Romans.” In *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: New Testament*, edited by John F. Walvoord and Roy B. Zuck, 435–503. Colorado Springs, CO: Chariot Victor Publishing, 1985.

Zulick, Margaret D. “The Agon of Jeremiah: On the Dialogic Invention of Prophetic Ethos.” *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 78, no. 2 (1992): 125–48.

Zwick, Mark, and Louise Zwick. *The Catholic Worker Movement: Intellectual and Spiritual Origins*. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2005.