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Abstract

This dissertation argues that the work of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement has, since its inception in the early 1980s, been successful and that its work is rhetorical activity. This study examines that activity: how it is situated; what it looks like; how it has changed over time; and how it has shaped both public policy and private behavior. The study provides a historical and cultural context for the movement, a taxonomy of movement stakeholders and their discourse, and analyses of artifacts with visual and verbal features. The taxonomy characterizes movement stakeholders (advocacy organizations, government entities, research entities, and the media); reviews literature by and about movement stakeholders; and models this successful social change movement.

I chose artifacts for analysis based on three criteria: chronology (including before and during the contemporary movement to demonstrate trends over time); representation; and richness of the data (the corpus analyzed is representative of the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement). I use Thomas Huckin’s “six general stages” (“Context-Sensitive Text Analysis,” 1992) to identify and analyze representative features of genres that constitute the corpus of the movement’s discourse (e.g., brochure, information booklet, magazine article, public service ad, press release, and newsletter). I use three complementary research approaches: rhetorical analysis, discourse analysis, and case study techniques that privilege the voice of a drunk-driving crash survivor who has held nearly all movement stakeholder positions over her 20-year involvement in the movement.

After discussing four features of the movement’s discourse (gendered language, slogans, figurative language, and stories that put a face on the victim), I provide close analyses of movement artifacts. I argue that contemporary movement leaders effectively forged alliances with key movement stakeholders, appropriated genres that had demonstrated success; adapted these communication strategies to contemporaneous circumstances, and kept pace with new technologies to carry the movement’s message widely, first to garner grassroots support, then to popularize their cause, and finally to establish and maintain the funding and general support necessary to influence the passage of legislation, including the national legal drinking age of 21 and .08 blood alcohol content laws.
Accident or Crash?  
The Rhetoric of the Anti-Drunk Driving Movement

Without the [anti-drunk driving movement’s] incessant and impassioned activity, drunk driving would not be a matter of national concern . . .

The anti-drunk driving movement, like all human endeavors, is constituted within a historical and cultural context and is acted out by a cast of characters who perform different activities toward accomplishing the work of the movement. This study argues that the work of the anti-drunk driving movement, this “incessant and impassioned activity,” is by and large rhetorical activity. This study tells a story about that rhetorical activity—how it is situated; what it looks like; how it changed over time; and how it has shaped both public policy and private behavior.

Telling this story meets the objectives of the study which are
  • to situate the rhetoric of the anti-drunk driving movement in a historical and cultural context;
  • to present and analyze the discourse of the movement to address the research questions; and
  • to put forward findings that will contribute to the rhetoric and professional communication discipline.

The next section of this chapter presents the research questions, followed by two sections that describe the genesis of this project and provide a look at Marti Belluschi, the key informant for this study in the context of her involvement in the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement.

Identifying the Research Questions

The following questions guide this study.

1. How has the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement changed over time?
   a. What genres have been used?
   b. How have these genres changed?

This question assumes that we can look at the discourse and identify both the genres used and how those genres and instantiations of the genres have changed. This study describes
how, from the early to mid-1960s—when Marti Belluschi was gravely injured in a drunk-driving crash—to the present, the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement changed. This study looks, in part, at changes in technology and the media (i.e., the increasing availability and affordability of four-color printed materials, availability of inexpensive video reproduction, and the prevalence of the internet) that the movement appropriated to further its purposes. Instead of relying only on conventional rhetorical genres available during the 1960s, stakeholders in the anti-drunk driving movement have kept pace with changes and have adapted their messages to the expanded rhetorical potential offered by these developing technologies.

Further, in addition to responding to technological changes, this study looks at ways the anti-drunk driving movement has been sensitive to social exigencies and has adapted its discourse to most effectively accomplish its goals. For example, based on their assessments of the social climate and their target audiences, movement stakeholders used both “old” (such as posters and brochures) and “new” tools (such as video tapes and websites). The stakeholders used this variety of tools to disseminate their discourse as the tools enjoyed increasing popularity in the general culture. Examples like the tools the movement used as they fashioned its discourse suggest this study’s second research question.

2. Has the anti-drunk driving movement’s discourse changed in response to
   a. reductions in alcohol-related traffic fatalities in general;
   b. reductions in alcohol-related traffic fatalities in certain demographic groups;
   c. changes in social conditions; or
   d. other now unknown factors?

This question argues that the anti-drunk driving movement’s discourse has changed and that those changes can be linked with identifiable factors. Historical evidence about reductions in alcohol-related traffic fatalities and studies of changes in public policy begin to show that such changes can be traced. In the foreword to one such study, H. Laurence Ross’s *Confronting Drunk Driving: Social Policy for Saving Lives*, Joseph R. Gusfield talks about “a dual dimension to public policies . . . . On one level the public discussion of drinking-driving . . . . is a way of asserting the moral values and ethical choices that are presented as the dominant norms of American life. . . . In another dimension, public policies are instruments
for reaching goals” (1992, x). And in his preface to the same volume, Ross says he unites with the citizens’ movement against drunk driving “in our concern with saving lives now lost due to drunk driving. . . . Without the movement’s incessant and impassioned activity, drunk driving would not be a matter of national concern” (1992, xv).

I examine this matter of national concern within the historical context surrounding the anti-drunk driving movement to tease out some of the social exigencies that might have influenced the discourse of the movement. For example, since the 1960s, Americans have steadily increased the amount and quality of acceptable car-related violence in a number of genres such as motion pictures and television. Wile E. Coyote, who debuted in 1949 and had a long career chasing Roadrunner over desert roads, may once have driven his Acme truck over a cliff and walked away whiskers askew and hair smoking after the BANG! CRASH! POW! Nowadays, though, prime-time television has heroes and villains alike roaring through city streets, narrowly missing surrounding traffic and stationary objects, only to crash at the crucial moment.

However, we almost never see the physical consequences of these chases and crashes—the ambulance never comes, the drivers never have to be extricated with the Jaws of Life. Foreheads may bleed and bandages may be worn in subsequent scenes, but for the most part, the key players hop right up to play the plot through to the end. At the same time, so-called reality media—both television and movies—offer up scenes where bullets spray blood and gore on contact.

The anti-drunk driving movement has capitalized on this trend of explicit scenes by bringing to high school parking lots carefully staged car crashes whose victims lie “dead” next to the cars and are rushed in real ambulances away from the scene to give the audience—typically members of a high school student body—an up-close-and-personal sense of the horror of alcohol-related crashes. Similarly, verbal and visual artifacts of the movement’s discourse use what might be considered extreme language or realistic images to convey carefully designed messages to targeted audiences. In fact, some of the words and images we find in the movement’s discourse may cause us to want to look away. However, when we come across these anti-drunk driving messages, we must interrogate how the messages came to be, to question who decided on the scenarios, and to wonder how
rhetorical strategies behind discourse artifacts like these might have changed over time. This study approaches these situations through the third research question.

3. Are there now or have there been rationales for the rhetorical strategies that have shaped the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement?
   a. If so, what are they?
   b. If so, how have these strategies been determined?
   c. If not, how have decisions been made?

One of the problems inherent in analyzing rhetorical artifacts of social movements is that it is difficult, if not impossible sometimes, to find and talk with the people who made the rhetorical decisions that shaped the artifacts. For example, Karen Schriver remarks that tracking down the document designers who worked on a series of brochures intended to educate youth about drugs “was incredibly difficult” (Dynamics 1997, 193). In this study, however, Marti Belluschi, the key informant, was active in composing text for and helping make some content and design decisions about some of the artifacts I analyze in later chapters.

**Identifying the Beginnings of this Study**

I became interested in the rhetoric of the anti-drunk driving movement when I met Marti Belluschi in March 2001, when I took Marti’s niece, Meredith (who is my daughter’s best friend) along on my daughter, Sarah’s, campus visit to the University of Chicago. After the visit when we were at Marti’s house, between making plans for shopping expeditions and meals, Marti and I visited. I knew that Meredith, who was then the president of the Ames High School chapter of what was then called Students Against Drunk Driving (SADD, which now stands for Students Against Destructive Decisions), had arranged for Marti to speak earlier in the semester at an all-school assembly about the perils of drunk driving. In fact, I happened to see Marti’s presentation late one night when I serendipitously tuned into the public access channel. I remembered her talk as engaging and thought it was a wonderful and appropriate presentation for my daughter and her peers. In the typical manner of making polite conversation, I mentioned having seen her talk. Marti immediately opened up and began to talk about her work.

Her passion for the anti-drunk driving movement was tangible. She was incredibly articulate, and I found myself wishing I had a tape recorder to capture the facts and narratives
she recounted simply because I found them so interesting. After our visit, I thought about what Marti had said and began to consider the rhetoric of the anti-drunk driving movement as a research topic because “what they did worked” (Conrad personal communication).

One thing led to another, and before I knew it, Marti, who had readily agreed to participate in the study, began filling my mailbox with all manner of documents related to drunk driving prevention.

**Providing a Context for Belluschi as the Key Informant**

Marti Belluschi is an excellent central figure and key informant for this study for two reasons. First, Belluschi has had personal access to a wide variety of artifacts from virtually the entire lifespan of the anti-drunk driving movement, many of which she keeps in a personal archive. She provided many of these artifacts for this study. Second, she is an excellent key informant because she is identified with—and, in many cases, has been a representative of—many of the stakeholders in the anti-drunk driving movement. She was a victim of a drunk driver at age fifteen when she and her father, who was driving their car, “were hit head-on by a drunk driver who was going nearly 90 miles per hour” (Belluschi 2001a, 68). Belluschi describes the experience this way:

> I was in the passenger seat, not wearing a safety belt. . . . my face went through the windshield and I whiplashed back. The glass slit my throat from ear to ear and severely lacerated my face. The force of the crash shattered part of my skull, knocked out my front teeth and broke my femur. I was thrown under the dash board and trapped in the car.

> In the ambulance, I was bleeding so badly that the paramedics did not have enough clamps to restrict the veins. They had to also use the bobby pins that were holding a ribbon in my hair.

---

1. This narrative demonstrates one way that Belluschi participates in the anti-drunk driving movement. She first prepared this narrative for a booklet that was printed for and distributed at a fashion show that raised funds to support AAIM, “the only anti-drunk driving organization in Illinois that provides direct financial assistance to victims” (AAIM 2001, 5). The narrative has since been included in *The Faces of Tragedy*, a book which is a compilation of stories that originally appeared in fashion show programs.
At the hospital, the doctors performed a tracheotomy... and spent six hours trying to put my body back together. I was wheeled out of the emergency room covered by a sheet. The nurses told my mother that if she wanted to know I was alive she could touch my hand, but they did not want her to see what I looked like. I was in a coma for five days and immobilized in a hospital bed for ten weeks.

My father suffered serious physical injuries—a shattered kneecap, broken hand, broken arm, and facial lacerations. But sadly, his most significant and long lasting emotional injury was that what happened to me broke his heart.

I have never seen Arthur, the drunk driver, who was also seriously injured. He was 21 years old. He was uninsured and unemployed. He never spoke to my family. He never said he was sorry. The only consequence of his unconscionable actions was losing his license for 90 days.

At that time, while everyone knew that Arthur was at fault, they still believed this was just a terrible "ACCIDENT." They felt that, unfortunately, Dad and I were just in the wrong place at the wrong time.

By the grace of God, while I am left with some difficulties, I have recovered well and have a good life. I have been given the opportunity to make my contribution toward ending the tragedies on our roadways. For the past seven years, I have served as a DUI victim advisor to the Illinois Secretary of State. Previously I was the executive director of MADD [Mothers Against Drunk Driving] in Illinois. . . .

AAIM's [Alliance Against Intoxicated Motorists] efforts have convinced the world that my father and I were in a terrible CRASH, not an unfortunate accident, and that we were victims of a CRIME, not victims of fate. (2001, 68)

Although Belluschi is not a specialist in rhetoric, she demonstrates here the rhetorical nature of anti-drunk driving efforts by calling attention to the difference between accident and crash. The day after her crash, the headline in the Sunday Times-Democrat read "Girl gravely injured when cars collide" (no author 1964, 3). The police report, filed at 9:50 pm on March 21, 1964, states,

ST LUKE'S HOSPITAL NOTIFIED THEY ARE TAKING THREE TO THE HOSPITAL, DOCTOR NEEDED IMMEDIATELY.

10:45 SGT. REEVES ALERTED TO THE FACT. THAT ONE OF THE ABOVE INJURED IS IN BAD CONDITION AND MAY EXPIRE.
Although Belluschi slowly recovered, the 1964 crash was not the last drunk driving incident involving a member of her family. Her favorite cousin, Tommy, grew up to be a drunk driver who, at the age of 21, killed himself and two others in a drunk-driving crash on March 28, 1966. After her lengthy recovery and rehabilitation, Belluschi went on to earn a BA in sociology at the University of Iowa with the intent of becoming a social worker. When she realized that she couldn’t make a living as a social worker, she accepted a position at a Chicago bank. Despite this shift in area of employment, Belluschi remarks,

It is interesting to me that everything that I’ve ever done has led to involvement a social issue. I always find myself working for the greater good, like when I became a lead participant in the successful discrimination suit against the bank where I worked. My core issues are truth and justice and I think it all relates to the car crash and from the strength that comes from being gravely injured. And it’s what you get when you’ve faced death directly. I think that if it hadn’t been for my crash, I would have been much more ego-centric. I don’t really think it’s survivor guilt, but I think I live with a responsibility of surviving. I think I owe a debt to the strangers who came to give blood for me and the doctors and others who helped to save my life. How do you repay something like that? Well, I think it’s by doing good in the world. (Belluschi 2001a and 2004)

In 1982, when she first heard about MADD, she sent them a check for $10. Despite this early financial support, she was reluctant to talk about her experiences as a victim of a drunk driver. She frequently wore turtlenecks to hide the scars on her neck so people wouldn’t ask questions about what had happened, and she told almost no one about being a crash victim, a victim of a crime.

In 1985, she joined MADD in Illinois, then an all-volunteer organization. Because of her finance background, she took the treasurer position specifically so she could use her professional skills and also so she could stay out of the limelight. She reports, “In 1985, I heard that the Chicagoland area MADD chapter had begun and I contacted them and said ‘I’d like to help and that I’d be the treasurer so nobody could steal the money, which is a perennial problem for charities. I was interested in limiting my involvement to the treasurer’s job. I had no intention or interest in doing presentations or anything else” (2001a, 2004). However, once, when the fledgling organization needed to honor a speaker request, Belluschi was asked to speak to a school group, “just this one time.” The presentation was a
success and Belluschi found herself agreeing to participate in more and more presentations to schools and community organizations, and serving on victim impact panels. Belluschi doesn’t pull any punches as she graphically recounts the consequences of her crash. A 1995 article about one presentation, titled “4 Boys Faint at Drunken-Driving Lecture,” quotes her as saying things like “they used the bobby pins that I’d put in to hold my blue hair ribbon in place to clamp off my blood vessels because they ran out of clamps and were desperate to try to stop the bleeding” (Steinberg 1995; Belluschi 2001b). Belluschi continued to speak (as she still does today), but her involvement in other aspects of the movement shifted dramatically.

In 1987, she became the first paid executive director for MADD in Illinois, after which she went to work for the Illinois Secretary of State, whose office oversees many transportation issues, including driver licensing. She worked as a special assistant to the secretary for nine years during the tenure of two secretaries of state. With her primary focus on drunk-driving prevention, she served as a liaison with the press, the federal government, business and industry, and the private, non-profit sector and continued to speak publicly.

In her presentations she says, “Every morning when I wake up and look in the mirror I’m reminded of that drunk driver . . . I see this face, and it’s a fine face. But it’s not my face” (Steinberg 1995). After our second round of interviews, Belluschi told me that after she came home from the hospital to pursue her recovery and get on with her life, she had never looked at pictures of herself from before the crash to compare the “before and after.”

Belluschi recently retired from her position in the state government but remains active and interested in what she now refers to as the drunk-driving prevention movement, a referential shift I explore in subsequent chapters of this dissertation as I examine this and other artifacts from conversations with Belluschi and from artifacts from the anti-drunk driving movement.
Positioning This Study:
A Look at History and Context

The ontological distinction I am relying on is that between a complex entity and a jumble or a heap. Complex entities differ from jumbles or heaps in the relationships of coherence among their component parts. There is no way of drawing this distinction in any absolute way, since there will always be relationships to be found, or created, among any collection of entities. Naomi Scheman 1998, 221

This chapter positions the anti-drunk driving movement in several ways. First, I describe aspects of the anti-drunk driving movement that do not have to do with its rhetoric but are nonetheless important for understanding the course of the movement. For example, this chapter provides relevant traffic statistics and historical references to establish the impact drinking and driving have had on various aspects of our culture. While I refer to traffic statistics in this chapter to establish the context of the anti-drunk driving movement, I want to point out that I did not specifically research the facts and figures of alcohol-related traffic crashes, injuries, and fatalities except as they construct the context within which the anti-drunk driving movement has operated. Instead, as I have said, I focus in this study on the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement. The history that follows argues that the anti-drunk driving movement did not spring to being in the early 1980s but instead was a product of many social and historical factors. In some cases, such as a look at the history of beer in America, this chapter shows how the “typical drunk driver” is a direct descendant of the colonists who thought nothing of drinking beer every day and workers during and immediately after prohibition whose culture also contributed to the “macho bohemianism” that marks the bar culture yet today. This chapter works with the next chapter to describe the historical and contextual influences that produced the movement itself and that produced the rich corpus that is the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement.

The next chapter, Mapping the Anti-Drunk Driving Movement, discusses the movement’s stakeholders and describes the discourse produced by those stakeholders. The sections in this chapter provide a historical and cultural context for the movement comprised of a history of beer in America, the context for the birth of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement, and a glossary of terms that are central to this project.
Situating the Project in a Historical and Cultural Context

This section begins with a look at the current status of one of the largest stakeholders in the anti-drunk driving movement, the alcohol beverage industry. After this look at the beverage industry as a whole, the next section provides a brief history of beer in America, which is followed by an examination of the context within which the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement was born.

When I mentioned to friends and colleagues that I was researching the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement, I frequently heard, “Oh, you mean like MADD?” And I’d reply, “Yes, but really the movement is much larger than just that one organization.” And, while the formal beginning of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement can be fixed as 1978—the year Doris Aiken started Remove Intoxicated Drivers (RID), the first modern anti-drunk driving movement organization—various entities have addressed the problems associated with alcohol consumption for as long as people have been drinking. People have been addressing the often lethal combination of consuming alcohol and operating motorized vehicles for as long as the combination has existed. And, when we interrogate the spectrum of issues related to drinking and driving, we must consider the influence of the American beverage industry.

The American alcohol beverage industry today—distillers, brewers, vintners, wholesale and retail sales outlets, including bars, restaurants, taverns, and stores—is huge. In addition to contributing to the economy and providing jobs, the industry considers itself and its members to be good corporate citizens. The Century Council, an alcohol beverage industry organization, describes its contributions to the anti-drunk driving movement this way:

America’s leading distillers have funded The Century Council for over ten years, allowing The Council to become a leader in the fight against drunk driving and underage drinking. These companies have promoted The Council’s mission since 1991 by investing close to $130 million in its programs: Allied Domecq Spirits and Wine North America, Bacardi USA, Inc., Brown-Forman, DIAGEO, Future Brands LLC, and Pernod Ricard USA. (Century Council 2001)

Even considering that the Century Council here uses an aggregate “since 1991” (the most recent date on this Century Council web page is September 2001) figure to increase the appearance of dramatic and generous contributions to the anti-drunk driving, those
contributions are only a fraction of the magnitude of the economic power of the alcohol beverage industry.

According to James B. Jacobs, professor of law and author of \textit{Drunk Driving: An American Dilemma}, “Americans annually spend $60 billion on alcoholic beverages” (1989, 5). In more current terms, an August 29, 2003, article in \textit{The Wall Street Journal}, “Diageo’s High Spirits Uncork Allied Domecq Speculation” provides a glimpse at the magnitude of the “global spirits and liquor industry” (Ball and Lawton 2003, C1). “For the six months ended Feb. 18 [2003], Allied Domecq posted sales of £1.794 billion [USD2.84 billion],\(^2\) up from £1,704 billion [USD2.71 billion] for the same period in 2002, while net profit rose to £187 million [USD295.79 million] from £180 million [USD284.72 million]” (Ball and Lawton 2003, C3). To put these figures in perspective in terms of the U.S. spirits market, in 2002, Allied Domecq held only a 9\% market share, second after Diageo with the largest market share (22\%) (Ball and Lawton 2003, C1). Allied Domecq’s profit on its 9\% market share translates to profit of USD2.067 trillion in the six months ended February 18, 2003. Against these figures, The Century Council’s aggregate “close to $130 million” since between 1991 and 2001 looks paltry, especially when we consider that the Century Council represents only “the distilled spirits industry,” and not the brewing industry which produces beer.

In a report about the beer industry and its economic contributions, the Beer Institute asserts that

\[ \text{The U.S. brewing industry is a dynamic part of our national economy, contributing billions of dollars in wages and taxes. An indication of beer’s importance is its inclusion in the basket of goods the government uses to calculate the Consumer Price Index.} \]

\[ \text{The industry today includes more than 1,800 brewers and beer importers, 2,200 beer wholesalers, and 560,000 retail establishments. The industry's economic ripple effect benefits packaging manufacturers, shipping companies, agriculture, and other businesses whose livelihood depends on the brewing industry.} \]

\[ ^2\text{Computed at an exchange rate of USD1=£1.5767, the exchange rate for 29 August 2003 reported by the \textit{Financial Times} at http://mwprices.ft.com/custom/ft-com/currency.asp.} \]

30 August 2003.
Directly and indirectly, the beer industry employs approximately 1.66 million Americans, paying them $47 billion in wages and benefits. The industry pays $27 billion in business, personal and consumption taxes, including $5.1 billion in excise taxes.

The Beer Institute was organized in 1986 to represent the industry before Congress, state legislatures and public forums across the country. It is committed to developing sound public policy that focuses on community involvement and personal responsibility. (Beer Institute 2003)

I include this long quote in order to convey a sense of the magnitude of the beer industry's impact on many aspects of American culture, including impaired driving. According to Jacobs, “Because beer so dominates the alcoholic beverage scene in the United States, it is not surprising that most alcohol abusers are beer abusers.” Jacobs provides the table in figure 1, which displays the relative consumption of the three major kinds of commercially available alcoholic beverages (1989, 4).

| Alcohol Consumption per Capita 1950–86 (Gallons per Capita) |
|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
|                     | Wine               | Beer            | Spirits       |
| 1950                | .89                | 16.85           | 1.25          |
| 1960                | .88                | 15.07           | 1.30          |
| 1970                | 1.25               | 18.48           | 1.82          |
| 1980                | 2.08               | 24.27           | 1.98          |
| 1986                | 2.42               | 23.98           | 1.63          |

Source: Distilled Spirits Council of the United States

Figure 1 Table of alcohol consumption per capita 1950–1986 (Jacobs 1989, 4).

Given the levels of consumption of beer, it should come as no surprise to learn that beer is the typical DUI offender’s beverage of choice (Belluschi 2002). In an effort to understand how this preference came about, the next section looks at the history of beer in America to provide an understanding of the role of beer in the story of drunk driving.

A history of beer in America

In an essay titled “Beer and America: It came over with the Mayflower and stayed on to be the unchallenged drink of democracy,” Max Rudin traces the cultural history of beer in America, asserting that in the days of the early settlers and on into colonial times “beer was food ... everyone drank beer” (2002, 29), which explains Jacob’s assertion that, despite the almost 24 gallon per capita beer consumption in 1986, Americans are, in fact, consuming less
beer than they did in colonial days. In fact, many people drank beer instead of water. According to Paul Aaron and David Musto, who prepared a historical overview of temperance and prohibition in America,

Water was considered dangerous to drink and inhospitable and low class to serve to guests. It was weak and thin: when not impure and filled with sediment, it was disdained as lacking any nutritional value. Beer and wine... not only quenched the thirst but were also esteemed for being fortified. (1981, 131).

Beer is relatively easy to produce, makes efficient use of crop resources, and, through the brewing process wherein the water is boiled, ensures that the consumers are less likely to be stricken with water-borne pathogens. However, the beer the early Americans drank bears little resemblance to today's ubiquitous lagers and ales.

According to Rudin,

until 1842 all beers everywhere were dark or cloudy or both. In that year brewers in Pilsen... discovered a process for making a clear, golden beer... Introduced at the same time that mass-produced "glasses" were replacing opaque wood, leather, and ceramic steins, the new golden lager was light, stimulating, and visually exciting" (2002, 30).

So beer moved literally from the dark into the light both in terms of the results of this quickly adopted new brewing technique and also in terms of the presentation of the brew. While in some cultures ceramic steins remained the customary vessels for beer, readily available and increasingly less expensive glass vessels—which included glasses and mugs styled after the traditional beer stein with its heavy bottom and handle for ease of use—became the common serving containers for beer. Combining the increased visual appeal of the beer itself with attractive and, perhaps, novel glass containers meant that visual perceptions of beer also moved from darkness into light.

The development of visually appealing beer and glass containers that enhanced the visual appeal of the beer paralleled social changes in the U.S., particularly shifts in attitudes toward and consumption of beer. Where once Americans drank beer that was produced and consumed in the home and in local taverns, Americans by the late 1800s patronized different

---

3. A later chapter, *Death in a Beer Mug*, explores in more detail the importance of visual aspects such as these.
locales such as beer gardens where they socialized while they drank beer. Rudin points out, "[Beer gardens were] festive places where people of all ages came to dance, flirt, eat, and relax, . . . Beer was no longer food. Now it was fun." (2002, 31).

The beer of this time, characteristic of all beers before and since, had a relatively short shelf life. As he chronicles the social nuances associated with beer, Rudin points out that, while most Americans drank beer, many also had access to wines and spirits that had, because of their production processes, a longer shelf life, which, in part, made these beverage choices more expensive and thereby less appealing to most Americans. Rudin asserts, "By the 1870s Americans had clearly chosen beer over spirits . . . As whiskey and cocktails climbed the social ladder, beer descended it" (2002, 32, 34). Rudin continues, "Beer acquired a new attitude from the working-class culture of the saloon, a kind of macho bohemianism that potently combined bravado, rebelliousness, masculine sentimentality, self-deprecating humor, and a large dose of skepticism" (2002, 35).

This attitude was sustained through the rise and fall of the Temperance Party and Prohibition as enacted by the 18th Amendment and enforced through the Volstead Act. Social historians note the importance of social class both in terms of those who supported the temperance and prohibition movements and in terms of the differences in effect on persons with differing class backgrounds. For example, although "Temperance had a broad-based support . . . the middle class—the skilled mechanics and tradesmen—represented the solid force" (Aaron and Musto 1981, 141–42). Aaron and Musto continue,

The prohibition movement in the late 19th century involved an attempt by 'the decent classes' to create a morally coherent national culture. . . . The alcohol addict and the millionaire brewer were each impulse-ridden. The gilded capitalist and the beer-swilling slum dweller were both dedicated to consumption. By contrast, a prohibitionist writer defined his fellow activists and himself: 'we are the whole better class. . . . Drunkenness and tippling belong now to the very rich, the reckless, the vicious and the very poor.' (1981, 152)

Rudin addresses this notion—that social class was an important factor in the way Prohibition was experienced by the American people—when he says, "[t]he irony was that Prohibition torpedoed a century of temperance campaigning. . . . Samuel Gompers of the American Federation of Labor fumed that Prohibition was a class law directed against the beer of the workingman" (35). Gompers made this assertion based on the fact that, under the
terms of the Volstead Act, Americans with means could stockpile the longer-lasting wines and spirits while working people watched their beer kegs hammered open and drained, leaving them no alternative except illicitly imported or distilled spirits. As early as the mid-1850s, prohibition laws were viewed as “class legislation that left the rich free to consume but penalized the workingman” (Aaron and Musto 1981, 141).

Although quite a popular social movement, Prohibition was fraught with conflicts, not the least of which was how wine and beer ought to be viewed. Some took the stance that “beer and wine were exempted from censure and, in fact, were praised as ‘temperance drinks,’” while others argued that all alcoholic beverages ought to be covered by pledges of abstinence and subject to the same strictures. However, this “long” pledge resulted in drops in membership in temperance societies (Aaron and Musto, 140).

Prohibition has been credited by some with a rise in alcohol-related problems because people who once consumed beer, which had a much lower percentage of alcohol, were forced to change their drinking habits and seek out the more readily available and certainly more potent bathtub gins and liquors distilled by their neighbors. However, this shift in habit did not hold once Prohibition was lifted and legal access to beer was restored.

After Prohibition, Americans returned to their beloved beer, but times had changed and the social milieu for drinking beer had changed as well. Many workers still stopped by the local tavern on the way home for a draught, but contemporary bottling and canning processes made take-home beer more available. For many people, beer was no longer associated with locally produced beer served in family-friendly saloons and beer gardens but instead was becoming associated with branded beers marketed by regional and, increasingly as time passed, national corporate brewers. Aaron and Musto comment, “[a]lthough beer drinking increased sharply after 1850 . . . consumption of whiskey and rum decreased by at least half between 1820 and 1850” (141). In general, though, consumption levels of beer remained essentially the same from 1850 well into the 20th century.

The trend toward big-business brewers brought along with it an increasing alliance between sports and beer. Big beer built stadiums, sponsored teams, and poured money into advertising, especially advertising during sporting events. Rudin explains,

The story of beer in America since World War II, apart from skyrocketing consumption, is about the shift in power from sales to marketing. By the 1960s the
big brewers were in every market, and the battle had become one for market share. 
. . . beer has had a powerful connection to sports. . . . [building baseball stadiums] 
would turn out to be child’s play compared with the marketing wars of the 1970s 
when Miller and then Bud would between them buy up every available minute of ad 
time during sporting events, using jock spokesmen. (36, 38)

Today, many Americans, especially men—and particularly working class men who are 
sports fans—experience the beer mug as not only a central element of their social life but 
also as part of their identity. The attitudes of the late 1800s, Rudin’s “macho bohemianism” 
with all its attendant characteristics, still are present today, particularly in working class bars 
(2002, 35). K. Lawrence Ross, a scholar who specializes in drunk driving laws, writes that 
‘beer culture’ . . . with its norms encouraging heavy consumption is centered in 
certain kinds of bars. . . . norms may also discourage intervention to prevent impaired 
patrons from driving. To imply that someone may have drunk too much to drive 
safely impugns his competency as a drinker and thus his social standing. (104)

Macho bohemianism, norms that encourage rather than discourage driving while 
impaired, and the pressure to, perhaps, “drink like a man” are but a few of the factors that 
make up the context within which the anti-drunk driving movement was born.

**The context for the birth of the movement**

Without a doubt, the anti-drunk driving movement was one of the most prominent and 
effective social change movements of the 20th century. No single moment defines the birth 
of the movement; rather, the movement evolved in response to the enormous costs related to 
alcohol-related traffic incidents. Whether those costs are measured in dollars or lives cut 
short, the social problems of alcohol-related traffic incidents resulting in alcohol-related 
injuries and fatalities, prove among the most costly in the United States and in the world. 
Although no specific data about alcohol-related traffic crashes are available for 1966, overall 
earn data show that 926 billion vehicle miles were traveled, and there was a total of 50,894 
crash fatalities, a 5.50% fatality rate, the highest fatality rate since crash data were centrally 
compiled. This overall fatality rate decreased incrementally over the next two decades. In 
1978, noted as the birth of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement, 1,545 billion 
vehicle miles were traveled, and there was a total of 50,331 crash fatalities. In the period 
during which the anti-drunk driving movement has been active, the total crash fatality rate
dropped to 1.51% (*Traffic Safety Facts 2001* 2002, 15). This consistent drop in the traffic crash fatality rate can be attributed to factors such as seat belt use, safer vehicles, speed limit regulations, general highway traffic safety initiatives (including roadway conditions, signage, and safety barrier improvements), and reductions in alcohol-related traffic crashes.

Even with this abundance of factors that make travel on our nation's highways and byways more safe, every year more people are killed and injured in alcohol-related traffic incidents than have been killed in many wars. For example, in 1968, the bloodiest year of the Viet Nam War, 16,589 U.S. casualties were counted (Veterans). Back in the U.S., 1,016 billion vehicle miles were traveled (BVMT), and there were 52,725 fatalities for a total fatality rate of 5.19% (*Traffic Safety Facts 2001* 2002, 15). In 1968, no one was compiling data about traffic fatalities directly related to alcohol, so we don't know exactly how many people died in alcohol-related traffic incidents. However, if we use the 1982 data, (the first year for which persons killed in alcohol-related traffic crashes was reported separately in addition to reports of the overall traffic crash fatalities), 60% of the 26,172 total fatalities (1,595 BVMT; 2.76% fatality rate) were the result of alcohol-related traffic crashes. When we use the 1982 figure to approximate the 1968 alcohol-related traffic crash rate, 60% of 52,725 total traffic crash fatalities is 31,635, nearly twice the number of 1968 Viet Nam War casualties (*Traffic Safety Facts 2001* 2002, 15, 32).

Even before the data about drunk driving crash fatalities began to be compiled in 1982, Americans, including some of the individuals and organizations who later would become stakeholders in the anti-drunk driving movement, began to realize the link between the alarmingly high overall fatality rate and a sense that alcohol was a major factor in that high rate. Alcohol-related traffic injuries and fatalities began to be a presence in the public agenda. Public communication campaign researcher William J. Paisley has examined trends in public attention to issues and discusses the notion of a public agenda. He argues that

The public agenda . . . always contains some 'gut issues,' such as disease, and some 'pocketbook issues,' such as taxes. At any time, issues rise on the public agenda because the problem has gotten worse, . . . because changes in society have made the problem relevant to more people, . . . or because a solution for the problem has become more feasible . . . . (2001, 8)
Paisley goes on to talk about the concept of episodic issues: “Issues rise and fall on the national agenda according to external factors, such as crises, incidents, and the appearance of effective advocates on the nation scene” (17). Paisley introduces the ideas of issue literacy and issue fatigue:

The problem of ‘too many issues, too little time’ has led to a creative strategy to reclaim our attention. In recent years, the public has been urged to attain scientific literacy, . . . technological literacy, . . . environmental literacy, . . . among many others, such as cultural literacy and computer literacy.

At one level, the redefinition of issues as literacies is only a strategy to retain attention in the crowded marketplace of issues. At another level, this trend acknowledges the complexity of issues . . . From wartime posters and slogans half a century ago, public communication campaigns have matured into many differentiated forms . . . At this historic juncture, a public communication campaign no longer exhorts. Instead it informs and advises. (2001, 18, 20)

In order to keep up with the fast pace and increasing complexity of our society, we piece together what we know about a given issue and, in a sense, file that information in our continuing literacy memory banks. Basically, as a society and as individuals, we can’t hold all the important data in our memory banks, especially when new issues emerge and demand that we attend to them. Figure 2 shows part of Paisley’s table that demonstrates the rise and fall of several social issues in the public consciousness. Paisley measures the various issues’ presence by the number of U.S. magazine articles about several social issues; the figures are weighted by the total number of articles indexed per time period. I’ve shaded the figures for drunk driving, which show a dramatic rise in the number of articles about drunk driving from the 1976–1980 half decade, with three articles, to the first half-decade of the 1980s with 51 articles. This rise corresponds to the birth and remarkable early growth of the anti-drunk driving movement. What we don’t see here, however, is the increase in discourse prepared and presented by the anti-drunk driving movement that did not appear in magazines.

In the early 1980s, various entities were sponsoring and disseminating research related to the growing literacy about problems associated with alcohol, especially alcohol-related traffic crashes. For example, Alcohol and Public Policy: Beyond the Shadow of Prohibition is the 1981 book-length report of the Panel on Alternative Policies Affecting the Prevention of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (commissioned and sponsored by the National Institute on
### Table 1.1 Number of U.S. Magazine Articles on Representative Public Issues in Half-Decades From 1961 to 1998, Weighted by total Number of Articles Indexed per Time Period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's rights</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe sex</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condoms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage pregnancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/lesbian</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsolescence</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pornography</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol abuse</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk driving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air bags</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child abuse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School violence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School prayer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information highway</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The number of articles per topic per time period is weighted by the total number of articles per time period indexed in the Magazine Index database. It is then expressed as a standardized number of articles per 100,000 articles indexed in the database. Thus, for example, the highest number in the table (4.4% of all articles indexed in the Magazine Index for the 1966-1970 time period concerned Vietnam) means that 4.4% of all articles indexed in the Magazine Index for the 1966-1970 time period concerned Vietnam. The annual number of articles indexed in the Magazine Index fluctuates—hence the need for weighting the raw frequencies—but averaged approximately 165,000 in the late 1990s. The weighting allows numbers to be compared across topics and time periods. Thus, in the row immediately above this note, it can be seen that information highway briefly reached almost the same level of discussion as child abuse (139 articles per 100,000 versus 151 per 100,000), but the "ready" issue then receded to a low level of discussion (26 articles per 100,000).

### Figure 2. Paisley's table showing issue distribution over time as measured by the Magazine Index (2001, 20).

Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism). One chapter of the final report, “The Role of Nonalcohol Agencies in Federal Regulation of Drinking Behavior and Consequences” focuses on an important finding—that significant aspects of the federal response to alcohol problems are formulated by federal agencies not usually associated with alcohol policy . . . [which have] various types of jurisdiction over alcohol distribution and alcohol-related problems. (Mosher and Mottl 1981, 388)

Mosher and Mottl’s list the following federal agencies that, in 1980, had some kind of jurisdiction over alcohol. The list reads like a who’s who of the federal government: the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Defense (with regulations for each branch of the armed forces), Consumer Product Safety Commission, National Transportation Safety Board (today known as the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration), Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Federal Railroad Administration, Coast Guard, and the Internal Revenue
Service (Mosher and Mottl 1981, 457–458). In a discussion of possible changes in the public policy of these agencies, Mosher and Mottl state, “agencies often resist public-health-oriented change, even when there are no costs or conflicting values, merely because it appears to fall outside their immediate mission” (392). That this report was released in 1981—about the same time that the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement was beginning—shows that public laws and regulations were already in place even in agencies that typically aren’t considered as directly dealing with alcohol policy and programs. Mosher and Mottl’s report provides a snapshot of the efforts in just one arena, the federal government, that evolved to become part of a category of stakeholders in the anti-drunk driving movement.

In addition to these efforts, as I mentioned before, in 1982 the federal government began compiling traffic data specifically about alcohol-related traffic fatalities. By comparison, in 2003, probably as one result of the efforts of the anti-drunk driving movement, even more federal agencies have become involved to some extent with alcohol-related safety issues. The government on all levels addresses social problems related to alcohol in each of the three branches, and since 2003, the federal government tied federal highway funding to passage and implementation of .08 BAC legislation at the state level. The National Council of State Legislature (NCSL) reported this action on their website this way:

On October 23, 2000, President Clinton signed the transportation appropriations bill (H.R. 4475) into law. The bill mandates that all states adopt a .08 percent blood alcohol content (BAC) or face sanctions of federal highway funds. States stand to lose two percent in 2004, four percent in 2005, six percent in 2006, eight percent in 2007 and eight percent each year thereafter. If states adopt the .08 BAC law during the first four years, the lost funds will be reimbursed to the state. (2000)

Some individuals and groups, such as Charles V. Peña writing for getMADD, an organization that opposes the efforts of the anti-drunk driving movement, view this sanction plan as “federal blackmail” (Pena 2003). However, the stakeholders of the anti-drunk driving movement contend that the sanctions effort is designed to save some of the lives that are being lost across the nation. For example, in 2001, the U.S. had a total of 42,116 fatalities (a 1.51% total fatality rate with 2,781 BVMT). Of those 42,116 fatalities, 41%—17,448 people—died in alcohol-related traffic incidents (Traffic Safety Facts 2001 2002, 32).
And, according to the 2001 Illinois State *DUI Fact Book*, in Illinois in 1999, 637 people were killed in alcohol-related traffic incidents, which was 44% of the 1,456 total crash fatalities (2).

This brief history of efforts to reduce the numbers of alcohol-related injuries and deaths shows that both governmental agencies and other organizations recognized the problem early on and put in place strategies designed to curb the apparently increasing incidence of drinking and driving. For instance, the government, primarily state legislatures, responded by placing the problem, and thus their response, squarely within the judicial system by criminalizing drunk driving. According to H. Laurence Ross in *Confronting Drunk Driving*: *Social Policy for Saving Lives*,

The cornerstone of all efforts to reduce the problem of alcohol-impaired driving is state laws making driving with high BACs [blood alcohol contents] illegal (Williams, 1989: 3). . . . The primary mechanism involved is that of general deterrence . . . .

Drunk driving has characterized American policy since the dawn of the automotive age. Even before World War I, New York and California adopted laws prohibiting impaired driving and stipulating punishments that included jail terms and license suspension. By 1924, Connecticut was jailing more than two hundred drivers per year for the offense. (42)

Governing bodies and law enforcement agencies were not alone in address the social problem of drunken driving. Paralleling the efforts of legislators, a variety of organizations responded in different ways. The National Safety Council (NSC), established in 1913, was federalized by "an Act of Congress on August 13, 1953, [that] created the National Safety Council as a body incorporated under federal law. Public Law 259 of the 83rd Congress formally established the Council as a federally chartered organization" (*National Safety Council: History*). The NSC, with its blend of governmental approval and private organizational status, focused attention on the problems associated with drinking and driving as well as other public safety matters including, for example, "workplace safety, highway, community and recreation safety . . . [and] all major causes of preventable injuries and deaths, including occupational and environmental health and general wellness" (*National Safety Council: History*).

Prior to the 1980s, the NSC designed and spearheaded publicity campaigns that were designed both to raise awareness of the magnitude of the problem as well as to motivate
individuals to change their behavior regarding drinking and driving. These efforts were joined by business and industry, especially insurance companies. Even with this early and continuous involvement by social organizers, government officials, and leaders from religion and industry, alcohol-related traffic incidents with their horrifying human and economic toll increased steadily from the day of the first recorded alcohol-related traffic fatality in New York City in 1899 (Greene 1999). Almost no efforts by these dedicated people had a noticeable effect on what was becoming a national crisis.

However, in 1978, Doris Aiken and a few other concerned citizens in New York started Remove Intoxicated Drivers (RID), which began what was to become the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement, a movement whose efforts are credited as—finally—reversing the trend of ever-increasing alcohol-related traffic incidents and fatalities. By now, most of us are at least somewhat familiar with the largest national anti-drunk driving organization, Mothers Against Drunk Drivers (MADD), which was started in 1980 by Candy Lightener and a group of mothers after Lightener’s daughter was killed by a drunk driver. From the beginning, MADD was a grass-roots organization whose members were predominantly women. In 1982, MADD changed its name to Mothers Against Drunk Driving. This shift changes the emphasis from hating the drivers to hating the behavior, an early indication that these early movement mothers were aware of the importance of their rhetorical decisions. In those early days, MADD, whose current mission is “to stop drunk driving, support the victims of this violent crime, and prevent underage drinking,” focused its efforts on rhetorical concerns, literally spreading the word of their campaign by encouraging the members to write letters—letters to recruit their friends and to ask for financial support, letters to policy makers on all levels of the government, and letters to the media (MADD Milestones 2004). From its earliest days, then, MADD’s efforts were largely rhetorical, as were the efforts of other early anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders. Defining various specialized terms and introducing shifts in vocabulary—such as changing drivers to driving and accident to crash—was an area where movement stakeholders focused their work. Similarly, other people who were researching alcohol-related problems also began to build a common vocabulary that meant that the stakeholders could speak with each other on the common ground of terms with agreed upon meanings. I continue that trend in the next section where I discuss terms and acronyms that I use in the rest of this document.
Defining Specialized Terms

As is the case for other professions or specialties, the literatures surrounding and influenced by the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement use specialized terms. This section presents some of these terms and acronyms, first those having to do with rhetoric and rhetorical analysis, followed by terms and acronyms that constitute part of the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement.

The rhetoric of the anti-drunk driving movement refers to the body of communication by and about the social movement whose thrust has been to address the social problem of drinking and driving. In some cases, I use discourse, a term that, in this study, is interchangeable with rhetoric.

In this project, I use reader throughout when I talk about listeners or audience except when to do so would be confusing. Similarly, when I use text I refer to both visual (images) and verbal features and I use writer throughout with the understanding that artists, designers, editors, subject matter experts, and others may have contributed to both the verbal and/or visual discourse of a particular artifact.

DUI is a commonly used acronym derived from driving under the influence which, in the state of Illinois is “defined as operating a motor vehicle while impaired by alcohol, other drugs or intoxicating compounds” (White 2001, 1). In other uses, designations such as DWI (derived from driving while intoxicated), OWI (derived from operating while intoxicated), and DUII (derived from driving under the influence of intoxicants) have been adopted. In general, the communities whose discourse focuses on alcohol-related traffic incidents, such as government agencies, community advocacy groups, social issue researchers, and prevention specialists, adopt one of these acronyms. Unless otherwise specified, I assume that all acronyms having to do with alcohol-impaired traffic incidents carry essentially the same meaning. Because I refer to sources and materials from a wide variety of these discourse communities, when I quote from these sources, I will retain the original designation. However, for simplicity, I use DUI in this text.

BAC is derived from blood alcohol content and generally is expressed as a number such as “0.10 grams per deciliter (g/dl)” (DOT HS 809 323). As of 1997, the “illegal limit of intoxication” in Illinois is .08 g/dl. Blood alcohol concentration describes the concentration of alcohol in a person’s blood expressed as weight per unit of volume. For example, at 0.10
percent BAC, there is a concentration of 100 mg of alcohol per 100 ml of blood (Insurance Institute for Highway Safety 2002). Illinois has established .08 BAC as the illegal per se limit for drivers aged 21 and older (MADD Merits 2003).

**BAC laws** regulate the illegal threshold of intoxication for **adults** who decide to drive after having consumed alcohol. The uniform legal age for buying and consuming alcohol now is 21 in all 50 states, which means that it is illegal for people under 21 to buy, possess, or consume any alcohol. Many states have zero tolerance laws, like Illinois’ “Use It & Lose It” law that penalizes teenage drivers who are apprehended with *any* measurable BAC.

**.08 BAC per se** means that it is “illegal, in and of itself, to drive with a BAC of .08 or greater” (Massachusetts Safety Coalition). In most cases, people use .08 without specifying .08 BAC or even .08 BAC per se. Similarly, in this study, when I use .08 BAC, I mean .08 BAC per se.

An **alcohol-related fatal traffic crash** is defined by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) as a crash with a fatality when “either a driver or a nonoccupant (e.g., pedestrian) had a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of 0.01 g/dl or greater in a police-reported traffic crash” (Traffic Safety Facts 2000). In this study, I use persons instead of motorists or drivers because impaired persons become alcohol-related traffic statistics when they are passengers, pedalcyclists, and even pedestrians.

The terms **impaired, intoxicated, inebriated, under the influence, and drunk** all represent a person’s status after having consumed some amount of a chemical (in this case, our focus is on the drug alcohol) that in some way changes the person’s relative ability to safely operate a motor vehicle. While some of these related terms have specific legal meanings and some have varying meanings in the vernacular, in this study, when I quote a source that uses one of these terms, I retain the original language; in other instances, I use intoxicated as the term that represents each of these words and phrases.

**Legal standard, legal threshold, and illegal standard** all are ways of describing and understanding the point at which a person can be detained and arrested and charged with a traffic offense. **Illegal standard** (which is .08 BAC) is the term that anti-drunk driving advocates in Illinois prefer.

I arrived at the definition of **stakeholder** for this study by combining definitions of stake and stakeholder from four sources. First, the 11th edition of *Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate*
*Dictionary* defines *stake* as “something that is staked for gain or loss . . . an interest or share in an undertaking or enterprise,” while *at stake* means “at issue, in jeopardy.” And *stakeholder* means, “one that has a stake in an enterprise” (2003, 1214) I use a definition from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) because the term stakeholder is widely used to discuss environmental issues. The USEPA Terminology Reference System, defines a stakeholder as “[a]ny organization, governmental entity, or individual that has a stake in or may be impacted by a given approach to environmental regulation, pollution, prevention, energy conservation, etc.” (USEPA 2003). The Online Ethics Center for Engineering and Science gives this definition of stakeholder:

A person or group who can affect or is affected by an action. Responsible decision making requires consideration of the effects on all stakeholders. Usually all stakeholders are not entitled to consideration of the same aspects of their welfare, however. For example, a corporate decision may affect or be influenced by employees, stockholders, customers, suppliers, communities, some government agencies, and corporate competitors. Competitors are entitled to fairness in competition, but not to the same consideration as, say, employees. (Online Ethics 2003)

Based on these definitions of stakeholder, for purposes of this study, I consider that a stakeholder is *any person or group of people who have an interest or share in an issue or enterprise*—in this case, the anti-drunk driving movement.

In the next chapter, I discuss the stakeholders of the anti-drunk driving movement and the discourse those stakeholders produce.
Mapping the Anti-Drunk Driving Movement:  
An Overview of the Stakeholders and their Discourse

Public communication campaigns are a familiar and essential part of American civic culture. Campaigns are regarded as public service programs if their goals are widely supported by the public and policymakers. Public communication campaigns have matured in recent decades, in part as the result of the contributions of social science. Social scientists are only the latest group of stakeholders to be involved in public communication campaigns, however. Prior to World War II, the principal stakeholders were voluntary associations, the mass media, and the federal government. William J. Paisley 2001, 3.

In this chapter, I first describe the stakeholders of the anti-drunk driving movement and then discuss representative artifacts of the discourse created and distributed by those stakeholders. The artifacts that comprise what Thomas Huckin calls the "initial corpus" (1992) for this study are discussed here in the context of the stakeholders that produce and distribute them. To frame this discussion of the stakeholders and their discourse, I first present a taxonomy that classifies the stakeholders and provides the structure for the discussion of the movement's discourse.

Before I present the taxonomy and discuss the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement, I want to discuss "stakeholder" as I use it in this project. As I mentioned earlier, for this study, the operant definition of stakeholder is any person, organization, or group of people who have an interest or share in an enterprise—in this case, the anti-drunk driving movement.

Anti-Drunk Driving Movement Stakeholders

The following taxonomy categorizes the stakeholders of the anti-drunk driving movement to serve four purposes. First, the taxonomy fills a niche in the literature about the anti-drunk driving movement specifically and about social change movements in general. The taxonomy is both a review of the literature of the anti-drunk driving movement and a description of the movement. Nowhere in my research did I find another model or a systematic way to talk about stakeholders of a social change movement like the anti-drunk driving movement. I developed this taxonomy to ensure that I included representative stakeholders and their discourse. The examples I use in the taxonomy are, in fact, representative of the discourse of the movement. Because the initial corpus for this study is
so rich, I did not have use the same examples in the taxonomy that I analyze in the study corpus. By including the examples in the taxonomy, I consider that I have characterized the movement more fully and in more detail than I could have by simply analyzing the artifacts in the study corpus.

Second, this taxonomy functions as a review of the literature that constitutes the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement. The taxonomy provides additional historical context for the anti-drunk driving movement, which is useful both in terms of exploring how the discourse changed over time and in terms of linking the different stakeholders with the different kinds of discourse that have been produced by those stakeholders over time.

A third purpose for this taxonomy is to model the anti-drunk driving movement. While it would be hasty to suggest that this taxonomy could be used without any modification to describe all manner of social movements, the taxonomy models a social change movement that has been successful. I suggest that this taxonomy could be appropriated by others who want to pursue other public policy agendas.

Finally, this taxonomy shows how the movement's stakeholders are related and interdependent. The boundaries between the different anti-drunk driving stakeholders often are blurred, and relationships among the stakeholders often are complex and are contingent on specific situations. Researching and identifying all the possible relationships among the movement stakeholders is beyond the scope of this project. Instead of such an exhaustive and highly detailed discussion, I present and discuss the movement stakeholders grouped according to how Marti Belluschi, the study's key informant, perceives the anti-drunk driving movement. This taxonomy is based on careful examination of a rather large corpus of social movement discourse and also is based on information provided by Marti Belluschi, a key player in that social movement.

According to Belluschi, the four main kinds of stakeholders are advocacy organizations, government entities, research entities, and the media. Each of these four kinds of stakeholders generally can be thought of as supporting a common goal: making our nation's roadways more safe by reducing drunk driving, which then results in fewer alcohol-related traffic incidents and the concomitant material and human losses.

In order for this taxonomy to be complete, it must include a fifth kind of stakeholder—individuals and organizations that claim to support this common goal, but oppose some of the
efforts of the other four kinds of stakeholders. What I call adversaries of the anti-drunk driving movement deserve mention here. On the face of it, opposing the efforts of the anti-drunk driving movement almost seems counterintuitive—after all, who wouldn’t want to make our roadways safer? to reach students and educate them about the perils of drinking and driving? to save hundreds of lives every year? Who would want to stand in the way of legislation—like the now federally mandated .08 BAC law—designed to reduce the numbers of alcohol-related fatal crashes?

**Adversaries of the anti-drunk driving movement**

As with most public policy issues, this one, too, has many sides. Describing a these sides as a dichotomy would oversimplify the issue. Just as anti-drunk driving movement supporters form alliances for specific efforts, adversaries also work independently and sometimes together depending on the current situation and how their alliances reflect common concerns. Organizations and individuals who appear to “oppose” the efforts of the anti-drunk driving movement are, in some cases, protecting a different interest or issue, such as business interests and, by extension, the economy. For example, the powerful alcohol beverage industry and the hospitality industry both are protecting their own survival, which translates not only into sales and profits but also into jobs and support of the tax base. The global alcohol beverage industry is enormous when measured by the production and distribution of their products, which range from near-beers and specialized micro-brews to mass-produced beer that is marketed in 30-second spots on the Super Bowl; from the Thunderbird wine that street bums clutch in wrinkled brown paper bags to the finest vintage wines selling at auction for astronomical sums; and from cheap no-name vodka and rot-gut whiskey to the rows of bar-back bottles of rum, gin, bourbon, schnapps, and liquors to the connoisseur’s boutique single-malt Scotch whisky. To produce, market, and distribute these products, the industry employs millions of people around the globe in communities that rely on the industry’s presence for property taxes (that support schools, local government, and infrastructure) and the industry’s employees who pour their earnings back into the economy.

Naturally, these businesses have a stake in the health and well-being of not only their workers and customers but also a stake in public opinions that constitute the environment for their continued profitability. To that end, the industry walks a fine line between ensuring that their industry will prosper and taking action to support the anti-drunk driving movement.
The Century Council is perhaps the best known result of the actions in support of the anti-
drunk driving movement that the industry has taken. According to its website, the council is
a not-for-profit organization dedicated to fighting drunk driving and underage
drinking. . . . [t]he Council develops and implements innovative programs and public
awareness campaigns and promotes action through strategic partnerships. The
Century Council promotes responsible decision-making regarding drinking or non-
drinking of beverage alcohol and discourages all forms of irresponsible consumption
through education, communications, research, law enforcement, and other programs.
(Century Council 2004)

The council, an organization "funded by America's leading distillers," publishes
documents like From the Grassroots to a National Agenda: Community Forums Report:
Issues and Insights on Hardcore Drunk Driving, a report of the National Hardcore Drunk
Driver Project. This 32-page, 8.5" x 11" glossy, four-color book begins by describing
hardcore drunk drivers, illustrating the scope of the problems associated with these drivers,
and describing a series of three forums (held in Massachusetts, Texas, and Ohio) in 1998 to
"[begin] a national dialogue focusing on shared problems and creative solutions. The forums
were part of The Century Council's commitment to build alliances with other public and
private organizations engaged in the fight against drunk driving" (4).

While the research done for this project was useful and professionally prepared, many
believe the goal of the project was to counter the push for proposed .08 BAC laws.
Advocates were concerned that one of the reasons that the council commissioned this study
when it did was to divert attention from the efforts of anti-drunk driving movement
advocates. The council used this project to try to make it appear that the real problem was
the recidivist drunk driver, the hardcore offender with a string of DUI and high BAC
convictions and, perhaps, a trail of broken lives behind him. The council wanted to deflect
the public's attention away from other stakeholders' efforts by arguing that, instead of
enacting the .08 BAC legislation, states ought to focus their efforts on these multiple DUI
and high BAC offenders. The bottom line here is the bottom line: The alcohol beverage
industry believed they stood to lose money.

In addition to the alcohol beverage industry, some organizations and individuals who
appear to "oppose" the efforts of the anti-drunk driving movement are, indeed, critical of the
movement and its key players. On getMADD.com, a website aimed at countering MADD
and other anti-drunk driving advocates, Charles V. Peña, now a policy studies director at the Cato Institute and the former executive director of the MADD Northern Virginia Chapter, charges that anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders have a new prohibition in mind. Peña praises the movement's stakeholder efforts but singles out MADD and other federal agencies for criticism.

Although MADD officially denies it is seeking the prohibition of moderate drinking when dining out, it remains unofficially committed to the prohibition of alcohol.

[and] the National Institute on Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse (NIAAA)—a taxpayer-funded agency with a $243 million budget—set out to cut the consumption of adult beverages by 24% as part of a ‘Healthy People 2000’ coalition” (emphasis in original; 2003)

The National Motorists Association joins Peña in criticizing MADD and other movement stakeholders and focuses its attack on the discourse of the movement.

The massive NHTSA, MADD, et al. [sic] misinformation campaign has long implied that the mere presence of alcohol, no matter how little or how much, in an auto accident victim’s system should be considered the cause of the accident. . . . Yes, drunk driving has taken many lives. Furthermore, society’s recognition and intolerance of drunk driving has resulted in a reduction of drunk driving accidents. But, drunk drivers NEVER caused 57% of all highway related fatalities; they do not cause 40% of fatalities today. . . Using the term ‘alcohol-related’ is the lynch pin that holds this whole fabrication together. (emphasis in original; National Motorists Association n.d.)

Similarly, others rally around points of law, especially when it comes to criminalizing drinking or placing drivers in situations where their civil liberties are threatened. This category includes the defense bar, specifically, attorneys who specialize in defending people who have been charged with DUI. Belluschi points out that many of our legislators are attorneys whose out-of-session practices may include defending those charged with DUI and she adds that “these guys often stick together” (2001a). This pattern also leads to one of the most powerful obstacles to successfully introducing and then passing legislation championed by anti-drunk driving activists. A National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA; pronounced nit-suh) publication, “A Legislative History of .08 Per Se Laws” puts it this way:
A major obstacle states found when trying to pass .08 per se was the opposition of a powerful legislator. In many instances, advocates of .08 believed they had gained the backing of enough legislators to obtain passage of the bill. However, the influence of a key person in the legislature was sufficient to keep the bill from reaching the House or Senate floor for a general vote. (2001, 2)

Adversaries like these who object to the movement’s efforts because of the relationship between the law and an individual’s behavior are organized and vocal in their opposition to some anti-drunk driving goals. Some adversaries are people like Don Ramsell, a defense attorney who specializes in DUI defense. In a 22-part investigative newspaper series that focuses on recidivist drunk drivers, especially those who continue to drive even though their driver license had been revoked or suspended, Ramsell is shown with his car, a Chevrolet Corvette, that bears a vanity license tag that reads “DIAL DUI” (Doubek 2000b, 1). Ramsell points out, “the simple truth is that drunken driving is a money-making venture for almost all involved: police departments, lawyers, judges, insurance companies, counselors” (Doubek 2000b, 2). Ari Trubitt, another DUI specialist, points out their “legal representation is needed to provide a system of checks and balances” (Doubek 2000c, 1).

These adversaries—while each is acting in accord with different motives—all acknowledge that our roadways are safer as a result of the efforts of the anti-drunk driving movement, whose stakeholders are described next.

**Advocacy organizations**

As a stakeholder category, advocacy organizations can be broken down into two main kinds according to the organization’s primary purpose: advocates whose primary purpose is the elimination of drunk driving and advocates whose purposes include the elimination of drunk driving as one goal among several other goals (Belluschi 2003).

When people think about the anti-drunk driving movement, they typically think about those organizations whose primary purpose is to eliminate drunk driving, and, indeed, these organizations and their efforts are well known; I will refer to these organizations as *dedicated organizations*. However, organizations whose goals include but are not limited to the elimination or reduction of drunk driving also play important roles in the anti-drunk driving movement; I will refer to these organizations as *distributed organizations*. For example, MADD’s sole purpose is the elimination of drunk driving, whereas the National Safety
Council spreads its organizational attention and efforts across an array of safety issues that includes, but is not limited to, alcohol-related traffic safety issues.

**Government entities**

Government stakeholders include officials, agencies, offices, and other bureaucratic units on several levels including national, state, county, and local levels. The U.S. government is a key player in the anti-drunk driving movement because it holds so much power in terms of legislation governing the behavior of so many millions of people. The government also holds tremendous power in terms of funds distributed to other movement stakeholders including advocacy organizations (both those dedicated to eliminating drunk driving and those with broader concerns), state governments, state and local agencies that receive grant money, and educational institutions that carry out important movement activities. Tying federal highway funds to a state’s enactment of a .08 per se BAC level is one example of the federal government’s influence.

On the state government level, legislators and state courts grapple with enacting federal government policies and plans while they also grapple with state laws and policies. For instance, state governments establish both criminal and administrative penalties for alcohol-related traffic offenses. County and local levels of state governments are involved not only in drunk driving prevention activities but also in enforcing laws and imposing the penalties prescribed by state laws. In addition to routine traffic enforcement, law enforcement agencies (such as county sheriffs and city police) plan and execute sobriety checkpoints that call attention to the numbers of people who drink and drive and demonstrate the local government’s commitment to apprehending drivers who are intoxicated before they cause a crash and aggressively prosecuting this criminal activity.

**Research entities**

Sobriety checkpoints not only represent government entities functioning as law enforcement stakeholders but also exemplify the third kind of movement stakeholders Belluschi mentions, *research entities*. According to Belluschi, virtually all the discourse produced by and about stakeholders in the anti-drunk driving movement has some basis in research (2003). In this taxonomy, I consider two aspects of research, how and by whom it is conducted and how and by whom it is disseminated.
Most of the research having to do with the anti-drunk driving movement is funded and carried out by the other kinds of movement stakeholders including those affiliated with government agencies, dedicated and distributed advocacy organizations, dedicated research organizations, and the media. Much of the research about alcohol-related problems—including drunk driving—is supported by the U.S. government in the form of research grants or contracts. These grants and contracts are managed by a variety of U.S. government entities. For example, the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) funds research centers like the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, and the U.S. Department of Transportation through NHTSA funds studies such as *Effectiveness of the Illinois .08 Law* (Voas et al. 2000).

The federal government also maintains central data systems such as the Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), the National Center for Statistics and Analysis (NCSA), and the General Estimates System (GES), which are used to gather, analyze, and disseminate all manner of data having to do with alcohol-related traffic incidents, including data from local law enforcement agencies such as the data from sobriety checkpoints mentioned earlier.

In addition to these central research organizations, a variety of research-oriented institutes, foundations, and centers are located within other organizations such as universities and anti-drunk driving advocacy organizations. These organizations both conduct research and disseminate the results. Similarly, dedicated anti-drunk driving organizations actively monitor research reports and use their public relations channels to further promote research and ensure wide dissemination. Many of these research-oriented organizations are explicitly aligned with the goals of the anti-drunk driving movement. For example, the Marin Institute works to reduce alcohol problems through environmental prevention—improving our physical and social environment to advance public health and safety. The Marin Institute promotes effective alcohol policy, conducts media advocacy, and supports grassroots campaigns in Marin County, California and nationwide” (Marin Institute *About Us* 2004).

In addition to advocacy organizations, government entities, and research entities, the *media* is the final category of stakeholder in the taxonomy.
Media entities

Media entities as I use the term here includes three main divisions, advertising, programming, and journalism. These divisions further can be defined by their modes of delivery, which include newspapers, magazines, radio, television, and, recently, the internet. Anti-drunk driving movement discourse is produced by entities in all three divisions and appears in each of these modes of delivery. Like all manner of enterprise in our market-driven society, these modes of transmission are, to some extent, profit driven. I argue here, though, that for purposes of this anti-drunk driving movement stakeholder taxonomy, the news media, journalism, is a special case. The study’s key informant, Marti Belluschi (who has, over the course of her life, starting 40 years ago when she was a victim of a drunk driver, been a stakeholder in each of the four categories of stakeholders and active in the movement for almost twenty years) considers the media to be part of the movement and she provided the rough outlines of the taxonomy I present here.

To determine whether or not a division of the media qualifies as a movement stakeholder, I test each division against this study’s operant definition of stakeholders. By this standard, organizations, businesses, and individuals whose business is advertising or programming do not meet the criteria to be included as anti-drunk driving stakeholders. However, I argue that when Belluschi refers to the media, she is referring to members of the press, professional journalists, and other news media professionals, all of whom do meet the criteria for movement stakeholders. This is not to say that advertising and programming are not important to anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders. Quite the opposite is true, but the relationships anti-drunk driving stakeholders have with advertising and programming are different from the relationship the news media have with movement stakeholders. I discuss these relationships in more detail later when I discuss the discourse from the four categories of movement stakeholders; the following discussions of the anti-drunk driving movement’s discourse are organized according to the four main categories of movement stakeholders, starting with a look at discourse from advocacy organizations.

Discourse from Advocacy Organizations

In this section, I address the discourse from both kinds of advocacy organizations, dedicated organizations and distributed organizations. As you might expect, discourse from advocacy organizations makes up a large part of the entire set of anti-drunk driving
movement discourse, the sheer amount of which makes an exhaustive accounting very
difficult. As I do in describing the discourse of all the anti-drunk driving movement, I
include representative examples of the main modes of delivery used by movement
stakeholders.

**Discourse from dedicated organizations**

Much has been written about the anti-drunk driving movement including books,
newspaper and magazine articles, and web sites by and about the various organizations and
their leaders who have spear-headed the movement from its emergence in the late 1970s and
early 1980s until today. In 1978, Doris Aiken founded Remove Intoxicated Drivers (RID),
the first grassroots organization in the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement. In 1980,
Candy Lightner started what now is known as Mother’s Against Drunk Driving (MADD) in
California. (I discuss the early change in MADD’s name in Chapter 2). Together RID and
MADD are perhaps the best known of the stakeholder organizations that make up the anti-
drunk driving movement. Both RID and MADD are active on local, state, and national levels
and both prepare and distribute a variety of discourse intended for different audiences.

For example, in 1990, MADD published *America Gets MADD! The Story of Mothers
Against Drunk Driving, the Grassroots Anti-drunk Driving Movement that Swept . . . and Is
Still Sweeping The Nation* (Sadoff 1990). This small (4.19" x 6.75"), 137-page paperback
briefly chronicles the history of MADD in a tapestry of victim and survivor stories in
fourteen chapters with titles like “A voice for the victim,” “Repeat offenders = More
victims,” and “Let’s save lives!” (iii). The book ends with a chapter called “You Can Make a
Difference,” which begins by asserting that, “MADD is living proof that the drive and
commitment of one person can make a difference” and follows with lists like, “Make Your
Voice Heard, Too,” “Support MADD’s Public Policy Goals,” “How to Spot a Drunk Driver,”
and “Thirty Simple Things You Can Do to Stop Drinking and Driving in America” (Sadoff
1990, 121).

In this volume, chapters like “Administrative License Revocation” and “Lower BAC to
.08/.05” are alternated with victim stories such as “I think it is time I do something” and “To
the graduates of the class of 1990” (iii). In addition to these books, MADD prepares and
distributes a wide range of materials, including sophisticated fund raising mass mailings to
both supporters and people who have not contributed to MADD before. MADD issues regular press releases to publicize events and to offer opinions about what is going on in the anti-drunk driving movement in general. For example, in 2002, MADD issued a press release (*USA's Drunk Driving Report Card Drops To "C" Grade*) that discusses how MADD "graded the nation, each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam and Puerto Rico on efforts to combat the most frequently committed violent crime—drunk driving, and underage drinking—the No. 1 youth drug problem" (2002).

MADD has been successful in drawing attention to the problems associated with drunk driving, and "people regularly contact MADD offices to request guidance in establishing their own grassroots organization." In response to these requests, MADD maintains a webpage called, *Lessons Learned Along the Way: Starting a Non-Profit*, which tells how "as MADD enters a third decade of changing lives, public opinion, and public policy, key elements from its past stand out as vital to any group wishing to establish itself as a force for change" and offers ten guidelines for nurturing a grassroots organization (MADD 2002).

RID’s purpose differs somewhat from MADD and other dedicated and distributed advocacy organizations’ purposes, and, as might be expected, RID’s discourse also is different. On the organization’s homepage, Doris Aiken, RID’s founder and president, declares that RID’s mission is,

> to deter impaired driving, and teen binge drinking that often leads to intense trauma for all concerned. We are advocates for victims, enablers of tough laws, and watchdogs for law enforcement and adjudication in the courts. We educate the public about the impact of abusive alcohol use on life and health with materials, public awareness campaigns, and intense media interactions. (Aiken 1997)

Aiken continues by describing the organization and offers statements about the all-volunteer status of the organization and a general statement about how organization spends its funds: “over 90% of all funds are spent on program, and less than 10% on administration and fund raising,” which can be read as a mild umbrage directed at other dedicated organizations that hire professional staff and use a greater percentage of their budget on fundraising (Aiken 1997).

As a national organization, RID’s commitment to spending the lion’s share of its funds on “programs” compares with the Alliance Against Intoxicated Motorists (AAIM), which is
an Illinois organization. AAIM, which focuses its efforts mostly on helping crash victims, does not prepare and distribute as many kinds of discourse as some of the other advocacy organizations. As an AAIM staff person remarked, “Everyone knows about MADD; we’re not that well known.” However, AAIM does prepare and distribute an “ad book” at its annual benefit and distributes bumper stickers (e.g., “Someone I love was killed by a drunk driver”); *DRUNK DRIVING: The Victim, The Offender*, a video about drunk driving; *The Faces of Tragedy: Drunk Driving—The Ripple Effect* (available both as a 170-page book of victim, survivor, and offender stories, and as an audio CD); and brochures (e.g., *Drunk Busters*, which details a reward program for drivers who contact law enforcement officials to report an erratic driver who subsequently is arrested for DUI). Like both MADD and RID, AAIM also maintains a website (http://www.aaim1.org/ibhp.htm). The sponsorship of this website exemplifies the interconnected nature of the movement’s stakeholders. Unlike RID and MADD’s websites, which are funded by the organizations, the AAIM site is “Funded by IDOT - Illinois Department of Transportation, Division of Traffic Safety & The DuPage County Anti-Crime Contribution Committee” (AAIM homepage 2004).

Finally, the National Commission Against Drunk Driving (NCADD) disseminates anti-drunk driving information. NCADD “is the successor to the Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving appointed by President Ronald Reagan in 1982” (2004b). NCADD evolved from the presidential commission but is not a government agency. Instead, NCADD is funded in part by the American alcohol beverage industry. NCADD publications include a video, *Driving Drunk: Your Choice?*, which “focuses on 4 real-life situations where someone made the decision to drive drunk, and shows the long-term effects of those choices” (2004b). NCADD sponsors workshops and seminars, promotes a variety of programs (including soberRide, which supplies free taxi rides to drinking drivers over holiday periods; information is available at http://www.soberride.org), and offers support services to law enforcement agencies.

**Discourse from distributed organizations**

Whereas the previous section addresses discourse from *dedicated* organizations, this section addresses discourse from *distributed* organizations. I define distributed organizations as organizations that include anti-drunk driving efforts as one among several areas of work.
Some of these organizations construe their efforts more broadly. For example, The National Safety Council (NSC), founded in 1913 and chartered by the United States Congress in 1953, is the nation's leading advocate for safety and health. Our mission is 'to educate and influence society to adopt safety, health and environmental policies, practices and procedures that prevent and mitigate human suffering and economic losses arising from preventable causes.' (National Safety Council)

The NSC "is a non-profit, non-governmental, international public service organization dedicated to improving the safety, health and environmental well-being of all people" (National Safety Council). In addition to NSC initiatives and programs that address specific issues (such as safety in the workplace and disaster preparedness), the NSC serves as an objective and impartial intermediary by bringing safety and health professionals representing industry and labor together with government, association and public-interest representatives to form national coalitions on key safety, health and environmental issues. (National Safety Council)

While organizations like the NSC generate texts in many genres that are aimed at educating people of all ages in order to persuade them to alter their behavior with regard to a range of safety issues, that includes alcohol consumption, some prevention programs produce materials in genres that are designed specifically to target a more narrow audience, such as children. D.A.R.E. (Drug Abuse Resistance Education) is perhaps the best known of these programs. D.A.R.E. is a national primary prevention program [that] is directed at the general population, i.e., all fifth graders . . . . the methods are more general and meant to be only part of a long-term, comprehensive strategy. D.A.R.E. is not designed to be a stand-alone program or to provide 5th graders with all skills and information they will need . . . . D.A.R.E. is a part of an on-going, multi-dimensional approach to prevention that spans the elementary, middle and high school years. (http://www.dare.com/index2.htm)

As such, D.A.R.E. is an umbrella organization that involves several different stakeholders, such as parents, educators, and police officers.

The Marin Institute for the Prevention of Alcohol and Other Drug Problems is another organization with an educational mission that targets several different kinds of stakeholders. The Marin Institute’s stated mission is: "The Public Health Approach To Prevention:"
Creating an environment that helps individuals make healthy choices and requires responsible action from government and business”
(http://www.marininstitute.org/mission.html).

More locally, the Iowa State University (ISU) Student Health Service and the Office for Substance Abuse and Violence Prevention co-sponsor a program called “MOST of Us.” The slogan “MOST of Us” is owned by the Montana Social Norms Project and is used at ISU with permission (Brian Dunn, Office of Prevention, Education, and Outreach, ISU 2002). The Montana Social Norms Project is “a public information and education project aimed at improving the health of all Montana citizens by communicating the healthy norms practiced by the majority of people” (http://www.mostofus.org/). At ISU, the “MOST of Us” campaigns not only target students' drinking habits but also promote healthy decisions about sexuality and other public health issues.

**Discourse from Government Agencies**

Several agencies within the U.S. government regularly produce volumes of statistics, training manuals for workplace professionals (especially local, state, and federal law enforcement workers), and proceedings of government-sponsored conferences where anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders and decision-makers gather. For example, many of the federal projects dealing specifically with problems associated with drunk driving are housed in the U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT). The U.S. DOT maintains a web presence with tabs for citizen services, business services, and government services (U.S. DOT 2004). On pages linked from this homepage, the DOT publishes information like *Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration: Regulations: PART 40: “Procedures For Transportation Workplace Drug And Alcohol Testing Programs,”* which apply to truckers (Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration; www.dot.gov). Many of the links having to do with traffic safety, including alcohol-related traffic issues, are under the auspices of the NHTSA, which is an agency of the U.S. DOT.

NHTSA is the agency most directly involved with researching and keeping records about highway safety and, as such, carries the most responsibility for dealing with the consequences of impaired persons. NHTSA was “established by the Highway Safety Act of 1970, as the successor to the National Highway Safety Bureau, to carry out safety programs under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 and the Highway Safety
Act of 1966" (http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/nhtsa/whatis/overview). NHTSA is one of the most prolific of the government agencies in terms of publications and conferences. In addition to its public information function, NHTSA publishes information about and oversees training for law enforcement agencies and others who work on traffic safety issues. NHTSA issues a wide range of publications in several different formats.

*A Manual for a Selective Traffic Enforcement Program for Alcohol-Related Motor Vehicle Crashes* (published by the Traffic Safety Programs, Office of Alcohol Countermeasures, which was a bureau within NHTSA) was “prepared for chief traffic law enforcement administrators . . . for looking at a traffic law enforcement problem—alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes—and planning and implementing a program to bring that problem under control” (Traffic Safety Programs 1972, iii). In many ways, this manual, which was published before what we consider the birth of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement, foretells various tactics and standards that have been put in place as responses to the movement’s advocacy. For example, “Chemical Tests for Intoxication,” a 1960 resolution of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (an appendix to the manual) states, “a blood alcohol concentration of 0.05 percent will definitely impair the driving ability of some individuals . . . at a blood alcohol concentration of 0.10 percent, all individuals are definitely impaired” (Traffic Safety Programs 1972, 39). The manual calls for states to “[e]stablish a Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) of .10% which if equaled or exceeded is, in and of itself, a violation” (Traffic Safety Programs 1972, 18).

*Effectiveness of the Illinois .08 Law,* is a 48-page research report based on results in Illinois during the first year and a half after the state implemented the .08 BAC per se law (Voas et al. 2000). Illinois was chosen for this study because it was one of the first Midwestern states to pass the .08 BAC law, which meant researchers could compare data from Illinois with parallel data from its five contiguous states (Iowa, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, and Wisconsin) without the law.

*A Guide to Developing a Community-Based Designated Driver Program,* is a “guide intended to help State traffic safety organizations, associations of bars, restaurants, and clubs; local and State government agencies; and others to develop or refine Designated Driver Programs for adults” (NHTSA 1994, 1).
"The Visual Detection of DWI Motorists" is a 4" x 9" 15-page brochure that provides "patrol officers with useful and scientifically valid information concerning the behaviors that are most predictive of impairment" (NHTSA 1998, 3; more details are in Appendix B). The brochure includes text and diagrams about the cues that signal the probability that a driver is impaired as specific behaviors separated into five categories: "Problems Maintaining Proper Lane Position (p = .50-.75); Speed and Braking Problems (p = .45-.70); Vigilance Problems (p = .55-.65); Judgment Problems (p = .35-.90); and Post Stop Cues (p ≥ .85).” Two subheadings just below the title, DWI Detection Guide chart note that “Weaving plus any other cue: p = at least .65.” and “Any two cues: p = at least .50” (NHTSA 1998, 5). In addition to the brochure, a plastic sleeve on the inside front cover of the brochure holds a 3.38" x 4.63" laminated card, shown in figure 3, that displays complete text (the five categories, specific behavioral cues, and probabilities) of the “DWI Detection Guide” chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems Maintaining Proper Lane Position</th>
<th>p = 0.50-0.75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Weaving</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Weaving across lane lines</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Straddling a lane line</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Swerving</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Turning with a wide radius</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Drifting</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Almost striking a vehicle or other object</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Speed and Braking Problems**  
*p = 0.45-0.70*  
- Stopping problems (too far, too short, or too jerky)  
- Accelerating or decelerating for no apparent reason  
- Varying speed  
- Slow speed (10+ mph under limit)

**Vigilance Problems**  
*p = 0.55-0.65*  
- Driving in opposing lanes or wrong way on one-way  
- Slow response to traffic signals  
- Slow or failure to respond to officer's signals  
- Stopping in lane for no apparent reason  
- Driving without headlights at night*  
- Failure to signal or signal inconsistent with action*  

**Judgment Problems**  
*p = 0.35-0.90*  
- Following too closely  
- Improper or unsafe lane change  
- Illegal or improper turn (too fast, jeryk, sharp, etc.)  
- Driving on other than the designated roadway  
- Stopping inappropriately in response to officer  
- Inappropriate or unusual behavior (throwing, arguing, etc.)  
- Appearing to be impaired

*Figure 3. Visual Detection of the DWI motorist laminated field reference card (NHTSA 1998, insert).*
The size, shape, and finish of this information card suggest that a law enforcement agent would keep the card handy in a shirt pocket or small notebook for easy reference.

In addition to NHTSA, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the U.S. Government Accounting Office, the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA; housed in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services), the Department of Justice, and legislative entities at all levels of government deal with some aspect of the social issues broadly referred to as drunk driving. These government organizations each generate a tremendous amount of discourse related to traffic safety in general and alcohol-related traffic incidents in particular.

The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) also disseminates information to various stakeholders. For example, the Office of Justice Programs’ Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention publishes the OJJDP fact sheet. The May 2001 issue (Ericson FS-2000117) is titled “Substance abuse: The nation’s number one health problem,” which also is the name of the study (“commissioned by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and prepared by the Schneider Institute for Health Policy at Brandeis University”) that is the fact sheet’s subject. The study “tracks positive and negative trends in adult and youth smoking, drinking, and illicit drug use over the past three decades” (Ericson FS-2000117). With private sector financial support, research overseen by an academic institution, and DOJ publication, this issue of the fact sheet series demonstrates the cooperative, mutually involved nature that characterizes many activities of the anti-drunk driving movement.

In some cases, the federal government takes the lead on highway safety issues ranging from highway design and maintenance (bridge abutment devices and breakaway highway signs) and safety features required by law (such as seat belts, safety glass in vehicle windows, and brake light placement) to parameters for state laws, such as setting the national drinking age at 21. These federal initiatives sometimes have been recommended by and are vigorously supported by other anti-drunk driving stakeholders. Recently, federal highway funding was tied to implementation of the .08 BAC limit. Although many state governments protested this as bribery and manipulation, other movement stakeholders believe it is important for all states to have a .08 BAC illegal limit.

The federal government also sponsors conferences, which include a wide variety of citizen, organizational, community and corporate participants. The proceedings from the
conferences seem to have a direct relationship with how public policy is formed and carried out to reduce alcohol-related traffic incidents. On many social issues, in addition to publishing proceedings and reports, including drunk driving, the federal government regularly produces and distributes proceedings and other reports, “public service advertising campaigns [that] portray the federal government as working in a caring and capable manner to solve social problems” (Salmon and Murray-Johnson 2000, 173).

**Discourse about Research**

As I mentioned earlier, many movement stakeholders carry out a research component. This section talks about stakeholders and the ways they conduct and disseminate research. For example, local law enforcement agencies operate sobriety checkpoints that, in addition to their law enforcement function, also serve a strong research function. Data from a sobriety checkpoint is collected by the sponsoring government agency and is reported through government-sponsored and -maintained research systems. In Illinois, arrest information is provided to the Secretary of State’s office and also to the Illinois Department of Transportation. The data are collected and used by a number of different organizations and agencies in a variety of ways. For example, the annual *DUI Fact Book* published by the Secretary of State’s office reports up-to-date figures based in part on the data gathered by various local and state government agencies in Illinois. For purposes of the rest of this discussion about research, when I refer to the government, unless I specify otherwise, I mean the U.S. government. In many cases, local governments acquire data in during daily law enforcement (arrest and adjudication records for alcohol-related traffic offenses) and other special efforts (such as sobriety checkpoints and heightened seatbelt enforcement during holidays with historically high alcohol-related crash rates). These local and regional data are fed into the federal government’s “two key crash databases [that provide] statistics on traffic crashes of all severities” (Runge 2002, iii). In addition to reporting data to the federal level, many local efforts are funded through the federal system.

While states and local governments may initiate, fund, and carry out research and may cooperate with businesses or other private organizations in research efforts, many, if not most, of those efforts use federal resources. Many times research funded by federal grants is carried out by state and/or local government agencies. Some of this research is used by state and local government agencies to evaluate the relative success of law enforcement programs.
These data also are collected on state and local government levels that feed back to the federal level through two crash database systems. The Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) operates under the auspices of NHTSA's National Center for Statistics and Analysis (NCSA). Crash data also is collected through a system called the General Estimates System (GES). FARS "contains data on a census of fatal traffic crashes within the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico" (FARS Operations 2002, 3). GES data "are based on a probability sample of crashes and not a census of all crashes" (GES Technical Notes 2002, 189). Data from these two databases are combined with data from other agencies (e.g., the U.S. Bureau of the Census and the Federal Highway Administration) and organizations (e.g., R.L. Polk and Co.) for annual editions of a NHTSA publication, Traffic Safety Facts.

Numerous private entities independently fund and carry out research into different aspects of the anti-drunk driving movement. Privately held institutes and foundations like the Marin Institute and the Robert Woods Johnson Foundation fund and carry out research into problems associated with alcohol-related traffic problems. The Marin Institute focuses its primary research attention on how alcohol is marketed. For example, the Backgrounder, "is an occasional publication of the Media and Policy Analysis Center" of the Marin Institute (1997, 4). The August 1997 issue reports on a study, "Alcohol Ads Increase Drinking," that was funded by a NIAAA grant (25).

Some movement stakeholders are more directly involved with carrying out research, while others are more involved in disseminating research results. As a stakeholder category, research includes a variety of movement stakeholders such as government agencies (e.g., FARS and GES), both dedicated and distributed advocacy organizations (MADD and the National Safety Council), research organizations (e.g., The Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation and The Marin Institute), and those who dispute some positions held by other anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders. Some organizations include some aspect of research as one of their many functions (e.g., MADD, which disseminates research results, and the Traffic Injury Research Foundation, which undertakes research projects, including projects that have to do with drinking and driving). Some research entities focus their research efforts on problems related to alcohol-related traffic incidents; the federal FARS and GES programs are examples of this kind of organizations. Data gathered, analyzed, and
distributed by these movement stakeholders are gathered and disseminated through various channels to movement stakeholders who, in turn, base subsequent actions on the research.

Virtually all of these research entities have, over time, developed an interdependence that prevents tidy categorization according to who funds particular research projects. While some professional associations, such as the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety and the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, independently fund research projects, many more projects rely on funding that has its origins in federal money, coming in the form of collaborative projects and grants that are administered by a variety of movement stakeholders. In fact, many times research—especially research that is reported in scholarly journals—can appear to be funded by a sponsoring agency but, investigation sometimes reveals that the sponsoring agency is not funding the research but is instead administering federal money. For example, a study looked into the fact that, despite the overall trend toward fewer alcohol-related traffic deaths over the past two decades,

even BACs as low as .02 percent impair driving-related skills. . . . The relative risk of being killed as a driver in a single vehicle crash at .08 BAC was found to be 13 times that at .00 BAC for drivers aged 21 to 34. Each .02 percentage point increase in the BAC of a driver more than doubled the risk of receiving a fatal injury in a single driver crash among male drivers 16–20, and nearly doubled the comparable risk for other driver groups. (Traffic Tech 222, 2000)

This conclusion is based on both experimental and field data; the study reports that “Westat and the Pacific Institute used recent data to refine estimates . . . they combined data from FARS with exposure data from the joint NHTSA and the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety’s 1996 National Roadside Survey” (Traffic Tech 222, 2000).

One of the most interesting research functions carried out by anti-drunk driving stakeholders is dissemination of research results. As previously indicated, researchers prepare their findings for readers in the form of the report required by the government funding. In addition, these researchers not only meet their contractual agreements for publication but also prepare their findings for publication in scholarly journals such as Alcohol, Drugs and Driving, the Journal of Safety Research, the Journal of Applied Statistics, the Journal of Studies on Alcohol, and the Journal of Substance Abuse. For example, Robert B. Voas, Eileen Taylor, Tara Kelley Baker, and A. Scott Tippetts, who work
for the Pacific Institute for Research and Education, carried out research that was sponsored by NHTSA and published as a DOT report (DOT HS 809 186). Voas and his colleagues published these same findings in the *Journal of Safety Research*. Government reports and scholarly journals like these, whose readers are specialists, are not the only places where research results are disseminated. Dedicated advocacy groups like MADD closely monitor studies and, when research reports are published, are quick to issue press releases that convey the information. These press releases and other ways of disseminating research results, such as on their websites or incorporated in other texts, tend to target more general audiences.

In addition to government-supported research, privately funded groups, such as the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the Marin Institute, also sponsor studies whose ultimate purpose is to help reduce deaths and injuries associated with drunk driving. Sometimes the research projects that foundations and institutes oversee are cooperative and operate with funding not only from the organization, but also benefit from contributions from other civic or philanthropic organizations. It is safe to say that very little of the research directly or indirectly related to issues that influence the anti-drunk driving movement is funded purely from one source.

One category of research that is definitely self-funded is research that is supported as part of a news media organization’s work. Madeleine Doubek’s work is a good example of how members of the news media independently gather, analyze, and distribute research. I have mentioned the 22-part independent investigation into recidivist drunk drivers and driver license revocation series published in the *Daily Herald* in 2001.

Doubek describes the process she and her reporters used to prepare this series.

Actually, the research took a really long time. After negotiating for access to what are called ‘driving abstracts’ for people with multiple DUls, the newspaper received printed copies of nearly 12,000 driving records. A team of 6 reporters worked for probably nearly a year—on and off as we juggled other beats—to go through each paper record by hand and count numbers of DUI convictions. From there, an electronic spreadsheet of the worst offenders was created. Story ideas were developed and re-worked into multiple parts, with a focus on chronic offenders from within the Chicago metro area and the Daily Herald’s circulation area.

We set out looking for a project . . . that would provide a needed public service. . . . we wondered whether all the [new drunk driving] laws were effective. . . . we
could find nothing in Illinois media that really examined in an analytical fashion the problem of chronic drunk driving. . . . We hoped to define the problem, and along the way, explore further solutions that would get people needed help and improve safety on our roads. (Doubek, 2004)

**Discourse and the Media**

As I have said, in this taxonomy, advertising and programming are not stakeholders in the anti-drunk driving movement, even though both play an important role in the movement: all movement stakeholders desire coverage both in advertising and in programming. However, because they are profit-driven, programming and advertising always have an agenda: they do what they are paid to do—for programming, it’s entertainment; for advertising, it’s selling products—and they do it without much regard for who’s paying the bill. The next section examines advertising and programming in terms of how they participate in the anti-drunk driving movement.

**Advertising and programming**

The relationship between advertising and programming is mutual and recursive; advertising drives programming, which drives advertising. Advertising supports programming, which, in turn draws audiences for both the overt purpose of entertainment or education and for the increasingly less covert purpose of apprehending the advertising and ultimately purchasing the advertised products (this depiction is necessarily rough; media scholars likely distinguish these purposes as more distinct based on more sophisticated criteria, but that is beyond the scope of this project). The ultimate goal of this programming/advertising cycle is that programming delivers the audiences—potential customers—who will buy the advertised products.

In some cases, media personalities who are engaged in entertainment—whether it is local or national programming—participate with other anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders to support anti-drunk driving campaigns. For example, in 2003, an alternative music V-jay, Jerry Bryant, hosted “the ‘15th Annual JBtv Don’t Drink and Drive Music Special.’ . . [a] five-hour special on CAN TV19, a Chicago-area public access television station (CAN TV News). As a public personality and popular entertainer, Bryant is such a strong supporter of drunk driving prevention that he not only hosts but also has funded the production every year.
The elements of a paid advertising model are the same as for public service announcement (PSA) placement except that PSAs don’t generate revenue but instead “engage learning processes by providing role models for innovation or maintenance of positive actions and lifestyles” (McAlister 2000, 380). The cycle is the same for PSAs except that the goal is to reach the audience in order to educate and inform them about a social issue and, ultimately, to change how they behave. Specifically addressing how PSAs are placed, Atkin and Freimuth report that ad placement and programming placement (such as broadcast times) are based on “preproduction research, ‘in which data are accumulated on audience characteristics that relate importantly to the medium, the message, and the situation within which the desired behavior will occur’” (Palmer 1981, 227 quoted in Atkin and Freimuth 2001, 125). PSAs typically are aired at no cost (except those associated with producing and distributing the PSA materials, which can range from camera-ready copy to audio or visual media) to the supplying organizations such as anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders.

Competition for PSA placement is fierce, partly because, “[i]n the 1970s, the Federal Communication Commission began abolishing the regulations aimed at providing an adequate amount of public interest programming. The Commission now requires only a ‘general obligation’ that broadcasters address issues of concern to their communities. . . . [For example,] CBS alone received over 5,500 storyboards in 1988” (PSA Research Center 2000). This competition means that PSA-eligible organizations must figure out how to get their messages to the public. For some, media grants are the answer while “others are buying media time in state and local markets. There are campaigns that pay for some air time and negotiate free air time as part of the package” (PSA Research Center 2000). Some PSAs are sponsored in the sense that a third party pays for the air time. As part of their support of the anti-drunk driving movement, distillers and brewers help produce and then pay for the placement of PSAs with an anti-drunk driving message. Charles Atkin, Sandi Smith, and Hae-Kyong Bang studied young viewers’ responses a series of PSA ads “on responsible drinking and drunk driving” (1994, 263). Nine of the PSA ads were produced by beer companies and nine were produced by MADD, the Ad Council, TV Networks, and Project TEAM. Atkin, Smith, and Bang report,
The brewer-sponsored spots tend to produce dual responses . . . . many regard these ads as selling-oriented messages that promote beer consumption . . . . the young viewers detect clear commercial and public relations elements in these campaigns. . . . The evidence indicates that the campaigns are more influential in enhancing the image of the sponsoring companies than in preventing problematic drinking practices and that certain portrayals in these ads produce a pro-drinking impact. (1994, 273)

One watershed anti-drunk driving campaign, the Harvard Alcohol Project (HAP) was a comprehensive media campaign that began in 1988 and sought to demonstrate how a new social concept, the ‘designated driver,’ could be rapidly diffused through American society via mass communication . . . . [it was] the first time that a health institution joined forces with . . . [a]ll major Hollywood studies [and] ABC, CBS, and NBC. . . . The project broke new ground when TV writers agreed to insert drunk-driving prevention messages, including references to designated drivers, into scripts of top-rated television programs, such as ‘Cheers,’ ‘L.A. Law,’ and ‘The Cosby Show.’ (Harvard Alcohol Project 2003)

HAP was successful in part because of its affiliation with Frank Stanton, who for 27 years was the president of CBS. His “direct intervention” and leadership in terms of soliciting and engaging the willing cooperation of a wide variety of media entities and personalities demonstrates how Stanton’s position as an entertainment industry insider provided crucial access that made HAP a success. According to Jay Winsten, “Without Frank Stanton and Grant Tinker, there would not be a designated driver campaign in the United States” (Harvard Gazette 1997).

HAP was deemed a success for several reasons. First, HAP was successful in “lobbying of the U.S. entertainment industry to include prosocial messages in television programs and films,” a goal that had been sought “during the past 25 years” (Winsten and DeJong 2000, 290).

Further, the campaign successfully used a combination of inserting prosocial dialog in programs, donated PSAs, and paid advertising. Winsten and DeJong report that HAP’s media strategies include dialog placement in top-rated network series, prime-time public service announcements (PSAs) sponsored by the major television networks, and major news coverage. Estimated by one industry expert to have a value of more than $100 million, the designated driver campaign has had the
frequency and reach of a major commercial advertising campaign (Winsten, 1994). (Winsten and DeJong 2000, 291)

HAP was effective in placing designated driver dialog, with more than 160 dialog placements in prime-time programs over a four-year period (Winsten and DeJong 2000, 291). Further, “President Bush and then President Clinton cut a PSA for the campaign” that ran in December, the month identified by MADD and other advocacy organizations as National Drunk and Drugged Driving (3D) Prevention Month (MADD Online 2002). Similarly, advertising related to HAP also included “a donated billboard on Sunset boulevard to thank Hollywood for its contributions to the campaign and a paid advertisement in *Emmy* magazine” (Winsten and DeJong 2000, 291–292). This advertising, which could be considered both a PSA spot and a paid advertising placement, demonstrates how a specific message that was part of a larger campaign’s purpose was directed at people who played a part in promoting the overall campaign strategy, in this case, the HAP designated driver campaign. Further, HAP “found several innovative ways to maintain awareness [of the campaign] including high-profile articles in *The New York Times* and *Variety*” (Winsten and DeJong 2000, 291), which brings us again to the third division of the media, journalism.

**News media**

For purposes of this project, I argue that the news media consists of people who practice journalism regardless of its modes of delivery and that members of the news media are stakeholders in the anti-drunk driving movement. For purposes of this taxonomy, by journalism, I mean “the public press” as well as journalism’s product, “writing characterized by a direct presentation of facts or description of events without an attempt at interpretation” (*Merriam Webster Collegiate Dictionary*, 11th ed. 2003, 676).

Some might argue that these definitions inherently preclude journalists from even the possibility of maintaining a stake in a public policy issue like drunk driving prevention. However, according to the definition of stakeholder that I use throughout this project, the news media definitely qualify as anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders because they have “a stake in an enterprise,” and journalists are “person[s] or [a] group who can affect or [are] affected by an action” (*Merriam Webster Collegiate Dictionary*, 11th ed. 2003, 1214; *Ethics Online*).
Along these lines, Madeleine Doubek, Deputy Managing Editor of the Daily Herald, a Chicago-area newspaper, writing about her award-winning 22-part investigative series on recidivist drunk drivers, says,

We really saw this as an example of our mission as a part of the communities we cover to try to make our world a better place. It's one of the highest callings of journalism to shed light on the dark corners, to lead the way toward solutions, it's a kind of civic journalism. . . . It's part of the media's role to build awareness and discussion aimed at solutions. (e-mail message to the author, March 17, 2004)

Here Doubek articulates how journalism, with its modern, Western notion of objectivity, also is driven by ideals of "civic journalism" and journalism's "highest calling." It is true that the news media is also profit driven. However, news media professionals recognize their responsibilities to their communities and thus understand their role as apart from the fray.

In a discussion of the historical and theoretical foundations of public communication campaigns, William J. Paisley writes, "At the end of the 19th century, the initiative for reforming many social problems shifted from associations to the mass media" (2000, 14). In his conclusion about the status of contemporary public communication campaigns, Paisley concludes, "At this historic juncture, a public communication campaign no longer exhorts. Instead it informs and advises" (2000, 20). Although Paisley is talking about public communication campaigns in general, his words ring true in terms of the role of the news media.

In a Phi Kappa Phi Forum article titled "The Essential Role for News Media," Deni Elliott establishes a case for a civic function for the news media. Elliott writes that

[government, news media, and citizens form the necessary triad for democracy. . . . journalists have the responsibility to be separate from government and separate from citizens as well. The journalistic voices should give citizens information that they need instead of perceptions that that [sic] might make citizens happier to have reinforced. . . . If journalists are doing their jobs well, the resulting stories will cause citizens and leaders alike a little discomfort. (2004, 33, 35)

Journalists who report the news and present editorials within social contexts that are rife with social issues must reconcile their "objectivity" with, as Doubek points out, their "role to build awareness and discussion" (Doubek 2004). Within these rich contexts, those who
grapple with complex social issues (like problems associated with drunk driving) affect and, to some extent, define the stakes of the enterprise.

Consequently, news media coverage ranges from research-based investigative series to current news coverage of local, state, and national events to local listings of police reports containing information about people arrested for DUI, public drunkenness, or minor-in-possession of alcohol offenses. Investigative coverage includes the July 2000 *Daily Herald* series on recidivist drunk drivers in Illinois who racked up DUIs whether or not their driver licenses had been suspended or revoked. In addition to investigative efforts like those of Doubek and her colleagues, news coverage can be sparked by press releases or can be part of extended coverage of state or national legislative or policy actions. MADD’s *Tie One on for Safety Campaign* happens every year in December and nearly always garners press coverage. Similarly, April has long been Alcohol Awareness Month and, because of proms and the approaching end of the school year, the local press tends to cover a variety of impaired driving related issues.

The bottom line is that anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders, without regard for their stakeholder category, are vocal, active, and passionate about pursuing the problem of impaired driving. The work of this project is to examine the anti-drunk driving movement’s discourse, a task that requires a grounding in other relevant literature and research methods.
Setting the Stage for the Story: 
A Review of Methods and Literature

In the end, any research report is a form of narration, a story about a selected set of observations. Gesa Kirsch 1992, 265.

The great god of Methodology is invoked to protect the researcher from charges of storytelling. . . . the account appears as the almost inevitable output of a methodological machine. The researcher didn’t write the study; the method did. . . . A more honest strategy . . . is to admit, from the beginning, that we are all story tellers. Thomas Newkirk 1992, 133–34.

In the process of designing and implementing this study, especially in drawing my questions and establishing the scope of the project, I researched the organizations, agencies, and other stake-holding entities that constitute the anti-drunk driving movement; the previous chapter describes those entities both as literature that informs the study and as data for the study. In addition to looking at the discourse of the movement, I also researched the literatures of rhetoric and professional communication and what I consider here under an umbrella term social policy. While I have located numerous reports on the effects of alcohol and reports based on traffic statistics, I have found almost no scholarly treatments of the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement. Sociologist Joseph R. Gusfield is the exception.

Gusfield published The Culture of Public Problems: Drinking-Driving and the Symbolic Order in 1981, and in it he borrows from rhetoricians like W. Ross Winterowd, Kenneth Burke, Chaim Perelman, and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca to discuss “drinking-driving” as the social problem through which he writes about “culture—public meanings—and social structure—authority, control, and deviance” (2). Gusfield talks of metaphors, of public and private facts, of semantic and poetic meanings, of fictions and dramas: “fiction and drama are deeply inherent in the way in which knowledge is presented at several levels of its development” (53). Gusfield’s analyses of drunk driving as a social problem are referred to by other researchers and scholars who situate their work within the realm of alcohol-related social problems. Unlike Gusfield’s, my task here is not to construct a sociological treatise; rather, I review relevant literature about rhetoric, about the research approaches used in this
project, and about some of the specific social policy and social movement ideas that inform this project. Before I turn to these reviews, however, I want to briefly discuss the notion of genre as I understand and use it in these pages, after which I restate my project objectives and research questions.

**Genres in Anti-Drunk Driving Discourse**

As a concept and feature of discourse, genre, despite regularly being problematized and explored, nevertheless remains without a Platonic capital G-genre definition. While I make no claims about elaborating here the elusive Platonic definition, I construct for purposes of this project an operative definition of genre from among works by scholars who explore the nuances of genre and genre theory.

First, David Russell and Charles Bazerman, in their guest editors’ introduction to the “The Activity of Writing/The Writing of Activity” issue of *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, articulate genre as “organized, situated practices of writing in which people come to participate—from the grandest treatises of science and literature to the humblest of bureaucratic forms” (1997, 223). In his chapter, “Systems of Genres and the Enactment of Social Intentions,” Bazerman says that “genres rely on our being able to recognize them and to some degree understand the meanings they instantiate within the systems of which they are a part. . . . A genre exists only in the recognitions and attributions of the user” (1994, 81).

The conception of genre in this study also is informed by Carolyn Miller in “Genre as Social Action”: “genres can serve both as an index to cultural patterns and as tools for exploring the achievements of particular speakers and writers; . . . genres serve as keys to understanding how to participate in the actions of a community” (1994, 39). Similarly, Carol Berkenkotter and Thomas Huckin present five conditions of genre: dynamism, situatedness, form and content, duality of structure, and community ownership (1995, 3–4). In their explication of dynamism, they continue: “Genres are dynamic rhetorical forms that are developed from actors’ responses to recurrent situations and that serve to stabilize experience and give it coherence and meaning. Genres change over time in response to their users’ sociocognitive needs” (1995, 4). Indeed, this dynamism becomes clearly associated with the anti-drunk driving movement materials I examine.

I draw upon the work of these scholars and appropriate the following as central to an understanding of genre as I use the term in this study. While an individual characteristic may
seem to contradict another, each characteristic supplies a basis for both understanding and exploring genre in action. These characteristics, then, constitute this study’s operative meaning of genre.

- Genre is organized and so is recognizable to users.
- Genre is situated practice (an action as opposed to a thing).
- Genre is a tool; genre performs a function and assists in meeting a goal.
- Genre is user oriented; that is, users control genres.
- Paradoxically, genre influences how users understand and enact cultural patterns as they participate in community.
- Genre is rhetorical and dynamic in that it changes over time based on specific user needs, including addressing shifting audiences and purposes, and appropriating new or different rhetorical forms.

Although the scholars mentioned above and others who wrestle with the notion of genre reject the lay person’s understanding of genre as a category, kind, or form, I identify the artifacts in this study first by the label a user of the artifact might apply (i.e., informational brochure, video cassette sleeve, pamphlet, or bookmark). However, beyond this labeling for convenience of reference, the work of this study is to address these characteristics of genre as essential to the analyses presented in subsequent chapters.

The objectives for the study and the research questions that guided the study focus on some of the aspects of genre presented here.

**The Study's Objectives and Questions**

The previous chapters that present the history and context of the anti-drunk driving movement and the discussion of the anti-drunk driving stakeholders bring some of the practical aspects of this study into focus. In order to focus now on the more academic aspects of this project, I present the study’s objectives and questions here. After this brief reminder, in subsequent sections, I talk about the two general kinds of data analyzed in the study and about some methodological issues that influenced my approach to the study. The objectives of this study are

- to situate the rhetoric of the anti-drunk driving movement in a historical and cultural context;
• to present and analyze the discourse of the movement to address the research questions; and
• to put forward findings that will contribute to the rhetoric and professional communication discipline.

The following questions guide this study.

1. How has the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement changed over time?
   a. What genres have been used?
   b. How have these genres changed?

2. Has the discourse changed in response to
   a. reductions in alcohol-related traffic fatalities in general;
   b. reductions in alcohol-related traffic fatalities in certain demographic groups;
   c. changes in social conditions; or
   d. other now unknown factors?

3. Are there now or have there been rationales for the rhetorical strategies that have shaped the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement?
   a. If so, what are they?
   b. If so, how have these strategies been determined?
   c. If not, how have decisions been made?

In the next section I present and discuss the data for this study. Then I address some methodological issues before I talk about the study’s methods. This chapter concludes with a review of the literature that grounds this study.

The Data for this Study

As I mentioned, the previous chapter serves both as a review of the literature of the anti-drunk driving movement and as a description of what Thomas Huckin calls the “initial corpus” for this study (1992, 90). In “Context-Sensitive Text Analysis,” Huckin describes six procedural steps or stages for a typical context-sensitive text analysis (1990, 90–93). Although Huckin suggests these procedural steps for analysis of a verbal text corpus, I found these stages useful in selecting visual texts as well. Huckin suggests that, “[i]nterpretation takes place not just at the end of the process but throughout” and asserts that “the investigator usually has a hunch that there is something about these texts, some linguistic pattern, that will be of interest” (1992, 90). In this case, my initial hunch was confirmed many times over
and, but generally following Huckin’s six steps, I narrowed the focus of the study, selected the artifacts for analysis, and used the research approaches I discuss later.

First, Huckin suggests selecting an initial corpus. Even though I didn’t have on hand all of the data I would eventually accumulate for the project, I defined the corpus early on as the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement; the taxonomy in the previous chapter shows how I organized this corpus in terms of movement stakeholders and their discourse.

Beginning when I received in the mail from Belluschi the first manila envelope filled with copies of newspaper clippings and a variety of anti-drunk driving publications produced and distributed by the Illinois Secretary of State’s office, I looked for what Huckin calls salient patterns. As I began to accumulate and examine more artifacts, I specifically looked for patterns according to three principles, chronology (to explore how the discourse had changed over time), representation (to ensure that my corpus included a representative sample of discourse from all of the movement’s stakeholders), and richness of the data (to ensure that the corpus is sufficiently rich to allow for analysis of a wide range of visual and textual elements and to ensure that my corpus included a representative sample of the different genres or kinds of discourse).

Then, as Huckin suggests, I sought to determine the “interestingness” of the artifacts by sharing a variety of artifacts from my mounting collection not just with professional colleagues in rhetoric and professional communication, but also with friends and family members. It would not be an exaggeration to say that virtually everyone with whom I shared my artifacts confirmed that the individual artifacts were interesting. Further, people seemed interested in the project in general; the project captured the attention of both rhetoricians and others whose interests and expertise lay in other areas. I used this feedback to complement along with the three principles as winnowed down the artifacts to a manageable number to consider for possible analysis until I identified a smaller, study corpus of artifacts. To accomplish what Huckin calls verification of the pattern, I examined the study corpus according to the three principles—chronology, representation, and richness—giving special attention to both visual and verbal texts.

From the earliest days of the project I intended to analyze both visual and verbal aspects of a variety of texts. For example, for the visual rhetoric analyses, I chose artifacts that display beer mugs for visual rhetoric analyses. Beer mugs and other kinds of containers for
alcohol beverages are common features of the discourse, not only in the discourse of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement, but in historical artifacts as well.

Similarly, I selected the verbal texts with the three principles in mind. The first research question asks how the discourse of the movement has changed over time, so I included historical artifacts to show the rhetorical features of early discourse that might either be present or absent in the contemporary movement’s discourse. The taxonomy that I present in the previous chapter was particularly useful when I was ensuring that I selected artifacts from all of the stakeholder categories. As Huckin suggests, I verified the patterns in the study corpus to confirm that the patterns did, indeed, exist, and that I had included sufficient artifacts to ensure thorough analyses. After the discussion of the data that follows, the next sections of this chapter describe the research approaches I used to conduct what Huckin calls a functional-rhetorical analysis. I deliberately combine three research approaches in this study in keeping with Huckin’s notion that “the investigator must look at the data from different perspectives and build the most faithful interpretation she can” (1992, 92).

As I gathered two kinds of data for this study. I interviewed Marti Belluschi (the key informant for the study), and I collected and cataloged artifacts from the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement, many of which were supplied by Belluschi. Some of the artifacts I examine in this study come from sources I found online and in libraries, archives, and places where information is disseminated (like brochure displays in clinics and schools).

**Interview data**

I began gathering interview data when I met with Marti Belluschi in her home in downtown Chicago on September 15–17, 2001. Over those three days, we recorded more than five hours of videotape. We met and videotaped several shorter interviews on two other occasions, talked on the telephone several times, and exchanged email. Our videotaped discussions were loosely guided by a questionnaire and were videotaped for project records and to provide a conversational context for the comments as well as a visual record of exactly which artifact(s) we were discussing (a copy of this questionnaire and the informed consent form are included in Appendix A). I reviewed the video tapes and noted sections that seemed to meet Huckin’s notion of “interestingness” (1992, 91). Only portions of the interviews that yielded quotes were transcribed. I also kept two separate journals, one a
collection of notes I made during interviews and another that I used to reflect on our conversations and as a record of my research and writing processes.

While some interviews were guided by the questionnaire and notes about issues I wanted to address during each interview, I did not hold rigidly to these plans. Instead, during the course of some interviews, Belluschi shared other, relevant documents or experiences that we discussed as they came up. Whenever possible, I obtained copies of documents we discussed for my records and considered these documents to be artifacts that could either be subject to close analysis or could inform analysis of other artifacts. Early in our conversations, Belluschi mentioned Madeleine Doubek, who now is deputy managing editor at *The Daily Herald*, a Chicago-area daily newspaper. I exchanged email with Doubek in order to confirm my understanding of an investigative series that she spearheaded as well as to solicit her and her newspaper’s philosophy regarding the news media as a category of anti-drunk driving movement stakeholder. Because coverage by the news media is widely sought by all the other categories of movement stakeholders, I especially value Doubek’s insights into decisions like those made by the editor and reporters from this newspaper as they researched, prepared, and published their investigative reports, parts of which I consider to be anti-drunk driving movement discourse artifacts like those I discuss in the next section.

**Artifacts**

Belluschi supplied more than 100 artifacts that she collected for her own archive over the time she has been involved with the anti-drunk driving movement. In addition, I obtained more than 130 artifacts from a variety of sources including the federal government, education-based resources, and movement stakeholders in the form of journal articles, government research reports, materials I downloaded from the internet, and books dealing with alcohol- or safety-related topics. From this data pool, I selected eleven artifacts for analysis. In some cases, I used other artifacts to provide supporting examples as well as to establish changes over time, changes within genres, and shifts in discourse strategies.

Artifacts were both subjects of interviews with Belluschi as well as data that I analyzed using techniques of the three general research methods. I selected the specific research method for each artifact or conversation based on characteristics of the data that indicated that a specific technique would yield insights that would help address the study’s objectives and research questions. In order to be systematic and principled both in the way I selected
artifacts and in the ways I analyzed them, I made certain decisions based on how I addressed some methodological issues. I discuss these issues in the next section.

**Methodological issues**

This section addresses some general methodological issues that influenced both my selection of data for analysis and my selection of specific research techniques. In this section I briefly present each of the three research approaches and discuss issues related to them.

In this study, I use three methodological approaches. First, I use a case study approach. I talked to people—primarily my key informant but also people who either contributed to the discourse or who otherwise knew about the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement, such as Madeleine Doubek, a staff member in the Alliance Against Intoxicated Motorists (AAIM) office, and an archive librarian at the National Safety Council headquarters. Second, I use rhetorical analysis techniques to look at visual and verbal artifacts. Third, I use techniques from discourse analysis to examine artifacts from discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement. Each of these research approaches has been detailed in the literature and each often apparently stands alone as the method used in a given study. Table 3.1 shows examples from the literature in rhetoric and professional communication that employ these three research approaches. Although these examples are classified as representing only one research approach, I suggest that none is a “pure” example of the approach. While research may be broadly categorized for purposes such as this, in reality, the boundaries among these approaches are blurred and, to some extent, such studies employ techniques from other research approaches.

What we call our approach, then, serves two functions, one for the readers of the research and another for the researcher. First, research approaches serve as schema within which content will be presented. When a research approach is named, readers familiar with research conventions in the social sciences and humanities will grasp the basic nature of the research and so will bring expectations that the researchers have taken pains to try to meet. Second, what we call our approach matters because it helps us focus on specific research techniques and thereby adjust the nature and scope of a project. By naming a research approach, we as researchers know in general what kind of data we will collect and which specific techniques we will apply to that data.
These reviews of relevant literature reinforce my argument that, because the efforts of the anti-drunk driving movement are largely rhetorical, a study of the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement will provide new and useful insights into the social power of applied rhetoric. To that end I now turn to some of the literature from the field of rhetoric and professional communication and suggest how this study fits in this body of literature. After discussing this literature, I discuss the literature that grounds the research approaches I use in the study. This chapter ends with a brief discussion of some ideas from social policy and public communication campaigns that inform this study.

Although my research has not uncovered any projects in rhetoric and professional communication that take a rhetorical approach toward understanding the discourse of anti-drunk driving movement, many scholars and researchers have addressed a wide range of topics within the movement. That literature not only informs this study but also serves as a source of data. Over the course of this chapter on related literatures and methods and in subsequent chapters which look at a number of representative verbal texts and visual texts, I
show how the discourse of the movement has influenced our culture, especially when we look at common verbal and visual texts.

Before discussing the literature in rhetoric, the professional and academic discipline in which this study is situated, I want to distinguish between *rhetoric*—a field of scholarship and practice and *rhetorical analysis*—a research approach. The discussion that immediately follows has two parts: the first specifically grounds this study within the literature from the professional and academic specialty called rhetoric and professional communication. In the second section, I specifically address the literature about rhetorical analysis as a research approach; next, I discuss literature about case study and discourse analysis as the second and third of the research approaches in study.

Although rhetoric has been around for a very long time, contemporary rhetorical researchers and scholars have distinguished between rhetorical analysis of verbal texts and rhetorical analysis of visual texts, referred to here as visual rhetoric. Certain researchers, scholars, and practitioners have focused attention on visual rhetoric as a more or less discrete field within the larger field of rhetoric. In these traditions, this project deals with both textual and visual rhetoric. I agree with those who argue that text and visual rhetoric cannot be analyzed separately because of the close and mutually influential effects of visual and verbal elements, which means that when I analyze the artifacts, I present descriptions of both the visual and textual features of the artifacts. However, for purposes of this review of relevant literature, I consider verbal and visual rhetoric separately, beginning with a look at literature and scholarship that focuses on verbal texts.

**Rhetoric and verbal texts**

Studies in rhetoric are rife with rhetoric as it changes over time: Bazerman, in his study of the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, provides a model for taking a systematic look at representative texts over time (Chapter 3, *Shaping Written Knowledge* 1988). Bazerman's other influential studies, some detailed in the same book, provide additional useful insights into both approaches to rhetorical studies as well as theoretical connections on conducting such research. For example, in his chapter, "How Language Realizes the Work of Science," Bazerman argues that scientific language needs to be studied as a historical phenomenon . . . . Out of this fluid world of ever-new and ever-different social action, interaction, and symbolic
realizations certain regularities develop in the social forms ... as the characteristic cultural forms. (Shaping, 313–14)

I suggest that scientific language is not the only language that requires a historical context, which is why I conceive this study as a case study complemented by discourse analysis and rhetorical analysis. For example, Kitty Locker’s studies of dunning letters and her work with the archives of the East India Company provide further useful insights (1985), and Beverly Sauer’s work with the rhetoric of risk and disaster contributes to this tradition of examining historical records in order to inform our understandings of how we came to communicate in our current manner (1993).

Also in this tradition, rhetoricians like M. Jimmie Killingsworth and Jacqueline Palmer, in Ecospeak: Rhetoric and Environmental Politics in America, trace the development of environmental rhetoric (1992). Killingsworth’s “How to Save the Earth” provides additional guidance as an example of how to conduct close rhetorical analyses. These works also provide models for analyses of texts that span a period of time during which the genres under examination shifted and the genres influenced public policy and shaped behavior of organizations and individuals. Tarla Rai Peterson’s 1997 study, Sharing the Earth: The Rhetoric of Sustainable Development, follows in the tradition of Killingsworth and Palmer’s examinations of environmental rhetoric.

Similarly, scholars like Susan Kleimann examined the rhetoric of government and the ways in which rhetorical strategies shaped both the workplaces within government as well as the discourse practices of the practitioners of the rhetoric of government. Further examples of these kinds of rhetorical studies can be found in Andrew Abbott’s The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor (1988) and Aviva Friedman and Graham Smart’s study of discourse practices in a Canadian banking system (1997).

Other researchers have focused a rhetorical lens on the discourse practices of science (Latour and Woolgar 1986) and engineering (Winsor 1990). These studies provide useful insights into discourse practices that shape public understandings of the development of concepts that, in turn, influence public policy and eventually turn again to shape the discourse communities of science and engineering. I argue here that this reflexive turn exists in the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement, which has shifted attitudes and behavior in our society and that can be traced in verbal texts as well as visual texts.
Rhetoric and visual texts

This study will necessarily involve analysis of visual rhetoric because much of the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement is carried by visual elements. To inform this aspect of my project, I draw in the tradition of visual rhetoric established by researchers and theorists such as Charles Kostelnick and Dave Roberts (Visual Language 2000), William Horton (Designing and Writing 1994), William Winn (Role of Graphics 1989; Color 1991), and Edward Tufte (Visual Explanations 1997; Envisioning 1990; Visual Display 1983).

In “Ideology and the Map: Toward a Postmodern Visual Design Practice,” Ben F. Barton and Marthalee S. Barton assert that visuals are inherently ideological and emphasize that visuals are “embodiments of cultural and disciplinary conventions” (1993, 49). Unlike the anti-drunk driving movement, other 20th-century social movements confronted ideologies that were not only embedded in social practices but also were codified as the law of the land. For instance, the suffrage movement challenged ideas about why only men could vote and the civil rights movement challenged racist policies that were perpetuated by all manner of laws and common practices, such as the “separate but equal” doctrine. From its beginnings, the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement’s values and goals were remarkably in line with government policies. This almost-privileged status as a movement propelled by positive public opinion, and support from and congruence with existing government policies meant that the anti-drunk driving movement did not have to rely on some of the extreme tactics that had garnered support for other movements. For example, instead of practicing civil disobedience, stakeholders in the anti-drunk driving movement could focus on textual and visual rhetoric to publicize and build support for their purpose.

In the next section, I discuss some of the literature that explains the parts of the combinative research approach taken in this research, starting first with readings having to do with case studies and discourse analysis, followed by a discussion of some of the literature about rhetorical analysis as a research approach.

Readings about the Research Approaches

The following sections present relevant literature about the three complementary research approaches: a case study approach, a discourse analysis approach, and a rhetorical analysis approach. While I treat each of these approaches here as separate, in practice, these as well as many, if not most, other research methods are far from distinct. Many qualitative
researchers identify their work as generally fitting in one methods camp, while, in many cases, the actual research techniques the researchers use span methodological boundaries. Many research approaches have common features, such as generally focusing on analysis of texts or characteristics of an audience.

As I mentioned earlier, by data-driven, I mean that each artifact was matched for analysis with specific techniques from the available three approaches. By eclectic, I mean that instead of predetermining one analytical method for all the data, I examined each artifact in the light of the “top levels” of the three research approaches. Then I selected and used techniques from “deeper” in the methods that seemed both to match the characteristics of the data as well as to address the research questions and study objectives. I used the top levels of each of the three methods to provide a combinatory viewpoint as opposed to an in-depth, exhaustive approach using only one approach.

This combinatory approach draws into view the blurred boundaries between what once may have been considered sharply differentiated research methods. For example, Thomas Huckin, who ostensibly writes about text-based analysis in his chapter, “Context Sensitive Text Analysis,” describes the project as a “case” and says he and his collaborators “collected Nate’s writings, interviewed him, followed him around, took notes, and did other activities of a quasi-ethnographic nature” (1992, 93). Indeed, the article that resulted from Huckin and his colleagues’ study is titled “Conventions, Conversations, and the Writer: Case Study of a Student in a Rhetoric Ph.D. Program” (Berkenkotter, Huckin, and Ackerman 1998; emphasis added).

Despite blurred boundaries, each of the approaches that constitute the eclectic approach used in this study have common features. First, each is a “social perspective” as described by Lester Faigley in “Nonacademic Writing: The Social Perspective” (1985). Faigley explains, “Researchers taking a social perspective study how individual acts of communication define, organize, and maintain social groups. . . . [and act] as links in communicative chains, with their meaning emerging from their relationships to previous texts and the present context” (1985, 235). And second, each is empirical in the sense Janice M. Lauer and J. William Asher suggest: “Empirical research is the process of developing systematized knowledge gained from observations that are formulated to support insights and generalizations about the phenomena under study” (1988, 7). Further, I consider these three approaches to be
empirical because they originate in and are based on observation—examinations of artifacts from the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement—and experience—privileging Belluschi’s voice as a movement insider.

In this instance, using a case study-based approach means that I as a researcher who does not belong to the discourse community have access to insider information. In fact, using case study-type data gleaned from interviews and other communications with Belluschi takes advantage of the fact that she is a movement insider. Being able to draw from Belluschi’s experience ameliorates some of the difficulties inherent in examining discourse created and distributed by corporate authors situated in public organizations or entities. In cases where researchers do not have direct access to a person in a decision-making position, researchers can examine only an end product and must either speculate on how decisions might have been made or must consider only the artifact at hand without information about what happened to prepare the artifact. In this study, however, Belluschi’s insider voice helps resolve some of the questions that arise when analysis must rely only on artifacts as remnants of complex decision-making processes.

The next three sections discuss the literature that grounds the approaches used in this study.

**Case study approach**

I use a case study approach to represent that kind of research that springs from ethnography that “examines entire environments, looking at subjects in context” (Lauer and Asher 1988, 39). Case study research approaches in rhetoric and professional communication are grounded largely in cultural anthropology as practiced and discussed by Clifford Geertz (see, for example, Geertz 1973; 1983). In *Local Knowledge*, Geertz discusses the “myth of the chameleon fieldworker, perfectly self-tuned to his exotic surroundings, a walking miracle of empathy, tact, patience, and cosmopolitanism” (1983a, 56). In strong contrast, in this study, I made every effort to avoid the particulars of this myth and strive instead for what I understand to be a case study that is based on what Geertz discusses as ethnography in modern life: “It is (or, anyway, ought to be) an historical, sociological, comparative, interpretive, and somewhat catch-as-catch-can enterprise, whose one aim is to render obscure matters intelligible by providing them with an informing context” (1983b, 152).
Therefore, in this study, I use a case study approach in order to include the voice of the key informant, Marti Belluschi. Belluschi’s history parallels and intertwines with the history of the anti-drunk driving movement, and I include her perspective both to fulfill Geertz’s expectations for an informing context and to provide an active narrative voice throughout.

In addition to including Belluschi’s active voice in this study, this report presents, analyzes, and discusses a variety of artifacts from the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement using the two other research approaches, discourse analysis and rhetorical analysis.

**Discourse analysis approaches**

Evelyn Hatch discusses planning a layered analysis and suggests that researchers look over the data at hand in order to “be sure there is sufficient data or evidence for a particular method. . . . Once you have decided which of the analyses would be most appropriate for the data” you proceed with each method of analysis and then combine the findings into an integrated report (1996, 314–15). Hatch proposes a “three-way classification” wherein each category contains several different theories or analysis practices:

1. Linguistic and cognitive templates (text characteristics),
2. Linguistic and cognitive processes (text structure results from selection/activation based on speaker’s/writer’s goals and intents), and

In keeping with Hatch’s model, I combine functional grammar, narrative theory, and context-sensitive textual analysis, each of which is discussed here.

I use functional grammar to look closely at text characteristics and to speculate about the choices the speakers or writers made in order to pursue their goals. I borrow narrative theory from sociolinguistics to consider the social nature of the communication processes at work in the artifacts, and I use context-sensitive text analysis to further explicate the verbal texts in relationship to other contextual matters.

**Functional grammar analysis**

Geoff Thompson, author of *Introducing Functional Grammar*, asserts that functional grammar explanations “correspond to things [we] already know intuitively . . . in order to systematize this knowledge” (1996, vii). Thompson goes on to say that functional grammar
sets out to investigate what the range of relevant choices are, both in the kinds of meanings that we might want to express . . . and in the kinds of wordings that we can use to express these meanings; and to match these two sets of choices. . . . we have to look outwards at the context . . . at the same time we need to identify the linguistic options (i.e., the lexical and structural possibilities that the language system offers for use), and to explore the meanings that each option expresses. (1996, 8; emphasis in original)

Thompson tells us that these two are "complementary perspectives . . . from the bottom up—from wording to context . . . and top down—from context to wording" (1996, 8). Thompson further asserts that in functional approaches to grammar, "we essentially equate meaning with function. . . . The meaning is the use" (1996, 26).

In this study, I use two functional grammar techniques, identifying and discussing grammatical metaphor and identifying and exploring the ramifications of theme and rheme as clause constituents. Theme is the first constituent of a phrase and generally is the subject—the starting point for the message (the rheme simply is the rest of the clause). Themes are important because they signal the aboutness of the text.

Grammatical metaphor analysis means examining text for both the literal and metaphoric meaning of words or phrases where metaphoric means "the opposite of literal" (1996, 163). Focusing attention on this sort of opposition also is an attribute of narrative theory.

**Narrative analysis**

What I call narrative theory here emerged from early sociology theory and practice and features prominently in sociolinguistic work. Sociologist William Labov's classic "The Transformation of Experience in Narrative Syntax" (1972), provided a starting point for modern scholars of narrative. Evelyn Hatch refers to a special issue on narrative structure of Journal of Pragmatics and presents a narrative template that draws on the work of Labov (1972) and Mandler, a cognitive psychologist (1978). Interestingly, Hatch describes this narrative template in a chapter called "Rhetorical Analysis," a curious turn that I offer as further evidence that boundaries between research approaches are blurred. Hatch proposes that

the narrative template . . . may include the following components: an abstract, the orientation (including time, place, and character identification), a goal and the
problem, the steps to resolve the problem . . . the resolution (or climax), and a coda (including a possible moral). (1992, 167)

While Hatch notes that the “orientation” is included in the narrative template, I suggest that this component translates directly into—and thus helps create the blurred boundary between—narrative analysis and context-sensitive textual analysis.

**Context-sensitive textual analysis**

In 1983, Thomas Huckin introduced and elaborated some fundamental concepts of context-sensitive text analysis in “A Cognitive Approach to Readability.” In that chapter he examines relevant research in cognitive psychology and presents “concepts developed by cognitive psychologists that seem most useful . . . ‘schema theory,’ ‘activated semantic contexts,’ the ‘levels effect,’ and the ‘leading edge strategy’” (92). Of these, two—schema theory and activated semantic contexts—are particularly useful as precursors for context-sensitive text analysis.

About schema Huckin says, “the power of schemata in the communication process resides largely in their ability to induce inferences from the reader . . . [schema] enriches the imagery of concepts, making them easier to perceive and easier to remember . . . it can increase the coherence of a message . . . [to help the reader] integrate various parts of the message” (92–93). Huckin’s activated semantic contexts are “activated whenever they are perceived by the reader as being *important* to comprehension” (94).

Later Huckin worked with Carol Berkenkotter on two projects that specifically describe context-sensitive text analysis. In “You Are What You Cite,” Berkenkotter and Huckin take great pains to describe June Davis’s context (1993). They describe her work environment, her research program, the activities she performs in her lab, and they focus their attention on the citations Davis uses in her scientific publications. Following a discussion of Davis’s research area (*in vivo* work with *C. albicans*), Berkenkotter and Huckin discuss in some detail the five drafts of the paper. They talk about how certain parts of the paper function: “The references further buttress the claim . . . ” and they refer to specific sentences: “With its claim/grounds warrant structure, sentence 5, like sentence 3, appears to fulfill the criteria for a Toulmin argument” (122). They talk about Davis’s attitude and wonder if it “doesn’t capture something more subtle about the ideological nature of the experimental article as a
genre" (125). In their end notes, they talk about intertextuality as an important part of a community, a social and cultural context.

In addition, Berkenkotter and Huckin are joined by John Ackerman first in a 1991 publication (Conventions) that was later revised and reprinted as a chapter in Berkenkotter and Huckin's 1995 book, Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication: Cognition/Culture/Power. The study reported by the three is presented as a case study and, indeed, the researchers carefully construct their case and describe in detail their research techniques and the chronology of the project. In fact, they spend a great deal of time discussing the context for the study, which is a looping back of sorts as the research subject, Nate, works over time to assimilate into the professional academic community in which the very research is situated. In some cases, comments are made based on conversations and interviews with Nate. Some comments, though, are based on the texts Nate produced over the span of the project and some of these comments are based on specific linguistic features:

This is not to say that Nate had fully assimilated the linguistic style of his professor or the other composition theorists and researchers whose work he was reading. He continued to use considerable hyperbole in his diction, with terms like shake, attack, revolutionary, draws fire, . . . whereas such imprecision occurred frequently in his earlier writing, now it occurred only occasionally: Only 1.3% of his words in this paper were marked by our judges as being off register . . . (1995, 137)

I suggest that context-sensitive text analysis with its careful consideration of all manner of contexts and its attention to a wide variety of features in texts lends itself well to the combinatory approach undertaken here, particularly the features of the approach that tend toward rhetorical analysis are employed.

Rhetorical analysis approach

In the "Preface" to Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice, Sonja Foss says that rhetorical criticism is a process that is an everyday activity that we can use to understand our responses to symbols of all kinds in our environment, to reject those with negative impacts, and to create symbols of our own that generate the kinds of responses we intend. (1989, xi)

Although Foss speaks in this volume of criticism, her points also can be understood in the context of what I am calling rhetorical analysis here. Foss and others—including those who
identify their approach as feminist or postmodern—have built on the historic tradition of rhetorical theory and practice. Remnants from this rich history provide both touchstones and places of departure for those who appropriate rhetorical analysis as an approach to understanding data, in this case selected artifacts from the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement.

In this study, I adopt Foss's term *rhetorical artifact*, a "tangible product . . . . the object of study" (1989, 5). Foss suggests two purposes for criticism/analysis of a rhetorical artifact: to understand a rhetorical artifact better and, consequently, to use that understanding to help others appreciate it or to change some aspect of the society that generated the rhetorical artifact. . . . [and] to make a contribution to rhetorical theory or to explain how some aspect of rhetoric operates. . . . to confirm, modify, or elaborate on rhetorical principles . . . to improve the effectiveness of communication—to generate ideas about how we and others may communicate more effectively. (6–7)

This study looks at how the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement changed over time and at how "some aspect[s] of the society that generated the rhetorical artifact[s]" also have changed.

Foss touches here on the "effectiveness of communication," a notion that can be related to the notion of "persuasiveness." In many instances, the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement has been both effective and persuasive. Remember that I entered into this project with a fundamental assumption that "what they did worked," that the discourse of the movement was effective not only in terms of carrying a coherent message about the aims of the movement but also in terms of facilitating real social change. For example, Jacobs points out how law enforcement and the legal profession has been influenced "[s]ince 1983 [by] the legislative deluge of new anti-drunk driving laws" (Jacobs 1989, xvii). As these laws—in themselves artifacts of the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement—were codified, demonstrable reductions in alcohol-related traffic incidents, fatalities, and injuries were noted, which, in turn, spurred on the movement. While a direct correlation between one particular rhetorical artifact or even a constellation of such artifacts and this statistical trend would be impossible to draw, virtually no one denies the overall impact of the efforts of the anti-drunk driving movement. The artifacts and their contexts are, however, available for rhetorical analysis.
In this study, I conduct two kinds of rhetorical analysis, analysis of verbal texts and analysis of visual texts. While I address these as separate analytical tasks, in the subsequent analysis chapters, I generally practice these two if not simultaneously, at least one right after the other, often in a recursive manner. Inherent in this approach is my contention that not one of the artifacts from the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement—whether at first glance categorized as “verbal” or “visual”—is totally and exclusively one or the other. That is to say that all the artifacts in this study, those with only “words” as well as those with only “pictures,” have both verbal and visual elements. I address and further discuss this notion as well as the notion of visual/verbal balance in Chapter 5, “Death in a Beer Mug: Visual Rhetoric in Anti-Drunk Driving Discourse.”

One way to look at the balance between visual and textual elements is presented in Designing Visual Language by Charles Kostelnick and David Roberts (1998). Kostelnick and Roberts present a 12-cell “Visual Language Matrix” that accounts for textual, spatial, and graphic elements in intra, inter, extra, and supra levels, moving from local variations and linear components (intra-level design) through fields and non-linear components (inter-level design) and data displays, pictures, icons, and symbols (extra-level design) to considerations of the whole document (supra-level design) (1998, 86–97). Kostelnick and Roberts note that “each document uniquely combines elements from the matrix” and that the boundaries between the 12 cells of the matrix are “fuzzy” (1998, 97–98). This approach to visual rhetoric complements work by Edward Tufte, who introduced the idea of visual confections, “an assembly of many visual events, selected . . . then brought together and juxtaposed . . . confections illustrate an argument, present and enforce visual comparisons, combine the real and the imagined, and tell us yet another story” (Visual Explanations 1997, 121).

Finally, I want to talk briefly about the notion of participants in rhetorical situations. Sociologist Erving Goffman suggests that

Society is organized on the principle that any individual who possesses certain social characteristics has a moral right to expect that others will value and treat him in an appropriate way. Connected with this principle is a second, namely that an individual who implicitly or explicitly signifies that he has certain social characteristics ought in fact to be what he claims he is. (1959, 13)

And Goffman similarly comments about teams,
we commonly find that the definition of the situation projected by a particular participant is an integral part of a projection that is fostered and sustained by the intimate co-operation of more than one participant. . . . each member of such a troupe or cast of players may be required to appear in a different light if the team’s over-all effect is to be satisfactory. (1959, 77–78)

These two ideas are important because they point out how expectations are enacted in social situations. Our expectations about the anti-drunk driving movement—how it acts, how it constructs its ends and considers its means to those ends, why players on the “same team” squabble or battle for turf (that sometimes exists in the form of big stakes money), and when the movement ebbs and flows in the public consciousness—are part and parcel of this project.

Primed now to consider this project in the context of the literatures discussed here, I move to the last section of this chapter, a discussion of some key ideas from other disciplines that deal with social issues that are addressed by public policy campaigns.

**Readings from Social Policy**

One premise that underlies this study is that the anti-drunk driving movement exists as a *movement*. To understand what I mean by *movement*, I borrow from literature about social policy, public policy campaigns, and community psychology to identify some of the characteristics of a movement. First, the anti-drunk driving movement can be characterized as an action-oriented mass communication campaign. By action-oriented mass communication campaigns I mean deliberately constructed public policy campaigns that specifically intend to change people’s actions, to encourage people to modify their behavior. Such public communications campaigns “are regarded as public service programs if their goals are widely supported by the public and policymakers” (Paisley 2000, 3) and “are public service oriented in the sense that the purpose is to benefit society” (Rice and Atkin, 2001, x).

The rhetoric of the anti-drunk driving movement provides numerous examples of multifaceted public policy/public communication campaigns. I specify here that the anti-drunk driving movement is multifaceted because no single group of stakeholders is now nor ever has been the sole source of the movement’s rhetorical efforts. In addition, many different audiences are targeted by various campaigns and for different purposes. People who drink—perhaps to excess—and then operate a motor vehicle are undeniably a huge
target community whose behavior the anti-drunk driving movement campaigns seek to modify through a variety of action-oriented mass communication campaigns. However, the movement constantly seeks to educate the public in order to bring new members to their organizations. A final purpose for these campaigns is to help the general public understand the enormous scope of the problem, both in terms of data about crashes, injuries, and fatalities, and also in terms of the stories of individuals, their families, and their friends that ripple outward through entire communities as one result of drunk driving crashes.

Alfred McAlister writes that action-oriented “campaigns combine community-based interpersonal communication with mass media messages” to alter behavior and says, “[a]n agreed upon effect of mass communication is ‘agenda-setting’” (2000, 379). Given this clear communicative purpose, McAlister then identifies “three main ways to use mass media,” all of which can be found in the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement: publicity, production, and co-production. Publicity features organizations and individuals finding ways to “be news,” and includes activities such as distributing press releases, asking for media advocacy in the form of editorial support, and encouraging media to feature certain individuals or efforts, with the goal of being treated in the media as “hard news.” Typically, publicity activities are free or arranged with minimal compensation.

Production means that stakeholders will “produce [their] own materials. Both radio and TV stations will broadcast public service spots on behalf of nonprofit organizations” (McAlister 2000, 385). In addition, when they have space available, magazines and newspapers will publish public service information. Other production items include “small items . . . leaflets, fliers, and posters” and multimedia items like audio- or video-cassettes that all benefit from “interpersonal transmission (handing it out directly) [to provide] an opportunity for engaging encouragement and reinforcement processes that directly influence behavioral and attitudinal change” (McAlister 2000, 386). McAlister also mentions newsletters that primarily are designed for stakeholder organization members but also can be useful when distributed to media outlets.

McAlister presents co-production as a third way of using the mass media. He says that co-production involves pooling the resources of two or more organizations that share a common goal or concern and that will benefit equally from the partnership. This is the most
effective strategy for generating high-budget communication . . . especially when the partner is a local television station or networker. This is possible if the issue or concern is perceived to be a benefit to the public at large. (2000, 388)

Remedying social problems associated with drinking has long been recognized to be in the interest of “the public at large,” and the anti-drunk driving movement has benefited from co-production relationships that have resulted in placement of messages supporting the movement in both documentaries and popular entertainment.

McAlister expresses a point that cannot be overemphasized: “Any single message can be expected only to produce a small, incremental effect” (2000, 392–393). However, such small, incremental effects have, in the past, been extraordinarily powerful. For example, in a discussion of public policy and community psychology, Deborah Phillips notes, community psychology shares its origins with the civil rights movement, the war on poverty and the community mental health movement. This is no accident. Prior responses to mental illness, poverty discrimination, crime, and other social ills were held up to public scrutiny and found lacking. The time was ripe for new perspectives and approaches to enduring problems. Social reform, rather than individual remediation, and empowerment, rather than treatment, provided the new lens through which prevailing issues were examined. (2000, 407–408)

The contemporary anti-drunk driving movement came to the fore in the social and cultural context that was, in part, resultant from the social reforms of the 1960s and early 1970s that Phillips refers to above. In “Public Communication Campaigns: The American Experience,” William J. Paisley points out that, Issues rise and fall on the national agenda according to external factors, such as crises, incidents, and the appearance of effective advocates on the national scene. Some issues are solved by actions or events; they drop off the national agenda until they become unsolved again. Many persisting issues are subject to issue fatigue; they leave the national agenda for a time and then return with new advocates or proposals. (2001, 17; my emphasis)

Similarly, Paisley introduces the idea of issue literacy: “The problem of ‘too many issues, too little time’ has led to a creative strategy to reclaim our attention. Many advocates now contend that their concern is not an issue but a literacy” and go on to list some of the different kinds of literacies “the public has been urged to attain” such as scientific,
technological, ethnic, legislative, environmental, legal, sexual, multicultural, ecological, and health literacies along with “many others, such as cultural literacy and computer literacy” (2001, 18).

To this list, I would add visual literacy; citizens of the post-modern world have of necessity become fluent in the grammar of visual codes to such an extent that, for many, those codes function as conventions. In *Shaping Information: The Rhetoric of Visual Conventions*, Charles Kostelnick and Michael Hassett write,

> Information design is infused with conventional codes—local and global, textual and nontextual—which are blended in any given document to satisfy the needs and expectations of readers. . . . as design artifacts, [conventions] are not inert, predestined, or accidental. Rather they are the visible utterances of living languages that constantly evolve. (2003, 17)

Anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders, who have demonstrated exceptional skill when it comes to taking advantage of the social nature of both verbal and visual conventions, have embraced and employed these conventions as they construct their discourse. Simply put, the movement both understands and has, over time, become adept at conveying messages that have shaped the face of public communication campaigns and furthered the common goal shared by all the movement stakeholders.

Without having understood, embraced, and used the literacies and social policy notions and all the social and cultural work those literacies represent, we would have a very different context within which to explore the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement.
Death in a Beer Mug
Visual Rhetoric in Anti-Drunk Driving Discourse

There are two kinds of perceptual thinking, . . . intuitive and intellectual cognition. Intuitive cognition takes place in a perceptual field of freely interacting forces. . . . This interaction of perceptual forces is a highly complex process, of which . . . very little reaches consciousness. . . .

But there is another procedure, namely, intellectual cognition. . . . [A]n observer, instead of absorbing the total image . . . intuitively, wishes to identify the various components and relations of which the work consists. . . .

The components of intuitive thought processes interact within a continuous field. Those of intellectual processes follow each other in a linear succession . . .

There is no necessary conflict, however, between intuitive and intellectual cognition. Rudolf Arnheim 1971, 233–235.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

The discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement abounds with visual rhetoric including pictures, icons, and images. Some of these images—the folded loop of red ribbon, for example—are associated with specific movement stakeholders (in this case, MADD), while others—such as a set of keys—have been appropriated by many movement stakeholders to accomplish specific, but possibly different, rhetorical purposes. Many artifacts that use these images have been carefully designed by professional teams that include graphic artists, writers, and subject matter experts. On the other hand, many anti-drunk driving movement artifacts have been prepared by stakeholders in the movement who have little or no formal training in rhetoric and probably even less experience with visual rhetoric. Nonetheless, virtually all anti-drunk driving artifacts can be subjected to an analysis of their visual rhetoric because many, if not most, of these pieces of discourse demonstrate the presence of, in Charles Kostelnick and David Roberts’s language, intra-textual, inter-textual, extra-textual, and supra-textual design elements in all three modes, the textual, spatial, and graphic modes.

I will not fully elaborate Kostelnick and Roberts’s taxonomy here except to say that the analysis of visual elements that follows will, for the most part, focus on inter-, extra-, and supra-textual design in the spatial and graphic modes. These elements of visual design address issues such as the justification and orientation of text; the shape, size, and orientation of a page; the placement of pictures; the use of pictorial images, with specific attention given to viewing angle and perspective; line weight and shading; treatment of borders; the color or texture of the paper; details on pictures; and the use of color (Visual Design 86 ff).
In the next section I present and briefly discuss design concepts that have a direct bearing on the analyses of the visual rhetoric of three representative artifacts that are the main focus of this chapter.

**Constructing New Associations**

Depending on a person's experiences and attitudes, visual depictions of beer mugs trigger different associations. For world travelers, beer mugs evoke images of pleasant company, a Bavarian maiden carrying many foaming mugs of beer to cheerful Oktoberfest patrons who sing and talk and laugh. Happy with life, celebrating a bountiful harvest, the red-cheeked drinkers keep the cheerful maiden busy delivering round after round of cold, refreshing lager.

For college students, beer mugs represent freedom, the freedom to be adults, to drink and socialize in good company, to enjoy the dances of courtship and the transformation from children to adults. In the fond memories of college graduates, beer mugs might trigger associations with good times spent with now life-long friends who walked through the rites of passage together and who find themselves at reunion tables scattered with beer mugs as they recreate those times.

These happy images are reinforced by the media. Drink this brand of beer and you'll be surrounded by bikini-clad nubile young women. Drink this foaming brew and you'll fit in with the crowd, you'll be liberated from feelings of insecurity or shyness, able to carry on scintillating conversation, tell the funniest jokes, and participate in witty repartee with other smart, interesting people. Beer mugs promise happy times, closeness with friends and family, relaxation and release from everyday cares.

These promises, however, are not borne out if you are a 34-year old male beer drinker with a BAC level of .16 who drives a car between 11pm and 4am on a weekend in Illinois, this is the profile of the typical DUI offender (*DUI Fact Book 4*). When these guys see a beer mug on a brochure or poster, they may associate the image not only with the positive images of good times and the promises of the media but also with flashing lights in the rear window, sobriety field tests, and breathalyzers.

To capitalize on both positive and negative memories, the anti-drunk driving movement has appropriated beer mugs as key visual images for use in a wide variety of artifacts, including "leaflets, fliers, and posters" (McAlister 2000, 386). By using images of beer mugs in their campaigns, the anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders not only build on the
variety of associations already triggered by beer mug images but also create new associations.

In *Visual Thinking: Methods for Making Images Memorable*, Henry Wolf argues that, "the creation of images is really an act of translation.... All design activity start[s] with the word.... Certain techniques... come into play when you transform words into imagery" (1988, 9). I submit that the images examined here represent the kinds of complex ideas that result from having been effectively translated and transformed in order to enhance their rhetorical power. The analyses of these artifacts specifically address the study’s third research question by considering the rationales for the many decisions whose traces are frozen in time, frozen as a gestalt image. The following analyses break these gestalt images, these visual confections, these graphic images, down, visual element by visual element to explore the message the artifacts’ designers created that convey specific messages.

Before I begin the analyses of these three artifacts, I want to introduce the idea that, when anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders select images—or words, for that matter—that might be considered “graphic” or that might cause us to recoil in discomfort, those stakeholders are walking a fine line. They employ the double entendre in “graphic.” They balance their graphic skills with graphic images, images that cause us to want to look away. This balancing act exists between that which is too hard—that which may be too painful to hold in a steady gaze—and that which may fail to arouse sufficient interest to even engage members of the target audience. In short, those who create artifacts with images like wrecked cars or skeletons are asking us not to look away; they are asking us instead to maintain our gaze, to beyond our discomfort and understand the context and the messages of the movement in a new way.

While a core image of a beer mug is common to each of the three artifacts, each image is more than a simple representation of a mug containing a beverage and each carries out a specific rhetorical function. Each image has been transformed by design techniques into “the combination of two or more images that have existed—separately—before, but now are combined to form a new entity with a new meaning, a visual intersection not foreseen” (Wolf 12). Wolf continues, “When a subject is combined with another subject in an unorthodox way, the more surprising is the transformation and the more successful the statement” (1988 14).
Another way to look at these transformations is to think in terms of Edward Tufte's visual confections. Tufte explains that "a confection is an assembly of many visual events, selected . . . then brought together and juxtaposed . . . confections illustrate an argument, present and enforce visual comparisons, combine the real and the imagined, and tell us yet another story" (Visual Explanations 121). According to Tufte's definition, then, these beer mugs, with their superimposed images are examples of visual confections. These confections present the visual argument that combining drinking and driving results in death, an argument that can be empirically supported and a story that is deeply ingrained in our collective cultural narrative. That this argument and its accompanying story can be captured in visual confections means that each of the constituents meets Tufte's criteria for effective elements for a visual confection. Tufte explains,

The limits of confections arise from thinness of content, flimsy logic, poverty of annotating text, and heavy-handed arrangement of structure . . . Confections stand or fall on how deeply they illuminate ideas and the relations among those ideas. At the heart of every intriguing confection, then, are intriguing concepts. (Visual Explanations 141)

The three artifacts considered below are examples of unorthodox combinations of images that combine to form visual confections. The visual aspects of these artifacts carry strong and effective messages. In the following sections I will describe the images on the covers of three different anti-drunk driving artifacts, first with attention to rhetorical and design features that are common to all three artifacts, and then consider the three representations as they appear in the separate artifacts. After describing and interpreting each artifact, I analyze the artifacts in terms of principles of visual rhetoric and offer concluding remarks.

"Describing and Interpreting Beer Mug Confections"

In each of the artifacts under consideration here, a beer mug not only figures prominently but also performs certain crucial rhetorical functions. Beyond the inclusion of a beer mug as a prominent visual element, each of the artifacts conforms to certain criteria based on how we think of these artifacts in terms of their genres. These three artifacts are representative of their generic categories, brochure, information booklet, and videotape cover.

Within a social and cultural context, readers easily recognize these generic categories and have certain rhetorical expectations of the discourse each represents. For example, we expect
that a brochure will have certain elements, such as an engaging cover and information relevant to that cover, and that the brochure will provide information about how to get more information from the agency or office that produced the brochure. Readers expect that brochures will be of a certain size and layout, both characteristics the *Facts About Illinois Drunk Driving Laws* brochure has. We also expect that a brochure will contain information we can use.

Our genre-based expectations for an informational booklet are, perhaps, less well formed because informational booklets are a somewhat less common rhetorical genre. Readers do, however, expect to find information displayed in a variety of manners, such as graphical representations like charts and tables as well as words set in recognizable patterns such as bulleted lists or chunked in accessible structures like short, coherent paragraphs. Readers similarly expect that the information inside the booklet will be linked to the promises made on the cover of the booklet. By this I mean that, if an informational booklet is titled *DUI Fact Book*, readers can reasonably expect to find information related to driving under the influence of alcohol covered in the text that is inside of the book. In the actual case of the *DUI Fact Book* with its visual representation of a crashed car superimposed on a beer mug, readers can expect to find information about car crashes resulting from alcohol intoxication.

Readers set their expectations based on the cover, which, in this case, provides information about who published the book ("Jesse White Secretary of State") and the title (the horizontal red stencil-like letters DUI on a black background over white all-capital letter, vertical FACT BOOK text, also on the black right flush background). These features prepare readers for the contents.

Like the cover of an informational brochure, videotape covers also suggest what the reader will encounter in the content of the enclosed videotape. Generally videotape covers use both visual and verbal strategies to provide information about the producers of the videotape, to give a general idea about the actual contents of the videotape, and, in some cases, to offer clues to the stance the videotape’s producers take on a particular theme or issue.

The videotape cover under analysis here differs from many videotapes in that it is not distributed through conventional commercial outlets like the ubiquitous corner video store. Instead, this video belongs to a genre that includes training videos, informational videos, and
other special purpose videos. This videotape genre is distributed privately and generally addresses a more targeted audience than a videotape of a movie, concert, process (such as an exercise instruction video), or documentary (for example, a travel information video) such as those distributed through videotape rental or purchase outlets. *Sex, Lies, and Profits: A Critical Look at the Advertising Practices of the Alcoholic Beverage Industry*, which was copyrighted in 1994, is a representative example of this kind of privately distributed videotape. The primary image on this cardboard videotape cover, like the covers of the *DUI Fact Book* and the brochure, *Facts About Illinois Drunk Driving Laws*, is a beer mug.

In the following sections, I examine the beer mug images on the covers of each of these artifacts. Because both the *DUI Fact Book* and *Facts About Illinois Drunk Driving Laws* were produced and distributed by the same office and because the same image of a crashed car superimposed over an image of a beer mug is on the covers of both artifacts, I first discuss rhetorical contexts specific to each of the two documents and then analyze the primary image of both of these artifacts together.

**Facts About Illinois Drunk Driving Laws**

This brochure, *Facts About Illinois Drunk Driving Laws*, carries an October 2000 date and was produced by the Illinois Secretary of State’s office while Jesse White was secretary of state. The cover of this 3.7" x 8.5" single fold informational brochure carries a 3.7" x 6.8" image of a beer mug with a crashed car superimposed in it. The size of the page is consistent with what people expect in terms of characteristics of brochures. This brochure was designed for distribution at fairs, as a handout at presentations given by the office’s staff and members of other organizations, and also is available by order from the secretary of state’s office (Belluschi 2001b). The cover of this brochure is shown on the next page in figure 4.

**DUI Fact Book**

This *DUI Fact Book* is the 2001 edition of a series produced annually by the Illinois Secretary of State’s office; a version of this fact book began to be published in the early 1980s. This edition carries a January 2001 publication date and presents 1999 data; 25,000 copies were printed. In general, the 1999 traffic fatality figures do not change greatly from year to year. Because the fact books are relatively expensive to prepare, they are distributed to the general public at no charge only upon request; they are distributed as a matter of course to state agencies, including the legislature and other agencies that deal with alcohol-
related issues, such as the state health department and law enforcement. These fact books are often requested by and widely used by drunk driving advocates, researchers, students, and the media. Prior to 2002, the fact book was only available as a printed document, but now, more recent fact books can be accessed on the Secretary of State's website, cyberdriveillinois.com, in .pdf form.

The 30-page booklet measures 6.4" x 8.5". The image of a beer mug takes up the left-hand side of the cover and measures 3.6" x 6.2". To the right of the panel with the image is a 1.7" x 8.5" black background within which the brochure title is printed. DUI is printed in red 0.88" stencil-type, all-capital letters on a horizontal alignment. Below these red letters FACT BOOK is printed in white 1.38" sans serif, all-capital letters on a vertical alignment and is shown on the next page as figure 6.

Figure 5. The cover of the Facts About Illinois Drunk Driving Laws brochure.
Figure 6. The cover of the Illinois Secretary of State's 2001 edition of the "DUI Fact Book."
Description of the primary cover image

The same image is used on the covers of both the DUI Fact Book (more details are shown in Appendix B) and “Facts About Illinois Drunk Driving Laws.” The images on both covers are the same height. The image on the cover of the DUI Fact Book is cropped on the left hand side; as a result, the image is slightly more narrow, which means that the white space to the left of the image is slightly reduced and the keys that appear to be resting against the bottom of the beer mug also are cropped to fit the different dimensions of the Fact Book as compared with the Facts brochure.

The image, which appears against a light gray background, consists of three major parts: a mug full of beer, a crashed car, and two car keys on a key ring. In the following sections, I interpret and evaluate each of these parts of the image. Then I discuss how the parts of the image are combined as a visual confection that conveys a new message.

The crashed car in the beer mug image

One person who viewed this image commented, “I know I see death and destruction inside the beer, but it still looks so good. I like beer, and that looks good to me.” The mug depicted on the covers of these documents is filled with beer, and not only with golden-colored liquid lager but also a head of foam that overflows the top of the mug. A bubbly foam head like this only lasts a few minutes after having been drawn into a glass or mug, so this image connects the reader with the notions of freshness and immediacy.

Drawing beer through a tap from a keg is an art form in which the proper amount of foam on top of the liquid beer reflects care borne from experience. Bartenders in more than 560,000 retail establishments tap literally billions of individual servings and pitchers full of beer every day. The care with which bartenders construct an ideal mug of beer with just the right amount of foam capping the top of the mug suggests both a sense of plenty and a sense of portion control.

The sense of plenty is evoked by the foam that overflows the bounds of the mug and slides down the smooth sides of the container. Sometimes, as in this image, the foam pools on the bar- or tabletop. This overflow, which leaves a bubbly trail over the image of the frosty beer inside the mug, must mean that the supply of beer is more than adequate, that the amount of beer spilled or wasted as foam that runs down the outside of the mug has been figured into the bottom line profitability of the establishment. The foam head on the top of
the mug reflects the generosity of the supply and assures the beer drinker that he can drink to his heart's content.

The translucent mug has been photographed in such a way that the visible parts of the handle almost appear to be metallic. Where the solid glass tubular handle joins the mug the handle thickens to form a solid connection. Between the points where the top and bottom handles connect with the mug, the glass wall is wedge-shaped, showing both the cylindrical outer dimension of the mug, as well as the concave inner surface, which slopes gradually from the thin rim at the top to the thicker bottom of the mug. The gradual thickening of the glass from the top of the mug to the bottom combines with the heavy glass bottom of the mug to convey the illusion that the mug may be bigger than it looks. That the mug holds more liquid than it actually does is one assumption linked to this illusion, an assumption that may not be accurate.

In these images, the wedge-shaped glass is represented in a shiny almost metallic silver color. Even though we know the mug is made of glass, the metallic hue suggests technology at work. The fact that the vertical part of the handle is not depicted suggests both that the handle is "out there" somewhere ready to be grabbed and that a solid, metallic handle brings technology into the image, technology that is further exemplified by the rust-colored image of the crashed car that is in the liquid lager.

The fact that no human hand is visible holding the mug suggests at least two ideas. First, the part of the handle that a hand would hold is cut off at the edge of the page, which automatically means that this beer cannot be picked up and consumed. Second, the lack of a useable handle suggests that the beer drinker would be best off with a "hands off" attitude with regard to the combination of drinking beer and driving.

The glass in the base mugs such as the one depicted here is not solid. Instead, the glass thickens immediately below the cavity that holds the liquid, which is a concave shape more narrow at the bottom than at the top. In these images, this solid glass of the base spans the width of the mug and is .875" (at the far right-hand side of the mug) narrowing horizontally to .375" where the handle joins the body of the mug. This base glass is transparent except where foam covers it. The visual effect created by the concave base of the mug, especially when that effect is combined with the thick wall of the mug, is an illusion that the mug holds more than it actually does.
The metallic cast of the handle continues in the bottom-most glass of the mug, where the bottom rim takes on a steel-like color with several lighter areas. One of the characteristics of this sort of mug is a concavity that causes these mugs to leave their telltale rings on tables and bar tops.

In these images, the concavity is the same dark metallic hue of the bottom surfaces of the handles. Because light reflects off of the top of this concavity, we see an oval reflection of the beer in the mug. This reflection is not, however, a simple mirror of the golden-yellow lager. Instead, the image is comprised of a series of circular and oval shapes in hues that include (from the top of the concavity) steely gray; the color of the clear glass; the same yellowish hue of the liquid; a more brown-toned hue; a bright white; a thicker dark gray with several lighter gray spots (.63" on the left near the keys sloping generally to a height of .38" near the right-hand edge of the concavity then increasing in height to .63" under the handle).

I mention these hues and their arrangement because, while taken separately, they constitute simply a photographic image of the bottom of a mug. However, when taken in as a gestalt, these elements combine in a most interesting manner: this bottom-of-the-mug appears to be a coffin-like shape (formed by the darker gray tones) with a shape roughly resembling a body (the brown-toned hue ringed by the yellow and bright white hues). In addition to the overt reference to death and chaos made by the crashed car superimposed on the liquid in the mug, this coffin-like shape with its suggestion of a body further gives the impression of covert doom within the beer mug.

The hue of the liquid beer visible in the mug differs between the two documents. The beer in the mug on the cover of the *DUI Fact Book* is more yellow than the beer on the *Facts About Illinois Drunk Driving Laws* brochure, which has a more brownish cast. This overall more brownish cast also makes the car on the brochure appear to be more rust colored.

While the foam on top of the beer as well as the foam that runs down the side of the mug is textured with tiny carbonation bubbles, the beer itself is oddly devoid of carbonation bubbles. I suspect that the original image of a freshly drawn mug of beer has been altered to form a uniformly colored background over which a crashed car is superimposed. The mug, too, is devoid of the condensate you might expect to see on a cold mug of beer. Again, I suspect this detail has been removed in order to emphasize the crashed car image, which is the focal point of each image. The car is the focal point because it is superimposed on the liquid beer.
in a manner that is contrary to our ordinary associations with and expectations for an image of a mug full of beer.

In these mugs, the crashed car appears to be submerged in the liquid beer, literally driven into the drink. Obviously the image of the car has been scaled down to fit in the space where the beer is in the mug. The different scales of the images further heighten the emphasis on the crashed car.

The crashed car itself appears to be a late model, four-door sedan which obviously has been involved in a crash. Notably, the car isn’t a recognizable make or model, but it clearly isn’t a muscle car—a Corvette, Camaro, or 280Z—nor is it an SUV, a soccer-mom mini-van, or a pickup truck. Instead, the car in the image is typical of a middle-class, working family all-purpose vehicle, the kind that might contain a car seat in the back or a U-haul rack on the top for a vacation. In fact, the four-door sedan represented in the image is consistent with the kind of car a typical DUI offender might drive: at 31, he may have a young family and he may own a utilitarian car like this that he drives to work, on errands, and to the bar. After a night at the bar, this is the kind of car that might end up crashed on the road, with its contents flung to the verge by the force of the crash and its once reliable frame crushed beyond repair.

The hood of this car has been crumpled by the force of the crash and appears to have been pushed back into the passenger compartment on the passenger side of the car. The driver’s side front tire is deflated and sits at an odd angle almost under where the driver’s seat would normally be. From the angle of this image, the crumpled front bumper is barely visible. The driver’s side door apparently has been forcefully removed from the car and the roof is raised in an unnatural arc that is characteristic of a powered tool like the Jaws of Life having been used to extricate the injured driver and, possibly passengers. The rear driver’s side door is wide open at an unnatural angle giving the impression that an injured passenger or passengers were removed from the car. The open door reveals debris and several darkened areas that possibly could be blood.

Even though the brunt of the force of the crash appears to have been borne by the driver’s side front of the car, the rim of the driver’s side rear tire is broken and the gas cap door is open, which reinforces the devastating effects of the crash.

The crashed car rests front-bumper down on the left-hand side of the bottom of the beer at an angle up and to the left where the rear bumper abuts the top part of the mug handle.
This downward orientation is suggestive of several notions. First, we typically equate down to mean bad, which, in this image, reinforces the negative consequences of the combination of beer, cars, and crashes. Second, the angle suggests death resulting not just from the crash but also from the involuntary sunken position of the car in the liquid beer. Third, despite its careful positioning by the artists who constructed the superimposed image, the very appearance of the car in the beer suggests loss of control. In addition, the size of the car compared to the size of the mug suggests the power of alcohol over the raw power of a vehicle weighing half a ton. The image suggests that the power of alcohol triumphs over the power of automotive technology.

Finally, there are no people in the image, which suggests the spectrum of human vulnerability ranging from the ultimate withdrawal by death or injury on one end to the loss of a car as a valuable resource to the loss of driving privileges on the other end. Ultimately, these suggestive notions combine to dramatically convey the consequences inherent in the combination of drinking beer and driving.

The final element of the image consists of two keys on a ring that rest against the lower left-hand side of the beer mug. The keys appear to be ignition and door keys for a Ford vehicle. These two are the only keys on the ring, which suggests, perhaps, the loss of a home. The placement of the keys outside the mug, away from the car suggests loss of access to the car, whose wreck is alcohol-saturated. The remote positioning of the keys also suggests both the loss of driving privileges and the message that using car keys should be done outside of the influence of alcohol.

**Sex, Lies and Profits: A Critical Look at the Advertising Practices of the Alcoholic Beverage Industry**

The video tape, *Sex, Lies and Profits*, was produced in 1994 by the Manocherian Foundation, Inc. Although many video tapes are distributed in plastic covers, this video was distributed in a paper sleeve, shown on the next page as figure 7. The video tape sleeve is constructed of a heavy paper with glossy, four-color printing on all sides. The sides of the cover both are a dark green with white text arranged vertically from the top, closed end of the sleeve. The entire name of the video is printed in white type. The main title of the video is in the same serif font each of the three times it appears on the cover. The subtitle of the
Figure 7. Sex, Lies, and Profits video sleeve cover.
video tape sleeve in white, lower-case sans serif type. This assumes that a person who picks up the tape is willing to read more than just the front of the video sleeve in order to go video, *A Critical Look at the Advertising Practices of the Alcoholic Beverage Industry*, appears only on the sides of the beyond the catchy title with its reference to the popular movie, *Sex, Lies, and Videotape* to learn more about the video's content. The subtitle type is .13" high, while the main title text on the sides of the sleeve is .25" high. Both sides also contain the text “Running Time: Approximately 17 minutes,” which is in small title-capitalized white, sans serif type. All of the text on the sides of the sleeve is centered horizontally within the 1" x 7.25" green background (both the front and back of the sleeve are shown in Appendix B).

The back and front covers of the video tape sleeve both have a variegated gray background that bleeds from dark gray at the top to a lighter gray at the bottom. The same beer mug image is on both the front and back covers of the tape sleeve. This full beer mug measures roughly 5.8" x 7.1" and on both the front and back of the video sleeve bleeds off the bottom and right side edges.

As you look at the back and front covers, the beer mug handle is on your right side, which, like the Illinois Secretary of State's documents (which for simplicity I will refer to after this as the *Illinois documents*), shows the image that a right-handed person drinking that mug of beer might most commonly see.

Like the images of the mug on the covers of the Illinois documents, the handle of this mug has been cropped, leaving visible only the top and bottom parts of the handle where it attaches to the mug itself. And, like the images described earlier, the images of the beer mugs on this video tape cover are superimposed by other images. The beer mug on the back cover has two superimposed green ovals with white text on the green background. The top oval is higher than it is wide and the top edge of the oval begins at the line between the foam and the liquid beer. This oval contains a précis of the video's contents. The four-sentence précis invites viewers to question the relationship between what the U. S. government spends on illegal drug interdiction and what the alcohol beverage industry, whose product is the legal drug alcohol, spends on advertising.

The front cover of the *Sex, Lies and Profits* video is almost entirely covered by the image of a beer mug that bleeds off of the bottom of the cover and reaches to within .25" of the top of the sleeve. The beer mug is superimposed by both a skeleton and the video's title. The
skeleton is superimposed over the mug of beer and the title is then superimposed over the skeleton.

Skeletons are typically associated with death. The black line drawing of the skeleton in this image is shown in a standing position with the right foot and leg slightly forward of the straight left leg. By the position of the legs and feet, which are within the base of the mug, the skeleton almost appears to be in mid-stride. The skeleton body, legs, and arms are within the gold-hued area of the beer in the mug, with the exception of the outstretched left hand which extends over the glass side of the mug between the two visible parts of the mug’s handle. The placement of the skeleton image with the left hand extending outside the area of the beer in the mug most likely is related to the designer’s desire to establish a balanced proportional relationship between the alcohol in the mug and the severe consequences associated with consuming alcohol. Further, the designer apparently wanted the skeleton, which is the focal point of the image, to fill most of the vertical space of the beer in the background. The designer chose this particular skeleton drawing even though the skeleton’s left hand would have to extend out of the liquid background and appear on the glassy surface of the mug.

The skeleton’s right hand, which is within the beer, rests at the side of and slightly in front of the right femur, a posture that seems consistent with a mid-stride stance. The left hand is slightly extended from the shoulder with the palm facing the viewer in a gesture that seems to suggest that the skeleton is offering something or holding something out for viewing. Given this suggestion of motion, the left hand could be preparing to strike something to the skeleton’s right, which is the direction of the gaze, with an open hand.

The skeleton head, which is entirely within the foam—perhaps creating a visual double entendre with head of foam—is turned slightly to the right and down, which provides a view of the back of the skull. The blackened eyes appear to be directed downward toward the capital L in the word lies in the video title. This orientation is perhaps less threatening than a full-frontal view of the death mask with only the outline of the skeleton’s face showing. It is also possible that the indirect gaze reflects the skeleton’s movement.

Compared with the Illinois documents, all the visual elements of the cover of the video tape, including the background and the beer mug image, are generally darker. This darkness lends an almost sinister air to the image.
For example, the foam, instead of being white, has a much more gray cast to it. Instead of inviting viewers to enjoy a refreshing beverage, the beer in this image—especially with its superimposed skeleton—suggests a repellant concoction. Each of the elements of the mug and the beer are shrouded by an overall darkness consistent with the notion of lies indicated in the second word of the video's title.

To combat the darkness and maximize the effect of the image, it appears that elements of the image have been modified. For example, the contrast between the top edge of the foam and the dark gray background appears to have been enhanced with an almost luminous thin red tint. It almost appears that the entire image has been overlaid with a gray screen to provide more figure ground contrast for the white letters of the video title. In addition to the darkened background, the small white letters have a thin shadow in the same color green used on the sides and the back of the sleeve that serves to enhance the figure/ground contrast between the letters and the background and lend sharpness to the image.

The full mug of beer that dominates the front cover is topped by a head of foam that extends above the rim of the mug. The foam is 2" high measured from the top of the liquid beer. Unlike the images on the Illinois documents, the visible difference between the glass of the mug and the foam is less clear. Only on the far left-hand side of the top of the mug is there any clear indication of the location of the top of the mug. Instead of seeing the clear glass of the rim, we can distinguish between the mug and the foam only by noticing a small dip in the foam that leaves the impression of the top rim of the mug.

Further, the edges of foam that overflow the top of the mug are not consistent with the organic lines of a flow of foam but instead are sharply demarked as though the foam has been wiped clean from the front of the mug. Like the Illinois documents, the foam on this mug also spills over the rim and runs down the side of the mug. In this image, however, the foam that spills over the side only runs down the mug to near the middle of the top portion of the handle.

The fact that the foam does not flow down the front of the mug when combined with the harder geometric lines of the foam edges further suggests human intervention, likely in the form of manipulating the image with a computer graphics program. Apparently the image of the skeleton was superimposed not as an independent image. Instead the skeleton image is surrounded by a transparent background measuring approximately 6" x 3". The transparent
background surrounding and including the skeleton creates a slice effect. Most of the beer in the mug lies within this area. Where the Illinois documents were devoid of carbonation bubbles, this beer has a cluster of bubbles. These bubbles are not arranged throughout the liquid beer, but instead are clustered in the top half of the liquid and form a background for the skeleton's torso.

In addition to the geometric lines of the edges of the foam, the front of the mug appears to have been sliced away during the construction of this image when the skeleton on its transparent background was placed over the image of the mug of beer. This slicing effect serves to place the superimposed skeleton "in" the beer by reducing the distance between the back of the mug and the drawing of the skeleton. The effect of this placement means that instead of appearing rounded in the manner of a typical beer mug, this mug appears flattened. This flattening results in a very distinct vertical line on the left-hand side of the mug that extends from the bottom of the mug up to near the rim of the mug. If the mug weren't electronically sliced and mechanically flattened, the skeleton would appear to be "on" the mug instead of appearing to be "in" the mug. While this computer modification of the image could be explained away as part of the process necessary to produce the desired cover image, the modification also suggests the consequences of the interaction between people and beer.

The appearance of the base of the mug also has been affected by the superimposition of the skeleton and its background. In fact, the slice effect is most clearly visible in the base of the mug. The once rounded edge of the front of the mug bleeds off the bottom of the cover, thus truncating the glass and rendering it flat and in line with the geometric line of the bottom of the image. The skeleton's feet and its right ankle rest in the area of the mug's thick (from .75" on both sides to 1.125" in the front) base. Like the mug base in the Illinois documents, this mug base also has several hues of gray and gold that create a three-dimensional impression and add depth and verisimilitude to the image. In fact, it is the mug base that gives the impression that the mug is rounded. In addition, the gold tones at the bottom of the base provide the appropriate visual information that the mug is, indeed, full of beer.

Like the Illinois documents, with a coffin shape image at the base, the tones in the base of this mug, too, form shapes. The most prominent shape is an eye that is created by a series of lines in shades including light gold, darker gold, light gray, and darker gray. Looking from the outside of the eye shape to the inside, the golden ovoid shape eye shape is markedly more
narrow on the viewers left. In fact, the shape comes a point, suggesting the outside corner of an eye. The next ring of color is a darker gold with a triangular area of lighter gold where the white of an eye would be. The oval iris ring of the eye is a lighter gray surrounded by a ring of very dark gray. The pupil appears as a vertical dark gray slit, suggestive of a predator’s sharp focus. Indeed, this eye appears to focus directly on the viewer where the skeleton’s gaze is averted. This eye isn’t an open, inviting eye but instead is a dark, sharply focused eye, a predator’s eye that suggests danger and death.

**Analyzing Danger and Death in Beer Mugs**

In this section, I tie descriptions and interpretations of elements of the three artifacts with principles of visual rhetoric. Among those who provide theoretical underpinnings for this analysis are Charles Kostelnick and David Roberts (*Visual Language* 2000) whose visual language taxonomy I discussed earlier. Notions put forth by Edward Tufte (*Visual Explanations* 1997; *Envisioning* 1990; *Visual Display* 1983), Karen Schriever (*Dynamics* 1997), and William Winn (*Color* 1991) also figure prominently in this analysis.

Danger and death. Each of the images described above—the covers of the *DUI Fact Book*, the *Facts About Illinois Drunk Driving Laws* brochure, and the sleeve of the video *Sex, Lies and Profits*—portrays aspects of danger and death associated with alcohol embodied in the beer in the mugs. The designers and artists—whether trained design professionals or stakeholders with little or no formal training in visual rhetoric—who created these visual images relied on associations between images of mugs of beer and the pleasure beer can bring to a drinker to first attract readers’ attention. This association accounts for what Belluschi refers to when she says, “We believe that people who drink and drive would be more likely to pick up and read a brochure with beer on the cover than a brochure with a picture of a state trooper or a car crash” (2001b).

The images on the fronts of each of these artifacts suggest the content of each artifact and prepare readers for the content by taking advantage of the readers’ preexisting associations with the mugs of beer. These uses of beer mugs break the typical association of beer mugs with pleasure and replace that common association with an association between beer and the tragic consequences of crashes that result from the criminal behavior of drinking and driving with a BAC of .08 or more. By triggering readers’ initial expectations with these visual elements and then incorporating text that articulates the specific content, the artifacts lure the
readers inside in order to employ further rhetorical strategies that, taken together, achieve the writers’ and designers’ rhetorical purpose(s) for the artifact.

Close examination and analysis of the images on these mugs of beer full of skeletons and crashed cars leave viewers with strong associations with danger and death. The visual impact of these images is undeniable: the reader immediately realizes the seriousness of driving and drinking that is conveyed by these images. Then, when the images are linked to text designed to inform the viewer about the contents under the covers, danger and death are linked to concepts like DUI facts and figures, information about DUI laws, and arguments about the alcoholic beverage industry.

Although a visual representation of a mug of beer cannot alone convey the complex and grave information usually associated with both verbal and visual texts created by stakeholders in the anti-drunk driving movement, certain principles of visual rhetoric suggest the power that the image brings to a reader’s understanding of the whole text. By whole text I mean the complex working together of all the elements of the artifact—visual and textual; overt and covert; intentional and unintended; contextual and isolated. Various researchers and theorists have examined these elements and suggest ways that our understandings can go beyond close examination, description, and initial interpretation to look more deeply, to systematically analyze in order to assess what makes a text work as it does.

In addition to the taxonomy Kostelnick and Roberts present, they discuss how readers’ “prior knowledge and experience and completing the task at hand” is complemented by the role of perceptual principles, specifically Gestalt principles, borrowed from cognitive psychology: “The term Gestalt itself means ‘form.’ . . . our perception of a form depends on its juxtaposition with other forms within a visual field. . . . the whole form plays an essential role in understanding its parts” (1998, 53). They assert “our perception of a given image depends on the visual field in which the image appears” and further discuss two Gestalt principles, figure-ground contrast and grouping (1998, 53).

When we look at the three artifacts under analysis here through the lens of these Gestalt principles, the striking power of grouping—in these instances created by the superimposition of the crashed car and skeleton over a mug of beer—leaps to the fore. When a beer mug is presented as a visual field upon which a crashed car or a skeleton is juxtaposed, readers are
challenged to expand their previous associations with both images of beer mugs and images of crashed cars and skeletons—the figures and the ground—and to form new associations.

These new associations could be experienced as shock at the vividness of the connection between drinking and violence and death. The new association could spark curiosity about the information represented by the superimposed image, the information on the subsequent pages of the brochure or booklet, or the content of the video in the sleeve. The writers and sponsors of these artifacts count on the new association and the curiosity it sparks to persuade people to pick up the artifact and access the information it contains.

I suggest that the artifacts examined here are effective visual confections because they conform to Tuftes’s list of effective elements for visual confections. Each artifact reflects rich content, an inherent logic that allows readers to connect the superimposed images and to associate the newly created images with information about the perils of drunk driving. Each artifact has sufficient accompanying text that complements the representational images and that is arranged in such a manner as to both enhance and be supported by the visual images. For example, the video sleeve has three visual elements juxtaposed as one figure on a single ground. One of the elements is the title of the video, and that title is logically tied with the beer mug and the skeleton over which it rests.

This arrangement creates an effective visual confection and demonstrates what Karen Schriver discusses as “[enabling] readers to construct a consistent story about the content through the design and integration of prose and graphics” (1997, 441). In the chapter “The Interplay of Words and Pictures” in Dynamics of Document Design, Schriver asserts, we must consider how people read—a complex knowledge-driven and text-driven process. By knowledge-driven, I mean what the reader brings to bear during interpretation—knowledge, experience, feelings, social awareness, and culture. By text-driven, I suggest the reader’s interaction with visual or verbal signs. (1997, 366–367; emphasis in original)

The writers and designers of the artifacts considered here have created texts that capitalize on both the knowledge-driven and text-driven aspects of the reading process. The writers chose images, especially the beer mug and the skeleton, from the visual vernacular of most late-twentieth-century North Americans. By visual vernacular I mean images that are common in the culture, images for which people already have, in Schriver’s words,
"knowledge, experience, feelings, social awareness, and culture" (367). I further suggest that apprehending the visual vernacular is what William Winn describes as a preattentive process, where "preattentive processes operate rapidly, automatically, in parallel, and with little demand on cognitive resources. . . . the most important characteristic of preattentive processes is that they are influenced primarily by the environment . . . at the early stages of perception" (1991, 180). The messengers of the anti-drunk driving movement, then, rely on readers' preattentive responses to create new groupings from this visual vernacular that build new and dramatic associations. The writers' choices of figure-ground contrast and juxtapositions of a crashed car or a skeleton—death in a mug—require readers to interact with these once common vernacular images in new ways.

In a discussion of the ways in which people read and understand images, Schriver refers to research by Larkin and Simon (1987) who show that the sequence in which people read a prose text or graphic makes a difference in how quickly they can form a representation of the content and what kinds of representation they form. . . . Compared to prose, most graphics place many fewer constraints on how people read them, allowing knowledgeable searchers to go straight to the content they want or need. (1997, 372)

I suggest that the visual confections examined here take advantage of Larkin and Simon's claim that people quickly understand visual representations in ways that are more memorable and effective than if the same ideas had been presented through strictly textual means.

The visual images found on these artifacts may have been chosen with a particular audience in mind—potential drinking drivers who, as we have seen, are likely to be mid-thirties male beer drinkers or their associates—with an ultimate rhetorical purpose of changing behavior and, thereby, reducing alcohol-related traffic fatalities and injuries. This strong effect created by these visual confections is greater than the effect of the individual constituents available in our visual vernacular.

This strong effect manifests when readers encounter and are forced to interact with the ideas represented in the visual confections: danger and death, both very dramatic notions. As Deborah Phillips notes in a discussion of the process of public policy, "every policy is part information, part ideology, and part drama" (2000, 401). The creators of these visual confections count on the drama created by the visual confections to draw readers into the
texts in order to present information that movement stakeholders want to use to influence the ideology and cultural processes surrounding the anti-drunk driving movement. Counting on this kind of drama is a rhetorical strategy that the movement stakeholders use not only in these artifacts but also in materials that include other strong confections that also carry the danger and death message.

By creating visual confections that carry such a strong dramatic message of danger and death, the creators of these artifacts take advantage of how readers interpret texts. Schriver comments, “interpretation typically happens so fast that readers are unaware of the complex processes that are involved. Readers may become aware of these processes only when something goes wrong” (369).

One way we can see the result of the process “going wrong” is by considering the video cover for *Sex, Lies and Profits*. The movie, *Sex, Lies and Videotape* was released in 1989 and it seems likely that the Manacherian Foundation sought to borrow identity and audience recognition from that movie title. However, this identity and audience recognition extends only as far as the title and does not extend to duplication of the visual elements on the cover of a *Sex, Lies and Videotape* video. Despite this borrowed identity, the *Sex, Lies and Profits* video cover nonetheless depends on the readers’ interpretation “going wrong”—the close replication of the name of a popular movie appears in an unexpected combination with the image of the beer mug and skeleton. By drawing on the audience’s familiarity with the movie title and by creating a brand new visual confection, the creators of this video cover succeed in establishing a new association for the audience, a visual association that effectively carries the message of the anti-drunk driving movement.

In the following chapter, I take up verbal texts and discuss how they, too, carry the movement’s messages.
Reading the Anti-Drunk Driving Movement: The Power of Words

Public opinion is a million times more powerful than all the laws and the army.
Leo Tolstoi, “On the Relation between the Sexes.”
Quoted in Thoughts from Tolstoi, 48.

As I have mentioned before, in our first conversation, Marti Belluschi explained to me the distinction between an accident and a crash. Belluschi wrote of her 1964 experience as a victim of a drunk driver, “while everyone knew that Arthur was at fault, they still believed this was just a terrible ‘ACCIDENT.’ They felt that, unfortunately, Dad and I were just in the wrong place at the wrong time. . . . AAIM’s efforts have convinced the world that my father and I were in a terrible CRASH, not an unfortunate accident, and that we were victims of a CRIME, not of fate” (2001, 68). In these three sentences Belluschi highlights one of the shifts in North American English vernacular that resulted from the efforts of the anti-drunk driving movement. In this chapter, I examine verbal artifacts from the discourse of the movement.

As I have discussed elsewhere, both verbal and visual texts constitute the work of the anti-drunk driving movement, work that I argue is largely rhetorical. Further, I argue that this work has contributed to shifts in both public opinion and individual behavior with regard to drinking and driving. In this chapter, because in so many instances, the visual and the verbal are tightly woven together, I also will briefly discuss some visual features, especially those that draw attention or add a new dimension to the verbal texts I consider here.

Because it would be beyond the scope of this project to include a sample artifact of every genre and from every class of anti-drunk driving stakeholder, I analyze here a representative sample of the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement. However, before I move to these analyses, I want to discuss some features of the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement that can be viewed over time, that cross genre boundaries, that are employed by virtually all of the movement’s stakeholders, and that perform a variety of rhetorical work for a variety of target audiences.
The Movement's Discourse and Its Features

For the most part, the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement is not spontaneous but instead is carefully constructed and exists more or less in the public domain and is available for researchers and scholars to analyze. This public discourse includes press releases, informational brochures and booklets, research reports, websites, books, and multimedia items like cassette tapes, CDs, and videotapes. In fact, most of the artifacts I discuss in this chapter have been constructed with care. This care encompasses discourse producers' attention to genre, purpose, audience, discourse conventions, and “fit” within an already established social movement campaign or organizational agenda.

This discourse may have been limited or shaped by other constraints such as available resources (e.g., funding and other organizational support) and the skills and abilities of the discourse producers. Despite these constraints, anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders draw from a wealth of experience and strategies that have been shown to work in the past. Even while the movement has stayed with some tried and true discourse strategies, the movement also has kept up with emerging trends as well as technological developments, such as web pages, electronic newsletters, and sophisticated ad campaigns. And, perhaps of more importance, movement stakeholders have, over time, packaged the movement’s messages in ways that effectively carry out rhetorical work.

The features I discuss here are by no means all the features of this incredibly rich body of work that could be called out and discussed. Although I discuss some of these other features all throughout this document, I want to focus attention on these features: gendered language, slogans, figurative language, and stories.

Gendered language

For the most part, the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement’s discourse almost always conforms to what might be thought of as politically correct, gender-neutral language, such as drivers, motorists, or persons. And most times, no one driver or motorist is singled out, which leads to the use of plural pronouns. However, when a singular pronoun is used, however, it is almost always a “him,” especially in the early literature.

In the discourse from the forerunners of the contemporary movement (such as NSC articles from the 1930s and 1950s that I discuss below) the illustrations paint a quaint picture of the happy, bumbling drunk, a happy guy (unless you count the photo of the guy holding
his head in his hands as he sits on a cot in a cell). And the overall representation of gender in these artifacts goes beyond the illustrations: the language, too, focuses almost exclusively on men. At this time, people were to assume that these masculine pronouns included women. Certainly in the 1950s more men than women drove, so it follows that most of the drunk drivers would be men. The technical language in this early discourse does include more gender-neutral language (speaking of violators and defendants), but masculine pronouns are used almost exclusively. Women are included by virtue of being subsumed into the masculine pronoun. Over time, the vernacular has shifted toward more gender-inclusive language. For example, we get the mail from our letter carrier, fires are put out by fire fighters, and servers bring us food and drink. However, the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement remains predominately male oriented.

In many ways, though, that masculine presence is realistic: still today the vast majority of DUI offenders are men. According to the 2001 *DUI Fact Book*, "85% of those arrested [for DUI] are men" (*DUI Fact Book*). And, when it comes to recidivist DUI offenders, Madeleine Doubek reports that, "[m]en tend to be the chronic offenders. Of those with five or more convictions, 92 percent were male" (Doubek 2000a, 6). While these reports are based on Illinois data, the proportions are the same nationwide (Belluschi 2004).

Naturally, I cannot claim to have conducted an exhaustive search of all the movement’s discourse. However, the image of a woman that appears on the cover of *Saturation Patrols Targeting Impaired Driving: Guidelines for Community-Based Alcohol Enforcement Programs* (1993), which shows a woman standing between two troopers (the female trooper is behind the woman) in front of a state trooper’s vehicle with the light bar ablaze, is memorable by its infrequency. Set against a dark background that suggests the night, this scene has the male trooper (here an African-American) holding a white stick, apparently administering a Horizontal Gaze Nystagmus test (one of several Standard Field Sobriety Tests including walk-and-turn and one leg stand as well as the breath test) to the woman (Voas et al. 2000, 18). Unlike the other elements in this image, the central figure, the woman, whose dark hair is haloed by a red reflection from the troopers’ light bar, is dressed all in white, including her shoes (A reproduction of this image is in Appendix B).

While women are not typical DUI offenders, many of the narratives that memorialize drunk driving crash victims and narratives by drunk driving crash survivors are written by
women. And, as I have mentioned elsewhere, many of the movement’s founders and its current spokespersons are women. Unfortunately, exploring these interesting representations of gender in greater detail here would divert the study from its objectives, so I direct our focus now to slogans.

**Slogans**

As we examine patterns in the discourse of a movement that has characteristics of a social issue-oriented public communication campaign, we can chart the ways carefully chosen and arranged words have propelled the movement and provided the energy to change public opinion, laws, and behavior. In fact, slogans are one genre that the movement has adopted and honed as part of its successful drunk driving prevention efforts. In general, slogans have a long history in terms of motivating people for a wide variety of rhetorical purposes. Slogans rally people around an idea: “Vive la France!” “Remember the Alamo!” They articulate how people are to behave: “Loose lips sink ships!” “Uncle Sam wants You!” “Hasten the homecoming: Buy Victory bonds.” Slogans accompany sea changes in public attitudes: “Give me liberty or give me death!” “1, 2, 3, 4, we don’t want your bleepin’ war!” “Make Love, Not War!” Slogans build support and generate enthusiasm for political campaigns: “A chicken in every pot, a car in every garage.” “I like Ike.” “In your heart you know he’s right.” Similarly, Madison Avenue recognizes the power of slogans: “This Bud’s for you.” “I’d like to buy the world a Coke.”

Almost from the beginning of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement, stakeholders recognized the power of slogans and adopted slogans that served each of the movement’s various purposes. Some of the movement’s slogans include: “Friends don’t let friends drive drunk.” “Arrive alive: Don’t drink and drive.” and “Tie one on for safety.”

These slogans are widely used in a variety of genres including press releases, radio spots, television ads, newspaper stories and ads, reports of research, and brochures and other materials prepared and distributed by movement stakeholders. Movement slogans rally people around the idea that drunk driving issues are important; articulate how people are to behave, especially in terms of drinking and driving; reflect sea changes in public attitudes, such as growing public support for more stringent enforcement of DUI offender penalties; and build support and generate enthusiasm for political action, such as contacting lawmakers to encourage support of legislation like the .08 BAC law. Many of the slogans use figurative
language, another rhetorical feature found in many other examples of anti-drunk driving movement discourse.

**Figurative language**

In some cases, successful artifacts from within the movement’s discourse rely on figurative language such as metaphors and analogies. Stakeholders in the anti-drunk driving movement use metaphors and analogies like these: “War on Drunk Driving,” “losing loved ones,” “blood border,” “slap on the wrist,” “slaughter on the streets,” and “grassroots movement.” Many movement stakeholders pride themselves on being part of a “grassroots’ citizens’ movement,” a metaphor that the movement has exploited to suit its various rhetorical purposes.

Grassroots is defined as “basic, fundamental,” “being, originating, or operating in or at the grass roots,” and “not adapted from or added to an existing facility or operation: totally new” (*Merriam Webster Collegiate Dictionary*, 11th ed. 546). Conceiving of and perpetuating the notion that the anti-drunk driving movement as a grassroots movement creates a schema that has served the movement well. This schema suggests that the movement is a new awakening—“like the mythical desert bird that rose from its ashes... a phoenix that emerged from tragedy”—of the people and by the people, consistent with the USA’s popular democratic ideals (Really MADD 1). Early in the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement, MADD and RID’s founders and other early movement stakeholders avoided affiliating with other causes or aligning with other political issues to retain their image as a grassroots movement. The benefits of being perceived as a grassroots movement included being perceived as populist and rejecting elitism and avoiding the political and cultural baggage associated with the ivory tower of academia, the detachment of the science lab, and the dogma of the pulpit. The nascent contemporary anti-drunk driving movement prized its image of the movement and first sought, and then won, broad support of individual citizens. This independent, grassroots status also freed the movement from the snarls of political affiliation that beset other social movements like the abolition of slavery, women’s suffrage, the civil rights movement, and peace initiatives. The drunk driving prevention movement did, however, adopt some of the successful tactics and rhetorical strategies from these other social movements. One idea that the movement not only adopted but has
employed with great success is the idea that telling the stories of people whose lives were affected by the issues that are central to the movement.

**Stories**

MADD was the first anti-drunk driving organization to capture the nation’s attention with its heart-string tugging stories about founder Candy Lightner’s daughter and “five-and-a-half-month-old Laura Lamb . . . one of the world’s youngest quadriplegics” as the result of a drunk driving crash. With early media coverage and, within three years of its founding, a made-for-television movie, in many people’s eyes, the entire movement appropriated the grassroots character based on MADD’s early campaigns. This campaign was directed toward MADD’s early mission “to mobilize victims and their allies to establish the public conviction that impaired driving is unacceptable and criminal in order to promote corresponding public policy, programs, and personal accountability” (Lord 2).

Lord continues, “By its 10th anniversary, MADD had grown to 407 local chapters” and a variety of other teams and affiliates. “Shortly thereafter, a Gallup survey revealed that Americans cited drunk driving as the No. 1 problem on the nation’s highways. Three years later, a second Gallup poll showed that the public had become less tolerant of drunk drivers and more supportive of stiffer penalties” (Lord 2). And through it all, MADD and other anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders held onto their identities as grassroots organizations. According to a history of MADD, even the government benefited from the support of anti-drunk driving organizations and pursued a national agenda based on association with the grassroots organizations. In this recounting, Lord says,

MADD vaulted into American homes on October 1, 1980, when three U.S. representatives announced the first strike in a national war on drunk driving—the federal Barnes bill. While the proposed legislation received little attention when introduced the previous year, the addition of two media-savvy mothers and little Laura Lamb seized the heart of America. (2000,2)

One of the things that makes this story so compelling is the way it incorporates figurative language. In this text, four examples of figurative language—“vaulted into American homes,” “first strike,” “national war on drunk driving,” and “seized the heart”—invoke schemata that the anti-drunk driving movement has used to shape both the image of the anti-drunk driving movement and the American vernacular. These early-1980s examples of
figurative language all focus on "putting a face on the victim," a central rhetorical construct that the anti-drunk driving movement discourse displayed over the next 25 years.

The movement has used stories that put a face on the victim to bring home to the American public the scope and intensity of the problem of drunk driving. These examples of figurative language are central to the story because they are the supporting details that effectively counter deeply entrenched beliefs that drunk driving crashes happen to someone else, somewhere else. This "it couldn't happen to me" attitude is a problem that anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders—and people who tackled the problems of alcohol-related traffic incidents before the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement took shape—have long battled. While the aggregate statistics about alcohol-related traffic fatalities are distressing in the abstract, the individual incidents of alcohol-related traffic crashes happen one by one, in different cities and states, and on streets, roads, highways, and interstates across the country. Because no one keeps a day-by-day tab on these fatalities, people are removed—physically and, probably more importantly, emotionally—from the staggering reality of the injuries and fatalities. As sociologist Joseph R. Gusfield points out,

A great many people in the United States have had direct and personal experience with automobile crashes and collisions. These are personal facts. The total number of automobile fatalities is not. It is a public fact. No one observes all the automobile crashes. We are dependent upon an organization of special investigators for the factually world of automobile casualties. (The Culture of Public Problems 1981, 51)

In part because they can't grasp the enormity of the problem, people do not accurately perceive the probability that they or their loved ones will become one of the statistics; people minimize the risks inherent in driving a car in general and in being in a drunk driving car crash. In "Creating Fear in a Risky World: Generating Effective Health Risk Messages," Michael Stevenson and Kim Witte write, "It is often considered a quirk of human nature that we are unrealistically optimistic about our likelihood of experiencing negative effects . . . . We believe that others might experience harmful effects of their behaviors, but not us" (2001 88). These beliefs allow people to minimize and to avoid thinking about the problem: It can't happen to me. Other people get killed in drunk driver crashes. Surely it has gotten better, what with MADD and all.
The flip side of this thorny issue stems from the same problem. People who drink and drive think that they surly wouldn’t cause a crash—and consequently behave in ways that perpetuate the devastating statistical trends. No one gets in a car or truck after having been drinking and sets out to cause a drunk driving crash. No one sets out to take a life, to forever alter the constellation of lives touched by each crash. Hardly any one is constantly aware of the possibility of being in a crash caused by a drunk driver because these crashes do not happen in one place at the same time.

Distributed organizations that addressed drunk driving in the 1960s—before the contemporary movement evolved—used strategies that the movement would later adopt and hone to reach specific target audiences to convey the seriousness of the problem. However, these efforts were unfocused and lacked the energy necessary to make people understand the relationship between themselves and their loved ones and drunk drivers who killed and injured people every hour of every day. These sincere but unfocused efforts were but isolated instances seeking attention in an increasingly more dense shower of information about the social issues of the times.

As I mentioned before, earlier movement stakeholders were not very successful at their efforts to “put a face on the victim.” However, the stories of people like Lightner and Lamb captured the attention of the American public, and the tradition of telling stories emerged as an effective movement strategy. These stories were constructed mostly of appeals to pathos and relied almost exclusively on a combination of figurative language (as just I mentioned) and specific details about a single crash, especially a crash whose victims are particularly sympathetic (such as a teenager killed within days of high school graduation or an innocent family wiped out by a drunk driver who was released from a DUI arrest only hours before causing a second tragedy). These stories help people understand the problem on a more personal level, which helps change people’s attitudes about the problem because they can identify with the people in the story. Such changes in the public’s attitudes are essential in terms of paving the way for changes in how people behave. Crash stories serve as extended slogans, if you will, to urge people to rally around the drunk driving cause and to change how they behave, whether that behavior change is a letter to a government official urging passage of a particular piece of legislation or staying sober to be the designated driver after a party.
The contemporary anti-drunk driving movement has learned how to effectively build support and generate enthusiasm for political action that addresses drunk driving on all levels of society. In fact, stories about drunk driving, the narratives of advocates, researchers, reporters, victims, survivors, and offenders form the warp of the tapestry that is the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement, which leads us now to the main focus of this chapter, analysis of artifacts from across the movement.

As I discussed earlier, I used Thomas Huckin’s six steps for a context-sensitive case analysis as I was deciding which artifacts to analyze for both the preceding visual texts as well as the verbal text analyses that follow. In addition, three principles guide the analyses that follow: chronology, representation, and richness of the data.

I chose the four early National Safety Council (NSC) texts as examples of artifacts from as early in the history of the movement as I could locate. The first three artifacts are from the 1930s; the fourth NSC artifact, dated 1951, roughly the era when the contemporary anti-drunk driving stakeholders were children.

- “If You Want to Drink, Don’t Drive,” and article in the May 1933 issue of Public Safety, the National Safety Council’s monthly magazine.
- “Posters Warn Drivers,” an article in the August 1935 issue of Public Safety.
- “A. A. A. Wages Fight on ‘Nips’ at the Wheel,” an article in the December 1936 issue of Public Safety.
- “Drunk Driving’s ‘Agin’ the Law,” an article published in the April 1951 issue of Public Safety.

The next two artifacts are from the February 1972 issue of the Reader’s Digest. I chose these two artifacts as examples of the kinds of discourse that more closely preceded the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement’s efforts (a decade earlier) that movement stakeholders would likely have encountered. I chose the public service ad as representative of its kind, although public service ads are not limited strictly to printed ads and may, indeed, take the form of radio, television, or internet placements. I included the article as a representative example of articles found in the popular press.

- A full-page public service ad in the February 1972 issue of the Reader’s Digest, co-sponsored by the National Safety Council, the Advertising Council, and the Reader’s Digest.
An article, “How Phoenix Gets Drunks Off the Road,” from the February 1972 issue of the Reader's Digest.

The rest of the artifacts that are analyzed in this chapter are from the discourse of the movement after 1982, which is generally considered to be the beginning of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement. These artifacts are representative because of the variety of stakeholders who produced the discourse, because they are distributed across time, and because they represent the richness of the initial corpus both in terms of genre and rhetorical features.

- Alcohol Limit .08: A Sign of the Times in Illinois, a brochure published by MADD Illinois Public Policy Liaison before the .08 BAC law was passed.
- A Safer State with .08, a brochure published by the Illinois Secretary of State’s office in 1997, after the .08 BAC law was passed.
- “Drunk Driving is a Costly Killer, Reports Erie Insurance: April is Alcohol Awareness Month,” a press release issued on April 9, 1999, by the Erie Insurance Group.
- “Someone You Should Know: Marti Belluschi Uses Personal Experience to Teach Others,” an article in Don’t Drink and Drive: A Newsletter for Teens published by George H. Ryan’s Illinois Secretary of State’s office in May 1996.

In addition to the figures in this chapter that primarily show the visual aspects of these artifacts, I include the complete texts of these artifacts in Appendix B. I begin now with a look at the four NSC artifacts.

### Early National Safety Council Publications

According to the categories of anti-drunk driving stakeholders introduced earlier in this study, the National Safety Council is a distributed organization. Since its organization in 1913 and national charter in 1953, NSC has advocated for safety in all corners of American life, including drunk driving prevention. NSC predates the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement and a look at some of the publications from between 1913 and 1951 can benchmark the discourse so we can see how it has changed over time.

“If You Want to Drink, Don’t Drive,” a short article in Public Safety, the NSC’s magazine (renamed Traffic Safety in 1957), addresses “the probable effect of the return of beer on highway safety” (NSC 1933, 3). Apparently the NSC and its correspondents had
inquired about the NSC’s stance on drinking and driving in the light of the end of
prohibition. NSC addresses this concern by talking about the “motor vehicle accident
reports” it researched. Because the NSC’s focus is on preventing accidents, framing their
research in terms of accident reports is consistent with their focus. The NSC’s use of
accident in this and other articles reinforced the idea that alcohol-related traffic incidents
happened without cause or blame, an idea that the contemporary anti-drunk driving
movement would later challenge. The 1933 article does talk about the fact that “[t]here can
be no question” that any drinking impairs the fine coordination and good judgment which are
essential for safe driving.” (NSC 1933, 3). The article concludes

The Council gives this specific advice to drivers who drink:

‘When you want to drive, don’t drink; when you want to drink, don’t drive.
Remember, if you are arrested for even a minor traffic violation and the officer finds
that you have been drinking, even moderately, the penalty is likely to be much more
severe than it otherwise would be.’ (1933, 3).

This direct “advice” pulls no punches and, although they don’t produce references to specific
laws in specific places, NSC establishes an attitude about drinking—even moderately.

During prohibition the drinking driver problem was, in Gusfield’s terms, “owned” by the
enforcers of Prohibition, which was based first on the idea

“that alcohol is a ‘dangerous commodity.’ Its use is restricted by laws limiting the
time, place, manner, and person of consumption” and second that “drinking is an
accepted custom in American society . . . . With repeal, alcohol policy became a minor
issue in American policies [and] private organizations, such as Alcoholics
Anonymous and the National Council on Alcoholism, were the major ‘owners’ of the
alcohol problem” (Control 1988, 117–118).

In other words, drinking was the problem, not driving. And, in fact, in the August 1935 issue
of Public Safety, in the right-hand column (next to a brief article about deaths due to swirling
dust), under the headline, “Posters Warn Drivers,” readers learn how the State of New Jersey
is “combating the growing menace of mixing drinking and driving” (32). Here we see the
war metaphor combined with “growing menace” at the same time Hitler was being called a
growing menace by some who correctly anticipated the effects of his rise to power.
Similarly, the “mixing” analogy suggests that drinkers do have a role, that drinkers who drive
will be held accountable, an accountability that is reinforced in the facsimile of the poster
that New Jersey’s “liquor czar” ordered to be “conspicuously displayed” in all of New Jersey’s “10,000 licensed cafes and liquor dispensaries” (1935, 32). The poster, titled “Don’t Let This Happen to You,” shows a courtroom peopled by a judge and a man whose clothes are rumpled and who is hanging his head even as he is supported by the strong arm of the law.

The message of sure punishment is combined with facts about drunken driving accidents and convictions in 1934. Further, the text at the bottom of the poster defines intoxication and admonishes customers in the cafes and liquor dispensaries not to “operate a motor vehicle in such condition” (1935, 32). This combination of admonition, education, and focus on the drunk driver has been passed from 1935 to the present; the genre, design, and technology may have changed, but the fundamental message has remained essentially the same.

In December 1936, *Public Safety* reported that “A. A. A. Wages Fight on ‘Nips’ at the Wheel” (54). Here we find another “war,” this time part of a “drive to eliminate drunken driving. ‘Nips,’ small vest pocket bottles of liquor to you [sic]…” (1936, 54). In this case, the culprit is the “Nips,” the small bottles in which liquor was sold, packaged, and, apparently, consumed by people while they drove.

This article uses specialized language—nips—which could be a form of slang, a colloquial expression, or a liquor packaging unit. The writer does not assume that the reader will understand the meaning of nips and provides an off-hand definition in an interesting sentence fragment tacked onto the end of the sentence: the “small vest pocket bottles of liquor to you” (1936, 54). This leaves little confusion about what will be banned: the nips.
However, instead of conveying the idea that prohibiting the sale of nips is the remedy for drunken driving, the association only "believes that the prohibition of the sale of these 'nips' will tend to reduce drunken driving" (54). Note, though, that drinking and driving is not referred to as against the law or as criminal activity, but that drinking and driving is made easier with "nips," a situation that must be remedied.

Whether the discourse is about menaces or nips, problems related to drunk driving continued to be covered in Public Safety. In April 1951, NSC published "Drunk Driving's 'agin' the law" (Schultz, 14–15, 26). This article is interesting for several reasons. First, the images that accompany the text are good examples of how drunks were portrayed and, by extension, thought about at this time (see figures 9 and 10). The cartoon-like drunk, with his rumpled fedora smashed on the back of his head and his red nose (the illustration is in black and white, but the nose is definitely a different color than the rest of the drunk's face) has gone through the windshield of his car. His distress is conveyed by the two sketchy ovals around his head—a common representation of the bugs flying around his head that only the drunk can see. The balloon tires are off the ground above jagged pieces of shattered windshield (1951 was, of course, before the advent of the shatterproof safety glass now required in all cars and trucks). The drunk's car is superimposed over the back of a "P.D." car with an angry-looking male police officer whose head, shoulder, and left arm are outside the car. The officer's head is turned back to look at the drunk and his open mouth suggests that he is saying, "Drunk Driving's 'Agin' the Law," which is the title of the four-page article that follows (a photocopy of this article is in Appendix B).

The second image, which appears above the middle column on the right-hand page of this two-page spread, shows a drunk—in this case, red-nosed, eyes at half-mast, disheveled, and leaning at a near-45 degree angle on the bar. This drunk also has something floating around his head. In this case, it's what appear to be bubbles above the drink he clutches almost as a salute and on the opposite side of his head. The visual story might be that the drink has so "gone to his head" that it's coming out his ears. The third image, again, is a drunk in a car whose wheels are tilted off the pavement—suggestive of a turn taken at high speed. High speed is indicated by the relatively long exhaust cloud that ends in a puff, as though the engine backfired while accelerating, leaving a contrail behind. This drunk driver, too, wears his hat askew, has a bubble by his head, and has one eye closed and the other half open.
These are images of a benign drunk described in the article as citizen Arduous Lee Guantapott, floral farmer, a friendly guy who “[partook] of the potcheen one night in May, [and] lost his weekend of a Friday evening, ditched his gas buggy, was jugged, mugged, processed and judged to be guilty of ‘driving under the influence’” (Schultz 1951, 15). One task taken up early by the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement was to counter these stereotypes and to frame drunk drivers as people who commit a crime.

Figure 9. Image on the front page that serves as the title of the article (1951).

Figure 10. Images within the columns on the second page of “Drunk Driving’s ‘Agin’ the Law”: the drunk at the bar is at the top of the middle column, while the driving drunk is at the bottom of the right-most column (1951).
I suggest that word choices in the article however *au courant* they seemed at the time, sounded dated to readers at the time of the nascent anti-drunk driving movement which, in turn, has appropriated currently stylish language to convey its message to a broad range of audiences. No longer do we see quaint language like “get plastered,” “overindulgence,” or “in his cups”; “John Q. Public,” “Sloppy Joe,” or “Freud V. Wetbrain.” Over time we have seen a move from these euphemisms to more clinical language that describes an intoxicated or impaired state, more “real names” as opposed to appellations that mask the drunk driver’s identity and shield him from taking responsibility for his actions.

The next section is about two pieces in the February 1972 edition of the *Reader’s Digest* that further show how the discourse of the precursors of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement changed over time.

**February 1972 Reader’s Digest**

The February 1972 issue of the *Reader’s Digest* is the 50th anniversary issue of the magazine. From its start in 1922, the magazine’s popularity grew by leaps and bounds. First available on newsstands in 1929, the magazine focused on condensations of articles published elsewhere. “The first signed original article, ‘Insanity—The Modern Menace,’ by Henry Morton Robinson appeared in the U.S Reader’s Digest” in 1933 (RDA Timeline). Although we can’t know the Wallaces’ motivation for selecting this article and this topic for the first signed original article, tackling insanity and framing it as a modern menace apparently reflect the Wallaces’ focus on social issues. The Wallaces took philanthropy seriously—especially as defined as “active effort to promote human welfare” (*Merriam Webster Collegiate Dictionary*, 11th ed. 930).

In a move consistent with other efforts to promote human welfare, the 50th anniversary issue of *Reader’s Digest* includes two items—a public service announcement and an article—having to do with drunk driving. Appearing a dozen years before what is considered the birth of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement, these two items might be viewed as direct predecessors of the movement.
1972 Public Service Ad

In February 1972 the NSC, the Advertising Council, and the Reader's Digest cooperated on a full-page ad "contributed for the public good." The ad is titled "The drunk driver. He helps us eliminate the overcrowding in our classrooms." The upper half of the page is a photo that shows an empty desk surrounded by children bent over their work, while text fills the lower half of the ad.

Drunk drivers kill and injure our children.
Last year, almost 6,000 children under 15 years old were killed in traffic accidents. Countless thousands were seriously injured.
No one can be sure how many drunken drivers were responsible.
But even one death or one injury is one too many.
What can you do?
Remember, it's not the drink that kills. It's the drunk, the problem drinker, the abusive drinker, the drunk driver.
Remember, drunk drivers may be sick, and we've got to give them help.
But first we've got to get them off the road. For their sake and yours.
Scream Bloody Murder.

Figure 11. A representation of the full-page public service announcement in the February, 1972 issue of the Reader's Digest.
Unlike earlier cartoon-like illustrations of happy, tipsy drunks and depictions of glum men in jail cells, this ad employs techniques that feel familiar to us today. Appealing to our emotions, the ad shows an empty desk, a visual reference to the drunk driver helping with the "problem" of overcrowding in our schools.

The ad appeals to our sense of logic by explaining that the drunk driver may be sick and in need of "our" help. The ethos of the National Safety Council is carried by both a small print sponsor notice and also by the Council's emblems, which exhort us to "Scream bloody murder." This cry firmly situates alcohol-related traffic incidents in the realm of violent crimes where most members of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement believe it belongs.

**How Phoenix Gets Drunks Off the Road**

We can't know if it is a coincidence that the February 1972 *Reader's Digest* issue also includes an article called, "How Phoenix Gets Drunks Off the Road." The article traces the history of the Phoenix Alcohol Research and Re-Education Project," a pioneering program initiated in 1966 by Ernest I. Stewart that was attended by "more than 6000 [DWIs] . . . . [whose] rate of reconviction for drunk driving is significantly better than normal" (McDowell 1972, 49–51). McDowell frames the Phoenix program in several ways. First, McDowell recounts Stewart's witnessing a three-fatality drunk driving crash "when the reality and horror just reached out and grabbed [him]" in 1965 which prompted him to take action. McDowell also contextualizes drinking and driving: "ours is a society that drinks; an estimated 75 percent of all U.S. drivers drink, and most of them drive occasionally after drinking. An insurance company estimates that one out of every 50 drivers on the highway has been drinking" (50). The article shares how Stewart begins the first session with a vivid account of that 1965 tragedy. 'If you drink, that's your problem . . . But if you drink and drive, then that's our problem.' With charts and training aids [Stewart] drives home the facts: More than 150 Americans killed in auto accidents each day. Another 9560 injured—ten times the daily number harmed by riots, beatings, and other forms of violence. Alcohol, which was directly involved in about 18 percent of all fatalities 25 years ago, is now involved in more than 50 percent. (49–50)

The article describes how the DWIs are required to reflect on their behavior, how they must watch horrific footage of drunk driving crashes, and how they are referred for further
treatment for alcoholism. In an adjacent text box, readers are told about the four states that had launched Alcohol Safety Action projects (ASAP), which are sponsored by the National Highway Safety Administration. . . [that focus] on better law enforcement and intensive public education . . . [and] countermeasures” such as supervised Antabuse (a drug that produces nausea, vomiting and other extremely uncomfortable effects when a person taking the drug consumes any alcohol whatsoever) programs, self-administered alcohol concentration breath tests, and telephone hotlines for free cab rides home for drinkers. (54)

This article is a useful exemplar for two reasons. First, by enumerating these strategies, McDowell articulates some of the ways individuals, government entities, and organizations addressed alcohol-related traffic incidents between the mid-1960s and the early 1970s, which gives us some insight into the circumstances of the day. Also, when we closely examine this article, we can see patterns of word choices and a variety of rhetorical strategies at work. Like all rhetorical strategies, these exist within a temporal, cultural, historical, and conventional context. I suggest that we can learn a great deal about the status of anti-drunk driving movement rhetorical strategies of the day that, in turn will help us get a sense of the complex context of the day.

What follows, then, is a close analysis of the first eight sentences McDowell’s 1972 article (a photocopy of the entire text is in Appendix B). First I present the text as eight discrete sentences. Then I discuss features of these sentences in the context of other strategies the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement has used. The article begins:

1. On the morning of December 24, 1965, in Phoenix, Ariz., a young man driving a pickup sped through two red lights at 80 miles per hour.
2. Seconds later, he crossed a center line and smashed head-on into a 1966 Pontiac from Idaho.
3. In the car were a father and mother and two teen-age children.
4. The parents died almost instantly.
5. The two children hurtled from the car and lay critically injured in a gruesome tangle of blood, metal, and oil, their bodies twisted and broken, their faces mutilated.
6. The man in the pickup, drunk, was so entrapped in the wreckage that it took rescuers with a blowtorch 35 minutes to cut him out.
7. But that hardly mattered; he had died in the shattering impact.

8. The accident would have been just another grim statistic but for one witness. (my formatting, 49)

These eight sentences form a narrative, they tell a story. The story begins, as many stories do, by setting the time and place and introducing a character, in this case, the young man driving the pickup. The third clause of the sentence describes the action in this first scene of the story, action that is fraught with clues that foreshadow the tragedy to come. And, in the next sentence, the tragedy begins with specific details: 1966 Pontiac—a relatively new car, a prized possession, perhaps—and “from Idaho,” a state that, unlike New York or California seldom makes the news with stories about corruption, crime, “alternative life styles,” or anything out of the ordinary. Idaho is about potatoes. Pontiacs from Idaho are white bread, solid citizens, innocents abroad thrust involuntarily into this tale of horror and loss.

Enter the four innocents: a family torn asunder in the next sentence, their tragic tale told in graphic detail. The young man also perishes, but the tragedy—unlike thousands of similar tragedies—is not without redemption: the witness takes up the cause and, over the course of the next few years, alters the pattern within which this narrative is placed. The story told in this article—and this eight-sentence introduction to the story—is typical of media coverage of drunk driving in the late 1970s and early 1980s. A further analysis of these eight sentences gives a more in-depth look at how drunk driving was portrayed in the early 1970s.

The theme of the first sentence sets the story chronologically: morning and December 24, 1965. Because readers have access to the article’s title, “How Phoenix Gets Drunks Off the Road,” the first mention of “morning” sets up a mild cognitive dissonance because most people believe that drunk driving crashes happen late at night. Further, readers can grasp the schema for December 24, Christmas Eve. A Christmas Eve schema carries certain stereotypical expectations, which enhance the drama and increase the reader’s sense of outrage. Christmas often is seen as a time out of time, a time of rest and truce, a time of joy, and a time for families to get together.

The rheme of the first sentence, “in Phoenix, Ariz., a young man driving a pickup sped through two red lights at 80 miles per hour” happens very quickly. This rheme establishes the location, the agent for the crash, and the speed of his actions. “Seconds later,” the rheme
of the next sentence, further signals the speed at which the event took place. The rheme carries the agent—he—and the actions performed by this agent—"crossed the center line and smashed head-on," active verbs that indicate dangerous driving (sped, crossed, smashed) and tie the driver irrevocably with the cause of the crash. He is, indeed, the agent who performed these actions, but his agency stops there.

The noun phrases in the first two sentences provide details that establish the context: morning, two red lights, 80 miles per hour (well above legal speed limits for roadways governed by stop lights), center line, 1966 Pontiac from Idaho (note that the literal meaning has the car originating in Idaho, a state that is, to most people because of the population patterns and geographic location, distant and not Arizona where the crash occurred). This detail suggests that such crashes happen to "others," but this idea is not followed up; instead, the article goes on to focus on the culpable agents, drunk drivers.

In the third sentence, the passive construction "In the car were a father and mother and two teen-age children" reinforces the victims' lack of agency and implies that the family is innocent, bearing no responsibility. Similarly, family togetherness is emphasized in sentence three where McDowell lists the victims by their family relationships—parents, children. The rheme in sentence three stands in stark contrast to the Christmas Eve schema invoked in sentence one and emphasizes the severity and long-lasting impact of this crash. Most survivors, like the children in this crash, keep track of the anniversary of their crash, but experiencing this devastation on Christmas Eve forever alters the holiday not just for the immediate survivors of the crash but also for the extended network of survivors that came into being at the moment of the crash. This crash simply happened to them, or as Belluschi says of her crash, "[everyone] felt that, unfortunately, Dad and I were just in the wrong place at the wrong time" (2001a, 68).

Sentence four, "The parents died almost instantly" is the most stark in reinforcing the attitude Belluschi describes. These parents died; they were not killed by an active agent. The adverbial phrase, "almost instantly," leaves open the question of suffering before death. This phrase combines with two details, "80 miles per hour" and "seconds later," and reinforces the extreme speed at which this crash happened. The implication here is that the parents had no control; there was nothing they could do—even if they weren't killed instantly—to prevent or avoid the crash.
In sentence five, “The children hurtled from the car and lay” suggests that the children had some agency in this situation, as though they’d hurtle on purpose and lay when they would rather still be riding in the car. Again, though, the driver is not the agent. Instead, that sentence carries the burden for describing the event in a few words while still conveying the horror of the event. To do so, the whole sentence “The two children hurtled from the car and lay critically injured in a gruesome tangle of blood, metal, and oil, their bodies twisted and broken, their faces mutilated” uses the most dramatic language including verbs, nouns, and adjectives.

Thirteen of the words in the fifth sentence are quite graphic: “hurtled,” “critically injured,” “gruesome tangle,” “blood,” “metal,” “oil,” “bodies twisted,” “broken,” and “faces mutilated.” From this sentence, five articles indicate specificity and possession. The prepositions “from,” “and,” and “in” situate the sentence’s subject, the children, exactly in the middle of the event. The sentence about the children—who are now simply children and not teenagers—and the description of the man graphically illustrate the high degree of horror surrounding the event. We are accustomed to critically injured—a somewhat sanitized term often used in press conferences and news coverage—a condition that implies a severity while at the same time communicates some hope of survival. Indeed, we are led to believe that the children did survive. However, most of us are not accustomed to reading phrases like “gruesome tangle,” “bodies twisted and broken,” and “faces mutilated.”

The sixth sentence, “The man in the pickup, drunk, was so entrapped in the wreckage that it took rescuers with a blowtorch 35 minutes to cut him out,” also deserves phrase-by-phrase analysis. The theme/rheme structure (“The man in the pickup” is the theme) refers directly back to the “he” who crossed and smashed and places agency squarely on the man—no longer a young man as in the first sentence. The first clause in the rheme places the man in the pickup followed by “drunk” set off by commas which summarily and clearly describes him with no room for excuses; he caused the crash. The next constituent, “was so entrapped in the wreckage,” shifts the driver from an active agent to a passive participant, a victim who cannot escape. The next constituent, “that it took rescuers with a blowtorch 35 minutes to cut him out” further describes the horror of the scene; 35 minutes’ entrapment in a wreckage can spell tragedy simply by indicating that medical care was not possible, but in this case, places rescuers—survivors who must deal with this kind of event on a regular basis—on the scene.
The theme of the seventh sentence, “But that hardly matters,” brings the driver’s life to a close. We know the driver is dead even before the phrase following the semicolon tells us “he had died in the shattering impact.” Note here that he died in the impact; we are only indirectly reminded that he had caused the impact. Further, we are given one final adjective, “shattering,” to reinforce the “gruesome” nature of the impact, a noun that carries only the vaguest notion of agency: “impact may be used to imply contact between two things, at least one of which is impelled toward the other” where impel “suggests a great motivating impetus” (*Merriam Webster Collegiate Dictionary* 11th ed. 622; 623).

Up to this point in the article, its language could be found in any of a number of today’s newspapers or magazines or it could be recounted in the dispassionate, even tones of today’s newscasters. However, sentence eight sets this tale firmly in a time before the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement influenced our vernacular. McDowell writes “The accident would have been just another grim statistic but for one witness. . . on that fateful morning” (my emphasis, 49). Marti Belluschi, whose crash happened in 1964, also talks about “accident” and “fate” but in very different ways. After having been involved in the anti-drunk driving movement, Belluschi highlights one of the most enduring changes in attitude and language when she says, “my father and I were in a terrible CRASH, not an unfortunate accident,. . . we were victims of a CRIME, not victims of fate” (2001a, 68).

As I mentioned earlier, “How Phoenix Gets Drunks Off the Road” displays various strategies that were used in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The article also presents a new model of the private citizen working with local law enforcement and jurists to tackle the problem of drunks on the road. After the first eight sentences, in the rest of the article McDowell tells the story of that “witness,” Ernest I. Stewart, who initiated—and then ran—the Phoenix Alcohol Research and Reeducation Project. Stewart’s pioneering efforts were followed by an experimental NHTSA project, Alcohol Safety Action Projects (ASAPs). The ASAP program “provided funds to state agencies to increase enforcement of DUI laws” as part of “the offensive against drunk driving [by] many cities, counties, and even entire states” first implemented in the 1970s” (Gusfield 1988, 122).

Efforts like those of Stewart and the advocates of programs like ASAPs reflect a shift in public attitudes and behavior especially in terms of ownership of the drunk driving problem. Instead of accepting that drunk driving is “somebody else’s problem,” early movement
stakeholders—individuals like Stewart, government entities like ASAPs, and organizations like NSC and the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety—claimed the problem and set out to do something about it. These combined efforts presage the grassroots efforts of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement that was initiated by Doris Aiken who started RID only six years after this story appeared and by Candy Lightener who started MADD within a decade.

**Contemporary Movement Appropriation of Successful Early Strategies**

The contemporary anti-drunk driving movement still uses strategies like those in the 1972 *Reader's Digest* article to bring home the reality of the problem. We still find some of the graphic words and victim stories framing the drunk driving problem to help people better relate to and understand both the enormity and severity of the issue and, as a consequence, to modify their behavior. Building on linguistic efforts like McDowell’s, in order to communicate the enormity of the problem, the movement has adopted a common formula: “The 16,653 fatalities in alcohol-related crashes during 2000 represent an average of one alcohol-related fatality every 32 minutes” (Traffic Safety Facts 2000: Alcohol). One problem with this formula—which is used to convey the magnitude of teen pregnancy, deaths from smoking, and deaths from starvation in Africa, among other social problems—is that people experience many, many 32-minute time periods with no incident, which perpetuates a negative reinforcement thinking pattern: “I’m okay so far, so I must be immune.”

For teens, this attitude combines with a common adolescent sense of personal invulnerability. In fact, Belluschi says, “the worst thing that can happen to a teen who drinks and drives for the first time is that he makes it home safely” because the experience negates the “every 32 minutes” message and reinforces the teen’s sense that this warning does not apply to him or her. For older drivers—especially drivers who drink—the “every 32 minutes” message is contradicted by experience when that drinking driver suffers no consequences (2001). We all have seen the news stories that follow an offender from the courtroom where his driving privileges were revoked directly to his car, which he climbs into and drives away, all the while shielding his face from the camera. Our experiences are not consistent with the warnings.

Similar processes, such as Nancy Reagan’s notorious “Just Say No” campaign, fail for similar reasons. Belluschi maintains that one reason Reagan’s campaign was not successful
has to do with powerful lobbying by the well-funded alcohol and hospitality industries to focus only on "drugs," which meant that alcohol was never mentioned in Reagan’s campaign, even though it is the most often consumed and abused drug in the world (2001). One dramatic image, shown here in figure 12, more accurately sums up the relationship between “drugs” and alcohol. Further, people who said “yes” to drugs—even one time—
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Figure 12. Image that accompanies the August 1997 Marin Institute newsletter, Backgrounder cover article titled “New Study: Alcohol Ads Increase Drinking” (1).

often experienced no consequences, which extinguished any conditioning related to abstinence that the “Just Say No” might have established.

To build on campaigns like Reagan’s and to more carefully target their messages to specific audiences, the anti-drunk driving movement has called for and used stronger measures and different tactics. For example, the movement has used metaphors and analogies including “war on” language and common experiences such as the number of people at a sporting event or on an airplane (discussed below) to help people understand the scope of the problem and to put a face on the victim. When they declare “war” on drunk driving, stakeholders convey images of skirmishes, battles, and war zones, which conjure notions of combatants as well as innocent bystanders being injured or killed. Because war is such a complex process, stakeholders can attach a wide variety of activities to the metaphor and label them as efforts toward winning the war on drunk driving. For example, MADD was instrumental in a campaign to establish 21 as the national legal drinking age. This campaign was motivated by dramatic, tragic numbers of fatalities of young people between 18 and 21 that occurred on the “blood border” between states with a legal drinking age of 21 and states with a legal drinking age of 18 (History of MADD 1). One such blood border was the border between Illinois and Wisconsin:
In those days [1982], they called it the ‘Blood Border.’ 65 people had been killed on those borders in less than three years. That was when Illinois had gone with the home rule of changing the drinking age to 21 while the surrounding states remained at 18. Young people would drive across the border, get drunk, and come back over the border. It was slaughter on the highways. (AAIM 2001, 3)

Analysis of the phrase, “Blood Border,” by looking at the theme and rheme sheds some light on the power of this language. The theme, blood, here the noun form of the word used as an adjective, suggests all manner of images. Taken literally, blood border would compare with a border formed by a river, such as the Mississippi, which happens to be the part of Illinois’s western border. A Mississippi River flowing with blood would, indeed, invoke carnage. Similarly, in some cases, blood is inversely associated with life; when we think of an enormous loss of blood, we tend to wonder if the person whose blood has spilled will survive. Further, “life’s blood” refers to that which is essential to a person, that which ensures survival and a sense of thriving. When this sense of blood is used in association with border—especially when we know that a disproportionate loss of life as compared with other borders—the image of threatened survival and prosperity suggests a dire situation, indeed.

Border, the rheme in this phrase, also carries several connotations. Literally, a border denotes a boundary, “something that indicates or fixes a limit or extent” (Merriam Webster Collegiate Dictionary 11th ed. 146). A blood border, then, suggests a limit based on how much blood has been spilled, a point beyond which some action must be taken to stop the flow of the state’s life blood. Further, a border can be viewed as decorative, an adornment; a blood border, instead of invoking a pleasing decoration, connotes a vivid, red streak that hurts the eye and tears at the soul.

Used together, the two words blood and border convey a sense of urgency: when a person is bleeding, stopping the flow is of the essence, so staunching the blood flow at a particular place requires, first, awareness of the wound and, second, the wherewithal to act to end the slaughter that is the source of the blood. Against this background, in reaction to the blood border with all its connotations, the Alliance Against Intoxicated Motorists (AAIM) was formed:

Among the early membership were people who had lost loved ones, doctors, coroners, legislators, and law enforcement officers—those who were tired of picking up the dead and injured from the highways, and then being forced to watch the drunk
drivers walk away from it all. AAIM was founded on the premise that every penny raised would go directly to support anti-drunk driving activities. (AAIM 2001, 3)

So AAIM, started about the same time as MADD, joined MADD and other nascent dedicated anti-drunk driving organizations and long-time public safety advocates as “awareness of the depth of the drunk driving issue was receiving increased attention.” From those early beginnings, the anti-drunk driving movement championed a wide variety of efforts all directed at reducing the “carnage on the highways” (AAIM 2001, 3). Fourteen years later, anti-drunk driving advocates in Illinois mounted a campaign to change the state’s illegal BAC limit from .10 (where it had stood since it was changed from .15 in 1967) to .08. The next section looks at an artifact from that effort.

**Alcohol Limit .08: A Sign of the Times in Illinois**

*Alcohol Limit .08: A Sign of the Times in Illinois* is a six-panel, two-fold brochure that was produced by the MADD Illinois Liaison for Public Policy before the .08 BAC law was passed in Illinois. The brochure is not dated, but we can assume that the brochure was published during the time that Senate Bill 8 was under consideration in the Illinois State Legislature both because of the language used in the brochure and because of a yellow Post-It note that Belluschi attached to the front panel of the brochure when she sent it to me that says, “before the .08 BAC law was passed.” The bill was signed into law and went into immediate effect on July 2, 1997 (Voas et al. 2000, 5). The brochure was circulated to inform people about the prospective law, to encourage people to support its passage, and, in keeping with MADD’s purpose, to encourage people to “Make the right decision so everyone can live” (MADD Illinois n.d., back panel). The page with the front and back panels and the inside fold panel is shown on the next page in figure 13; figure 14 on the following page shows the brochure’s inside spread.

The brochure is printed in red and black on white paper. Red text and graphic elements typically are used to call attention to something, to add urgency to a message, to indicate a hierarchy of the text, or to help guide readers through text. In this brochure, red text is set in three different typefaces: the brochure title, first- and second-level headings, and in the MADD logo. Five of the six panels—the elements on the cover of the brochure, the inside fold panel with the “Where is .08?” graph, and the three columns on the inside spread—are surrounded by a red and white border.
About two out of every five Americans will be involved in an alcohol-related crash at some time in their lives. Drinking and driving is killing us.

Impaired driving on Illinois roadways killed 656 people in 1994. It is clearly time to examine the current definition of what Illinois considers to be illegally impaired.

**WHY .08?**

**FACT:** At .08 BAC virtually all drivers experience a loss of critical driving skills. For the vast majority of drivers, even experienced drinking drivers, .08 is a level at which critical driving skills such as lane changing, braking, comprehension, divided attention and speed control are substantially impaired.

**FACT:** .08 is not aimed at the "social drinker." .08 is not just a couple of drinks after work. The average 170 pound male would have to consume 4 drinks within 1 hour on an empty stomach to reach .08. This is a consumption rate most adults do not consider "social drinking."

**FACT:** At .08, the risk of being involved in a crash begins to increase dramatically. By the time a level of .08 is reached, a driver is 3 times more likely to be involved in a crash at .08 the risk is increased to 9 times greater; and at .10 the likelihood of a crash becomes 12 times greater than for a non-drinking driver.

**FACT:** Lowering Illinois' illegal BAC standard from .10 to .08 will save lives. A recent analysis of .08 laws in five states revealed significant decreases in alcohol-related crash fatalities after the law went into effect. For example in California, there were reductions in alcohol-related crash fatalities at all BAC levels after .08 was adopted.

**FACT:** Thirteen states have now adopted .08. Alabama, California, Florida, Hawaii, Kansas, Maine, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah, Vermont and Virginia have enacted a .08 law. The trend to lower the BAC standard stress from public support and greater technical and medical knowledge about the loss of critical driving skills at lower BAC levels.

**FACT:** 61% of Illinois voters want the illegal BAC standard lowered to .08. In 1993, Illinois registered voters who had voted in recent elections were polled about .08 by Kemper National Insurance Companies. The results of this poll differ by no more than +/- 3.5% from the results obtained if all Illinois voters had been questioned.

**FACT:** Proponents of .08 seek to minimize loss of life.

**FACT:** Opponents seek to minimize loss of revenue.

The most vocal and visible opponents of .08 tend to be the alcohol and hospitality industries because they fear loss of revenue. .08 is not about drinking — it's about drinking and driving.

**HOW CAN YOU HELP?**

Your show of support for .08 legislation is crucial for its passage in Illinois. Please contact your Illinois legislators to voice your support of .08.

For assistance in contacting your legislators or obtaining their addresses or phone numbers, please contact the MADD Illinois Public Policy Liaison at (309) 662-2000.

Your call or letter will make a difference!

**REMEMBER!**

.08 is a limit which is reasonable and necessary for the driving safety of us all.

Passage of .08 will save lives... and that is the bottom line!
Drinks

- .08
- .10
- .08
- .09
- .08
- .08
- .07
- .06
- .06
- .04
- .03
- .02
- .01

Male
4.170
1 lbs.

Female
3.137
1 lbs.

Drinks

Where is .08?

5 Drinks → .10
4 Drinks → .08
3 Drinks → .06
2 Drinks → .04
1 Drink → .02

.5 ounces of pure alcohol

Number of drinks and blood alcohol content level (BAC) in ONE HOUR of drinking:

A can of beer, a glass of wine, or a shot of liquor, all contain an equivalent amount of alcohol.

However, many drinks contain more alcohol.

FACT:
Nationally, 16,389 people were killed and nearly one million were injured in alcohol-related traffic crashes in 1994.

Impaired driving destroys lives.

Make the right decision so everyone can live.

MADD
Mothers Against Drunk Driving in Illinois

For more information, contact:
MADD Illinois Public Policy Liaison
309-862-2800
1150 North Beach Street
Normal, IL 61761

A Sign of the Times in Illinois
The top "fact" text unit on the back panel is different from the seven "fact" text units on the inside spread because the entire text unit on this panel—including the bullet—is centered in the column which both calls attention to and adds emphasis to the text. This text unit presents the fact that "16,589 people were killed and nearly one million were injured in alcohol-related traffic crashes in 1994." This text unit is at the top of the column and the MADD logo and contact information are at the bottom of the column. In a four-inch, vertical white space in the middle of this back panel are two centered sentences, set in slightly larger black, bold type: "Impaired driving destroys lives." and "Make the right decision so everyone can live." The placement, which affords sufficient white space to draw attention to the text, combines with the larger, darker text to add emphasis to the words. These sentences reflect MADD's core message, but, in this context, carry a double meaning. Encouraging citizens of Illinois to "make the right decision" can mean both deciding not to drink and drive and deciding to "make a difference" by calling or writing their legislators to urge passage of the .08 BAC law.

The two sentences on the back panel are visually similar to the three exhortations in the right-hand column in the center spread, one of which says, "Your call or letter will make a difference!" (note here one of the three exclamation points in the brochure). The other two exhortations are "REMEMBER! [a first-level heading] .08 is a limit which is reasonable and necessary for the driving safety of us all," and, set in red in the text typeface, "Passage of .08 will save lives... and that is the bottom line." And that literally is the bottom line of the brochure's text, a visual characteristic that subtly reinforces the meaning of the text.

On the front panel, the brochure's subtitle, A Sign of the Times in Illinois, is set in red (which signals importance or urgency to readers) and plays on a double meaning of "sign." First, the image contains an image of a "real" sign. The phrase, "a sign of the times," implies that .08 will be a reality based on a prophecy of sorts, in this case the accumulated "facts" that constitute the narrative found on the inside spread.

The image on the brochure's cover resembles a highway speed limit sign that reads, "alcohol limit .08," set in a typeface that resembles the lettering used on highway signs. The words and letters and the rectangular shape of the sign on the brochure, which echo the relative proportions of signage text, look realistic. Verisimilitude with a highway or roadside
context is further enhanced by placing the sign against a background, which is a blurred image of a road curving from the bottom left to disappear behind the pole holding the sign.

The inside fold shows a graph titled, "Where is .08?" that gives approximate BAC as compared with the number of drinks per hour for a 170 lb. male and a 137 lb. female. The graph is in the form of a wineglass outlined in black against a variegated red background (from a lower percentage red screen at the bottom to a darker red at the top). On the left-hand side of the BAC scale notations of 2 drinks, 3 drinks, 4 drinks, and 5 drinks are aligned next to the scale, with each drink number and an arrow that points from the drink number to the value on the scale for a corresponding BAC level. The left-hand side of the graph shows the supposed BAC for the "number of drinks and blood alcohol level (BAC) in ONE HOUR of drinking" for a "Male 170 lbs." The drink equivalent for a "Female 137 lbs." is on the right-hand side of the BAC range, but unlike the drinks distribution on the male side, the female BAC is much higher for each drink, with 2 drinks equaling a .05 BAC, the same BAC attained with 3 drinks for the male.

The base of the stem gives information about alcohol equivalents: "1 drink = .54 ounces of pure alcohol." Set in red, bold display font is the caption for the graph: "Number of drinks and blood alcohol level (BAC) in ONE HOUR of drinking." Directly below that text, set in small, black sans serif typeface, are two centered sentences: "A can of beer, a glass of wine, or a shot of liquor, all contain an equivalent amount of alcohol" and a warning, "However, many drinks contain more alcohol." This sentence qualifies the information given in the graph; this disclaimer is interesting for two reasons. First, the disclaimer is consistent with the way disclaimers are presented; what we have here is the fine print. Also, this disclaimer reflects a minor controversy about "you can drink this much alcohol" graphs.

Distributing this kind of information about how much alcohol a person can consume before he or she becomes impaired is a subject for some debate even among anti-drunk driving stakeholders. Proponents of this sort of graph (sometimes this kind of information is presented in different forms such as a rotating wheel chart or a reference card with the information in a table) say that drinkers need to have this information to help them make informed choices about drinking and driving. Opponents of these aids to calculating BAC, on the other hand, contend that the effect of alcohol on a person varies widely depending on a range of factors and that this simplistic "drink this much and you’ll have this BAC level" can
be misleading. Drinkers might use the chart and underestimate their degree of impairment and decide to drive.

MADD probably included the chart to counter the hospitality industry’s argument that the .08 BAC limit is so low that it threatens ‘social drinkers’ who are at relatively low risk of crash involvement compared to high BAC ‘hard core’ drinking drivers with BACs of .15 or higher. . . . Further the hospitality industry claims that a small woman could reach the .08 limit with two large glasses of wine on an empty stomach. However, tests in actual drinking situations indicate that, with rare exceptions, three or more drunks are required for even small individuals to reach .08. (Voas et al. 2000, 2)

Including the graph speaks to an interesting characteristic of the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement. Stakeholders can draw from a wide variety of commonplace texts and visuals; they can literally pick and choose in order to suit a particular rhetorical purpose. It isn’t news that rhetors on different sides of a controversy “spin” the same “facts.” What is unusual about the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement is that even proponents of various aspects of the movement—such as passage of the .08 BAC law described here—may be willing to bend their principals and include something—in this case, a “Where is .08?” graph that they ordinarily wouldn’t use—to persuade people not to drink and drive. In fact, in some cases, because they appropriate each other’s strategies and do it so well, it can be difficult to sort out the players. For example, the alcohol industry sends messages that urge people to “drink responsibly” and organizations like the Century Council (supported by America’s distillers) routinely issue press releases tooting their horns with regard to their commitment to safe highways.

In this case, conveying information in a genre that has come under fire from anti-drunk driving activists in a sense beats the opposition at their own game. In this case, proponents of the .08 BAC law use the graph and accompanying text to show that, really, “.08 is not aimed at the “social drinker” and that drinkers may actually be able to drink more than they thought they could and not be impaired.

The idea that the .08 BAC law criminalizes or somehow interferes with people’s right to drink is addressed again below when I talk about the two elements at the bottom of center column of the inside spread. However, before I discuss those elements, I want to move back
to the top left-hand corner of the center spread to discuss the other text on the inside spread, starting with the left-hand column which is visible along with the BAC chart when a reader opens the first fold of the brochure.

The inside spread is set in three roughly equal width columns, and the three column headings read, from left to right, “Why .08?”; “How can you help?”; and “Remember!” The first heading, “Why .08?” appears below the two paragraphs that set the scene for the brochure’s narrative by presenting information about alcohol-related crashes in the U.S. in general (“About two out of every five Americans will be involved in an alcohol-related crash . . . . Drinking and driving is killing us.”). This heading gives facts specifically about Illinois (“Impaired driving on Illinois roadways killed 656 people in 1994”). The next sentence frames the issues that this brochure explains (“It is clearly time to examine the ‘current definition’ of what Illinois considers to be illegally impaired”). This sentence is somewhat misleading because all of the text units that follow in these two columns address not the “current definition,” as the text states but instead present arguments for the .08 BAC law.

With the exception of the final bulleted text unit (which follows the visual conventions of the first two paragraphs), the multi-line text units below “WHY .08?” each are comprised of

- a windshield-crack black bullet in the margin;
- the word “fact” printed in red all-caps display typeface;
- a declarative statement about .08 BAC set in bold in a slightly larger size of the serif typeface; and
- a sentence or two (set in the regular serif typeface) that elaborates on the bold declarative statement.

According to Karen Schrider, a bullet “[d]raws the reader’s attention . . . . bulleted items stand out from their surroundings because they employ extra horizontal and vertical space” (1997, p. 504). The bullet chosen for this brochure looks very much like the small circular crack with an irregular, jagged border that is made in a windshield by a pebble, a BB, or a small-caliber bullet. These windshield-crack bullets—a total of seven on the inside spread—visually suggest a windshield that might have been cracked in a crash. I suggest that using a bullet shaped like a windshield crack heightens the attention-getting effect of the bullets.

The seven text units on the inside spread include “.08” in a declarative statement. For example, the first states, “At .08 BAC virtually all drivers experience a loss of critical driving
skills.” The second addresses the contention that .08 BAC will criminalize social drinkers: “.08 is not aimed at the ‘social drinker.’” The third, which begins like the first, states, “At .08 the risk of being involved in a crash begins to increase dramatically.” I specifically mention these three sentences because, in the next section of this chapter, I analyze *A Safer State with .08*, a brochure prepared by the Illinois Secretary of State’s office after the .08 BAC law went into effect in Illinois.

The text below the three “fact” chunks in the middle column deviates both visually and textually from the other “facts” on the page. Instead of a bullet and one fact, only one bullet is associated with two assertions. Adjacent to the bullet, a red capital P runs in with the black text and begins this declarative statement: “Proponents of .08 seek to minimize the loss of life.” Immediately below that, but not marked with a bullet, a red capital O runs in to start the text that reads, “Opponents seek to minimize loss of revenue.”

These sentences ascribe motives to both the .08 law proponents and opponents, and are followed by, “The most vocal and visible opponents of .08 tend to be the alcohol and hospitality industries because they fear loss of revenue. .08 is *not* about drinking—it is about drinking and driving” (emphasis in original).

Further, the text at the bottom of this column reads “Facts from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.” This attribution serves at least two rhetorical purposes. First, it affiliates the MADD Illinois Public Policy Liaison with a federal agency, NHTSA, which functions to appropriate the ethos of the agency and enhance the credibility of the numerous “facts” asserted in the brochure. Placed directly below the two assertions about proponents and opponents, the citation implies that NHTSA considers these assertions to be “facts,” a situation that the .08 BAC law opponents might challenge. Indeed, by not following the visual and typographic pattern used for the rest of the “facts,” and by placing these two sentences relative to only one bullet, MADD (clearly the proponent in this duality) uses NHTSA’s authority to reinforce the difference between the opposing goals. By talking about these goals in terms of “minimizing,” here MADD attempts to establish itself and other proponents of .08 as more noble, motivated by a more lofty goal: preventing the loss of life. After balancing this stance against the opponent’s more pedestrian and certainly, according to MADD, more selfish goal of minimizing loss of revenue, MADD hammers home the
message that readers ought to wonder how they can help .08 proponents value life over revenue, which is the red first-level heading on the right column.

The red text, "How can you help?" continues the narrative thread established in the first two columns. Two paragraphs reinforce the idea that passing the .08 law is "crucial" (emphasis in original) and exhort readers to contact their legislators to "voice your support of .08." The second paragraph offers MADD's assistance in contacting the legislators and provides MADD Illinois Public Policy Liaison's telephone contact information, information that is repeated on the back panel below the MADD logo.

The following sentence, which is in bold type, is "Your call or letter will make a difference!" Surrounded both above and below by white space, the exclamation "Remember!" precedes two assertions that finish the narrative. The first sentence, " .08 is a limit which is reasonable and necessary for the driving safety of us all," is in the same size black typeface used for the two messages on the back panel. The bottom sentence is in red display text on two lines: Passage of .08 will save lives . . . and that is the bottom line!"

The back panel of the brochure has four chunks of text. The top chunk uses the windshield crack-shaped bullet and display typeface structure that is similar to the text units on the inside spread. Like the bulleted text units on the inside spread, this one uses the black windshield crack bullet and the word "fact" and a colon. There the similarity ends. This text unit deviates from the other text because the "fact"—"Nationally, 165,899 people were killed and one million were injured in alcohol-related traffic crashes in 1994—is presented in a black, centered typeface.

About 1.5" below this fact are two text chunks, both centered and in a larger, bold typeface that read, "Impaired driving destroys lives" and "Make the right decision so everyone can live." These two messages, which are central messages for MADD, are prominently placed and benefit from being set in attention-getting red type and surrounded by the most white space on the entire brochure which increases the figure-ground contrast. It is almost as if MADD Illinois wants to back away a bit from soliciting support for the .08 BAC law—as though a reader might not be persuaded by the facts on the inside spread—but still wants to convey its central message. The lower quarter of the back panel consists of the MADD logo over "Mothers Against Drunk Driving in Illinois," which is above contact information for MADD's Public Policy Liaison.
The brochure’s subtitle, *A Sign of the Times in Illinois*, did predict the passage of the .08 BAC law in Illinois, and the brochure’s assertion that “Lowering Illinois’ illegal BAC standard from .10 to .08 will save lives” also was borne out. After the .08 BAC law passed in Illinois, NHTSA commissioned a federal study to assess the effects of the law. According to *Effectiveness of the Illinois .08 Law*, in the first full year after the .08 BAC law was in place, “[t]here was an overall reduction of 13.7% in the proportion of drinking drivers in fatal crashes. Surrounding states without a .08 law, showed no similar decline” (Voas et al. 2000, 44). In response to the .08 BAC law, the Illinois Secretary of State’s office published *A Safer State with .08*, the brochure that is discussed next.

### A Safer State with .08

One of the most interesting aspects of the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement is the extent to which something that works—whether a slogan, a graphic image, or an entire public policy campaign—is taken up and used in a variety of settings and in a variety of genres. The example I use in this section exists as a slogan: A safer state with .08. When spoken aloud, the slogan reads, “A safer state with point-oh-eight.” When Belluschi provided me with artifacts that use the slogan, “A Safer State with .08,” she wrote this note: “I actually thought of the slogan ‘A Safer State with .08’ to emphasize the ‘safer roadways for the public’ positive message rather than the negative ‘we’re going to arrest you’ message” (2001b). In addition to Belluschi’s artifacts, I have seen the large (approximately 5’ x 7’) highway sign on the verge of Interstate 80 within three miles of the Iowa-Illinois border. The slogan also is used on other Secretary of State’s office traffic safety publications. In addition, Illinois driver’s licenses use this slogan as part of a holographic image behind the driver’s information. I have found this phrase only in information about Illinois; to my knowledge, no other states or organizations have adopted this slogan. Despite the slogan having appeared in several genres, the following detailed analysis focuses on one instantiation of the slogan, a 3.5” x 8.5” single-fold, brochure that was printed and distributed beginning in mid-1997 after the .08 per se BAC law was enacted in Illinois. The front and back panels of this brochure are shown on the following pages in figures 15 and 16.

The cumulative effect of the verbal and textual elements on the cover of the brochure is suggestive of a vehicle passing the sign at highway speed. This sense of motion is accomplished, in part, by the angled double yellow line and the slight expansion
Driving Under the Influence is a serious criminal offense with devastating consequences.

• A person caught driving with a BAC of .08 percent or more can be arrested and charged with DUI and will face an automatic driver's license suspension. DUI offenders are handcuffed, booked, fingerprinted and put in jail.

• Getting a DUI is costly, embarrassing and leaves a permanent blemish on a person's driving record. Bail bond, fines, attorney fees, court costs, increased insurance premiums and alcohol education programs all contribute to the $9,000 average cost to a DUI offender.

• By far, the most devastating consequences of DUI are thousands of needless, senseless injuries and deaths. Nationally, more than 17,000 people die each year in alcohol-related crashes, and about 1 million people are injured.

What you can do?

• Think before you drink. Before you begin drinking, choose a designated driver — a person who voluntarily abstains from drinking alcohol and pledges to take everyone home safely.

• If you or someone you know has been drinking, arrange for a taxi or other means of safe transportation home.

• Keep in mind that alcohol impairs judgment. After several drinks you may convince yourself that you can drive safely. Statistics prove otherwise.

Remember...

.08 is a limit at which all motorists are too impaired to drive safely!

http://www.sos.state.il.us

Printed by authority of the State of Illinois
June 1997 - 100M - GA-1120

Figure 15. Outside panels of A Safer State with .08 (1997, 1)
Dear motorist,

The creation of Illinois' new .08 law marks an important milestone in our state's efforts to end drunk driving and improve safety on our roadways.

With this law, Illinois joins a growing number of states that now recognize a blood-alcohol content (BAC) of .08 percent as the level at which all motorists are too impaired to drive. Any person who now drives in Illinois with a BAC of .08 or more risks being charged with Driving Under the Influence (DUI).

Unfortunately, alcohol involvement is still the most common factor in highway deaths and injuries. Only 7 percent of all crashes involve alcohol use, but 41 percent of fatal crashes do.

I pushed for passage of a .08 law because research shows that states with this BAC limit experience a significant decline in alcohol-related crashes, injuries and deaths. They do so primarily because .08 laws make all motorists — even habitual drunk drivers — far more reluctant to drink and drive.

By setting a more sensible limit on the amount of alcohol motorists can consume before driving, I hope we in Illinois also can save lives and spare more families from heartbreaking, needless tragedies.

I encourage you to read this brochure about the .08 law and share this information with your family and friends.

GEORGE H. RYAN
Secretary of State
of the word, Illinois, which appears as if it were glimpsed by a motorist traveling at highway speed. These elements do the following informative work: they establish the “alcohol limit,” the new BAC as .08 and they reinforce the increased safety of the highways in Illinois under the new .08 BAC law. The cover accomplishes a persuasive function by linking the message with a common experience for drivers—the quick flash of a sign glimpsed at highway speed. However, that link alone is different enough and contains enough additional information that the reader will not only take in the information about the new BAC limit but also may consider his or her own behavior with regard to drinking and driving. The practical work of the cover is accomplished when the reader—whose curiosity may have been piqued by the dissonance between the cover sign and what is normally on a sign like the one on the cover—opens the brochure. Perhaps the people who prepared the brochure also counted on readers to skim the cover quickly and might read .08 as 80, which would be understandable because some people drive 80 miles per hour.

On the inside of the brochure, readers are greeted with a personal letter from the then-Secretary of State George Ryan. Clearly, although Ryan is an important official in the Illinois state government, his picture shares equal billing with the brochure’s main messages: .08 is the law. Ryan writes, “Any person who now drives in Illinois with a BAC of .08 or more risks being charged with Driving Under the Influence (DUI)” (1997, 2). Because his picture and the text carry about the same emphasis, Ryan also may be able to achieve a political presence that will serve to remind voters of his accomplishments and, ultimately, help him in future elections.

The theme of the slogan is “a safer state.” In this use, the literal meaning of state refers to the State of Illinois. However, a metaphoric meaning of state might refer to a person’s state of sobriety or ability to properly and safely operate a vehicle. The rheme is “with .08.” Consider the awkwardness of switching the positions of these two elements: Point-oh-eight makes the state safer. This slogan contains the same information, but it doesn’t roll off the tongue in the same way.

Not only does a reversed theme-rheme pattern (which is not as pleasing and therefore not as easily understood or remembered) feel awkward to native speakers of North American Standard English, the reversed pattern violates the given-new contract. This brochure was produced when the .08 BAC illegal limit had just become Illinois law, so using .08 as the
theme of the slogan would put new information in a position of emphasis without sufficient previously known information.

Further, consider the "Safer State With .08" slogan in terms of the narrative it provides. In Illinois, this slogan appears in brochures and other materials that explain the change in the illegal BAC limit from .10 to .08. The declarative nature of the slogan suggests that the steps that need to be taken to resolve the problem of driving and drinking are the responsibility of individual drivers. After the narrative places the responsibility in the hands of the driver, the resolution (or climax) of the story, especially as it is told in this brochure, is a sense of satisfaction on the part of a sober driver ("The state is safer because I'm sober"). Or it would be possible to get another reading of the narrative, a reading that might interject a sense of dissonance on the part of a driver whose BAC might, at times, be greater than .08: "Yikes, they could make the state more safe by arresting and prosecuting me. I'd better be careful."

**Paired Discussions of Texts from Before and After .08 Brochures**

In this section, I compare *A Sign of the Times for Illinois*, the brochure printed and distributed to urge citizens to support the then-proposed .08 BAC law, with *A Safer State with .08* published after the law was in force. Both of these brochures follow both visual and textual conventions for brochures. While the *A Sign*, the "before" brochure and *A Safer State*, the "after" brochure differ in paper size, number of folds, and subsequent number of panels, they have much in common. First, they both employ the ".08 alcohol limit" roadway sign motif on the covers. Both use catchy phrases for a title, each of which is at least somewhat ambiguous, which might cause readers to slow down and more completely apprehend the message. Both use questions as headings to indicate the hierarchy, to carry the narrative, and to guide readers through the text. Both present "facts" and both include all three basic kinds of rhetorical appeals, appeals to ethos, logos, and pathos. However, instead of focusing here on all the similarities between these two texts, I want to focus on differences in the discourse that we can immediately trace by comparing three parallel pairs of text from the two brochures. These example texts are reproduced here with the original type characteristics—what was bold, is bold; what was italic, is italic and so on—and the punctuation in the examples also is reproduced exactly. All of these example texts were printed in black except where noted. All three parallel texts are shown in figure 17.
Before: *A Sign of the Times for Illinois*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair A</th>
<th>At .08 BAC virtually all drivers experience a loss of critical driving skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair B</td>
<td>.08 is <em>not</em> aimed at the “social drinker.” .08 is <em>not</em> just a couple of drinks after work. The average 170 pound male would have to consume 4 drinks within 1 hour on an empty stomach to reach .07. This is a consumption rate most adults would not consider “social drinking.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair C</td>
<td>Passage of .08 will save lives . . . and that is the bottom line. (set in red, bold, serif typeface)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following sections begin with the row that contains the pair under analysis.

**Pair A Texts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair A</th>
<th>1 Before: <em>A Sign of the Times for Illinois</em></th>
<th>2 After: <em>A Safer State with .08</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1 At .08 BAC virtually all drivers experience a loss of critical driving skills.</td>
<td>A2 Remember . . . .08 is a limit at which all motorists are too impaired to drive safely.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pair A texts both refer to .08 as the level at which a drinking driver’s performance is impaired. The theme of Text A1, “At .08 BAC,” sets the reader up to learn more about what happens to someone with a .08 BAC. In this case, the rheme begins with “virtually,” a qualifier, that modifies “all drivers,” which leads us to understand that almost, but not quite all drivers either are or behave a certain way. This somewhat limited class of drivers is the
subject of the sentence. However, instead of having these drivers actually driving, the
writers hedge their assertion and use “experience,” which means that our limited pool of
drivers have something happen to them—a loss of critical driving skills—as opposed to
having the drivers act. This passive construction, coupled with the qualifier minimizes the
effect of this assertion.

This sentence is one of the bold face declarative sentences preceded with the bullet and
the word “fact” set in all cap red display text. Text A1 is the first one after the first-level
heading, “WHY .08?” The elaboration text that follows this hedged declarative (“For the
vast majority of drivers, even experienced drinking drivers, .08 is the level at which critical
driving skills . . . are substantially impaired.”) begins to repair the hedge, but it is almost as if
MADD Illinois is reluctant to assert a research finding that supports the passage of the .08
BAC law. This reluctance could be related to a desire to couch the “facts” in order to walk
the line between garnering support for the bill and frightening “social drinkers” who may be
confused about their impairment status.

Text A2, from after the .08 law’s passage, on the other hand, begins by commanding
readers to “remember.” This command, which is the theme of the phrase, is emphasized both
by Text A2’s placement in the brochure in a place of prominence (at the bottom of the back
panel of the brochure, centered, and surrounded by white space) and typographically
(“Remember” is on a line by itself and is set in the largest type of any other text except the
title and the inside subtitle). “Remember” also is followed by an ellipsis, a device that either
signals something that has been left out or signals a pause, in this case a pause that
emphasizes what comes next. The rheme—.08 is a limit at which all motorists are too
impaired to drive safely!—is a straightforward assertion. The indefinite article “a” “narrows
down the reference to a single number of a class,” in this case the class of limits (Biber et
al.1999, 69–70). This indefinite reference (as opposed to the definite article “the limit”
which would pin down the exact limit beyond discussion) leaves open the option for other
limits, too, that might govern drivers’ degree of impairment such as the amount of food
consumed and the time span during which the driver was drinking alcohol. The indefinite
nature of the limit is somewhat offset by the phrase “at which all drivers are dangerously
impaired,” a construction that uses a be-form primary verb both as a stative verb of existence
and as a linking verb that connects “drivers” and “dangerous impairment.”
In this brochure, the Illinois Secretary of State assumes the authority to make explicit the relationship between .08 BAC and “all motorists” (my emphasis). Secretary Ryan—or at least his staff—is up on the research. Ryan knows, and has plenty of data (some of which are presented in *A Safer State*) to support his reminder about being “too impaired to drive safely.” The driver with a .08 or greater BAC may not be too impaired to drive, but certainly is too impaired to drive safely. This reminder leaves both the motorist’s decision to drive and hints at the consequences that could result from the driver choosing to drive. After all, the .08 BAC law is all about affixing stricter consequences on drinking and driving.

On the whole, Text A1 is more inflected than the straightforward assertion in Text A2. In Text A1, the status of the .08 BAD law is still tentative; federal highway funds are in jeopardy if the .08 BAC law is not enacted by July 1, 2004. In contrast, Text 2 can afford to be declarative because it is the voice of the end of the story, the voice of authority; further, it carries the ethos of the secretary of state.

**Pair B Texts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before:</strong></td>
<td><em>A Sign of the Times for Illinois</em></td>
<td><em>A Safer State with .08</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1</strong></td>
<td>.08 is not aimed at the “social drinker.”</td>
<td><strong>B2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.08 is not just a couple of drinks after work. The average 170 pound male would have to consume 4 drinks within 1 hour on an empty stomach to reach .07. This is a consumption rate most adults would not consider “social drinking.”</td>
<td>While all drivers have a responsibility to avoid intoxication, .08 does not target the social drinker who may have a couple of drinks after work or a glass or two of wine after dinner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both of these texts directly address an argument designed to persuade some people—social drinkers—to oppose the proposed .08 BAC illegal limit law. To garner support for the law, Text B1, the voice of the legislation’s advocate, is reassuring: “This law is not directed at you, it does not threaten you social drinkers. You can still stop for a drink after work. You don’t have to change your drinking habits. We won’t be out to get you. You are different from “those drinkers” who are not considered by “most adults” to be social
drinkers. In contrast, Text B2 doesn’t have to reassure readers that the .08 BAC law is “out to get” the social drinker. As I discussed earlier, anti-drunk driving adversaries were vocal in their opposition to the .08 BAC law. One tactic that adversaries adopted was to try to persuade social drinkers that the law would require that they drastically alter their behavior, a prediction that simply has not come to pass. In fact, data collected in Illinois for the two years right after the passage of the .08 BAC law show that, while the overall DUI arrest rate rose 11%, the percentage of arrests within the .08–.09 range (the range within which social drinkers might fall) rose from < 1% to only 4% (Voas et al. 2000, 17).

This voice of the state in Text B2 reminds all drivers of their “responsibility to avoid intoxication” and reiterates the notion that the state is not “out to get the social drinker.” And here the state defines social drinker—a couple of drinks after work or wine with dinner—and provides a behavioral benchmark for people who drink and then, perhaps drive.

**Pair C Texts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair C</th>
<th>Before: <em>A Sign of the Times for Illinois</em></th>
<th>After: <em>A Safer State with .08</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>C1</strong> Passage of .08 will save lives . . . and that is the bottom line. (set in red, bold, serif typeface)**</td>
<td><strong>C2</strong> Experts estimate that as many as 65 lives could be saved each year in Illinois—and thousands of injuries prevented—due to the .08 law.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Text C1 solidly predicts the future that the brochure’s sponsors, other anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders, and, when it comes right down to it, nearly everyone hopes will come true. Saving lives is important. The numbers of people killed on our nation’s streets and highways have steadily decreased over the past 30 years for a number of reasons. Late-model cars are built with more safety features. More people wear seat belts. The highways themselves are engineered to be safer. Bridge abutments are now equipped with impact-reducing barriers. The list goes on. Stakeholders in the anti-drunk driving movement have made great strides in terms of attacking the various factors that contribute to alcohol-related traffic incidents.
As a nation, we are now more aware of drunk driving as a social problem, and we have been equipped with strategies to work to solve this problem. What the anti-drunk driving movement has attempted and accomplished has worked. The movement’s stakeholders have, because of their tireless efforts, tenacious progress, and resulting successes, over time been able to project a genuine authority when it comes to speaking about the future. For this reason, text C1—especially as presented in the brochure in a prominent place, surrounded by white space, and formatted in bold red text—can close the argument they support in various ways throughout the brochure: here the MADD Illinois Public Policy Liaison can predict the future.

Text C2 also predicts the future in some detail. This paragraph answers the question in the heading, “What is .08?” When the authority of the State calls upon the authority of “experts,” and predicts that “as many as 65 lives could be saved each year in Illinois—and thousands of injuries prevented,” the .08 BAC law seems well worth the struggle it took to get the law passed. We may not think that 65 lives are very many until we think about the movement’s efforts to “put a face on the victim” and remember the individual victim’s and survivor’s stories. Then we can understand the idea of 65 people on a personal level.

**Drunk Driving is a Costly Killer, Reports Erie Insurance: April is Alcohol Awareness Month**

Just as we can relate to the 65 lives being saved every year, we can relate when movement stakeholders put a face on the drunk driving problem by disclosing the statistics one story at a time, over and over again, in many different genres and in many different situations. Placing a face on the victims of drunk driving is one side of the coin when it comes to understanding the problems associated with drunk driving. Not only do we become more aware of the personal, human dimension of the problems, we also need to understand the magnitude of these problems. Movement stakeholders address this flip side of the coin when they use analogies to help discuss the statistics. Many of the analogies involve framing one or more statistics in terms of common experiences that people can relate to. For example, in an effort to help people grasp the frequency of drunk driving fatalities, in 1999, the Erie Insurance Group issued a press release titled “Drunk Driving is a Costly Killer, Reports Erie Insurance: April is Alcohol Awareness Month” that begins
Imagine reading the headline: “Two jetliners collide, killing 315 people. Cause of crash: pilot was drunk!” The tragic reality is 315 people are dying every week at the hands of drunk drivers on our nation’s roads. Although it’s not grabbing national headlines, thousands of people are being killed each year—one person every 32 minutes—and more than one million Americans are injured annually in alcohol-related crashes. (1, emphasis in original; full text in Appendix B)

These paragraphs use the crashing jetliners analogy because most people have been on a commercial jetliner or are at least somewhat familiar with the numbers of passengers a commercial-size airplane can carry. We have up-close-and-personal contact with the individuals who share a leg of air travel with us. And, because FFA regulations require it, all of these traveling companions are reminded of the dangers of air travel when the cabin attendants demonstrate the oxygen masks and seat belts and point out the emergency exits. We can relate to this multi-sensory experience. Although no one calls our attention to the dangers awaiting us on our nation’s streets and highways, when we are presented with the idea that an airplane-full-of-passengers-worth of people die every week, we can put faces to the plane’s passengers and, by comparison, put faces on the weekly drunk driving victims.

Humanizing the statistics in this way is an enormous project, one that requires near-constant attention from movement stakeholders. A similar tactic helps us understand the numbers of people who are killed in traffic incidents of all kinds over a year’s time. When we are asked to imagine a football stadium full of people—around 40,000 people—we can relate that to the number; by analogy, we can conceptualize the number of people killed over the course of a year. If all the people killed in alcohol-related traffic incidents in 2001—17,448 people—were massacred in one place at one place, it would wipe out the population of a city the size of Coralville, Iowa, or all of the students enrolled at the University of New Orleans.

These analogous relationships that help people understand statistics go beyond simply helping people envision the people who already have been killed in drunk driving crashes. These analogies are also intended to get people to stop and think before they drink and drive, just as the cabin attendants take time to make people think as they sit in an airplane preparing to fly. Ideally, when drivers get in their cars and before they start to drive, they’d mentally
run through a safety checklist that parallels the cabin attendants’ spiel and then, if they’ve been drinking, choose not to drive.

We know, however, that no one approach—no amount of humanizing the statistics, no collection of compelling stories, no comparison with planes, stadiums, or small towns—is going to completely stop drunk driving crashes. We do know, though, that for many people who are convicted of DUI, what happens to them as the result makes a big difference to them in terms of changing how they behave in the future. In some instances, as we saw in the 1972 Reader’s Digest article about Phoenix’s pilot post-DUI-conviction program, programs do target offenders in an effort to reduce the rate of DUI recidivism.

Someone You Should Know:
Marti Belluschi Uses Personal Experience To Teach Others

The strategies outlined in the 1972 Reader’s Digest article, which are echoed in Erie Insurance’s 1999 press release, have been widely adopted and have been adapted over time into programs variously called DUI schools, court-supervised rehabilitation, or driver safety training that increasingly target recidivist DUI offenders. One way to think about part of what happens in these programs is to consider that these programs and other movement efforts “put a face on the victims.” One strategy that is common in DUI schools is scheduling a panel of people whose lives have been changed by a drunk driver. Called victim impact panels, these people tell their stories to those who have been convicted of DUI. Victim impact panels are typically small groups of people (ranging from a single individual to a panel of three to five people) who have suffered in some way from a drunk driving crash. Some may be survivors of drunk driving crashes, like Belluschi, but others may be the loved ones left behind when a family member or friend is killed in a crash. Depending on the situation, still others may be convicted drunk drivers whose motivation to tell their stories may be the result of a guilty conscience or may be the result of adjudication that requires the offender to participate in victim impact panels.

One purpose of victim impact panels is to “put a human face on the tragedy,” to bring home to offenders that real people suffer real losses and other sometimes devastating consequences as the result of the behavior that landed the offender in the rehabilitation program (Belluschi 2001). Members of the victim impact panel talk about the crash that changed their lives forever. Some people describe their own experiences, and others describe
what happened to another person, but they all talk about the ways those experiences have altered their lives. Just as the prevention presentations have a dramatic impact, victim impact panels can have the same kinds of effects.

On post-rehabilitation treatment evaluations, DUI offenders often remark that the victim impact panel made the most impression on them; the next most often cited as important in the training is writing out the events preceding their arrest to look at both their pattern of behavior as well as to deliberately examine their decision to drink and drive (Christy 2002). DUI schools and other similar programs are designed to reduce recidivism, to lower the chances that a person who is apprehended, charged with, and adjudicated for a first DUI will go on to make the same poor decisions and commit the crime of drunk driving again.

Although these efforts have been demonstrated to be successful with offenders, logic tells us that prevention must take place at a different point in drivers' lives, which is where prevention presentations come into play.

It is safe to say that Marti Belluschi is well known in Illinois for her prevention presentations. She has touched thousands of lives by sharing her experiences. However, she can’t possibly visit all the high schools in Illinois, so different individuals and agencies report on her presentations and her other activities within the movement to extend her message.

When he was the Illinois Secretary of State, George Ryan published the “3-D” newsletter, Don’t Drink and Drive: A newsletter for teens, a single-page, double sided, tabloid-style broadsheet that targeted teenagers. The front includes a quiz that teens could take to “find out how much [they] know about the consequences of drinking and driving” and a letter from Ryan that, in part, tells teens that “the most serious consequence of drinking and driving isn’t the loss of a driver’s license—it’s a loss of life.” The rest of the front page is taken up by an article titled, “Someone You Should Know: Marti Belluschi Uses Personal Experience To Teach Others.” The article talks about Belluschi’s work in preventing alcohol-related deaths and injuries in general and her efforts with teens in particular. In these presentations, Belluschi graphically describes her experience as a victim of a drunk driver to students in many high schools in and around the Chicago area. She speaks to other organizations, such as Rotary, PTAs, and other civic organizations by invitation. Belluschi, who particularly enjoys speaking to groups of students, remarks that, “high school is the last bastion of forced participation in our society in general. After students leave school, they seldom can be
Someone you should know

Marti Belluschi uses personal experience to teach others

Marti Belluschi's interest in traffic safety dates back to 1964 when she and her father were victims of a drunk driver. Her father was seriously injured in the crash, which left Marti fighting for her life.

Belluschi now works in the Secretary of State’s office as a special assistant. Her responsibilities include organizing DUI programs and coordinating public education and outreach efforts.

Part of Belluschi’s public education program is to tell the story of how a drunk driver affected her life. She sometimes goes into graphic detail of the events that took place during and after the crash.

Belluschi speaks of being thrown through the windshield, her face and throat slashed and her leg shattered. She tells of how emergency workers took bobby pins from her hair to clamp off severed veins; how nurses put a sheet over her face before they would let her mother see her; how it took many operations to create a new face.

"Every morning when I wake up and look in the mirror, I’m reminded of that drunk driver," Belluschi tells students. "I see this face, and it’s a fine face. But it’s not my face."

Belluschi said that 18 students have fainted during her speeches over the past three years.

"I’m particularly touched when people do faint because you know they’re listening and you know they care," she said. "Kids who faint wake up — kids killed by drunk drivers don’t."

Belluschi was initially hospitalized for two and a half months and has had related surgery as recently as 1985.

The drunk driver who hit Belluschi and her father was 21 years old and uninsured, so all expenses resulting from the crash have been paid by Belluschi and her family. The drunk driver lost his license for 90 days.
compelled to gather for presentations like mine” (2001). Belluschi teams with secondary educators and administrators to make sure that students have been exposed to her powerful message. Her message is so powerful, so vivid that students faint during her presentations. In “Someone you should know,” published in 1996, Belluschi reports that “18 students have fainted during her speeches over the past three years. ‘I’m particularly touched when people do faint because you know they’re listening and you know they care. . . . Kids who faint, wake up—kids killed by drunk drivers don’t’” (Ryan 1996, 1). By 2004, the number of people who faint during her presentations has reached 300.

In addition to recounting her experiences to students, Belluschi also emphasizes another Illinois program, “Use It & Lose It.” Because the legal drinking age in Illinois is 21, the “Use It & Lose It” program establishes a zero tolerance policy for drivers who are under 21: any measurable BAC is cause for license suspension and multiple offenses or involvement in a crash can result in more severe penalties. Illinois’ zero tolerance law was passed in 1994, and “[b]etween January 1, 1995 and December 31, 1999, . . . 14,382 Illinois drivers under the age of 21 lost their driving privileges for drinking and driving” (Governing Illinois: On the Web 2000, 1). Belluschi, who is quoted in “Chapter 2 updates,” part of Governing Illinois: On the Web, says

she is ‘optimistic and excited’ about the effectiveness of the . . . ‘Use It & Lose It’ law. . . . In 1982, alcohol-related crash fatalities for those in the 15–20 age group totaled 200. In 1998, that number was 85. The law has resulted also in an increased number of teen DUI arrests, from 2,829 in 1993 to 4,253 in 1999. Belluschi says that there are not necessarily more teens drinking and driving, but more of them are caught. She hopes word of mouth from teen to teen about the possibility of losing your license will decrease the number of those driving under the influence. As the numbers show, [a teen] can have his or her license taken away for driving after drinking even small amounts of alcohol. (Governing Illinois: On the Web 2000, 4)

Belluschi and other anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders are optimistic about the future when it comes to saving lives by reducing the numbers of alcohol-related traffic incidents. They stand on the shoulders of a strong legacy, a history of purposefully shifting rhetorical strategies to address specific problems with discourse—consisting of both verbal and visual language—that has been carefully chosen to effectively address a range of target audiences from all walks of American life to educate and to influence behavior.
Conclusions, Implications, and Comments

Ending One Story and Beginning Another

From *The Art of Blessing the Day*:

This is the blessing for a political victory:

Although I shall not forget that things
work in increments and epicycles and sometime
leaps that half the time fall back down, . . .

But the discipline of blessings is to taste
each moment, the bitter, the sour, the sweet
and the salty, and be glad for what does not
hurt. The art is in compressing attention . . .

Attention is love, what we must give
children, mothers, fathers, pets,
our friends, the news, the woes of others.
What we want to change we curse and then
pick up a tool. Bless whatever you can
with eyes and hands and tongue. If you
can't bless it, get ready to make it new.


When I first became aware of the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement and then started thinking about possible directions for this project, about the only thing I knew about the anti-drunk driving movement was that my grandmother, normally a peaceful soul, caught the zeal of the earliest movement stakeholders. As a member of one of the last generations that held communicating through hand-written letters in high esteem, she wrote both to her friends and to her elected representatives to garner support for the issue that so moved her. She donated money and she followed the movement's early course. Although, to my knowledge, no one in my family had any direct experiences as drunk driving victims or offenders, my grandmother became a dues-paying member of MADD, then a fledgling organization whose primary tools were women like my grandmother who discovered an outrage that would move them from their kitchens to their writing desks. At the time, I was mystified by the intensity of her passion for this cause. But no longer.

My grandmother was in her 80s when she was swept up by the anti-drunk driving cause, but she did not live to see the results of her commitment. I originally thought I'd find some repository of letters like those that my grandmother and her friends and neighbors had written and begin to trace the discourse of the movement from there. I was wrong. Instead of
seeking these early documents, the urgency of 9/11 caused me to fast forward and to look more closely at the state of the discourse of the movement in real time. As I have mentioned, Marti and I first met on September 16, 2001, to videotape our interviews and to talk about the history of the movement and Marti’s association with it. Our interviews were interrupted by watching the television in her kitchen and, whenever we went out to eat or to go to the grocery store, by pacing the downtown Chicago streets to find the special editions of major newspapers and newsmagazines that were rushed to press in response to our nation’s stunned disbelief and sorrow from that fateful day.

Was September 11th a fateful day? Were all those people in the Twin Towers simply in the wrong place at the wrong time? Were the passengers on the flights that crashed into the towers, the field in Pennsylvania, and the Pentagon unlucky or ill fated? It dawned on me then just how much our language about events like 9/11 and our language about drunk driving crashes had in common. As I have mentioned, Marti’s and my experiences that weekend were mediated by televised coverage and print media, including newspapers and magazines. And, acted out before our very eyes was the cycle of trauma that drunk driving victims and survivors experience, albeit on a different scale. Immediately after the initial shock and horror of the first plane crashing into the first tower, members of the press began to express outrage commingled with fear and confusion. Before the second plane crashed into the second tower, as a nation, we were suspended between disbelief and a mounting sense of outrage. Could this be a deliberate act? How could this have happened? Were there not laws prohibiting this kind of mass murder? After the second plane crashed and we knew for sure that the third and fourth flights were also headed for similar devastating ends, our outrage turned to anger and our anger brought forth our sense of injustice. And, based on all of those complex feelings, we “declared war” on those who had perpetrated these enormous crimes. Yes, crimes. It became quite clear that these horrors had behind them a dispassionate, calculated decision process that supported impeccable planning and careful orchestration. And decisions. Those highjackers decided to board those planes. They decided what they were going to do, and they acted upon those decisions.
Over that weekend, I gained a bone-deep understanding of and felt a kinship with Marti and others whose lives have been forever altered as the result of a person committing a crime by drinking and then deciding to drive. Of course, the big difference between the highjacker and drunk drivers is purposeful action. The highjacker wrote their purposes on the world for all to see. On the other hand, most drunk drivers—who compound the crime of driving while intoxicated by causing a crash in which other people may be injured or may die—in all probability, do not set out to maim or kill. Despite this difference in purpose, for millions of people whose lives are shattered by a drunk driver, the feelings of horror, outrage, and loss are much the same as our nation's responses to what happened on 9/11.

Now, with the passage of time and some distance, as a nation we have made some steps toward channeling our despair and outrage toward the 9/11 perpetrators. Although we may vigorously debate the motives of its architects and its ultimate effectiveness, as a nation, we have put in place a system that, we hope, will reduce the chances that we again might suffer at the hands of terrorists. Where once people whose lives have been affected by drunk driving had no such recourse, no way to resolve their despair, sorrow, and pain, now these survivors are benefiting from the work of the anti-drunk driving movement. Among the results of the early anti-drunk driving movement is a social climate that recognizes crash survivors' pain and suffering. Now victims and survivors have some recourse and, perhaps of equal importance, these traumatized people also have the support of public opinion. In some cases, survivors get actual assistance from movement stakeholders—like AAIM in Illinois, whose primary purpose is to support victims. This support may take the form of financial support for funerals or rehabilitation, assistance in navigating the complexities of the health care bureaucracy, transportation to and from offenders' court appearances, and purchases of equipment like wheelchairs or other adaptive equipment. Perhaps one of the most important aspects of the support provided by the movement is becoming a part of the movement, by joining with others and taking action as a participant, by having the chance to make a difference. These kinds of support have not always been available.

For a long time, some individuals and groups (such as the NSC or NCADD) have sought to make a difference by bringing to and keeping the issues associated with drunk driving in the public consciousness. However, it took the special confluence of a moment in time (the late 1970s and early 1980s), people whose lives had been disrupted by a drunk driving crash,
and a certain space in the public agenda. When these all came together, early movement stakeholders began to shift public attitudes toward the issues associated with drunk driving. As they worked on many fronts to address drunk driving, stakeholders named the problem, gathered resources, and enlisted other stakeholders to unite with a common purpose: to reduce the toll of human suffering and loss from drunk driving crashes. By naming the problem, which leads to owning the problem, movement stakeholders took one of the most critical steps of bringing about societal change.

One of the fronts where the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement began its rhetorical work was changing how survivors and victims of drunk drivers could reframe their experiences. The movement carved a rhetorical space for people who once were considered to have been in a bad accident, for people who, like Marti and her father, were expected to take comfort in the randomness of chance, the hazards of fate. This notion of fate has curious effects. In post-9/11 America, the traditional fickleness of fate has sparked the primitive, nearly visceral impulse to lash out. Just as movement stakeholders had to perform the rhetorical work that it took to sharpen the focus on not only the offenders but also the system that passively perpetuated their crimes, we are engaged in “wars on” that at once galvanized and threaten to destroy our nation.

It’s too soon to tell—and certainly beyond the scope of this project—to speculate about the effectiveness of our various responses. However, the intensity of that September weekend has remained just under the surface during the entire time I’ve been reading and learning about the anti-drunk driving movement, talking with Marti and other movement stakeholders, sifting data, and putting aside interesting ideas that simply couldn’t be addressed in this project. However, no matter where I turned, no matter what I observed happening around me, I could not escape the intensity.

Perhaps one reason this intensity has been my near-constant companion is precisely because of my immersion in the movement’s discourse, a body of work that is at once compelling and horrific. In a sense, the only thing I could responsibly do was to document the work of the movement. The cause that incited my grandmother propelled me to apply my skills, to tackle this project so I can make a difference, too. Unlike my grandmother’s efforts, which were instances of the rhetoric that has powered the movement, my contributions are more likely to factor into future research and scholarship within rhetoric and professional
communication. As I have indicated, the ultimate “so what?” for this project is the fact that
the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement has made a difference: what they did
worked. And, when all is said and done in this study, I suggest that our responses to threats
to our safety and well-being can benefit from taking note of rhetorical situations and
strategies that the anti-drunk driving movement used as they accomplished their work.

I set out to explore these strategies and to examine the discourse of the movement armed
with objectives and research questions. I repeat them here in order to begin to talk about how
the process of this study brought to light concepts that merit serious consideration from those
who track public policy campaigns, for those who want to learn from the successes of the
anti-drunk driving movement in order to construct campaigns that put another burning issue
on the public agenda, and for those in classrooms who seek fertile fields of important issues
upon which to continue in the rich research and pedagogical traditions of rhetoric.

**Examining The Objectives of the Study**

In this section, I present and briefly discuss the objectives of the study, which were

- to situate the rhetoric of the anti-drunk driving movement in a historical and
cultural context;
- to present and analyze the discourse of the movement to address the research
questions; and
- to put forward findings that will contribute to the rhetoric and professional
communication discipline.

The second and third chapters of this work directly address the first objective. To
contextualize my study of the discourse of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement, I
first described the social situations and cultural processes within which the precursors to the
contemporary anti-drunk driving set the stage for those who followed. This contextual
narrative introduced and discussed adversaries, primarily those who refute the movement.
Specifically I explored and described two important adversaries, the two industries that
together constitute the beverage industry, the spirits industry and the beer industry.

In addition to defining the movement by pointing out the forces that resist the efforts of
the movement, I created a taxonomy of anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders who, for
the most part, work in concert toward a common goal. This taxonomy served several
functions in this study, but the most important was providing a systematic way to discuss the
discourse of the movement, which is part of the second objective.

This taxonomy also helped meet the third study objective of contributing to future
research and scholarship by breaking new ground both for scholars of rhetoric and for people
whose interests or research focuses on other aspects of the anti-drunk driving movement; I
discuss those implications below. The need for the taxonomy emerged when I realized that,
while some accounts of the movement discuss the various players within and around the
movement, no one had previously categorized the movement stakeholders. I suggest that,
although doing so was beyond the scope of this project, using the categories of the taxonomy
(advocates, researchers, government, media, and adversaries) to frame studies of other social
movements and their discourse might prove interesting and useful. However, in order to
contextualize the ways this project can contribute in the future, I address the research
questions that guided the study.

**Addressing the Research Questions**

These are the research questions that guided this study:

1. How has the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement changed over time?
   a. What genres have been used?
   b. How have these genres changed?

2. Has the discourse changed in response to
   a. reductions in alcohol-related traffic fatalities in general;
   b. reductions in alcohol-related traffic fatalities in certain demographic groups;
   c. changes in social conditions; or
   d. other now unknown factors?

3. Are there now or have there been rationale(s) for the rhetorical strategies that
   have shaped the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement?
   a. If so, what are they?
   b. If so, how have these strategies been determined?
   c. If not, how have decisions been made?

I address the research questions here one by one so I can very briefly summarize the
study and can comment on the analyses discussed earlier. I begin with the first question,
which assumes that the discourse of the movement has changed over time.
1. How has the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement changed over time?
   a. What genres have been used?
   b. How have these genres changed?

Exploring the early discourse of the contemporary anti-drunk movement led to a problem in conceiving the more global context for the discourse and for the movement. The movement's discourse did not spring *ex nihilo*, but instead was informed by and evolved within cultural and social contexts. Researching the predecessors of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement revealed several situations that deserve mention here both because those situations established a platform for research from which the new movement vaulted into the public consciousness and because pioneering efforts by the government and industry, especially the insurance industry, tempered the rhetorical appeals of the early movement.

Not only did the discourse of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement change from its early patterns (those observed in the NSC artifacts 1930s, like the images of the bumbling drunk and references to John Barleycorn, for example), the discourse also shifted from the genres and rhetorical strategies that were common in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Where once these early pioneers—some of whom focused on safety issues while others studied alcohol and its effects in several different arenas—communicated mostly with each other through more or less specialized genres, the pioneers of the contemporary anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders used different genres and appealed to a much wider audience.

These early stakeholders prided themselves on being a grassroots movement. These women were motivated to act based on strong conviction and personal experience rather than being motivated by some desire to further a research career or improve corporate public relations or strengthen the bottom line. These leaders took advantage of what was familiar to them and appropriated genres that were common at the time and available to them at little or no cost, such as letter writing campaigns.

However, within a few years, these leaders were building on swells of grassroots support as well as support from government and some industries, especially the insurance industry. Because their efforts had begun to carve out a niche in the public agenda, they and their fledgling organizations began to get attention from the media. Some of the media’s attention was traditional news coverage, but some came from a different quarter, the relatively new
and increasingly popular genre of made-for-TV movies. Specifically, in 1983, "NBC produced a made-for-television movie about MADD and its founder resulting in the growth of more chapters and significant media attention" (MADD 2004).

Around this time, MADD made a dramatic rhetorical shift: Mothers Against Drunk Drivers became Mothers Against Drunk Driving. This small, but important shift reflects an early rhetorical consciousness. This early attention to detail was not an isolated instance but was an early example of what was to follow. Movement stakeholders continued to refine their strategies, especially when it came to targeting and effectively communicating with specific audiences. For example, when people noticed that large numbers of young people between the ages of 18 and 21 were perishing within a few miles of state borders where the 18 drinking age was luring young drinkers by the carload, these people responded in two important ways. First, having been made aware of anti-drunk driving organizations, these concerned people affiliated with the movement. Second, because these affiliations eventually reached a sort of political critical mass and helped focus efforts on one goal, the universal 21 drinking age, people began to see the possibilities for change and to understand the power of their language. Having succeeded, in part, because of rhetorical constructs like "blood border," supporters were encouraged and continued to support the growing movement.

Taking advantage of the very real need to tell the stories of victims of drunk drivers as memorials to those people as well as part of the process of healing from the trauma of sudden loss, the movement began to circulate stories. People were drawn to participate, and even people without any particular rhetorical training could find ways to express themselves in ways that motivated others to both share their stories and to find audiences who would be swayed by those stories. These stories necessarily employ the figurative language that helps us as human beings cope with grief and loss.

I chronicled these stories as well as the increasingly sophisticated discourse that emerged when advocates affiliated with other media stakeholders, such as government and researchers. When the emotional appeals of the people drawn to advocacy by their personal loss were combined with the rhetorical skills of journalists like Madeleine Doubek, who were committed to "doing good in the world, the movement took on new challenges.
I identified patterns in the discourse like those I just discussed when I organized the data to address the second research question.

2. Has the discourse changed in response to
   a. reductions in alcohol-related traffic fatalities in general;
   b. reductions in alcohol-related traffic fatalities in certain demographic groups;
   c. changes in social conditions; or
   d. other now unknown factors?

Of the three questions, this one requires the most care, particularly because of the difficulty inherent in establishing a direct causal relationship between social facts and contemporaneous discourse. In a general sense, the answer to this question in all its parts is “Yes. The discourse of the movement did, indeed, change in response to these factors.” However, when it comes to establishing a one-to-one causal relationship between the effects of the movement’s discourse and a statistical pattern that emerges over time, it would be irresponsible for any researcher to assert that such a relationship exists, much less that it could be measured in some way.

In Chapter 5, I discuss how the three “death in a beer mug” visual confections à la Tufte are carefully constructed to combine a complex set of social conditions that belong to a certain demographic group. I show in that chapter how visual artifacts that appear in the discourse of the movement display traces that correlate with certain events or trends, such as a beverage preference that represents typical DUI offenders.

As another example, the discourse surrounding the .08 BAC *per se* legislation can clearly be divided into discourse designed to support the law’s passage and discourse disseminated after the laws were enacted. In Chapter 6, rhetorical and discourse analyses of the brochures from before and after the .08 law passed in Illinois point out strategies the writers used to deliver effective messages to different audiences and for different purposes.

Once again, I must acknowledge Marti Belluschi’s role in this project. Without her insider knowledge, addressing the third part of this question (which left open the opportunity to explore factors that were not evident when the study began) would have been extremely difficult. In fact, talking about some of the effects of the discourse in correlation with various events would have been speculative at best. Belluschi was generous in sharing her broad understanding of not only how the movement targets its messages to different
audiences but also how various factors influenced rhetorical decisions. Her assertions about how different audiences are targeted for different purposes reflect the breadth of her experience in the field. For example, she talked about how research about D.A.R.E., an early preventive education program apparently was successful in the short term but that over the long term, the program did not enjoy the same kind of success. She talked about how the research into the long-term success of the D.A.R.E. program was controversial because the program had been so widely adopted and was so well funded. Because D.A.R.E. programs were housed in local law enforcement agencies, it was particularly difficult for other prevention-based programs to acquire funding, which injected the process with political overtones.

Requests to shift funding away from D.A.R.E. were seen as moves to reduce local law enforcement budgets and, because the D.A.R.E. programs were often well entrenched in communities and school districts, a sort of brand loyalty kicked in, and vying for funding became very competitive. In their bid to get more funding from a limited funding pool, anti-drunk driving stakeholders argued that, while D.A.R.E. was effective in changing children’s attitudes about street drugs, the program fell short when it came time for the students to begin to drive, the success claims of the D.A.R.E. programs were not borne out. Even before I spoke with Belluschi about this situation, I knew about the problems D.A.R.E. was having in terms of measuring its success through conversations with Barbara Christy, the owner of a drug and alcohol treatment center that dealt directly with adjudicated DUI offenders.

Belluschi confirmed Christy’s analysis and used the discussion about D.A.R.E. to point out both how politically charged various aspects of the movement are and how movement stakeholders used each other’s discourse as part of a continual process of assessing and reconfiguring messages to meet specific audiences and to fulfill specific goals. In a less politically charged example, Belluschi discussed how she adapts her presentations to teens, presentations that tend to cluster in April and May. April typically is the time for proms, leading into May with its busy calendar of graduations and end-of-school celebrations, all events that historically spawned tragic DUI crashes. In fact, some movement stakeholders (including the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services) have declared that April is Alcohol Awareness Month. Not only does the anti-drunk driving movement work to build
public literacy about drunk driving issues, movement stakeholders display a remarkable rhetorical sensitivity when it comes to targeting young people.

In addition to carefully staged "crashes" complete with bloody victims and Jaws of Life rescues on school lawns, one of the most clear examples of this rhetorical sensitivity comes from reports about Belluschi’s presentations, especially those to gymnasiums full of high school students. Where once she spoke directly to those students who already had licenses to drive, she now addresses her comments to students who are on the cusp of acquiring a driver’s license and then moving onto the roadways. She asserts that, based on research conducted for the past 20 years, the students who are just beginning to drive are the ones who are most open to her story and its implications.

I will never forget her telling me during one of our very first conversations that, “The very worst thing that can happen to a kid who drinks and drives is that he makes it home safely” (Belluschi 2001c). By the time she enters the school gym, the students who already have their licenses and who have been driving and, perhaps, drinking and then driving, have already acquired the experiential evidence that no consequences follow from drinking and driving. As Belluschi has said, combining this evidence with adolescents’ sense of invulnerability creates a chain of behaviors that is almost impossible to counteract. Once movement stakeholders came to understand this notion, they shifted their attention to younger students who were being issued learners’ driving permits. One way we can trace this kind of thinking is by considering the new ways that driver’s licenses are issued. Newly licensed teen drivers no longer are granted a driving license with full privileges; in fact, in many states, young drivers begin their driving career with conditional licenses that limit when they may drive and how many passengers they can carry and that also carry explicit consequences for driving with any detectable BAC—based on the laws that prohibit people under the age of 21 from purchasing or consuming any alcohol at all. For example, in Illinois, the Secretary of State’s office has implemented a graduated driver license program and a “Use It & Lose It” program designed to impress on young drivers just how seriously the state takes drinking and driving. These kinds of programs that have been put into effect as the result of the efforts of the anti-drunk driving movement draw into focus issues addressed by the third question in this study.
3. Are there now or have there been rationale(s) for the rhetorical strategies that have shaped the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement?
   a. If so, what are they?
   b. If so, how have these strategies been determined?
   c. If not, how have decisions been made?

One reasonably obvious answer to this question is that, of course, movement stakeholders made decisions about their discourse that were based on feedback obtained either directly—such as the counting the teens who faint when Marti tells the story of her crash—or on feedback from less direct sources, such as noticing the relative frequency with which different brochures are picked up during a booth or display at a fair. Similarly, from artifacts that Marti supplied, it is clear that—at least in the Illinois Secretary of State’s Office—people met and talked about strategies for promoting various campaigns or producing artifacts with specific target audiences that would meet specific rhetorical purposes.

Belluschi is very clear that these decision makers know absolutely that more people will pick up an artifact that has some sort of image of beer on it than nearly anything else. I am not sure how the first picture of a beer mug or a martini glass made its way onto anti-drunk driving materials, but I do know that the decision to keep using these images is based on so much experience that, as Belluschi says, “it’s second nature. We’ve been doing this for a long time and we just know what works” (2004). Of course, many other rhetorical choices are made. These choices include carefully crafting the wording in a press release and deliberating whether or not to accept financial support from an organization that expects for that support to be “repaid” by including a corporate logo or an ad. This is no small matter.

In several earlier chapters I discussed the Century Council, which is “funded by America’s distillers.” On the face of it, the Century Council has been generous in supporting the movement; I discuss this “generosity” in some detail in Chapter 2. However, many advocates within the movement are reluctant to completely align themselves or their organizations with the council because of what they perceive to have been convenient sponsorship where the topic and audience are low-stakes endeavors, such as supporting efforts to curb underage drinking. In this case, the council and its affiliates have nothing to lose by such a public stance because it is illegal for people under 21 to buy, possess, or consume any alcohol. On the other hand, when the .08 BAC legislation was tied to federal
highway funds, the council sponsored and distributed results of a study that undercut the
efforts of the .08 BAC proponents. Another example of this dual allegiance can be seen on
the rear panels of many beer delivery trucks and in the fine print on televised beer
commercials that show nubile young women in scanty clothing at festive gatherings: drink
and drive responsibly. Unfortunately, exploring all of the implications of these kinds of
discourse has been beyond the scope of this project, which brings me to what I suggest as
possible topics for future research.

Implications for Future Research

In addition to documenting the movement's stakeholders and its discourse, this study also
points the way to future research. In fact, time and time again over the course of this study, I
identified interesting data and corresponding questions that were beyond the scope of this
study but that might prove to be areas for future research. For example, on a global level,
this study opens the door to a field of discourse that has not yet been explored by scholars of
rhetoric and professional communication. Also, one of the basic premises of this study is
that if you want to change social policy and shift social attitudes and values, if you want to
address complex social issues, one of the things you want to do is to explore what others
have done in similar arenas that has been met with some success. This study began with an
exploration of that notion, but many questions that were outside the scope of this project
remain. For example, one of the documents that can be found on MADD's website is called
Lessons Learned Along the Way: Starting a Non-Profit, which is organized around a series of
ten questions that include "Enlist a charismatic and tireless spokesperson," "Choose a name
that is catchy or symbolic," and "Develop a simple mission statement" (MADD 2000). Each
of these questions suggests a possible direction for further research. It would be interesting
to trace the discourse of an early movement leader such as Candy Lightner or Doris Aiken.
Both of these women are "charismatic and tireless" spokespeople and both have prepared
discourse over the past twenty years, which could be analyzed either by pairing the discourse
of the two women as a comparison/contrast study or by considering each woman's discourse
for analysis of features shifting over time or analysis of artifacts considered in an immediate
cultural context. By this, I mean looking at discourse from before and after a notable event
such as a legislative shift or within the context of the parallel development of a government
agency like the National Council Against Drunk Driving (NCADD), which "is the successor
to the Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving appointed by President Ronald Reagan in 1982" (NCADD 2004a). This organization's history coincides with the period when both Aiken and Lightner were actively mounting their respective anti-drunk driving campaigns. Similarly, another area for future research could be based on criticisms leveled at movement majority stakeholders (especially MADD and Lightner) by the minority opposition. Specifically, such research could examine the discourse of the movement to explore how crash data are represented and interpreted, one area that the opposition has targeted by claiming that statistics used to demonstrate the frequency of DUI-caused traffic incidents are inaccurate. In addition to research that would include a statistical component in addition to rhetorical analyses, because so many of the leaders of the movement have been and are now women, research into the gendered nature of the discourse of the movement would be very interesting.

Similarly, it would be interesting to explore aspects of programs like D.A.R.E., which has met with wide acceptance despite research that indicates that, over the long term, the program has not been successful in changing how program graduates actually behave with regard to drugs and alcohol.

Another area of potential interest that was beyond the scope of this project is a look at how movement stakeholders present and re-present research results. Like most arenas where specialists conduct research and report it in their disciplines' publications, the research that grounds the anti-drunk driving movement is disseminated not only by researchers in professional publications and in discourse that fulfills the reporting requirements of research grant contracts that supported the work. Other anti-drunk driving movement stakeholders attend to these kinds of research reports and then, in many instances, transform the information in those reports and disseminate it as “news” generated by those stakeholders. The patterns of distributing research about the movement—such as translating technical discourse into the vernacular in order to ensure that research is reported widely and effectively—are complex webs of discourse that deserve more attention from scholars and researchers in rhetoric and professional communication.

And finally, this project was chronologically bounded by 1964, the date of her crash, and, roughly, fall of 2001 when we met for the first time. Similarly, this project was geographically bounded in Illinois, the state where Belluschi has been most active and where
she has experience in most of the movement stakeholder roles. Future research that would focus more on artifacts from the past five years would be interesting because of the widespread adoption of the web as a communication tool, especially if a researcher were to find a stakeholder who had played a technical support role in website development, site architecture, or information management. While the State of Illinois has been a fruitful territory for research into the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement, other studies might focus on a different location or compare the discourse of the movement from different geographical locations. No matter which of these options might be pursued by me, by other rhetoric and composition researchers, or by students investigating an artifact that has caught their eye, the only option that I would find unthinkable would be looking away, avoiding the possibilities because the discourse is so intense.

**Looking Back, Looking Away, And Looking Ahead**

One of the features of rhetorical studies is a consistent placement in time: we can only examine discourse as it comes into being and goes forth into the world. If we are so lucky as to be part of rhetorical processes that yield interesting artifacts for study or processes that can be mined for specific research, most of the time, we collect naturally occurring artifacts that come our way for one reason or another. Even with a participant/observer like Marti Belluschi, who was on the scene as a decision maker for many of the artifacts examined in this study, as a researcher, I must rely on what exists in order to open a window on the past and to try to discover and reflect on the processes that exist behind every rhetorical artifact. In short, like all of us whose business is looking at artifacts, most of the time, we look back. And it is in looking back that we comb the artifacts and their contexts to glean insights that can, perhaps, influence future rhetorical processes. However, even as we turn our attention to the past, we must look at what is. We must not look away.

Over the time I've been engaged with this project, I have shared various artifacts with a wide range of people including members of my family who often served as my sounding board for ideas, friends and professional colleagues who generously read and commented on the work in progress, and people who asked how my work was progressing. In nearly all of these instances, I shared not only my own account of the project, but I also shared some of the artifacts that I found so striking. And, as time passed, I became aware that, no matter how widely the anti-drunk driving movement and all it represents is supported, the discourse
of the movement can be a hard thing to face. One of the visuals that I often showed people is a photocopy of the picture that accompanied the newspaper story about Marti’s crash. I was surprised at the vehemence of people’s response to that image. I noticed that, when confronted with stories of victims and survivors and images of crashes, people turned away. In some cases, people quickly turned a page to get past the image of Belluschi’s crash without comment. However, more often than not, that image sparked comments like, “I don’t want to see that,” or “Don’t show that again. I can’t handle it.” And it isn’t just the graphic image of crashed cars that cause people to recoil.

In some cases, students faint when Belluschi intones in presentations what to her is now like a grocery list. She “tells students how she almost drowned in her own blood, how paramedics used bobby pins from her hair to close the gushing blood vessels in her neck, how three people held her down at the hospital as they gave her a quick tracheotomy without anesthetic” (Zimmerman 2004). After one presentation that drew quite a lot of media coverage, a student remarked, “I didn’t expect [that fifteen boys would faint] at all because there were no visuals” in Belluschi’s talk (Vittachi 2004). One young man who fainted recalls, “She was talking about how she broke her femur, and she held up a pin that was supposed to go through her knee. That was the last thing I remember” (Zimmerman 2004).

Unlike the students who faint during presentations, we must remember. Those of us who are involved in rhetorical scholarship and the teaching of rhetoric must not forget. We must not look away. When we keep alive the Encomium of Helen, when we teach Silent Spring, when we bring complex social and political issues into the classroom, we are not looking away. Indeed, we sometimes stand at a crossroads and wonder which way to turn. I know teachers of young college students who no longer assign “The most important thing that has ever happened to me” essays because they can’t bear to read one more awkwardly told story about the students’ dear friends who died in a drunk driving car crash. We want to look away. But we must not. Instead, I suggest that we bring the discourse of the drunk driving prevention movement into the rhetoric classroom as a way to frame this issue that has touched all of us in some way.
Just as the student who faints will remember Belluschi and her message as he looks forward and learns how to be a citizen of the world working to improve society, we rhetoricians, too, who have looked unflinchingly at the hard texts, have much to teach our students. And I suggest that we can use the discourse of the anti-drunk driving movement to do just that.

Belluschi has learned much over the four decades since her crash, and she shares what she remembers and what she has learned that others might not have to experience the tragedy of drunk driving. She looks ahead and thinks about the future. As she says, she is working for the greater good and she approaches that work as a rhetorician might. Each time she speaks, whether she is standing at a podium in front of a school assembly, participating in a radio interview, addressing a civic club, or simply conversing with people who may know about her work, she deliberately fashions her message for each audience and for a particular purpose.

Belluschi is one of the many thousands of people whose lives have been forever changed by drinking drivers. However, instead of letting the past rest, she works tirelessly to persuade us that we should not look away, even when to do so might diminish the effects of a painful experience. As a skillful rhetorician, she helps us turn our attention from the difficulties of the past and helps us focus on the future, a future that Belluschi hopes will include fewer and fewer tragedies caused by drinking drivers.

Some have argued that this future will come to pass by legislating for prohibition, by addressing, as the State Farm project did, the behavior of those who drink. Belluschi’s future, though, hinges on a different rhetorical strategy. When she started this work, she considered her work to be a part of the anti-drunk driving movement. Now, though, she thinks of her work as drunk driving prevention. Her rhetorical project is not to persuade people not to drink but instead is to share her story as an example of what can happen when people do drink and then decide to drive. Her project is to keep the movement vital and to keep the issue in front of people who still have time to change how they behave in order to ameliorate the heartache, to reduce the ripple effect of sorrow and loss associated with driving drunk. We owe it to Belluschi and other anti-drunk driving stakeholders to bring the power of their rhetorical work into the public arena not only to provide public exposure to the
drunk driving prevention message but also to demonstrate its value as a field rich in rhetorical possibility.
Appendix A
Interview Questionnaire and Informed Consent Form

Date

Research Participant
Street Address
City, State

Dear Research Participant:

I would like you to participate in research toward my Ph.D. dissertation. The purpose of this letter is to inform you about my study in order to obtain your consent to participate in the study. In addition to the information in this letter, you will find a copy of the questionnaire that will guide our interview and two copies of the informed consent form are included at the end of this letter. Please keep this letter, the questionnaire, and your copy of the consent form for your records.

My research project is titled *Accident or Crash? The Rhetoric of the Anti-Drunk Driving Movement*. The goal of the study is to tease out and explore the strategies used by the anti-drunk driving movement to effect social change to two ends: first, to present some of the successful (and, possibly, some of the unsuccessful) strategies that the movement has used so that other individuals and groups can appropriate them for their use. The second aim of the study is to inform people about rhetorical strategies so that they can become more rhetorically savvy.

My preliminary research questions are:

1. Has the anti-drunk driving message changed over time?
   a. If so, how?
   b. How have the genres used changed?
2. Has the message changed in response to
   a. reductions in alcohol-related fatalities in certain demographic groups;
   b. feedback from different programs; or
   c. other now unknown factors?
3. Are there now or have there been rationale(s) for the rhetorical strategies that have been used to shape the message of the anti-drunk driving movement?
   a. If so, what are they and how have they been determined?

In addition to a review of relevant literature in rhetoric and professional communication, I will investigate these questions by conducting document-based interviews with people who are now or have been associated with the anti-drunk driving movement.

Data collection. I will obtain data by collecting and cataloging written materials related to the anti-drunk driving movement. After examining these materials, I will select specific texts to use as the basis for interview(s). The discussion of the texts will be guided by a questionnaire; a copy of this questionnaire is attached.
If, in the course of the interview, you choose to share other relevant texts, we will discuss them using the questionnaire as a guide.

The interview(s) will be audio- or videotaped for project records. I may transcribe some or all of the interview(s).

If you would like, I will include you when I circulate copies of chapters or other portions of my work to my committee for review.

**Time needed.** I anticipate that each interview will take no more than two hours. I may request follow-up meetings to confirm my findings.

**Location of the research activity.** I will conduct each interview at a mutually agreed upon location near each participant’s home or office.

**Risks and benefits.** This project involves no foreseeable risks or discomforts. No incentives or compensations are involved in participating in this study.

**Confidentiality.** On the enclosed informed consent form, you will be given the option of being a confidential participant. If you choose to have your personal information treated confidentially, I will ensure confidentiality by assigning a pseudonym and I will cloak related details in order to protect your identity when interpreting this research.

Any participant may choose to have the confidentiality of his or her information protected at any time during the study.

**Voluntary participation.** Participation in this research project is voluntary. You are free to withdraw your consent or to change confidentiality status at any time without prejudice.

**Additional information.** Many people active in public safety are eager for more information about effective persuasive strategies and I will willingly share my findings with any participant. I will provide additional information about the project at any time; if you have any questions, please ask!

If you need more information or have questions about the procedures in this research project, feel free to contact my major professor, Assistant Dean of the Graduate College Donna S. Kienzler, Ph.D. Her telephone number is 515.294.4533. Her address is 20 Pearson Hall, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011.

**Giving consent.** This letter is yours to keep. If you are willing to participate in this study, please read, sign, and return the informed consent form on the next page. The copy of the consent form is yours to keep. I realize that this study would not be possible without the gifts of your time and expertise, for which I am exceedingly grateful. Thank you for your help.

Cordially,

Christianna White

encl.
Informed Consent Form (Researcher Copy)

Your signature indicates that this research study has been explained to you, that your questions have been answered, and that you agree to take part in this study. The researcher, Christianna White, will keep this copy of this form in her files for five (5) years past the end of the project.

I, ____________________________, prefer to have my contributions to this research project carry my name when this research is published and/or presented in professional settings. I understand that my organizational affiliation(s) will also be referred to without masking details (such as the name, location, etc. of the organization). Whenever possible the researcher will secure permission from the organization(s) to use pertinent details except where the information about the organization(s) is already in the public domain.

I, ____________________________, prefer to be a confidential participant in this project. I understand that my contributions to this research project will be protected by a pseudonym when this research is published and/or presented in professional settings. I further understand that details about my organizational affiliation(s) details (such as the name, location, etc. of the organization) will be appropriately masked with pseudonyms and general information.

Participant’s Name (Printed)

______________________________

Signature of Participant Date

Address City State zip phone number

I have explained this consent agreement to the participant, discussed the research project, and have answered any questions to the best of my ability.

______________________________

Signature of Researcher Date
Informed Consent Form (Participant Copy)

Your signature indicates that this research study has been explained to you, that your questions have been answered, and that you agree to take part in this study. This is your copy of the consent form.

I, ____________________________, prefer to have my contributions to this research project carry my real name when this research is published and/or presented in professional settings. I understand that my organizational affiliation(s) will also be referred to without masking details (such as the name, location, etc. of the organization). Whenever possible the researcher will secure permission from the organization(s) to use pertinent details except where the information about the organization(s) is already in the public domain.

I, ____________________________, prefer to be a confidential participant in this project. I understand that my contributions to this research project will be protected by a pseudonym when this research is published and/or presented in professional settings. I further understand that details about my organizational affiliation(s) details (such as the name, location, etc. of the organization) will be appropriately masked with pseudonyms and general information.

Participant’s Name (Printed)

Signature of Participant Date

Address City State zip phone number

I have explained this consent agreement to the participant, discussed the research project, and have answered any questions to the best of my ability.

Signature of Researcher Date
Appendix B
Full Texts and 100% Scale Representations of Selected Artifacts

List of Items in Appendix B

1. *Visual Detection of DWI Motorists.* Full-scale outside panel and sample page spread (laminated card included in figure 3, page 41).

2. *Facts About Illinois Drunk Driving Laws.* Full-scale outside and inside panels of the brochure (figure 5, page 84).

3. *DUI Fact Book.* Full-scale cover, “A Message from Jesse White, Secretary of State,” and a sample page spread (not to scale) (figure 6, page 85).


5. *Saturation Patrols Targeting Impaired Driving: Guidelines for Community-Based Alcohol Enforcement Programs.* Booklet cover (not to scale; discussed on page 102).


8. *Drunk Driving is a Costly Killer, Reports Erie Insurance: April is Alcohol Awareness Month.* Photocopy of the full text of the press release (discussed on pages 143–145).
The Visual Detection of DWI Motorists

Strictly Enforced

Please Drive Safely
PROBLEMS IN MAINTAINING PROPER LANE POSITION

Maintaining proper lane position can be a difficult task for an impaired driver. For example, we have all seen vehicles weaving before. Weaving is when the vehicle alternately moves toward one side of the lane and then the other. The pattern of lateral movement can be fairly regular, as one steering correction is closely followed by another. In extreme cases, the vehicle's wheels even cross the lane lines before a correction is made. You might even observe a vehicle straddling a center or lane line. That is, the vehicle is moving straight ahead with either the right or left tires on the wrong side of the lane line or markers.

Drifting is when a vehicle is moving in a generally straight line, but at a slight angle to the lane. The driver might correct his or her course as the vehicle approaches a lane line or other boundary, or fail to correct until after a boundary has been crossed. In extreme cases, the driver fails to correct in time to avoid a collision.

Course corrections can be gradual or abrupt. For example, you might observe a vehicle to swerve, making an abrupt turn away from a generally straight course, when a driver realizes that he or she has drifted out of proper lane position, or to avoid a previously-unnoticed hazard.

Weaving

Drifting

Swerving
WHAT IS DUI?

- It is defined as Driving Under the Influence and refers to impairment resulting from alcohol and/or other drugs. The most common DUI offense is drunk driving, which is operating a vehicle with a blood alcohol content of .08 or greater. A DUI arrest may also occur at lower BAC levels with other competent evidence.
- A DUI offense may also include being under the influence of any medication, inhalant or substance, legal or illegal, that renders an individual impaired.
- Impairment slows reflexes, distorts coordination, blurs vision, and can cause drowsiness or unconsciousness. When driving, these conditions threaten safety and lives.

THERE IS NO TYPICAL DUI OFFENDER.

- They come from all walks of life and income levels. They are also from all age groups. However, nationally, 21-34-year-olds are responsible for more alcohol-related crash fatalities than any other age group.

DUI IS MUCH MORE THAN JUST A TICKET.

- You face criminal charges. You’ll need money, and lots of it, for bail, bond, attorney fees, fines, court-ordered assessments, and remedial education or treatment programs.
- You’ll lose your driver’s license and possibly your job. And watch your insurance premiums increase, if you’re lucky enough not to be canceled.
- A DUI offense is costly, embarrassing and never erased from your driving record.
- By far the worst DUI consequence is that you could be responsible for the serious injury or death of another person or yourself.
- So if you choose to drink, don’t risk getting a DUI arrest or causing a crash. Use a designated driver or call a cab. Remember, drinking and driving don’t mix.

A safety belt is your best defense against a drunk driver.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:

If you are interested in an educational presentation on traffic safety laws, please contact this office at:
2201 S. Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, IL 62723 • (217) 785-0440
OR
100 W. Randolph, 5th Floor, Chicago, IL 60601 • (312) 814-2262

Jesse White
Secretary of State

www.cyberdrivellinois.com

JESSE WHITE • SECRETARY OF STATE
### Statutory Summary Suspension Penalties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loss of Driving Privileges</th>
<th>Driving Permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failing Chemical Testing, first offense</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusing to Submit to Chemical Testing, first offense</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing Chemical Testing, second or subsequent offense</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusing to Submit to Chemical Testing, second or subsequent offense</td>
<td>36 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IN ADDITION TO AN AUTOMATIC DRIVER'S LICENSE SUSPENSION, A DUI OFFENDER MUST ALSO APPEAR IN COURT TO FACE CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AND THE FOLLOWING PENALTIES UPON CONVICTION:**

### DUI Penalties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conviction</th>
<th>Loss of Driving Privileges</th>
<th>Jail</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Community Service</th>
<th>Driving Permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DUI, first (Class A Misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Minimum 1 year</td>
<td>Possible imprisonment for up to 1 year</td>
<td>up to $2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eligible to apply for a Restricted Driving Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI, second within 20 years (Class A Misdemeanor)</td>
<td>Minimum 5 years</td>
<td>Possible imprisonment for up to 3 years; mandatory 2 days (or 10 days community service) for second conviction in 5 years</td>
<td>up to $2,500</td>
<td>10 days community service (or two days in jail) for second conviction in 5 years</td>
<td>Eligible to apply for a Restricted Driving Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI, third (Class 4 Felony)</td>
<td>Minimum 10 years</td>
<td>Possible imprisonment for 1-3 years</td>
<td>up to $25,000</td>
<td>If given probation, possible 30 days community service or 48 hours jail</td>
<td>Eligible to apply for a Restricted Driving Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI, fourth or subsequent (Class 4 Felony)</td>
<td>For life</td>
<td>Possible imprisonment for 1-3 years</td>
<td>up to $25,000</td>
<td>If given probation, possible 30 days community service or 48 hours jail</td>
<td>Not eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drivers under age 21 are subject to zero tolerance and graduated driver licensing laws, as well as more severe penalties for DUI.
Jesse White
SECRETARY OF STATE
Each year, the Secretary of State’s office publishes the *DUI Fact Book* containing facts, statistics and information about Illinois’ efforts to combat drunk driving.

In July 1997, the illegal blood-alcohol content (BAC) for Illinois drivers was lowered from .10 to .08. Even with the lower BAC level in 1999, 43.8 percent of all traffic crashes were alcohol-related, resulting in the deaths of 637 individuals on our streets and highways.

Efforts to eliminate drunk driving must continue through educational awareness campaigns, tougher penalties and treatment programs for those convicted of this offense. During the year 2000, a new program became effective that allows prosecutors and judicial officials access to an offender's complete driving record for court proceedings. Additionally, legislation was passed that makes the pilot program for the Breath Alcohol Ignition Interlock Device (BAID) a permanent fixture in the state’s efforts to stop the most severe drivers from continuing to drive drunk on Illinois highways.

Driving Under the Influence claims innocent victims every day. We must all work together to educate and eliminate this continuing problem in Illinois.

Sincerely,

JESSE WHITE
Secretary of State
Driving Under the Influence

Driving Under the Influence is defined as operating a motor vehicle while impaired by alcohol, other drugs or intoxicating compounds. In Illinois, a driver is legally considered to be under the influence if he/she has a blood alcohol content (BAC) of .08 percent or greater, has used any illegal substance, or is impaired by medication. A driver's BAC is based on the ratio of alcohol to blood or breath. However, an individual's blood alcohol levels between .05 and .08 percent may be convicted at 104 if additional evidence determines that the driver was impaired.

When the Illinois General Assembly passed legislation in 1907 to lower the illegal BAC limit to .08 percent from .10 percent, Illinois became the 15th state to impose such a change.

The effect of alcohol on an individual is determined primarily by two factors: the amount of alcohol consumed and the rate at which it is absorbed by the body. Other contributing factors include gender, body weight, alcohol tolerance, mood, environment and the amount of food consumed.

From the first drink, alcohol affects coordination and judgment. Even with a BAC well below .08 percent, a person's reaction time slows. The risk of being in a crash begins to increase between a BAC of .04 and .05 percent and increases rapidly thereafter. By the time a driver reaches a BAC of .06 percent, he/she is twice as likely to be involved in a fatal crash as a non-drinking driver. By the time a driver reaches a BAC of .08 percent, he/she is 11 times more likely to be killed in a single-vehicle crash than a non-drinking driver.

The only way to rid the body of alcohol is time. Fresh air, coffee, showers and food cannot help a person sober up. It takes about one hour for the body to metabolize one drink. Each of the following has a comparable amount of alcohol and counts as one drink: one 12-ounce mug of beer, one 5-ounce glass of wine or one 1.5-ounce shot of hard liquor.
There is a major inconsistency in the position of our government. If a person is caught with an ounce of marijuana, he is arrested, prosecuted and incarcerated. On the other hand, our government allows $2 billion annually worth of promotions and advertising so that the liquor industry can sell some $92 billion per year of the drug known as ALCOHOL. Does it make sense for our government to allow the promotion of one drug which costs society 100,000 deaths and $100 billion each year; while the same government spends billions to stop the distribution of other drugs?
GUIDELINES FOR COMMUNITY-BASED ALCOHOL ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS
ABOUT the only degree of uniformity in these 48 states on the subject generally handled, "The Drinking Driver" is that it is "agin' the law" everywhere in the United States to drive a motor vehicle while under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

And even on this point it is difficult to compare the kinds of law and sometimes justice that the common, garden-variety of "drinking driver" will encounter. For one thing, we have to define this business of operating a vehicle when in one's cups. We must necessarily concern ourselves only with the individual who brushes with the law and who is suspected of being under the influence while operating a motor vehicle. We aren't concerned if the person in question is loaded to the gills, at that spurious stage of being "aglow," hanging on to the lamp post to keep from flying off into space, or at any stage between.

In terms of dollars and sense, let's assume that Fred V. Wehrman weaves down the highway in either Indiana, Nebraska or Minnesota, is collared by state police officers and gets off with a minimum fine. In any of these three states Fred could possibly get off with a fine as low as $10 to get out of the pokey. In Iowa, Mr. Wehrman would have to lay still back on the line to pay his minimum fine and in other sections of the country, the minimum fine would range between these extremes.

Obviously, it is much more expensive to get plastered in the State of Iowa, even at minimum rates and what's more, you lose your hair. Nebraska has the lowest maximum fine for drunken driving. $50 in Iowa the same situation would call for $1,000, which is also the maximum fine in 11 other states.

All other states surveyed have maximum fines ranging from $100 up to $1000.

But the variations in money fines are merely symptomatic of the general confusion which exists on all levels of legislation and jurisprudence in dealing with this most serious subject. Fortunately, our study did not concern itself with the interpretation of statutes by the courts, or we might still be counting our fingers.

The practices of the 48 states in revoking and/or suspending a convicted drunken driver's license are equally sorry. The practices range from a potential pat on the wrist in Colorado, Ohio or Oregon to a 3-year stretch on your shoe leather in Maine. And, as the survey shows there are tremendous differences in practice in the states which range between these extremes.
As it is, a citizen in his cups is liable to run into all sorts of penalties for his condition, depending on the state he finds himself in—geographically speaking. Throughout the land, everyone seems to have his own idea of what constitutes a proper penalty for overindulgence when driving. And, if there is one sphere in which Americans are not equal under the law, it is in that—never-never land of the drinking driver.

The cure, obviously, is the adoption by all states of a uniform law, prescribing adequate safeguards to protect the innocent and satisfactory penalties to act as a deterrent to the transgressor. Such a solution is possible through adoption of Act V of the Uniform Vehicle Code. This is no mere opinion of the author. It has been urged by the President's Highways Safety Conference, implemented by the Governors' Conference recommendations of the Council of State Governments, and is a vital part of the Action Program which has been proposed by America's top leaders in the field of traffic control and accident prevention.

Take what happens to Arduous Lee Gauntaport, Florida, partaking of the potcheen one night in May. Arduous lost his weekend at a Friday evening, ditched his gas buggy, was jugged, mugged, processed, and judged to be guilty of "driving under the influence."

To add insult to injury as far as Citizen Gauntaport was concerned, they took away his license to drive, and he found himself a full-time pedestrian Saturday night's neon procession. Saturday night's neon provision to the effect that impaired or drunk drivers have a right to treat of legal complications in an atomic age.

Let's examine the condition of the individual charged with driving while drinking. Most states use the term "under the influence of intoxicating liquor". Alabama uses the term "intoxicated," and Missouri and New York use the words, "intoxicated condition." Florida's law is the most interesting provision to the effect that impairment of ability must be shown.

Twelve states—Arizona, Indiana, Maine, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin define sobriety and inebriety so far as the operation of a motor vehicle is concerned in terms of the percentage of alcohol in the defendant's blood.

These 12 states follow the Uniform Code quite closely in that presumptions are set up as follows: A person who has 1 part of alcohol per 2,000 parts of blood, or less, is not "under the influence" so far as the operation of a motor vehicle is concerned. This ratio is expressed as 0.05 per cent by weight. If the suspect has 3 parts of alcohol in 2,000 parts of blood (0.15 per cent), or more, he is under the influence of intoxicating liquor so far as the operation of a vehicle is concerned. This is probably still something that stage of intoxication at which a person would be charged with public intoxication, but the individual will have lost that keenness that is necessary for safe operation of a car.

Maine sets the lower limit at 0.07 per cent. The in-between stage, between 0.05 per cent and 0.15 per cent, doesn't give rise to any presumption that the person was or was not under the influence, but it is admissible, and when accompanied by other evidence of symptoms of intoxication, can provide the clincher that the defendant had had more than the proverbial two beers. Two shots of 100 proof whiskey would give the average person a maximum reading of 0.03 per cent.

Several Supreme Courts have described the condition at which a person is "under the influence" as any impairment of ability or loss of that clearness of intellect and judgment necessary to operate a motor vehicle safely. This one point should be clear—a person who drives after drinking is dangerous long before he arrives at the stage commonly described as drunk.

While driving with a buzz on from drinking liquor is dangerous, another practice in the same category and usually treated in the same paragraph of law is the matter of driving while under the influence of drugs. Unless...
Drunk Driving’s "Agin' the Law

From Page 15

Local definition of an 'habitual user' includes the person who is at the instant in question under the influence of a narcotic drug. It is permissible for such a person to drive a car in Alabama and Oklahoma. Their laws make the operation of motor vehicles by habitual users an offense, but do not include the person who is under the influence of a narcotic drug, but not necessarily an habitual user.

In Massachusetts and New York, there are no provisions of law to deal with this offense as such. Arizona, Michigan. North Carolina, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin follow the provisions of the Uniform Vehicle Code and provide that the habitual user of narcotics, drugs and the person under the influence of any drug, narcotic or otherwise, shall be punished.

Another group of 8 states prohibit habitual users and persons under the influence of narcotic drugs to drive cars, with nothing being said about drugs other than narcotics. They are Colorado, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Oregon, and South Carolina. In 11 states it is against the law to drive while under the influence of any drug, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Florida, Maine, Missouri, Georgia, Montana, Nebraska, Texas, and Vermont make up this group.

In Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Ohio, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia, it is unlawful to operate a motor vehicle while under the influence of narcotic drugs, but no provision could be found to deal with the habitual use of narcotics nor the person under the influence of drugs other than narcotics.

California has statutes which catch all three varieties, the habitual user of narcotic drugs, the person who is under the influence of narcotic drugs, and the person who is under the influence of drugs other than narcotics.

In passing, one case has been reported where the defendant claimed that his apparent intoxication was caused by having taken cold tablets of the antihistamine type. He was freed of the charge of driving while under the influence of intoxicating liquor but the fact remains that his driving and apparent lack of coordination, etc., caused experienced police officers to consider him a 'drunken driver'.

In general, the penalties for driving while under the influence of narcotic drugs are the same as for driving while under the influence of intoxicating liquor. California is an outstanding exception in that the habitual user and person under the influence of narcotic drugs who gets caught driving is considered a felon and may be imprisoned from 90 days to 5 years and/or fined as much as $5,000.

In Colorado, if another person is injured in an accident resulting from driving while under the influence of narcotics, the defendant, on conviction, draws from 1 to 5 years. If death results, the term of imprisonment ranges between 1 and 14 years. In addition to fines, jail terms, driver license revocation or suspension and the other costs to be heaped on the head of the person who has been convicted or driving while under the influence of intoxicating liquor, some states put a permanent brand on the person who repeats this offense. That is with respect to the classification of the crime as a misdemeanor or as a felony.

For example, in most jurisdictions, the testimony of a felon can be imputed, and there are a lot of other objectionable features. Getting a bond for an office of trust becomes much more difficult, if not impossible. Should an alien who is in the process of getting his citizenship papers be convicted of a felony, he could plead on another one-way boat ride, because our authorities are rather narrow-minded about the duties of a citizen. Upholding the Constitution and violating the laws are not compatible.

To get into the matter of which states and under what circumstances this mobile mixture of gasoline and alcohol becomes a felony, there is only one set of penalties in Missouri and they can call for a sentence of as much as 5 years in Jefferson City, therefore the first offense could be either a misdemeanor or a felony. In Maine, the expression 'high or aggravated' describes the circumstances under which the offense becomes a felony. In West Virginia, the third offense is a felony. The second offense becomes a felony by statute in Delaware, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, New York, and Texas. In California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Nebraska, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington, the offense of driving and drinking

is classified as a felony when bodily injury or death of another person results.

In the following states, the offense of operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of intoxicating liquor is never considered a felony, as such. For example, a manslaughter charge might grow out of a person being under the influence and causing a wreck in which someone was killed, but the death itself, rather than the condition of the person who caused it would be the primary consideration.

These states are:

Arizona
Kentucky
Florida
George
Dist. of Col.
Maryland
Massachusetts
Minnesota
Michigan
Montana
Wisconsin
Utah

In terms of dollars, as we have stated heretofore, the survey made no sense in either money fines or jail sentences. Ten states and the District of Columbia specify no minimum fine for this offense, but merely place a top penalty ranging from $100 to $1,000. They are Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Wisconsin.

Indiana, Minnesota and Nebraska assess a minimum fine of $10. Colorado and Florida call for $25, and Massachusetts sets $35 as the minimum money fine for the first offense. Iowa again has a $300 minimum. New Jersey is second most expensive with a minimum fine of $200.

The median figure for all jurisdictions surveyed is $50. And nine states—California, Montana, Michigan, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont, Washington and West Virginia set this figure as the minimum fine for a first offense. Thirteen states have adopted the minimum fine set out in Section 4 of Act V of the Uniform Vehicle Code, which is $100.

North Dakota has the lowest maximum fine for a first offense—$50. The others—ranging from $100 to $1,000 are:

$100
Connecticut
Indiana
Michigan
Minnesota
Missouri
New York
North Dakota
South Carolina
Utah
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Que-Wa Streets. Published by Highway Research Board, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington 25, D. C., 1950, 53 p. Price 64c. (Bulletin No. 42.)


They're Going to Drive. A Progress to Safe Driving. Published by The Department of Public Instruction, Lansing, Michigan, 1941, 63 p.
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NEW PUBLICATIONS in the field of Public Safety


Magazine Articles


Off-Street Parking in Lending in Miami. By Earl J. Reeder (in Traffic Quarterly, January, 1951, p. 49)


Attitude—Key to Accidents. By Donald S. Buck (in Commercial Car Journal, January, 1951, p. 51)


For the purpose of this study, the terms "suspension" and "revocation" are considered synonymous, because the effect of either kind of action on the violator. Since the amount of time for which he is barred from driving, regardless of nomenclature, is the important factor, an attempt has been made to arrive at a usable breakdown.

Minimum periods of driver license suspension or revocation vary almost as broadly as do the fines and jail sentences. The laws of 16 states require that the person so convicted must not drive for a period of 1 year from the date of conviction. They are:

Connecticut
Delaware
Indiana
Massachusetts
Missouri
Mississippi
Montana
Nebraska
New Hampshire
New Jersey
North Carolina
Ohio
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
South Dakota
Utah
Virginia
Washington
Wisconsin

In Maine, the driver's license is revoked for 3 years, but it may be reinstated after 2 years. In Kentucky, New York, South Carolina, Texas, West Virginia and the District of Columbia, the license is revoked for "at least 6 months." In California, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, and Wisconsin, the minimum period of revocation is 90 days. In Iowa and Georgia, licenses are revoked for at least 60 days, and 40 days is the minimum in Illinois and Florida.

In Ohio, the revocation can be permanent, it can last for 3 years in Colorado, and so much as a year in Oregon. In Minnesota, the license is suspended upon the recommendation of the court. No minimum period is provided by law in the last 4 states.

Obviously, these hundreds of varying penalties for the one offense make for much law and little justice. What's worse, they fail to arrive at the effective deterrent so vital to control the lawless.

An aroused public opinion is always the hope of those who seek reform, but in this case, what is needed is education at the top level—with legislators, state and municipal officials, governors and other leaders in our legislative halls backed by an alert and intelligent bench and bar and effective police agencies. They can then feel secure in the knowledge that the answer lies in the adoption of Act V of the Uniform Vehicle Code—a way out of one legal briar patch that will have as its destination—justice to all, so that all Americans can be equal under the law.
Dramatic results from a new program of rehabilitation may revolutionize our approach to the menace of drivers who drink.

How Phoenix Gets Drunks Off the Road

Condensed from CHRISTIAN HERALD
EDWIN McDOWELL

O
n the morning of December 24, 1965, in Phoenix, Ariz., a young man driving a pickup sped through two red lights at 80 miles an hour. Seconds later, he crossed a center line and smashed head-on into a 1966 Pontiac from Idaho. In the car were a father and mother and two teen-age children. The parents died almost instantly. The two children hurtled from the car and lay critically injured in a gruesome tangle of blood, metal and oil, their bodies twisted and broken, their faces mutilated. The man in the pickup, drunk, was so entrapped in the wreckage that it took rescuers with a blowtorch 35 minutes to cut him out. But that hardly mattered; he had died in the shattering impact. The accident would have been just another grim statistic but for one witness. Ernest I. Stewart, associate dean of liberal arts and professor of health education at Arizona State University, was driving close behind the Idaho car and saw it all. For 30 years, Professor Stewart had studied and taught the perils of mixing alcohol and gasoline. He was acutely aware that traditional methods of punishing drinking drivers—stiff fines, jail sentences, license revocation, insurance cancellation—did little or nothing to rehabilitate those drivers. And on that fateful morning—"when the reality and horror just reached out and grabbed me"—he knew that he himself must do something about it. What he did is changing the approach of a growing number of communities toward...
the most deadly menace on America's highways.

Several days after the tragedy, Stewart talked with Eugene K. Mangum, chief city magistrate of Phoenix, who had been interested in trying to educate drunken drivers. They set up a meeting of Phoenix police and public-health officials, traffic-safety researchers and university officials. The group understood that ours is a society that drinks; an estimated 75 percent of all U.S. drivers drink, and most of them drive occasionally after drinking. An insurance company estimates that one out of every 50 drivers on the highway has been drinking. Could such people, they asked, be made more socially responsible?

For several months, Stewart and aides gathered every scrap of information about many of the 3000 persons then being arrested in Phoenix each year for "driving while intoxicated" (DWI). They interviewed them, individually and in small groups, in city "drunk tanks" immediately after arrest and in police stations after arraignment. They analyzed data and collated it with studies of DWIs in other cities.

They found that the majority of violators were employed males between ages 20 and 50 who owned their own cars, had no previous arrests in Phoenix and were not involved in an accident at the time of their DWI arrest. One half to two thirds of them were not problem drinkers, and few realized how serious their offense was, beyond the fact that it jeopardized their drivers' licenses. Most appeared to be responsible citizens who would want to change their behavior once they understood the gravity of their offense.

The group next launched the "Phoenix Alcohol Research and Re-Education Project," a 10-hour series of courses held on four consecutive Wednesday nights in a Phoenix courtroom. No city ordinance required DWIs to attend. Those of low motivation, and those convicted of manslaughter, were not even given the opportunity. Others faced a choice: loss of driving license for 90 days, plus a $165 fine, or 10 hours in class, plus the fine.

Offenders paid $10 for the course. Some were hostile or indifferent during registration; they joked about getting caught, or whined that they had better things to do. Yet in the end most responded. In the 5 1/2 years since the initial session, more than 6000 have taken the course; studies show that their rate of reconviction for drunk driving is significantly better than normal.

Until last fall, Stewart personally conducted each class session. Now several trained teachers have been hired to cope with the expanding program. The first class begins with a vivid account of that 1965 tragedy. "If you drink, that's your problem," the instructor tells the students. "But if you drink and drive, then that's
our problem. I don't want to meet you drunk on the street some Christmas Eve. I don't want you to litter the street with my body." With charts and training aids, he drives home the facts: More than 150 Americans killed in auto accidents each day. Another 9560 injured—ten times the daily number harmed by riots, beatings and other forms of violence. Alcohol, which was directly involved in about 18 percent of all fatalities 25 years ago, is now involved in more than 50 percent.

Films and charts are used to explain the effects of alcohol. One film shows how four shots of whiskey or four bottles of beer can so impair the attitude, judgment and skills of the average adult male driver that on a routine obstacle course he knocks down barriers and crosses center stripes. A delay of just two fifths of a second in hitting the brakes at 30 m.p.h. will cause a car to travel through a crosswalk instead of stopping to miss a darting child. The most horrifying film is one whereby viewers—via cameras placed in cars of the Ohio State Patrol—are first on the scene at a number of gruesome accidents involving drunken drivers. For 28 minutes, students are subjected to color movies of mangled and bleeding bodies, adults burnt beyond recognition, youngsters crushed behind the wheel.

After the first session, students write a chronological report of what they did during the 12 hours before their arrest—where they went, what they drank, why they were drinking, and details of the arrest itself. "After work Friday I was tired and bored, so I decided to go out and have a few beers," wrote a 23-year-old clerk who had experienced blackouts behind the wheel, and had been fired from a job for showing up hung-over and for absenteeism. "I wound up at a dance. When the dance was over, I decided to ride around for a while. I didn't realize how fast I was going until I saw the red lights of the patrol car behind me." He was doing 70 in a 35-m.p.h. zone.

These reports force students to give more thought to their arrests than most otherwise do. And they enable Stewart and his staff to analyze behavioral patterns—most of which are strikingly similar—in free-wheeling discussions that bring to the students a measure of self-understanding. The students also take the Johns Hopkins University Hospital test and the National Council on Alcoholism test, both designed to reveal actual or potential drinking problems. The instructor explains the various resources—Alcoholics Anonymous, psychological counseling, mental-health clinics, rehabilitation agencies—available to problem drinkers. He introduces assistants, who usually are working for doctoral degrees in counseling, and he implores students who think they may need additional help to contact one of them. Many do.

At the final session, students are asked to write what they intend to do to avoid repeating their offenses.
Some are still unrepentant. But most recognize the seriousness of drinking and driving. Much of their original hostility is gone. Some of the students who were uncooperative during registration apologize to Stewart.

The course is no cure-all. It is simply one approach to a serious social problem. But it has been so effective that 30 U.S. and Canadian cities have adopted it. The AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety has produced and sent to 800 affiliate offices a 27-minute film describing its highlights and, last year, the co-founder of the program, Judge Mangum, received the American Bar Association's annual award for traffic-court jurists. It is, says Columbia University's Dr. James Malfetti, widely recognized authority on drinking and driving, "the best program of handling drunk drivers in the United States."

In the offensive against drunk driving, many cities, counties and even entire states (Idaho, South Dakota, Vermont and Delaware) have launched Alcohol Safety Action Projects (ASAP), which are sponsored by the National Highway Safety Administration. General emphasis is on better law enforcement and intensive public education, and communities are encouraged to develop their own alcohol countermeasures. Some noteworthy examples:

* In Portland, Ore., under medical supervision, many problem drinkers convicted of drunk driving are required to take a daily dose of Antabuse, a drug that makes a person violently ill if he has even one drink.
* In Charlotte, N.C., liquor stores pass out free breath-testing kits so that customers can determine their own blood-alcohol level after drinking.
* In Albuquerque, N.M., cabs and police cars are available to drive drunks home from taverns and parties. Similarly, in Nassau County, New York, a round-the-clock telephone hot line has been set up so that a drunk can call for transportation home.

For information about ASAP write the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C. 20590

Skeptics may continue to doubt that rehabilitation-reaching people by appealing to their heightened sense of responsibility-can work. But in Phoenix it is working. And it promises to revolutionize our approach to the menacing motorists who mix drinking with driving.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Drunk Driving is a Costly Killer, Reports Erie Insurance
April is Alcohol Awareness Month

ERIE, Pa. --- April 9, 1999 --- Imagine reading the headline: "Two jetliners collide, killing 315 people. Cause of crash: pilot was drunk!" The tragic reality is 315 people are dying every week at the hands of drunk drivers on our nation's roads. Although it's not grabbing national headlines, thousands of people are being killed each year -- one person every 32 minutes -- and more than one million Americans are injured annually in alcohol-related crashes.

Although the number of deaths attributed to Driving Under the Influence (DUI) have fallen slightly in recent years, alcohol-related crashes cost billions of dollars and thousands of lives each year. It is a costly, yet all-too-common crime. And this crime -- along with the emotional, social and insurance costs that accompany it -- can be prevented.

"Drunk driving has plagued this country for so long that many people have become numb to the statistics," said Stephen A. Milne, President and Chief Executive Officer of Erie Insurance Group, one of the nation's largest auto insurers. "But this problem is not about numbers, it's about lives that are being devastated and destroyed. In light of April being designated national Alcohol Awareness month, we all need to take action in our personal lives to put an end to this catastrophic crime."

While it's impossible to put a value on the lives taken by drunk driving, DUI crashes have a measurable economic impact. In addition to fatalities, another 1,058,990 Americans were injured in alcohol-related crashes in 1997. That's an average of one person injured every 30 seconds. About 30,000 people a year will suffer permanent work-related disabilities from these crashes.

According to figures from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the economic cost of motor vehicle traffic crashes in 1994 totaled $150.469 billion in the U.S. This equates to a $2.817 billion cost to employers or $500 per employee. About 40 percent of these costs can be attributed to crashes involving alcohol.

Even when drunk drivers are not involved in accidents, those convicted of Driving Under the Influence will pay court costs, legal fees, increased insurance costs and a variety of related charges. For instance, the average cost of a DUI conviction -- including high-risk insurance, legal fees, court costs, income loss, rehabilitation and driver's license reinstatement -- is $9,750.

The Good News

We are making progress. In fact, 1997 marked the first time ever that the percentage of traffic deaths related to drunken driving fell below 40 percent in the United States. Since 1982, annual alcohol-related traffic deaths have been reduced 38 percent, saving more than 100,000 lives.

What Can You Do?

According to NHTSA, 97 percent of people who are of driving age consider drinking and driving by others a threat to themselves and their families. And their concern is justified since about three in every five Americans will be involved in an alcohol-related crash at some time in their lives.

There are steps you can take, however, to protect yourself and your loved ones.

1. **Buckle Up.** Your best defense against a drunk driver is to wear your safety belt and be sure children are secured in child safety seats.
2. **Adopt a zero tolerance attitude.** Never ride in a car with someone who has been drinking -- call a cab or find someone else to drive you home. Remember that impairment begins with just one drink.

3. **Avoid driving or be extra alert during high-risk times.** Every weekday night from 10 p.m. to 1 a.m., one in 13 drivers is drunk (BAC of .08 or more). Between 1 a.m. and 6 a.m. on weekend mornings, one in seven drivers is drunk.

4. **Report erratic driving to law enforcement.** If you witness a driver who appears to be drunk, report it to your local police department.

5. **Implement a "call me" policy with teenagers.** Instruct them to never get into a car with a driver who's been drinking, but instead to call you for a ride, "no questions asked."

6. **Be a responsible party host.** Serve food and offer non-alcoholic beverages. Never let your guests drive after drinking alcohol and never serve alcohol to someone under the age of 21.

"Police can increase enforcement, organizations can step up anti-drunk driving messages and friends can take the keys away. But the true responsibility for preventing drunk driving rests on the shoulders of individual drivers," Milne said. "Each and every motorist is responsible for his or her own actions. There is no excuse for driving drunk and taking a chance of killing yourself or someone else."

With more than 2.5 million policies in force, Erie Insurance Group is the 17th largest property/casualty insurance group and the 12th largest auto insurer in the United States. Erie Insurance Group includes seven companies operating in 10 states and the District of Columbia. Erie Indemnity Company (NASDAQ - ERIE) is the management company for Erie Insurance Group.
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